EXPLORING THE ORGANISATIONAL TRUST AMONG EMPLOYEES OF THREE COMPANIES IN THE SARAWAK CORRIDOR OF RENEWABLE ENERGY (SCORE) REGION

Lau, Hieng Soon
University College of Technology Sarawak
96000 Sibu, Sarawak, Malaysia
lau.hs@ucts.edu.my

Lau, Hui Lin
University College of Technology Sarawak
96000 Sibu, Sarawak, Malaysia
lauhuilin@ucts.edu.my

ABSTRACT

This study explored the organisational Trust among employees for three companies located at the SCORE region of Sarawak. A Survey questionnaire was administered to 229 employees of the three companies .The questionnaire consisted of the profile such as gender, current role, working experiences and perceptions of employees related to the five dimensions of trust for the companies they were working with. The findings indicated the employees' organisation trust of the selected companies for all dimensions (competency, openness, concerns for employees, reliability and identifications) were high. Each dimension of the organisation trust was also significantly and highly correlated with overall level of the organisation trust. ANOVA analysis showed   that there was a significant difference between overall organisation trust indices among selected companies (p=0.000<0.05 (F[2,197] = 8.006. There was significant difference for overall Employee's organisation trust indices between organisation A and B at P =0.023< 0.05, and also B and C at P=0.000<0.05. However, there was no significant difference on overall employees' organisation trust indices between organisation A and C at P=0.111>0.05. There was also a significant difference between employee's organisational trust indices and years of their working experiences , P=0.019<0.05 (F [6,179] = 2.618. Using Independent Samples T-Test, the result indicated that there was no significant difference between Managerial and non- Managerial roles of staff in the companies and their respective overall organisation trust indices with P = 0.689 > 0.05, t = 0.400 , df =189. Independent Samples T-Test showed that there was no significant difference between male and female and the overall organisation trust indices with P = 0.071 > 0.05, t = 1.817 and df = 197. The study concluded that the overall employees'organisation trust indices for the companies located at the Score Region of Sarawak were high at all levels of staff. This would therefore bring about high levels of performance which may be associated with effective teams and leadership of high competency, openness and honest, concerns for subordinates, reliability and identification of members themselves with organisations they were working with. This would ultimately contributing to the economic and social development of the SCORE region in Sarawak.

Key words: Organisation trust, Compentency, openness, concerns for employees, reliability, identifications.

Introduction

Trust is more than a social virtue. According to Fukuyama (1995), trust is an economic imperative for business resilience in a global market. Various studies had been carried out related trust with effective organizations (Barnes,1983; Boss,1979; Gibb,1998; Dwivedi, 1983; Maslow, 1954 and Zand, 1972). The global economy with increasingly competition, emerging technologies, and rapid product development have brought about what so called today's business environment. We are encountered with creating "on the spot" agreements and relationships with co-workers, leaders, customers, and other organisations to make things happen daily. With every business transaction, we create these spontaneous connections even sometimes without face to –face contact, and we do so in faith and trust. We have to make good efforts and judgments about trust with others. We may face serious consequences for being unable to do this well.

Trust can also be an individual's expectation that some organised system will act with predictability or goodwill' (Maguire and Phillips 2008). According to the International Association (IABC, 2000), trust is related to profits, innovation, successful business, organization survival and a variety of crucial worker perceptions and behavior. Given the dynamics of today's global marketplace, organizational trust is now an economic imperative. According to the International Association (IABC, 2000), organisation must be able to create long-distance relationships across national and cultural boundaries so as to survive and be resilient on the international scene. Francis Fukuyama (1995) also argues that the ability to develop relationships of "spontaneous sociability" could   predict whether an organization will compete effectively. Thus, the capacity to participate in these transactions of spontaneous sociability is an organization's "social capital". In other words, organization has the ability to make strategic alliances, associations and partnerships.

