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ABSTRACT

The outcome of this research paper provides an emphasis on the role of trust as a trigger for the turnaround strategy that can influence employees' behaviour, and hence increase satisfaction levels within the organisation in challenging moments of unstable political environment. The aim of understanding trust in this context, is thus to reduce the incidents of business interruptions and eventually improve business performance. Dimensions of trust were categorised into affect-based and cognition-based trust. Furthermore, two influencing moderators; internal communication within the organisation and organisation commitment among employees; were introduced to explicitly identify the dynamics of the relationship between the dimensions of trust and job satisfaction.

The study was completed using a survey conducted in Egypt, during the critical period after the president was ousted and there was a take-over by the military, which caused massive turbulence to the business environment. Data was collected from four different firms operating in different industries.

The multiple regression model was able to identify the vital role of cognition-based trust as a dominant trigger for job satisfaction. Moreover, internal communication and organisational commitment were found to moderate the impact on the relationship between dimensions of trust and job satisfaction, and hence are able to stimulate improved job satisfaction, thus improve business performance.
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CHAPTER 1: DEFINITION OF PROBLEM AND PURPOSE

1.1 Introduction

Employee job satisfaction is a continuous concern for any organisation. A myriad of theories and research have been developed to tackle such matter. Firms have spent a great amount time and money in an attempt to continuously improve job satisfaction. Recently, firms realised that without investing appropriate attention to such topics, their potential future performance would be in great danger. Intensive research was done in areas like organisational structure, processes, strategy and performance management, with the aim of meeting organisational expectations. Organisational trust has always been a vital aspect in studying organisational behaviour, and concentrated analysis was carried out in the last 40 years that resulted in the identification and assessment of various relationships regarding the influence of these relationships on job performance. In this research a special focus has been directed towards the relationship between organisational trust and job satisfaction within certain moderating work-related conditions; such as internal communication and levels of commitment within the organisation. This relationship has been measured in a specific macro-environment condition, which extends the scope of the previous studies through the exposure of an unstable political environment caused by national turmoil.

1.2 Problem and Background

The infamous uprising that encapsulated more than half of the Arab world’s population in late 2010 and early 2011, starting with Tunisia, followed by Egypt, Libya, Yemen and finally Syria, has left the region unstable. Furthermore, some minor disturbances impacted countries like Morocco, Jordan, Kuwait and Bahrain. These uprisings stemmed from the accumulated discontent and rage of the people with each nation’s own long-lasting dictatorships; where elections were
continuously rigged, which then enforced brutal police states that, in turn, supported corruption on all levels and deteriorated economic conditions in some of the countries (Manfreda, 2013).

In the case of Egypt, middle class people were seeking better living conditions and human dignity; these were obvious demands from the protestors who marched in the streets, chanting “Bread, freedom and social justice” (EL-ERIAN, 2011). This research commences with an analysis of the Egyptian case study, where the workers’ behaviour within an unstable political environment was comprehensively deconstructed to understand the implications on the business environment. The political transition after the revolution has propagated uncertainty over the entire business domain, and forced institutions to reconsider their means of doing business (Abdelhafez, 2013). It has been almost two and half years since the revolution, and the country faces continuous escalation in government debt, depletion of foreign exchange reserves and a decrease in local and foreign investments (Economist Intelligence Unit, 2012).

The uprisings of 2011 were fabricated around social movements that accumulated throughout the previous decade, that were in turn based on the neoliberal project supported by the United States (Beinin, 2012). These uprisings were dissimilar to the US civil rights struggle, the second wave of feminism and the Polish Solidarity (Gross, 2011). The scene prior to the revolution was dominated by continuous slack in business legislations, in order to attract as much foreign direct investments (FDI) into the country, which had sometimes taken an irrational approach. Based on the central bank figures, FDI grew in Egypt from USD 435 million in fiscal year 2003/04 to USD 17.8 billion in just four years, and then fell slightly to USD 11 billion due to the economic recession. The remarkable growth that was experienced was accompanied by governmental reforms that exerted pressure on labour rights and corporate taxes, which then augmented domestic demand and attracted more investments (Egypt Country Monitor, 2012).

Moreover, a substantial wave of privatisation was launched in Egypt that resulted in the creation of a large informal sector, and dashing any sort of effective regulation
in the public domain (Beinin, 2012). As a result, public sector employees were heavily impacted by the loss of intrinsic benefits such as a job security, pension and health care, workers were compensated instead with little extrinsic benefits; social benefits were replaced by diminutive rewarding schemes such as once-off payments or menial salary increases that could not replace the loss experienced from the intrinsic benefits (Leat & El-Kot, 2009).

1.2.1 Political Environment

While moving forward on the road towards democracy, military had intervened to maintain political stability after ousting Mubarak’s regime, which had faced continuous challenges from protestors and workers strikes. Eventually the supreme council of the armed forces (SCAF) had to limit freedom levels in order to maintain control over the country, but the consequences were even worse and protests increased. Military found itself confined in its effectiveness because it did not have support from the media, which served to jeopardise its historical reputation among the Egyptian people. Furthermore, the military exploited most of its resources to run the country, which created a gap in the national security. Effectually, the military only had one option, which was to hand-over the country to a civil regime through a fairly democratic election, and narrow down the interim ruling period (Teti&Gervasio, 2012).

At the same time the Muslim Brotherhood (MB) gained more support and power within the country. While the MB was not involved in the protests that took place in the transition period, they busied themselves by preparing for the election by garnering as many votes as possible. The MB had been oppressed by various actors, at different levels that ranged from torture to exile (Leiken& Brooke, 2007). With the successful acquisition of voters, the MB decided to run for the presidential election and decided to nominate Mohamed Mursi as their representative. After a fairly democratic election and with a very small lead, Mursi was elected to lead a heavily divided society. Despite the claims in his campaigns to be an inclusive president for all Egyptians, he did not show any attempts of exhibiting an inclusive government, unlike the case of Nelson Mandela in South Africa (Sparks,2013).
During the year of Mursi’s tenure, Egyptians were aware of the changes happening to the country’s identity; moving from an open and diverse society to a mono-polar extremist, which was more of a religious project rather than a national progressive vision (Elmasry, 2013). Moreover, the economic situation continued to deteriorate, foreign reserves had fallen drastically; the president and the cabinet were replacing government positions with members of the MB and their followers. The same Egyptian youth who led the early revolution decided that they would not to wait an additional three years for the end of the tenure and watch the country slip away from democracy and freedom (Elmasry, 2013). Instead, people decided to march back to the streets and demanded early elections. Protest numbers increased as people showed their deep frustration. However, Mursi and his cabinet decided to ignore what was going on, similar to Mubarak’s reaction two years earlier (Elmasry, 2013). Eventually the military intervened to protect the people and avoid the clash between both sides, thereby creating an interim government which was established to guide the country through the bottleneck. However, the situation was still complicated because there were now two groups in disagreement, which has created a sense of urgency for the current or future leader to unite the people into a common sense of nationhood (Sparks, 2013).

1.2.2 Implications and Business Relevance

With the 2011 uprisings, all barriers that hindered free expression of rights were broken and the labour sector started to express their demands more freely. However, the space that was created due to this freedom was not anywhere close from being controlled and without any sort of boundaries (Beinin, 2012). Ultimately, it caused interruption of business progress and hence impacted the overall performance, which was reflected on all economic indicators in the country such as gross domestic product (GDP) growth, FDI, unemployment, inflation and tourism (NIELD, 2011).

Continuous disruptions in the labour market; due to the ongoing strikes; have caused a severe decline on the GDP growth that slumped down to reach two percent compared to the 5.1% recorded in 2009/10. FDI on the other side is
declining 40% year-on-year, in addition to the continuous increase of inflation that exerts even more pressure on ordinary citizens (NIELD, 2011). Obviously, due to the current performance of the economy, businesses had started a heavy wave of retrenchments in several industries causing a severe increase in the unemployment rate that has reached 14%, compared to nine percent back in 2009/10 (EGYPT: RISK SUMMARY, 2012). Finally, the tourism sector was not protected from the overall disharmony. It had had a massive knock due to the unstable country conditions, even though the sector had always been a significant contributor to the Egyptian economy with total earnings of USD 12 billion in 2009/10. Currently, it is estimated that the tourism industry has decreased to 80% of its initial value in 2009/10 (NIELD, 2011).

1.2.3 Motivation for the Research

In such blurred conditions, coupled with a lack of legislations and confusion in practices, people are left with their own instincts, in which emotional driven decisions are mostly dominant. In such moments, people tend to revert back to the basics; such as rebuilding the cohesiveness of the society and strengthening the invisible interlinks between the fellow citizens (Abdelbaki, 2013). Not ignoring the fact that the revolution has increased the sense of social responsibility among all the segments of society, and strengthened the level of patriotism within the country, which has created the driving gear for the growth of the economy, and enriched the social capital in the short and long terms (Abdelbaki, 2013).

By analysing the business dynamics throughout the tenure of the Mubarak’s regime, lack of trust was one of the major issues that hindered the progress of the economy. However, there were signs of positive intentions towards investment which stimulated the growth in the economy during that period, but it was always accompanied with uncertainties, investors were still cautious with policies instability, which justified the importance of trust as being one of the main pillars that can drive the progress of the economy (Mollering, Bachmann, & Lee, 2004). Abdelbaki (2013) suggested the need for a new theory to deal with the macro-economic situation during the unstable political environment. Most of the previous scholars
referred to trust when building a balanced employee-organisation relationship (Wood, & Mellahi, 2003; Dass, & Kumar, 2011; Costigan, Insinga, Berman, Ilter, Kranas, & Kuershov, 2006; Chan, 1997; O'Brien, 1995; Mollering, Bachmann, & Lee, 2004; Gould-Williams, 2003; Cunningham, & MacGregor, 2000) The aim for this research is to emphasize the role of trust as a trigger for the turnaround strategy that can, in turn, influence employees’ behaviour, and eventually increase satisfaction levels within the organisation in challenging moments of unstable political environment.

1.3 Research Objectives

The objective of the research is to study the influence of trust in re-establishing the satisfaction levels within an organisation in such turbulent environments; understanding organisational trust through its different dimensions (affect-based and cognition-based) can be a powerful tool in lifting up the levels of satisfaction during difficult times of social conflicts. Moreover, two supporting factors were introduced to the relationship in order to study their interactive influence on the dimensions of trust regarding employee job satisfaction. These factors are defined as the internal communication within the organisation and the perceptions of organisational commitment.

The turbulent environment in the model was induced from the unstable political environment caused by the revolution in Egypt, which is not measured in the research but provides the context within which the research was conducted.
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

The theory reviewed in this chapter of the research report was structured according to the flow of the model and framework used in the research. Firstly, various definitions of trust were explored, followed by establishing the framework for the dimensions of trust utilised in the research as well as explaining the reason behind using this specific framework for such an environment. Then the relationship between the dimensions of trust and the relevant organisational behaviour was analysed, and hence the study of the influence on employee job satisfaction could be conducted. Subsequently, the impact of the dimensions of trust was further explored in the turbulent environment, and an explanation of the variations that could impact the relationship strength was discussed. Finally, internal communication and organisational commitment were introduced to study the interactive impact of dimensions of trust regarding job satisfaction.

2.1 Dimensions of Trust

Trust has attracted many scholars over the past 20 years with a myriad of interests within the social science (Mollering, Bachmann, & Lee, 2004), in addition to the internal ability of trust to influence organisational behaviour. In complex and uncertain situations mutual adjustments and sustainable effective coordination are required and are only possible unless there is mutual confidence and trust (McAllister, 1995). Chan (1997) noted that the relationship between trust and effectiveness as indicated by Rotter (1967) is “One of the most salient factors in the effectiveness of our present complex social organization is the willingness of one or more individuals in a social unit to trust others. The efficiency, adjustment, and even survival of any social group depends upon the presence or absence of such trust” (p.228), at the same time Seligman (1997) emphasized the importance of trust as “the rising concern with trust is a response to the fact that in the current situation we are more dependent on trust (and less on familiarity) to supplement those interstitial points where system confidence is not sufficient; this is occurring at
the same time that these points become more numerous with the ever-increasing differentiation of roles” (p.160). Mollerig, Bachman and Lee (2004) argued that trust normally peaks when issues rise and become significantly problematic, specifically in disruptive environments. Finally, one of the most emphasised definitions of trust was stated by Dayan (2010) which “is the willingness of a subordinate to be vulnerable to the actions of his or her supervisor whose behaviour and actions he or she cannot control” (p.95).

Conversely, economists perceive trust as a sort of commodity or a viscous lubricant that reduces friction in workplace relations, smoothens productivity and minimises transaction costs. By the early nineties where globalisation peaked, organisations started to revalue trust as an asset within the firm (O’Brien, 1995). Trust can stimulate a creative environment and instil innovative behaviours due to the safe atmosphere within the organisation (Dayan, 2010). Firms utilised trust as a competitive advantage, which is difficult to imitate, especially if it is deeply integrated within the organisational culture.

Dimensions of trust are quite dynamic depending on the factors that influence the building blocks of the model of trust (Martins, 2002). Within the organisational context, different models of trust occurred either in intra-organisational environment among; co-workers; leaders and subordinates; employees and employers (Mollering, Bachmann, & Lee, 2004), or in an inter-organisational environment among partners, joint ventures, suppliers and customers (Orleow, 2009). Organisational trust is defined as the collective perception of employees towards the trustworthiness of their organisation. Several constructs have been studied and developed in order to be able to identify and measure the dimensions of trust (Li, Bai, & Xi, 2012).

Organisational trust has been explained through two main approaches. Firstly, the dyadic model encapsulates the antecedents of interpersonal trust and explores these in a dyad-level manner, between the supervisor and subordinates in a direct relationship (Li, et al., 2012). Such dyadic nature, specifically in the high levels of trust; motivates reciprocity (Chan, 1997), increases predictability of the other party
and hence increases the willingness to take risk in the relationship (Mayer, Davis, & Schoorman, 1995).

Secondly, a more comprehensive approach was developed to emphasize further the institutional sources of organisational trust which are the institutional rule, norm and role. Three contextual antecedents were identified and shaped the second model that was called transformation leadership (TFL), which was derived from these sources: (1) organisational structure shapes the institutional rule which defines workflow and processes; (2) organisational culture shapes the institutional norm, where the values that influence employee’s behaviour are expressed; and (3) organisational leadership that shapes the institutional roles that are mainly driven by top management teams (TMT) where the strategy and direction for the employees to follow are set (Li, et al., 2012).

These two approaches target different levels within the organisation. The dyadic model can be demonstrated by the leader-member exchange theory (LMX) which is more of an explicit relationship that resides in the lower levels of the organisation. The TFL model is based on a collective vision and identity, that implicitly position trust within the leadership domain, and resides on the higher levels of organisation (Li, et al., 2012).

Martins (2002) identified five different levers of trust, namely openness, honesty, fairness, intentions and beliefs, which were perceived to be fairly vague and missing tangible measurements. Dayan (2010) defined specific antecedents of trust from behavioural, communication and concerns perspectives; analysing the consistency and integrity of the behaviour, transcending the quality of information communicated and finally the demonstrations of concerns in the organisational environment.

The most used and cited approach of identifying and measuring trust is defined by McAllister (1995), who proceeded to divide trust into two different dimensions; cognition-based and affect-based, which clarified the measurement thresholds and simplified the direction of questionnaire, which has been utilised and further developed by many scholars (Dirks, & Ferrin, 2001; Costigan, et al., 2006; Chan,
1997; O'Brien, 1995; Mollering, et al., 2004; Gould-Williams, 2003; Cunningham, & MacGregor, 2000).

Trust can emerge from either an affective experience showing care and concern, or from a track record in dealing with other parties, based on competency and reliability (Chua, Morris, & Ingram, 2008). Means of exploring dimensions of trust have varied, based on cultural norms and characteristics. Research that took place in China explained the stronger influence of the affect-based and cognition-based trust on the Chinese culture compared to the American culture (Chua, et al., 2008).

Based on Hofstede’s (1980) cultural scale, Chinese culture is characterised by high degrees of collectivism and high power of distance, that is widely known as guanxi practices (Chua, et al., 2008), which has many similarities to the Egyptian culture. Aspects like family cohesion, authority and respect for elder members of the family permeate both societies; Egypt enjoys another facet with an Islamic culture that pervades society. These traits require a kind of charismatic leader that is able to establish social integration on the basis of cooperation and coordination (Shahin, & Wright, 2004). In another study, that compared the cultural dimensions of Hofstede (1980) between the United States and Egypt, it was proven that individualism and power distance were the two dimensions that exhibited the largest differences between the countries. Egypt scored low on individualism, and therefore would be considered a collectivistic country. This fact strengthens the argument of using affect-based and cognition-based trust in the social context of the empirical study (Beekun, Hamdy, Westerman, & HassabElnaby, 2008).

2.1.1 Cognition-based trust

Cognition-based trust identifies the rationality behind trust. In respect to subordinate employee’s trust towards his/her supervisor, aspects like competence, professionalism, dedication and respect are considered to be trustworthy (Costigan, et al., 2006). Additional antecedents were defined by O'Brien (1995) such as reliability, competence, fairness and consistency.
McAllister (1995) argued that antecedents are broken into three main sections. The first part addresses peer reliable role performance, which is explained through the evidence of consistent peer’s behaviour with the traits of reciprocity and fairness in the different stages of commitment. Consistent peer behaviour based on trust influences satisfaction levels within the organisation, which eventually impact personal productivity.

Secondly, cultural ethnic similarity denotes groups with similar characteristics such as culture and ethnic backgrounds. These groups have more potential to develop trustworthiness environments rather than diverse groups. Theorists have observed that individuals with similar attributes such as race, age and gender find it much easier to group themselves together (McAllister, 1995). Finally, organisations explained that the boundaries of trust based on professional credentials, reputational aspects such as educational institutions, professional associations and credentialing agencies; play a strategic role in providing guarantees through accredited certifications (McAllister, 1995).

Thus, cognitive-based process is required to obtain individual’s confidence towards trust, as it justifies reliable proof concerning trustworthiness of others. In the early phases of trust, one party weighs the evidence embedded within the attributes of the transaction, and the responsiveness of the other party towards the transaction (Morrow, Hansen, & Pearson, 2004).

2.1.2 Affect-based trust

Affect based trust deals more with the emotional side rather than rational one, addressing aspects like sharing ideas and feelings, sharing problems with constructive and caring feedback, and experiencing a feeling sense of loss when individuals are no longer working together (Costigan, et al., 2006). O’Brien (1995) comprehensively categorised constituents of the affect-based trust, defining four different components, namely care, concern, openness and support.
McAllister (1995) argued that the antecedents are driven based on two directions, behavioural and interaction frequency. The behavioural component is quite complex in nature, as it defines the nature of partners' relationships with a predictable component being impacted by external factors, while the other components focus on the insights of the motives of the partners' relationships in which lays the foundation for the affect-based trust. Such behaviour corresponds to the characteristics of the organisation’s citizenship behaviour (OCB), which is intended to provide assistance outside the work context, and non-rewarding related work. Altruistic behaviour has also shown some attributes to affect-based trust, which is very similar in nature with OCB. Such behaviour has shown some positive correlation towards organisational effectiveness. The other component addresses the quantitative social flow of data through frequent interaction that increases confidence in the partners' relationships (McAllister, 1995).
Morrow et al. (2004) explained that the response of an affect-base trust is in agreement with the behaviour of conditional trust which denotes "sufficient positive affect and a relative lack of negative affect" (p.53) and thereby supports the behaviour that obtains the conditional trust. Due to the significant emotional component in the relational trust, it is often called affect-based trust. Indeed, this affective process; in dealing with co-workers, supervisors and subordinates; would influence the perceptions of trustworthiness within the organisation (Morrow, et al., 2004).

O’Brien (1995) argued whether the relationship between the affect-based and cognition-based trust can be completely distinctive or influence each other or even replace each other, while McAllister (1995) expanded this relationship and defined the development stages of the relationship of both dimensions of trust in the following manner: initially, cognition-based trust is formed as a foundation of the trust relationship, people need tangible evidence to take risks, and it develops much faster. The next phase, affect-based trust diffuses slowly on top of the foundation created by the cognition-based trust, at this stage they are attached to each other, despite the distinctive nature of their antecedents. Eventually, affect-based trust starts maturing and is capable of fully detaching from the cognition-
based trust, nevertheless they still need to be mutually maintained and managed (McAllister, 1995).

Later studies have utilised the interaction theory developed around affect-based and cognition based trust, and have used it as a foundation to build the model for their own research (Mollering, et al., 2004; Costigan, et al., 2006; Hopkins, & Weathington, 2006).

2.1.3 Relationship between trust and organisational behaviour

Organisational behaviour in the workplace is defined by Costigan et al. (2006) by citing Campbell (2000) through five different levers, namely “a proactive employee, reflect initiatives, speaking out, independent judgement and active involvement” (p.274). Further characteristics like creativity and risk taking were introduced to align with managerial practices, such as credibility, team management, information sharing and work support, as explained by Martins (2002). It is essential to integrate organisational behaviour and managerial practices to achieve equilibrium in the workplace, as this will eventually maintain and strengthen the psychological contract within the organisation (Pate, 2006).

