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Abstract: This study examines the role of trust in management as a mediator of the relationship between job related variables, managerial practice variables and commitment to change. The job related variables studied include feedback, job autonomy, employee participation and goal clarity. The managerial practice variables studied include procedural justice, perceived organizational support, transformational leadership, shared values, opportunistic behavior and communication. Data were gathered from 294 managerial staff in a selected service organization in Malaysia using self-administered questionnaires. The results of a structural equation modeling indicate that the relationships among the job related variables, managerial practice variables, and commitment to change were fully mediated by trust in management. This is evidence with the goodness of fit measures, GFI, IFI, NFI, CFI > .90, RMSEA < .08. The results imply the need for the management to consider interventions that could improve managerial staff’s commitment to change by promoting job related variables and managerial practice variables that would directly or indirectly, through trust in management, support employees’ commitment to change, and hence lead to desired organizational change.
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GLOBALIZATION, DEREGULATION, PRIVATIZATION and mergers advances in technology business process redesign are only some of the reasons for organizational change. For better or for worse, organizations throughout the world are being reengineered, restructured and reorganized. Understanding how committed employees function/work within an organization is a valuable tool for managing and fostering a successful organizational change. A continued appreciation of employee commitment is especially beneficial following organizational change as it has been shown that change inevitably impacts commitment levels to some degree. It is also important that communication with employees on these matters occurs early in the change process, preferably well before change begins. By doing this in the planning stages and continuing on into the implementation phases of the changes, employees’ confidence, commitment and willingness to participate, can be developed (Smith, 2005). With corporatization there are several inevitable changes in organizations that management and employees need to accommodate. Such changes involve interventions which demand commitment to change as well as trust in management from employees. One of the biggest public service providers experienced this change is a selected service organization in Malaysia. Reorganization in a selected service organization makes a lot of change initiative has taken place, affected employees’ skill set, operation and administration but not easy to implement. With the changes, there exist much resistance and dissatisfaction from stakeholders especially employees.

Literature on organizational development has identified several important factors for successful organizational change. Empirically, literature has recognized that an atmosphere conducive to trustworthy communication and commitment to change is a foundational factor for achieving organizational change (Atkinson & Butcher, 2003). More interestingly, trust, is a major contributor to organizational competitiveness because it cannot be easily imitated or replicated (Jones & George, 1998). In view of the arising curiosity whether trust plays a role in commitment to change, this study examines the determinant variables of trust in management and its effects on commitment to change. The researcher posits and theorizes that trust as a mediator variable to commitment to change is in tandem with commitment trust theory as proposed by Morgan and Hunt (1994), the preferred theory in this study. Research in this area often focuses on relationship marketing (Morgan & Hunt, 1994; Mukherjee & Nath, 2003) and places less emphasis on other contexts such as relationship...
between employees and their superior. This suggests that there is a need to understand commitment trust relationship from a different perspective. Nonetheless, the gap in research that motivates this study is the lack of studies on the role of trust in management and its mediate effects on job related variables, organizational variables and managerial practice variables on commitment to change and very little empirical work in the managerial context have been done.

This study examines trust in management as a mediator variable and commitment to change as a dependent variable. Trust has been defined as a psychological state comprising the intention to accept vulnerability based upon positive expectations of the intentions or behaviour of another. (Rousseau, Sitkin, Burt, & Camerer, 1998). Trust is also what one would expect as a positive outcome from a partner on whose integrity one can rely on confidently (Morgan & Hunt, 1994). In this study, trust in management is conceptualized as existing when employees have confidence in the management’s reliability and integrity. Commitment is an enduring desire to maintain a valued relationship (Mohrman, Mohrman, Jr. & Ledford, 1992). Expanding this perspective, Morgan and Hunt (1994) define commitment as a belief by an exchange partner that an ongoing relationship with another is so important as to warrant maximum efforts at maintaining it, that is, the committed party believes that the relationship is worth working on to ensure that it endures indefinitely. In this study, commitment to change has been defined as an enduring desire and willingness to work in an employment relationship, aimed at maintaining a valued relationship to implement change. Independent variables for this study are namely job related variables (feedback, job autonomy, employee participation and goal clarity), organizational variables (procedural justice, transformational leadership, perceived organizational support and shared values) and managerial practice variables (opportunistic behaviour and communication).

