A Study On The Impact Of Organizational Trust And Commitment On Moonlighting Among The Academicians Of Higher Education Institutes Of Gujarat

Ms. Jeel Sheth[1*], Dr. Kaushal Bhatt[2]

[1*]Research Scholar, Gujarat Technological University, Email: Sheth1992@gmail.com
[2]Associate Professor, Graduate School of Management Studies, GTU, Email: Kaushal.bhatt@gtu.edu.in

ARTICLE INFO	ABSTRACT
	Moonlighting is increasing in India, and it is observed in all sectors. This research aims to analyse the impact of organizational trust and commitment on the academicians of higher educational institutions in Saurashtra, Gujarat. To analyze this, a plethora of research in the field of organizational commitment and trust have been presented and its relationship with moonlighting is presented. It was identified that there was limited research in this field, especially among higher educational academicians. The research methodology chosen is positivism philosophy, deductive approach, quantitative analysis by doing cross tab among the variables and also presenting the descriptive analysis for the same. 883 respondents gave their responses on the questionnaire links distributed among the higher education academicians of Saurashtra region. **Keywords:** Moonlighting, Organizational Trust & Commitment, Academician, HEIs

1: Introduction

1.1: Background of the Research
Today's economy faces critical crises such as inflation and the decreasing value of money (Georgieva, 2023). In such a situation, income earned through a single source does not seem to be sufficient. Due to this reason, a big part of the world's population is finding new ways to earn and to fulfil their various kinds of requirements. Moreover, increasing levels of competition and technological advancements also lead to such situations where employees get engaged in multiple works to gain knowledge and experience. This leads to moonlighting. Moonlighting is a situation where an individual is involved in multiple sources of earning at a given point in time, due to many personal or professional reasons (Nikam et al., 2022).

Moonlighting impacts many professional and personal traits of the individual such as organizational commitment, organizational trust, loyalty, leadership, job satisfaction, work engagement, etc.

Organizational commitment is the situation where workers and employees feel dedicated to their work and find themselves satisfied while working. Committed employees work with all the effort they can put into their work (Mowday et al., 1979). Organizational trust is the trust of employees that they show in their workplace; it can also be defined as the confidence of the employees toward the employer as well as their company (Joo et al., 2022).

Some of the studies state that moonlighting impacts the level of commitment and trust of the employees while others reject the existence of this relationship; for example, Thamilselvan et al. (2022) claimed that moonlighting is among the reasons that create stress. This stress can hurt the level of commitment and trust of the employees.

1.2: Aim
The present paper aims to find out whether moonlighting has any kind of impact on the organizational commitment and trust of the employees who are providing their services in the education sector.

1.3: Objectives

The objective of the research is to study the moonlighting prevailing in the education sector and whether this moonlighting impacts the level of organizational trust and commitment of the employees working as academicians.

2: Literature Review

2.1: Organizational commitment and moonlighting

Organizational commitment is the belief of the employees in their organization. Such employees who are committed to their organizations feel dedicated to their organization and the team in which they work. These employees find their level of job engagement higher and also are full of desire to stay in the organization (QIC.WD, 2023), (Mueller & Straatmann, 2014). Moonlighting and getting engaged in multiple sources of income often impacts the level of commitment and it is claimed that these impacts are negative and moonlighting reduces the level of commitment of the employees.

To test the above-claimed fact, Khatri (2014) presented a study that was based on the region of Delhi, NCR. This study collected samples from the managerial level employees of 10 companies belonging to different regions of this city. A total of 160 responses were received and 100 out of these were selected for the experiment. The conclusion stated that employees working in SMEs face a reduction in the level of their organizational commitment when they get engaged in side gigs.

Another piece of research that studied about 161 participants working in the IT hubs in the north Indian region was examined to test if their results vary from the result presented above. This study was performed to test the relationship between organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and moonlighting intentions of IT professionals. The conclusion of this experiment claimed that organizational commitment works as a mediator between the other two variables and the relationship between organizational commitment and moonlighting is strongly negative. Precisely, those employees who moonlight are facing the issue of reducing commitment to their organization (Seema et al., 2021). This result is in line with the conclusion presented by Khatri (2014).