The main focus is investigating the trust dimensions that can initiate positive organisational behaviour within the workplace, in order to ensure employee creativity, assertiveness and intrinsic motivation, in order to overcome challenges and conflicts in the work environment (Costigan, et al., 2006). Costigan et al. (2006) argued that there is a positive relation between both the affect-based trust and cognition-based trust with organisational behaviour. Research was completed between employees and their own supervisors in four different countries (USA, Turkey, Russia and Poland). Despite being from different culture orientations, in aspects of power distance and individualism-collectivism, results demonstrated that there was no significant difference among different cultures, which increases the reliability of the relationship around various cultural perspectives.

Dirks and Ferrin (2001) studied the effects of trust on the workplace-related attitudes and behaviour on micro-organisational levels. They claimed that by
maintaining high levels of trust in a straightforward manner, results in more positive attitudes and more collaborative-type of behaviour which boost organisational performance. While Zhu and Akhtar (2013) went further and dissected the effects of trust based on the dimensions of trust, in which each dimension was studied separately.

Based on the nature of each dimension, a relevant type of behaviour was developed accordingly, treating the affect-based trust as a social exchange process that reflects a sense of obligation for reciprocity and leader-follower bond reinforcement. Leader’s benevolence behaviour that embraces care and concern, mixed with follower’s recognition towards such behaviour, stimulates an attitude of caring, loyalty and a sense of reciprocal obligation among members of the organisation, which will strengthen the leader-follower social exchange relations, and finally this motivates the follower to pursue the extra mile (Zhu & Akhtar, 2013).

Cognition-based trust creates a sense of confidence within followers towards their leader decisions, reducing the risk and uncertainties. Followers attempt to increase the predictability of their leaders’ actions, through rational thinking and taking into account their track record. In that sense, leader’s characteristics, such as integrity and capability, influences followers’ risk perceptions around vulnerability to the hierarchical organisational structure, which then reduces the anxiety and concern around leader’s potential exploitative behaviour (Zhu, & Akhtar, 2013).

The relationship between the dimensions of trust and cooperation within the organisation was explored by Ng and Chua (2006). It was found that there were some drawbacks for the continuous increase of trust on the cooperation, specifically cognition-based trust. In the case of the affect-based trust, it was proven that there was a continuous positive relation with cooperative behaviour, as it avoids developing negative attitudes within the organisation. While on the cognition-based trust, initial development also stimulates cooperative behaviour, but it was found that further development in the cognition-based trust can start instigating negative attitudes, such as encouraging free-riding behaviour, and thus cause the decline to the cooperative behaviour in the organisation (Ng, & Chua,
2006), which contradicts with Dirks and Ferrin’s (2001) proposition that higher levels of trust always lead to higher levels of cooperation.

Other research discussed the relationship between trust and job design, which has proven to be totally distinctive according to Cunningham and MacGregor (2000). De Jong, Schalk, and Croon (2009) studied the influence of job insecurity on the role of trust in the context of the relationship between the psychological contract breach and employee attitudes, which can lead to several outcomes: affective commitment, satisfaction and the intention to quit.

Firstly job insecurity was divided into two types; objective insecurity which is defined through the type of contract; temporary or permanent; and subjective insecurity which is more of the feeling of insecurity in the position. It was concluded that trust plays a partial role in the mediating role, irrespective of the job insecurity type. Finally it was explained through the social exchange theory that the psychological contract breach triggers disruption to the whole relationship, decreasing the trust levels and eventually impacts the employee willingness for commitment towards the organisation (De Jong, et al., 2009).

2.1.4 Influence of trust on employee satisfaction in relation with organisational behaviour

Based on previous research, Goris, Vaught and Pettit (2003) indicated that superior trust is associated with job satisfaction, affection, innovative behaviour and organisation citizenship behaviour (OCB). Based on the Job Characteristics Model (JCM) developed by Hackman and Lawler (1971), high levels of job satisfaction are obtained when there is an alignment between the employee's desire for achieving growth at work and the characteristics offered by the organisation in order to get the job done.

Job satisfaction is derived from three experience psychological states: (1) Meaningfulness experiences that are based on the importance and value of the role; (2) Responsibility experiences that are based on perceived autonomy of the job; (3) Knowledge of the results that is based on the perception of the feedback
around the effectiveness of the work done. JCM suggests that the high level of job satisfaction is achieved when there is an alignment between the three psychological states (Goris, Vaught, and Pettit, 2003). However, some other studies conducted by Graen, Scandura, and Graen (1986) have proven to be in disagreement with the JCM. Therefore, it was later suggested to introduce certain moderating variables; such as demography, organisational structure and communications in order to explore more accurately the relative effects on the relationship (Goris, Vaught, and Pettit, 2003).

Studies done by micro-organisational behavioural scholars were based on the straightforward nature in which trust operates. These scholars argued that trust in direct management results in higher levels of job satisfaction because of the nature of the manager’s responsibilities towards their subordinates, that have a major impact on the job satisfaction (Dirks, and Ferrin, 2001). Further evidence was obtained through 12 different studies that examined the impact of trust on various aspects of workplace satisfaction. Facets such as satisfaction with management decisions, perceptions on shared information, procedural justice judgements, perceptions of organisational changes and perceptions of breach of a psychological contract all demonstrated significant relations (Dirks, and Ferrin, 2001).

A study by Brown and Mitchell (1993) was conducted to describe the relationship between organisational obstacles and organisational performance. They found negative correlation between organisation’s obstacles and employees’ satisfaction; specifically in the areas of information sharing, co-workers’ interactions, decision authorities and role demands. Furthermore social obstacles were proven to be more significant when compared to technical obstacles.

Research by the Pakistani banking sector was conducted to distinguish the relationship between employee productivity, commitment and participation because organisational behaviour with regard to job satisfaction demonstrated a positive correlation when analysed according to those three areas (Shahzad & Bhatti, 2008). Moreover, the three different variables mentioned above were tested against
organisational performance, and a positive correlation was again found in the three areas towards the job performance (Shahzad & Bhatti, 2008).

### 2.1.5 Trust in turbulent environment

Dass and Kumar (2011) emphasized the role of trust in building economic and social stability within the organization to balance the absence of trust in the external environment. A model was developed to study the impact of congruence between the economic and social orientations along with the trust or trusted dyad in the team level. Results demonstrated that economic orientations had a greater effect on the mutual trust relationship compared to the social one. More detailed analysis on each specific orientation was performed, which served to prove that trust enhances both governance and structure, in order to prevent and limit abuse and fraud within organisations from an economic perspective. On the social side, trust was found to reduce transactional cost, increase social capital among teams and create additional respect towards the organizational authorities (Dass & Kumar, 2011).

In Egypt, the progression of the Islamists towards political power, with a certain ideology that was unable to achieve consensus in the presidential elections, in addition to the chosen strategy of exclusivity for a certain sector of the society, had created a crack in the social fabric of the country, that eventually led to the recent uprisings (Elmasry, 2013), and hence lowered the levels of trust between the societal groups (Abdelhafez, 2013). Diverse cultural participation and dialogue is required to improve the both quantity and quality of social capital, which can lay the foundation for the societal trust that can be supported by the institutional structure (Wood & Mellahi, 2003). The potential role of the legal institutions and culture environment is the essential solution for stabilising the social order; the theory of social capital enables investigations with the social networks inside the society, and at the same time stimulates individual and group participation to resolve such conflicts (Lakis, 2009). Finally, in the absence of proper legislation, trust becomes a risk averse solution for decision making (Wood & Mellahi, 2003).

Political instability has inevitable consequences on the management practices within organisations; triggering conflicts and inefficiencies within the work
processes, and resulting in disruptions regarding the stability of the workplace (Wood & Mellahi, 2003). Organisational conflicts are divided into either task or relationship conflicts. Task conflicts are mainly focused on the related job issues; such as structure, processes and job design. While relationship conflict focuses on the interpersonal non-work related issues, which is a consequence of the turbulent environment (Lau, & Cobb, 2010).

Lau and Cobb (2010) studied the influence of the relationship conflict on job performance, taking into account the intervening role of trust. It was argued that relationship conflict arose out of differences over personality, values, norms and attitudes, which become salient points when attempting to deconstruct interaction. Several negative outcomes from relationship conflict have been experienced; such as rude behaviour that not only increases interpersonal dissatisfaction, but also inhibits constructive debate, thereby emphasising negative attribution to people’s behaviour and breaking promises (Lau, & Cobb, 2010).

It is obvious that relationship conflict resides mainly in the affect-type of interactions, based on the findings of Kramer (1999), McAllister (1995), and Rousseau et al. (1998) that explain the nature of affect-based trust as the fabric of the interpersonal ties among people and the shared belief of care and concern. Thus, in the case of a relationship conflict, affect-based trust is undermined and the interpersonal ties disintegrate and interaction then relies solely on cognition-based trust, since it reduces the exchange risk by making it more explicit, specific and tangible. In summary, in the conditions of relationship conflicts, employees will tend to rely more on cognition-based trust than on affect-based trust to drive their exchange activity and hence their job satisfaction (Lau, & Cobb, 2010).

Further research addressed human resource issues in turbulent environments from the recruitment perspective, which measures the trust levels of supervisors when it comes to employee selection. In the case of lack of trust, Hayden (1983) argued that the process of modernisation is challenging and only possible when a party takes on a mediating role to improve the development process. Conversely, the continuous weakness of the moderator results in further social conflicts that widen
the gap of trust between parties (Wood & Mellahi, 2003). In such events people within the organisations have introduced the term “coping mode” which is shrinking their sources of selection towards the network of their trusted peers, hence to avoid further conflicts. However it has been mentioned that trust in that case is a prerequisite for doing the job, but does not ensure that it will be done successfully (Wood & Mellahi, 2003).

As a conclusion, the relationship between the dimensions of trust, both cognition-based and affect-based; can be identified with the employee job satisfaction, through influencing organisational behaviour. Several results were previously measured and concluded for such relationships in a stable environment. The new factor that is introduced to the research is studying the relationship influence in a turbulent environment caused by political instability within the macro environment. The turbulent environment is not directly measured, but rather considered as a surrounding context to the different variables, and hence the first hypotheses was studied.

**Figure 3 Trust Flow to Generate Employee Satisfaction**
2.2 Influence of Communication

Goris, *et al.* (2003) suggested the introduction of moderating variables in order to explore more accurately the relative effects of the relationship on job satisfaction; such as demography, organisational structure and communication. Dennis (1974) defined communication as “a subjectively experienced quality of the internal environment of the organisation; the concept embraces a general cluster of inferred predisposition, identifiable through reports of members’ perception of messages and message-related events, occurring in the organisation” (p.29).

The role of communication within the organisation has been examined as a mediator or a moderator towards the relationship between organisational trust and employee satisfaction. Mediation is a process that translates environmental characteristics into individual feelings and actions, as it channels the relationship; it is often tested on the micro-organisational level. While the moderating variable alters the independent variable’s (dimensions of trust) impact on the dependent variable (job satisfaction), it might mitigate or dampen the relationship or on the contrary amplify or strengthen it (Garnett, Marlowe, & Pandey, 2008).

Communication is considered to be the channel that allows the concept of trust to flow and spread throughout the entire organisation in order to influence effectiveness in the organisation’s performance. At the same time, it enables reciprocity of trust to be formed in the sort of constructive feedback. It was examined whether different forms of communication can have a significant impact on performance in a mission-oriented culture, which is characterised by innovation, development, growth and resource acquisition. These different kinds of communication can be in the form of upward, downward, lateral, strategic, task oriented and feedback communication (Garnett, et al., 2008).

The communication climate is designed, based on a complete alignment with the seven dimensions of the organisational climate: organisational structure, individual responsibility, support, performance management, conflict resolution, performance standards such as goals and organisational identity (Pincus, Knipp, & Rayfield, 1990). Garnett, *et al.* (2008) tested the relationship with individual worker
productivity on eight different dimensions of communication: supervisory, subordinate, co-worker, personal feedback, organisational integration, media quality, corporate information and communication climate. It was concluded that communication had more than the average impact on productivity, and was perceived to affect productivity in different degrees (Garnett, et al., 2008).

Gibb (1961) identified two climate types as cited by Pincus, et al. (1990): the supportive/open climate which enables efficient message transfer, and the defensive/closed climate which hinders the transmission of successful messages. Likert (1967) further explained the impact of the organisational structure’s role on communication as cited by Pincus, et al. (1990), in which defensive/closed climates are triggered from a centralized type of organisation where the transmission of messages always flows in one direction, which results in dropping the motivation levels.

Similar approaches were confirmed by Kim (2007), by breaking down the means of communication into two different topologies, symmetrical and asymmetrical communication. Symmetrical communication is a bi-directional nature that amplifies dialogue, negotiation, and listening and conflict management. While asymmetrical is considered to be a top-down approach that takes place through persuasion, manipulation and commanding orders; in essence it is designed to control the behaviour of employees based on management’s desires.

Trust is emphasised as one of the triggers influencing communication, which accentuates the importance of trust in a successful communication (Pincus, et al., 1990). Kim (2007) argued that the strategic usage of communication can aid in building trust, commitment, mutual satisfaction and mutual control of relationships with key stakeholders within the organisation. The interaction between the role of communication as an antecedent or as a mediator of trust may impose a risk of multi-collinearity among the independent variables constituting the employees’ performance (Garnett, et al., 2008), thus communication acts as moderator for the relationships between dimensions of trust and job satisfaction.
Pincus, et al. (1990) adjusted the five factors developed by Dennis (1974) to include superior-subordinate communication, downward accuracy, supervisor empathy with subordinates, upward influence and information reliability; into a comprehensive framework that quantitatively explains superior-subordinate communication, and qualitatively discusses the focus of the information satisfaction rather than perceived downward accuracy. Several scholars since this development have (Byrne, & LeMay, 2006; Chiva, & Alegre, 2009; Holtzhausen, 2002; Kim, 2005) relied on the very same basis as Pincus, et al.'s (1990) interpretation for the communication factors.

One of the strategic aspects of effective communication, in driving satisfaction and performance, is the sharing of the tacit knowledge among employees. Tacit knowledge is mainly the information obtained whilst performing the work, or the significant learning through experience rather than trainings or skills development. More effective means of open communications in a trust-based environment stimulates the sharing of such knowledge (O'Brien, 1995).

In summary, open communication climate was proven to be positively related to job satisfaction, nevertheless the strongest contributor to the relationship was the organisational trust, opposing the widely perceived view that the superior-subordinate communication is the dominant contributor (Pincus, et al., 1990). Hence it supports the view that communication, as a moderating variable, can strongly influence the relationship between trust and job satisfaction (Garnett, et al., 2008). Finally, the findings from Kim (2007) demonstrated that symmetric communication cannot guarantee positive relationship outcomes, but definitely asymmetric communication system can have a negative impact on employees' commitment, trust and satisfaction.
2.3 Levels of organisational commitment

Organisational commitment (OC) has become quite popular in the literature of organisational psychology and behaviour in the recent decades (Mathieu and Zajac, 1990), with the organisational shift towards studying the relationship between the intrinsic values and job satisfaction/performance. Commitment has been perceived as two distinctive sides; behavioural and attitudinal (Meyer & Allen, 1991). OC started to cover areas such as personal variables, role states and different forms of work environment; ranging from job characteristics to aspects of organisational structure. Several studies on OC were able to predict certain behaviours such as employees’ absenteeism, performance and turnovers (Mathieu and Zajac, 1990). OC was analysed in several different manners; one of the frequently used methods is breaking it down into antecedents, correlations and consequences, as illustrated in Figure-5.
Antecedents constitute five different characteristics; personal, organisational, job, role states and group/leader relations (Mathieu and Zajac, 1990). Correlation between the overall personal characteristics and OC was average, in which some characteristics demonstrated significance while others were fairly insignificant. Also, job characteristics did not express any clear direction of influence due to the subjective nature. Feedback results had shown that more committed employees tended to perceive their jobs as more satisfying compared to less committed people, while very little research has been done on the role states (Mathieu and Zajac, 1990). Results from leaders' behaviour did not display direct significant correlation to OC, nevertheless the relationship becomes more significant when it is moderated with factors such as subordinate characteristics and some aspects of work environment. Few studies have examined the influence of organisational characteristics with OC, and while a weak correlation to relationships prevailed,
mostly it was found that contextual aspects like organisational size and centralisation can be mediated by work environment (Mathieu and Zajac, 1990). This finding contradicted Mayer and Allen’s (1991) results that displayed a strong correlation between organisational structure and organisational commitment.

Based on Mowday et al’s (1979) findings as cited by Mathieu and Zajac (1990), motivation is considered to be highly related to commitment. A highly committed employee appears to be motivated to achieve high levels of performance. It is perceived that the magnitude of the relationship between the internal motivation; derived from accomplishment and self-fulfilment; would be higher in the case of attitudinal commitment. While the external motivation; based on cash and bonuses; would play a more influential role in the relationship in the case of calculative commitment. Overall, motivation had emphasised a relatively high correlation with commitment in approximately ten different studies, where five of those studies exhibited a significantly strong correlation in the area of internal motivation (Mathieu and Zajac, 1990).

Zhu and Akhtar (2013) suggested that the dimensions of trust, both affect-based and cognition-based; could be further explained by the integration with the motivational insights obtained from the research, specifically pro-social aspects of motivation which relates to the internal motivation explained earlier. In that sense, it was claimed that high pro-social motivated employees expressed more interest in others and placed more emphasis in guiding and enabling behaviours towards their peers. Conversely, demotivated employees react in a more rational and self-interested manner. As such, the motivation aspect as a moderating variable to measure the influence on the relationship between trust with employee behaviour and satisfaction is useful (Zhu, and Akhtar, 2013). Results have presented a positive relationship between affect-based trust and helping behaviour in high motivational conditions, which positively influences employees’ satisfaction. While it was claimed that in the case of low motivational factors, cognition-based trust would be positively related to the helping behaviour, and hence improve employee satisfaction (Zhu, and Akhtar, 2013).
Further studies on OC suggested different approaches of analysing its constituents. Three-component model (TCM) conceptualisation was developed by Meyer and Allen (1991). In this model, OC was broken into affective commitment reflecting the desire, continuance commitment reflecting the need and normative commitment reflecting the obligation. Meyer and Allen (1991) desired to go beyond the globally accepted approach of distinction between behavioural and attitudinal commitments which is triggered by the surrounding conditions. The model commences with affective commitment that is based on the affective attachment and cohesion, despite of the overlap with some previously discussed antecedents. This specific model sets a clear boundary among the different components of commitment, which were used as the basis for several further studies (Colquitt, LePine, Piccolo, Zapata, Rich, 2012; Eisenberger, Karagonlar, Stinglhamber, Neves, Becker, Gloria Gonzalez-Morales, & Steiger-Mueller, 2010).

Furthermore, Solinger, Olffen, and Roe (2008) argued and criticised the three component model (TCM) of organisational commitment from Meyer and Allen (1991) due to its motivational/behavioural and attitudinal purposes. Several empirical criticisms targeted the normative and continuance parts, due to its inconsistent results and the lack of explaining its position within the constructs of the organisational commitment; there were several overlaps between the normative and continuance constructs with the affective commitment, which increases multi-collinearity for the whole model (Solinger, et al., 2008). Therefore, there were suggestions to revert back to the old model proposed by Mowday, et al. (1982) as cited by Solinger, et al. (2008), where direct organisational commitment was the sole outcome of affective attachment. Furthermore, Ashill, Rod, and Carruthers, (2008) found that affective organisational commitment is considered to be a significant predictor to the job performance through several meta-analysis. Another study was done on the Turkish banking sector that confirmed the strength of the relationship between the affective construct of commitment and service recovery performance (Ashill, et al., 2008).

Based on the findings mentioned previously, in addition to the results from previous multiple regression analysis studies, the study showed that affective commitment
contributed the most in the correlation with organisational behaviour, compared to a very modest relation with normative commitment, and almost no relation with the continuance commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1991). Hence it demonstrates the strong influence of affective commitment on job satisfaction/performance. Ultimately this finding influences the relationship towards job performance, based solely on the affective commitment and discarding the continuance and normative ones (Solinger, et al., 2008).

**Figure 6 Three component model of organisational commitment (Meyer, & Allen, 1991)**

2.3.1 Personal Characteristics

Four categories defined the characteristics of affective commitment: personal, structural, job-related and work experiences (Meyer & Allen, 1991). The combination of job-related characteristics and work experience to form Human
Resource (HR) practices that will have an influence on job satisfaction/performance through the moderating role of commitment (Gould-Williams, 2003) are discussed later. Personal characteristics cover all demographic aspects. Some studies revealed that the correlation between personal characteristics and commitment is indirect and the relationship is severely weakened when work-related rewards and values are controlled (Becker, 1960). Personal dispositions were found to complement the characteristics through aspects like need for achievement, affiliation and autonomy, in addition to personal work ethic, locus of control and central life interest in work. Disposition showed a modest correlation with commitment, perhaps due to its subjective nature. Nonetheless, it had explained to a great extent the moderating role of commitment to attain job satisfaction/performance (Meyer & Allen, 1991). Personal characteristics have been assessed through the identification of variables included in the designed questionnaire, in order to study the relationship with the levels of commitment, and hence distinguish the influence on job satisfaction.

