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Abstract
This study examines the influence of organizational trust on job performance by analyzing perceptions of public employees in the Land and Survey Department. The structured questionnaire survey was carried out. One hundred (100) usable questionnaires collected and were analysed accordingly to test the various hypotheses. The measurement items were rated with 5-point Likert. Results of the instrument’s Cronbach Alpha measurement show that the score of reliability is above .90 which indicates an acceptable level. The results indicate that organizational trust is positively correlated with job performance. These results imply that job performance may be dependent on organizational trust in the public sector. This study provides insights on the relationship between organizational trust and job performance in the public sector. The findings of this study may help public sector to enhance its organizational trust and its effect on job performance. Limitations and recommendations are also discussed.
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INTRODUCTION
The presence of trust in the workplace is essential to organizational performance and competitiveness in an increasingly global economy Lamsa & Pucetaite (2006). Trust is commonly important element in the organization as well to determine the level of performance and automatically is a source of competitive of advantage. Organizational trust which is defined as the readiness of the employee to be vulnerable to the actions of the employers based on the expectation that they would act in order to satisfy his needs irrespective of the ability to monitor or control in order to increase performance among the employees (Mayer et al., 1995). Trust has been a widely studied concept both by itself but, most importantly, as a component of the quality of relationships. It is where in psychology and interpersonal communication, trust has been one of numerous dimensions identified in relationships. In order to gain the increasing level of organizational trust, there are few trust dimensions that should be measured which are competency, durability, vulnerability, integrity, dependability, openness and honesty.
During the last two decades increasing staff performance in public institutions has become one of the main concerns of governments in times of financial constraints, declining public revenues, and increasing demands for more and better public services (OECD, 2011). In the search for better public job performance, as relevant previous studies show, organizational trust could be a valuable asset that can improve job performance in the public sector. So, examining the ways in which Organizational trust influence job performance can be seen as an important effort in enhancing job performance in the public sector in a public organization such as Land and Survey Department in Kuching, Sarawak.

Organization trust may also be better described as intra-organizational trusts that focus on the relationship between workers and the supervisors, and the relationship between workers and the leaders. Brown & Leigh (1996) have noticed that when employees have trust in the top managers and management, their organizational commitment and organizational identity also improve, which in turn cause employees to work harder and spend more time and energy in their jobs. Also, Zauderer (2002) found that employees who work in organizations with higher levels of organizational trust were more successful and innovative than institutions with lower levels of trust. Organizational trust facilitates positive psychological conditions of meaningfulness, safety, and availability. These conditions are also among predictors of individual job performance (Li & Tan, 2013). Empirical studies in the public sector also support the theoretical linkage between organizational trust and performance (Chen, Hsieh, & Chen, 2014). For instance, Nyhan (1999) reported a positive relation between affective commitment (which in turn results in higher performance levels) and supervisory trust in public sector organizations, while Gould-Williams (2003) found that systems trust was a strong predictor of self-reported performance (effort).

Michael & Werner (2017) posit a new model of integrity that provides access to increased performance for individuals, groups, organizations, and societies. The relationship between integrity, measured by the HPI Reliability scale, and job performance was significant in two models. According to Hogan & Hogan (1989) the correlation between integrity and job performance controlling for sex and tenure in integrity was also significant. This indicates that integrity may be useful predictor of job performance.

Becker et al., (1996) argues that commitment based on the internalization of goals and values seems likely to predict performance. Thus, employees who are highly committed to their organization and supervisors and who internalize the values and goals of these foci can be expected to perform at the higher level than employees with less commitment. As a result, generally, we could say that there is a significant and strong relationship between commitment and job performance Becker et al., (1996) and Benkhoff (1997).

Dependability is a measure of a system's availability, reliability, and its maintainability. Dependability can be broken down into three elements which are attributes; a way to assess the dependability of a system, threats; an understanding of the things that can affect the dependability of a system and
Lastly means; ways to increase a system's dependability. It is anticipated that dependability will enhance employees job performance.

**METHODOLOGY**
A survey design was used to reach the research objectives. The specific design was the cross sectional design, where a sample is drawn from a population at a particular point in time Shaughnessy & Zechmeister (1997). About 130 questionnaire were distributed to employees in the Land and Survey Department. About 100 employees returned back the questionnaire giving a response rate of 77%. Organizational trust was measured using a scale developed by Institute of Public Relations. (2003). Job performance was measured using an instrument developed by Borman & Motowidlo (1997). Results of the instrument’s Cronbach Alpha measurement show that the score of reliability is above .80 which indicates an acceptable level. This is summarized in Table 1 below.

This study intend to test the following hypothesis:
H1: There is a significant relationship between organizational trust and job performance.
H1a: There is a significant relationship between integrity and job performance.
H1b: There is a significant relationship between commitment and job performance.
H1c: There is a significant relationship between dependability and job performance.