Further, to examine this conclusion in the field of teaching, a study was conducted on the teaching professionals providing their services in various higher education institutions. The sample size for the study was 189 and the aim was to find out the relationship between organizational commitment and dual job habits of the teachers. The conclusion stated that if organizations work to improve the environment and management of the workplace then this might increase the commitment of the employees which in turn can reduce the moonlighting behavior of the teachers (Manogna & Swamy, 2023).

All the above results describe the negative relationship between organizational commitment and with moonlighting habits of the employees. But in contrast to these results, the dissertation presented by Betts (2002) claimed the conclusion that there is no relationship between organizational commitment and moonlighting behaviour of academicians. This study was based on 223 educators who were teaching to -12 students and more than 75% of these teaching professionals had supplementary sources of income.

2.2: organizational trust and moonlighting

Organizational trust is the belief of the employees in their organization. They believe that their employer will think about their well-being and would not make any such decision that can harm the employees. The level of this trust is so strong that the employees mostly do not question the decisions of their employees and work in the organization with utmost support and care (Egriboyun, 2015). A high level of organizational trust in the employees makes them work hard and think about the organization's growth. On the other hand, when employees do not trust their employers then this might result in repeatedly occurring conflicts, labour turnover, or even strikes.

Organizational trust is said to have an impact on the job-related behaviour of employees. Scholars and experimenters have diversified views regarding this impact. A study conducted in Turkey examined the relationship between organizational trust and organizational commitment among a total of 176 sports sector employees. The conclusion found claimed that these variables are directly linked to each other and a strong level of trust in the organization leads to strong trust (Bastug et al., 2016). As studied in the experiment presented above by Manogna & Swamy, (2023) who claim that commitment impacts moonlighting behaviour negatively. It can be concluded that organizational trust can also hurt the moonlighting behaviour of the employees.

The same kind of relationship was tested in the hospitality industry in Saudi Arabia. 212 employees working in 20 hotels were selected through voluntary participation as samples for the experiment. Analysis was done using statistical inferences and the results were no different from the result presented by Bastug et al., (2016) above. The conclusion came out that organizational trust impacts strongly all the variables of organizational commitment (Alomran et al., 2024). This again points toward the fact that organizational trust impacts the decision to moonlight negatively through the mediating effects of organizational commitment. Yasser, (2022) also concluded the same results on testing the employees working in the Central Library of Mohammed Seddik Ben Yahia University. Further in this series, Dahmardeh and Nastiezaie (2019) also presented a study that discussed the relationship between organizational trust and organizational commitment. The study was based

on samples collected from two Zahedan education organizations for the academic year 2017-18. The sample size consisted of 208 academic employees and the data was collected through providing two different questionnaires to each of the participants. The study presented various results including a positive relationship between organizational trust and organizational commitment through the mediating effects of organizational participation. This experiment also concluded the same results as presented by Yasser, (2022) and other scholars discussed above. Organizational trust is impacted by commitment and commitment is impacted by moonlighting. Thus, it can also be concluded that moonlighting impacts trust, and if trust is strong then there are chances that moonlighting can have negative consequences of this.

2.3: Research gap

Moonlighting among the professionals in the education sector is not a new phenomenon but still, it somehow managed to escape the eyes of scholars. Many pieces of research talk about moonlighting and its relationship with organizational commitment. However, only a few researches talk about the relationship between moonlighting and organizational trust or this relationship in the field of education. Talking about the number of such researchers on the country level, this number is perhaps yet to start. The present study is trying to link these variables with the moonlighting behaviour of the academicians specifically in the field of college education thus providing its contribution to bridge this gap in the literature.

3: Research Methodology

Every research is based on a predefined methodology that defines philosophies, approaches, methods, designs, etc. that are used in the research to reach the desired goal of the study, and this information regarding the present study is described in this section. The present research is based on positivism philosophy along with epistemology and ontology paradigms. Positivism is a paradigm that is based on the use of measurement and reason. It showcases that knowledge is obtained by neutral and measurable observations of activity, action, or reaction. Positivism asserts that if something cannot be measured in this manner, it cannot be definitively known. In this study, positivism can be used to measure the impact of organizational trust and commitment on academicians. The relationship between variables of their demographic information is measured (Park et al., 2020). The study aligns with the positivist approach by presenting data on demographics, job status, family members, and other variables in a quantitative manner and by focusing on empirical evidence and observable phenomena. In this series of assessing the values of beliefs, epistemology paradigm helps to understand the knowledge that is prevailing and the truth that is observed (Sol & Heng, 2022). Ontology, on the other hand, helps to understand the nature and the reason behind this prevailing truth (Dudovskiy, 2010). In the present study, this philosophy along with the paradigms would help to observe the prevailing truth regarding the moonlighting behaviour of the academicians and would help to understand the truth of its impact on the work engagement of these employees. Here, demographic variables of the respondents would also be studied so it is qualitative analysis.

