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Abstract: This study examines the relationship between trust building, motivating employees, and employee commitment toward organizational change. A self-administrated questionnaire was used to gather data. The study provides a basic understanding of organizational change. Through systemic, theoretical, and conceptual understanding, the arguments of the study are built on the importance of communication in the organization and how in bringing organizational change. The current study proposed that trust-building, employee motivation, and employee commitment will be related to organizational change. A total of 292 copies of completed questionnaires were returned, representing 90.7% of the total questionnaire distribution to both managers and owners of manufacturing firms. Out of which, only 275 questionnaires were usable for the analysis after removing incomplete data and outliers. Partial Least Square-Structural Equation Modelling (PLS-SEM) was used to analyze as a popularly accepted model to justify the theory with the observation data. The study results revealed that trust-building, employee motivation and employee commitment have significant effects on organizational change. The current study also claims the importance of collaboration within employees of any organization at the level of transition. The current study will help professionals and academics and enhancing their leadership abilities, it will benefit and inspire trust members to show better outcomes. However, it is recommended that further research is needed in this direction to confirm the result of this study. Finally, this study concludes that trust-building, employee commitment and employee motivation play a significant role in organizational change.
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1. Introduction

Organizational change is essential for any organization to subsist and advance different opportunities in the current wave of competition. Working organizations should have an idea of their employees’ working behavior and attitude towards the change programs that take place within. Researchers are showing keen interest in studying organizational change and it is becoming a popular subject among researchers. Organizations are spending a handsome amount of cash, time, and man efforts for practicing a successful change within an organization. On the other hand, a study conducted by De Keyser, Guiette, and Vandenbempt (2021) identifies that organizational change processes frequently remain unsuccessful and make the situation poorer. Such results have urged researchers and experts to dig out the effecting elements and possibilities for implementing successful change programs. Collins (2019) disclosed the...
motives for the failure of practicing change such as technical hitches and insufficient amount, notably there were work-related behaviors of individuals problems.

Russ (2009) explored communication challenges, which are practiced by workers throughout change processes and highlighted the importance of resources and supervisory power for change. Similarly, Al-Hussami, Hammad and Alsoleihat (2018) disclosed that resources during the change, for instance, private resources and skilled supportive leadership behavior, help in practicing change. Mainly regarding leadership, they exemplified the importance of the behavior and attitude of superiors in this regard with subordinates. Furthermore, numerous research articles debated the vital role and importance of effective superior-subordinate communication in practicing organizational change programs (Waisbord, 2020). The study also found that interpersonal relationships, including the sharing of knowledge and consequences between workers and employees and their superiors, significantly impact the psychological complexity of an employees’ job, including job satisfaction (Kurniawaty, Ramly & Ramlawati, 2019). Corresponding to the inferences, this study aims to examine the element of communication change toward an organizational change.

Current changes in the competitive world are putting pressure on the business worldwide, driving organizations to implement practices aimed at achieving greater engagement and higher performance. To elaborate more, in the superior-subordinate relationship, and in the feeling for the jobs and employment and communication tends to be essential (Robinson 2020). According to Corrner (1993), organizations are practicing many new changes in their working structure compared to the previous era but in a logical sequence. Effective communication is one of the influencers to reach the optimal degree of excellence in the growth of an organization. Thus, workers must have the capacity to absorb and respond to change. It would aim to clarify the needs of the skills manager, such as the need to efficiently handle and guide change effectively to sustain and maximize performance and an understanding of human factors during change. Therefore, the issue that arise emerges as to which variables toward organizational change.

From the above mention part, this study aims to examine the relationship between trust-building, employee motivation and employee commitment with organizational change. The current study will help professionals and academics and enhancing their leadership abilities. It will benefit and inspire trust members to show better outcomes.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Organizational Change

According to Stephens, Jahn, Fox, Charoensap-Kelly, Mitra, Sutton & Meisenbach, (2020) defined organizational change as modifications such as stopping over something, continuing it, or taking an initiative for some possible amendments etc. In other words, changing the existing organizational measures and activities, for instance approaches structures, strategies, systems, principles, policies, and management. In longitudinal review, Schweiger and Denisi (1991) uncovered that most changes are related to adverse outcomes bringing instability, decrease employee satisfaction and lowering trust within organizational structures.

Alongside different angles, an assessment by Oreg, Vakola, and Armenakis (2011) considered change results that were evaluated in empirical reviews. Moreover, a review demonstrated a link of instability regarding change and job satisfaction that the supervisory support intervenes. Following that, De Korte, Wiezer, Roozeboom, Vink and Kraaij (2018) exhibited workers’ inertia; therefore, it can be assumed that management support for change can decrease the disturbance of employees. Uncertainty related to change process frequently consisted of mislaid, separately, fizzled correspondence and communicating failure. According to this, the central principle to examine this change process with progress, administration or execution is communication (Stouten, Rousseau & De Cremer, 2018). Moreover, different reviews verify that the association and superior influence the responses of workers in an unexpected way regarding
change by Fuchs and Prouska (2014) and that leaders or superior authorities play a vital and important role at their best in supporting change.