PWC (2015) elaborates three types of trust and the underlying trust drivers. Three types of trust are competency trust, Experience trust and Value trust. Within each of these types of trust, there are a series of trust drivers that organisations can measure an d manage in order to improve their overall trust levels.

However, an organization's social capital is anchored in its regional, national or religious culture. Some societal cultures promote flexible networks of business and economic relationships, while some others do not. The societal cultures of Japan, Germany and Unites States for instance, demonstrated record of alliances that are diverse and multinational. In contrast other cultures have relied historically on relationships with family members or close friends before entering economic transactions that require trust. Consequently, they avoid doing business with "outsiders".

The proposed study will focus on study regarding the five dimensions of Organisation Trusts for selected companies located at the SCORE region. Building upon the Mishra Model for Organisation Trust (1996), the organsiation trust can be defined as the organisation's willingness, based upon its culture and communication behaviours in relationships and transactions, to be appropriately vulnerable based on the belief that another individual, group, or organization is competent, open and honest, concerned, reliable, and identified with common goals, norms and values. Thus, this study will address five dimensions of the Organization Trust which are competence, openness and honesty, concerns for employees, reliability and identification which can be termed as the Organisation Trust Index (OTI).

The **Sarawak Corridor of Renewable Energy** (SCORE) is a new development corridor in central Sarawak. It was launched on 11 February 2008 by then Malaysian fifth Prime Minister, Abdullah Ahmad Badawi. SCORE covers an area of 70,709 km^2 of central region of Sarawak; with a coast line of 320 km long. In 2014, SCORE accounts for 90% of Sarawak total foreign direct investment of RM 9.6 billion, and about 87.2% were from foreign investors. Sarawak's industrial sector is currently undergoing a transformation and the opportunities for investment are immense. Value-added industries are taking an increasingly dominant role in the development of the state and the days when Sarawak exported raw materials that were finished elsewhere are long over, with the new clusters set to put "Made in Sarawak" stamps on more goods and services in the years to come.

Three Companies were selected as they are the prominent business entities operating in the SCORE region. They play a key role in the business development of the region which will consequently bring about a great impact in the economic and social development of Sarawak. As Sarawak is the largest state in Malaysia with rich natural resources, its economic development will contribute largely to the income revenues of Malaysia in realizing the Vision 2020 that Malaysia would become a developed country by the year 2020.

The Problem Statement

Research has consistently linked high trust levels with performance. High levels of trust are also associated with effective teams and leadership. Organisations with high trust levels will continually benefit from:

- More adaptive organizational structures (Barnes,1983; Bennis, 1997; Crawford,1998; Dwivedi, 1983; Miles and Snow, 1995; Rousseau, Sitkin, Burt and Camerer, 1998).
- Strategic alliances (Das & Teng,1998; Ingham &Mothe,1998; Jones& Bowie, 1998; Rule & Keown, 1998).
- Responsive virtual teams (Coutu, 1998; Fukuyama,1996; Jarvenpaa, Knoll, Leidner, 1998; Tsai & GHoshal,1998).
- Effective crisis management (Mishra, 1996; Webb, 1996).

According to IABC Research Foundations (2000), high levels of organizational trusts can critically reduce litigation charges (Brickner & Siegel, 1996) and transaction costs (Gibbs & Gibson, 1998; Maccoby, 1998; Rousseau, et al,1998). High –trust cultures minimize the potential for destructive and litigated conflict, unnecessary bureaucratic control and administrative expenditures, and expensive overhead required to sustain operations that have outlasted their need.

However, no study has ever been made on the organizational trust of the three prominent business entities whose businesses are related to the timber –based industry, palm oil industry, livestock industry, tourism industry and aquaculture industry and marine engineering industry. This motivates the researcher to carry out the pioneer study about organisation trust for the three companies located at the SCORE region.

Research Objectives

The main objective of this study is to identify the Organisation Trust Levels of the companies located at the SCORE region of Sarawak suggesting for more conducive working environment and increased efficiency.