The framework, which allows for an investigation into the relationship between the job related variables (feedback, autonomy, employee participation, goal clarity) and trust in management is based on a study conducted by Weber and Weber (2001). The study conducted by Connell, Ferres and Travaglione (2003) also helps to strengthen this study as the researcher owes those studies in developing the association between perceived organizational support, procedural justice, transformational leadership and trust in management. There is another relationship that makes up the framework of this study: on one hand, the relationship between shared values, communication, opportunistic behaviour and trust in management, which is based on the study by Morgan and Hunt (1994), Mukherjee and Nath (2003), while the relationship between trust in management with commitment to change, is based on the study by Zineldin and Jonsson (2000).

Based on the literature review, the objectives of this research were developed and hypotheses were proposed. The objectives of this research are: 1) to test the hypothesized model on commitment to change among managers; 2) to identify the determinants of trust in management (TM) among managers in a selected Malaysian private service organization; 3) to determine the effect of the determinant variables on commitment to change (CC) among managers in a selected Malaysian private service organization; and 4) to determine the effect of trust in management, as a mediator, on commitment to change in a selected Malaysian private service organization. The hypotheses proposed are as follows:

**H1:** Job-related variables have significant effects on trust in management
**H2:** Organizational variables have significant effects on trust in management
**H3:** Managerial practice variables have significant effects on trust in management
**H4:** Organizational variables have direct effects on commitment to change.
**H5:** Managerial practice variables have direct effects on commitment to change
**H6:** Trust in management has mediating effects on commitment to change.

**Method**

**Subjects and Procedures**

The subjects in this study consisted of 294 managerial staff from a service organization in Malaysia. Two criteria were used in selecting the subjects in the sample, namely 1) have served a minimum of one year in the organization, and 2) work at the managerial level. These criteria were considered appropriate and relevant in the context of this study. A minimum of one year working in the organization was considered appropriate because with this minimum tenure, it is expected that the managers would be more knowledgeable of the current organizational strategies, programmes and initiatives. Only managers and assistant managers were included because of their greater involvement in implementing change in the organization.

A sample of 364 managers and assistant managers were selected using stratified random sampling, and the sample size was determined using Cohen’s (1988) procedure. Self-administered questionnaires were used to collect data and the return rate of complete questionnaires was 294 (80.7%). The managers in this study averaged 35.6 years (SD = 7.9) of age, 59.2% were males while 40.8% were females, and
they had served as managerial staff for an average of 2.9 years (SD = 2.1) (Table 1).

**Measures**

Trust in management was measured using 13 items, 2 items developed by LaRocca, Gunderson, Dean, James, Jones and Sells (1975), 7 items developed by Garbarino and Johnson (1999), 2 items developed by Morgan and Hunt (1994), and 2 items developed by Swan, Trawick, Jr., Rink and Roberts (1988). The reliability coefficient (Cronbach alpha) of the scale was .97. Commitment to change was measured using 16 items developed by Leithwood, Jantzi and Fernandez (1993). The items were rated on a ten-point scale, in which the score ranged from ‘1’ representing ‘strongly disagree’ to ‘10’ representing ‘strongly agree’. The reliability coefficient (Cronbach alpha) of the scale was .91.

Five survey questions addressed feedback. Scale source was adapted from Sim et al. (1979). The researcher also adapted another 2 items of a survey instrument from Mathieu & Zajak (1990) for this variable. The reliability coefficient (Cronbach alpha) of the scale was .93. Six survey questions dealt with employee perceptions of autonomy. Scale source was based on a study by Sim et al. (1979) and used by Weber and Weber (2001). The researcher also adapted one item of a survey instrument School Values Inventory (SVI) from Pang (1998) for this variable. The reliability coefficient (Cronbach alpha) of the scale was .89. Four survey questions dealt with employee participation. Scale source was based on a study by White and Ruh (1973) and used by Weber and Weber (2001). In addition, the researcher also adapted instruments developed by Benkoff (1997a, b); Siegal & Sisaye, (1997); Singh & Vinnicombe, (2000). It consisted of 5 items. The reliability coefficient (Cronbach alpha) of the scale was .91. Four survey questions addressed goal clarity. Scale source was from Gordon and Cummins (1979). In addition, the researcher also adapted instruments developed by Benkoff (1997a, b); Siegal & Sisaye, (1997); Singh & Vinnicombe, (2000). It consisted of 4 items. The reliability coefficient (Cronbach alpha) of the scale was .97.