2.2. Trust Building

According to Komodromos, Halkias and Harkiolakis, (2019) claims that workers recognize trust in the business and plays an important part when organization attempts to change. Husain (2013) said that communication functions should be determined in the workplace to manage trust. Workers who trust and have positive performance emotions within the corporate context are likely to take part in the change process and more showcase better relationships with staff and line managers (Yue et al., 2019). Trust has distinctive consequences, such as more optimistic behavior, higher levels of teamwork, and higher success levels. The expectations of corporate trustworthiness of workers partly mediates the interactions of management processes and procedural fairness with trust (Yue et al., 2019). To elaborate more, trust is not only seen as a significant enabler of good partnerships, but also as a source of durable strategic advantages both, internally and externally. As a consequence of this relationship, trust can serve as an implicit system of influence and collaboration over different organisational activities. Lack of trust in work contracts may contribute damaging communication and commitment, hence resulting in the inefficient use of resources (Mérida-López & Extremera, 2020).

According to Zanini and Migueles (2013) trust is important for organizational change and serves as a resource to boost relationships between employees and top management. Research findings clearly support the role of trust, coordination and social ties between workers and managers during organisational change have an significant impact on the progress of change (Komodromos et al., 2019). When workers are aware of the proposed reforms in the business, they can better appreciate and embrace it. Therein, existing trust requirements among the parties should be fulfilled (Zanini & Migueles, 2013). The extent to which workers trust their top management will translate to how they view organizational change.

2.3. Employee Motivation

Studies have shown that motivation constitutes a personal effort to attain the highest aims (Huynh, 2020). It is the optimistic outlook that contributes to innovation at work. Motivation is driven by the needs of all workers. The leaders should understand and sympathize with their workers, support their ideas, and inspire them to keep them motivated (Huynh, 2020). Husain (2013) stated that motivation is a force that makes individuals act and can be defined as energy in a particular manner. Motivation is a aim-oriented activity that drives workers to some activities. In order to understand motivation, it is essential to understand internal physiological needs and external situational demands (Rakić & Živković, 2019). Motivational forces to make the change and the causes for reluctance are visible for workers who embrace or oppose change (Allaoui & Benmoussa, 2020). Leaders should empower their workers to delegate authority and improve their motivation, allowing them to have more responsibility and autonomy in their work, thereby improving the end results (Jung, Kang & Choi, 2020).

2.4. Employee Commitment

Soumyaja, Kamalanabhan and Bhattacharyya (2011) defined organizational commitment as the overall strength of the identification and participation of an individual in an organization. A commitment to change as a force (mentality) binds an individual to a course of action that is considered necessary if the change initiative is to be successfully implemented (Mangundjaya, 2013). Moreover, Soumyaja et al., (2011) and Jaros (2010) assert that employee commitment should be reflected with three components (1) deep belief in and recognition of the goals and values of the organization (affective commitment); (2) a desire to make significant efforts on behalf of the organization (continuance commitment); (3) a willingness to keep
membership in the association (normative commitment). Mangundjaya (2013) also give three extents of commitment to Change as below:

1. Affective commitment to change (AC2C): feelings of loyalty and readiness to foster programs on change.
2. Normative commitment to change (NC2C): sense of responsibility to help the strategies for reform of the company.
3. Continuance commitment to change (CC2C): concern that fear of the risks of quitting or avoiding organizational change.

2.5. Theoretical Background

Human morality is a matter of great importance, both individually and collectively. Organizational change is a collection of principles central to the achievement of self-directedness and a sense of consistency and meaning in one’s life. In the absence of personal expectations and the exercise of self-regulatory control, people will act like weather vans, constantly changing directions to adhere to whatever is acceptable (Chong, 2018). A common morality is central to the human existence of every culture. Many types of conduct are personally beneficial; however, they harm others or infringe their rights. Without any consensual moral codes, people will neglect each other’s rights and wellbeing if their wishes came into social conflict (Chadwick, Quinn & Fullwood, 2017).

The social codes and sanctions express collective moral imperatives to control social behavior. External penalties, however, are relatively weak dissuasive since most contraventions can go undetected. However, people continue to preside over their actions in endless circumstances that present little or no external threat. According to Wang, Yang, Yang, Wang, and Lei (2017), the practice of self-sanction must play a central role in regulating moral behavior. Much of the recent psychological interest in morality has been focused on the study of moral thought. The apparent neglect of moral behavior demonstrates both the rationalist bias of many moral philosophies and the convenience of the investigative process. It is much easier to analyze how people reason moral dilemmas than to research their actual moral actions. People suffer from the wrongs they have done, but the perpetrators can justify their inhumane acts. The processes for self-regulation of moral behavior require far more than moral thought. Nor is moral thinking purely in the traps of chic affairs (Bostyn, Sevenhant & Roets, 2018).

