

## Mediation effect of trust on the relationship between perception of organization politics and commitment

Setyabudi Indartono  
Email: setyabudi\_indartono@uny.ac.id

**Abstract:**

*This paper is the extension study of the relationship between perception of organization politics (POP), and commitment. This study investigates how trust explained the relation between these relationships. Mediation effect of trust was used to explain how this perception was related to commitment. Moderation effect was used for further explanation on investigation the complexities of these relationships.*

*The result showed that the model was adequacy fit. PoP has negative correlation with commitment. Trust has fully mediated the relationship between PoP and commitment. In order to the moderation, the result showed that employee who has higher of trust was seen stronger POP-Commitment relationship than those who has lower ones.*

*Implication of the findings for organizations and suggestions for future research are discussed.*

**Keywords:** *perception of organizational politics, perception of equity, trust, Commitment*

### Introduction

In the face of increased global competition, the construct of employee commitment is importance to both scholars (e.g., Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982) and practitioners (e.g., O'Malley, 2000). Commitment is the construct which is able to reinforce the processes and reinforce the relationship between employees and organization, gaining to the best performance (Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Riketta, 2002, Lavelle, 2009). The focus of present commitment studies is exploring the understanding of commitment's antecedents, processes, and its consequences. Antecedents of commitment may explain in various situations in the workplace such as political behavior. Reducing the employee's commitment might occur if political behavior was

arising up and if employee was felt treat unfairly. Sometimes heightened political activity in the workplace promotes the defamation of character, or set up the down playing of the achievement motivation of another employee (Vigoda, 2000).

Previous studies found that higher level of political behavior lead to anxiety and job stress (Poon, 2003; Valle & Perrewe, 2000), poor employee attitudes, diminished job satisfaction and reduce organizational commitment (Hochwarter, 2003; Randall et al., 1999; Valle & Perrewe, 2000; Vigoda, 2000; Witt, Andrews, & Kacmar, 2000). In nature, higher levels of political behaviors often indicate the presence of injustice and the inequitable distribution of resources among employees (Thompson and Ingraham 1996), than may influence in reducing employee's commitment to the organization (Hochwarter, 2003; Randall et al., 1999; Valle & Perrewe, 2000; Vigoda, 2000; Witt, Andrews, & Kacmar, 2000).

Perception of organization politics (POP) which is defined as being characterized by self-serving and manipulative behaviors mostly conveyed negative connotations (Vigoda, 2000). However, Pfeffer (1981) suggested that the organization politics might not be as disruptive as perceived by some individuals, but political activities can sometimes facilitate organizational change and adaptation to the environment. It was become complex phenomena especially because the different ways of perception, between individual employees and managers (Brian, K. et al, 2008). Now days study, no one of scholar has provided the explanations of why or how the perception of organizational politics and commitment are related.

In order to continue the broaden explanation of commitment antecedent and which is the understanding on the consequence of organizational politics

(Poon, 2003; Vigoda, 2000), this study attempted to provide the explanations of this perception (POP) and commitment relationship. Trust that is known as the most necessary to reduce the risk of opportunistic behavior, and develop a long-term orientation (Arrow, 1974; Williamson, 1975, 1979; Anderson and Weitz, 1989; Ganesan, 1994), found has the most important antecedents, i.e., organizational justice (Pillai et al., 2001; Aryee et al., 2002) and also mediate the relationship between organizational justice and outcomes (Ertürk, A., 2007). Thus, by mediating effect mechanism (Muller and Judd, 2005, MacKinnon, 2008), trust is expected providing the answers of why or how POP and commitment are related. For further investigation to identify the strength and direction of this relationship, the moderation effect was used. It was expected that employee who has higher of trust was seen stronger POP-commitment relationship than those who has lower ones.




Figure 1  
 Research Model of Mediation (M) and Moderation (Z) effect of Trust on the relationship for POP and Commitment

### Conceptual background and hypotheses

#### *Perceptions of organizational politics and commitment*

Although Ferris and colleagues have consistently argued that POP has a negative effect on organizational commitment (e.g., Ferris et al. 1989, 2002). But there is a complex phenomena's on POP. This complex phenomena of

POP was because the different perception among members, especially between employees and managers (Brian, K. et al, 2008). The different perception is caused due to differences interest among member (Ferris et al 1989) and different organizations situation (Perrewe, 2000)

POP-commitment relationship has more complex phenomena. It is caused by multiple dimensions of commitment it self. Organizational commitment that is widely viewed as being multi-dimensional constructs such as affective commitment, continuance commitment and normative commitment (e.g., Allen and Meyer 1990; Porter et al. 1974) was still try to be teased in the relationship with POP. Although, the most POP researchers have measured organizational commitment by use of a uni-dimensional measure (e.g. Mowday et al. 1979), there is only a few POP researchers (e.g. Cropanzano et al. 1997; Hochwarter et al. 1999) have measured this construct with only the Affective Commitment (sub-scale of Meyer and Allen 1984) and one study measured more than one dimensions of organizational commitment, i.e., affective commitment and continuous commitment (Randall et al. 1999, Miller et al, 2008).