The specific objectives are as follows:

- To investigate the Organisation Trust Level of the companies located at the Score region of Sarawak
- To examine how is each dimension of the Organisation Trust (competence, openness and honesty, concerns for employees, reliability and identification) is respectively correlated with the overall level of the Organisation Trust?
- To investigate any significant difference between the Organization Trust levels and sizes of companies.
- To investigate any significant difference between levels of Organisation Trust and years of working experience.

- To investigate any significant difference between levels of Organisation Trust and current roles/positions in the companies.
- To investigate any significant difference between levels of Organisation Trust and gender

Research Questions

- What is the Organisation Trust level of the companies located at the SCORE region of Sarawak?
- How is each dimension of the Organisation Trust (competence, openness, honesty, concerns for employees, reliability and identification) is respectively correlated with the overall level of the Organisation Trust?
- Is there any significant difference between the Organization Trust levels and sizes of companies?
- Is there any significant difference between the Organization Trust levels and years of working experiences?
- Is there any significant difference between levels of Organisation Trust and current roles/positions in the companies?
- Is there any significant difference between the Organization Trust levels and gender?

Significance of the study

The current study attempt to investigate the trust levels among some selected companies located at the Sarawak Corridor of Renewable Energy where the region is planned to be developed rapidly along the corridor. Companies at the region play a significant role to accelerate the economic and social development. Trust levels among the staff and towards the companies are particularly important to assist the companies to accelerate the engines of development along the corridor. It has been argued that there is significant relationship between the trust levels and perceived organisatiional effectiveness and job satisfaction respectively.

Research Methodology

Both quantitative and qualitative methods were employed to carry out the research through questionnaire and interviews with employees of the identified companies. This study involved selected companies within SCORE areas by adopting clustered random sampling. Descriptive and inferential statistics were employed for quantitative analysis. Qualitative analysis was done from interview transcripts.

After getting approval, one set of questionnaire was randomly administered to 50% of the staff (cutting across top managerial , middle –line managerial and non-managerial) of the **three** companies concerned which were located at Sibu, Mukah and Bintulu within the SCORE. The questionnaire comprises the profile of the respondents and 29 statements describing the current state of respondents' organisations. **229** sets of questionnaires were collected for analysis.

Literature Review

There has been various arguments on definitions of trust. However, a general consensus among researchers concludes that trust is important in a range of organisational activities and processes such as team work, leadership, goal setting, performance appraisal, and in general , cooperative behaviours (Axelrod, 1984; Elangovan & Shapiro, 1998; Gambetta, 1988; Jones & George, 1998; Mayer, David & Schoorman, 1995, McAllister, 1995 as cited in IABC (2000).

Recently, definitions of trust have moved from emphasis on intentions and motivations to behavioural orientations. Hosmer (1995) defines trust as one party's optimistic expectation of the behaviour of another when the party must make a decision about how to act under conditions of vulnerability and dependence. Mayer, Davis and Schoorman (1995) describe trust as "the willingness of a party to be vulnerable to the actions of another party based on the expectation that the other party will perform a particular action important to the trustor, irrespective of the ability to monitor or control that other party" (p712). Lewicki, McAllister and Bies (1998) define trust as confident positive expectations regarding another's conduct, while distrust is confident negative expectations regarding another's conduct. Bhattacharya, Devinney, and Pillutla (1998) suggest that trust is an expectancy of positive (or nonnegative) outcomes that one can receive based on the expected action of another party in an interaction characterized by uncertainty.

Whitener, Brodt, Korsgaard, Devinney, and Werner (1998) merge several existing definitional approaches reflecting three basic facets of trust which are firstly, trust in another party reflects an expectation or belief that the other party will act benevolently; secondly, a party cannot control or force another party to fulfil the expectation – that is trust involves a willingness to be vulnerable and risk and thirdly, trust involves some level of dependency on the other party so that the outcomes of one party are influenced by the actions of another.