2.3.2 Organisational Structure

Organisational structure is a second antecedent for the OC, and includes structure such as centralisation and decentralisation, which influences the circulation of information within the organisation and the authoritarian role of decision making, that impacts the formation of trust inside the organisation. Despite the very few studies on the impact of the structure on the OC, there is some evidence that affective commitment is positively correlated with decentralised work structure, although it influences the individual commitment rather than the organisational commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1991). Most of the studies on organisational structure have identified multiple dimensions of constructs that were later combined into two types. Firstly, mechanical structure is based on centralised, formalised structure which is less complex and does not allow employees to participate in decision making. On the other hand organic structure is based on de-centralised, less formalised and more homogenous structure, and thus more complex and empowers employees to participate in decision making (Kim, 2007)
2.3.3 Human Resources Practices

Work experiences have been intensely examined unlike the personal and organisational characteristics, but due to the fact that it was largely shaped in an unsystematic approach, hence it was difficult to substantiate and conclude (Meyer & Allen, 1991), and that is the main reason behind using the HR practices instead, practices can be explained as follows: employment security, selective hiring, team-working, performance-related pay, training, development, egalitarianism and knowledge sharing.

These practices were perceived to be strongly correlated with job performance, nevertheless Marchington and Grugulis (2000) argued that the practices are fundamentally flawed due to the fact that each selected practice has very limited evidence, while the normative HR management theories suggest that bundling HR theories increase the influence on the employee commitment. Another view from Barney, who was cited by (Gould-Williams, 2003); states that HR practices can moderate the relationship between human capital and superior performance; hence they can impact organisation performance. The HR practices bundle was not strongly correlated with high commitment, nonetheless there were some practices that appeared to be quite influential such as team-working and promotion (Gould-Williams, 2003).
2.4 Conclusion

In summary, the relationship between the dimensions of trust as a trigger; affect-based and cognition-based, and employee satisfaction as a consequence, is influenced by several correlates like organisational behaviour and moderators like communication and levels of commitment. As such, the model extends from...
previous research, by measuring the strength of the relationship in conjunction with two moderators introduced as shown in Figure 8.

**Figure 8 Relationship between dimensions of trust and employee satisfaction through the moderating factors of communication and commitment levels in a turbulent environment**

Firstly, the relationship between the dimensions of trust is studied directly by using employee satisfaction through the mediating role of organisational behaviour. Then, the variable of internal communication within the organisation is introduced separately as a moderator to measure the influence of trust on job satisfaction in
different communication environments. Subsequently, levels of employees’
commitment within the organisation are separately introduced as a moderating
variable in the relationship between trust and job satisfaction, and hence the
disruptive influence on the relationship was studied accordingly.

Similar results were previously measured and concluded for such relationship in a
stable environment. The research in this case was completed in a different type of
environment. The current political instability in the country had resulted in a
turbulent environment which is imposed on the whole model. This disruptive
environment may influence the strength of the relationship between dimensions of
trust and job satisfaction, and the impact of the moderating variables (internal
communication and organisational commitment) on such relationships. However,
the degree of turbulence in the environment was not directly measured, but rather
considered as a surrounding context to the different variables.
CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND HYPOTHESES

The objective of the research is to distinguish the relationship between the dimensions of trust (cognition-based and affect-based trust) with the employee job satisfaction, considering the moderating variables of internal communication and levels of commitment within the organisation. The research was conducted in an unstable political environment such as Egypt, which has recently experienced a massive political transition, which resulted in economic and social disruptions across the entire country, contained implications on the organisational environment. Based on the problem identified and the literature reviewed earlier, the research questions that guided this research are the following:

RQ1: How affect-based trust and cognition-based trust can influence job satisfaction within the organisation

Based on the previous findings from (Costigan, et al., 2006; McAllister, 1995; O’Brien, 1995), it was found that affect-based trust had a positive relationship with job satisfaction. In the same sense, cognition-based trust was evidenced to have a positive relationship with job satisfaction, nevertheless the strengths of the relationship fluctuated based on different work-related conditions in which research was conducted. For this case, research was conducted in unstable environment, characterised by social and economic disruptions. Both relationships were studied directly regarding job satisfaction (Kramer, 1999; Dirks, & Ferrin, 2001).

RQ2: Which dimension of trust is more influential in the relationship with job satisfaction within the organisation?

Studies on the relationship between the dimensions of trust and job satisfaction had shown some drawbacks for the continuous increase of trust on the cooperative behaviour, specifically cognition-based trust. In the case of the affect-based trust, it was proven that there was a continuous positive relation with cooperative behaviour, while on the cognition-based trust, it was found that further development
in the cognition-based trust would instigate negative attitudes, such as encouraging free-riding behaviour, and thus impact cooperative behaviour and eventually decrease the satisfaction levels within the organisation (Ng, & Chua, 2006). It would be interesting to measure the comparative influence of the dimensions of trust on job satisfaction regarding the turbulent environment.

RQ3: How internal communication within the organisation moderates the relationship between dimensions of trust and job performance

Here the influence of internal communication is measured as a moderator for the relationship between affect-based and cognition-based trust with job satisfaction (Garnett, et al., 2008). Communication can amplify both dimensions of trust impact on job satisfaction if it is conducted through open-type communication, or else it can hinder the impact of the dimensions of trust on job satisfaction if it is done through closed-type communication (Kim, 2007).

RQ4: How levels of commitment within the organisation moderate the relationship between dimensions of trust and job performance

In this question the influence of levels of commitment is measured towards the relationship between affect-based and cognition-based trust with job satisfaction (Meyer & Allen, 1991). As stated earlier in the organisational commitment literature, that the TCM model is not fully effective in determining and identifying the type of relationship with job satisfaction, subsequently affective commitment components are only considered, while continuance and normative are excluded from the model (Solinger, et Al., 2008). Overall motivation had emphasised a relatively high correlation with commitment, specifically in the area of internal-type of motivation (Mathieu and Zajac, 1990).

It was suggested that the relationship between the dimensions of trust; affect-based and cognition-based; and job satisfaction would be further explained by the integration with the motivation insights obtained from the research (Zhu, and Akhtar, 2013). To that end, levels of commitment reflecting the internal motivation insights due their high correlation are discussed (Mathieu and Zajac, 1990). It was claimed that high pro-social motivated employees express more interest in others.
On the other hand, demotivated employees react in a more rational and self-interested manner. As such, it will be very useful to introduce the levels of commitment as a moderating variable to measure the influence on the relationship between trust with employee behaviour and satisfaction (Zhu, and Akhtar, 2013).

From the research questions stated above and the overall models discussed in Chapter 2, four hypotheses have been developed to measure the relationships:

H01:  
A) Affect-based trust has a direct positive relationship with job satisfaction.  
B) Cognition-based trust has a direct positive relationship with job satisfaction

H02:  Affect-based trust is more influential on job satisfaction than cognition-based trust.

H03:  
A) Communication moderates the relationship between affect-based trust and job satisfaction, such that the positive relationship between affect-based trust and job satisfaction is stronger in the case of open-type communication.  
B) Communication moderates the relationship between cognition-based trust and job satisfaction, such that the positive relationship between cognition-based trust and job satisfaction is stronger in the case of open-type communication.

H04:  
A) Levels of commitment moderate the relationship between affect-based trust and job satisfaction, such that the positive relationship between affect-based trust and job satisfaction is stronger among employees with high levels of commitment.  
B) Levels of commitment moderates the relationship between cognition-based trust and job satisfaction, such that the positive relationship between cognition-based trust and job satisfaction is stronger among employees with low levels of commitment.
CHAPTER 4: RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

The objective of the research was to measure the influence of the relationship between the dimensions of trust and job satisfaction, then taking into consideration the moderating factors of internal communication and organisational commitment. This study was executed in an turbulent business environment to understand the impact that can be experienced on the parties to a relationship. This chapter explains the methodology of the study, research design, data collection, data sampling, data analysis and limitations.

4.1 Research Methodology

Based on the literature review from Chapter 2, all variables that were studied in this research have been quantitatively analysed by previous scholars, namely dimensions of trust (McAllister, 1995; O'Brien, 1995; Costigan, et al., 2006), internal communication (Pincus, et al., 1990; Kim, 2007), organisational commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1991; Gould-Williams, 2003) and finally job satisfaction (Gould-Williams, 2003; Goris, Vaught, and Pettit, 2003). Due to the exploration depth that was performed on the analysis of this topic that dates back to the late 1960s, this exploratory study has been fully exploited in similar research topics. These studies have created a rich amount of literature, which have enabled scholars to further formulate the literature into stronger relationships between the various antecedents, correlates and consequences (Mathieu and Zajac, 1990). Accordingly the usage of descriptive study can best explain the relationship among the different variables, and can emphasise clearly the impact of the unstable political environment in Egypt on the relationship (Wood, & Mellahi, 2003). Subsequently, a deductive reasoning approach was used to structure the relationship equation that augments the theory emphasised in the literature.
4.2 Population and Unit of Analysis

The population included all firms that existed in Egypt during the uprising; which have experienced the unstable political environment; and at the same time are heavily reliable on labour intensive-type of industries (for example: manufacturing plants, labour related service firms such as maintenance and cleaning sectors). The focus was on firms with more than 100 employees; surveys addressed employees and first line supervisors. These parties were chosen to ensure that the targeted population were more vulnerable towards the macro-environment conditions, specifically political, social and economic. At the same time, the population chosen allowed a reach of a greater amount of employees within the organisation, so that more emphasis could be obtained from the inter-relationship behaviour among employees, which in turn could help to amplify the positive or negative influences of the relationship between trust and job satisfaction (Ferres, Connell, & Travaglione, 2004). The unit of analysis in the research is the individual respondent in the selected organisations; the analysis was conducted based on employees’ perceptions of trust towards job satisfaction; taking into account internal organisational communication and levels of organisational commitment as moderating variables.

4.3 Sampling

Due to huge size of population, a sampling frame was impossible to be identified; therefore the sampling approach was performed in two stages. The first stage was done by selecting the target firms, which was done based on the current accessible network of people in Egypt, through connections with either corporate shareholders or top management within the firms, hence a non-probability sample based on convenience technique was used (Saunders & Lewis, 2012). Data was collected from four different firms all located in Egypt, selected industries varied between textiles manufacturing, medical services, telecommunications and tourism sector.
A convenience non-random sampling technique was used based on the available accessible network, to overcome the challenges caused by the turbulent environment which has imposed threats to the vulnerable labour environment, and thus made many firms reluctant to conduct such surveys as they were concerned about the labour responses (Saunders & Lewis, 2012). In one of the cases, the firm was initially quite enthusiastic and excited to know the results of the survey, but at the very last moment they cancelled due to top management’s concerns from labour reactions after conducting the survey, since their employees had not received any salary increases in the last two years and they were afraid that such a survey would open the door for such discussions.

The second stage was based on employees' availability, accessibility and willingness to participate in the survey. An equally diversified sample was obtained across all departments within the firms in order to maintain a balanced-type of response, in which quota sampling technique was used (Saunders & Lewis, 2012). Four firms were selected for the survey. The first firm employed around 1500 employees and mainly focuses on medical services with its related supporting functions; such as catering and administration; 250 questionnaires were sent out, and 109 responses were obtained. The second firm employed around 150 employees and operates in the textiles manufacturing domain, Of the 100 questionnaires that were sent out, 34 responses were obtained. The third firm operates in the telecommunication support services, which employs around 200 employees between engineers and technicians. The questionnaire mainly focused on the technical side due to their higher vulnerability to the macro-economic conditions. Of the 50 questionnaires that were sent out, 16 responses were obtained. Finally, the fourth firm operates in the tourism sector with 900 employees. There were 30 questionnaires that were sent out that specifically targeted the sales department in the firm, in order to be able to understand the business impact on the sector, and 13 responses were obtained.

Theoretically, the target sample size should have been approximately 200 respondents to be considered viable, relating to the recommendation to acquire five times the number of responses when compared to the number of questions that
were asked in the survey (Saunders & Lewis, 2012). However, due to the unfortunate conditions that the country experienced during the conduction of the survey, only 172 responses were obtained from the four different firms.

4.4 Data Collection Tool and Method

A self-administered survey was conducted, using printed lists of questionnaires in simple Arabic language form that were easily read, understood and answered. After the pilot survey was conducted, it was obvious that the questionnaire had to be further simplified to reflect the educational background of the targeted sampling group. The questionnaire was initially written in English language, but then it was officially translated in Arabic to be filled out by the targeted sample. Afterwards responses were mapped back into the English version. Some of the questions appeared to be confusing and misleading after translation into Arabic, specifically in the areas of co-workers’ relationship with respect to the affect and cognitive perceptions of trust. Questions also seemed to overlap, and hence had to be further simplified to make a clear distinction between both dimensions of trust. All copies of the questionnaires were documented and stored in the form of both hard and soft copies (Dayan, 2010).

Responses were collected by several different methods; in the case of the medical firm, questionnaires were handed out while employees were signing-in in the morning, and were collected back while employees signed-out from work. In some cases, it took one week to receive the questionnaires back from the employees. Another method was employed in the case of the manufacturing plant, where employees were gathered at the same place and questionnaire was distributed, explained, and responses were collected by the end of the session. Finally, in the case of the last two firms, the questionnaires were sent via email to the human resources (HR) department, and they took the responsibility of distributing the questionnaire and collected the responses and eventually sent it back to the researcher. The most efficient method was proven to be the session approach in the manufacturing plant. Nevertheless a relatively high response rate was achieved
in the medical services firm, by obtaining wide accessibility within the firm, due to the fact that it was supported by a broad top management team, who were highly motivated to receive feedback on the current condition of the firm and the different methods to improve, which would guide them in improving the overall firm’s performance.

One of the main challenges faced while collecting the data, was the tendency of the respondents having bias due to the perceived lack of anonymity from the respondents side. Essentially, the respondents could have been influenced by the organisation while conducting the survey, as some questionnaires were handed-out directly by the respective direct supervisor (Saunders & Lewis, 2012), and even though it was clearly mentioned in the questionnaire that responses are treated with absolute confidentiality, and that respondents had complete right to reserve their anonymous identity, the practical dissemination of the questionnaires could have raised concerns. Moreover, the collection of responses was obtained through box submission or inserting completed questionnaires into a file tray, in order to ensure total anonymity of the respondent, thereby making it almost impossible to distinguish the respondent’s identity. Finally, it was agreed to eliminate any response received by the direct supervisor.

### 4.5 Questionnaire Design

A five Likert-type scale questionnaire was used (see Appendix-1). A cognitive-based trust construct was based on four antecedents (reliability, competence, fairness and consistency). Each construct had two different questions to measure the strength of each factor. Affect-based trust was based on four antecedents (care, concern, openness and support). Each construct had two different questions to measure the strength of each factor. Effectually, there were 16 questions in total (O'Brien, 1995). Eight questions addressed communication influences on job satisfaction; questions were selected based on the list of questionnaire developed by Pincus, et al. (1990). Commitment levels consisted of ten questions divided between personal characteristics which were mainly covered by the identification
variables such as gender, position tenure, years of service within the organisation and educational background (Meyer & Allen, 1991). Three questions were developed to measure the aggregated organisational commitment, and three more were created to measure organisational structure (Meyer & Allen, 1991). Finally, HR practices had another four questions (Gould-Williams, 2003). Job satisfaction was based on a set of eight questions covering various aspects of individual and organisational related satisfaction (Gould-Williams, 2003).

A quantitative type of survey was used in order to explain the descriptive side of the data. Furthermore, categorical-type of scales based on ordinal data were used, by utilising rating-type of questions in the questionnaire in order to represent the respondent’s opinion and belief in the best form for such a behavioural-type of research. Since the research was focused on many social and emotional aspects of the organisational environment, categorising the data in an ordinal type of representation provided more emphasis on the relationships among such social and emotional constructs (Saunders & Lewis, 2012).

4.6 Data Analysis

Data analysis is the application of reasoning and interpretation for the data collected. The questionnaire was designed to ensure content and construct validity, where the research questions would be answered and the objectives of the research would be met (Saunders & Lewis, 2012).

Data processing and analysis was based on scoring the questionnaire. Scores were identified based on the level of agreement with the respective questions, in which “strongly disagree” scored zero while “strongly agree” scored four. In the case of the independent variables, affect-based and cognition-based trust, each variable had four different constructs. A total average score per construct was calculated and then was equally allocated to each variable, whereas each construct had a contribution weight of 25% on each variable (O’Brien, 1995), as shown in Figure-9.
In the case of communication as a moderating variable, a total average score for all eight questions were calculated (Pincus, et al., 1990). The other moderating variable of levels of commitment was addressed differently, due to the fact that the related constructs were strongly correlated as antecedents to the levels of commitment, which was based on the literature and this cannot be detached (Mathieu, and Zajac, 1990; Meyer, and Allen, 1991; Gould-Williams, 2003; Solinger, et al., 2008).

Normally, when asking employees directly about their perceptions of commitment towards organisations, answers are always driven by emotional and passionate mind-sets and hence responses are mostly exaggerated, whereas overall organisational commitment should be aggregated by the surrounding effects of the organisation; such as organisational structure and HR practices that balance and offers a genuine commitment score (Meyer, and Allen, 1991). Subsequently, based on the structure of the questionnaire, a total average score was calculated per construct, whereas contribution of employee commitment/motivation questions had a weight of 40%, HR practices had 40% weight and organisational structure had 20% percent weight. Personal characteristics explained the different behaviour patterns of commitment in respect to age, position tenure, sex, educational background (Meyer & Allen, 1991), as shown in Figure-9.

Accordingly, all scores were compared to the total average score of job satisfaction, in which dimensions of trust had a direct influence on the relationship, while communication and commitment had a moderating influence on the relationship. Questions were positively structured, whereas the highest scores expressed stronger relationship with the constructs. For the sake of reducing the response-bias error, some questions were inverted in a negative direction form, and then scores were transposed back for alignment (Saunders & Lewis, 2012).
Figure 9 Relationship between dimensions of trust and employee satisfaction through the moderating factors of communication and commitment levels, showing distribution and loading of questions.
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Different types of statistical analysis were considered for answering the research questions. Firstly, descriptive and correlation analysis were used to measure the relationship strengths between the dimensions of trust; cognition-based and affect-based; concerning job satisfaction. Subsequently, multiple regression analysis determined whether the dimensions of trust, together, had an influence on job satisfaction, and which one had more influence compared to the other. Thus, the different techniques mentioned earlier reflected the independent influence of the dimensions of trust on job satisfaction, and hence answered the first two research questions.

For measuring the moderating influence of communication and commitment to job satisfaction, a procedural technique was followed that consisted of two stages. Firstly, applying the moderation regression analysis, where dimensions of trust were considered the independent variable; and the internal communication and organisational commitment were considered the moderating variable, and finally job satisfaction was considered the dependent variable. The interaction between the independent and moderating variables was measured against the strength of job satisfaction (Sharma, Durand, and Gur-Arie, 1981).

The second stage was applied through sub-grouping the moderating variables into high and low scoring around the mean scoring of each variable (Sharma, et al., 1981). In the case of third propositions, internal communication was classified either as an open-type communication, in case of average scoring above the mean value, or as a closed-type communication in case of scoring below the mean value. Results of the independent and dependent variables were studied in correspondence of the two types of communication, and results were obtained based on the role of communication in whether amplifying or hindering the effects of job satisfaction, based on each dimension of trust. In case of the fourth proposition, commitment was classified either as high levels of commitment in case of scoring above the mean value, or classified as low levels of commitment in case of scoring below the mean value. Results of the independent and dependent variables were studied in correspondence of the two types of organisational commitment, and results were obtained based on role of commitment in whether
amplifying or hindering the effects of job satisfaction, based on each dimension of trust (Sharma, et al., 1981).

Finally, multi-collinearity among the independent and moderating variables was tested due to the necessity emphasised in the literature. One of the strategic assumptions of regression analysis is that no independent or moderating variable should be closer to a linear function with any of the other predictors or moderators, as it can result in the following (Weiers, 2011):

- Multi-collinearity is a matter of degree, not an either/or a condition, and the worse it becomes, the more the problem with the regression estimates;
- In the worst-case scenario, the coefficient of a variable can change sign. Thus the existence of sufficient multi-collinearity makes it very difficult to estimate a regression equation; and
- Multi-collinearity is often a problem in survey data because several attitudinal variables are often used to predict an outcome, and these attitudinal variables may measure some related set of concepts, which is the case in the research. As a consequence, some of the attitudinal variables will be highly correlated.