Empirical work on the POP-commitment relationship has been found equivocal. Most have found POP to have an inverse relationship (e.g., Maslyn and Fedor 1998; Nye and Witt 1993; Witt 1998), but others have found a positive relationship (Khumar and ghadially, 1989; Cropanzano et al. 1997), and two further studies have found no relationship at all between POP and commitment (e.g., Cropanzano et al. 1997; Randall et al. 1999). This negative relationship between POP- commitment found in the ranges of -.70 (Cropanzano et al. 1997) to -.13 (Vigoda-Gadot et al. 2003). This wide range of the findings on the magnitude of the relationship and disparate findings on

POP-commitment relationship directionality, begs for further research (Miller et al, 2008) of this study within prediction:

*Hypothesis 1: Perceptions of organizational politics negatively related to commitment*

#### *Trust and Commitment*

Trust that is believed to be central to the social relationships occurring at the lateral and hierarchical levels in the organization, is usually needed in uncertain situations (Ladebo, 2006), so that the lack of trust may circumscribe the well-being of an organization (Ammeter, et al, 2004). It is believed that a high level of trust climate in an organization is often associated with greater employee loyalty, better customer service, increased efficiency, while a climate of distrust promotes secrecy among employees in the organization (Ladebo, 2006).

Empirical work on the trust-commitment relationships, previous study found that trust has a direct and positive effect on commitment such as affective commitment (Hopkins et al, 2006, N'Goala, 2007, Powel et all, 2006), and normative commitment (Powel et all, 2006). Based on previous empirical research, this study proposes the prediction:

*Hypothesis 2: Trust positively related to Commitment*

#### *Mediation of trust*

In order to provide the explanations of why or how the perception of organizational politics and commitment are related, the construct of trust was the most suspected mediator variable used on this study. The construct of trust was necessary to reduce the risk of opportunistic behavior, and develop a long-term orientation (Arrow, 1974; Williamson, 1975, 1979; Anderson and

Weitz, 1989; Ganesan, 1994). Thus, the explanation of PoP-commitment relationship may able to be described by trust.

Point of the explanations, trust that was highly suspected as construct that would clearly able to describe the relationship between POP and commitment within predictions:

*Hypothesis 3: Trust mediate the relation between perception of organizational politics and Commitment*

#### *Moderation effect of trust*

Explanation of the strength and direction of POP and commitment relationship was explained by using the moderation effects. Previous empirical work, trust is related to commitment (Hopkins et al, 2006, N'Goala, 2007, Powel et all, 2006), and trust was potential moderate between variables (Goris, 2003), make the proposition of this study was plausible. Within the finding of employees who work within higher trust to supervisor are more supported to positive work attitude (Goris, 2003). In this study, the following hypotheses are tested:

*Hypothesis 4: employee who has higher of trust was seen stronger POP-commitment relationship than those who has lower ones,*

## **1. Method**

### *3.1. Participant*

Participants were 261 employees from several businesses. Participants were approximately 36.5 years old and work for 7.7 years. Participants level of study; 38 (14.6%) were colleges, 120 (46%) were undergraduate, 52 (19.9%) were master and 12 (4.6%) were doctorate level. The participants that have

leader/managerial level were 97 (37.2%) and 151 (57.9%) participants were men, and 149 (57.1%) participant has married.

### 3.2. Measures

#### *Measure Development*

Items were written by the authors or obtained from previous research. After review of wording, content, and so forth, 44 item sets for total items were retained for inclusion in the instrument. Responses were made on a 5-point Likert-type scale with scale anchors ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

*Perception of organization Politics* were measured using 26 items taken from *Kacmar, K. M. & Baron, R. A. (1999)*. Participants were asked i.e., "People in this organization attempt to build themselves up by tearing others down". A Five-point likert-type scale was used, and the individual items were averaged (Cronbach's  $\alpha = .817$ ;  $M=2.8028$ ,  $SD= .442$ ).

*Trust* was measured using 6 items taken from *Podsakoff et al, 1990*. Participants were asked i.e., "I have a divided sense of loyalty toward my manager". A Five-point likert-type scale was used, and the individual items were averaged (Cronbach's  $\alpha =.818$ ,  $M=3.489$ ,  $SD=.625$ ).

