ELK
Asia Pacific Journals

www.elkjournals.com

IMPACT OF ORGANIZATIONAL TRUST ON EMPLOYEE MORALE

Samithamby Senthilnathan

PhD in Business (Finance, NZ), MSc in Mgnt. (SL),
BSc in Business Administration (SL)
Senior Lecturer in Department of Accounting and
Finance, Nilai University, Malaysia
E-mail: sennathans@yahoo.com

Kamalachandran Rukshani

Assistant Lecturer, Discipline of Human Resource
Management, Department of Management, FCM
Eastern University, Sri Lanka, Chenkalady 30350,
Sri Lanka
E-mail: sheebaeusl@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

This study attempts to investigate the extent to which the organizational trust of these employees is significantly related to employee morale in comparison between Sri Lanka Telecom and Ceylon Electricity Board in Trincomalee Town and Gravets, Sri Lanka. Findings explore a positive significant relationship between organizational trust and employee morale. Comparatively, correlation coefficient of the relationship is higher for the employees in Sri Lanka Telecom than for the employees in Ceylon Electricity Board. Further, results indicate that all employees in both organizations have high level attributes of organizational trust and employee morale. Comparatively, Sri Lanka Telecom has higher level attribute in organizational trust and Ceylon Electricity Board has higher level attribute in employee morale. Extended analysis confirms that there is a difference between mean values of organizational trust and employee morale in Sri Lanka Telecom and Ceylon Electricity Board in Trincomalee Town and Gravets, Sri Lanka.

Keywords: Organizational Trust, Employee Morale, Univariate and Bivariate Analyses

1. INTRODUCTION

Employees are the most valuable asset and main actors in an organization. They are associated with organizational aspects and functionalities, and provide meaning to its performances by achieving organizational objectives and goals. Hence, the degree of employees' feelings is referred to as their mental status, which is understood as the morale.

Employee Morale is an exceptional determinant of organizational health and becomes important, since organizational performance and efficiency depends on it. Morale implies that how employees positively and supportively feel about and to their organization (Haddock, 2010). An organization needs to create some positive impacts on the minds of its employees to have positive morale of employees. These positive impacts make the employees to have initially trust and a strong association

with the organization. Therefore, organizational trust of an employee creates positive morale on the organization (e.g., Fard *et al.*, 2010a).

Even though Fard *et al.* (2010a) indicate positive relationship of organizational trust to employees' morale, they question the extent to which the public organizations in electricity supply and telecommunication industry have created organizational trust of employees with positive impacts on their minds to have positive morale. This study considers the same and attempts to investigate the relationship of organizational trust to employee morale, particularly in relation to Sri Lanka Telecom (SLT) and Ceylon Electricity Board (CEB) in Trincomalee Town and Gravets, for two reasons: (a) Fard *et al.* (2010a) endorse significant relationship between the study variables, and (b) the entities are public organizations.

By focusing on the relationship of organizational trust to employee morale, organizations can be benefitted to retain best employees for producing their high level performances. Employees' high level performances in aggregate can result in improved organizational performances and this can lead to increase organizational market share. Hence, this study can facilitate organizational decision makers and managers to explore the factors that

contribute to determine the organizational trust and employee morale.

The results of this study indicate that there is a positive significant relationship between organizational trust and employee morale. In comparison, correlation is higher for the employees in SLT than for the employees in CEB. Further, results indicate that all employees in both organizations have high level attributes of organizational trust and employee morale. In comparison, SLT has higher level attribute in organizational trust and CEB has higher level attribute in employee morale. This study has extended to investigate the mean difference between the organizations. The results confirm that the mean values of organizational trust in SLT and CEB in Trincomalee Town and Gravets are statistically significantly different. This is also consistent for the variable of employee morale too.

The rest of the paper is organized with problem statement and objectives of the study, literature review and conceptualization, methodology and hypotheses, results of data analysis and interpretation, and conclusion.

2. PROBLEM STATEMENT AND OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

Fard *et al.* (2010b) state that job performance and organizational

commitment of a workforce in public organizations of Iran is low. This implies that low level of employee commitment in public organizations can cause for low organizational trust, thus resulting in high employee turnover. This is similar in Sri Lanka, generally in the government sector and is observed that employee morale in private sector is higher than the public sector organization. This implies that government employees have low morale and this might have resulted with low organisational trust. Therefore, this study considers SLT and CEB in Trincomalee Town and Gravets in Sri Lanka. SLT and CEB are mostly government owned institutions¹. Therefore, it is questionable the extent to which, the organisational trust has relationship with employee morale in SLT and CEB in Trincomalee Town and Gravets.

Therefore, the primary objective of this study is to examine the relationship between Organizational Trust (OT) and Employee Morale (EM) in SLT and CEB in Trincomalee Town and Gravets. Further, this study also focuses on identifying the level of OT and EM in SLT and CEB in

Trincomalee Town and Gravets, as the secondary objectives of this study.

3. LITERATURE REVIEW AND CONCEPTUALIZATION

Nowadays, organizations always focus on their strategic and overall performances. The creating morale of employees is important and it becomes an essential component of human resource management in carrying out business operations, since job performances and efficiency of an employee depend on the employee's morale. According to Bowles and Cooper (2009), the morale is defined as *"the state of individual psychological wellbeing based upon a sense of confidence and usefulness and purpose."*

Child (1941) explains that morale is a condition of mental health; it contributes to a person to act effectively and confidently; and it highly interests him/her in performing his/her duties. Simply, morale means how individuals feel about performing tasks at a particular point in time (Watson, 1988). Guion (1958) considers morale as a personal phenomenon. He states that the extent to which an employee feels overall satisfaction in his/her job. Ransom (1995) also states that high morale of employees in organizations leads to more productive than competition. All of the above definitions imply that attaining high

¹ The SLT is a semi-government organization (the ownership shares of SLT are distributed among Sri Lanka government 49.5%, Global Telecommunication Holdings N.V. of Netherlands 44.98%, and the rest 5.52% by the public – source: Sri Lanka Telecom Annual Report, 2011). Similarly, CEB is a board with the ownership by government-Source: Ceylon Electricity Board Annual Report and Accounts 2010.

standards of morale is important to expose the feelings of employees and their abilities in the work. Linz *et al.* (2006) indicate positive relationship between expected rewards and morale among the Russian employees. They explore that expected monetary rewards exhibit a greater influence on morale than expected non-monetary rewards. Their results indicate that there is a strong positive correlation of morale with performance assessment and work attitudes.