Approaches are the pathways that instruct about the direction of the research. These pathways are of three types, namely inductive, deductive, and abductive (Okoli, 2021). The present study is based on the deductive approach that uses top-down method in which a general idea is narrowed down by specific testing and observation. This approach can handle only quantitative data. A hypothesis is formulated, followed by conduction of experiments in order to deduct the data in order to conclude (Pandey, 2019).

Methods to perform research define the type of data collected for the study. These types could be qualitative, quantitative, or mixed (Abdul Wahab et al., 2017). In the present experiment quantitative method of data collection by utilising numerical data, statistical analysis, and percentages to quantify and measure numerous variables, including gender distribution, age groupings, marital status, job designations, and organisational dedication. The study utilises quantitative data to conduct a comprehensive analysis of the participants' attributes and their responses, enabling the measurement of correlations between different variables. Further, this quantitative data is collected directly from the participants of the research through the survey questionnaire method, this means that the data sets used in the present study are collected from the primary sources. The data for the present study is collected from the academicians providing educational services in the colleges and universities in the Saurashtra region of Gujarat, India. From the collected data, sampling is done using a non-probability, convenient, and purposive sampling method (Rahman, 2020). A total of 883 responses were selected for the study. Further, the study adopts an explanatory research design with a cross-sectional time zone.

4: Analysis

4.1: Descriptive analysis

The demographic information of the participants described various information such as gender, age, marital status, experience, etc of the participants which is presented in the table below:

Demographic information

Gender		
	Frequency	Percent
Female	397	45
Male	486	55
Total	883	100

Age group		
	Frequency	Percent
21-25 years	104	11.8
26-29 years	138	15.6
26–29 years	48	5.4
30-35 years	217	24.6
36-39 years	204	23.1
Over 40 years	172	19.5
Total	883	100

Martial Status		
	Frequency	Percent
Married	532	60.2
Other	44	5
Unmarried	307	34.8
Total	883	100

Designation		
	Frequency	Percent
Assistant Professor	340	38.5
Associate professor	187	21.2
Lecturer	143	16.2
Other	36	4.1
Professor	177	20
Total	883	100

Job Status		
	Frequency	Percent
Full-time	728	82.4
Part-time	80	9.1
Visiting	75	8.5
Total	883	100

Number of family members		
	Frequency	Percent
2 members	37	4.2
3 members	259	29.3
4 members	349	39.5
More than 4 members	238	27
Total	883	100

Family members have government Job		
	Frequency	Percent
Contract Basis	107	12.1
No	599	67.8
Yes	177	20
Total	883	100

Any Family members are a retired government employee		
	Frequency	Percent
No	687	77.8
Yes	196	22.2
Total	883	100

Are you doing any other economic activity apart from your primary job?		
	Frequency	Percent
No	401	45.4
Yes	482	54.6
Total	883	100

Out of the total of 883 respondents, 486 participants were male and the remaining 397 were female. Thus, the gender-wise distribution of the data represents that 55% of the participants were male and the other 45% were female. Distribution of these samples in their age group presented that a total of 104 participants or 11.8% of them belonged to the age group of 21-25 years. Participants who were somewhere between 26 and 29 years of age were 186 in absolute terms and 21% in relative terms. The next age group was 30-35 years and 217 participants selected this option to provide their age. These were equal to 24.6% of the total responses. 204 people or 23.1% were those who belonged to the 36-39 years age group. The remaining 172 participants who were equal to 19.5% of the total population marked themselves as 40 and above 40 years of age.