*Commitment* was measured using 12 items taken from *Meyer, Allen and Smith's, 1993 adopted by Chinen and Enomot, 2004*. Participants were asked, i.e., "I feel a strong sense of belonging to company". A Five-point likert-type scale was used, and the individual items were averaged (Cronbach's  $\alpha =.716$ ,  $M= 3.356$ ,  $SD=0.718$ ).

## 2. Result

### *Model of fit*

Evaluate the adequacy of the model of fit, the index of fit show *Goodness of fit* with *Model*. Evaluation of the adequacy of the model of fit are; GFI=.997, AGFI=.979, CFI= .997, NFI = .988, TLI= .991, RMSEA= .036 and RMR=.008. Coefficient of Cronbach's  $\alpha$  measures how well a set of items measures a single unidimensional latent construct. It showed that the items measure a single construct of POP, trust and commitment. Average inter-correlation among items of POP was .817, among items of trust was .818, and among items of commitment was .716.

In order to test the first 3 hypothesis, correlation analysis was used. Hypothesis 1 sought POP is negatively related to commitment. Hypothesis 2 sought that trust is positively related to commitment. Table 1 showed that POP has negative correlation with commitment ( $r=-0.251$ ,  $p<.01$ ), and Trust has positive correlation with commitment ( $r=0.455$ ,  $p<.01$ ). Thus, hypothesis 1 and hypothesis 2 was supported.

Table 1  
Correlation and Cronbach's  $\alpha$  coefficient

	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1. Gender	1.42	.495	-											
2. Year Graduate	7.11	6.09	-.084	-										
3. Education Grade	4.88	1.07	-.049	-.212**	-									
4. Marital	1.42	.53	.253**	-.328**	.009	-								
5. Children	1.99	1.08	.008	.251*	.111	-.195	-							
6. Boss position	1.60	.49	.030	-.073	-.068	-.058	-.138	-						
7. Ages	36.54	57.5	-.074	.071	.041	.013	.437**	.047	-					
8. experience	7.75	6.35	-.160*	.530**	.221**	-.265**	.441**	-.133*	.053	-				
9. Tenure	5.26	5.32	-.089	.321**	.293**	-.260**	.385**	-.064	.021	.764**	-			
10. POP	2.83	.46	.015	-.128	.020	.089	-.136	-.037	-.127*	-.096	-.013	-		
11. Trust	3.49	.64	-.095	.152*	-.098	-.026	-.015	-.020	.147*	.077	.053	-.424**	-	
12. Commitment	3.33	.72	-.127*	.180**	-.054	-.168**	.248*	.082	.535**	.167*	.162*	-.251**	.455**	-

\* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

\*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Mediation effect of trust on the relationship between perception of organization politics and commitment

To test hypothesis 3 that sought trust mediate the relation between perception of organizational politics and commitment, used multiple regression of POP on commitment and POP with trust on commitment together. Trust will known as mediator if trust will not have a significant effect on commitment in a second step regression ( $\beta'$ ). Regression equations used to assess mediation was:

$$Y = C_1 + \beta X + e_1 \quad \text{Equation 1}$$

$$Y = C_2 + \beta' X + bM + e_2 \quad \text{Equation 2}$$

$$M = C_3 + aX + e_3 \quad \text{Equation 3}$$

Where Y represented the dependent variable, X is the independent variable, M is the mediating variable or mediator,  $\beta$  represents the relation between the independent variable to the dependent variable in the first equation,  $\beta'$  is the parameter relating the independent variable to the dependent variable adjusted for effects of the mediator, b is the parameter relating the mediator to the dependent variable adjusted for the effect of the independent variable, a is the parameter relating the independent variable to the mediating variable,  $e_1$ ,  $e_2$ , and  $e_3$  represent unexplained or error variability, and intercept are  $C_1$ ,  $C_2$ , and  $C_3$ . The parameters of this model can be estimated by multiple regression. Equation 1 defines the total effect of POP on Commitment. Equation 2 and 3 define the mediation model of trust on POP - Commitment relationships.

We firstly regressed the POP on trust and commitment partially, then regressed POP and trust together on commitment. The effect of POP on trust on the equation 3 was -.424, and on commitment on the equation 1 was -.251. These effects were significant,  $p < .01$ . Including the mediator, the effect of

POP on commitment on the equation 2 was become not significant,  $\beta = -.071$ ,  $p > .05$ . Trust will mediate the POP-commitment relationship when the direct effect of POP on commitment (equation 1) was significant and become not significant if trust was included (equation 2). Table-II showed that trust mediates the relationship between PoP and Commitment ( $\beta = -.251^{**}$ ;  $\beta' = -.071^*$ ), thus hypothesis-3 was supported. And the indirect effect from PoP mediated by trust to commitment is  $.424 \times .426 = .18$  (path coefficient).