### 4.7 Limitations

Based on the research objective and timeline granted for the research submission, it would have been very useful if the impact of the political stability/instability could have been measured and included in the relationship, and hence several political environments could have been compared against each other. By measuring the targeted independent variables in various environments and comparing the job satisfaction result based on the impact of the macro environment, it would increase the reliability of the research output in order to be applied for a wider population.

Due to the challenges faced while collecting the data in Egypt, that included the turbulent environment, a more balanced sample across the different enterprises would have developed a stronger representation of findings. Also, the inclusion of more firms would have increased the reliability of the data. The lower than expected
response rate caused several implications on the validity and reliability of the data. Factor analysis and Cronbach’s alpha results were obtained and discussed in the following chapters. Data showed an overlap between the dimensions of trust, and no clear distinction was distinguished and cross-loading were found, which thus decreases the validity of the data. Despite of the refinement of the questionnaire in order to obtain a clear distinction between the dimensions of trust, the respondent sample size still impacted the result of the factor analysis. Reliability results were also below expectations.
CHAPTER 5: RESULTS

5.1 Descriptive Statistics

The statistical analysis was processed on the raw data gathered using the Software package of statistical analysis (SPSS) and excel. The data went through several refining stages, firstly by removing respondents whose feedback was collected by their supervisors, in order to avoid any sort of auspices-bias that could be influenced by supervisors or management being involved in the process. Furthermore, respondents who were not able to answer most of the questionnaire were also removed.

The data was captured based on the structure of the questionnaire designed in the survey. Five main variables were developed around the model to study the various relationships’ impacts on job satisfaction. Variables such as affect-based trust, cognition-based trust, communication and satisfaction consisted of eight questions, while organisational commitment included ten questions due to the various antecedents (HR practices, personal characteristics, organisational structure) influencing the overall commitment perception (Meyer, & Allen, 1991). Each question had a zero to four Likert-type scale, including demographic responses that covered the personal characteristics aspects such as age, gender, position tenure and educational background.

5.1.1 Response Sample Description

Of the 625 sample targeted, 217 responses were received, which makes a 34.7% response rate. Of these 217 respondents, 27 samples were excluded due to the supervisor’s involvement in the process; 18 further samples were excluded as a result of incomplete response for the questionnaire. Six firms were targeted for the survey, in of which only four firms responded. The current turbulent environment in the country has influenced the willingness of many firms to participate in the questionnaire. Response rates varied between 52% and 32%, for each firm.
5.1.2 Demographical sample description

5.1.2.1 Respondent's related industries

Six different industries were initially targeted to obtain responses. Only four industries replied as shown in Figure-10.

Figure 10 Samples targeted and obtained per industry

With regard to the responses obtained per industry, the majority of responses were driven by the health sector (63%), followed by the manufacturing sector with 20%,
and a small contribution was made from the tourism and information technology sectors with 7.5% and 9.3% respectively. Moreover, the health sector represented the public enterprises, while the tourism, manufacturing and information technology sectors represented the private sector.

**Figure 11 Percentage of respondents by Industry**

Responses to the constructs were studied against respondent industry. Significance was found in two different constructs; affect-based trust scored slightly higher in the information technology industry, while commitment scored slightly lower in the manufacturing industry. Nevertheless, it is worth mentioning that due to the unbalanced size of respondent sample across industries, the significant relationship may change if equal sample size would be obtained.

**5.1.2.2 Respondent's related age**

The graph in Figure-12 displays the breakdown of respondents' ages. The majority of respondents (34.8%) were in the range of between 30 and 40 years of age, 27.3% of respondents were in the age range of 20 to 30 years old, followed by 23.26% of the respondents who were in the range of 40 to 50 years old, then 8.7% above the age of 50, and finally around six percent of respondents were below 20 years old. This confirms that 68% of the respondents' sample represented the early
20 years of the work career, reflecting the target group of labour this research had aimed for, as this was the portion of the population that most likely participated in the recent uprising and had been severely impacted by the turbulent business environment (Abdelhafez, 2013). Responses to the constructs were studied against the respondent age; no significant distinction was found.

**Figure 12 Percentage of respondents by Age**

![Bar chart showing the percentage of respondents by age](image)

5.1.2.3 Respondent’s related gender

The graph in Figure-12 expresses the breakdown of respondents’ gender, in which 61% of total respondents were males, while 39% were females. This further demonstrates an approximate 64% female to male ratio, while countrywide the ratio was much smaller in the employment domain; around 32% (The World Bank, 2013). Responses to the constructs were studied against the respondent’s gender. Significance was observed in the aspects of affect-based and cognition-based trust, in which females demonstrated higher levels of trust when compared to males.
5.1.2.4 Respondent’s related to position tenure

The histogram in Figure-14 illustrates the distribution of respondents through their years of service within the current position. Zero years of service was the highest occurring years of service highlighted by respondents (35 respondents), followed by three years of service (23 respondents). The maximum years of service was 28 years, which surprisingly occurred more than the average in such range of years of service. The mean score of respondents’ years of service was computed to be 7.91 years. Responses to the constructs were studied against the respondents’ position tenures. No significant distinction was found. Nevertheless, it was believed that the specific question addressed the position tenure was not fully understood by all respondents; respondents were mixing current position tenure with current job grade tenure, and hence zero years of service occurred more often than any other
score. Therefore, by excluding the respondents of zero scores, it was found that organisational commitment increased with the increase of number of years in service within the current position.

Figure 14 Distribution of respondents by position tenure

5.1.2.5 Respondent’s related to educational background

The graph in Figure-15 indicates the breakdown of respondents’ educational background. Employees that were holding diplomas and Bachelor’s degrees were the majority of respondents (39%), while employees holding Master’s degrees or higher came third with 10.47%, followed by secondary or high school graduates with seven percent, and finally basic primary education contributed 4.65% out of the total number of respondents. Responses to the constructs were studied against the respondents’ educational backgrounds. Significant differences were observed in the
aspect of cognition-based trust, whereas perception of cognition-based trust among employees decreased with higher levels of education. Moreover, satisfaction with HR practices was found to be significantly declining with higher levels of education, and finally overall job satisfaction was found to be significantly declining with higher levels of education.

**Figure 15 Percentage of respondents by Educational**

![Bar chart showing percentage of respondents by educational level.](chart.png)
5.1.3 Descriptive statistics for each scale

Table 1 Descriptive Statistics for all variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Affect-based trust</th>
<th>Cognition-based trust</th>
<th>Communication</th>
<th>Commitment</th>
<th>Organisational Structure</th>
<th>HR practice</th>
<th>Employee satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>-0.54</td>
<td>-0.91</td>
<td>-0.60</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.1.4 Sample description – Independent variables

As previously mentioned, all means scoring were calculated based on five-point Likert-type scale. The analysis of the means assumed equal interval scales, the scoring of each construct was based on the average scoring of all questions related to the same construct, which ranged from zero (total disagreement) to four (full agreement). The overall scores were then mapped to an equivalent percentage of agreement (for example a score of two means 50% percentage of agreement). These percentages were then represented graphically in bar graphs, grouped by the specific construct, and hence comparison among constructs was done accordingly.

5.1.4.1 Affect-based trust

Figure-16 demonstrates the percentage of agreement for respondents towards the different constructs of affect-based trust, and hence an equal average was calculated for the independent variable. Affect-based trust consists of four different constructs, in which each contributed equally to the overall score; each had a 25%
load on the overall affect-based trust. Care among employees scored the highest percentage of agreement (66%). Openness in expressing thoughts and ideas among employees, and concern among co-workers with related and non-related work matters came second with 61% agreeing. Finally, support offered among employees in the case of challenges scored the lowest percentage of agreement (60%). Subsequently, affect-based trust scored 62% percentage of agreement as an equal weighted average among the four constructs.

**Figure 16 Percentage of respondents’ agreement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Percentage of Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total affect-based trust</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**5.1.4.2 Cognition-based trust**

Figure-17 demonstrates the percentage of agreement for respondents towards the different constructs of cognition-based trust, and hence an equal average was calculated for the independent variable. Cognition-based trust consists of four different constructs, in which each contributed equally to the overall score; each had a 25% load on the overall cognition-based trust. Perception of competence among employees scored the highest percentage of agreement (71%). Secondly, reliability on peers in performing the work scored 63% percentage of agreement, followed by the perception of consistent job performance among employees scored 61% percentage of agreement. Finally, fair treatment perceived by employees from
their management scored the lowest with 59% percentage of agreement. Subsequently, cognition-based trust scored 63% percentage of agreement as an equal weighted average among the four constructs.

**Figure 17 Percentage of respondents’ agreement towards**

![Cognition-Based trust](image)

5.1.5 Sample description – Moderating Variables

5.1.5.1 Internal Communication

Figure-18 establishes the percentage of agreement for respondents towards the internal communication environment within the organisation. Communication addresses both directions; top-down and bottom-up, and the scale varies from closed-type communication with low scoring and open-type of communication with high scoring. The perception of internal communication from respondents scored on average 65% percentage of agreement.
5.1.5.2 Organisational Commitment

Figure-18 demonstrates the percentage of agreement of respondents towards the levels of commitment within the organisation. As mentioned previously, organisational commitment should integrate the surrounding effects of the organisation, such as employee commitment, organisational structure and HR practices, and hence organisational commitment can be represented in a balanced form. Subsequently, based on the structure of the questionnaire, a total average score was calculated per construct, whereas contribution of employee commitment questions had a weight of 40%, HR practices had 40% weight and organisational structure had 20% percent weight.

Perception of employee commitment towards the organisation had an average of 82% percentage of agreement (highest among all constructs), perception of clarity and understanding of organisational structure had a score of 63% percentage of agreement, and finally perception of effective HR practices had the lowest score among all constructs with a 54% percentage of agreement. Effective HR practices were in employment security, team-working, training, development, egalitarianism and knowledge sharing.

Based on the weighted average percentage loading emphasised above, overall perception of organisational commitment scored an average of 67% percentage of agreement.
5.1.6 Sample description – Dependent variable – Job satisfaction

The histogram in Figure-19 illustrates the distribution of respondents through their perception of job satisfaction. Here the scale is based on the actual scoring from zero to four. Scoring varied from minimum 0.75 (18.75% percentage of agreement) to a maximum of 3.75 (93.75% percentage of agreement). The mean score of respondents’ perception of job satisfaction was 2.685 which is equivalent to 67.13% percentage of agreement.
Overall, in terms of the percentage of agreement of respondents towards all variables and their related constructs, the highest scoring items were:

- Perception of employee commitment at 82% percentage of agreement (organisational commitment); and
- Perception of competence among employees at 71% percentage of agreement (cognition-based trust)

The lowest scoring items were:

- Perception of effective HR practices followed by the organisation at 54% percentage of agreement (organisational commitment); and
- Perception of fairness treatment from management at 59% percentage of agreement (cognition-based trust)

The remainder of the constructs scored between 60% and 70% percentage of agreement, as presented in Table-2.

**Table 2 Summary of percentage of agreement across all variables and constructs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>Percentage of agreement of respondents’ perception</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affect-based trust</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Care</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concern</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weighted Average</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cognition-based trust</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fairness</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reliable</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Competent</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consistence</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weighted Average</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisational Commitment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employee commitment</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organisational Structure</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HR practices</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weighted Average</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Satisfaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2 Psychometric properties of the scales

5.2.1 Internal Consistency and Validity

In order to investigate the reliability and validity of the questionnaire, internal consistency of each of the scales was explored to test the model, factor analysis were performed and Cronbach’s alpha was calculated.

With regard to the dimensions of trust questions, one would have expected two factors to emerge containing the items pertaining to affect-based and cognition-based trust, explaining the distinction between both dimensions. Alternatively, scales presented mixed results, The initial analysis of Eigenvalues (shown in
Figure-20) suggested that four to five factors could be extracted. However, a number of items showed cross-loadings on other factors, as did those in the second factor, which was not well defined. Items from both the cognition-based and affect-based trust subscales were mixed on all factors.

The Internal consistency (Cronbach’s alpha coefficient) of the overall trust scale was (0.743) which are within acceptable limits. However, very few of the factors in the factor analysis obtained the threshold value of (0.65) (see Appendix- 2, section A), confirming that various factors could not be identified in this scale as per the expectations.

**Figure 20 Eigenvalues results for dimensions of trust**

For the case of the communication scale, the intention was to obtain one factor-scale. The reliability of the scale as a whole was 0.687, which was almost considered to be at the acceptable level. However initial inspection of the Eigenvalues showed that at least two factors could be extracted, as shown in Figure-21 (see Appendix- 2, section B).
With regard to the organisational commitment scale a similar pattern to the dimensions of trust was found. The expectations were supposed to follow the triple dimensions of organisational commitment defined in the literature, namely employee commitment, organisational structure and HR practices. Although these three factors were indeed suggested based on initial inspection (shown in figure-22), the distinction among the three factors was not clearly emphasised. Items from the three original scales were mixed on the factors and many cross-loadings occurred, specifically between HR practices and organisational structure. Alternatively, reliability estimates for the three factors were 0.599, 0.499 and 0.659, thus not reaching the expected levels for confirming internal consistency for the questionnaire related to organisational commitment (see Appendix-2, section C).
Finally, as in the case of communication, employee satisfaction was developed to be a uni-dimensional measurement. Factor analysis suggested that either two or three factors could be identified. However, factors were not clearly separated; Cronbach’s alpha coefficients for one factor was 0.539, while the two factors obtained were 0.723 and 0.455 respectively. Hence, there was a tendency to support the uni-dimensionality of the scale, due to high Cronbach’s alpha value obtained for the stronger factor. Nevertheless it could not be confirmed due to the evolvement of the second factor although its value was not as significant (see Appendix-2, section D).

5.2.2 Multi-collinearity of variables

Multi-collinearity among the independent (affect-based and cognition-based trust) and moderating variables (internal communication and organisational commitment) was tested against the dependent variable (job satisfaction) due to the necessity emphasised in the literature. In order to ensure validity of the regression analysis discussed later in the chapter, one key assumption is that no independent or moderating variable should be closer to a linear function with any of the other
predictors or moderators. Multi-collinearity analysis was performed through “collinearity diagnostics”, and result of the variance inflation factor (VIF) and condition index are shown in Table-3 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multi-collinearity dimension</th>
<th>VIF values</th>
<th>Condition index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affect-based/Cognition-based trust</td>
<td>1.662</td>
<td>13.296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affect-based trust/Internal Communication</td>
<td>1.335</td>
<td>11.955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognition-based trust/Internal Communication</td>
<td>1.446</td>
<td>10.927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affect-based trust/Organisational Commitment</td>
<td>1.194</td>
<td>11.809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognition-based trust/Organisational Commitment</td>
<td>1.345</td>
<td>10.728</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the guidelines from SPSS, VIF is directly related to tolerance, and if predictors are perfectly uncorrelated, the VIF values will have a value of one. The greater the value from one, the more the variance is artificially inflated for this variable because of its relationship to the other predictors or moderators. As a general rule, VIF seeks values above about three to four, in order to point out multi-collinearity effects. Another set of multi-collinearity diagnostics is the condition index and associated variance proportions. Another general rule is that if the condition index is near 30 or above for a dimension, it is a sign of possible multi-collinearity.

It is clear from Table-3 that all VIF values are well below three and closer to one. Furthermore, all condition index values are below 30, which reflects weak multicollinearity effects among all dimensions, thus it is safe to proceed with regression analysis for the tested variables.
5.3 Response to the research proposition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition (1A)</th>
<th>Affect-based trust has a direct positive relationship with job satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposition (1B)</td>
<td>Cognition-based trust has a direct positive relationship with job satisfaction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Motivating the correlation analysis

Correlation analysis was used to measure the strength of the relationship between two variables and the probability of occurrence by chance (Saunders & Lewis, 2012). In the first part of the proposition, the Pearson correlation coefficient (-1 < r < +1) is measured between the two variables (Affect-based trust and job satisfaction) in order to identify the relationship direction. Whereas, in the second part of the proposition, the Pearson correlation coefficient (-1 < r < +1) is measured between the two variables (Cognition-based trust and job satisfaction) in order to identify the relationship direction. Positive value means that as one variable increases, so does the other. However, a negative value means that as the values of one variable increase, the values of the other variable decrease (Saunders & Lewis, 2012).

Thus, the correlation analysis was the most suitable method for testing the proposition, in order to distinguish the type of relationship between the two variables at a statistically significant level.

Findings

A- Affect-based trust

The four constructs that shape the affect-based trust were measured against job satisfaction. Pearson correlation coefficients were calculated based on the data scoring for each construct and the score of job satisfaction. As shown in Table-4:
• The relationship between perception of caring among employees and job satisfaction was the highest strength value \((r = 0.459, p<0.001)\), which shows a positive moderate correlation (Saunders & Lewis, 2012);

• The relationship between support offered among employees in the case of challenges and job satisfaction scored \((r = 0.291, p<0.001)\), which shows a positive weak correlation (Saunders & Lewis, 2012);

• The relationship between openness in expressing thoughts and ideas among employees and job satisfaction scored \((r = 0.27, p<0.001)\), which shows a positive weak correlation (Saunders & Lewis, 2012); and

• Finally, the relationship between concern among co-workers with related and non-related work matters and job satisfaction scored \((r = 0.027, p>0.05)\), which shows a weak significance on relationship type (Saunders & Lewis, 2012).

Table 4 Pearson correlation coefficients among the constructs of affect-based trust and job satisfaction with the equivalent significant level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>Employee satisfaction</th>
<th>Openness</th>
<th>Care</th>
<th>Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee satisfaction</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.270</td>
<td>.459</td>
<td>.291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>.270</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.362</td>
<td>.271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care</td>
<td>.459</td>
<td>.362</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>.291</td>
<td>.271</td>
<td>.277</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (1-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee satisfaction</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern</td>
<td>.364</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.473</td>
<td>.467</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B- Cognition-based trust

The four constructs that shape the cognition-based trust were measured against job satisfaction. Pearson correlation coefficients were calculated based on the data scoring for each construct and the score of job satisfaction. As shown in Table-5:
• The relationship between perception of fair treatment by employees from their management and job satisfaction was the highest strength value ($r = 0.425, p<0.001$), which shows a positive moderate correlation;

• The relationship between perception of competence among employees and job satisfaction scored ($r = 0.382, p<0.001$), which shows a positive moderate correlation;

• The relationship between perception of consistent job performance among employees and job satisfaction scored ($r = 0.265, p<0.001$), which shows a positive weak correlation; and

• Finally, the relationship between reliability on peers in performing the work and job satisfaction scored ($r = 0.265, p<0.005$), which shows a positive weak correlation.

Aggregating the constructs of each independent variable in order to calculate the overall average score of affect-based trust and cognition-based trust; was based on 25% weight from each construct. Then, the overall score of each independent variable was measured against job satisfaction, in order to identify the strength of the relationship between two affect-based trust and job satisfaction, and cognition-based trust and job satisfaction, as shown in Table-6.

• The relationship between cognition-based trust and job satisfaction scored the higher strength value ($r = 0.488, p<0.001$), which shows a positive moderate correlation;

• The relationship between affect-based trust and job satisfaction had a lower strength value ($r = 0.423, p<0.001$), which shows a positive moderate correlation

Thus, there was evidence to support both parts of proposition one, namely, that affect-based and cognition-based trust have a positive direct relationship with job satisfaction.
Table 5 Pearson correlation coefficients among the constructs of cognition-based trust and job satisfaction with the equivalent significant level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>Employee satisfaction</th>
<th>Fairness</th>
<th>Reliable</th>
<th>Competent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>Employee satisfaction</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.425</td>
<td>.248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fairness</td>
<td>.425</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reliable</td>
<td>.248</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Competent</td>
<td>.382</td>
<td>.416</td>
<td>.439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consistence</td>
<td>.265</td>
<td>.196</td>
<td>.212</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sig. (1-tailed)</th>
<th>Employee satisfaction</th>
<th>Fairness</th>
<th>Reliable</th>
<th>Competent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistence</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 Pearson correlation coefficients between affect-based and cognition-based trust with job satisfaction the equivalent significant level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>Employee satisfaction</th>
<th>Total cognition</th>
<th>Total Affect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>Employee satisfaction</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total cognition</td>
<td>.488</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Affect</td>
<td>.423</td>
<td>.631</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sig. (1-tailed)</th>
<th>Employee satisfaction</th>
<th>Total cognition</th>
<th>Total Affect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cognition</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Affect</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposition (2) Affect-based trust is more influential on job satisfaction than cognition-based trust.

Motivating the simple linear regression and multiple regression analysis

Simple linear regression was used to determine the linear relationship between the dependent variable (job satisfaction) and the independent variables (affect-based
and cognition-based trust). Saunders and Lewis (2012) stated that regression analysis assumes that the dependent variable can be predicted using the independent or predictor variable, which can be extrapolated from the straight line relationship between the dependent and independent variable. The Pearson’s correlation coefficient (r) was examined to measure the strength of the relationship between two variables and the probability of occurrence by chance.