In order to assess respondents’ perception of procedural justice related changes, eight items were adapted from Shapiro and Brett’s (1993) study. The reliability coefficient (Cronbach alpha) of the scale was .95. For measuring perceived organizational support, 13 items were used, consisting of a three items developed by Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchinson and Sowa (1986), two items developed by Porter Steers, Mowday and Boulian (1974) and eight items from Mathew and Zajac (1990). The reliability coefficient (Cronbach alpha) of the scale was .93. Transformational leadership was measured using 15 items developed by Leithwood, Jantzi and Steinbach (1999). For the transformational leadership practices the items used had been developed based on four dimensions, including building a shared vision, developing consensus about goals and priorities, creating high performance expectations and also modeling important values and practices. The reliability coefficient (Cronbach alpha) of the scale was .97. The variable, shared values, was measured using nine items, five developed by Morgan and Hunt (1994) and 4 developed by Burke (1995). The reliability coefficient (Cronbach alpha) of the scale was .89.

Opportunistic behaviour was measured through items developed by Anderson, Rungtusanatham and Schroeder (1987). The reliability coefficient (Cronbach alpha) of the scale was .88. Scale for communication was adapted from Martins, Watkins, Von der Ohe and De Beer (1997). In addition, the researcher adapted the instrument from Miller, Allen, Casey and Johnson (2000) on communication of change. The reliability coefficient (Cronbach alpha) of the scale was .95. All the items in the instruments were rated on a ten-point scale, in which the score ranged from ‘1’ representing ‘strongly disagree’ to ‘10’ representing ‘strongly agree’.

**Data Analysis**

First, frequency distribution and measures of central tendency were calculated and used to describe the respondents, and the variables studied. Second, confirmatory factor analysis was conducted to check for the adequacy of the measuring scales. Since the factor loading for each of the input variables was more than 0.5, the scales were considered adequate (Bagozzi & Yi, 1988). Third path analysis by using structural equation model was conducted to examine the mediating effect of trust in management on the relationships between the predictor variables (job-related variables, organizational variables and managerial practice variables) and the criterion variable (commitment to change).

Analysis of Moment Structures (AMOS) Program Version 4.0, a graphic and statistic analysis tool embedded inside SPSS was utilized to test the proposed Organizational Change Commitment Model. Since the hypothesized model was judged to be unacceptable due to the various offending estimates that are technically known as “Heywood” problems, the model was revised. According to Tate (1998) it is a common practice to introduce an exploratory element into the study by considering possible revisions based on the collected data. One of the techniques the data-based revision is by referring to the modification indices (MI). In this study, the research-
er reviewed the model resulting in the larger modification indices (MI > .40). The modification indices suggested for the portion of unexplained variance (PUV) of the manifest variables job, organizational and managerial practices.

**Results**

Objective 1: To answer the first objective – to test the model of commitment to change. A number of indices were used to measure the overall fit of the model, namely GFI, NFI, CFI and RMSEA. First, an adopted measure to evaluate the hypothesized model in this study is Goodness-of-Fit (GFI). It assesses only the overall model fit without adjustment for over fitting (when the data does not meet a 5:1 ratio of the number of respondents to estimate coefficients). GFI values equal to or greater than .90 indicating a fairly good fit to accept the model. The second adopted index is Normed Fit Index (NFI). It is one of the more popular measures (Hair et. al, 1998). NFI is a relative comparison of the proposed model to the null model. The commonly recommended value is NFI greater than 0. 90. In addition to the above indices, a stringent goodness-of-fit adjusts the measure of fit to provide comparisons between models with differing number of coefficients. It is to determine the amount of fit achieved by each estimated coefficient. The indicator is the comparative fit index (CFI) with the recommended value greater than 0.9 (Hair et. al, 1998). Finally, the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) takes into consideration for the sample size and parsimony. The recommended RMSEA is the value less than 0.08. Table 3 indicates the RMSEA and PCLOSE fit measures of this study. In this study, the summary of the fit measures can be observed in Table 2 and Table 3.