Marital status described that 60.2% or 532 participants were married 307 (34.8%) participants were unmarried and the remaining 44 participants or 5% belonged to others category. 38.5% or 340 participants were working as assistant professors and 187 or 21.2% were working as associate professors. 16.2% of participants or 143 in absolute terms were working as lecturers and 177 or 20% were professors as per their designation. The remaining 36 participants or 4.1% marked themselves as others.

728 participants or 82.4% were working a full-time job, 80 participants (9.1%) were part-timers, and the remaining 75 (8.5%) participants were visiting academicians. 37 participants (4.2%) had 2 members in their families; 259 participants (29.3%) had 3 members in their families; 349 academicians (39.5%) had 4 members, and the remaining 238 or 27% academicians had more than 4 members in their families. 107 participants or 12.1% claimed that they had a government employee in their family who is working on a contract basis; 177 of them or 20% claimed that there was a permanent government employee in their family while the remaining 599 (67.8%) participants were not having any government employee in their families. 196 participants out of the total of 883 claimed that they have a retired government employee in their family while the remaining 687 academicians (77.8%) refused to have any.

When asked about the sufficiency of family income 601 educators or 68.1% of participants claimed that their family income is sufficient enough while the remaining 282 or 31.9% disagreed. 54.6% of participants or 482 of them agreed to have more than one earning source while the remaining 401 refused to have any.

4.2: Crosstab description

Being satisfied with the work and the organization was the cross-tab used to test the level of organizational commitment of the academicians. The analysis of the data presented that there is a strong and positive relationship between the moonlighting status of the academicians and organizational commitment as most of the participants claimed that they find it satisfying to work with the organization they were working with. This result is in contrast with the results presented by Khatri (2014) who claimed that moonlighting impacts negatively the level of organizational commitment.

Another cross-tab that was used to test the level of commitment of the academicians was whether they used to praise and talk about their employer outside the workplace. The analytical study claimed that the relationship is positively strong and that the academicians were highly praising their employer in front of the others who are not a part of the organization. This indicates that organizational commitment is still strong among the employees even when the academicians are moonlighting. The conclusion can be drawn from this result that can be that moonlighting does not impact the commitment negatively. Strongly contrasting results are presented by (Seema et al., 2021) who claim that there is a negative correlation between commitment and dual job holdings.

Sense of belongingness is also an indicator of commitment and this matter was also examined. The conclusion turned out that there is a positive relationship between the variables and those employees who are more into moonlighting are those who consider the problems of their organizations as their own. Completely contrasting results are presented by Manogna & Swamy, (2023) who claim that organizational commitment is directly and negatively linked to moonlighting. The scholars also claimed that if organizations are struggling to tackle the situation of moonlighting then they must work to improve the work environment which would improve organizational commitment among employees resulting in reduced moonlighting.

Employers and employees valuing each other is an important concern that leads to organizational trust. This variable was tested in the study to find out whether organizational trust is impacted by the moonlighting habits of the academicians. The results concluded that organizational trust is not impacted even if the employees are earning through multiple sources. Precisely, moonlighting does not impact organizational trust negatively. The discussion made above regarding the research presented by Bastug et al., (2016), it was concluded that if trust is strong then employees do not tend to moonlight. This result is strongly in contrast with the conclusion presented in this section.

Trust also makes it difficult for employees to switch jobs and leave the place of work where they are working. Keeping this fact in mind, this variable was tested to know whether there is any relationship between this variable and with moonlighting behaviour of the employees. The results of this analysis also concluded the same fact that academicians with side gigs did not have any negative sense towards their organization and that their moonlighting was not impacting their organizational trust. Contrasting results are presented by Yasser, (2022). This scholar claimed that organization trusts results in commitment and Seema et al., (2021) claimed that commitment is negatively impacted by moonlighting. Hence, trust is also negatively impacted by moonlighting. Same way, if leaving the organization creates hustle for academicians then this indicates the fact

that they trust their organization but still are engaged in moonlighting without any negative impacts on trust. The analytical part of the research proved this fact there those employees who are moonlighting, they trust their primary organization so well that they find it full of hustle to leave their place of work and thus moonlighting is not impacting their trust. Contrasting results are presented in the study conducted by (Alomran et al., 2024).