The r-square ($r^2$) or the regression coefficient (coefficient of determination) was also examined to explain the strength of a cause-and-effect between the relationship of a dependent variable and one or more independent variables, and the probability of occurrence by chance (Saunders, and Lewis, 2012). Simplistically, the coefficient of determination can be explained in terms of the total variation in the dependent variable that was accounted for by knowing the independent variable, versus the unexplained variation in the dependent variable. The closer the value of ($r^2$) is to one the better the linear fit is of the regression line, and the closer the value is to zero the worse the linear fit is (Weiers, 2011).

Multiple regression analysis was further used to study the association effects of two or more independent variables on a single dependent variable, which is investigated simultaneously. The partial regression coefficient; which is explained by a single independent variable; was measured in terms of percentage of variance within the dependant variable, holding all other independent variables constant (Saunders, and Lewis, 2012). Finally the coefficients of $\beta$ were compared to determine the strongest influencer of the independent variables (affect and cognition-based trust) on the dependent variable (job satisfaction). The highest $\beta$ value has the greater influence on the variance of job satisfaction (Weiers, 2011).

This method of analysis was the most suitable for testing this proposition because:

- Comparing the influence on the dependent variable relationship with two predictor variables,
- showing the stronger influencing variable through the coefficients of the regression line; and
• the objective was to confirm whether the relationship can be represented at a statistically significant level.

Findings

As shown in the scatter plots of Figures 23 and 24, a linear relationship is explained to exist for both independent variables. For the case of affect-based trust, the regression equation demonstrates that affect-based trust is responsible for almost 18% ($r^2=0.179$) of the variance in employee job satisfaction, and one unit increase in affect-based trust will result in 0.439 ($p<0.001$) factor increase in employee satisfaction, as shown in Table-7.

Figure 23 Distribution of respondents for affect-based trust towards job satisfaction
Table 7 Regression model for affect-based trust versus job satisfaction with the equivalent significant level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regression Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Square</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficients</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>t Stat</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1.598</td>
<td>0.183</td>
<td>8.741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affect-based trust</td>
<td>0.439</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>6.081</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the case of cognition-based trust, the regression equation demonstrates that affect-based trust is responsible for almost 24% ($r^2=0.238$) of the variance in employee job satisfaction. Moreover, it shows that one unit increase in cognition-based trust would result in 0.437 ($p<0.001$) factor increase in employee satisfaction, as shown in Table-8.

Figure 24 Distribution of respondents for cognition-based trust towards job satisfaction
Table 8 Regression model for cognition-based trust versus job satisfaction with the equivalent significant level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regression Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Square</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficients</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>t Stat</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1.579</td>
<td>0.156</td>
<td>10.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognition-based trust</td>
<td>0.437</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>7.284</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, by combining both independent variables to distinguish the stronger influence on the relationship with job satisfaction, the regression model demonstrates that both affect-based and cognition-based trust together are responsible for more than a quarter ($r^2=0.26$) of the variance in employee job satisfaction. Moreover, it illustrates the stronger influence of cognition-based trust on job satisfaction. One unit increase in cognition-based trust results in 0.329 ($p<0.001$) factor increase in employee satisfaction, while one unit increase in affect-based trust only results in 0.198 (0.05>$p>0.001$) factor increase in employee satisfaction, as shown in Table-9. Thus the evidence explained earlier does not support the second proposition, but it actually proves the opposite; whereas cognition-based trust is more influential on job satisfaction than affect-based trust.

Table 9 Regression model for affect-based and cognition-based trust versus job satisfaction with the equivalent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regression Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Square</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficients</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>t Stat</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1.361</td>
<td>0.182</td>
<td>7.460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affect-based trust</td>
<td>0.198</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>2.238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognition-based trust</td>
<td>0.329</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>4.304</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Motivating the subgroup regression analysis and moderated regression analysis

In studying the degree of association between a predictor/independent variable and a criterion/dependent variable through the moderating influence of a different variable on a relationship, two methods have been defined for identifying and testing moderator variables; subgroup regression analysis and moderated regression analysis (Sharma, Durand, and Gur-Arie, 1981). Some researchers have claimed that a variable can act as a moderator if it interacts with the independent variable. Others added that the moderator cannot act as a predictor for the dependent variable nor relate to the independent variable. A final approach to utilise an analytic procedure to study the differences between the subgroups and ignore the interaction relationship is utilised (Sharma, et al., 1981).

Four different classifications have been defined for the moderating variable, based on the relationship with the dependent variable and the interaction with the independent variable. If the variable is related to the dependent and/or independent variable and at the same time does not interact with the independent variable, it is referred to be intervening or antecedent or predictor but not moderator (Quadrant 1, as per Figure-25). If the variable does not interact with the predictor, but still not significantly related to either the independent or the dependent variable, then it will be defined as homologizer moderator which is influenced by the error term in the function (Quadrant 2, as per Figure-25). Finally, in the case of interaction with the

Proposition (3A) Communication moderates the relationship between affect-based trust and job satisfaction, such that the positive relationship between affect-based trust and job satisfaction is stronger in the case of open-type communication.

Proposition (3B) Communication moderates the relationship between cognition-based trust and job satisfaction, such that the positive relationship between cognition-based trust and job satisfaction is stronger in the case of open-type communication.
independent variable, if it was significantly related to either the independent or the dependent variable, it will then act as a quasi-moderator (quadrant 3, as per Figure-25). Subsequently, if it was not related to any of the variables then it will be a pure moderator (Quadrant 4, as per Figure-25) (Sharma, et al., 1981).

**Figure 25 Typology of specification variables (Sharma, et al., 1981)**

In the subgroup regression analysis, the hypothesized moderator sample is divided into subgroups. The data can be fragmented based on the mean or median value. After sub-grouping the respondents, typical regression analysis is used to study the relationship between the independent variables (affect-based and cognition-based trust) and the dependent variable (job satisfaction) for each subgroup (Sharma, et al., 1981). Emphasis from the regression analysis was then noted, such as the coefficient of determination and $\beta$ coefficients of the independent variable with the equivalent significance levels. Should the $R^2$ (coefficient of determination) vary between subgroups, one can conclude that the variable used for sub-grouping is a moderator, or if the regression coefficients $\beta$ for the independent variable differ significantly across subgroups, the variable is assumed to be a moderator variable (Sharma, et al., 1981).
Moderated regression analysis (MRA) is differentiated from subgroup analysis due to its analytic approach that controls the effects of a moderator variable. Predominantly, MRA can be considered as a complement or an extension to the subgroup regression analysis. When applying MRA in terms of predictor/independent variables, one should examine the below three regression equations for equality of the regression coefficients (Sharma, et al., 1981):

\[ y = a + b_1x \]  
\[ y = a + b_1x + b_2z \]  
\[ y = a + b_1x + b_2z + b_3xz \]

If equations two and three are not significantly different (for example, \( b_3 = 0; b_2 \neq 0 \)), then \( z \) is not a moderator variable but simply an independent predictor variable (Quadrant 1, Figure-25). For \( z \) to be classified as a pure moderator variable (Quadrant 4, Figure-25), equations one and two should not be different but should be different from equation 3 (for example, \( b_2 = 0; b_3 \neq 0 \)). For \( z \) to act as a quasi-moderator (Quadrant 3, Figure-25), equations one, two and three should be different from each other (for example, \( b_2 \neq b_3 \neq 0 \)) (Sharma, et al., 1981). This procedural approach of analysis was the most suitable for testing this proposition in that:

- There is the existence of a third variable that has a surrounding impact on the relationship and does not directly trigger the outcome; and
- Determine the moderating influence of such variables on the relationship between the predictor variables and the dependent variable, whether an amplifying or a contracting influence; and
- Finally distinguish which type of moderation the moderating variable imposes on the relationship, in relation to the interaction and the significant relationship with the predictor and the dependent variable, and hence confirm statistical confidence.

Findings

A- Affect-based trust
Based on the third proposition, communication was examined for moderation influence on the overall relationship between the affect-based and trust and job satisfaction. Firstly, MRA was examined to identify the different regression coefficients, through three steps of regression analysis as depicted in Table-10.

Table 10 Three steps of moderating regression analysis for communication as moderator on the relationship between affect-based trust and job satisfaction

\[ Y = a + b_1X \quad \text{(1)} \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regression Statistics</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple R</td>
<td>0.423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Square</td>
<td>0.179</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficients</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>t Stat</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1.598</td>
<td>0.183</td>
<td>8.741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affect-based trust</td>
<td>0.439</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>6.081</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ Y = a + b_1X + b_2Z \quad \text{(2)} \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regression Statistics</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple R</td>
<td>0.516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Square</td>
<td>0.266</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficients</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>t Stat</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1.308</td>
<td>0.185</td>
<td>7.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affect-based trust</td>
<td>0.262</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>3.308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>0.282</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>4.478</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ Y = a + b_1X + b_2Z + b_3XZ \quad \text{(3)} \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regression Statistics</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple R</td>
<td>0.519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Square</td>
<td>0.270</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficients</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>t Stat</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>0.871</td>
<td>0.488</td>
<td>1.786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affect-based trust</td>
<td>0.450</td>
<td>0.211</td>
<td>2.139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>0.459</td>
<td>0.194</td>
<td>2.371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product</td>
<td>-0.074</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>-0.967</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The outcome of the MRA examined on communication has proven to have insignificant interaction relationship with predictor (affect-based trust) \((b_3=-0.074, p>0.1)\). Also communication had a significant relation with the dependent variable (job satisfaction) \((b_2=0.282, p<0.001)\), and hence weakens the evidence of supporting the moderation influence of communication. Nonetheless, the regression model can only explain 27\% of total variance of job satisfaction \((R^2=0.27)\), which required further study and examination through the subgroup regression analysis.

The second stage applied sub-groupings for respondents' data on the hypothesised moderating variable (communication), by dividing the data into open communication that scored higher than the mean value \((\mu = 2.6, \text{ equivalent to } 65\% \text{ of percentage agreement})\), and a closed communication that scored below the mean value.

**Table 11 Subgroup regression analysis for communication as moderator on the relationship between affect-based trust and job satisfaction**

**Open-type of communication**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regression Statistics</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple R</td>
<td>0.265</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Square</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficients</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>t Stat</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>2.128</td>
<td>0.271</td>
<td>7.857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affect-based trust</td>
<td>0.274</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>2.691</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Closed-type of communication**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regression Statistics</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple R</td>
<td>0.447</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Square</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficients</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>t Stat</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1.423</td>
<td>0.254</td>
<td>5.597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affect-based trust</td>
<td>0.460</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>4.238</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two regression models have been derived from the two subgroups formed, as shown in Table-11; one regression model represents the relationship between...
affect-based trust and job satisfaction in an open communication environment ($R^2=0.07$, $\beta=0.274$, $p<0.01$). The other regression equation represents the relationship between affect-based trust and job satisfaction in a closed communication environment ($R^2=0.2$, $\beta=0.46$, $p<0.001$). The two equations are represented in Figure-26 to explain the moderating effect of communication, which emphasises a stronger influence on job satisfaction in the case of closed-type of communication (steeper slope), and thus offers support for third proposition around the moderating effect of communication on the relationship. The positive relationship is stronger in the case of closed communication environment not in the open-type communication environment, and hence partially supports the first part of the third proposition.

In the second part of the third proposition, communication was examined for moderation influence on the overall relationship between the cognition-based trust
and job satisfaction. Firstly, MRA was examined to identify the different regression coefficients, through three steps of regression analysis as shown in Table-12.

Table 12 Three steps of moderating regression analysis for communication as moderator on the relationship between Cognition-based trust and job

\[ Y = a + b_1X \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regression Statistics</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple R</td>
<td>0.488</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Square</td>
<td>0.238</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficients</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>t Stat</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1.579</td>
<td>0.156</td>
<td>10.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognition-based trust</td>
<td>0.437</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>7.284</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ Y = a + b_1X + b_2Z \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regression Statistics</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple R</td>
<td>0.542</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Square</td>
<td>0.294</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficients</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>t Stat</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1.330</td>
<td>0.166</td>
<td>8.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognition-based trust</td>
<td>0.296</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>4.245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>0.235</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>3.651</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ Y = a + b_1X + b_2Z + b_3XZ \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regression Statistics</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple R</td>
<td>0.542</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Square</td>
<td>0.294</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficients</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>t Stat</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1.384</td>
<td>0.452</td>
<td>3.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognition-based trust</td>
<td>0.272</td>
<td>0.195</td>
<td>1.393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td>0.186</td>
<td>1.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product Cognition/ Communication</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>0.129</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The outcome of the MRA examined on communication has proven to have insignificant interaction with predictor (cognition-based trust) \( (b_3=0.009, p>0.1) \). Furthermore, communication had a significant relation with the dependent variable (job satisfaction) \( (b_2=0.235, p<0.001) \), and hence weakens the evidence of supporting the moderation influence of communication. Nonetheless, the regression model can only explain 29.4% of total variance of job satisfaction \( (R^2=0.294) \), which required further study and examination through the subgroup regression analysis.

The second stage was applying sub-grouping for respondents' data on the hypothesised moderating variable (communication), by dividing the data into an open communication that scored higher than the mean value \( (\mu = 2.6, \text{ equivalent to } 65\% \text{ of percentage agreement}) \), and closed communication that scored below the mean value.

**Table 13 Subgroup regression analysis for communication as moderator on the relationship between cognition-based trust and job satisfaction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regressions Statistics</th>
<th>Open-type of communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple R</td>
<td>0.426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Square</td>
<td>0.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coefficients</td>
<td>Standard Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1.72690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognition-based trust</td>
<td>0.40853</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regressions Statistics</th>
<th>Closed-type of communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple R</td>
<td>0.389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Square</td>
<td>0.151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coefficients</td>
<td>Standard Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognition-based trust</td>
<td>0.343</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two regression models have been derived from the two subgroups formed, as shown in Table-13; one regression model represents the relationship between cognition-based trust and job satisfaction in an open communication environment.
(R^2=0.182, β=0.409, p<0.001). The other regression equation represents the relationship between affect-based trust and job satisfaction in a closed communication environment (R^2=0.151, β=0.343, p<0.001). The two equations are represented in Figure-27 to explain the moderating effect of communication, which emphasises a stronger influence on job satisfaction in the case of open communication (slightly steeper slope), and thus offers support for the third proposition around the moderating effect of communication on the relationship. Moreover, the positive relationship is slightly stronger in the case of open communication environments, when compared to the closed communication environments, which is due to the weak statistical significance in the relationship. The two lines in Figure-27 are very close to each other. Thus, the evidence supports the second part of the third proposition, however the difference in results between both types of communication were very narrow.

Figure 27 Figure-27 Relationship between cognition-based trust and job satisfaction in different communication environments
Proposition (4A) Levels of commitment moderate the relationship between affect-based trust and job satisfaction, such that the positive relationship between affect-based trust and job satisfaction is stronger among employees with high levels of commitment.

Proposition (4B) Levels of commitment moderates the relationship between cognition-based trust and job satisfaction, such that the positive relationship between cognition-based trust and job satisfaction is stronger among employees with low levels of commitment.

The same motivation proposed for the third hypothesis was applied for proposition four, since the same type of moderation experienced previously would be imposed on the relationship between the same independent and dependent variables, but in this case communication would be replaced by the perception of commitment levels within the organisation.

Findings

A- Affect-based trust

Based on the fourth proposition, perception of commitment levels was examined for moderation influence on the overall relationship between the affect-based trust and job satisfaction. Firstly, MRA was examined to identify the different regression coefficients, through three steps of regression analysis as shown in Table-14.

Table 14 Three steps of moderating regression analysis for perception of commitment levels as moderator on the relationship between affect-based

\[ Y = a + b_1X \]  

\[ \text{Regression Statistics} \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0.423</th>
<th>0.179</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Square</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficients</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>t Stat</th>
<th>P- value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1.598</td>
<td>0.183</td>
<td>8.741</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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\begin{align*}
\text{Affect-based trust} & = 0.439 \\
\text{Commitment perception} & = 0.371
\end{align*}

\[ Y = a + b_1X + b_2Z \]

\[ Y = a + b_1X + b_2Z + b_3XZ \]

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
\textit{Regression Statistics} & & & & \\
\hline
\textit{Multiple R} & 0.576 & & & \\
\textit{R Square} & 0.332 & & & \\
\hline
\textit{Coefficients} & \textit{Standard Error} & \textit{t Stat} & \textit{P-value} & \\
\hline
\text{Intercept} & 1.049 & 0.187 & 5.602 & 0.000 \\
\text{Affect-based trust} & 0.260 & 0.071 & 3.644 & 0.000 \\
\text{Commitment perception} & 0.371 & 0.060 & 6.228 & 0.000 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
\textit{Regression Statistics} & & & & \\
\hline
\textit{Multiple R} & 0.581 & & & \\
\textit{R Square} & 0.338 & & & \\
\hline
\textit{Coefficients} & \textit{Standard Error} & \textit{t Stat} & \textit{P-value} & \\
\hline
\text{Intercept} & 0.393 & 0.572 & 0.688 & 0.493 \\
\text{Affect-based trust} & 0.540 & 0.242 & 2.238 & 0.027 \\
\text{Commitment perception} & 0.625 & 0.218 & 2.869 & 0.005 \\
\hline
\text{Product Affect/Commitment} & -0.106 & 0.088 & -1.214 & 0.226 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

The outcome of the MRA examined on perception of commitment has proven to have insignificant interactions with predictor (affect-based trust) \((b_3=-0.106, p>0.1)\). Also, the perception of commitment had a significant relation with the dependent variable (job satisfaction) \((b_2=0.371, p<0.001)\), and hence weakens the evidence of supporting the moderation influence of perception of commitment. Nonetheless, the regression line can only explain 33.8\% of total variance of job satisfaction \((R^2=0.338)\), in which required further study and examination through the subgroup regression analysis.

In the second stage, sub-grouping the respondents’ data was performed based on the hypothesised moderating variable (perception of commitment), by classifying
the respondents’ data into high levels of commitment with scores higher than the mean value ($\mu = 2.67$, equivalent to 66.75% of percentage agreement), and low levels of commitment with scoring below the mean value.

**Table 15 Subgroup regression analysis for perception of commitment as moderator on the relationship between affect-based**

**High levels of commitment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regression Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Square</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficients</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>t Stat</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1.9297</td>
<td>0.2629</td>
<td>7.3413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affect-based trust</td>
<td>0.3695</td>
<td>0.0989</td>
<td>3.7351</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Low levels of commitment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regression Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Square</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficients</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>t Stat</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1.644</td>
<td>0.247</td>
<td>6.661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affect-based trust</td>
<td>0.360</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>3.512</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two regression models have been derived from the two subgroups formed, as shown in Table-15; one regression model represents the relationship between affect-based trust and job satisfaction in high levels of commitment environment ($R^2=0.147$, $\beta=0.37$, $p<0.001$). The other regression equation represents the relationship between affect-based trust and job satisfaction in low levels of commitment environment ($R^2=0.124$, $\beta=0.36$, $p<0.001$). The two equations are represented in Figure-28 to explain the moderating effect of perception of commitment, which emphasises an equal influence on job satisfaction in both cases of levels of commitment (two parallel regression lines), and thus does not support the fourth proposition around the moderating effect of perception of commitment on the relationship.
B- Cognition-based trust

In the second part of the fourth proposition, perception of commitment was examined for moderation influence on the overall relationship between the cognition-based and trust and job satisfaction. Firstly, MRA was examined to identify the different regression coefficients, through three steps of regression analysis as shown in Table-16.
Table 16 Three steps of moderating regression analysis for perception of commitment as moderator on the relationship between Cognition-based Trust

\[ Y = a + b_1X \]

**Regression Statistics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.488</td>
<td>0.238</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coefficients</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>t Stat</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1.579</td>
<td>0.156</td>
<td>10.120</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognition-based trust</td>
<td>0.437</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>7.284</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Regression Statistics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.587</td>
<td>0.345</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coefficients</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>t Stat</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognition-based trust</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment perception</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Regression Statistics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.588</td>
<td>0.346</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coefficients</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>t Stat</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1.498</td>
<td>0.636</td>
<td>2.357</td>
<td>0.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognition-based trust</td>
<td>0.115</td>
<td>0.263</td>
<td>0.438</td>
<td>0.662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment perception</td>
<td>0.189</td>
<td>0.243</td>
<td>0.778</td>
<td>0.438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognition/Commitment</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>0.590</td>
<td>0.556</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The outcome of the MRA examined on perception of commitment has proven to have insignificant interaction with predictor (cognition-based trust) \( (b_3=0.056, p>0.1) \). Furthermore, perception of commitment had a significant relation with the dependent variable (job satisfaction) \( (b_2=0.33, p<0.001) \), and hence weakens the
evidence of supporting the moderation influence of perception of commitment. Nonetheless, the regression line only explained 34.6% of total variance of job satisfaction ($R^2=0.346$), which required further study and examination through the subgroup regression analysis.