Ngambi (2011) indicates that leadership approaches can influence the staff morale. His results reveal that the new leadership initiatives have positive impacts on morale and have significantly reduced the intentions of employees to leave their organization. Neely (1999) concludes that there is strong direct correlation between morale and productivity. According to Munck (2001), employee turnover causes a decrease in productivity and often contributes to low employee morale.²

Fard *et al.* (2010a) indicate that organizational trust leads to organizational effectiveness and has impacts on intrapersonal and interpersonal relationships inside and outside of an organization. Zalabak *et al.* (2000) define

organizational trust as the positive expectation that the employees have about organizational roles, experiences, and mutual dependency. Gilbert and Tang (1998) define organizational trust as the feeling of confidence and support in an organization. Mishra (1996) indicate “*Organizational trusts as a unidirectional tendency toward susceptibility to other party*”, where the employees have perceived that their organization has no lack in reliability, openness and trustworthiness, compared to other (party) organization concerned.

According to Laschinger *et al.* (2011), high level of organizational trust requires a change in organization. However, the organizational change itself, in other way, can dilute the organizational effectiveness and trust. The increasing level of workload and job insecurity can lead to: (a) downsizing the number of employees and (b) affecting employee trust and morale. Laschinger *et al.* (2011) also indicate that some common characteristics of organizations with low trust lead to: an increasing rate of absenteeism, extended breaks, lack of learning habits, unwillingness to accept responsibilities, negative thinking and reactive behaviour, and low level of creativity.

Though many factors determine organizational trust and employee moral

² Senthilnathan and Rukshani (2013) explore the literatures outlines illustratively how the morale of employees contributes to other aspects of business and management.

(see Figure 1 of Senthilnathan and Rukshani, 2013), Fard *et al.* (2010a) explain that organizational trust leads to improvement of an employee's morale. The study concludes positive correlation ($r = 0.71$) between organizational trust and employee morale in public sector organizations. Many studies have investigated the relationship of organizational trust to other variables: commitment and involvement (e.g., Bussing, 2002)³, innovation and empowerment (e.g., Vineburgh, 2010)⁴, conflict (e.g., Hoy and Tschannen-Moran)⁵, Structural empowerment (e.g., Laschinger and Finegan, 2005)⁶, Human Resource Management Practices (e.g., Whitener, 1997)⁷ etc.

Fard *et al.* (2010a) endorses significant role of organizational trust to predict employee morale. This study conceptualizes, as in Figure 1, the relationship between organizational trust as the independent variable and employee

morale as the dependent variable. This study assesses organizational trust with ten dimensions as in Fard *et al.* (2010a and 2010b): “*competency, preciosity and rectitude, reliability, honesty, vulnerability, attention to employees, feelings of existence and identity, mutual supervision, satisfaction and commitment*”, and employee morale with eleven dimensions based on Fard *et al.* (2010a): “*honoring the job, dependency to organization, recommendation to others, job satisfaction, proper Job, helping organization, not changing the organization, not changing job, thought of changing job, peer's view, leaving organization*”.

Figure 1: Conceptual Framework of the Study

(Source: Adapted from Fard *et al.*, 2010a)

4. METHODOLOGY AND HYPOTHESIS

4.1 Sampling

This study considers only two government-dominated organizations, namely SLT and CEB in Trincomalee Town and Gravets. They consist of 218 employees (83 in SLT and 135 in CEB) as population. The sample size targeted for this study is 100 based on stratified sampling technique. About 180 questionnaires are issued and

³ Bussing (2002) shows significant relationship of organizational trust with morale commitment, alienative commitment, job involvement and work involvement for healthcare personnel.

⁴ Vineburgh (2010) explores support for innovation and empowerment is a positive and significant determinant of organizational trust.

⁵ Low level of interpersonal conflict is significantly linked with high level of organizational trust a negative relationship between them, as explored by Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (1999).

⁶ Laschinger and Finegan (2005) states, there is a positive relationship of structural empowerment to interactional justice perception, as well as to the organizational trust of nurses.

⁷ Whitener (1997) explains that employee trust in an organization can influence the successful implementation of the Human Resource Management (HRM) practices.

only 126 questionnaires have been responded and received. A number of 27 responses are found not fully responded, thus resulting of 99 questionnaires responded. However, the stratified sampling technique has resulted in zero percentage for one executive of CEB Area

Office. Therefore, the study has a special consideration to make the sample size to 100 (see Table 1) by including the response from CEB executive, since this study assumes that adding 1 (1%) can result in insignificant error in results.

Table 1: Sampling

Employee Category	Ceylon Electricity Board (CEB)					Sri Lanka Telecom		Total
	Area Office		DGM Office		CEB Total			
	Pop.	Sam.	Pop.	Sam.		Pop.	Sam.	
Minor Staff	31	15	15	6	21	21	10	31
Clerk	16	7	46	21	28	23	11	39
Technical Staff	8	4	7	3	7	27	12	19
Executive Staff	1	1	11	5	6	12	5	11
Total	56	27	79	35	62	83	38	100

In Table 1, DGM = Deputy General Manager, Pop. = population and Sam. = samples.

4.2 Data

The study basically considers the primary data of questionnaire responses from 100 employees of CEB (62) and SLT (38) in Trincomalee Town and Gravets. The degree of their individual agreement with every statement in relation to dimensions of study variables is measured with Likert's scale (1-5) from every employee's perception point of view. The independent variable 'organizational trust' is measured with 10 dimensions with each indicator (statement); and dependent variable 'employee morale' is with 11 statements, one statement (indicator) for each dimension.

4.3 Data Analysis and Evaluation

4.3.1 Reliability test of data

To confirm the righteousness of data applicably in the context of study problem, reliability test has been carried out, where Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient (CAC) is calculated for statements of each of the dimensions and full set of data collected. Their degrees of reliability are evaluated based on the technique applied in Thusyanthy and Senthilnathan (2012) with reference of the George and Mallery (2003) as:

$CAC \geq 0.9$	Excellent
$0.8 \leq CAC < 0.9$	Good
$0.7 \leq CAC < 0.8$	Acceptable
$0.6 \leq CAC < 0.7$	Questionable
$0.5 \leq CAC < 0.6$	Poor
$CAC < 0.5$	Unacceptable

However, citing Malhotra (2005) and Godard *et al.* (2001), Thusyanthy and Senthilnathan (2012) indicate the data reliability, if the CAC is at least 0.6.

4.3.2 Univariate analysis and evaluation

Central tendency of mean, median and mode is in consideration; and however, the mean value of every dimension and variable is evaluated with its standard deviation, coefficient of variance, standard error of mean, maximum and minimum of data, number of variables, and lower and upper limits of the mean that consist of standard error of the mean and standard normal deviate (Z-value) at the 95% confidence limit.

