

# A STUDY OF EXPLORING RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FACTORS AFFECTING THE ORGANIZATIONAL LEVEL AND THEIR IMPACT ON ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR

Abdulmohsin Jawad Keshwan, University of Kufa  
Mohammed Saleh Mahdi, University of Kufa

## ABSTRACT

*Organizational trust (OrgTrst) is established by a variety of Organizational-factors for instance, perceived organizational support (PerOrgSpt), procedural justice (ProcJustc), and communication. The research interviewed over 400 participants from various industrial and service businesses at the top, medium, and lower positions of management. OrgTrst, as well as its predecessors and later, the causes, was assessed using conventional measures. According to the outcomes, antecedent factors did have an effect on the degree of OrgTrst. When OrgTrst is present, it has a favorable effect on all of the Organizational citizenship behavior (OrgCtnBhr) dimensions disclosed by the organisation's people. OrgTrst served as a partial mediator between OrgCtnBhr and organizational -level components. Due to these outcomes, organisations should encourage individuals to be involved in actions that aren't related to a certain function in order to improve Organizational and personal efficacy.*

**Keywords:** Organizational Trust (OrgTrst), Procedural Justice (ProcJustc), Perceived Organizational Support (PerOrgSpt), Organization Citizenship Behavior (OrgCtnBhr)

## INTRODUCTION

The current study investigated the link between Organizational-level characteristics such as PerOrgSpt, ProcJustc, and communication as drivers of OrgTrst, as well as their influence on OrgCtnBhr. The information was gathered from 303 participants at the top, medium, and lower positions of management from diverse firms in the manufacturing and services sectors. To measure OrgTrst and its antecedent and subsequent causes, standard scales were utilized. The outcomes revealed that the preceding factors did aid in increasing the degree of OrgTrst. The existence of OrgTrst is related to all of the dimensions of OrgCtnBhr reported by the organisation's members. OrgTrst also moderated the connection between Organizational -level variables and OrgCtnBhr to some extent. Based on the outcomes, it was suggested that businesses should encourage employees to engage in extra-role activity, which would outcome in better individual and Organizational success.

### Organizational Trust (OrgTrst)

Changes in Organizational structure that are significant, activities, processes, and employee behavior have emerged from two decades of structural reforms. As a outcome of Organizational policies and structural changes, there has been a general decrease in employee confidence in the organisation.

Several articles have discovered a need of trust in a variety of organisations, as well as the difficulties that come from it ("Ferris, Connell & Travaglione, 2004). Organizational justice (Crorpanzano & Randell, 1993; Lind & Tylor, 1988; McFarlen & Swieny, 1992), OrgCtnBhr (Konvosky & Pugh, 1994; Koys, 2001), and PerOrgSpt (McFarlin & Sweeny, 1992) are all aspects linked to the human element in Organizational success (Eisinberger,

Fasolou & Daves-LaMastrio, 1990). There is a paucity of research on Organizational /management trust, and less focus has been made on the relationship between OrgTrst, its origins, and its consequences. Again, there is little evidence in the research to determine how relevant these variables are in determining OrgTrst and hence in influencing staff citizenship behavior. The objective of this research is to better understand OrgTrst and its interaction with Organizational-level factors, as well as its influence on OrgCtnBhr in the Iraqi cultural context, so as to make a contribution to research and practice.

According to Gambetta (1988), OrgTrst is "the worldwide evaluation of an organisation's trustworthiness as seen by its workers." Employees believe the firm will take substantial action or, at the very least, will not harm them. Trust in management, assurance about their behavior, honesty, and the anticipation of optimism are some of the components connected to building (Yilmaz & Atalay, 2009). It is the outcome of a social exchange system (Blau, 1964) in which employees interpret and trade actions while continually monitoring the workplace to evaluate whether or not to trust top management. According to "Seal (1998)", evaluating a person's or company's attributes leads to trust. Establishing a trustworthy connection with an organization enhances interpersonal interactions amongst people, particularly critical DisMkng.

A trustworthy culture guarantees that senior management follows through on its pledges, eliminating ambiguity and uncertainty (Connill & Manneon, 2006). These different highlights believe in a mutual reaction. The study backs up the notion that the attitude of the Management toward its personnel is reflected in its choices and policies. The management's conviction will be shared by the workforce.

Employees will be suspicious if the organisation's structures, roles, and atmosphere demonstrate distrust. According to "Shockley-Zalabake, Ellise & Wirogarde (2000)", Organisations with a higher level of trust are most successful, adaptable, and inventive than those with a lower level of trust, which can hurt company in a variety of ways, including cutting costs. Transactions and production, as well as the health of people and organisations (Whitney, 1994).

According to "Sonnenberg (1994)", Lack of confidence can result in poor group decisions, higher stress, employees being distracted from their responsibilities, being less creative and inventive, and avoiding workplace problems. System-wide characteristics like the degree to which the organization's performance is evaluated on system fairness and job security are linked to trust in management at work, which may explain variation in trust in management at work and relationship variables, for example, functional independence and supervisory support (McCuaaley & Kohnet, 1992).

Employees that are more confident are more driven by the team and company objectives instead of personal desires" (Meshra, 1996). The study's goal is to look at Organizational aspects or essential elements across the system that impact OrgTrst, such as ProcJustc, PerOrgSpt, and communication, as well as the link between Trust and OrgCtnBhr.