Mishra (1996) defines trust as "one party's willingness to be vulnerable to another party based on the belief that the latter party is competent, open, concerned and reliable. These four dimensions operate collectively to create the perception of trust. Fukuyama (1995) defines trust as "the expectation that arises within a community of regular, honest, and cooperative behaviour, based on the commonly shared norms on the part of other members of that community".

The current study would view trust as positive expectations interdependencies about the intent and behaviours of others based on roles, relationships, experiences, and. The current would also employ the four dimensions of trust suggested by

Mishra (1996) and adopt the 29 items that require the respondents to describe the current state of their organisation. Another dimension, identification was added.

The five dimensions with items are :

i)   Dimension One : Competence comprising of items 3, 10, 14 and 18.
ii)   Dimension Two: Openness /Honesty comprising of items 1, 6, 11, 12, 13, 15, 20, 23 and 27.
iii)   Dimension Three: Concern for Employees comprising of items 4,7, 16, 21, 24, 28 and 29.
iv)   Dimension Four: reliability comprising of items 2, 8, 17 and 25
v)   Dimension Five : Identification comprising of items 5, 9, 19, 22 and 26.

Definitions of terms

The following definitions are adopted from the study of IABC Research Foundation (2000).

Competence involves the extent to which we see not only our co-workers and leaders as being effective, but also our organisation as a whole. It measures how strongly we believe that our organisation will compete and survive in the market place.

Openness /Honesty involves not only the amount ad accuracy of information that is shared, but also how sincerely and appropriate it is communicated.

Concern for Employees includes the feelings of caring, empathy, tolerance, and safety that are exhibited when we are vulnerable in business activities. Sincere efforts to understand feelings contribute to high level trusts in any relationship.

Reliability is determined by whether or not co-worker, team, supplier, or organisation acts consistently and dependably. We can count on them to do what they say.

Identification measures the extent to which we hold common goals, norms, values, and beliefs associated with our organisation's culture. This dimension indicates how connected we feel to management and co-workers.

Analysis

Three companies located at the SCORE region were randomly selected for the study. After seeking the consent from the top managerial level, the researchers administered questionnaires to the employees of companies. Data obtained from the survey questionnaires were then analysed with SPSS version 22. Descriptive statistics, mean and standard deviation were employed to determine the levels of trust which employees perceived with the companies they were working with. Likert scale of 1 to 5 were employed whereby 1 represents very little, 2 represents little, 3 represents some, 4 represents great and 5 represents very great.

This section attempts to analyse the data in answering the research questions relating to the organisation trust which the employees perceived with the companies they are working.

Research Question 1: What are the Organisation Trust levels of the selected companies at the SCORE region of Sarawak ?

The analysis for the organsiation trust are based on five dimensions which are competency, openness, concerns for employees, reliability and identifications.

Table 1: Competency

Item No	Dimension One : Competency	Mean	SD
A3	I am highly satisfied with my 4organization's overall efficiency of operation.	3.57	0.799
A10	I am satisfied with the overall quality of the products and/or services of my organisation.	3.65	0.868
A14	I am highly satisfied with the capacity of my organisation to achieve its objectives.	3.68	0.880
A18	I am satisfied with the capability of my organisation's employees	3.69	0.919
Average Mean		**3.65**	**0.866**

Cronbach alpha = 0.858; 0-1.66 (Low); 1.67-3.32 (Moderate); 3.33 – 5 (High)

Table 1 above shows the organisation trust in terms of competency as seen by the staff. As a whole the staff perceived the competency level of the organisation at high level, that is with mean of 3.65. This implies that employees have confidence in the competence of their organizational's leadership (Barnes, 1983) and also the organizational ability to survive in the market place and be able to compete (Shockley-Zalabak & Morley, 1989).