The mean value is lying in the range of 1-5; and the value of each respondent for a variable is compared with the mean/median value 3, since it is assumed that (a) every respondent is unbiased and represents neutral state of agreement of 3 in the Likert's scale, which (as population mean value 3) lies in a normal distribution with the 95% confidence limit; and (b) the 95% confidence limit is determined with

sample standard deviation, since its population parameter is unknown. Based on the confidence limits, data of the respondents (X_i) for a dimension/variable can be categorized into three as in Tharmi and Senthilnathan (2012), Thusyanthy and Senthilnathan (2012) and Thusyanthy and Senthilnathan (2013) as given in Table 2.

Table 2: Decision Criteria for Univariate Analysis

Range for Decision Criteria	Decision Criteria	Decision Attribute
$X_i < (3 - Z \sigma_x)$	$X_i < 3$	Low Level
$(3 - Z \sigma_x) \leq X_i \leq (3 + Z \sigma_x)$	$X_i = 3$	Moderate Level
$X_i > (3 + Z \sigma_x)$	$X_i > 3$	High Level

Where X_i = mean value of an indicator/dimension/ variable, σ = standard deviation, Z = value of the 95% confidence limit in normal distribution and σ_x = standard error of the mean.

4.3.3 Bivariate analysis and evaluation

In this context, the correlation analysis is carried out to measure the strength of relationship between the study variables organizational trust and employee morale. This study assesses the significance of relationship variables, if the respective p -value of the correlation coefficient is less than the 0.05. However, irrespective of the significance level of the association between the variables, the correlation becomes meaningful to an extent as indicated in Table 3 as in Senthilnathan and Tharmi (2012).

Table 3: Decision Criteria for Bivariate Analysis

Range	Decision Attributes
$r = 0.5$ to 1.0	Strong positive relationship
$r = 0.3$ to 0.49	Medium positive relationship
$r = 0.1$ to 0.29	Weak positive relationship
$r = -0.1$ to -0.29	Weak negative relationship
$r = -0.3$ to -0.49	Medium negative relationship
$r = -0.5$ to -1.0	Strong negative relationship

Note: Table 3 implies no correlation between two variables, if the range of r is: $-0.1 < r < +0.1$.

Testing Hypothesis of Correlation

H_0 : There is no a positive relationship between variables ($p \geq 0.05$)

H_A : There is a positive relationship between variables ($p < 0.05$)

Decision: Accept H_A , if $p < 0.05$.

5. RESULTS OF DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

5.1 Data Reliability

The results of Cranach's alpha test (see Table 4) indicate the reliability of data (all $CAC > 0.6$) that are consistently meaningful to carry out this study as indicated in Malhotra (2005), Godard *et al.* (2001) and Thusyanthy and Senthilnathan (2012) for data reliability.

Table 4: Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient for Variables

Variable	Number of Elements	Overall CAC	CAC of SLT	CAC of CEB
Organizational Trust (OT)	10	0.850	0.846	0.847
OT as a whole with dimensions	11	0.877	0.874	0.875
Employee Morale (EM)	11	0.694	0.624	0.73
EM as a whole with dimensions	12	0.745	0.686	0.775
Reliability for all dimensions only	21	0.838	0.849	0.841
Overall Reliability	23	0.864	0.874	0.867

In this table, SLT = Sri Lanka Telecom, CEB = Ceylon Electricity Board and CAC= Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient

5.2 Univariate Analysis

5.2.1 Organizational trust (OT)

Overall OT has the mean value 4.376 with standard deviation 0.485 (see Table 5 (a)). This implies that level of OT of the samples in SLT and CEB in Trincomalee Town and Gravets is high and it is also noted that about 100 percent of the respondents have the same high level of

attribute of OT. The OT in SLT and CEB reveals mean values 4.497 and 4.302 and standard deviations 0.443 and 0.497, respectively. Consistently in both mostly government owned institutions (government dominated organizations), the OT reveals high level of attributes, individually (see Table 5(b) for SLT and Table 5(c) for CEB). Results further reveal

that mean values for the OT in SLT (4.497) is comparatively higher than the CEB (4.302).

The dimensions of vulnerability (4.560), mutual supervision (4.520) and competency (4.530) have high level of attribute to influence the overall OT, respectively. This is consistent with the employees in SLT (4.605, 4.605 and 4.684, respectively). However, the response of the employees in CEB reveal that dimensions of vulnerability (4.532), mutual supervision (4.468) and honesty (4.532) has high level of mean value to influence the OT, respectively. However, the dimension of attention to employees has comparatively lowest mean values in aggregate (3.930) and for both the organizations SLT (4.211) and CEB individually (3.758).

Fard *et al.* (2010a) point out that public service organizations have mean value of overall OT is 3.13 and also states that value of OT is higher than the mean value of 3. This is consistent with our results of exploring the level of OT. Further, the results of their study reveal that the dimensions of mutual supervision, vulnerability and reliability have the higher rank in their mean value, while the dimension of preciosity and rectitude appears to be with low rank. Notably, our findings are also not much significantly different from Fard *et al.* (2010a) in terms of dimension of preciosity and rectitude.

Though both institutions consistently have higher level of attribute of OT, their mean values are however not approximating to each other (mean value of OT in SLT = 4.497 and CEB = 4.302). Therefore, it is questionable whether the mean values of these institutions for OT are statistically different, though they imply high level of attribute in both organizations in using estimation technique.

Hence, this study extends the analyses to examine the difference between the mean values of OT in these organizations and the following hypotheses are tested.

H_0 = There is no difference between the mean values of OT in SLT and CEB.

H_1 = There is a significant difference between mean values of OT in SLT and CEB.

Decision rule:

Accept H_1 , if $Z_C > Z_T (= 1.96)$

or $Z_C < Z_T (= -1.96)$

Accept H_0 , if $(-1.96 \leq Z_C \leq 1.96)$

Where Z_C = Calculated value of Z using test statistic with normal distribution and Z_T = Table value of Z at 95% confidence limit of normal distribution.

Hypothesis testing concludes that there is statistically significant difference between mean values of OT in SLT and CEB, where $Z_C (2.0459) > Z_T (1.96)$ and H_1 is therefore accepted at the 5% significance level (see Table 6).

Table 5: Organizational Trust and its Dimensions

The Table 5 consists of three sub sets for overall organizational trust (Table 5(a)), organizational trust in SLT (Table 5(b)) and CEB (Table 5(c)). In these tables, OT1 = Vulnerability, OT2 = Mutual supervision, OT3 = Satisfaction, OT4 = Feelings of existence and identity, OT5 = Attention to employees, OT6 = Commitment, OT7 = Reliability, OT8 = Honesty, OT9 = Preciosity and rectitude, OT10 = Competency, OT = Overall organizational trust, CL = Confidence limit, and HIGH = High level attribute.