### **Procedural Justice (ProcJustc)**

ProcJustc (Korsgaard, Schweiger, & Sapienza, 1995) refers to the impact of decision-making (DisMkng) procedures' fairness on the conduct of individuals participating in and impacted by such choices. The theory of equity ("Adams, 1965"), when it comes to with distributing resources in a fair and equal manner, inspired the study of ProcJustc. Since the conceptual development of ProcJustc, several types of study have proven that the perception of ProcJustc is positively related to confidence in the leader or management (Leventhal, 1976; Thibaut & Walker, 1975). The procedures utilized to generate such judgements are equally as important as the apparent fairness of allocation and outcome. Brockner & Siegel (1996), observed that a person's positive attitude toward process and ProcJustc was connected to levels higher of trust in the company and the supervisor. People are seen as objectives, not

instruments, when fair methods are used. Fair process may be interpreted by employees as representing institutional principles. Processes are considered to have a longer lifespan than outcomes, which are supposed to occur just once (Tyler, 1989). The adoption of procedurally fair procedures has an impact on higher-order issues, such as the staff's allegiance to the system and belief in its authority. Fair procedures demonstrate a company's respect for the rights and dignity of its employees. ProcJustc is a popular metric for determining if a social transaction is fair. Processes are evaluated based on their consistency of application, contemporary ethical norms, bias, accuracy, correct ability, and the extent to which they reflect all persons involved, according to Leventhal (1980). Furthermore, while the structural characteristics of ProcJustc may vary over time, the nature of institutional variables indicates that they are likely to stay constant for an organisation. As a outcome, if a firm uses fair practices once, it is expected that they will continue to do so in the future, giving employees confidence that the organisation can be trusted to function in this manner (Brockner & Siegel, 1996; Knvosky & Cropanzano, 1991; Knvosky & Pugh, 1994). ProcJustc is predicted to be the most powerful predictor since it is more likely to be impacted by, or at least restricted by, the broader Organizational structure.

When compared to other forms of justice, Hubbell & Chory-Assad (2005)" discovered that ProcJustc was the greatest predictor of OrgTrst. Higher-order trust emotions in strategic DisMkng teams were positively influenced by ProcJustc-based judgements (Kim & Mauborgne, 1991). According to "Cropanzano, Prehar & Chen (2002)", ProcJustc in performance evaluation has an influence on Organizational trust. A high ProcJustc in a year's divestment, according to "Gopinath & Becker (2002)", is associated with new owners' increased confidence and commitment. Even after accounting for the impact of PerOrgSpt, "Stinglhamer, De Cremer & Mercken (2006)" found a clear link between ProcJustc and OrgTrst. People desire to have a positive connection with their authority, therefore they assess their authority's kindness and trustworthiness, according to the group value model (Tyler & Lind, 1992). One method to show this confidence is via ethical behavior.

### **Perceived Organizational Support (PerOrgSpt)**

Employees' impressions on their company's performance worth and concern for their well-being are measured by PerOrgSpt (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison & Sowa, 1986). It ensures that corporate assistance will be accessible when needed to complete tasks and cope with difficult situations (George, Reed, Ballard, Colin & Fielding, 1993). PerOrgSpt and trust have theoretical links based on social exchange theory (Blau, 1964). If the employees believe the organisation has benefited them, they feel compelled to return it (Setton, Bennett & Liden, 1996). The employees will have faith in themselves and do a good (or at least non-harmful) activity, and the firm will continue to recognize and reward their achievements by providing a nice work environment and strong support. Employees may see a company's concern for their well-being as benign proof of the company's trustworthiness, according to "Chen, Aryee & Lee (2005)". PerOrgSpt was a powerful predictor of confidence in public sector senior management, according to Albrecht & Travaglione (2003). PerOrgSpt is a PerOrgSpt predictor of manager trust, according to a few other outcomes (Narang & Singh, 2012; Riggle, 2007; Tan & Tan, 2000; Tremblay, Cloutier, Simard, Chenevert & Vandenberghe, 2010). PerOrgSpt concludes that PerOrgSpt is a major predictor of OrgTrst based on this assumption. As a outcome, the research will look at the relationship between PerOrgSpt and OrgTrst.

### **Communication**

Professionals and academics tend to believe that employees who have a favorable impression of their company's communication environment will develop positive views

toward their jobs and employers. Management's actions, according to evidence, may have a significant impact on how people feel about communication (Kulhavy & Schwartz, 1981). Loomis (1959), investigated the role of communication in a trusting relationship, concluding that communication is positively related to trust perceptions and that communication increases the level of trust (Loomis, 1959; Mahajan, Bishop & Scott, 2012). The establishment of trust is influenced by a variety of communication variables. Cufaude (1999), observed that frequency of communication, punctuality, and forthrightness are all beneficial to trust. Communication provides more information, according to "Gilbert & Tang (1998)". Openness and accuracy are two important components of good communication and are considered as important criteria in defining trust. Companies that practice open communication (OpnCom) provide employees with accurate information about the company, provide explanations behind management and human resource decisions, encourage employee participation, and communicate organizational values (Caudron, 2002). According to "Elsbach & Eloffson (2000)". As a result of this, employees and management are better able to communicate and trust one another. According to "Gilbert & Tang (1998)," a person who is a member of the channel and delivers critical information is more likely to experience anxiety. Employees were able to better connect with their firm because of a communication environment that encouraged employee openness and engagement (Smidts, Pruyn & Van Riel, 2001). Employees who are informed about the company's accomplishments are more likely to acquire cognitive-based confidence in it (Elsbach & Eloffson, 2000), demonstrating employee faith in senior management's abilities. "Korsgaard, Brodt & Whitener (2002)" discovered that when managers spoke honestly and transparently with employees and shown care, a negative outcome of a quarrel between an employee and a boss does not always result in a lack of trust.

In general, increasing the number and/or quality of communication can help to build trust over time. According to social exchange theory, communication paints a good picture of the firm in the minds of employees, who respond by placing more trust in management. Despite this, research to far have revealed a lack of understanding of which communication elements might enhance employee confidence in management. Since most research has focused on interpersonal trust, there have been few studies on OrgTrst from a communication viewpoint. As an outcome, the current research looks into the two most important aspects of communication, namely openness and accuracy, in relation to Organizational /management trust.