Table 2: Openness/Honesty

Item No	Dimension Two: Openness/Honesty	Mean	SD
A1	I can tell my immediate supervisor when things are going wrong.	3.71	0.861
A6	I am free to disagree with my immediate supervisor.	3.45	0.911
A11	I have a say in decisions that affect my job.	3.48	0.920
A12	My immediate supervisor keeps confidences	3.80	0.907
A13	I receive adequate information regarding how well I am doing in my job.	3.66	0.931
A15	I receive adequate information regarding how I am being evaluated	3.54	0.933
A20	I receive adequate information regarding how my job-related problems are handled.	3.54	0.796
A23	I receive adequate information regarding how o5rganizational decisions are being made that affect my job.	3.59	0.854
A27	I receive adequate information regarding the long term strategies of my organisation.	3.60	0.955
	Average Mean	**3.60**	**0.896**

Cronbach alpha= 0.900; 0-1.66 (Low); 1.67-3.32 (Moderate); 3.33 – 5 (High)

Table 2 displays the level of openness/honesty of the companies. The average mean is 3.60 with standard deviation of 0.896 indicating the staff perceived at a high level regarding the openness/ honesty of the companies which they were working with. This implies that employees are most likely to hold trust in their organisations when they see organizational leadership as open and honest(Whitener, Brodth, Karsgaard &Warner, 1998). Hence, it fosters effectiveness in team work.

Table 3: Concerns for Employees

Item No	Dimension Three: Concerns for Employees	Mean	SD
A4	My immediate supervisor listens to me.	3.58	0.965
A7	Top management is sincere in their efforts to communicate with employees.	3.66	0.897
A16	Top Management listens to employee's concerns	3.53	0.965
A21	My immediate supervisor is concerned about my personal well being.	3.54	0.888
A24	Top management is concerned about employees' well being.	3.62	0.884
A28	My immediate supervisor is sincere in his/her efforts to communicate with team members.	3.78	2.19
A29	My immediate supervisor speaks positively about subordinates in front of others.	3.70	0.933
	Average Mean	**3.63**	**1.103**

Cronbach alpha=0.896; 0-1.66 (Low); 1.67-3.32 (Moderate); 3.33 – 5 (High)

Table 3 indicated that the staff perceived highly their company's concerns shown for them (mean = 3.63, SD =1.103). Consequently, the staff have high trust in the organisations they are working with. Caring and empathy not only enhances trust (Larson& LaFasto, 1989), but also enhances trust in top leadership (Ellis & Shockely-Zalabak, 1999), and subsequently the organisations as a whole.

Table 4: Reliability

Item No	Dimension Four : Reliability	Mean	SD
A2	My immediate supervisor follows through with what he/she says.	3.66	0.841
A8	My immediate supervisor behaves in a consistent manner from day to day.	3.57	0.920
A17	Top Management keeps their commitments to employees.	3.61	0.906
A25	My immediate supervisor keeps his/her commitments to team members.	3.72	0.865
Average Mean		3.64	0.883

Cronbach alpha= 0.792; ; 0-1.66 (Low); 1.67-3.32 (Moderate); 3.33 – 5 (High)

Table 4 shows the level of reliability as perceived by the staff which is at high level (Mean = 3.64, SD =0.883). This indicates that there has been congruence between what the top management and executives of the companies do and what they expect and ask of their employees which would bring about immense impact on credibility and   organizational trust (Shockley-Zalabak & Morley, 1989).

Table 5: Identifiaction

Item No	Dimension Five: Identification	Mean	SD
A5	I am satisfied with the capability of my organisation's employees / my colleagues.	3.79	0.900
A9	My work values are similar to the work values of my peers / colleagues.	3.68	0.900
A19	I am satisfied with the capacity of my institution to achieve its objectives.	3.61	0.849

A22	Top management is concerned about well being of employees.	3.47	0.845
A26	My immediate supervisor follows through with what he/she says.	3.48	0.871
Average Mean		3.61	0.873

Cronbach alpha= 0.837' 0-1.66 (Low); 1.67-3.32 (Moderate); 3.33 – 5 (High)

Table 5 indicates that the staff perceived the identification with the companies at high level (Mean = 3.61, SD = 0.873). This indicates that there is an active communication between staff and leaders which they could share accounts with each other, giving meaning to activities and fostering sensed –making regarding events (Weick, 1995).