Table 5(a): Overall organizational trust and its dimensions

Measure	OT1	OT2	OT3	OT4	OT5	OT6	OT7	OT8	OT9	OT10	OT
Mean	4.560	4.520	4.400	4.380	3.930	4.270	4.340	4.490	4.340	4.530	4.376
Standard Deviation	0.574192	0.61101	0.778499	0.599326	1.112418	0.827006	0.669992	0.73161	0.684902	0.688359	0.484532
Coefficient of Variance	0.125919	0.135179	0.176932	0.136832	0.283058	0.193678	0.154376	0.162942	0.157812	0.151956	0.110725
Minimum	3	3	1	3	1	2	2	2	3	2	3.2
Maximum	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
No of data	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Standard Error of mean	0.057419	0.061101	0.07785	0.059933	0.111242	0.082701	0.066999	0.073161	0.06849	0.068836	0.048453
Z value (95%) CL	1.96	1.96	1.96	1.96	1.96	1.96	1.96	1.96	1.96	1.96	1.96
Low Level of mean (<)	2.887458	2.880242	2.847414	2.882532	2.781966	2.837907	2.868682	2.856605	2.865759	2.865082	2.905032
Upper Level of mean (>)	3.112542	3.119758	3.152586	3.117468	3.218034	3.162093	3.131318	3.143395	3.134241	3.134918	3.094968
Decision Attribute	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH

Table 5(b): Sri Lanka Telecom (SLT) - organizational trust and its dimensions

Measure	OT1	OT2	OT3	OT4	OT5	OT6	OT7	OT8	OT9	OT10	OT
Mean	4.605263	4.605263	4.447368	4.552632	4.210526	4.473684	4.473684	4.421053	4.5	4.684211	4.497368
Standard Deviation	0.594546	0.495355	0.760418	0.554947	0.963044	0.76182	0.506009	0.858395	0.647239	0.525319	0.44326
Coefficient of Variance	0.129101	0.107563	0.170982	0.121896	0.228723	0.170289	0.113108	0.194161	0.143831	0.112147	0.09856
Minimum	3	4	2	3	2	2	4	2	3	3	3.5
Maximum	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
No of data	38	38	38	38	38	38	38	38	38	38	38
Standard Error of mean	0.096448	0.080357	0.123356	0.090024	0.156226	0.123584	0.082086	0.13925	0.104996	0.085218	0.071906
Z value (95%) CL	1.96	1.96	1.96	1.96	1.96	1.96	1.96	1.96	1.96	1.96	1.96
Low Level of mean (<)	2.810962	2.8425	2.758222	2.823552	2.693796	2.757776	2.839112	2.72707	2.794208	2.832973	2.859064
Upper Level of mean (>)	3.189038	3.1575	3.241778	3.176448	3.306204	3.242224	3.160888	3.27293	3.205792	3.167027	3.140936
Decision Attribute	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH

Table 5(c): Ceylon Electricity Board (CEB) - organizational trust and its dimensions

Measure	OT1	OT2	OT3	OT4	OT5	OT6	OT7	OT8	OT9	OT10	OT
Mean	4.532258	4.467742	4.370968	4.274194	3.758065	4.145161	4.258065	4.532258	4.241935	4.435484	4.301613
Standard Deviation	0.564459	0.670643	0.794115	0.605152	1.169075	0.846338	0.745159	0.645736	0.693896	0.76009	0.497038
Coefficient of Variance	0.124543	0.150108	0.181679	0.141583	0.311084	0.204175	0.174999	0.142476	0.16358	0.171366	0.115547
Minimum	3	3	1	3	1	2	2	3	3	2	3.2
Maximum	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
No of data	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62
Standard Error of mean	0.071686	0.085172	0.100853	0.076854	0.148473	0.107485	0.094635	0.082009	0.088125	0.096532	0.063124
Z value (95%) CL	1.96	1.96	1.96	1.96	1.96	1.96	1.96	1.96	1.96	1.96	1.96
Low Level of mean (<)	2.859495	2.833063	2.802329	2.849366	2.708993	2.789329	2.814515	2.839263	2.827275	2.810798	2.876277
Upper Level of mean (>)	3.140505	3.166937	3.197671	3.150634	3.291007	3.210671	3.185485	3.160737	3.172725	3.189202	3.123723
Decision Attribute	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH

Hence, this study extends the analyses to examine the difference between the mean values of OT in these organizations and the following hypotheses are tested.

H_0 = There is no difference between the mean values of OT in SLT and CEB.

H_1 = There is a significant difference between mean values of OT in SLT and CEB.

Decision rule:

Accept H_1 , if $Z_C > Z_T (= 1.96)$

or $Z_C < Z_T (= -1.96)$

Accept H_0 , if $(-1.96 \leq Z_C \leq 1.96)$

Where Z_C = Calculated value of Z using test statistic with normal distribution and Z_T = Table value of Z at 95% confidence limit of normal distribution.

Hypothesis testing concludes that there is statistically significant difference between mean values of OT in SLT and CEB, where $Z_C (2.0459) > Z_T (1.96)$ and H_1 is therefore accepted at the 5% significance level (see Table 6).

5.2.2 Employee morale (EM)

Overall EM has the mean value 4.436 with standard deviation 0.376. This implies that level of EM of the samples in Sri Lanka Telecom and CEB in Trincomalee Town

and Gravets is high and it is also noted that about 100 percent of the respondents have the same high level of attribute of EM (see Table 7(a)). the EM in SLT and CEB reveals mean values 4.342 and 4.493 and standard deviations 0.365 and 0.375, respectively. Consistently in both government dominated organizations, the EM reveals mostly high level of attributes, individually (see Tables 7(b) and 7(c)).

Table 6: Institutional Mean Difference of Organizational Trust (OT)

Organizational Trust Measures	SLT	CEB
Mean	4.497368	4.301613
Standard Deviation	0.443260	0.497038
Number of Data	38	62
Z_T for two tail 95% confidence	± 1.96	
Standard error of mean difference	0.095682478	
Test statistic of Z_C	2.045881375	
Decision (as $Z_C > Z_T$)	Accept H_1	

In this table, SLT = Sri Lanka Telecom, CEB = Ceylon Electricity Board, Z_C = calculated value of Z using test statistic with normal distribution and Z_T = table value of Z at 95% confidence limit of normal distribution.