How moral values are applied in dealing with different moral dilemmas differs depending on the situational imperatives, the spheres of action, and social power constellations. It is not rare for sophisticated moral justifications to serve inhumane purposes. A systematic moral theory must clarify how moral reasoning, combined with other psychosocial influences, regulates moral behavior. The social cognitive theory takes an interactionist interpretation of moral phenomena. Under this conceptual framework, personal factors in the form of moral thinking and emotional self-reaction, moral behavior, and environmental factors all serve as interactive determinants that affect each other bi-directionally (Stanger, Backhouse, Jennings & McKenna, 2018).

2.6. Research Framework

The study examines the element of change communication on the organizational change of selected manufacturing firms in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. The study used organizational change as the dependent variable and the element of change communication (trust-building, employee motivation, and employee commitment) as independent variables. Figure 1 provides more information on this.

2.7. Hypotheses of the Current Study

H01: Trust building is directly related to organizational change.
H02: Employee motivation is directly related to organizational change.
null
al., 2016) and equally for organizational change research due to the high grade of flexibility as it provides for the relationship between data and theory, which indicates directly vital given the present state of study in organizational change.

4. Analysis Results and Interpretation

This study examined the measurement model by assessing the convergent validity, construct reliability, and discriminant validity as suggested by Hair et al. (2014). In the first place, this study examined to construct reliability by investigating the composite reliability and Cronbach alpha. Meanwhile, the composite reliability from the measurement model ranges between 0.797 and 0.880 and the result of the Cronbach alpha between 0.718 and 0.836. As per Hair et al. (2016), the results higher than 0.7 show that the measurement model is reliable and fit for relationship testing. Furthermore, we examined average variance extracted (AVE) (Fornell & Larcker, 1982). Thereby, the AVE of all the constructs ranged between 0.504 and 0.567, which is higher than the threshold value of 0.50. Hence, the summary of the result of the convergent validity and construct reliability is indicated in Table 2 below and model image in Appendix A.

Table 2. Summary of the Measurement Model

| Constructs               | Items Description                                      | Items | Factor Loadings | Cronbach Alpha | CR  | AVE  |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|-------|----------------|----------------|-----|------|
| Employee Commitment      | This is a good company to work at                       | EC1   | 0.725          | 0.718          | 0.797| 0.567|
|                          | I'm glad to have joined this company                    | EC2   | 0.759          |                |     |      |
|                          | I take pride in being a part of this company            | EC4   | 0.774          |                |     |      |
| Employee Motivation      | Appreciation for work done                             | ME1   | 0.742          | 0.803          | 0.859| 0.504|
|                          | Understanding of personal problems                     | ME10  | 0.682          |                |     |      |
|                          | Feeling ‘in’ on things                                 | ME2   | 0.695          |                |     |      |
|                          | Good working conditions                                | ME4   | 0.717          |                |     |      |
|                          | Job security                                           | ME6   | 0.710          |                |     |      |
|                          | Management loyalty to workers                          | ME7   | 0.714          |                |     |      |
| Organizational Change    | This organization needs to be changed                   | OC1   | 0.739          | 0.836          | 0.880| 0.550|
|                          | I am aware of about the models of change and the reasons why change is needed | OC3   | 0.747          |                |     |      |
|                          | There are a number of good and rational reasons for this change to be made | OC4   | 0.740          |                |     |      |
|                          | There is an established a sense of urgency for the need of this change | OC7   | 0.710          |                |     |      |
|                          | I feel that I have the necessary skills and knowledge to make this change work | OC8   | 0.788          |                |     |      |
|                          | I think that the change is well planned in the organization | OC9   | 0.725          |                |     |      |
| Trust Building           | Offers assistance to trust members without hidden agendas. | TB1   | 0.664          | 0.804          | 0.860| 0.506|
|                          | Builds goals and objectives that support and complement those of peers. | TB2   | 0.731          |                |     |      |
|                          | Sacrifices personal results for the betterment of the team. | TB3   | 0.735          |                |     |      |
|                          | Meets commitments of the team in a timely way with quality results. | TB4   | 0.677          |                |     |      |
|                          | Shows appreciation for trust accomplishments.           | TB6   | 0.728          |                |     |      |
|                          | Participates as an active trust player by contributing ideas and effort to move the team toward the goal. | TB7   | 0.730          |                |     |      |
4.1. Discriminant Validity