The original hypothesized model (Refer Figure 2) was rejected due to the offending estimated values. Table 2 presents a summary of the default models, saturated models and independence models. In this table, NPAR was the number of parameters being estimated in the model and was not a measure of fit. The P value of the discrepancy deals with minimum sample discrepancy. If the P was less than 0.5, the null hypothesis that the data were a perfect fit to the model was not accepted. As a result, the hypothesized model was revised to achieve the acceptable model fit without the offending estimates and theoretically sound explanation of the model. The estimated standardized structural coefficients of the revised model are shown in Figure 3 and Table 4. Table 4 presents the standardized regression weights. The path model depicting the standardized regression weights can be observed in Figure 3. All of the estimated direct effects were statistically significant and were of practical importance (i.e., all were larger than 0.2). Moreover all the signs of these effects were consistent with the presumed directions. The revised model does not only have high goodness of fit indices values but also explained the studied phenomenon reasonably. The main findings of the revised model are discussed in the Objectives 2 to 4.

Objective 2: Job related variables have significant effects on trust in management. Organizational and Managerial Practice Variables have insignificant negative effects on trust in management. Referring to Figure 3, at 1% significant level, it was found that only job-related variables were significant determinants of trust in management with the standardized regression coefficient of .99. This suggests that one standard deviation increase in job related variable is followed by 0.99 standard deviation increase in trust in management. Thus $H_2$ was supported. Among the job-related variables, the most significant variables were feedback and goal clarity. Both of them had the highest standardized regression coefficient of .81. These were followed by employee participation and job autonomy, which were found to have the standardized coefficient of .68 and .50 respectively.

As depicted in Figure 3 and Table 4, the direct effect of managerial practice variables on commitment to change had been combined with organizational variables. Organizational and managerial practice variables have insignificant negative effects on trust in management. Organizational and managerial practice variables were found to have no significant relationship with trust in management (E.C= - .16 C.R. = 1.188, p =.540) and thus $H_2$ was not supported. Figure 3 shows that organizational variables were indicated by perceived organizational support with the highest standardized coefficient .95, followed by transformational leadership with the standardized coefficient .94. Then organizational variables were indicated by procedural justice and shared values with the standardized coefficient .86 and .52 respectively. In other words, there is no direct effect of organizational variables on trust in management. Procedural justice, perceived organizational support, transformational leadership, and shared values among managers do not determine trust in management. Managerial practice variables were indicated by two manifested variables namely communication and opportunistic behaviour with the standardized coefficient of .92 and .66 respectively and therefore $H_2$ and $H_3$ were not supported by the data. However, these factors are significantly related to job related variables.

Objective 3: Based on the revised model of Figure 3 and Table 4, only job-related variables had significant direct effect on commitment to change at 0.01 alpha level. The standardized causal direct effect was found to be significant (E.C. = .41, C.R. 2.063, p
In the hypothesized model, the researcher did not include the effect of job-related variables on commitment to change. However, when the organizational commitment to change model was revised, the addition of this relationship was necessary. Job-related variables have significant direct effects on commitment to change.

In contrast, based on the revised model as shown in Figure 3, this hypothesis was rejected. In order to have an admissible model, the direct effects of managerial practice variables on commitment to change had been combined with organizational variables. Organizational and managerial practice variables have insignificant negative effects on commitment to change. Therefore, $H_4$ and $H_5$ were not supported. However, organizational and managerial practice variables have significant positive effects on job-related variables.

Objective 4: Trust in management has significant positive effect on commitment to change, thus mediate the effects of job-related variables on commitment to change.

In reference to the revised organizational change commitment model shown in Figure 3, and Table 4, it was found that trust in management mediates job-related variables, organizational variables or managerial practice variables. At 1% significant level, the results indicate that trust in management mediates its determinants towards commitment to change due to the significant relationship between trust in management to commitment to change (E.C. = .83, C.R = 1.00, $p = .001$). Thus, $H_6$ was supported. Moreover, the findings provide evidence that is less substantial (<.20) indirect effect of the determinant variable. Specifically, job-related variables mediated via trust in management on commitment to change is the product of the causal relationship job-related variables to trust in management and a causal relationship trust in management to commitment to change (.99 x .83 = .823). The level of trust in management among managers is relatively moderate (Mean = 6.48, S.D. = 1.68) while the level of commitment to change is high (Mean 7.51, S.D. = 1.05). The $R^2$ value of trust in management is equal to .72. The value suggests that job-related variables, organizational variables and managerial practice variables explain 72% of the variation of trust in management. Out of the three factors the most contributing factor for trust in management was the job-related variables. Specifically, feedback, job autonomy, employee participation, and goal clarity entrusted the managers most as compared to other variables.