### **Organisation Citizenship Behavior (OrgCtnBhr)**

Extra-role execution alludes to work conduct that reaches out past conventional occupation definitions. The operationalization of extra-job execution is OrgCtnBhr. Organ (1988) divided OrgCtnBhr into five categories, including:

- (1) Altruism (Altsm)—assisting other members of the group with their responsibilities ( for example, assisting in a voluntary manner staff who are not so skillful or new staff, helping colleagues who have too much work or were absent and sharing work strategies),
- (2) Courtesy (Cortsy) entails an employee's regard for others and the avoidance of problems arising from the workplace relationship,
- (3) Sportsmanship (Sportship) entails that employees do not whine but instead have a positive attitude (e.g., minor annoyances).
- (4) Civic virtue (Civitue) entails employees actively participating in the organisation's political affairs (e.g., being invited to attend meetings/functions that are not considered necessary but beneficial to the organisation, staying informed about change initiatives, and taking the necessary steps to suggest ways to improve processes), and

- (5) **Conscientiousness (Contsnss)**—indicates that employees go above and beyond the bare minimum of in-role behavior (e.g., working long days, gladly completing duties outside of their scope, adhering to the company's standards, and never squandering any time). Moreover, “Williams (1988)”, divided citizenship behaviors into two classes: benefits to the OrgCtnBhr organisation (Sportship, Civitue, and Contsnss), and benefits to the person in the OrgCtnBhr organisation (Altsm and politeness (Poltss)).

The connection between Organizational confidence and OrgCtnBhr has been the subject of much research. Social exchange theory (Blau, 1964) explains OrgCtnBhr by encouraging workers to act in ways that are not dictated by their employers (Rousseau & Parks, 1993).

Social exchange is necessary for OrgCtnBhr, according to Organ (1990), since the mutual trust that supports social exchange relations guarantees that OrgCtnBhr will be reciprocal in the long run. According to “Dirks & Ferrin (2002)”, Altsm, Civitue, Contsnss, civility, and Sportship are all linked to Organizational trust.

Employees' perceptions of their superiors' trust in them had an impact on their performance and OrgCtnBhr, according to “Lester and Brower (2003)”. Employees' OrgCtnBhr in a Chinese joint venture was impacted by their faith in both the firm and the supervisor (Wong, Ngo & Wong, 2006). Trust has a significant influence on extra-role activities, as “Tyler & Blader (2003); Gould-Williams (2003)”, discovered. However, just a few studies have looked at the influence of OrgTrst on various elements of OrgCtnBhr in Iraqi businesses, necessitating more study. As a outcome of the research, it is apparent that OrgTrst has a positive relationship with ProcJustc, PerOrgSpt, communication, and OrgCtnBhr. Meanwhile, the function of trust sometimes is unclear, with ProcJustc, PerOrgSpt, and communication parameters serving as predictors and OrgCtnBhr serving as a result. As a outcome, the study's main objective was to look at the roles of ProcJustc, PerOrgSpt, and communication in defining OrgTrst. To investigate the relationship between OrgTrst and OrgCtnBhr, a number of theories have been proposed:

*H1: The employer's ProcJustc, PerOrgSpt, and OpnCom & AccCom would outcome in trust in the organisation.*

*H2: OrgTrst would be a strong predictor of OrgCtnBhr.*

*H3: ProcJustc, PerOrgSpt, OpnCom & AccCom, and OrgCtnBhr factors would be mediated by OrgTrst.*

## Method

### Sample

There are 400 managers from manufacturing and service businesses at the top, middle, and lower management levels were chosen using stratified random selection. Production, “data”, technology, and information technology-enabled services account for the vast majority of services (IT&ITES) corporate headquarters were located in metropolises and capital metropolitan areas including Baghdad, Dyala, Sulaimanya, Tikrit, Anbar, Dohouk, Mosul, and Najaf. With the aid of the Human Resources department, an individual gathered the information, and a few pieces of information were retrieved through mail. A total of 500 survey instruments were distributed, with 360 (72%) of them being returned. For a self-report survey of this type, the response rate was judged satisfactory (Babbie, 2001; Miller, 1991; Yammarino, Skinner & Childers, 1991).

There are fifty seven of the surveys had to be discarded due to inadequate information or high participation feedback bias, leaving a total sample size of 400. In all, 24 percent of managers came from the highest levels of seniority, 34 percent from the middle levels, and 42 percent from the lower levels. Graduates, postgraduates, and doctorates each accounted for

56, 40, and 4% of the total. The average age of the responders was 37 years. The respondents had spent a decade with their present company, but 13 years in their preferred occupation. Respondents were assured that their “data” will be kept private and only shared in aggregate. There were no administrative personnel aware of the review information at any point during the “data” gathering processing.

## Measures

The study's questionnaire has 106 items with various values on a seven-point Likert scale. The objects were picked from pre-existing scales, with a few of them tweaked to fit the objectives of the study. The measures are summarized below.

**Organizational Trust (OrgTrst):** “Pearce, Branyiczki & Bakacsi (1994)”, developed a nine-item measure to assess employees' trust in the company to protect their interests. Cronbach's alpha was 0.82 for this scale.

**Procedural Justice (ProcJustc):** Moorman's 7-item formal processes scale was used to assess procedural justice (1991). This was true of the ProcJustc construct as it was conceived in the current investigation. Cronbach's alpha for this scale was 0.92.

**Perceived Organizational Support (PerOrgSpt):** PerOrgSpt was quantified using a scale developed by “Eisenberger, et al., (1990)”. This scale's reliability was 0.89, according to Cronbach's alpha.

**Communication:** To evaluate communication, O'Reilly and Roberts developed a 10-item measure (1976). The correctness and openness of communication were measured on the scale. Every one of the characteristics included five items. A single item was deleted from this scale during item analysis since it had an extremely low correlation (i.e., 0.41) with the item total. The dependability coefficient was 0.78.

**Organizational OrgCtnBhr:** The OrgCtnBhr was evaluated using Podsakoff and Mackenzie's five-dimensional scale (1989). Every one of the five measurements—selflessness, graciousness, Sportship, principles, and metro righteousness—had four components that portrayed explicit practices, and administrators approved each for laborers with whom they worked. Cronbach's alpha for this scale was 0.97.

## Outcomes and Discussion

The review was directed in an exploratory way to decide the significance of the connection between OrgTrst factors and their effect on OrgCtnBhr boundaries. To factor dissect every one of the factors found in the review, the central part investigation with varimax rotation was used. The most elevated scoring things were decided to be portrayals of the significant scales, affirming the scales' develop legitimacy. The components of the relative multitude of scales got by factor investigation were measurably assessed to make decisions. The results of the factor examinations for the scales utilized are summed up beneath.