Research Question 2: How is each dimension of the Organisation Trust (competence, openness and honesty, concerns for employees, reliability and identification) is respectively correlated with the overall level of the Organisation Trust?

The Pearson correlations are employed to indicate the strength of relationships between the individual dimension and the overall trust indices of the companies and whether they are significant at 0.05. This is illustrated in the following table 6.

Table 6: Correlations between each dimension of trust with overall organizational trust

Dimensions/Pearson Correlation	Overall
Competence	0.921*
Openness	0.969*
Concerns for Employees	0.966*
Reliability	0.929*
Identifications	0.944*

Table 6 indicates that each dimension of trust (competence, openness, concerns for employees, reliability and identifications) are strongly and significantly correlated with overall organisation trust. This implies that five dimensions of trust are of paramount importance in determining the overall organizational trust.

Research Question 3: Is there any significant difference between the overall Organization Trust indices and companies?

By employing One-Aay Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), the result shows that there is significant difference between different companies and overall organisation trust at P = 0.000 <0.05 (F[2,197] = 8.006 as shown in Table 6a.

Table 6a: Mean Difference between overall Organization Trust Indices and companies

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	5370.791	2	2685.396	8.006	.000
Within Groups	66081.084	197	335.437		
Total	71451.875	199			

Table 6b: Mean Difference between overall Organisation Trust Indices and companies using Post Hoc Tests

(I) organisation	(J) organisation	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
A	B	-7.84998*	2.94397	.023	-14.8024	-.8976
	C	7.21914	3.58338	.111	-1.2432	15.6815
B	C	15.06912*	3.87223	.000	5.9246	24.2137

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Table 6b shows that there is significant difference for overall organisation trust indices between organisation A and B at P =0.023< 0.05, and also B and C at P=0.000<0.05. However, there is no significant difference on overall organisation trust indices between organisation A and C at P=0.111>0.05.

Research Question 4 : Is there any significant difference between the overall Organization Trust Indices and years of working experiences?

Table 7: Mean Difference between between the overall Organization Trust indices and years of working

experiences

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	5161.069	6	860.178	2.618	.019
Within Groups	58808.716	179	328.540		
Total	63969.785	185			

By employing ANOVA analysis, Table 7 indicates that there is a significant difference between organisational trust indices and years of working experiences of staff with $P=0.019<0.05$ (F [6,179] = 2.618. This means that years of experiences is not a factor in determining the organisation trust indices of staff.

Research Question 5: Is there any significant difference between levels of Organisation Trust and current roles/positions of staff in the companies?

Using Independent Samples T-Test, the result indicates that there is no significant difference between Managerial and non Managerial roles of staff in the companies and the overall organisation trust indices with $P = 0.689 > 0.05$, t = 0.400 and df =189. Managerial staff has a higher trust indices (Mean = 107.08, SD = 14.5) than the Non-managerial staff (mean = 105.6). This implies that managerial staff putting their trust to the companies they are working more than the non- managerial staff.

Table 8: significant difference between levels of Organisation Trust and current roles/positions of staff in the companies

	Role	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	Sig.
Overall	Managerial	37	107.0811	14.52274	2.38752	0.689
	Non Managerial	154	105.6688	20.23071	1.63024	

Research Question 6: Is there any significant difference between the Organization Trust and gender?

Independent Samples T-Test shows that there is no significant difference between male and female and the overall organisation trust indices as shown in Table 9 with $P = 0.071 > 0.05$, t = 1.817 and df = 197 as shown in Table 9 below.