Table II  
Table Mediation effect analysis of trust on PoP-outcomes relationship

	Trust (M)	Commitment (Y)	
		$\beta$ Step1	$\beta'$ Step2
POP (X)	-.424**	-.251**	-.071**
Trust (Y)	-.**	-.**	.426**
R <sup>2</sup>	.180**	.063**	.211**
F	56.689**	17.939**	34.597**
$\Delta R^2$			.205**
F change			48.604**

\*  $p < .05$ . ; \*\*  $p < .01$ .

Hypothesis 4, sough that employee who has higher trust was seen stronger PoP-commitment relationship than those who has lower ones. This prediction tested with multiple regression models that included the POP interaction to trust. Trust will moderate the POP-commitment relationship if the effect of POP(X) - trust (Z) interaction to commitment ( $\beta = -.132$   $p < .05$ ) and F change values  $X * Z$  (F change = 5.208,  $p < .05$ ) were significant. Table III showed that trust moderate the relationship between POP and Commitment ( $\beta = -.132$   $p < .05$ ; F change = 5.208,  $p < .05$ ), thus hypothesis-4 is supported.

Mediation effect of trust on the relationship between perception of organization politics and commitment

Table III  
Moderation effect analysis of trust to POP- commitment correlation

	Commitment (Y)		
	R	β in regression	
		Step 1	Step2
Perception of Organizational Politics (X)	-.251**	-.071**	-.093**
Trust (Z)	.455**	.426**	.453**
X * Z		-	-.132**
R <sup>2</sup>		.211*	.227**
F		34.597**	25.177**
Δ R <sup>2</sup>			.016**
F change			5.208**

\* p < .05. ; \*\* p < .01.

Figure 2 explain the interaction using the standardize regression weight, plotting POP at below and upper of trust mean. The independent variables of POP and trust has been mean-centered (minus by the variable means) in order to avoid the multicollinearity among independent variables and moderator. Employee who has higher on trust showed stronger ( $\beta = -.153$ ;  $n = 109$ ) POP-commitment relationship than those employees who has less on trust ( $\beta = -.149$ ;  $n = 152$ ).




Figure 2 contribution of trust x POP interaction to commitment

## 4. Conclusion

### 5.1. Discussion

This study continues to broaden the explanation of commitment antecedent and within the consequence of organizational politics (Poon, 2003; Vigoda, 2000) and the consequence perception of equity. To find out the deeper explanations of these perceptions and commitment relationship, trust was used as a mediation effect on these two relationships (Muller and Judd, 2005; MacKinnon, 2008). This mediation effect was also used to explain why POP and commitment are related. Finding of the direct relationship between POP and trust with commitment was found consistent with previous studies (Nye and with, 1993, Cropanzano et al, 1997, Maslyn and Fedor 1998, Vigoda-gadot et al, 2003, Tansky et al, 1997, Robert et al, 1999, Lemons, 2001, Hopkins et al, 2006, Powell et al, 2006, N'Goala, 2007, Brian et al, 2008). POP-commitment relationship findings were still explained as a negative relationship within the range of Cropanzano and Vigoda-gadot study ( $-.13 \sim r = -.251 \sim -.70$ ).

To explain why and how the POP and commitment are related, finding of mediation of trust answered this POP and commitment relationship. Trust was able to improve the effect of PoP with Commitment relationship, significantly. It was consistent with previous studies (Judge, 2007, Ertürk, A., 2007), that though trust has a fully mediated the relationship between organizational justice and outcomes. Thus, intervention of trust on perception of organization politics would have significant effect on the commitment changes. Other finding is that trust moderated the relationship between POP and commitment. This finding explained the strength and direction of POP commitment relationship. In an inverse direction, the higher of employee

trust will strengthen the POP-Commitment relationship, than the lower one. This study proved the previous study that trust is a potential moderator between variables (Goris et al, 2003).

## 5.2. *Managerial Implication*

Relationship between POP and trust with commitment has number of implications because of their complexity and uniqueness. Firstly, in order to increase the employee's commitment based on political perception point of view, the manager/leaders should making sure the situation of political behaviors in the workplace was controllable (Ferris & Kacmar, 1992; Kacmar & Carlson, 1997). Increase the trustworthy to organization will also able to decrease negative effect of POP on commitment. This study found that the path coefficient of trust avoided the negative effect on commitment. Secondly, regarding to the moderator effect of trust, the situation of high trust in the relationship between POP and commitment, managers could playing risky with decrease trust to reduce the power of POP-commitment relationship within the limit of its significances. This process must be followed with increasing trust to decrease and avoid the negative effect of POP on commitment.