The second stage applied sub-grouping for respondents’ data on the hypothesised moderating variable (perception of commitment), by dividing the data into high levels of commitment with scoring higher than the mean value ($\mu = 2.67$, equivalent to 66.75% of percentage agreement), and low levels of commitment with scoring below the mean value.

**Table 17 Subgroup regression analysis for perception of commitment as moderator on the relationship between cognition-based trust and**

High levels of commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regression Statistics</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple R</td>
<td>0.471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Square</td>
<td>0.221</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficients</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>t Stat</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1.651</td>
<td>0.263</td>
<td>6.274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognition-based trust</td>
<td>0.440</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>4.799</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Low levels of commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regression Statistics</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple R</td>
<td>0.310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Square</td>
<td>0.096</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficients</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>t Stat</th>
<th>P-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1.826</td>
<td>0.225</td>
<td>8.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cognition W.A.</td>
<td>0.295</td>
<td>0.097</td>
<td>3.038</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two regression models were derived from the two subgroups formed, as shown in Table-17; one regression model represents the relationship between cognition-based trust and job satisfaction in high level of commitment environment ($R^2=0.221$, $\beta=0.44$, $p<0.001$). The other regression equation represents the relationship
between affect-based trust and job satisfaction in low levels of commitment environment ($R^2=0.096, \beta=0.295, p<0.01$). The two equations are represented in Figure-29 to explain the moderating effect of perception of commitment, which emphasises a stronger influence on job satisfaction in the case of high levels of commitment (steeper slope), and thus offers support for the fourth proposition around the moderating effect of perception of commitment on the relationship. Nevertheless the positive relationship is stronger in the case of high levels of commitment compared to the low levels of commitment environment, and hence partially supports the second part of the fourth proposition. In other words, perception of commitment moderate the relationship between cognition-based trust and job satisfaction, but the positive relationship between cognition-based trust and job satisfaction is stronger among employees with high levels of commitment.
5.4 Conclusion

To summarise the discussion above, the following observations must be discussed and concluded in accordance to research topic: Firstly, both dimensions of trust (affect-based and cognition-based) have shown a positive impact on the employee job satisfaction, although various degrees of satisfaction were obtained in each case, cognition-based trust has shown more influence on the job satisfaction. Also, the role of communication was emphasised as a moderator on the relationship between the dimensions of trust and job satisfaction, where closed-type communication stimulates more positive impact on job satisfaction in the case of affect-based trust, and where open-type of communication stimulates more positive impact on job satisfaction in the case of cognition-based trust. Finally, the perception of organisational commitment has shown partial moderating influence on
the relationship in the case of cognition-based trust only, whereas high-levels of commitment stimulates more positive impact on job satisfaction, while commitment did not show any moderating influence in the case of affect-based trust. These results will be discussed in further detail in Chapter 6.
CHAPTER 6: DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

6.1 Interrelation among variables

In this chapter, the discussion of the results emphasised in the previous chapter will take place; providing further insights to the context of the research, in terms of the findings of the survey in comparison to the literature review. Firstly, the interrelationships among the different variables are assessed; highlighting the influence of each variable on the other. Then the findings of the various propositions are discussed, and hence the study of the agreements and disagreements with the literature review that were explained in Chapter 2 are concluded.

Table 18 Correlation matrix for all variables and their related

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Openness</th>
<th>Care</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Concern</th>
<th>Avg. Affect-based trust</th>
<th>Fairness</th>
<th>Reliable</th>
<th>Competent</th>
<th>Consistency</th>
<th>Avg. cognition-based trust</th>
<th>Communication</th>
<th>Commitment</th>
<th>Organisational Structure</th>
<th>HR practice</th>
<th>Organisational commitment</th>
<th>Job satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care</td>
<td>.362</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Affect-based trust</td>
<td>.737</td>
<td>.669</td>
<td>.616</td>
<td>.471</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>.344</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>.377</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.425</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>.446</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent</td>
<td>.365</td>
<td>.528</td>
<td>.370</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>.522</td>
<td>.416</td>
<td>.439</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>.367</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.368</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>.341</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. cognition-based trust</td>
<td>.426</td>
<td>.555</td>
<td>.660</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>.631</td>
<td>.646</td>
<td>.670</td>
<td>.802</td>
<td>.599</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>.467</td>
<td>.349</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>.501</td>
<td>.467</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.566</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.555</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Commitment</td>
<td>.393</td>
<td>.313</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>.371</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>.326</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>.361</td>
<td>.633</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational Structure</td>
<td>.358</td>
<td>.332</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>.374</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>.444</td>
<td>0.497</td>
<td>.404</td>
<td>.404</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR practice</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.410</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.505</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>.415</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>.422</td>
<td>.495</td>
<td>.417</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational commitment</td>
<td>.400</td>
<td>.444</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-0.049</td>
<td>.403</td>
<td>.482</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>.478</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>.507</td>
<td>.676</td>
<td>.629</td>
<td>.876</td>
<td>.1000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>.459</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>.423</td>
<td>.425</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>.382</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>.488</td>
<td>.467</td>
<td>.499</td>
<td>.401</td>
<td>.385</td>
<td>.529</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Numbers in bold ----- Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
Numbers underlined ----- Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)
Number in red ----- Correlation is insignificant

As shown in Table-18, correlation analysis for the various variables is studied to distinguish the strength of the relationships. Independent variables are marked in yellow, moderating variables are marked in grey and dependent variables are marked in black. Each independent variable constitutes four different constructs
with equal weighted average, and organisational commitment constitutes three different constructs with unequal weighted average, in which all constructs are marked in red. Obviously all constructs were highly correlated with their own related variables, as they were considered their antecedents. Most of the correlation scores were in the range of (0.2) to (0.5), there were some correlations that scored higher than average, which emphasises the strong interaction between them. The usual interpretation of the correlation scoring is that anything greater than 0.5 is large, 0.5-0.3 is moderate, 0.3-0.1 is small, and anything smaller than 0.1 is insubstantial (Cohen, 1988).

Affect-based and cognition-based trust had a high correlation value of (0.631), which have demonstrated to a certain degree an overlap between both dimensions of trust, and hence have highlighted some challenges from respondents to distinguish the difference between them, which is a common challenge with an attitudinal behaviour-type of analysis (Zhu, and Akhtar, 2013). Additionally, the strong correlation score (0.555) among employees between care (one of affect-based trust construct) and overall cognition-based trust, explains the attachment link between some of the constructs of the dimensions of trust, which was illustrated by McAllister (1995) in explaining the formation of trust dimensions.

From the factor analysis results in regard to the dimensions of trust discussed in Chapter 5, there was no clear distinction between the two factors, but rather one stronger factor combining most of the constructs in both dimensions of trust and two weak factors that also combined both dimensions (see Appendix- 2, section A). In conclusion, it is noticeable that the responses obtained are still in earlier phases of trust regeneration. This is after two years of turbulent environment in the country, which caused severe damage to the social fabric of the society. In such early phases both dimensions of trust are attached together which imposed significant challenges to identify the distinctive nature between affect-based and cognition-based trust (McAllister, 1995).

Furthermore, a strong correlation score of (0.566) was found between perception of competence among employees and communication type, which explains the
degree of confidence in pursuing open-type communication when there is a high perception of competence among employees. Also communication type obtained high correlation scores with employee and organisational commitment with values of (0.633) and (0.676) respectively. This demonstrates that perception of employee commitment towards the organisation strongly interacts with the type of communication used within the organisation; namely that with higher levels of commitment within the organisation, firms will tend to pursue an open-type of communication.

It was found that concern among co-workers with related and non-related work matters had the lowest correlation scoring among all other variables (most scores are in red as shown in Table-18), which emphasises the weak interaction of concern on the relationship between dimensions of trust and job satisfaction, and thus explains the negligence from employees on concern related matters when it comes to job satisfaction. It was also found that HR practices that comprise of employment security, performance-related pay, training, development, egalitarianism and knowledge sharing; had a low correlation score with both (0.11); support offered among employees in the case of work-related challenges and reliability on peers in performing the work. This finding confirms the nature of HR practices as being mostly influenced by the organisation and top management (Gould-Williams, 2003), while support and reliability are instilled among the layer of co-workers and have an indirect or even limited influence from top management.

6.2 Addressing the research propositions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition (1A)</th>
<th>Affect-based trust has a direct positive relationship with job satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposition (1B)</td>
<td>Cognition-based trust has a direct positive relationship with job satisfaction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Affect-based trust

The four constructs that form the antecedents of affect-based trust were studied with respect to the influence on job satisfaction. Each response was equally contributing to the overall dimension of trust (25% each), most scores were in the moderate correlation range with job satisfaction, except for concern among co-workers with related and non-related work matters which was weak and almost insignificant. The highest score obtained was for caring among employees ($r = 0.459, p<0.001$), which is almost on the border of being a large correlation score (Cohen, 1988). Care and concern are considered pivotal for the definition of the emotional basis of trust (O’Brien, 1995), and at the same time they set the foundation for the altruistic behaviour, that significantly contributes of the organisational citizenship behaviour (OCB) based on the literature, and thus influence job satisfaction (McAllister, 1995).

Support and openness scored relatively moderately (0.29) and (0.27) respectively on the correlation scale with respect to impact on job satisfaction, therefore these can be viewed as being more supportive to the relationship rather than an actual trigger. O’Brien (1995) suggested that openness is a factor that confirms trust and guide it to be more secure, which is emphasised in later stages of trust formation. While emotional support—offered among employees in the case of work challenges—occurs only as a result of higher levels of trust among employees, it significantly impacts the relationship towards job satisfaction in the case of high commitment levels (O’Brien, 1995). Subsequently, it confirms the fact that the questionnaire was conducted in the early stages of trust environments, in which secondary factors such as openness and support are moderately significant on the relationship with job satisfaction.

Finally, concern among co-workers regarding work-related and non-work-related matters had an insignificant correlation with job satisfaction, which contradicts the finding of O’Brien (1995) about the triggering effect of concern on the overall relationship being the same as care. It is believed that due to the turbulent surrounding environment, employees tended to be more concerned with their own
life challenges and work-related issues rather than being concerned with co-workers' related issues (Lakis, 2009).

Overall, affect-based trust correlation score concerning job satisfaction was relatively high in the moderate range (r = 0.423, p<0.001), which shows a significant positive relationship with a moderate strength towards job satisfaction, and hence provided evidence to support the first part of proposition one, namely, that affect-based trust has a positive direct relationship with job satisfaction.

Cognition-based trust

The four constructs that form the antecedents of cognition-based trust were studied with respect to the influence on job satisfaction. Each response reaffirmed that each construct equally contributed to the overall dimension of trust (25% each). All scores were in the moderate correlation range regarding job satisfaction. The highest correlation score was obtained for the perception of fair treatment by employees from their management (r = 0.425, p<0.001). Despite the suggestion from O'Brien (1995) that fairness confirms the concept of trust within the organisation, and hence becomes more effective in later stages of trust formation rather than an instigator or a trigger, it had the highest score among other constructs and therefore prevails as the main objective behind the Egyptian revolution in achieving equality and fairness in treatment from all different authorities. Fairness in treatment appeared to be the prime mandate from the employees' perspectives, and hence was strongly attaching to job satisfaction.

The perception of competence among the employees' correlation scores to job satisfaction came second with value of (r = 0.382, p<0.001). O'Brien (1995) suggested that the perceived competence and reputation among employees and teams are the main triggers to initiate trust willingness towards senior management. Thus in the early stages of trust formation, competence was perceived among employees to have a significant influence in triggering the positive behaviour within the organisation, and hence impacting job satisfaction (McAllister, 1995).

A slightly lower correlation score was obtained regarding the perception of consistent behaviour and job performance among employees when discussing job
satisfaction \((r = 0.265, p<0.001)\). It was suggested that perceived consistency of senior management had a significant impact on employees' willingness for trust and attachment to organisational goals (O'Brien, 1995). Consistence in performance among senior management and co-workers facilitates more trust, and thus improves organisational behaviour, thereby enhancing job satisfaction (McAllister, 1995). Thus, consistence was found to be essential for respondents in maintaining trust levels, and therefore slightly impacting the levels of job satisfaction.

Finally, reliability on peers in performing the work had the same correlation score regarding job satisfaction as consistence \((r = 0.265, p<0.005)\). McAllister (1995) illustrated the role of reliability in meeting the expectations of trust and further developed it. Reliability is considered to be the main antecedent for cognition-based trust. Nevertheless results did not reveal strong interaction with organisational behaviour, and hence provided a weak impact on job satisfaction. Thus, reliability was found to be slightly related to job satisfaction, the weak scoring obtained in the survey compared to the strong influence emphasised in the literature stresses on the importance of achieving a certain level of trust before relying on peers. It was evident that this stage had not yet been met. In a turbulent environment people are more concerned with risking their reputation and track record. Therefore, they tend to be less reliable on their peers, and they become exposed to a very limited network whom they trust the most (Wood & Mellahi, 2003)

The overall cognition-based trust correlation score was hinging between moderate to high relations when concerned with job satisfaction \((r = 0.488, p<0.001)\) (Cohen, 1988). All its related constructs have shown significant moderate relationship with job satisfaction. According to McAllister (1995) cognition-based trust is formed in the early phases of creation of trust, which should significantly influence the organisation, and eventually impact on job satisfaction. Thus, it illustrates a significant positive relationship with a moderate to high strength towards job satisfaction, and thereby provides evidence to support the second part of proposition one, namely, that cognition-based trust has a positive direct relationship with job satisfaction.
Proposition (2) Affect-based trust is more influential on job satisfaction than cognition-based trust.

In the second proposition, affect-based and cognition-based trust are studied simultaneously in comparison to job satisfaction. Results of simple and multiple regression analysis were explained in Chapter 5; both simple regression analysis have shown strong relationship with job satisfaction.

Affect-based trust coefficient of determination has explained around 18% of the variance of job satisfaction, which is relatively acceptable for such behavioural analysis due to its subjective nature. Also, the score of \( \beta \) coefficient score was \((0.439, p<0.001)\), which is explained as a one unit increase in affect-based trust will result in 0.439 factor increase in employee satisfaction, and hence moderate influence on job satisfaction (Cohen, 1988).

Alternatively, cognition-based trust coefficient of determination has explained around 24% of the variance of job satisfaction, which is relatively average for such behavioural analysis due to its subjective nature. Also the score of \( \beta \) coefficient score was \((0.437, p<0.001)\), which is explained as one unit increase in affect-based trust that will result in 0.437 factor increase in employee satisfaction, and hence creates a moderate influence on job satisfaction (Cohen, 1988).

Based on the result from the factor analysis, where it explains the overlap between affect-base and cognition-based of trust, a strong factor that combines both dimensions of trust dominated, while two other weak factors demonstrated an overlap of both dimensions of trust. This finding complicates the analysis of the study that is based on the distinction between the dimensions of trust. Nevertheless it was discussed by McAllister (1995) that in the early stages of trust formation both dimensions of trust are attached to each other, and hence it is difficult to distinguish between the natures of them. As discussed earlier, the questionnaire was conducted in a turbulent environment. In such a disruptive atmosphere, trust is in its early stages and hence explains the attachment nature of both dimensions trust.
Despite the challenges of having a distinctive nature between the dimensions of trust, multiple regression analysis was used to study the association effects of the dimensions of trust with job satisfaction, and hence distinguish the stronger influences on the relationship to job satisfaction. It was found that cognition-based trust has a higher $\beta$ coefficient as the score was $(0.329, \ p<0.001)$, while affect-based trust obtained a $\beta$ coefficient score of $(0.198, \ 0.05>p>0.001)$. The overall regression equation of the dimensions of trust had a coefficient of determination that explained around 26% of the variance of job satisfaction. Thus, based on the findings explained, the second proposition is rejected, as it was proven that cognition-based trust has the stronger impact on the relationship with job satisfaction compared to affect-based trust.

The proposition was based on the study explored by Ng and Chua (2006) in studying the relationship between the dimensions of trust and cooperation within the organisation, which reflects the organisational behaviour and eventually job satisfaction. It was found that there were some drawbacks for the continuous increase of cognition-based trust on cooperation. In the case of the affect-based trust, it was proven that there was a continuous positive relation with cooperative behaviour, as it avoids developing negative attitudes within the organisation.

With cognition-based trust, initial development also stimulates cooperative behaviour, but it was found that further development in the cognition-based trust would instigate negative attitudes, such as encouraging free-riding behaviour, and thus causes decline to the cooperative behaviour in the organisation and eventually decreases job satisfaction (Ng, & Chua, 2006). Thus it was based on the continuous relationship with job satisfaction, that the affect-based trust influence on the relationship dominate, while cognition-based trust diminishes. This confirms the finding discussed earlier around the early stages of trust formation in which the survey was conducted, and hence emphasises the significant role of cognition-based trust on the relationship with job satisfaction.

Moreover, the finding of the proposition is supported by the study of Lau and Cobb (2010) around the influence of the relationship conflict on job performance whilst
taking into account the intervening role of trust. Based on the findings of Kramer (1999), McAllister (1995), and Rousseau et al. (1998); who had explained the nature of affect-based trust as the fabric of the interpersonal ties among people, it was obvious that relationship conflict resides mainly in the affect-type of interactions. Thus, in the case of a relationship conflict, affect-based trust is undermined and the interpersonal ties disappear, relying solely on cognition-based trust. In summary, in the case of relationship conflicts, employees tend to rely more on cognition-based trust rather than affect-based trust to drive their exchange activity and hence their job satisfaction (Lau, & Cobb, 2010).

Proposition (3A) Communication moderates the relationship between affect-based trust and job satisfaction, such that the positive relationship between affect-based trust and job satisfaction is stronger in the case of open-type communication.

Proposition (3B) Communication moderates the relationship between cognition-based trust and job satisfaction, such that the positive relationship between cognition-based trust and job satisfaction is stronger in the case of open-type communication.

The impact of communication on the relationship between the dimensions of trust and job satisfaction was studied in the third proposition. The role of communication within the organisation was debated, concerning its role as either a mediator or moderator to the relationship between organisational trust and employee satisfaction. In effect, communication can either mitigate or dampen the relationship or on the contrary amplify or strengthen it (Garnett, Marlowe, & Pandey, 2008). The interactive role of internal communication can become more influential as a moderator on the relationship between the dimensions of trust and employee satisfaction (Garnett, et al., 2008). Moreover Kim (2007) argued that the strategic usage of communication can support the trust building process and that mutual
satisfaction within relationships between key stakeholders within the organisation can be enhanced.

**Affect-based trust**

Internal communication was examined for moderation influence on the overall relationship between the affect-based and trust and job satisfaction. Two methods were pursued in order to identify the type of moderation exhibited on the relationship; four types of moderation were explained earlier in Chapter 5.

The output of the moderated regression analysis was found to have an insignificant interaction with predictor (affect-based trust), the interactive coefficient score between affect-based trust and communication was \( b_3 = -0.074, p>0.1 \), which is very weak and insignificant. Thus, it eliminates the possibility of having either a pure moderator or a quasi-moderator type, which are represented in quadrant three and four as, shown in Figure-25 (Chapter 5).

Therefore, by applying sub-grouping regression analysis; two equations represented the moderating effect of communication; affect-based trust in open-type of communication (\( \beta_3 = 0.274, p<0.01 \)) and closed-type of communication (\( \beta_3 = 0.46, p<0.001 \)) as discussed in Chapter 5. The results emphasised a stronger influence on job satisfaction in the case of closed-type of communication (steeper slope in Figure-26, Chapter 5), and thus offered support for the third proposition around the moderating effect of communication on the relationship, where it is explained as a homologizer moderator.

Nevertheless, the positive relationship is stronger in the case of closed communication environment, hence it partially supports the first part of the third proposition. Thus, the finding contradicts the literature that argued that open communication climates were found to be positively related with job satisfaction (Pincus, et al., 1990). In addition to the findings of Garnett, *et al.* (2008) the view of the strong influence of open-type communication on the relationship between trust and job satisfaction was also supported.
The finding from the questionnaire demonstrated that the closed-type communication stimulated higher job satisfaction along the increase of affect-based trust. This result can be explained through various reasons. Firstly, the Middle East culture; in which the survey was conducted, is characterised by a high power distance as explained earlier by Hofstede (1980). Societies with such high power distance tend to be more comfortable in pursuing closed-type communication (Chua, et al., 2008); people feel more vulnerable in communicating openly when emotional aspects are involved such as affect-based trust. Although transparency was one of the main reasons behind the revolution in Egypt, people tend to take more time in adopting such cultural changes.

Secondly, the turbulent environment that was a consequence of the revolution had caused social disruptions across the country which had an impact on the overall trust environment and subsequently job satisfaction levels. As discussed earlier, the environment in which the survey was conducted is still experiencing early stages of trust formation, which does not motivate pursuing open-type of communication due to the risks foreseen in the surrounding environment.