Table 7: Employee Morale and its Dimensions

The Table 7 consists of three sub sets for over all employee morale (Table 7(a)) and employee morale in SLT (Table 7(b)) and in CEB (Table 7(c)). In these tables, EM1 = Honoring the job, EM2 = Dependency to organization, EM3 = Recommendation to others, EM4 = Job satisfaction, EM5 = Proper job, EM6 = Helping organization, EM7 = Leaving organization, EM8 = Not changing job, EM9 = Thought of changing job, EM10 = Peer's view, EM11 = Not changing the organization, EM = Overall employee morale, CL = Confidence limit, HIGH = High level attribute and MOD = Moderate level attribute.

Table 7(a): Overall employee morale and its dimensions

Measure	EM1	EM2	EM3	EM4	EM5	EM6	EM7	EM8	EM9	EM10	EM11	EM
Mean	4.76	4.66	4.55	4.63	4.63	4.62	4.08	4.45	4.68	4.61	3.12	4.4355
Standard Deviation	0.5148	0.5724	0.5925	0.5441	0.5056	0.5646	1.1072	0.5925	0.6176	0.6013	1.4790	0.3763
Coefficient of Variance	0.1082	0.1229	0.1302	0.1175	0.1092	0.1222	0.2714	0.1331	0.1320	0.1304	0.4740	0.0849
Minimum	2	3	3	3	3	3	1	3	2	2	1	3.2727
Maximum	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
No of data	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Standard Error of mean	0.0515	0.0572	0.0592	0.0544	0.0506	0.0565	0.1107	0.0592	0.0618	0.0601	0.1480	0.0376
Z value (95%) CL	1.96	1.96	1.96	1.96	1.96	1.96	1.96	1.96	1.96	1.96	1.96	1.96
Low Level of mean (<)	2.8991	2.8878	2.8839	2.8934	2.9009	2.8893	2.7830	2.8839	2.8790	2.8822	2.7101	2.9262
Upper Level of mean (>)	3.1009	3.1122	3.1161	3.1066	3.0991	3.1107	3.2170	3.1161	3.1210	3.1178	3.2899	3.0738
Decision Attribute	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	MOD	HIGH

Table 7(b): Sri Lanka Telecom (SLT) – employee morale and its dimensions

Measure	EM1	EM2	EM3	EM4	EM5	EM6	EM7	EM8	EM9	EM10	EM11	EM
Mean	4.8158	4.5789	4.5789	4.5526	4.5789	4.4737	3.8421	4.3158	4.6316	4.7105	2.6842	4.3421
Standard Deviation	0.3929	0.6831	0.6423	0.5549	0.5004	0.6872	1.3661	0.5745	0.6747	0.5151	1.4162	0.3651
Coefficient of Variance	0.0816	0.1492	0.1403	0.1219	0.1093	0.1536	0.3556	0.1331	0.1457	0.1093	0.5276	0.08419
Minimum	4	3	3	3	4	3	1	3	2	3	1	3.5455
Maximum	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
No of data	38	38	38	38	38	38	38	38	38	38	38	38
Standard Error of mean	0.0637	0.1108	0.1042	0.0900	0.0812	0.1115	0.2216	0.0932	0.1094	0.0836	0.2297	0.0592
Z value (95%) CL	1.96	1.96	1.96	1.96	1.96	1.96	1.96	1.96	1.96	1.96	1.96	1.96
Low Level of mean (<)	2.8751	2.7828	2.7958	2.8236	2.8409	2.7815	2.5656	2.8173	2.7855	2.8362	2.5497	2.8839
Upper Level of mean (>)	3.1249	3.2172	3.2042	3.1764	3.1591	3.2185	3.4344	3.1827	3.2145	3.1638	3.4503	3.1161
Decision Attribute	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	MOD	HIGH

Table 7(c): Ceylon Electricity Board (CEB) – employee morale and its dimensions

Measure	EM1	EM2	EM3	EM4	EM5	EM6	EM7	EM8	EM9	EM10	EM11	EM
Mean	4.7258	4.7097	4.5323	4.6774	4.6613	4.7097	4.2258	4.5323	4.7097	4.5484	3.3871	4.4927
Standard Deviation	0.5774	0.4921	0.5645	0.5364	0.5103	0.4576	0.8948	0.5928	0.5836	0.6447	1.4638	0.3745
Coefficient of Variance	0.1222	0.1045	0.1245	0.1147	0.1095	0.0972	0.2117	0.1308	0.1239	0.1417	0.4322	0.0834
Minimum	2	3	3	3	3	4	2	3	2	2	1	3.2727
Maximum	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
No of data	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62	62
Standard Error of mean	0.0733	0.0625	0.0717	0.06812	0.0648	0.0581	0.1136	0.0753	0.0741	0.0819	0.1859	0.0476
Z value (95%) CL	1.96	1.96	1.96	1.96	1.96	1.96	1.96	1.96	1.96	1.96	1.96	1.96
Low Level of mean (<)	2.8563	2.8775	2.8595	2.8665	2.8730	2.8861	2.7773	2.8524	2.8547	2.8395	2.6356	2.9068
Upper Level of mean (>)	3.1437	3.1225	3.1405	3.1335	3.1270	3.1139	3.2227	3.1476	3.1453	3.1605	3.3644	3.0932
Decision Attribute	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH	HIGH

The dimensions of honoring the job (4.760) and thought of changing job (4.680) have high level of attribute to influence the EM in aggregation, in SLT (4.816 and 4.632) and in CEB (4.726 and 4.710). The dimension of dependency to organization has high mean value for overall attribute (4.66) and for CEB (4.710). The mean value of 4.710 is consistently the same for the dimension of helping organization in the same CEB. Further, SLT also has higher level of attribute in peer's view (4.711).

Particularly and comparatively, the dimension "*not changing the organization*" has lowest mean values in aggregate (3.120) and for both the organizations SLT (2.684) and CEB (3.387), individually. Results of this dimension reveal moderate level in SLT and have affected the high level of attribute in CEB to bring its overall attribute to the moderate level. However, the level of attributes of EM and its dimensions, except dimension of "*not changing the organization*", fall into high level attribute in aggregation and SLT. Notably, CEB have higher level attribute for all dimensions. Results further reveal that mean value of EM in SLT (4.342) is comparatively lower than that in CEB

(4.493). Especially in SLT, the dimension of leaving the organization (3.842) has lower mean of attribute than CEB (4.226).

Results show that except "*honoring the job*", "*recommendation to others*" and "*peer's view*", all other (8) dimensions of EM in CEB have comparatively higher mean values than in the SLT. It indicates that CEB has high level of positive EM in order to carry out its business. Among these dimensions, job satisfaction and leaving organization have reasonably contributed to result in high level attribute of EM in CEB and this is consistent with Upadhyay and Gupta (2012) and Munck (2001).