Table 9: Significant difference between the Organization Trust and Gender

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	Sig.
Overall	Male	82	108.4878	20.47356	2.26093	0.071
	Female	117	103.5556	17.62270	1.62922	

Discussion and Conclusion

This study has explored the organizational trust among employees of three selected companies located at the SCORE region of Sarawak. The findings have shown that the employees' organisation trust levels of the selected companies for all dimensions (competency, openness, concerns for employees, reliability and identifications) were high. This implies that employees at the selected companies have put their trust to their companies at high level. According to IABC Research Foundations(2000), high levels of organizational trusts can critically reduce litigation charges (Brickner & Siegel, 1996) and transaction costs (Gibbs & Gibson, 1998; Maccoby, 1998; Rousseau, et al,1998). High –trust cultures would also minimize the potential for destructive and litigated conflict, unnecessary bureaucratic control and administrative expenditures, and expensive overhead required to sustain operations that have outlasted their need. Furthermore, high levels of trust are also associated with effective teams and

leadership. Thus, high level of trust of employees towards the organisations they are working would contribute to the productivity and efficiency in operations and hence maximize revenues and profits for the companies.

Each dimension of the organisation trust was also significantly and highly correlated with overall level of the organisation trust. This Implies that five dimensions (competency, openness, concerns for employees, reliability and identifications) of trust are of paramount importance in determining the overall organizational trust.

One Way ANOVA analysis also shows that there is a significant difference between overall organisation trust indices among selected companies (p=0.000<0.05 (F[2,197] = 8.006. Detailed analysis using the Post Hoc tests show that there is significant difference for overall organisation trust indices between organisation A and   B at P =0.023< 0.05, and also B and   C at P=0.000<0.05. However, there is no significant difference on overall organisation trust indices between organisation A and C at P=0.111>0.05. Analysis of Mean indicates that Organisation B has the highest mean of trust indices with 112.35 followed by Organisation A with mean = 104.5 and Organisation C = 97.28 which all fall under the high level of trust.

There is a significant difference between organisational trust indices and years of working experiences of staff, P=0.019<0.05 (F [6,179] = 2.618. Analysis of mean indicates that the mean trust indices of staff increases with years of working experiences from up to 3 years (Mean = 103.3,) till 11-15 years (Mean = 110.12). However, the trust indices then decreases with years of working experiences from 16-20 years (Mean = 102.2) to over 30 years (Mean = 74). This implies that as very senior staff work longer years with companies, they are losing their trust and confidence to the companies they are working with. It is suggested reengineering program is good especially to reengineer the veteran group of staff.

Using Independent Samples T-Test, the result indicates that there is no significant difference between Managerial and non Managerial roles of staff in the companies and the employees' overall organisation trust indices with P = 0.689 > 0.05, t = 0.400 and df =189. Managerial staff has a higher trust indices (Mean = 107.08, SD = 14.5) than the Non-managerial staff (mean = 105.6). This implies that managerial staff putting their trust to the companies they are working more than the non managerial staff do.

 Independent Samples T-Test shows   that there is no significant difference between male and female and the overall organisation trust indices as shown in Table 9 with P = 0.071 > 0.05, t = 1.817 and df = 197. Thus, gender is not the factor which determines the level of trust indices of staff towards the oraganisations they are working with.

The study concludes that the overall organisation trust indices for the companies located at the Score Region of Sarawak are high at both managerial and non managerial levels of staff. This may increase the willingness of employees to recommend it to others, enhance job satisfaction and reduce their intention to leave the organisation (CIPD, 2012).   This would therefore bring about high levels of performance which may be due to effective teams and leadership of high competency, openness an d honest, concerns for subordinates, reliability and identifications of members with organisations. This would ultimately contributing to the economic and social development of the SCORE region in Sarawak.