Other management implication of these relationship are; the leader have to point out the reality of work it self (Lewin, 1936) equally percept both by employee or managers their self (Brian K et al, 2008). The leaders also may reduce the risk of opportunistic behavior, and develop a long-term orientation of employee's work (Arrow, 1974; Williamson, 1975, 1979; Anderson and Weitz, 1989; Ganesan, 1994). Finally, Leaders should build the productive organization culture and productive working system (creed et al.,

1996; bradac et al., 1989, Dan et al, 2005) to improve the working environment (Porter and Lawler, 1968).

### 5.3. *Limitation and Future Research Direction*

Notwithstanding these contributions, this study also has several limitations. Although this allows us to rule out employee perception of organization politics on the job related explanations for the observed findings (i.e., trust and commitment), it is an open question as to whether these results on different complexities (such as different and complex individual or group player within organization). By incorporating the issue of POP antecedents, the future studies were hope to make an advance contribution to understanding of how to manage organizational politics, precisely, gaining higher behavioral and attitudinal outcomes. Another possible direction for further development is to investigate the impact of trust on the relationship between POP and others work behavioral and attitudinal outcomes.

Trust that is needed within uncertainty situation perspectives might be expanded to others situational perspective based on the specific motivational theory background. Comparison of the different perspective and motivational theory may determine when and under what circumstances trust will contribute more preferable outcomes.

Additional longitudinal study on POP is needed so that its consequences can more fully understand. Future study could investigate more time points to determine the future POP able to influence the outcomes. Finally, although these results support most of our hypotheses, additional research should be conducted to measure different outcomes, investigate other mediation variables, or trying to compare the sub conditions such as political perception

Mediation effect of trust on the relationship between perception of organization politics and commitment

for profit versus non-profit organizations, or private versus public sectors, home country versus host country strategic perspectives.

**References**

1. Adams, J. S. (1963). Toward an understanding of inequity. **Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology**, 67: 422- 436.
2. Alma, Mintu-Wimsatt, 2005, Equity Sensitivity and Negotiation Behaviors: A Look at Mexican Exporters, **Academy of Marketing Science Review**, Vol. 2005; p. 1
3. Ammeter, A. P., Douglas, C., Ferris, G. R., & Goka, H, 2004, A social relationship of trust and accountability in organizations, **Human Resource Management Review**, 14, 47–65.
4. Anderson, E. and Weitz, B. (1989), "Determinants of continuity in conventional industrial channel dyads", **Marketing Science**, Vol. 8 No. 4, Fall, pp. 310-23.
5. Anderson, E. and Weitz, B. (1992), "The use of pledges to build and sustain commitment in distribution channels", **Journal of Marketing Research**, Vol. 24, pp. 18-34.
6. Andrew C Smith, Jason C Laurent (2008), Allocating Value Among Different Classes of Equity, **Journal of Accountancy**. New York: Mar 2008. Vol. 205, Iss. 3; pg. 50, 7 pgs
7. Arie Shirom, Mina Westman, Samuel Melamed, 1999, The effects of pay systems on blue-collar employees' emotional distress: The mediating effects of objective and subjective work monotony, **Human Relations**, Vol. 52, Iss. 8; pg. 1077, 21 pgs
8. Arrow, KJ. (1974), *The Limits of Organization*, **W.W. Norton & Company, Inc.**, New York, NY.
9. Bertil 2007, Customer segmentation: The concepts of trust, commitment and relationships, **Journal of Targeting, Measurement and Analysis for Marketing**. London: Sep 2007. Vol. 15, Iss. 4; pg. 256, 14 pgs
10. Birnbaum, D. and Somers, M.J. (1998). Work-related commitment and job performance: It's also the nature of the performance that counts. **Journal of Organizational Behavior**, 19, 621-634.
11. Brian K Miller; Kay McGlashan Nicols, 2008, Politics and Justice: A Mediated Moderation Model, **Journal of Managerial Issues**; Summer 2008; 20, 2; ABI/INFORM Global, pg. 214
12. Bruce J McNeil (2006), Equity-Based Compensation: A Road Map for Compliance with Sarbanes-Oxley and Internal Revenue Code Section 409A, **Journal of Deferred Compensation**, New York: Spring 2006. Vol. 11, Iss. 3; pg. 54, 32 pgs
13. Campell, J. P. (1990). Modeling the prediction problem in industrial and organizational psychology. In M.D. Dunnette, & L.M. Hough (Eds.), **Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 2<sup>d</sup> Ed.**: 687-732. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychology Press.
14. Caplan RD, Job, S., French JR, J.R.P., Horrison, R.V., Pinneau, S.R., J.R., 1975, Job Demand and worker health: main effect and occupational difference, Washington DC, US., Department of health, education and welfare
15. Cropanzano, R., Howes, J. C., Grandey, A. A., & Toth, P. 1997, The relationship of organizational politics and support to work behaviors, attitudes, and stress, **Journal of Organizational Behavior**, 18, 159–180.
16. Dan S. Chiaburu, Sophia V. Marinova, 2005, Employee role enlargement Interactions of trust and organizational fairness, **Leadership & Organization Development Journal**, Vol. 27 No. 3, 2006, pp. 168-182
17. David Bruner, Michael Mckee, Rudy Santore (2008), Hand in the Cookie Jar: An Experimental Investigation of Equity-Based Compensation and Managerial Fraud. **Southern Economic Journal**, Stillwater: Jul 2008. Vol. 75, Iss. 1; pg. 261, 18 pgs