### OrgTrst (Organizational Trust)

The factor analysis outcome of the nine-item OrgTrst scale yielded a single factor, much like the original scale. As a consequence, OrgTrst was identified as a single component with an eigenvalue of 2.57, accounting for 28.53 percent of the total variance.

### Procedural Justice (ProcJustc)

Component analysis of the seven-item ProcJustc scale revealed just one unique factor with an

eigenvalue of 3.98, accounting for 58.24 percent of the variance.

### **Perceived Organizational Support (PerOrgSpt)**

A single component with an eigenvalue of 4.01 considered for 60% of the variation in the PerOrgSpt scale, according to factor analysis.

### **Communication**

Component analysis was used on the communication scale, yielding two variables that matched the original scale, OpnCom and AccCom, with eigenvalues of 4.01 and 2.02, respectively, accounting for 59 percent of the variance. Due to insufficient loading, the eighth component on the scale was discarded.

### **Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OrgCtnBhr)**

This scale's factor analysis revealed five unique components that were comparable to the original scale. The fourth component was removed because its loading was less than 0.50. Altsm had an eigenvalue of 2.58, Civitue had a value of 2.34, Poltss had a value of 2.15, Sportship had a value of 2.02, and Contsnss had a value of 1.96. All five variables combined made up for 55% of the variation. To assess the degree of the link between the variables, inter-correlations were generated for each one. Because the correlation coefficient of all variables was not especially high, less than 0.83, the "data" suggested that multicollinearity was not an issue (Table 1). The outcomes revealed a favorable connection between ProcJustc, PerOrgSpt, and OpnCom & AccCom, and OrgTrst. OrgTrst also has a favorable relationship with all of OrgCtnBhr's dimensions. To determine the significance of the association, a multiple regression analysis was used.

PerOrgSpt ( $\beta = 0.32$ ), ProcJustc ( $\beta = 0.3$ ), accuracy ( $\beta = 0.24$ ), and OpnCom ( $\beta = 0.16$ ), according to Table 2, were significant predictors of OrgTrst, accounting for 46 percent of the variance ( $R^2 = 0.51$ ,  $F = 65.001$ ,  $p = 0.02$ ). The most powerful predictor of OrgTrst was found to be PerOrgSpt ( $\beta = 0.32$ ). This indicates that employees value management's relationship components, such as care and concern, as well as the company's job support, which allows them to do their responsibilities efficiently. PerOrgSpt takes it a step further by describing the human condition approach demonstrated by the organisation's management, which was thus valued higher by the workforce. Hence, trust, being context-dependent on relationships, maybe impacted more by the relational component of the job connection. Several studies have found a link between PerOrgSpt and trust. PerOrgSpt was a strong predictor of trust in government top management, according to "Albrecht & Travaglione (2003)". Organizational help has been identified as a possible predictor of management trust by "Tan & Tan (2000); Narang & Singh (2012)". The current research work shows that the caring dimension of PerOrgSpt has a substantial effect on Organizational trust.

Another predictor with a high relationship with OrgTrst ( $\beta = 0.3$ ) was ProcJustc. Employees have a higher level of assurance in a company if they observe fairness in the formal systems for allocating resources, making choices, and determining the outcome of their achievement. Thus, although supporting previous research outcomes, this outcome reinforced the idea that ProcJustc is a powerful predictor of workers' endorsement for prosocial conduct toward Organizational members and organisations.

**Table 1**  
**“MEAN, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND CORRELATION BETWEEN INDEPENDENT AND DEPENDENT MEASURES”**

	OrgTrst	ProcJustc	AccCom	OP	AL	S	SD	PerOrgSpt	CV	C	S	CO	M
OrgTrst	0.00						8.77						42.14
ProcJustc	0.56**	0.00					7.88						32.84
PerOrgSpt	0.62**	0.70**					9.12	0.00					42.17
AccCom	0.45**	0.32**	0.00				4.55	0.45**					16.98
OP	0.48**	0.55**	0.33**	0.00			4.9	0.53**					24.63
AL	0.31**	0.42**	0.20**	0.38**	0.00		3.8	0.39**					14.14
CV	0.51**	0.57**	0.31**	0.50**	0.43**		3.94	0.48**	0.00				19.6
C	0.43**	0.55**	0.2**	0.49**	0.38**		4.04	0.48**	0.42**	0.00			19.21
S	0.35**	0.36**	0.51**	0.34**	0.22**	0.00	5.54	0.36**	0.3**	0.34**	0.00		20.73
Contsness	0.28**	0.44**	0.20**	0.47**	0.41**	0.35**	3.74	0.43**	0.45**	0.36**	0.35**	0.00	13.45

Note: \*\* At the 0.02 level, this is significant

Source: Owned by the authors.

**Table 2**  
**MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS OUTCOMES SHOWING PERCEIVED ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT, PROCJUSTC AND COMMUNICATION AS PREDICTOR VARIABLES (PRDVAR) AND ORGTRST AS CRITERION VARIABLE (CRTVAR)**

PrdVar	CrtVar
	OT
PerOrgSpt	0.32**
ProcJustc	0.3**
AccCom	0.24**
OpenCom	0.16**
R	0.68
R <sup>2</sup>	0.51
R <sup>2</sup>	0.45
F	65.001**

PrdVar  
(1) \*\* At the 0.02 level, this is significant.  
(2) PerOrgSpt, AccCom, OrgTrst, ProcJustc, and OP.

Relational justice theories ,for instance, the group-value model (Lind & Tyler, 1988), the relational model of authority (Tyler & Lind, 1992), as well as the model of collective participation (Tyler & Lind, 1990) may all be used to define it, according to “Tyler (1990); (Tyler & Blader, 2003)”. According to the models, the implementation of fair processes by leaders conveys to staff that they are appreciated and deserving participants of the business and that the acting institution or leader can be expected to address them properly in the forthcoming time. Furthermore, because fair treatment is something that is provided to a basic group and Organizational players, ProcJustc has a major effect on the self-esteem of employees and perceptions of the authorities' reliability (Tyler & Degoey, 1996; Tyler & Kramer, 1996).