Based on literature, normally open communication will lead to higher levels of job satisfaction compared to closed-type of communication, provided the affect-based trust increases within the organisation (Pincus, et al., 1990; Garnett, et al., 2008). Alternatively, the finding was not fully aligned with the literature reviewed. Firstly, in the case of low levels of affect-based trust, open-type of communication obtained higher job satisfaction levels compared to closed-type of communication, which shows the significant impact of open-type of communication on the levels of job satisfaction in the absence of trust (Kim, 2007). Thus, the evidence in this case supports the literature, as shown in Figure-26 (Chapter 5).

Surprisingly, with the increase of affect-based trust, closed-type of communication starts to become more dominant, and eventually obtains higher levels of job satisfaction compared to open-type of communication in the case of high levels of affect-based trust, which totally contradicts the finding from the literature. Essentially, employees were more comfortable with closed-type of communication
to achieve job satisfaction at high levels of affect-based trust, as shown in Figure-26 (Chapter 5).

This finding could explain the persistent challenges in the culture, by maintaining continuous increases in job satisfaction through open-type of communication. In such cultures, transparency in communication at such high level of emotional/affect-based trust can become very risky, in the case of the organisation not meeting the employees’ expectations. In open-type of communication expectation settings are more profound compared to closed-type of communication, and therefore the case of not meeting employees’ expectations, disappointment becomes dominant in the case of open-type of communication (Kim, 2007), which emphasises the difficulties in dealing with open-type of communication in such culture and environment. Thus, at higher levels of affect-based trust employees are more emotionally attached. In addition to the vulnerability from the open-type of communication, the cases of disappointment can cause severe decline in job satisfaction levels, whereas in the case of closed-type of communication less exposition to vulnerability is experienced which then weakens the impact of disappointment on job satisfaction levels.

**Cognition-based trust**

In the second part, internal communication was examined for moderation influence on the overall relationship between the cognition-based trust and job satisfaction. The same two methods were pursued as explained earlier in order to identify the type of moderation exhibited on the relationship.

The output of the moderated regression analysis was found to have an insignificant interaction relationship with predictor (cognition-based trust), the interactive coefficient score between cognition-based trust and communication was ($b_3=-0.009$, $p>0.1$), which is very weak and strongly insignificant. Thus, it eliminates the possibility of having either a pure moderator or a quasi-moderator type, which are represented in quadrant three and four as shown in Figure-25 (Chapter 5).

Therefore, by applying sub-grouping regression analysis; two equations represented the moderating effect of communication; cognition-based trust in open-
type of communication ($\beta=0.408$, $p<0.01$) and closed-type of communication ($\beta=0.343$, $p<0.001$) as discussed in Chapter 5. The results emphasise a stronger influence on job satisfaction in the case of open-type of communication (steeper slope in Figure-27, Chapter 5), and thus offers support for third proposition around the moderating effect of communication on the relationship. Despite the relatively small difference between the two regression lines as shown from the Figure-27, communication can still be explained homologizer moderator.

As noted in the findings, the positive relationship is stronger in the case of open-type communication environment; not in the case of closed-type, hence it fully supports the second part of the third proposition. Thus, the finding is aligned with the literature explained earlier that open communication climates were found to be positively related with job satisfaction (Pincus, et al., 1990).

The finding from the survey has demonstrated that the open-type communication stimulates higher job satisfaction along the increase of cognition-based trust. This result can be explained through the confidence established in people’s mind-set through cognition-based trust, which can further expose them to open-type of communication environment, and not feel as vulnerable as in the case of affect-based trust, since it is supported by rational basis.

In such turbulent conditions, the overall trust environment is unstable and people seek different means of social reestablishment, and thus the initial stages of trust re-creation are experienced. McAllister (1995) argued that at this stage cognition-based trust would be more dominant than affect-based trust, and hence people would feel more secure with aspects like transparency on rational basis of trust rather than emotional basis of trust.

Based on the findings explained by previous scholars in the literature reviewed in Chapter 2, results have shown that open-type of communication leads to higher levels of job satisfaction compared to closed-type of communication, when cognition-based trust increases within the organisation (Pincus, et al., 1990; Garnett, et al., 2008). The findings from respondents’ feedback were fully aligned with the literature explained in Chapter 2. Although, a relatively small difference
was experienced between the two types of communication that could weaken the moderating effect of communication on the relationship between cognition-based trust and job satisfaction. Nevertheless that difference cannot be ignored.

Firstly, in the case of low levels of cognition-based trust, open-type of communication obtained almost the same levels of job satisfaction compared to closed-type of communication, which shows insignificant impact of open-type of communication on the levels of job satisfaction at low levels of cognition-based trust, and hence contradicts Kim’s (2007) findings. At this stance, satisfaction levels could only be explained by the referring to intensity of affect-based trust within the organisation, which has demonstrated higher satisfaction levels with closed-type communication compared to open-type communication. This can have a significant influence in disrupting the levels of satisfaction in the case of low cognition-based trust, as shown in Figure-27 (Chapter 5).

Then, with the increase of cognition-based trust, open-type of communication commences with dominance and eventually obtains higher levels of job satisfaction compared to closed-type of communication in the case of high levels of cognition-based trust, which is fully aligned with the finding from the literature. Put simply, employees were more comfortable with open-type of communication to achieve higher job satisfaction at high levels of cognition-based trust, as shown in Figure-27 (Chapter 5).

This finding draws a distinction between the rational and emotional basis of trust in such turbulent environments, people feel more secure with the rational mind-set in maintaining continuous increases in job satisfaction through open-type communication, compared to the emotional mind-set which exposes more vulnerability and hence more disappointment where expectations have to be met. Challenges arise from open-type of communication in such cultures and environments, although these become insignificant with cognition-based trust. Thus, at higher levels of cognition-based trust employees are more confident rather than emotionally attached. Therefore, utilising open channels of communication within the organisation improves levels of job satisfaction, whereas keeping a
closed channel of communication risks the achieved level of cognition-based trust, and hence increases disappointment and eventually decreases the levels of job satisfaction.

Proposition (4A) Levels of commitment moderate the relationship between affect-based trust and job satisfaction, such that the positive relationship between affect-based trust and job satisfaction is stronger among employees with high levels of commitment.

Proposition (4B) Levels of commitment moderates the relationship between cognition-based trust and job satisfaction, such that the positive relationship between cognition-based trust and job satisfaction is stronger among employees with low levels of commitment.

The fourth proposition focuses on the impact of perception of levels of commitment on the relationship between the dimensions of trust and job satisfaction. Zhu and Akhtar (2013) suggested that the dimensions of trust; affect-based and cognition-based; will be further explained by the integration with the commitment perceptions maintained within the organisation.

It was found that highly committed employees would express more interest in others and place more emphasis in guiding and enabling positive behaviours towards their peers. Conversely, demotivated employees react in a more rational and self-interested manner. As such, it makes more sense to study the influence of perception of commitment as a moderating variable, and hence the measure of the impact on the relationship between dimensions of trust and the subsequent employee behaviour and job satisfaction (Zhu, and Akhtar, 2013).

Affect-based trust

Levels of commitment were examined for moderation influence on the overall relationship between the affect-based trust and job satisfaction. The same two
methods of analysis that were explained earlier in the third proposition were used in order to identify the type moderation exhibited on the relationship.

The output of the moderated regression analysis was found to have an insignificant interaction relationship with predictor (affect-based trust), the interactive coefficient score between affect-based trust and perception of commitment was \( b_3 = -0.106, \ p > 0.1 \), which is relatively weak and insignificant. Thus, it eliminates the possibility of having either a pure moderator or a quasi-moderator type, which was represented in quadrant three and four as depicted in Figure-25 (Chapter 5).

Therefore, by applying sub-grouping regression analysis; two equations represented the moderating effect of perception of commitment; affect-based trust in high levels of commitment \( (\beta = 0.37, \ p < 0.001) \) and low levels of commitment \( (\beta = 0.36, \ p < 0.001) \) as discussed in Chapter 5. Results have shown an equal impact on job satisfaction in both cases of high or low levels of commitment (the two regression lines are parallel with almost same slope as shown in Figure-28, Chapter 5), and hence does not support the fourth proposition concerning the moderating effect of commitment on the relationship in the case of affect-based trust. Accordingly, the perception of levels of commitment in the case of affect-based trust is considered to be intervening, or exogenous, or antecedent, or predictor, or suppressor (lies in quadrant 1 in Figure-25, Chapter 5) but not moderator.

The findings from the survey demonstrated that high levels of commitment stimulate higher job satisfaction compared to low levels of commitment at the same level of affect-based trust (the regression line of high levels of commitment is always above the line of low levels of commitment at any given level of affect-based trust as shown in Figure-28, Chapter 5). This result is aligned with the finding explained by Ashill et al. (2008) that linked higher levels of commitment with higher levels of job satisfaction. However, it does not match the findings from Zhu and Akhtar (2013) about the moderating influence of levels of commitment on the relationship between affect-based trust and job satisfaction; it was explained that
high levels of commitment amplify the positive impact exhibited on the relationship compared to low levels of commitment.

One plausible explanation for the finding can be the emotional basis behind the affect-based trust, which overlaps to a great extent with affective commitment that is based on the affective attachment and cohesion (Meyer, & Allen, 1991). As explained earlier, in such turbulent environments people tend to be more cautious in dealing with each other when emotional aspects are involved. In cases where affect-based trust is evident, failing to meet employees’ expectations can cause more disappointment that leads to decline in job satisfaction. Accordingly, high levels of commitment interaction with affect-based trust did not meet the expected outcome on job satisfaction, due to an overlap in the emotional aspect rather than a complement that can enhance, and result in higher job satisfaction levels.

Based on the literature, the perception of the levels of commitment moderated the relationship between affect-based trust and job satisfaction, such that the interaction between the affect-based trust and the high levels of commitment lead to higher levels of job satisfaction compared to low levels of commitment (Zhu, and Akhtar, 2013). Obviously, the overall finding from the survey was not in agreement with the proposition. Firstly, in the case of low levels of affect-based trust, high levels of commitment obtained slightly higher job satisfaction levels compared to low levels of commitment, which emphasises the impact of high levels of commitment on the levels of job satisfaction in the absence of trust (Ashill, et Al., 2008). Therefore, the evidence supports that part of the literature, as shown in Figure-28 (Chapter 5).

Along the increase of affect-based trust, job satisfaction grows with almost the same rate in the case of high and low levels of commitment. Therefore, at high levels of affect-based trust, high levels of commitment still maintained higher job satisfaction compared to low levels of commitment. In other words, employees were indifferent regarding the perception of commitment interaction with affect-based trust in improving job satisfaction.

**Cognition-based trust**
In the second part, the perception of levels of commitment were examined for moderation influence on the overall relationship between the cognition-based and trust and job satisfaction. The same two methods as explained earlier were pursued in order to identify the type moderation exhibited on the relationship.

The output of the moderated regression analysis was found to have an insignificant interaction with predictor (cognition-based trust), the interactive coefficient score between cognition-based trust and perception of commitment was \( b_3 = 0.056, p > 0.1 \), which is very weak and strongly insignificant. Thus, it eliminates the possibility of having either a pure moderator or a quasi-moderator type, which are represented in quadrant three and four as shown in Figure-25 (Chapter 5).

Therefore, by applying sub-grouping regression analysis; two equations represented the moderating effect of levels of commitment; cognition-based trust in the high levels of commitment \( (\beta = 0.44, p < 0.001) \) and the low levels of commitment \( (\beta = 0.295, p < 0.005) \) as discussed in Chapter 5, the results emphasise a stronger influence on job satisfaction in the case of high levels of commitment (steeper slope in Figure-29, Chapter 5), and thus offers support for the third proposition around the moderating effect of perception of commitment on the relationship. This was clearly explained through the intersection of the two regression lines representing the different levels of commitment as shown from the Figure-29, and hence the perception of commitment can be explained as a homologizer moderator.

As emphasised in the findings of Chapter 5, the positive relationship is stronger in the case of high levels of commitment and not in the low levels, hence it contradicts the second part of the fourth proposition. In summary, the perception of commitment moderates the relationship between cognition-based trust and job satisfaction. Nonetheless the positive relationship between cognition-based trust and job satisfaction is stronger among employees with high levels of commitment.

The finding from the survey has demonstrated that the high levels of commitment stimulate higher job satisfaction along the increase of cognition-based trust. This result is explained based on the fact that cognition-based trust is considered to mainly focus on the rational aspects of trust, and thus complements the affective
side of commitment and can enhance each other (Morrow, Hansen, & Pearson, 2004). This is unlike the affect-based trust which overlaps with perception of commitment, where the interaction between cognition-based trust and high levels of commitment increase the perception of job satisfaction.

Moreover, in such turbulent conditions, the overall trust environment is unstable and people are seeking different means of social reestablishment, and thus the early stages of trust re-creation are experienced. McAllister (1995) argued that at this stage cognition-based trust can have a more positive impact on organisation’s behaviour and eventually lead to an improvement in job satisfaction.

The findings from the survey contradicted the claims from Zhu and Akhtar (2013) around the impact of commitment on organisation behaviour. They asserted that at low levels of commitment, cognition-based trust is positively related to positive organisation behaviour, and hence improves employee satisfaction.

When analysing the finding from the survey on the cognition-based trust scale, it was found that in the case of low levels of cognition-based trust, high levels of commitment obtained slightly lower levels of job satisfaction compared to the case of low levels of commitment as shown in Figure-29 (Chapter 5). This finding could be explained through the different expectations of employees around the two types of commitment; in the case of low levels of commitment accompanied with low cognition-based trust, employees’ expectations are relatively low, and thus impact of disappointment is not that significant on job satisfaction. Whilst in the case of high levels of commitment, expectations rise and with the absence of rationality of trust, disappointment has a significant impact on job satisfaction, and hence obtains lower levels of job satisfaction compared to the case of low levels of commitment.

Then, with the increase of cognition-based trust, high levels of commitment dominate, and eventually obtain higher levels of job satisfaction compared to low levels of commitment as shown in Figure-29 (Chapter 5). In other words, employees start to react to the increase of cognition-based trust instilled by the organisation, and hence show more confidence in providing positive organisation behaviour, which reflects in increased job satisfaction. While in the case of low
levels of commitment, employees are disengaged from the organisation, and increasing cognition-based trust does not significantly impact the positive organisational behaviour, and eventually job satisfaction is not reflected well.

6.3 Summary

The results of this study draw a distinction between the rational and emotional basis of trust in such turbulent environments from several aspects:

When affect-based and cognition-based trust were measured in isolation from the moderating effects of communication and organisational commitment, each dimension of trust had a different impact on job satisfaction (proposition 1). While when both dimensions were measured simultaneously, one dimension dominated the impact on job satisfaction (proposition 2).

When the moderating effect of communication was introduced, each dimension of trust had a different impact on job satisfaction (proposition 3).

When the moderating effect of organisational commitment was introduced, each dimension of trust had a different impact on job satisfaction (proposition 4).

Although the findings from the factor analysis have failed to draw a distinction between the two factors, crucial differences on the results are summarised in Table-19 below.
Table 19 Summary of the Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Affect-based trust</th>
<th>cognition-based trust</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Result of relation</td>
<td>Result of hypothesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H01: Relationship with job satisfaction when measured separately</td>
<td>Positive relationship</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H02: More influence on job satisfaction when both dimensions of trust are studied simultaneously</td>
<td>Less influence</td>
<td>Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H03: Communication moderates the relationship with job satisfaction</td>
<td>Moderates</td>
<td>Accept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of communication that impact positively the relationship with job satisfaction</td>
<td>Closed-type of communication</td>
<td>Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H04: Levels of commitment moderates the relationship with job satisfaction</td>
<td>Does not moderate</td>
<td>Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levels of commitment that impact positively the relationship with job satisfaction</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Reject</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results shown in the table summarises the finding from the survey and examine it against the literature and proposition, the results from the survey supported three hypotheses, and hence were in agreement with the literature (green colour in Table-19):

H01: A) Affect-based trust has a direct positive relationship with job satisfaction.

B) Cognition-based trust has a direct positive relationship with job satisfaction

This finding clearly explains the positive impact of trust on job satisfaction within organisation irrespective of the nature of environment; whether it is a stable environment as per the literature or unstable as per the survey outcome.

H03: B) Communication moderates the relationship between cognition-based trust and job satisfaction, such that the positive relationship between cognition-based trust and job satisfaction will be stronger in case of open-type communication.

In this case, the finding confirmed the role of internal communication as a moderator to the overall relationship, and at the same time emphasises the influence of open-type communication in stimulating increased levels of job satisfaction when cognition-based trust is instilled in the organisation.
Moreover, results from the survey partially supported two other hypotheses, in which they were in agreement on the moderating influence but not on the type of moderation, and thus were in partial agreement with the literature (yellow colour in Table-19):

H03:  A) Communication moderates the relationship between affect-based trust and job satisfaction, such that the positive relationship between affect-based trust and job satisfaction will be stronger in case of open-type communication.

The findings agreed with third proposition on the moderating effect of communication on the relationship between affect-based trust and job satisfaction. Nevertheless, the positive relationship between affect-based trust and job satisfaction was stronger in the case of closed-type communication, which is explained due to the perception of vulnerability from the open-type of communication in such turbulent environments and specifically in the Middle Eastern culture where the survey was conducted. Hence such perception of vulnerability can be mitigated using closed-type of communication, and thus improve job satisfaction.

H04:  B) Levels of commitment moderates the relationship between cognition-based trust and job satisfaction, such that the positive relationship between cognition-based trust and job satisfaction will be stronger among employees with low levels of commitment.

The findings agreed with fourth proposition on the moderating effect of levels of commitment on the relationship between cognition-based trust and job satisfaction, nonetheless the positive relationship between cognition-based trust and job satisfaction was stronger in case of high levels of commitment. This is explained from the positive reaction from the employees in the case of high levels of commitment, due to the confidence obtained from the cognition-based trust exhibited in the organisation and hence improves the perception of job satisfaction. Whilst on the low levels of commitment employees are indifferent with additional cognition-based trust, and eventually would not have much impact on job satisfaction.
Finally, results from the survey did not support the remaining two hypotheses, whereas the findings have shown full disagreement with the literature (red colour in Table-19):

H02: Affect-based trust will be more influential on job satisfaction rather than cognition-based trust.

The results totally disagreed with the second proposition, as it was found that cognition-based trust has the stronger influence on job satisfaction not affect-based trust. This finding clearly emphasises the impact of the turbulent environment on the relationship. Based on the literature in normal conditions; affect-based trust has the stronger impact on job satisfaction (Ng and Chua, 2006). Nonetheless, due to the social conflict caused by such conditions; affect-based trust is undermined and the interpersonal ties disappear, relying solely on cognition-based trust.

Moreover, in such turbulent conditions, the overall trust environment is unstable and people seek different means of social re-establishment, and thus the initial stages of trust re-creation are experienced its early stages. McAllister (1995) argued that at this stage cognition-based trust can have a more positive impact on organisation behaviour and eventually improvement in job satisfaction.

H04: A) Levels of commitment moderates the relationship between affect-based trust and job satisfaction, such that the positive relationship between affect-based trust and job satisfaction will be stronger among employees with high levels of commitment.

The findings implicitly disagreed with the fourth proposition, as it was found that levels of commitment do not moderate the relationship between affect-based trust and job satisfaction. This could be explained due to the emotional basis behind the affect-based trust, which overlaps to a great extent with affective aspects of commitment, and hence it is difficult to form a constructive argument to improve the job satisfaction. As explained earlier, in such turbulent environments people tend to be more cautious in dealing with each other when emotional aspects are involved, and hence the interaction between affect-based trust and levels of commitment are undermined and do not impact job satisfaction.
These findings add a broader view to the literature discussed in Chapter 2. Different impacts were explored on the relationship between the dimensions of trust and job satisfaction, which can be related to the turbulent environment and the middle eastern culture; where the survey was conducted. These variations could influence the approach pursued by the organisation to obtain higher levels job satisfaction among employees, specifically in such types of environment and culture which was introduced to the research context. The implications of the results on the theoretical context are discussed in further detail in Chapter 7.
CHAPTER 7: CONCLUSION

7.1 Research scope and context

The research aimed to address the increasing trend of business interruptions that occur in unstable political environments, like the case of Egypt. One of the main reasons impacting these interruptions is employee job satisfaction, and thus factors affecting job satisfaction were studied throughout the research. Factors were classified according to either triggering or moderating factors; triggering factors take on the form of affect-based and cognition-based trust which are mediated through organisational behaviour, whereas moderating factors were in the form of internal communication within the organisation and perception of organisational commitment from employees' perspectives. As such, the model extends previous research, by measuring the strength of the relationship in a turbulent environment between the dimensions of trust and job satisfaction, in conjunction with two moderators introduced.

Firstly, the relationship between the dimensions of trust was studied directly with employee satisfaction through the mediating role of organisational behaviour. Each dimension of trust was examined separately, which revealed positive correlations for both dimensions with job satisfaction. Subsequently, both dimensions were examined simultaneously in order to indicate the dominant triggering factor on job satisfaction, which was found to be the cognition-based trust. The moderating factor of internal communication was introduced separately in order to measure the influence of trust on job satisfaction in different communication environments. Finally, organisational commitment was introduced as a separate moderating factor on the relationship between trust and job satisfaction.