To test the trust of the academicians, a variable was put in the questionnaire that asked if there was any necessity rather than their choice to stay in their current organization. The responses of these academicians when analyzed concluded that there is a weak but statistically significant relationship between this variable and the moonlighting behaviour of the academicians. Precisely, some academicians do not trust their organization deeply and this might be due to their secondary source of income. A similar result is presented by the experimenters Alomran et al., (2024). These scholars also claimed that trust can positively impact the behaviour of the employees including the reduction in side gig adoption.

Further in the series of testing trusts, academicians were asked if they had reasons to leave their current place of work. Analysis of these responses indicated the fact that those academicians who were more inclined towards side gigs had reasons to leave their place of work, and this relationship was statistically significant. Precisely, lack of trust can cause moonlighting. The same result is presented by Dahmardeh and Nastiezaie (2019). These experimenters claimed that trust impacts moonlighting and building trust can change the mindset of the employees positively.

The academicians were asked if they wish to leave their workplace but due to lack of alternatives it becomes difficult for them to do so. The responses to this question did not show any relationship with the moonlighting habit of the educators. Thus concluding that there is no relationship between these variables and staying in the organization due to the lack of availability of the alternatives and moonlighting habit of the academicians are not linked to each other. Precisely, trust is not impacted by moonlighting. Contrasting results are presented by Dahmardeh and Nastiezaie (2019) as stated above as these scholars claimed that there is a relationship between trust and moonlighting.

5: Conclusion

Organizational commitment and organizational trust are the variables that can change the behaviour of the employees and positively hold them in the organization. Building the level of commitment and trust in the minds of the employees helps to reduce the outgoing of the human resources or binding them to not adopt side hustle. Moonlighting is prevailing in today's economy but it has negative impacts on the primary jobs and the primary employers. This research aimed to study the relationship between these variables and the moonlighting behaviour of academicians.

The results of the study did not show any strong negative relation between the variables. Precisely, the conclusions of the study claim that there is no negative relationship between organizational commitment and moonlighting. Those employees who are moonlighting are not found to have any negative impact on their commitment to their primary job due to the side hustle they are engaged in. This means moonlighting does not impact the level of organizational commitment of the employees. Further, the other conclusion of the study states that moonlighting has a partial influence on the organizational trust of the employees. A few variables of organizational trust are found to have a slightly negative impact on the moonlighting behaviour of educators. These conclusions fulfil the aim and the objectives of the study.

Although the study has successfully concluded its results, still some limitations are present in this experiment. The study is only based on a particular region of a state in India. The sample size is also not so huge to cover every aspect of the variables. Further, academicians related to only colleges and universities are selected as a sample which fails to examine the thought process of the school teachers who are said to have less pay as compared to these higher educators.

Working well with these limitations can provide a vast future scope for research in this field. Working on a big sample size and also including school teachers can lead to more reliable results. Expanding the boundaries of the experimental area can make the results more functional and guidance providers for organizations working in the education sector. Adopting the past data and including those data sets in the study can also help to understand the trend of moonlighting in the education sector and trying to understand the reason for this trend can help organizations to take further steps in dealing with such situations.

References

1. Abdul Wahab, S. F., Ismail, A. R., & Othman, R. (2017). Qualitative, quantitative, or mixed: Which is the most preferred for healthcare studies? *Advances in Intelligent Systems and Computing*, *590*, 331–336. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-60483-1_33
2. Alomran, A. M., Ahmed, & Ayman Mounir Kassem. (2024). Impact of organizational trust on organizational commitment: The moderating effect of national identity. *Cogent Social Sciences*, *10*(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2024.2309712

3. Bastug, G., Pala, A., Kumartasli, M., Günel, I., & Duyan, M. (2016). Investigation of the relationship between organizational trust and organizational commitment. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, *4*(6), 1418–1425. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1103173

4. Betts, S. C. (2002). An exploration of multiple job holding (moonlighting) and an investigation into the relationship between multiple job holding and work-related commitment - proquest. In *www.proquest.com*. https://www.proquest.com/openview/6c27ae50011ffe285bfaea9b42bb302d/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750&diss=y

5. Dahmardeh, M., & Nastiezaie, N. (2019). The impact of organizational trust on organizational commitment through the mediating variable of organizational participation. *Public Management Researches*, *12*(44), 155–180. https://doi.org/10.22111/jmr.2019.23818.3788

6. Dudovskiy, J. (2010). *Ontology - research-methodology*. Research-Methodology. https://research-methodology.net/research-philosophy/ontology/