The outcomes shed light on the significance of workers' impressions of the organisation's communication atmosphere. Both communication characteristics, openness, and precision were shown to be positively linked with OrgTrst in the whole sample, supporting previous outcomes on honest and transparent communications, in which managers openly communicate opinions and ideas with workers, increases trust perception (Butler, 1991; Tzafirir, Harel, Baruch & Dolan, 2003).

Employees benefit from OpnCom because it allows them to understand their position within the company (Bowen & Lawler, 1995). OpnCom in companies decreases anxiety about the unknown impacts of change, reduces concerns caused by uncertainty, and increases



a feeling of connection to an Organizational setting. Furthermore, when the management's communication is precise, the staff regard the manager as trusted and reliable (Konovsky & Cropanzano, 1991). The study found that precision of "data" ( $\beta = 0.24$ ) was a greater predictor of OrgTrst ( $\beta = 0.16$ ) than openness ( $\beta = 0.16$ ) among the communication aspects..

Past research has demonstrated the need for both accurate and transparent communication, but there is currently inadequate information on which communication actions by management are more likely to result in the preferred effects, such as improved employee trust in management. As a outcome, the current study sheds light on this topic and shows how the preciseness of "data" conveyed correlates substantially to the establishment of dependability in an organisation.

Predictor	OrgCtnBhr Factors (criterion)				
	AL	Civitue	C	S	Contsnss
OrgTrst	0.31**	0.51**	0.44**	0.36**	0.28**
R	0.31	0.51	0.43	0.35	0.28
R <sup>2</sup>	0.1	0.24	0.2	0.13	0.08
R <sup>2</sup>	0.1	0.24	0.2	0.12	0.08
F	28.01**	80.73**	70.25**	43.29**	26.01**

Note:  
(1) \*\* At the 0.02 level, this is significant.  
(2) OrgTrst; Altsm; Civitue; Cortsy; Sportship; and Contsnss.

Source: Owned by the authors.

According to the outcomes in Table 3, Organizational trust forecasted all aspects of OrgCtnBhr aimed towards an employee and the organisation. Employee Altsm was influenced by the OrgTrst by 9% ( $\beta = 0.31$ ,  $R^2 = 0.1$ ,  $F = 28.01$ ,  $p = 0.02$ ). It accounted for 21% of the variation in Civitue ( $\beta = 0.51$ ,  $R^2 = 0.24$ ,  $F = 80.73$ ,  $p = 0.02$ ); 19% of the variation in employee Cortsy ( $\beta = 0.5$ ,  $R^2 = 0.2$ ,  $F = 70.25$ ,  $p = 0.02$ ); and 13% of the variation in Sportship and Contsnss, of which OrgTrst accounted for 13% ( $\beta = 0.36$ ,  $R^2 = \text{OrgCtnBhr}$  is founded on the social exchange theory, which states that individuals with trustworthy relationships want to react by engaging in extra-role behavior. According to Organ (1988), one possible channel for personnel social exchange is OrgCtnBhr. The general rules and processes of a firm have an impact on Organizational trust. Personnel who have a trusting relationship with their organisation respond to OrgCtnBhr directed at both a person and the organisation, making the company's operations easier. Using meta-analyses, "Dirks & Ferrin (2002)" revealed that Altsm, Civitue, conscientiousness, Poltss, and Sportship all had a positive association with organizational trust. As a result, the findings corroborated previous findings, suggesting that OrgTrst is linked to all OrgCtnBhr components.

The outcomes revealed an intriguing outcome: the OrgTrst provided more variation in conduct oriented towards the organisation, like Civitue, particularly in comparison to the additional part of behavior aimed at the people, such as benevolence, Poltss, and Contsnss.

With the current outcomes, the importance of other aspects of trust, like trust in superiors and trust in coworkers, and other job and Organizational environmental variables, must not be understated. Extra-role conduct directed toward people is affected more by personnel's interpersonal relationships with their supervisor and coworkers than by the general trusting connection maintained by administration. "McAllister (1995)", discovered that trust in colleagues was positively associated with OrgCtnBhr. Employees who trust their superiors have greater levels of supervisor-directed OrgCtnBhr, according to studies ("Aryee, Budhwar & Chen, 2002; Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Moorman & Fetter, 1990").

According to "Singh & Srivastava (2009)", confidence in coworkers was important in

anticipating extra-role behavior aimed towards a person while trust in superior justified OrgCtnBhr aimed at both a person and the organisation. As a outcome, while OrgTrst has an influence on many aspects of OrgCtnBhr, the existence of other elements, like trust in superiors and co-workers, would balance each other and contribute to the enhanced certainty of OrgCtnBhr aimed at both a person and the organisations.

OrgTrst's role as a link between PrdVar (ProcJustc, PerOrgSpt, and OpnCom & AccCom) and dependent variables (ProcJustc, PerOrgSpt, and OpnCom & AccCom) was investigated (factors of OrgCtnBhr). To conduct the mediation analysis, many hypotheses were utilized (Baron & Kenny, 1986). The first step is to determine if the independent variable affects the dependent variable (factors of OrgCtnBhr). The next step is to examine if the independent variable influences the OrgTrst intermediate. The third stage is to determine whether the intermediary has a substantial influence on the dependent variable, and the fourth stage is to determine whether the intermediary (trust) has an impact on the dependent variables when combined with the independent variable. When trust is included in the model, a substantial relationship between the independent and dependent variables is anticipated to vanish (perfect mediation) or be diminished (partial mediation).

Table 4 summarizes the outcomes of the investigation into the function of OrgTrst as a mediator between organizationally relevant elements and workers' OrgCtnBhr. Two of the five OrgCtnBhr factors had their link mediated by OrgTrst.

When OrgTrst ( $\beta = 0.16$ ) was included to the model with Civitue as the dependent variable, the impact of ProcJustc ( $\beta = 0.34$ ) and OpnCom ( $\beta = 0.13$ ) was somewhat reduced but remained significant. The influence of ProcJustc ( $\beta = 0.35$ ) and OpnCom ( $\beta = 0.18$ ) was reduced in the model with Cortsy as the dependent variable, but it remained significant. The impact of ProcJustc ( $\beta = 0.35$ ) and OpnCom ( $\beta = 0.18$ ) was significantly reduced in the model using Cortsy as the dependent variable, but it was still significant. In each of these models, OrgTrst was also revealed to be significantly related to the dependent variables. The outcomes indicate that OrgTrst acts as a mediator between independent and dependent variables (ProcJustc and OpnCom) (Civitue and Cortsy). OrgTrst was seen to have aided the staff's civic behaviors, such as Civitue and civility, to some level.