18. De Boer, E. M., Bakker, A. B., Syroit, J. E., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2002). Unfairness at work as a predictor of absenteeism. **Journal of Organizational Behavior**, 23: 181- 197.
19. Deutsch, M, 1960, the effect of motivational orientation upon trust and suspicion. **Human Relation**, 13. 123-139
20. Drummond, H. (2000). Introduction to organizational behaviour. New York: Oxford, **University Press**.
21. Dwyer, F.R., Schurr, P.H. and Oh, S. (1987), "Developing buyer-seller relationships", **Journal of Marketing**, Vol. 51 No. 2, pp. 11-27.
22. Dyer, J. H., & Chu, W. 2003. The role of trustworthiness in educing transaction costs and improving performance: Empirical evidence from the United States, Japan, and Korea, **Organization Science**, 14: 57-68.
23. Eric W.T. Ngai, Vincent C.S. Heung, Y.H. Wong, Fanny K.Y. Chan, 2007, Consumer complaint behavior of Asians and non-Asians about hotel services; An empirical analysis, **European Journal of Marketing**, Vol. 41, Iss. 11/12; pg. 1375
24. Ertürk, Alper, 2007, Increasing organizational citizenship behaviors of Turkish academicians; Mediating role of trust in supervisor on the relationship between organizational justice and citizenship behaviors, **Journal of Managerial Psychology**. Bradford: 2007. Vol. 22, Iss. 3; pg. 257
25. Folger, R., & Cropanzano, R. (1998). Organizational Justice And Human Resource Management. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
26. Folger, R., & Greenberg, J. (1985). Procedure Justice: an interpretative analysis of personnel system. **Research in Personnel and Human Resource Management**, 3: 141- 183.
27. Gadot, V (2006) Citizens' Perceptions of Politics and Ethics, **Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory**, 285-305
28. Ganesan, S, 1994, Determinants of long-term orientation in buyer-seller relationship. **Journal of marketing**, 60, 1-9
29. Ganesan, S. (1994), "Determinants of long-term orientation in buyer-seller relationships", **journal of Marketing**, Vol. 58, pp. 1-19.
30. Goris, Jose R.; Vaught, Bobby C.; Pettit Jr. John D., 2003, Effects of Trust in Superiors and Influence of Superiors on the Association Between Individual-job congruence and job performance/satisfaction, **Journal of Business and Psychology**; 17, 3; ABI/INFORM Global, pg. 327
31. Goris, Jose R.; Vaught, Bobby C.; Pettit Jr., John D., 2003, Effects of Trust in Superiors and Influence of Superiors on the Association Between individual-job congruence and job performance/satisfaction, **Journal of Business and Psychology**; 17, 3; ABI/INFORM Global pg. 327
32. Greenberg, J. (1986). Determinants of perceived fairness of performance evaluation. **Journal of Applied Psychology**, 71 (2): 340- 342.
33. Hopkins, Sharon M, Weathington, Bart L, 2006, The Relationships Between Justice Perceptions, Trust, and Employee Attitudes in a Downsized Organization, **The Journal of Psychology**, Vol. 140, Iss. 5; pg. 477, 22 pgs
34. Hunt, S.D., Chonko, L.B. and Wood, V.R. (1985). Organizational commitment and marketing. **Journal of Marketing**, 49, 112-126.
35. Huseman, Richard C., Hatfield, John D., Miles, Edward W, 1987, A New Perspective on Equity Theory: The Equity Sensitivity Construct, **The Academy of Management Review**. Briarcliff Manor: Apr 1987. Vol. 12, Iss. 2; pg. 222, 13 pgs
36. Ingram, T.N. Lee, K.S. and Skinner, J. (1989). An assessment of sales person motivation, commitment and job outcomes. **Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management**, 9, 25-33.