7. Egriboyun, D. (2015). The relation between organizational trust, organizational support, and organizational commitment. *African Journal of Business Management*, *9*(4), 134–156. https://doi.org/10.5897/ajbm2014.7623

8. Georgieva, K. (2023, July 13). *Weak global economy, high inflation, and rising fragmentation demand strong G20 action*. IMF. https://www.imf.org/en/Blogs/Articles/2023/07/13/weak-global-economy-high-inflation-and-rising-fragmentation-demand-strong-g20-action

9. Joo, B.-K. (Brian), Yoon, S. K., & Galbraith, D. (2022). The effects of organizational trust and empowering leadership on group conflict: Psychological safety as a mediator. *Organization Management Journal*, *20*(1). https://doi.org/10.1108/omj-07-2021-1308

10. Khatri, P. (2014). A study of organizational commitment and moonlighting practices of SME employees in delhi-ncr. *Global Journal of Finance and Management*, *6*(6), 535–544. https://www.ripublication.com/gjfm-spl/gjfmv6n6_08.pdf

11. Manogna, B. S., & Swamy, R. (2023). To moonlight or not to moonlight: The role of organizational commitment dimensions in secondary employment decisions among higher education teachers. *Higher Education Quarterly*, *78*(1). https://doi.org/10.1111/hequ.12448

12. Mowday, R. T., Steers, R. M., & Porter, L. W. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *14*(2), 224–247.

13. Mueller, K., & Straatmann, T. (2014). Organizational commitment. *Encyclopedia of Quality of Life and Well-Being Research*, 4520–4525. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-0753-5_2030

14. National Academies of Sciences, E., Education, D. of B. and S. S. and, Board on Behavioral, C., Use, C. on A. B. S. through O. D. and, Beatty, A. S., & Kaplan, R. M. (2022, May 17). *Understanding ontologies*. Www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov; National Academies Press (US). https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK584339/

15. Nikam, R., Lahoti, Y., & Tripathy, L. (2022). Concept of moonlighting and its causes and impact on organization's growth section a-research paper eur. *Chem. Bull*, *2022*(06), 292–299. https://doi.org/10.53555/ecb/2022.11.6.37

16. Okoli, C. (2021). Inductive, abductive, and deductive theorizing. In *SSRN Electronic Journal*. Researchgate. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3774317

17. Pandey, J. (2019). *Deductive Approach to Content Analysis*. Qualitative Techniques for Workplace Data Analysis. https://www.igi-global.com/chapter/deductive-approach-to-content-analysis/207796

18. Park, Y. S., Konge, L., & Artino, A. R. (2020). The Positivism Paradigm of Research. *Academic Medicine*, *95*(5), 690–694. Researchgate.

19. QIC.WD. (2023). *Organizational commitment | quality improvement center for workforce development*. Qic-Wd.org. https://qic-wd.org/umbrella-summary/organizational-commitment

20. Rahman, S. (2020). The Advantages and Disadvantages of Using Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches and Methods in Language "Testing and Assessment" Research: a Literature Review. *Journal of Education and Learning*, *6*(1), 102–112. https://doi.org/10.5539/jel.v6n1p102

21. Seema, Choudhary, V., & Saini, G. (2021). Effect of Job Satisfaction on Moonlighting Intentions: Mediating Effect of Organizational Commitment. *European Research on Management and Business Economics*, *27*(1), 100137. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iedeen.2020.100137

22. Sol, K., & Heng, K. (2022). Understanding epistemology and its key approaches in research. *Cambodian Journal of Educational Research*, *2*(2), 80–99. https://doi.org/10.62037/cjer.2022.02.02.05

23. Thamilselvan, R., Govindarajan, A., Venkata, T. S., Naga, P. M., Kandregula, J. surya , & Vaddi , S. (2022). Effect of moonlighting among students - an investigative study. *NeuroQuantology*, *20*(8), 266–270. https://doi.org/10.14704/nq.2022.20.8.NQ44028

24. Yasser, A. (2022). Organizational trust and its impact on the organizational commitment of human resources. *International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change*, *16*(1). https://www.researchgate.net/publication/358509597_Organizational_Trust_and_its_Impact_on_the_Organizational_Commitment_of_Human_Resources