Variables	AL	Civitue	C	S	Contsness	OrgTrst
ProcJustc	0.28**	0.39**	0.38**	0.20**	0.17**	0.3**
PerOrgSpt					0.22**	0.32**
OpnCom	0.2**	0.15**	0.28*		0.3**	0.16**
AccCom				0.43**		0.24**
R	0.47	0.62	0.61	0.56	0.54	0.68
R <sup>2</sup>	0.23	0.39	0.37	0.32	0.31	0.51
R <sup>2</sup>	0.22	0.38	0.36	0.31	0.28	0.45
F	29.54**	48.60**	44.75**	46.95**	40.99**	64.29**
ProcJustc	0.28**	0.34**	0.35**	0.20**	0.17**	
PerOrgSpt		0.13*	0.18**		0.22**	
OpnCom AccCom OrgTrst	0.2**	0.16*	0.13*	0.43**	0.3**	
R	0.47	0.63	0.61	0.56	0.54	
R <sup>2</sup>	0.23	0.4	0.38	0.32	0.29	
R <sup>2</sup>	0.22	0.39	0.37	0.31	0.28	
F	29.54**	40.90**	45.36**	46.95**	40.99**	

Fair treatment of workers through ProcJustc and communication aspects (0.1), according to partial mediation models, not only creates trust in the company, but also has a direct influence on the employees' extra-role behavior. The outcomes support the

interpersonal foundation of employee work behavior, in which employees appreciate management's fair, helpful, and open approach toward them. According to “Rupp and Cropanzano (2002)”, extra-role activity that benefits the organisation is associated with justice from superiors, but justice from superiors is associated with extra-role conduct that is significant to the superior. OrgTrst's poor mediation might be due to a variety of causes. In today's business environment, businesses are competing fiercely to implement the finest HR practices in recruiting and maintaining talent. Workers, on the other hand, are competing for the finest job opportunities accessible in the marketplace. Personnel is much more devoted to their vocation than they are to their employer. As outcome, generally, companies comply with fair, just, and transparent policies, such as ProcJustc, OpnCom & AccCom, and staff welfare and assistance, which does not distinguish them from their rivals. Aside from that, with improved career opportunities accessible, staff turnover is great. This provides less room for trust formation, which is a more time-consuming process.

In contrast to interpersonal confidence, which is more personal and plays a more essential role in sustaining the relationship between independent and dependent variables, OrgTrst is neutral and has no impact (Singh & Srivastava, 2009). As a result, system-wide features like ProcJustc, Communication Factors (OpnCom & AccCom), and PerOrgSpt have a direct effect on employee attitudes.

## CONCLUSION

The research seeks to contribute to the current literature in both theoretical and practical ways. For starters, it expands our knowledge of OrgTrst in Iraqi companies. The research examines the influence of workers' ProcJustc, PerOrgSpt, and communication habits on OrgCtnBhr and trust. The study stresses the relevance of OrgTrst in affecting the entire aspects of OrgCtnBhr in a rapidly changing business ecosystem where workers' extra-role conduct is appreciated as it contributes more efficacy to Organizational achievement. In reality, identifying which component of the predictor variable will have the most impact on OrgTrst and OrgCtnBhr helps professionals to take necessary measures to promote HR practices and Organizational structure.

Various restrictions of this study should receive attention. Due to all of the “data” was collected from a single employee questionnaire, the common method variance is emphasized first. Future study might avoid this issue by combining “data” from many sources and use a longitudinal methodology. Although some interviews were conducted, the current study mostly focused on quantitative “data”. The researchers only looked at a few specific issues. In this field, both qualitative and quantitative “data” would greatly increase understanding. The study's failure to generalize was another flaw. Because telecommunications, software, and steel manufacturers were included in this study, the findings do not apply to the entire range of service and manufacturing businesses. However, the findings are likely to apply to any other industrial or service environment. Future research organizations working in a range of service industry activities should be included in this study to broaden its scope.

## REFERENCES

- Abdullah, M.H., & Rashid, N. (2012). The implementation of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) programs and its impact on employee organizational citizenship behavior. *International Journal of Business and Commerce*, 2, 67–75.
- Aguinis, H.; Glavas, A. (2012). What we know and don't know about corporate social responsibility: A review and research agenda. *Journal of Management*, 38, 932–968.
- Aguilera, R.V., Rupp, D.E., Williams, C.A., & Ganapathi, J. (2007). Putting the S back in corporate social responsibility: A multilevel theory of social change in organisations. *Academy of Management Review*, 32, 836–863.
- Alilyyani, B., Wong, C.A., & Cummings, G. (2018). Antecedents, mediators, and outcomes of authentic leadership in healthcare: A systematic review. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 83, 34–64.