Fard *et al.* (2010a) point out that public service organizations have overall EM to mean value of 3.02 as moderate as equal to the expected mean value of 3. Our results are inconsistent from the findings of Fard *et al.* (2010a). Further, the results of their study reveal that the dimensions of not changing job, helping organization and dependency to organization have the higher rank in their mean values, while the dimension of peer's view appears to be low in ranking of mean values. In our study, the results inconsistently indicate that peer's view highly support for overall EM.

Though both organizations have higher level of attribute of EM in using estimation technique, it is not clear whether their mean values approximate to each other (mean value of EM in SLT = 4.3421 and CEB = 4.4927). Therefore, it is possible to question statistical difference of those mean values. Thus, this study extends the analysis to examine the difference between the mean values of EM in these organizations and the following hypotheses are tested.

H_0 = There is no difference between mean values of EM in SLT and CEB.

H_2 = There is a significant difference between mean values of EM in SLT and CEB.

Decision rule:

Accept H_2 , if $Z_C > Z_T (= 1.96)$

or $Z_C < Z_T (= -1.96)$

Accept H_0 , if $(-1.96 \leq Z_C \leq 1.96)$

Where Z_C = Calculated value of Z using test statistic with normal distribution and Z_T = Table value of Z at 95% confidence limit of normal distribution

Hypothesis testing concludes that there is statistically significant difference between mean values of EM in SLT and CEB,

where $Z_C (-1.9826) < Z_T (-1.96)$ and H_2 is therefore accepted at the 5% significance level (see Table 8).

Table 8: Institutional Mean Difference of Employee Morale (EM)

Measures	SLT	CEB
Mean	4.3421	4.4927
Standard Deviation	0.3651	0.3745
Number of Data	38	62
Z_T for two tail 95% confidence	± 1.96	
Standard error of mean difference	0.075960142	
Test statistic of Z_C	-1.982618726	
Decision (as $Z_C > Z_T$)	Accept H_2	

In this table, SLT = Sri Lanka Telecom, CEB = Ceylon Electricity Board, Z_C = calculated value of Z using test statistic with normal distribution and Z_T = table value of Z at 95% confidence limit of normal distribution.

5.3 Bivariate Analysis

5.3.1 Relationship of employee morale (EM) and dimensions of organizational trust (OT)

Correlation analysis shows each of the dimensions of OT has positive significant relationship with EM. Further, it shows

low level of multicollinearity between dimensions of OT and between dimensions of EM (see Annex 1). Therefore, each dimension is important in determining the employee morale (see Table 9).

Further, the correlation analysis of SLT shows each dimension of OT generally has positive relationship with EM. Dimension ‘competency’ of OT has insignificant relationship with EM; whereas, other dimensions have significant relationships with EM (see Table 9). Therefore, it reflects competency is not a key determinant of EM in SLT in particular.

The correlation analysis of CEB demonstrates that dimensions of OT generally have positive relationship with EM. However, dimensions of mutual supervision, attention to employees, preciosity and rectitude, and honesty have insignificant relationship with EM (see Table 9). Results confirm that these dimensions are not statistically significant in determining the EM particularly in CEB. Comparing with CEB, most of the dimensions of OT in SLT has statistically significant and positive relationship with EM.

5.3.2 Relationship between organizational trust (OT) and employee morale (EM)

The coefficient of correlation (r) of OT and EM is 0.451 at the 0.01 level. The correlation lies between 0.3 and 0.49, thus confirming a medium positive significant relationship between the study variables: OT and EM (see Table 10). Further, it demonstrates (1) the degree of association between OT and EM is about 45.1%; and (2) the OT is useful to explain about 20.34% variation of EM in both SLT and CEB as a whole in Trincomalee Town and Gravets. It proves meaningful significant role of the OT to predict EM from a social science perspective.

Analysis shows significant correlation coefficient between OT and EM in SLT ($r = 0.709$, $p = 0.01$). The coefficient is between 0.5 and 1.0 and confirms a strong significant positive relationship between OT and EM in SLT. CEB has also statistically positive and significant correlation coefficient ($r = 0.405$, $p < 0.01$); and as its correlation is between 0.3 and 0.49, it confirms a medium significant positive relationship between the OT and EM (see Table 10).

Table 9: Relationship of Employee Morale and Dimensions of Organizational Trust

Employee Morale and Dimensions of Organizational Trust		Overall	SLT	CEB
OT1	Pearson Correlation	.326**	.480**	.262*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.002	.040
OT2	Pearson Correlation	.303**	.631**	.207
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.002	.000	.107
OT3	Pearson Correlation	.434**	.682**	.323*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.011
OT4	Pearson Correlation	.313**	.436**	.341**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.006	.007
OT5	Pearson Correlation	.199*	.460**	.144
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.048	.004	.264
OT6	Pearson Correlation	.318**	.532**	.283*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.001	.026
OT7	Pearson Correlation	.361**	.482**	.381**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.002	.002
OT8	Pearson Correlation	.268**	.351*	.192
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.007	.031	.135
OT9	Pearson Correlation	.289**	.587**	.199
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.004	.000	.121
OT10	Pearson Correlation	.245*	.015	.407**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.014	.930	.001
Number of responses		100	38	62

In this table, OT1 = Vulnerability, OT2 = Mutual supervision, OT3 = Satisfaction, OT4 = Feelings of existence and identity, OT5 = Attention to employees, OT6 = Commitment, OT7 = Reliability, OT8 = Honesty, OT9 = Preciosity and rectitude, OT10 = Competency, ** = Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed) and * = Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Comparatively in SLT, OT has strong positive relationship with EM. Further, the study findings demonstrate that OT is useful to explain 50.26% and 16.40% of variations in EM in SLT and CEB, respectively. Notably, finding confirms that OT is an important predictor of EM, especially and comparatively in SLT in

Trincomalee Town and Gravets. As the correlation coefficient of the CEB ($r = 0.405$) for the relationship between OT and EM is considerably lower than that of SLT ($r = 0.709$), the overall correlation coefficient of the variables ($r = 0.451$) is diluted to closer to the lowest correlation coefficient of CEB. This implies that there

are different employees' perceptions in relation to the study variables, though they are government dominated organizations.

Table 10: Correlation between Organizational Trust and Employee Morale

Measure	Overall	SLT	CEB
Pearson Correlation	0.451**	0.709**	0.405**
Significance (2- tailed)	0.000	0.000	0.001
Number of observations	100	38	62

In this table, SLT = Sri Lanka Telecom, CEB = Ceylon Electricity Board and ** = significance at the 0.01 level (2- tailed)

Fard *et al.* (2010a) indicates higher level and significant positive correlation between OT and EM in public sector in Iran ($r = 0.71$). Our study also consistently indicates positive significant correlation between the study variables and inconsistently with (medium) level of association. However, this study confirms the overall positive relationship of variables as in Fard *et al.* (2010a).