Mediation effect of trust on the relationship between perception of organization politics and commitment

37. Jin Feng Uen and Shu Hwa Chien (2004) Compensation Structure, Perceived Equity and Individual Performance of R&D Professionals, **Journal of American Academy of Business**, Cambridge. Hollywood. Vol. 4, Iss. 1/2; pg. 401
38. Johnson, J.T., Barksdale, H. Jr and Boles, J.S. (2001b), "The strategic role of the salesperson in reducing customer defection in business relationships", **Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management**, Vol. 21 No. 2, pp. 123-35.
39. Johnson, M.D., Gustafsson, A., Andreassen, T.W., Lervik, L. and Cha, J. (2001a), "The evolution and future of national customer satisfaction index models", **Journal of Economic Psychology**, Vol. 22 No. 2, pp. 217-45.
40. Kacmar, K.M., Bozeman, D.P., Carlson, D.S. and Anthony, W.P. (1999), "An examination of the perceptions of organizational politics model: replication and extension", **Human Relations**, Vol. 52, pp. 383-416.
41. Kanter, R. M. (1987). The attack on pay. **Harvard Business Review**, 2: 60- 67.
42. Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1978). *The social psychology of organizations*, N.Y.: Wiley.
43. Kerr, S. (1999). Practical, cost-neutral alternatives that you may know, but don't practice. **Organizational Dynamics**, 28(1): 61- 70.
44. Khumar P and R. Ghadially (1989), Organization politics and its effects on member of organization, **human relation**, vol. 42, pp. 305-314.
45. Konopaske, R. & Werner, S. (2002). Equity in non-North American contexts: Adapting equity theory to the new global business environment. **Human Resource Management Review**, 12(3): 405- 418
46. Kotabe, Masaaki, Dubinsky, Alan J., Chae Un Lim, 1992, Perceptions of Organizational Fairness: A Cross-National Perspective, **International Marketing Review**, Vol. 9, Iss. 2; p. 41, 18 pages
47. Ladebo, Olugbenga Jelil, 2006, Olugbenga Jelil Ladebo, Perceptions of Organisational Politics, Examination of a Situational Antecedent and Consequences among Nigerias, **International Association for Applied Psychology**, 55 (2), 255-281
48. Ladebo, Olugbenga Jelil, 2006, perception of trust and employees attitudes: A look at Nigeria's Agricultural extentions worker, **Journal of Business and Psychology**, Vol. 20, No. 3
49. Lado, Augustine; Wilson, Mary C, 1994, Human Resource System and Sustained Competitive Advantage: A Competency Based Perspective, **The Academy of Management Review**.
50. Lawler, J. E. E. (1995). The new pay: a strategic approach. **Compensation & Benefit Review**, 27: 14- 22.
51. Lawler, J. E. E., and Ledford, G.E. (1985). Skill-base pay: A concept that's catching on. **Personnel**, 62: 30- 37.
52. Lawler, E. E. III (1990). *Strategic pay*. San Francisco: JosseyBass.
53. Lee, T. W. and Mowday, R.T. (1989). Voluntary leaving an organization: An empirical investigation of Steers and Mowday's Model of Turnover. **Academy of Management Journal**, 30, 721-743.
54. Lemons, Mary A , Jones, Coy A, 2001, Procedural justice in promotion decisions: Using perceptions of fairness to build employee commitment, **Journal of Managerial Psychology**. Vol. 16, Iss. 4; pg. 268, 13 pgs
55. Mathieu, J. and Zajac, D. (1990). A review and meta analysis of the antecedents, correlates and consequences of organizational commitment. **Psychology Bulletin**, 108, 171-194.
56. Mead, M., 1937, *Cooperation and competition among primitive people*, new york: Mc Graw-hill