- Avolio, B.J., & Walumbwa, F.O. (2014). Authentic leadership theory, research and practice: Steps taken and steps that remain. In *The Oxford Handbook of Leadership and Organisations*; Oxford University Press: New York, NY, USA, 331.
- Avolio, B.J., Gardner, W.L., Walumbwa, F.O., Luthans, F., & May, D.R. (2004). Unlocking the mask: A look at the process by which authentic leaders impact follower attitudes and behaviors. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 15, 801–823.
- Avolio, B.J. (1999). *Full Leadership Development: Building the Vital Forces in Organisations*; Sage: Thousand Oaks, CA, USA.
- Blau, P.M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*; Transaction publishers: Piscataway, NJ, USA.
- Bohn, J.G. (2002). The relationship of perceived leadership behaviors to organizational efficacy. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 9, 65–79.
- Bozkurt, S., & Bal, Y. (2012). Investigation of the relationship between corporate social responsibility and Organizational citizenship behavior: A research. *International Journal of Business Innovation and Research*, 1, 40.
- Brown, M.E., & Treviño, L.K. (2006). Ethical leadership: A review and future directions. *Leadership Quarterly*, 17, 595–616.
- Bridoux, F., Stofberg, N., & den Hartog, D. (2016). Stakeholders' responses to csr tradeoffs: When other-orientation and trust trump material self-interest. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 6, 1992.
- Caudron, S. (2002). Rebuilding employee trust. *Workforce*, 81(10), 28.
- Chen, Z.X., Aryee, S., & Lee, C. (2005). Test of a mediation model of perceived Organizational support. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 66(3), 457–470.
- Connell, N.A.D., & Mannion, R. (2006). Conceptualizations of trust in the Organizational literature: Some indicators from a complementary perspective. *Journal of Health Organisation and Management*, 20(5), 417–433.
- Cropanzano, R., Prehar, C., & Chen, P. (2002). Using social exchange theory to distinguish procedural from interactional justice. *Group and Organisation Management*, 27(3), 324–351.
- Cropanzano, R., & Randall, M.L. (1993). Injustice and work behavior: A historical review. In R. Cropanzano (Ed.), *Justice in workplace: Approaching fairness in human resource management*. (1–20). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Cufaude, J. (1999). Creating Organizational trust. *Association Management*, 51(7), 26–34.
- Dirks, K.T., & Ferrin, D.L. (2002). Trust in leadership: Meta-analytic findings and implications for research and practice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 611–628.
- Du, S., Swaen, V., Lindgreen, A., & Sen, S. (2013). The roles of leadership styles in corporate social responsibility. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 114, 155–169.
- Edú Valsania, S., Moriano León, J.A., Molero Alonso, F., & Topa Cantisano, G. (2012). Authentic leadership and its effect on employees' Organizational citizenship behaviours. *Psicothema*, 24, 561–566. [PubMed]
- Eisenberger, R., Fasolo, P., & Davis-LaMastro, V. (1990). Perceived Organizational support & employee diligence, commitment & innovation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75(1), 51–59.
- Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived Organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(3), 500–507.
- Elsbach, K.D., & G. Eloffson. (2000). How the packaging of decision explanations affects perceptions of trustworthiness. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(1), 80–89.
- Ferres, N., Connell, J., & Travaglione, A. (2004). Co-worker trust as a social catalyst for constructive employee attitudes. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 19(6), 608–622.
- Fu, H., Ye, B.H., & Law, R. (2014). You do well and I do well? The behavioral consequences of corporate social responsibility. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 40, 62–70.
- Gardner, W.L., Avolio, B.J., Luthans, F., May, D.R., & Walumbwa, F. (2005). "Can you see the real me?" A self-based model of authentic leader and follower development. *Leadership Quarterly*, 16, 343–372.
- Gardner, W.L., Cogliser, C.C., Davis, K.M., & Dickens, M.P. (2011). Authentic leadership: A review of the literature and research agenda. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 22, 1120–1145.
- Gao, Y., Zhang, D., & Huo, Y. (2017). Corporate social responsibility and work engagement: Testing a moderated mediation model. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 1–13.
- Gambetta, D. (1988). Can we trust trust? In D. Gambetta (Ed.), *Trust: Making and breaking cooperative relations*. (213–237). Cambridge, MA: Basil Blackwell.
- George, J.M., Reed, T.F., Ballard, K.A., Colin, J., & Fielding, J. (1993). Contact with AIDS patients as a source of work-related distress—Effects of Organizational and social support. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36(1), 157–171.
- Gilbert, J.A., & Tang, T.L. (1998). An examination of organizational trust antecedent. *Public Personal Management*, 27(3), 321–338.
- Glavas, A. (2016). Corporate social responsibility and employee engagement: Enabling employees to employ more of their whole selves at work. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7, 796.
- Glavas, A., & Kelley, K. (2014). The effects of perceived corporate social responsibility on employee attitudes. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 24, 165–202.