The research was undertaken in a different type of environment, because the current political instability in Egypt had resulted in a turbulent environment. This type of environment may influence, the strength of the relationship between dimensions of trust and job satisfaction, and impact the moderating variables
(internal communication and organisational commitment) on such relationships. The degree of turbulence in the environment was not directly measured, but rather considered as a surrounding context to the different variables.

7.2 Implications of trust on job satisfaction in turbulent environment

The results of this research help to identify the different approaches that can be pursued by the organisation in order to improve employee job satisfaction, and hence improve the productivity of employees. The research provides more insights to the dynamics of the organisational behaviour in the case of turbulent environments, which identifies the impact of instilling trust among co-workers, employees and supervisors, and employees and organisations.

Each dimension of trust has been examined separately regarding job satisfaction, and they have both showed positive impacts on relationship, which emphasises the vital role of trust in creating and maintaining a successful organisation through content employees, even in turbulent times. When both dimensions were examined together, cognition-based trust demonstrated a stronger influence on job satisfaction compared to affect-based trust, which emphasises the willingness of employees to be more satisfied when experiencing the rational basis of trust rather than the emotional basis.

Ng and Chua (2006) claimed that were some drawbacks for the continuous increase in cognition-based trust, as it starts stimulating negative organisational behaviour such as free-riding attitudes, and thus negatively impact job satisfaction. At the same time McAllister (1995) explained that in the early stages of trust formation both dimensions of trust are attached to each other, and stressed on the importance of cognition-based trust in triggering the trustworthiness environment.

The findings identified that it is essential to solidify trust formation in the initial stages within a turbulent environment; such as the one in which the survey was conducted. Both dimensions of trust overlap; as explained in the factor analysis
results in Chapter 5. Also, organisational behaviour is more emphasised by the cognition-based trust. As a result, organisations in such environments need to focus more on the rational basis of trust, and should emphasise aspects such as building competency of their teams, instilling a reliable environment within the organisation and demonstrate consistency in decision making. Most importantly, organisations should always ensure fair treatment towards their employees. This specific point has turned into very critical aspect of organisational health in the recent period; the revolution in Egypt clearly addressed the desire for fair treatment and equality in the society (Abdelbaki, 2013), so compromising on this point may jeopardise the whole job satisfaction improvement plan.

This should be complemented by instilling affect-based trust, according to respondents’ perspectives in improving job satisfaction. Organisations should be considering certain factors that are essential in driving the dimensions of trust positively towards employee satisfaction. In terms of affect-based trust, organisation should be taking initiatives in showing care among employees, through exploring various intrinsic benefits (O’Brien, 1995); such as pension and medical support. One of the firms that was surveyed gave priority for recruitment to their own staff’s families. Secondly, organisations should be demonstrating and offering support towards their employees in the case of work challenges. Support can take the form of assigning mentors to employees in case of challenges with work. Finally, organisations should always maintain openness in expressing thoughts and ideas among employees, hence providing them with the feeling of being empowered. Finally, not much attention needs to be spent on concern among co-workers regarding work-related and non-work-related work matters, since it has shown very weak influence on job satisfaction.

The demographic results explained in Chapter 5 indicated that the influence of cognition-based trust diminishes with higher levels of education, so it is crucial to understand the employees’ educational background when establishing cognition-based trust inside the organisation. Subsequently, higher levels of educated employees reflected less job satisfaction, which identifies the efforts that should be spent efficiently to improve employee satisfaction. This does not mean
organisations should avoid raising expectations for the higher educated employees, but should rather prioritise the efforts on each group to achieve the best outcome for the overall organisation.

When introducing the influence of internal communication within the organisation to improve job satisfaction among employees, it did not actually follow the fact illustrated by most scholars that open-type of communication always achieves higher levels of job satisfaction. An essential aspect should be taken into account, which is employees’ perception towards dimensions of trust. It was found that employees who perceive high affect-based trust within their organisation are more comfortable with closed-type of communication. Thus, organisations that have built a strong affect-based trust perception among their own employees should not put too much attention on enforcing open-type of communication at this stage of turbulent environment within the country. Conversely, in the case of weak affect-based trust perception among employees, organisations should assess the strengths of the cognition-based trust and accordingly decide on the type of communication to be used.

On the contrary, it was found that organisations with a strong basis of cognition-based trust among their employees should rather pursue open-type of communication to improve the levels of satisfaction among employees. People are more confident with transparency in their communications when there is strong rationality basis of trust among each other in such an environment.

Thus, organisations should have the confidence to explore open-type of communication among their employees in the case of established rational basis of trust, such as: (1) motivating bi-directional type of communication; (2) empowering employees to let them express their views openly; (3) ensuring full understanding of organisation’s goals and objectives; (4) illustrating clearly their contributions to the success of the organisation; (5) ensuring active listening to employees from their supervisors (Pincus, et al., 1990; Kim, 2007).

Furthermore, when introducing the influence of perception of organisational commitment to improve job satisfaction among employees, interestingly
perceptions of organisational commitment did not moderate the impact of affect-based trust on job satisfaction, opposing the view propounded by Zhu and Akhtar (2013) on the moderating influence of commitment on job satisfaction. It was found that employees who experience emotional based trust within their organisation are indifferent from the commitment levels towards the organisation in order to achieve improved job satisfaction.

Thus, organisations that focus on building affect-based trust perception among their own employees do not need to add much attention on improving commitment levels among employees at the stage of turbulent environment within the country, as it will not show the expected returns on job satisfaction. Alternatively, in the case of weak affect-based trust perceptions among employees, organisations should assess the strengths of the cognition-based trust and accordingly decide on whether to invest in improving commitment levels; although slightly higher levels of job satisfaction can be obtained with higher levels of commitment at low levels of affect-based trust.

It was also found that organisations with a strong basis of cognition-based trust among their employees should rather invest in improving the perception of organisational commitment among employees. Highly committed employees tend to have higher levels of satisfaction with increasing rational basis of trust towards the organisation. When commitment is mixed with cognition-based trust, improved job satisfaction levels is achieved.

Thus, organisations should direct their efforts in enhancing the commitment levels among their employees in the case of established rational basis of trust. Improving levels of commitment can be done by ensuring full interaction between the different teams, and full alignment and understanding of the organisational goals. Furthermore, focusing on improving HR practices can moderate the relationship between human capital and employee performance; hence impact organisation performance (Gould-Williams, 2003). HR practices can be improved through the following: employment security, selective hiring, team-working, performance-related pay, training, development, egalitarianism and knowledge sharing (Gould-Williams, 2003).
The demographic results explained in Chapter 5 suggested that satisfaction with HR practices was found to be significantly declining with higher levels of education, so it is important to understand the employees’ educational background when assessing organisational commitment and its related impact on the overall job satisfaction.

7.3 Limitations of the Research

Due to the challenges faced while collecting the data in Egypt during the critical turbulent environment, firms were reluctant to provide direct access to respondents; therefore surveys were administered by the organisation itself. This can be attributed to non-response bias issues that were experienced due to accessibility issues. Moreover, response bias can become a real challenge in such situations, specifically auspices’ bias where respondents are influenced by their organisations. Discarding all responses received by supervisors was a solution to limit these biases, however it was still difficult to be avoided. Moreover, there was a trend in the responses that tended towards extremity while responding to the questionnaire, which was mainly driven from the respondents’ emotional attachment to the current situation in the country.

The lower than expected response rate caused several implications on the validity and reliability of the data. Factor analysis and Cronbach’s alpha results were obtained and discussed. Data demonstrated an overlap between the dimensions of trust, and no clear distinction was distinguished and cross-loading was found. This decreased the validity of the data. Despite the refinement of the questionnaire in order to obtain clear distinction between the dimensions of trust, the respondent sample size still impacted the result of the factor analysis. Furthermore, reliability results were below expectations. A larger sample within the organisations, with more balance across different industries would have developed a stronger representation of findings and would have increased the validity and reliability of the data.
7.4 Suggestions for Future Research

The results of this research have raised some interesting opportunities for future research. As has been emphasised, the survey was conducted in a turbulent environment during post revolution phase in Egypt. Due to time constraints of the research, the influence of turbulence within the environment was not measured against the relationship between the dimensions of trust and job satisfaction. This would have introduced an extra dimension to the relationship, by measuring the different degrees of influence from the environment and its related impact on job satisfaction.

Moreover, performing the same survey in different countries where there is a stable political and business environment unlike the situation in Egypt, would offer more depth into the relationship findings, and hence will be able to assess the moderating influence of the political environment on the overall relationship, similar to the case of internal communication and organisational commitment. This kind of analysis can extend the validity and reliability of the findings to different settings, and thus include more countries into the relationship analysis, which will eventually broaden the research context.

Furthermore, due to the challenges found in the distinction between the factors of cognition-based and affect-based trust, which was due to the early phases of trust establishment in the country after revolution (McAllister, 1995), it would be very insightful if research was conducted in countries where stronger establishment of trust exists within the business environment, and thus the dimensions of trust influence on job satisfaction can be measured in distinction, isolating any sort of overlap between affect-based and cognition-based trust. Accordingly, the impact of the moderating variable on the relationship would then be more emphasised.

It would be also beneficial to extend the outcome measurement of the research towards employee job performance and organisational performance, and hence be able to relate more towards business performance, in that case a stronger argument can be built around the importance of establishing trust within the organisation.
One aspect that was slightly sensitive to be measured and is strongly recommended to be included in further research is the context around business interruptions; including the number of disruptions as well as reasons for them and the related impact on business. Due to the sensitivity of the topic in Egypt at the time of the survey, firms were reluctant to provide such data, and hence it would be recommended to be measured in environments where more labour issues persist rather than political issues (for example the mining or the automotive sector in South Africa).

Finally, by combining the two moderating variables into one proposition, internal communication and organisational commitment, these can be measured simultaneously and different combinations (open/closed-type of communication and high/low levels of commitment) can explicitly indicate the impact of dimensions of trust on job satisfaction in more types of organisational environments.
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# Appendix-1: Questionnaire template

**Age:**  
- □ less than 30  
- □ 30-40  
- □ 40-50  
- □ More than 50

**Position tenure:** yrs

**Years of service in the organisation:** yrs

**Gender:**  
- □ M  
- □ F

**Education:**  
- □ Basic  
- □ High School  
- □ Diploma  
- □ High Degree  
- □ Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. We have a sharing relationship in the workplace, we can share our ideas, feelings and hopes. (openness)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I can talk freely about difficulties I am facing at work. (openness)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I feel that people within the organisation show interest when listening to my challenges (Care)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. People will respond constructively to my challenges within the workplace (care)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Colleagues will respond to my support request in case of challenges with accomplishing the work (support)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6.</strong> Colleagues will be proactively offering support when they feel their peers are in trouble (support)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7.</strong> We would feel a sense of loss if someone got transferred or left the workplace (concern)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8.</strong> Colleagues show concern with non-related work matters with their peers (concern)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9.</strong> We are fairly treated from our supervisors irrespective of the relationship with the supervisor (Fairness)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10.</strong> Performance management process is applied very fairly based solely on the job performance (fairness)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11.</strong> I can rely on my peers in making my job less difficult by trusting their work (Reliable)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12.</strong> I can rely on my peers in accomplishing the work in the case of absence with any quality degradation (reliable)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13.</strong> My colleagues approach their job in a professional and dedicated manner (competent)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>In general, I trust the quality of work produced by my peers (competent)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Based on colleagues’ track record, I do not doubt their competency and job performance (consistence)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Colleagues start to disengage from work, when they feel that their performance is degrading (consistence)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Supervisor makes you feel free to talk with him/her. (communication)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Supervisor makes it easy for you to make your best work. (communication)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Supervisor tolerates argument and make the effort to fairly hear all views (communication)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Supervisor listens and understands when you tell things that bother you. (communication)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>You are satisfied with top management explanation of how things are done in the organisation (communication)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Your views have got real influence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>You are regularly informed on how organisational goals and objectives are met (communication)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Management communicates the information you really need and utilise in performing your job. (communication)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>We are proud to belong to this organisation (commitment)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>We have a general feeling of commitment towards the organisation (commitment)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>We are willing to exert an extra effort to help the organisation succeed (commitment)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>I believe that the current organisational structure best fit the organisational goal (structure)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>I fully understand the scope and responsibilities of my function (structure)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Interaction between the different teams in the organisation are well designed and understood by employees (structure).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I am provided with sufficient opportunities for training or development (HR practice)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Organisation attempts to make jobs as interesting and varied as possible (HR practice)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>I feel my job is secure (HR practice)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Management involves people when they make decisions that affect them (HR practice)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Overall, I am very satisfied with my job and couldn't be more satisfied. (Job performance)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Even if the department was not doing too well, I would be reluctant to change to another employer (Job performance)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>The offer of more money with another employer will not be the main reason for leaving the organisation (Job performance)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>I would recommend a friend to join our staff (Job performance)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>To know that my own work had made a contribution to the good of the department would please me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Job performance)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>I volunteer for things that are not part of my job (Job performance)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>I strongly believe that my organisation provides excellent product or service (Job performance)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>Overall I think that the organisation performs extremely well (Job performance)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix-2: Psychometric results

A) Dimensions of trust

Factor Analysis:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colleagues will proactively offer support when they feel their peers are in trouble (support)</td>
<td>.711</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, I trust the quality of work produced by my peers (competent)</td>
<td>.666</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have a sharing relationship in the workplace, we can share our ideas, feelings and hopes. (openness)</td>
<td>.663</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My colleagues approach their job in a professional and dedicated manner (competent)</td>
<td>.647</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People will respond constructively to my challenges at the workplace (care)</td>
<td>.600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that people within the organisation show interest when listening to my challenges (Care)</td>
<td>.513</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on colleagues’ track record, I do not doubt their competency and job performance (consistence)</td>
<td>.496</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can rely on my peers in accomplishing the work in my absence without any quality degradation (reliable)</td>
<td>.482</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are fairly treated from our supervisors irrespective of the relationship with the supervisor (Fairness)</td>
<td>.440</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance management process is applied very fairly based solely on the job performance (fairness)</td>
<td>.380</td>
<td>-.372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We would feel a sense of loss if someone got transferred or left the work place (concern)</td>
<td>.291</td>
<td>-.288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleagues start to disengage from work, when they feel that their performance is degrading (consistence)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find it difficult sometimes to rely on my peers in making my job less challenging (Reliable)</td>
<td>.484</td>
<td>.651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleagues will support me in case of facing challenges accomplishing my work (support)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleagues show concern with non-related work matters with their peers (concern)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can talk freely about difficulties I am facing at work. (openness)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Axis Factoring.
Rotation Method: Oblimin with Kaiser Normalization.
a. Rotation converged in 7 iterations.
Reliability test:

### Reliability Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.743</td>
<td>.752</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Item-Total Statistics

| We have a sharing relationship in the workplace, we can share our ideas, feelings and hopes. (openness) | .705  |
| I can talk freely about difficulties I am facing at work. (openness) | .753  |
| I feel that people within the organisation show interest when listening to my challenges (Care) | .723  |
| People will respond constructively to my challenges at the workplace (care) | .717  |
| Colleagues will support me in case of facing challenges accomplishing my work (support) | .762  |
| Colleagues will proactively offer support when they feel their peers are in trouble (support) | .705  |
| We would feel a sense of loss if someone got transferred or left the work place (concern) | .741  |
| Colleagues show concern with non-related work matters with their peers (concern) | .766  |
| We are fairly treated from our supervisors irrespective of the relationship with the supervisor (Fairness) | .725  |
| Performance management process is applied very fairly based solely on the job performance (fairness) | .734  |
| I find it difficult sometimes to rely on my peers in making my job less challenging (Reliable) | .723  |
I can rely on my peers in accomplishing the work in my absence without any quality degradation (reliable) .724

My colleagues approach their job in a professional and dedicated manner (competent) .715

In general, I trust the quality of work produced by my peers (competent) .710

Based on colleagues’ track record, I do not doubt their competency and job performance (consistence) .724

Colleagues start to disengage from work, when they feel that their performance is degrading (consistence) .748

B) Internal Communication

Factor Analysis :

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor tolerates argument and make the effort to fairly hear all views (communication)</td>
<td>.741</td>
<td>.352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor listens and understands when you speak about things that bother you. (communication)</td>
<td>.710</td>
<td>.572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor makes you feel free to talk with him/her. (communication)</td>
<td>.508</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor makes it easy to get the best work out of you. (communication)</td>
<td>.415</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You are regularly informed on how organisational goals and objectives are met (communication)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management communicates the information you really need and utilise in performing your job. (communication)</td>
<td>.325</td>
<td>.623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have the feeling that your ideas contribute to the organisation success. (communication)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You are satisfied with top management explanation of how things are done in the organisation (communication)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reliability test:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliability Statistics</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach's Alpha</td>
<td>.687</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items</td>
<td>.691</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Items</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Item-Total Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor makes you feel free to talk with him/her. (communication)</td>
<td>.662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor makes it easy to get the best work out of you. (communication)</td>
<td>.686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor tolerates argument and make the effort to fairly hear all views (communication)</td>
<td>.627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor listens and understands when you speak about things that bother you. (communication)</td>
<td>.602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You are satisfied with top management explanation of how things are done in the organisation (communication)</td>
<td>.692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have the feeling that your ideas contribute to the organisation success. (communication)</td>
<td>.679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You are regularly informed on how organisational goals and objectives are met (communication)</td>
<td>.659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management communicates the information you really need and utilise in performing your job. (communication)</td>
<td>.645</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C) Organisational Commitment

Factor Analysis:

Pattern Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel my job is secure (HR practice)</td>
<td>.769</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe that the current organisational structure best fit the organisational goal (structure)</td>
<td>0.689</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management involves people when they make decisions that affect them (HR practice)</td>
<td>0.647</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction between the different teams in the organisation are well designed and understood by employees (structure).</td>
<td>0.799</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation attempts to make jobs as interesting and variable as possible (HR practice)</td>
<td>0.640</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am provided with sufficient opportunities for trainings and development (HR practice)</td>
<td>0.442 0.459</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I fully understand the scope and responsibilities of my function (structure)</td>
<td>-0.789</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have a general feeling of commitment towards the organisation (commitment)</td>
<td>-0.758</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are willing to exert an extra effort to help the organisation succeed (commitment)</td>
<td>0.320 -0.542</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are proud to belong to this organisation (commitment)</td>
<td>0.457 -0.498</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Rotation Method: Oblimin with Kaiser Normalization.

a. Rotation converged in 12 iterations.
Reliability test:

Factor 1

Reliability Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.599</td>
<td>.598</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item-Total Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel my job is secure (HR practice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe that the current organisational structure best fit the organisational goal (structure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management involves people when they make decisions that affect them (HR practice)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor 2

Reliability Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.499</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Item-Total Statistics

| Interaction between the different teams in the organisation are well designed and understood by employees (structure). | 0.435 |
| Organisation attempts to make jobs as interesting and variable as possible (HR practice) | 0.384 |
| I am provided with sufficient opportunities for trainings and development (HR practice) | 0.370 |

### Factor 3

### Reliability Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.659</td>
<td>0.660</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Item-Total Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I fully understand the scope and responsibilities of my function (structure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have a general feeling of commitment towards the organisation (commitment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are willing to exert an extra effort to help the organisation succeed (commitment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are proud to belong to this organisation (commitment)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D) Employee Satisfaction

Factor Analysis:

Pattern Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall I think that the organisation performs extremely well (Job Satisfaction)</td>
<td>.795</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I strongly believe that my organisation provides excellent product or service (Job Satisfaction)</td>
<td>.740</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, I am very satisfied with my job and couldn’t be more satisfied. (Job Satisfaction)</td>
<td>.505</td>
<td>.224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Even if the department was not doing too well, I would be reluctant to change to another employer (Job Satisfaction)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To know that my own work had made a contribution to the good of the department would please me (Job Satisfaction)</td>
<td>.790</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I volunteer for things that are not part of my job (Job Satisfaction)</td>
<td>.504</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The offer of more money with another employer will not be the main reason for leaving the organisation (Job Satisfaction)</td>
<td>.357</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would recommend a friend to join our staff (Job Satisfaction)</td>
<td>.204</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Axis Factoring.
Rotation Method: Oblimin with Kaiser Normalization.
a. Rotation converged in 7 iterations.

Reliability test:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha Based on Standardized Items</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.539</td>
<td>.557</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Cronbach’s Alpha if Item Deleted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am very satisfied with my job</td>
<td>.456</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Even if the department was not doing too well, I would be reluctant to change to another employer</td>
<td>.586</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The offer of more money with another employer will not be the main reason for leaving the organisation</td>
<td>.573</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would recommend a friend to join our staff</td>
<td>.529</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To know that my own work had made a contribution to the good of the department would please me</td>
<td>.473</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I volunteer for things that are not part of my job</td>
<td>.476</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I strongly believe that my organisation provides excellent product or service</td>
<td>.470</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall I think that the organisation performs extremely well</td>
<td>.461</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>