**RESULTS**
Both genders are equally represented male (52 percent) and females (48 percent). Majority of respondents are aged between 21 to 40 years old (61 percent) and mostly were married (77 percent). Majority of the respondents were Malay (55 percent). About 54 percent of the sample had SPM qualification. As for length of service 54 percent had served for 1 to 9 years followed by 26 percent for 10 to 15 years. About 57 percent of the respondents were from the Support Group 2. This is summarized in Table 2.

**Table 1: Reliability Analysis, Mean and Standard Deviation Scores ( N=100)**

| Variables            | No. of Items | Cronbach’s Alpha | Mean | S. D. |
|----------------------|--------------|------------------|------|-------|
| Organizational Trust | 19           | .952             | 3.48 | .575  |
| Job Performance      | 10           | .856             | 3.88 | .430  |
| Profile                   | No. of Respondents | Percent |
|--------------------------|--------------------|---------|
| **Gender**               |                    |         |
| Male                     | 52                 | 52      |
| Female                   | 48                 | 48      |
| **Age**                  |                    |         |
| 21-30 years old          | 25                 | 25%     |
| 31-40 years old          | 36                 | 36%     |
| 41-50 years old          | 27                 | 27%     |
| 51-60 years old          | 12                 | 12%     |
| **Race**                 |                    |         |
| Malay                    | 55                 | 55%     |
| Iban                     | 14                 | 14%     |
| Bidayuh                  | 12                 | 12%     |
| Chinese                  | 10                 | 10%     |
| Others                   | 9                  | 9%      |
| **Marital status**       |                    |         |
| Single                   | 23                 | 23%     |
| Married                  | 77                 | 77%     |
| **Education’s level**    |                    |         |
| SPM                      | 54                 | 63.1%   |
| STPM                     | 14                 | 13.8%   |
| Diploma                  | 22                 | 13.8%   |
| Degree                   | 3                  | 6.2%    |
| Others                   | 7                  | 3.1%    |
| **Year of services**     |                    |         |
| 1-3 years                | 12                 | 12%     |
| 4-6 years                | 23                 | 23%     |
| 7-9 years                | 19                 | 19%     |
| 10-15 years              | 26                 | 26%     |
| More than 15 years       | 20                 | 20%     |
| **Job Category**         |                    |         |
| Management & Professional Group | 7                 | 7%      |
| Support Group 1          | 36                 | 36%     |
| Support Group            | 57                 | 37%     |
Based on Table 1, the mean for organizational trust is 3.48 indicating a moderate level of organizational trust. And for job performance the mean is 3.88 indicating a high level of job performance based on Best and Kahn (2003). In addition, the study found a strong positive relationship between organizational trust and job performance \( r = 0.588; p<0.01 \). This indicates that organizational trust has a positive relationship with job performance. Thus higher organizational trust is associated with higher job performance. Thus H1 is accepted. In addition all dimensions of organizational trust also had positive relationships with job performance: Integrity \( r = .508, p<0.01 \), Commitment \( r = .626, p<0.01 \) and dependability \( r = .468, p<0.01 \). Thus H1a, H1b and H1c are accepted. This is shown in Table 3.

**Table 3: Correlation between Organizational Trust Dimensions and Job Performance**

| Variables          | Job Performance (r value) |
|--------------------|--------------------------|
| Organizational Trust | .588**                   |
| Integrity          | .508**                   |
| Commitment         | .626**                   |
| Dependability      | .468**                   |

**Discussion**

Our findings provide support that a direct positive relationship exits between dimensions of organizational trust and job performance in Land Survey Department. Majority of staff perceive that the level of organizational trust as moderate and job performance as high. In terms of correlation, high level organizational trust is related to higher levels of job performance amongst the staff. This study supports previous findings by Li & Tan (2013) and Gould-Williams (2003) who argued organizational trust has a positive effect on job performance. The study presents two major implications: theoretical contribution and practical contribution. In terms of theoretical contribution, the results of this study confirm that organizational trust and job performance are highly correlated and hence contributes to research on organizational trust and job performance in the public sector. In terms of practical contributions, the findings of this study can be used as a guideline by public agencies to enhance organizational trust and use it to increase its staff’s level of job performance.

**CONCLUSION**

This study confirmed that organizational trust influence job performance. The study used valid and reliable measurement scales were used to measure the relationship between organizational trust and job performance. The correlation test revealed a positive relationship between organizational trust and job performance. Furthermore the study also found significant relationship between dimensions of organizational trust and job performance. Therefore, current research and practice
within organizational trust needs to understand organizational trust as a related to job performance.
This study further suggests that a high level of organizational trust will strongly enhance and promote
higher levels of job performance amongst employees in public sector.

This study acknowledges several limitations. First, a cross-sectional research design was used to
gather data at one point within the period of study. This may not be able to capture the
developmental issues and/or causal connections between variables of interest. Second, the survey
questionnaires relied heavily on the respondents’ self-responses that were selected based on random
sampling technique. Finally, the samples were taken from one public agency namely land and survey
department in Kuching via survey questionnaires. These limitations may decrease the ability of
generalizing the results to other public agencies in Malaysia. It is suggested that future research may
look at other variables such as employee motivation, job satisfaction and organizational commitment
may moderate or mediates the relationship between organizational trust and job performance.
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