- Hayes, A.F. (2013). Mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis. In introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis: A regression-based approach; Guilford Publications: New York, NY, USA, 1–20.
- Humphrey, A. (2012). Transformational leadership and Organizational citizenship behaviors: The role of Organizational identification. *Psychologist-Manager Journal*, 15, 247–268.
- Ilies, R., Morgeson, F.P., & Nahrgang, J.D. (2005). Authentic leadership and eudaemonic well-being: Understanding leader–follower outcomes. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16, 373–394.
- Kegan, R. (1982). *The Evolving Self*; Harvard University Press: Cambridge, MA, USA.
- Khalili, A. (2017). Transformational leadership and Organizational citizenship behavior: The moderating role of emotional intelligence. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal (LODJ)*, 38, 1004–1015.
- Kim, H.-R., Lee, M., Lee, H.-T., & Kim, N.-M. (2010). Corporate social responsibility and employee–company identification. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 95, 557–569.
- Kim, M.-S., & Thapa, B. (2018). Relationship of ethical leadership, corporate social responsibility and organizational performance. *Sustainability*, 10, 447.
- Ko, S.-H., Moon, T.-W., & Hur, W.-M. (2017). Bridging service employees' perceptions of CSR and organizational citizenship behavior: The moderated mediation effects of personal traits. *Current Psychology*, 1–16.
- Korsgaard, M.A., Schweiger, D.M., & Sapienza, H.J. (1995). Building commitment, attachment and trust in strategic decision making teams: The role of procedural justice. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(1), 60–84.
- Koys, D.J. (2001). The effects of employee satisfaction, organizational citizenship behaviour, and turn over on Organizational effectiveness: A unit-level, longitudinal study. *Personnel Psychology*, 54(1), 101–114.
- Kulhavy, R.W., & Schwartz, N.H. (1981). Tone of communication and climate perception. *Journal of Business Communication*, 18(1), 17–23.
- Lee, K., & Allen, N.J. (2002). Organizational citizenship behavior and workplace deviance: The role of affect and cognitions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 131–142.
- Lim, B.T., & Loosemore, M. (2017). The effect of inter-organizational justice perceptions on organizational citizenship behaviors in construction projects. *International Journal of Project Management*, 35, 95–106.
- Lichtenstein, D.R., Drumwright, M.E., & Braig, B.M. (2004). The effect of corporate social responsibility on customer donations to corporate-supported nonprofits. *Journal of Marketing*, 68, 16–32. [CrossRef]
- Lin, C.-P. (2010). Modeling corporate citizenship, Organizational trust, and work engagement based on attachment theory. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 94, 517–531.
- Lin, C.-P., Lyau, N.M., Tsai, Y.-H., Chen, W.-Y., & Chiu, C.-K. (2010). Modeling corporate citizenship and its relationship with Organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 95, 357–372.
- Luthans, F., Avolio, B.J., Avey, J.B., & Norman, S.M. (2007). Positive psychological capital: Measurement and relationship with performance and satisfaction. *Personnel Psychology*, 60, 541–572.
- Luthan, F. (2011). *Organizational Behavior*, 12th ed.; The Mc Graw Hill Companies Inc.: New York, NY, USA.
- Luthans, F., & Avolio, B. (2003). *Authentic leadership: A positive development approach*; Cameron, K.S., Dutton, J.E., Quinn, R.E., Eds.; Positive Organizational Scholarship; Berrett-Koehler: San Francisco, CA, USA.
- Luthans & Church, A.H. (2002). Positive organizational behavior: Developing and managing psychological strengths. *Academy of Management Executive*, 16, 57–72.
- May, D.R., Chan, A.Y.L., Hodges, T.D., & Avolio, B.J. (2003). Developing the moral component of authentic leadership. *Organizational Dynamics*, 32, 247–260.
- McWilliams, A., & Siegel, D. (2001). Corporate social responsibility: A theory of the firm perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 26, 117–127.
- Mueller, K., Hattrup, K., Spiess, S.O., & Lin-Hi, N. (2012). The effects of corporate social responsibility on employees' affective commitment: A cross-cultural investigation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97, 1186–2000.
- Organ, D.W., Podsakoff, P.M., & MacKenzie, S.B. (2005). *Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature, antecedents, and consequences*; Sage Publications: Thousand Oaks, CA, USA.
- Organ, D.W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome*; Lexington Books/DC Heath and Com.: Lexington, MA, USA.
- Peus, C., Wesche, J.S., Streicher, B., & Frey, D. (2012). Authentic leadership: An empirical test of its antecedents, consequences, and mediating mechanisms. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 107, 331–348.
- Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B., & Bommer, W.H. (1996). Transformational leader behaviors and substitutes for leadership as determinants of employee satisfaction, commitment, trust, and Organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 22, 259–298.
- Podsakoff, N.P., Whiting, S.W., Podsakoff, P.M., & Mishra, P. (2011). Effects of Organizational citizenship behaviors on selection decisions in employment interviews. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96, 310–326.
- Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B., Paine, J.B., & Bachrach, D.G. (2000). Organizational citizenship behaviors: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of*

- Management*, 26, 513–563.
- Podsakoff, N.P., Whiting, S.W., Podsakoff, P.M., & Blume, B.D. (2009). Individual-and Organizational -level consequences of Organizational citizenship behaviors: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94, 122–141.
- Rupp, D.E., Shao, R., Thornton, M.A., & Skarlicki, D.P. (2013). Applicants' and employees' reactions to corporate social responsibility: The moderating effects of first-party justice perceptions and moral identity. *Personnel Psychology*, 66, 895–933.
- Rupp, D.E., Ganapathi, J., Aguilera, R.V., & Williams, C.A. (2006). Employee reactions to corporate social responsibility: An Organizational justice framework. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 27, 537–543. [CrossRef]
- Ryan, R.M., & Deci, E.L. (2001). On happiness and human potentials: A review of research on hedonic and eudaimonic well-being. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 141–166.
- Sen, S., Bhattacharya, C.B., & Korschun, D. (2006). The role of corporate social responsibility in strengthening multiple stakeholder relationships: A field experiment. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 34, 158–166. [CrossRef]
- Shapira-Lishchinsky, O., & Tsemach, S. (2014). Psychological empowerment as a mediator between teachers' perceptions of authentic leadership and their withdrawal and citizenship behaviors. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 50, 675–712.
- Turker, D. (2009). How corporate social responsibility influences organizational commitment. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 89, 189.
- Valentine, S., & Fleischman, G. (2008). Ethics programs, perceived corporate social responsibility and job satisfaction. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 77, 159–172.
- Walumbwa, F.O., Avolio, B.J., Gardner, W.L., Wernsing, T.S., & Peterson, S.J. (2008). Authentic leadership: Development and validation of a theory-based measure. *Journal of Management*, 34, 89–126.
- Walumbwa, F.O., Wang, P., Wang, H., Schaubroeck, J., & Avolio, B.J. (2010). Retracted: Psychological processes linking authentic leadership to follower behaviors. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 21, 901–914.
- Walumbwa, F.O., Luthans, F., Avey, J.B., & Oke, A. (2011). Retracted: Authentically leading groups: The mediating role of collective psychological capital and trust. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 32, 4–24. [CrossRef]
- Walumbwa, F.O., Wu, C., & Orwa, B. (2008). Contingent reward transactional leadership, work attitudes, and Organizational citizenship behavior: The role of procedural justice climate perceptions and strength. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 19, 251–265.
- Walumbwa, F.O., Hartnell, C.A., & Misati, E. (2017). Does ethical leadership enhance group learning behavior? Examining the mediating influence of group ethical conduct, justice climate, and peer justice. *Journal of Business Research*, 72, 14–23.
- Wang, W., Fu, Y., Qiu, H., Moore, J.H., & Wang, Z. (2017). Corporate social responsibility and employee outcomes: A moderated mediation model of organizational identification and moral identity. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8, 1906.
- Waddock, S. (2004). Parallel universes: Companies, academics, and the progress of corporate citizenship. *Business and Society Review*, 109, 5–42.
- Zhang, M., di Fan, D., & Zhu, C.J. (2014). High-performance work systems, corporate social performance and employee outcomes: Exploring the missing links. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 120, 423–435.
- Zamahani, M., Ghorbani, V., & Rezaei, F. (2011). Impact of authentic leadership and psychological capital on followers' trust and performance. *Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences*, 5, 658–667.