Based on Baron and Kenny (1986) study of mediating effect model, there are four conditions to establish the mediating effect:

1. the independent variable is significantly related to the dependent variables
2. the independent variables is significantly related to the mediating variable
3. the mediating variables is significantly related to the dependent variables
4. full mediation is established when the effect of independent variables on dependent variables controlling for mediating variable should be zero. Partial mediation is established when the direct effects of independent variables on dependent variables are weaker than the indirect effect.

Discussion

Test on the hypothesized commitment to change model was not admissible – standardize regression was greater than one. Thus, we revised the model. The significant effect of job-related variables on trust in management indicates that trust in a selected service organization is highly influenced by feedback, job autonomy, employee participation and goal clarity. The insignificant negative effect of organizational and managerial practice variables on trust in management indicates that leaders in a selected service organization unable to gain trust from their managers in implementing change. They lack in giving explanation about change, providing information, receptive to suggestion and encouraging progress and teamwork. The significant effect of job-related variables on commitment to change indicates that when participation of managers is high, freedom to engage in variety practice, strategic direction and openness on performance review system likely to result in high commitment to change. The negative insignificant effect of organizational and managerial practice variables on commitment to change indicates that management is weak in just procedure, supporting managers, provide guidance and values shared in a selected service organization. Trust in management is a mediator for job-related variables to commitment to change indicates that trust play a role to increase managerial staff’s commitment in implementing change. The finding also indicates that the organizational and managerial practice variables have significant effect on job-related variables. It’s due to attitude of leaders. They were concerned with managerial staff’s interest and give appropriate fact of organizational change.

Theoretical Contributions

This study enriches existing commitment trust theory through the studied variables. The variables suggested in commitment trust theory and used in this study were shared values, opportunistic behaviour and communication; and trust as a mediating variable. This study proposes an integrated framework complementing earlier works in the field. The framework
for this study acknowledges that commitment to change can be a consequence of job-related variables (feedback, autonomy, employee participation and goal clarity), organizational variables (procedural justice, perceived organizational support, transformational leadership and shared values) and managerial practice variables (opportunistic behaviour and communication); and trust in management as mediator variables. This framework was developed based on Leithwood et. al (1994) model for explaining the development and commitment to change as well as previous research on interrelationships among the predictor variables, trust in management and commitment (Connel, Ferress & Travaglione, 2003; Metalfé & Dick, 2001; Iverson, McLeod & Erwin, 1996 and Weber & Weber, 2001). The addition of variables in this study together with the existing variables has afforded more comprehensive of the phenomenon of commitment to change. This research adds to commitment trust theory by offering a comprehensive model, which is based on theoretical foundations and findings that describe the effect of job related variables influences trust in management and commitment to change. Thus, this study contributes to the expansion of a commitment trust model developed by Morgan and Hunt (1994).

Managerial Implications
The role of senior managers in the organization is critical. Organizational change required build transformational leadership talent, procedural justice, perceived organizational support and shared values and develop trust and commitment to change. The phenomenon and reality of organizational change in the organization was not as what the researcher hypothesized. Trust in management and commitment to change strongly relate to the way job-related variables among managers are managed. Leaders in the organization need to improve their awareness and implement all the planned organizational change, justice in change procedures, provide support, practice transformational leadership style and inculcate shared values have been set in organization. The management should design mechanisms to communicate change. The senior management can improve commitment to change by prolonged interaction and intense association between the organization and managers. Managers should manage change in a way (i) employees can cope with it; (ii) should not seek to control change but rather to expect it, understand it and manage it; (iii) closure in the plan, like other adults, more willing to work independently and apply their own work experiences in adapting change. Human Resource Department need to take action on: (i) human resource policy-makers and implementors should highly consider the creation of organizational environment that would induce trust in management; (ii) survey feedback (iii) entrust decisions to managers as much as possible (iv) consider meeting – opportunity to share information and to solve problem (v) employ Balanced Scorecard to achieve greater efficiency (vi) tie the change through individual performance measurements; and (vii) give feedback on performance more often.