57. Meyer, J., Paunonen, S., Gellatly, I., Goffin, R. and Jackson, D. (1989). Organizational commitment and job performance: it's the nature of commitment that counts. **Journal of Applied Psychology**, 74, 152-156.
58. Milkovich, G. T. (1987). Compensation System in High Technology Companies. In D.B. Balkin and L.R. Gomez-Mejia (Eds.) **New Perspectives on Compensation**, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
59. Milkovich, G. T., & Newman, J.M. (1999). Compensation, 6th Ed. **McGraw- Hill**.
60. Motowildo, S. J., & Van Scotter, J. R. (1994), Evidence that task performance should be distinguished from the contextual performance. **Journal of Applied Psychology**, 79: 475-480.
61. Muller, Dominique, Judd, Charless M, Yzebyt, Vincent Y, 2005, When moderation is mediated and mediation is moderated, **Journal of personality and Social psychology**, Vol. 89, No. 6, 852-863
62. Newman, J. M. (1989). Compensation program for special employee group. **Compensation and Benefit**, 3: 182- 215.
63. N'Goala, Gilles 2007, Customer switching resistance (CSR); The effects of perceived equity, trust and relationship commitment, **International Journal of Service Industry Management**, Vol. 18, Iss. 5; pg. 510
64. Organ, D. W. (1988). Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Good Soldier Syndrome. Lexington, MA: Lexington Book.
65. Peter Boxall (1998), Achieving Competitive Advantage Through Human Resource Strategy: Towards A Theory of Industry dynamics, **Human Resource Management review**, Volume 8, Number 3,1998, pages 265-288
66. Pfeffer, J. (1995). Producing sustainable competitive advantage through the effective management of people. **Academy of Management Executive**, 9: 55-69.
67. Pfeffer, J., & Langton, N. (1993). The effects of wage dispersion on satisfaction, productivity, and working collaboratively: Evidence from college and university faculty. **Administration science Quarterly**, 38 (3): 382- 4017.
68. Porter, LW. & Lawler, E.E. (1968). Managerial attitudes and performance. Homewood, Illinois: **Irwin**
69. Powell, Anne, Galvin, John, Piccoli, Gabriele, 2006 Antecedents to team member commitment from near and far; A comparison between collocated and virtual teams, **Information Technology & People**, Vol. 19, Iss. 4; pg. 299
70. Richard S Allen, Charles S White (2002), Equity sensitivity theory: A test of responses to two types of under-reward situations, **Journal of Managerial Issues**. Pittsburg: Winter 2002. Vol. 14, Iss. 4; pg. 435, 17 pgs
71. Roberts, James A, Coulson, Kevin R, Chonko, Lawrence B, 1999, Salesperson perceptions of equity and justice and their impact on organizational commitment and intent to turnover, **Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice**, Vol. 7, Iss. 1; pg. 1, 16 pgs
72. Sager J.K. and Johnston, M.W. (1989). Antecedents and outcomes of organizational commitment: A study of sale people. **Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management**, 9, 30-41.
73. Samuel Aryee, Pawan S Budhwar, Zhen Xiong Chen, 2002, Trust as a mediator of the relationship between organizational justice and work outcomes: Test of a social exchange model, **Journal of Organizational Behavior**, Vol. 23, Iss. 3; pg. 267
74. Shelley, Peterson, 2001, Teachers' perceptions of gender equity in writing assessment, **English Quarterly**, Vol. 33, Iss. 1/2; p. 22
75. Sockley-zalabackP., Ellis, K., and Winograd, G., 2000, Organizational trust: what it mean. Why it matters. **Organization Development Journal**, Vol 18, pp. 35-48

Mediation effect of trust on the relationship between perception of organization politics and commitment

76. Staikovic, A. D. & Luthans. F. (2001). Differential effects of incentive motivators on work performance. **Academy of Management Journal**, 44(3): 580- 590.
77. Tansky, Judith W, Gallagher, Daniel G, Wetzels, Kurt W 1997, The effect of demographics, work status, and relative equity on organizational commitment: Looking among part-time workers, **Revue Canadienne des Sciences de l'Administration**, Vol. 14, Iss. 3; pg. 315, 12 pgs
78. Tax, S.S., Brown, S.W. and Chandrashekar, M. (1998), "Customer evaluations of service complaint experiences: implications for relationship marketing", **Journal of Marketing**, Vol. 60/62 No. 2, pp. 60-76.
79. Vigoda-Gadot, E., Vinarski-Peretz, H., & Ben-Zion, E. 2003, Politics and image in the organizational landscape, **Journal of Managerial Psychology**, 18, 764-787.
80. Ward, E.A and Davis, E. (1995). The effect of benefit satisfaction on organizational commitment. **Compensation and Benefits Management**, 11(3), 35-40
81. Weiner, N.J. (1991). Job evaluation systems: a critique. **Human Resource Management Review**, 34: 86- 109.
82. Williamson, O.E. (1979), "Transaction-cost economics: the governance of contractual relations", **Journal of Law and Economics**, Vol. 22, pp. 233-60.
83. Williamson, O.E. (1975), *Markets and Hierarchies: Analysis and Antitrust Implications*, **The Free Press**, New York, NY.
84. Witt, L.A. (1998), Enhancing organizational goal congruence: a solution to organizational politics, **Journal of Applied Psychology**, Vol. 83, pp. 666-74.
85. Zaheer, A., McEvily, B., & Perrone, V. 1998. Does trust matter? Exploring the effects of interorganizational and interpersonal trust on performance, **Organization Science**, 9: 141-159.

Biographical notes:

**Setyabudi Indartono** is a Doctoral Student in Department of Business Administration, National Central University, Taiwan. Lecturer of Management Department, Yogyakarta state University, Indonesia. His Major interest field of research includes Leadership, and Organizational Behavior  
Department of Business Administration  
National Central University  
No. 300, Jungda Rd, Jhongli City  
Taoyuan, Taiwan 320, ROC