5.3.3 Testing hypothesis of correlation

Correlation between organizational trust (OT) and employee morale (EM) is significant at the 5% level ($r = 0.451$, $p=0.00 < 0.05$). This demonstrates to

accept the hypothesis "*H_A: There is a relationship between organizational trust and employee morale*".

**Decision: Accept H_A, since $r = 0.451$,
 $p=0.00 < 0.05$.**

6. CONCLUSION

This study investigates the relationship between organizational trust (OT) and employee morale (EM), since the previous studies explore low employee morale in public sector due to low organizational trust. This study considered this as an issue in public sector and attempt to investigate the relationship of the organizational trust to employee morale from employees' perspectives in the Sri Lankan context, particularly by considering two government dominated organizations in Trincomalee Town and Gravets: Sri Lanka Telecom (SLT) and Ceylon Electricity Board (CEB). The samples of this study are chosen from these two organizations, in which about 38% of the respondents are from SLT and the rest (62%) are from CEB.

The results of this study indicate that there is a statistically significant positive relationship ($r=0.451$) between organizational trust and employee morale, thus confirming the primary objective of

this study by accepting the hypothesis relating these the study variables. However, in comparison, the correlation coefficient of the variables is higher for the employees in SLT ($r=0.709$) than for the employees in CEB ($r=0.405$). It confirms that organizational trust is useful to explain about 20.34%, 50.26% and 16.40% variation of employee morale in aggregation, and individually in SLT and CEB in Trincomalee Town and Gravets. This implies that CEB needs to pay attention on improving its present strategy to transform its employees trust into their moral meaningfully. Our results are consistent with Fard *et al.* (2010a) that concludes organizational trust has positive impact on employee morale.

Considering the levels of variables (secondary objective), most of the dimensions and the variables have reflected high level of organizational trust and employee morale in aggregate and relevant organizations individually. However, in comparison, SLT has higher level of organizational trust ($X_{11} = 4.4973$) and CEB has higher level of employee morale ($X_{23} = 4.4927$) in Trincomalee Town and Gravets. Additionally, in order to identify the statistical difference, this study has extended to investigate the mean

difference between the organizations. The results confirm that the mean values of organizational trust in SLT and CEB in Trincomalee Town and Gravets are statistically, significantly different. This is also consistent for the study variable 'employee morale' too.

REFERENCES

- [1] Bowles, D., & Cooper, C. (2009), Employee morale: Driving performance in challenging times, Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, United Kingdom. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1057/9780230250789>
- [2] Bussing, A. (2002), Trust and its relations to commitment and involvement in work and organisations. *Sa journal of industrial psychology*, 28(4), 36-42. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4102/sajip.v28i4.77>
- [3] Ceylon Electricity Board. (2010), Annual Report and Accounts, Sri Lanka.
- [4] Child, I. (1941), Morale: A bibliographic review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 39, 393-420. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/h0057043>

- [5] Fard, H. D., Ghatari, A. R., & Hasiri, A. (2010a), Employees morale in public sector: is organizational trust an important factor? *European Journal of Scientific Research* , 46(3), 378-390.
- [6] Fard, H. D., Ghatari, A. R., & Hasiri, A. (2010b), Organizational trust in public sector: Explaining the role of managers' managerial competency. *European Journal of Economics, Finance and Administrative Sciences*, 25, 29-43.
- [7] George, D., & Mallery, P. (2003), *SPSS for Windows step by step: A simple guide and reference*. 11.0 update (4 ed.), Allyn & Bacon, Boston.
- [8] Gilbert, J. A., & Tang, T. L. P. (1998), An examination of organizational trust antecedents. *Public Personnel Management*, 27(3), 321-339.
- [9] Guion, R. M (1958), Industrial morale: The problem of terminology. *Personnel Psychology*, 11(1), 59-61.
- [10] Haddock, P. (2010), Importance of morale. www.ehow.com. Retrieved from http://www.ehow.com/facts_5474415_importance-morale.html (18/1/2012)
- [11] Hoy, W. K., & Tschannen-Moran, M. (1999), Five faces of trust: An empirical confirmation in urban elementary schools. *Journal of School Leadership*, 9(3), 184-208.
- [12] Laschinger, H.K.S., & Finegan, J. (2005), Using empowerment to build trust and respect in the workplace: A strategy for addressing the nursing shortage. *Nursing Economics*, 23(1), 6-13.
- [13] Laschinger, H.K.S., Labatt, A., Finegan, J., & Wilk, P. (2011). Testing a multi-level model of staff nurse organizational commitment, *Journal of Healthcare Management*, 56(1), 81-96.
- [14] Linz, S. J., Good, L. K., & Huddleston, P. (2006), Worker morale in Russia: an exploratory study. *Journal of managerial psychology*, 21(5), 415- 437. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/02683940610673951>
- [15] Malhotra, N. (2005), *Marketing research - An applied orientation* (4 ed.), Prentice- Hall of India Private Limited, New Delhi.
- [16] Mishra, A. (1996), Organizational responses to crisis: The centrality of

- trust. In R.M.Kramer, T.R.Tyler(Eds),
Trust in organizations: Frontiers of
theory and research (pp. 261-287),
Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. DOI:
<http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781452243610.n13>
- [17] Munck, B. (2001), Changing a
culture of face time. Harvard Business
Review, 79(10), 125-131.
- [18] Neely, G.H. (1999), The relationship
between employee morale and
employee productivity, Fire Service
Financial Management, Oklahoma, 1-
12.
- [19] Ngambi, H.C. (2011), The
relationship between leadership and
employee morale in higher education.
African Journal of Business
Management, 5(3), 762-776.
- [20] Ransom, W. (1995), Building
employee morale. Daily Reporter (Sept
1995).
- [21] Senthilnathan, S., & Rukshani, K.
(2013), A review on relationship
variables to employee morale and
organizational trust. International
Journal of Innovative Research and
Practices, 1(10), 8-15.
- [22] Shockley-Zalabak, P., Ellis, K., &
Winograd, G. (2000), Organizational
trust: what it mean and why it matters?
Organizational Development Journal,
18(4), 35-48.
- [23] Sri Lanka Telecom PLC (2011),
Annual Report, Sri Lanka.
- [24] Tharmi, U., & Senthilnathan, S.
(2012), The relationship of brand
equity to purchase intention. IUP
Journal of Marketing Management,
11(2), 7-26.
- [25] Thusyanthy, V., & Senthilnathan, S.
(2012), Customer satisfaction in terms
of physical evidence and employee
interaction. IUP Journal of Marketing
Management, 11(3), 7-24.
- [26] Thusyanthy, V., & Senthilnathan, S.
(2013), Level of job satisfaction and its
association with demographic
variables. IME Journal, 7(2), 39-45.
DOI:
<http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2229712>
- [27] Upadhyay, D., & Gupta, A. (2012),
Morale, welfare measures, job
satisfaction: The key mantras for
gaining competitive edge. International
Journal of Physical and Social
Sciences , 2(7), 80-94.