Future study should adopt longitudinal design to understand the effect on commitment to change. Findings that implied for causality is best comprehend and interpret with this design. In order to establish cause and effect relationship, the predictor has to exist prior the outcome for inference of causality (McMillan & Schumacker, 1989; Morgan & Hunt, 1994). Moreover, organizational change is a dynamic process, how the employees react and respond at the onset of the changes may not be similar in a year time frame.
Figure 1: Research Framework
Figure 2: The Hypothesized Organizational Change Commitment Model

Figure 3: The Revised Organizational Change Commitment Model
Table 1: Characteristics of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>59.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>40.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age (years)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>≤ 30</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 – 40</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 – 50</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ 51</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure in Current Job Position (years)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 4</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>73.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 – 8</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2(a): Summary of the Hypothesized OCC Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>NPAR</th>
<th>CMIN</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>CMIN/DF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Default model</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>182.965</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>6.627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturated model</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence model</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3173.151</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>48.078</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:
- NPA : Number of parameters
- DF : Degrees of freedom
- CMIN : Minimum sample of discrepancy
- CMIN/DF : Discrepancy / df

Table 2 (b): Summary of the Revised OCC Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>NPAR</th>
<th>CMIN</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>CMIN/DF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Default model</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>182.965</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>4.158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturated model</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence model</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3173.151</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>48.078</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:
- NPA : Number of parameters
- DF : Degrees of freedom
- CMIN : Minimum sample of discrepancy
- CMIN/DF : Discrepancy / df

Table 3(a): Summary of GFI, NFI, CFI and RMSEA Fit Measures the Hypothesized OCC Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>GFI</th>
<th>NFI</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Default model</td>
<td>.848</td>
<td>.902</td>
<td>.915</td>
<td>0.139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturated model</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence model</td>
<td>.202</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.401</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:
- CFI: comparative fit index
- GFI: Goodness-of-Fit Index
- RMSEA: root mean square error of approximation
- NFI: Normed Fit Index
Table 3(b) : Summary of GFI, NFI, CFI and RMSEA Fit Measures the Revised OCC Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>GFI</th>
<th>NFI</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Default model</td>
<td>.933</td>
<td>.958</td>
<td>.971</td>
<td>0.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturated model</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence model</td>
<td>.202</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.401</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:
- CFI: comparative fit index
- GFI: Goodness-of-Fit Index
- NFI: Normed Fit Index
- RMSEA: root mean square error of approximation

Table 4: Standardized Regression Weights for the Paths in the Revised Organizational Changed Commitment Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regression Weights</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TIMGT &lt;--- OMPV</td>
<td>-0.155</td>
<td>-0.641</td>
<td>1.188</td>
<td>-0.540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIMGT &lt;--- JRV</td>
<td>0.993</td>
<td>0.624</td>
<td>3.259</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC &lt;--- JRV</td>
<td>0.807</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPPART &lt;--- JRV</td>
<td>0.676</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>12.591</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOBAUT &lt;--- JRV</td>
<td>0.495</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>8.755</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBACK &lt;--- JRV</td>
<td>0.806</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>14.401</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVALUES &lt;--- OMPV</td>
<td>0.518</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRLEADER &lt;--- OMPV</td>
<td>0.940</td>
<td>4.426</td>
<td>0.448</td>
<td>9.888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS &lt;--- OMPV</td>
<td>0.947</td>
<td>0.283</td>
<td>9.438</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROCFAIR &lt;--- OMPV</td>
<td>0.856</td>
<td>2.228</td>
<td>0.234</td>
<td>9.512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNICTN &lt;--- OMPV</td>
<td>0.829</td>
<td>2.747</td>
<td>0.280</td>
<td>9.827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB &lt;--- OMPV</td>
<td>0.656</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>7.649</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMCHANGE &lt;--- JRV</td>
<td>0.407</td>
<td>0.244</td>
<td>2.063</td>
<td>.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMCHANGE &lt;--- TIMGT</td>
<td>0.829</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMCHANGE &lt;--- OMPV</td>
<td>-0.266</td>
<td>-0.664</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>-1.392</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: estimates are significant at < 0.001 level
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