References

Axelrod, R. *The Evolution of Cooperation*. New York, NY: Basic Books, 1984.
Becky.J.S et   al (2016) Organisational Trust: Employee-Employer Relationships. ASQ Report. Retrieved from http://rube.asq.org/hdl/2010/06/a-primer-on-organizational-trust.pdf
Barnes, L.B.(1983) Managing the Paradox of Organizational Trust., H*arvard Business Review*, 107-   116.
Bennis, W., & Bierderman, P. W.(1997) *Organizing Genius: The Secrets of Creative Collaboration*.Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
Boss, R.W. Trust and Managerial Problem-Solving Revisited.*Group and Organizational Studies, 3 (1978)*, 331-342.
CIPD.(2012) Where has all the Trust Gone*? Research Report,* March 2012
Coutu, D.L. (1998). Organization: Trust in Virtual Teams. *Harvard Business Review***,** 20-21.
Das, T.K. & Teng (1998) Between Trust and Control: Developing Confidence in Partner Cooperation in Alliances.*Academy of Management Review*, 23, 491-512.
Dietz, G. and Gillespe, N. (2011) *Building and restoring organisational trust*. London: Institute of Business Ethics
Elangovan, A. R., & Shapiro, D. L.(1998). Betrayal of Trust in Organizations. *Academy of Management Review, 23, 547-566.*
Fukuyama, F. (1995) *Trust: The Social Virtues and the Creation of Prosperity*." New York: Free Press..
Gambetta, D. G., Ed.(1988) *Can We Trust, Trust?*. New York: Basil Blackwell.
Gibbs, J., & Gibson, S. (1998). Organizational Effectiveness. *Internal Auditor, 55, 34-36.*
Hosmer, L. T. (1995) Trust: The Connecting Link between Organizational Theory and Philosophical Ethics.*Academy of Management Review*, 20 : 379-402.
Ingham, M., & Mothe, C.(1998). How to Learn in R & D Partnerships? *R & D Management, 28,249-261.*
Jarvenpaa, S.L., Knoll, K., & Leidner, D.E. (1998). Is Anybody Out There? Antecedents of Trust in Global Virtual Teams.. *Journal of Management Information Systems, 14, 29-64.*
Jones, T.M. & Bowie, N.E. (1998). Moral Hazards on the Road to the 'Virtual' Corporation.*. Business Ethics Quarterly, 8 (1998),273-292.*

Jones, G. R., & George, J. M. (1998)The Experience and Evolution of Trust:Implications for Cooperation and Teamwork. *Academy of Management Review, 23,531-546.*

Lewicki, R.J., McAllister, D.J., & Bies, D.J. (1998).Trust and Distrust: New Relationships and Realities.. *Academy of Management Review, 23,438-458.*

Mayer, R.C., Davis, J. H., & Schoorman, F.D. (1995). An Integrative Model of Organizational Trust..*Academy Management Review, 20 (1995): 709-734.*

Maguire, S. and Phillips, N. (2008) Citibankers' at Citigroup: a study of the loss of institutional trust after a merger. *Journal of Management Studies*. Vol 45, No 2, March, 372–401.

McAllister, D. J. (1995) Affect- and Cognition-Based Trust as Foundationsfor Interpersonal Cooperation in Organizations..*Academy of Management Journal, 38, 24-59.*

Mishra, A.K. (1996). Organizational Responses to Crisis: The Centrality of Trust.. In . R.M. Kramer & T.R. Tyler, Eds . *Trust in Organizations: Frontiers of Theory and Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

PWC (2015). *Understanding the Value and Drivers of Organisatioanl Trust: trust Insight*. PWC Global Suvey2015, UK

Rule, E., & Keown, S. (1998). Competencies of High-Performing Strategic Alliances. *Strategy and Leadership, 26, 36-37.*

Tsai, W., & Ghoshal, S. (1998). Social Capital and Value Creation: The Role of Intrafirm Networks,.*Academy of Management Journal, 41 ,464-476.*

Webb, E.J. (1996). Trust and Crisis.,.in R.M. Kramer & T.R. Tyler, Eds. *Trust in Organizations: Frontiers of Theory and Research* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Whitener, E. M., Brodt, S. E., Korsgaard, M. A., & Werner, J. M.Managers (1998)as Initiators of Trust: An Exchange Relationship Framework for Understanding Managerial rustworthy Behavior. *Academy of Management Review, 23,513-530.*

Zand, D.E (1972). Trust and Managerial Problem-Solving. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 2, : 229-239*