This study discussed the result of the discriminant validity and Heterotrait-monotrait Ratio (HTMT). This was examined through the Fornel and Larcker criterion, cross-loading and HTMT, and mean and standard deviation. Thereby, according to Fornell and Larcker (1982), the square root of the AVE as the diagonal elements is greater than the off-diagonal correlation in the column and row, indicating the achievement of the Fornel and Larcker criterion. Finally, the HTMT of correlations was lower than 0.9, showing the satisfactory HTMT. Thereby, the joint results of the Fornel and Lacker criterion, HTMT, and descriptive statistics revealed that the discriminant validity of the data is satisfactorily as indicated in Table 3 below.

| Constructs                  | Mean  | SD    | EC   | EM   | OC   | TB   |
|-----------------------------|-------|-------|------|------|------|------|
| Employee Commitment         | 4.384 | .456  | 0.753|      |      |      |
| Employee Motivation         | 4.394 | .448  | 0.701| 0.710|      |      |
| Organization Change         | 4.409 | .474  | 0.650| 0.639| 0.742|      |
| Trust Building              | 4.397 | .460  | 0.574| 0.625| 0.437| 0.711|

4.2. Structural Model

In consonant with the research objectives, the hypothetical model is formulated to analyze the relationships of the variables. This study tested the hypothesis from the two-step contexts, which includes the significance of the direct path analysis with the set constructs where 5000 bootstrapping samples were adopted to determine the path coefficient. Hence, to measure the structural model’s explanatory power, the $R^2$ value was employed as an endogenous construct. The structural model amounted to 78% of the variance in organizational change, which confirms the predictive validity as suggested by Hair et al. (2016). Then, the study tests the relationship between exogenous construct and organizational change by path coefficient (beta value); t-value, and p-value. The result of the structural model showing in Table 4 below and the diagram result in Appendix B.

| Hypotheses                     | Beta  | se    | T-value | P Values | Decisions | $f^2$ | $q^2$ |
|-------------------------------|-------|-------|---------|----------|-----------|-------|-------|
| Employee Commitment -> Organization Change | 0.139 | 0.050 | 2.769   | 0.006    | Supported | 0.031 | 0.258 |
| Employee Motivation -> Organization Change | 0.417 | 0.061 | 6.855   | 0.000    | Supported | 0.225 |       |
| Trust Building -> Organization Change | 0.385 | 0.054 | 7.122   | 0.000    | Supported | 0.176 |       |

Regarding the result in Table 4 above, there is a significant positive relationship between trust-building and organizational change ($\beta= 0.385; t= 7.122; p<0.001$). This revealed that trust-building is a vital determinant for organizational change. Hence, hypothesis H1 was supported. In addition, employee motivation has found a positive relationship with organisational change with ($\beta= 0.417; t= 6.855; p<0.001$). This also indicated that employee motivation serves as a determinant for organizational change ($\beta= 0.139; t= 2.769; p<0.005$). Thus, hypothesis H2 was supported. Finally, the result from table 4 revealed the positive and significant relationship between employee commitment and organizational change. Hence, hypothesis H3 was supported.

5. Conclusion and Recommendations

This study aims to examine the relationship between trust-building, motivate and employee commitment toward organizational change of selected manufacturing companies in Malaysia. Through systemic, theoretical, and conceptual understanding will be developed. Also, the argument builds on the
importance of communication in the organization and how it will help in organizational change. The current study proposed the assumption of trust-building; motivate employees, employee commitment, and organizational change. Thus, the analysis of 275 questionnaires on the relationship between exogenous constructs and organizational change indicated support for all the hypotheses. It was indicated from the results all three constructs (trust-building, employee motivation, and employee commitment) have a positive and significant effect on the organizational change of the manufacturing firms in Malaysia, specifically for medium and large enterprises. This indicates that the three exogenous constructs are the determinant factors for organizational change.

The result of this study supports the proposed theory as well as the previous studies on the relationship between trust-building, employee motivation, and employee motivation towards organizational change (Komodromos, Halkias & Harkiolakis, 2019; Zanini & Miguel, 2013; Huynh, 2020; Soumyaja et al., 2011; Mangundjaya, 2013). The study will help professionals and academics and enhancing their leadership abilities. The results of the investigation also show that it will benefit and inspire team members to show better outcomes. The study outcomes will benefit decision-makers and organization change consider the external and internal generators in aspects of trust building, motivating employees, and employee commitment. Part of the limitations of the study is that the study only collected the data from the manufacturing firms in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. Hence, this study needed to consider other sectors of the economy for the generalization of the study. Also, it is recommended that further research is needed in this direction to confirm the results of the study. The study concludes that trust-building, employee commitment, and employee motivation play a significant role in organizational change.
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