- [28] Vineburgh, J. H. (2010), A study of organizational trust and related variables among faculty members at HBCUs, Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Iowa, Iowa.
- [29] Watson, D. (1988), Intraindividual and intraindividual analysis of positive and negative affect: their relation to health complaints, perceived stress, and daily activities. Journal of Personality and Social psychology , 54(6), 1020-1030. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.54.6.1020>
- [30] Whitener, E. M. (1997), The impact of human resource activities on employee trust. Human Resource Management Review, 7(4), 389-404. DOI: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1053-4822\(97\)90026-7](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1053-4822(97)90026-7)

Annex 1: Correlation between Dimensions of Study Variables

The correlation analyses show that there is no high level of multicollinearity between the dimensions of each study variable. The predetermined multicollinearity level (approximately $r \geq 0.9$) does not allow eliminating any of the dimensions. Therefore, there is no substitutability between each of the dimensions of a study variable. It implies that the respondents have understood each statement in the questionnaire without perceiving the dimensions in the same context, rather they found them differently. Conclusively, this implies that each dimension is considered important in this study.

Panel A: Correlation between dimensions of organizational trust

In this table, OT1 = Vulnerability, OT2 = Mutual supervision, OT3 = Satisfaction, OT4 = Feelings of existence and identity, OT5 = Attention to employees, OT6 = Commitment, OT7 = Reliability, OT8 = Honesty, OT9 = Preciosity and rectitude, OT10 = Competency, OT = Overall organizational trust, ** = Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed) and * = Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Correlations		OT1	OT2	OT3	OT4	OT5	OT6	OT7	OT8	OT9	OT10	OT
OT1	Pearson Correlation	1	.400**	.511**	.491**	.283**	.317**	.340**	.254*	.204*	.238*	.579**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000	.004	.001	.001	.011	.041	.017	.000
OT2	Pearson Correlation	.400**	1	.663**	.393**	.351**	.319**	.501**	.260**	.587**	.419**	.715**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000	.000	.001	.000	.009	.000	.000	.000
OT3	Pearson Correlation	.511**	.663**	1	.385**	.418**	.270**	.414**	.220*	.519**	.449**	.722**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000	.000	.007	.000	.028	.000	.000	.000
OT4	Pearson Correlation	.491**	.393**	.385**	1	.449**	.484**	.530**	.170	.371**	.364**	.682**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.091	.000	.000	.000
OT5	Pearson Correlation	.283**	.351**	.418**	.449**	1	.482**	.358**	.192	.535**	.313**	.711**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.004	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.056	.000	.002	.000
OT6	Pearson Correlation	.317**	.319**	.270**	.484**	.482**	1	.380**	.363**	.407**	.225*	.659**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.001	.007	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.024	.000
OT7	Pearson Correlation	.340**	.501**	.414**	.530**	.358**	.380**	1	.440**	.516**	.481**	.729**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000
OT8	Pearson Correlation	.254*	.260**	.220*	.170	.192	.363**	.440**	1	.269**	.181	.501**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.011	.009	.028	.091	.056	.000	.000		.007	.071	.000
OT9	Pearson Correlation	.204*	.587**	.519**	.371**	.535**	.407**	.516**	.269**	1	.407**	.731**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.041	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.007		.000	.000
OT10	Pearson Correlation	.238*	.419**	.449**	.364**	.313**	.225*	.481**	.181	.407**	1	.602**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.017	.000	.000	.000	.002	.024	.000	.071	.000		.000
OT	Pearson Correlation	.579**	.715**	.722**	.682**	.711**	.659**	.729**	.501**	.731**	.602**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	

Panel B: Correlation between dimensions of employee morale

In this table, EM1 = Honoring the job, EM2 = Dependency to organization, EM3 = Recommendation to others, EM4 = Job satisfaction, EM5 = Proper Job, EM6 = Helping organization, EM7 = Leaving organization, EM8 = Not changing job, EM9 = Thought of changing job, EM10 = Peer's view, EM11 = Not changing the organization, EM = Overall employee morale, ** = Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed) and * = Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Correlations		EM1	EM2	EM3	EM4	EM5	EM6	EM7	EM8	EM9	EM10	EM11	EM
EM1	Pearson Correlation	1	.440**	.470**	.149	.509**	.239*	-.001	.258**	.169	.249*	.078	.493**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.140	.000	.017	.989	.009	.093	.012	.440	.000
EM2	Pearson Correlation	.440**	1	.497**	.468**	.468**	.315**	.235*	.337**	.318**	.198*	.001	.613**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000	.000	.001	.019	.001	.001	.049	.992	.000
EM3	Pearson Correlation	.470**	.497**	1	.356**	.518**	.208*	.225*	.353**	.320**	.353**	-.053	.599**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000	.000	.038	.025	.000	.001	.000	.600	.000
EM4	Pearson Correlation	.149	.468**	.356**	1	.452**	.360**	.268**	.428**	.305**	.265**	-.007	.584**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.140	.000	.000		.000	.000	.007	.000	.002	.008	.945	.000
EM5	Pearson Correlation	.509**	.468**	.518**	.452**	1	.564**	.324**	.359**	.232*	.185	.155	.715**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.001	.000	.020	.065	.125	.000
EM6	Pearson Correlation	.239*	.315**	.208*	.360**	.564**	1	.453**	.426**	.256*	.124	.116	.635**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.017	.001	.038	.000	.000		.000	.000	.010	.218	.252	.000
EM7	Pearson Correlation	-.001	.235*	.225*	.268**	.324**	.453**	1	.314**	.200*	.047	.013	.555**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.989	.019	.025	.007	.001	.000		.001	.046	.640	.901	.000
EM8	Pearson Correlation	.258**	.337**	.353**	.428**	.359**	.426**	.314**	1	.204*	.328**	-.074	.566**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.009	.001	.000	.000	.000	.000	.001		.041	.001	.466	.000
EM9	Pearson Correlation	.169	.318**	.320**	.305**	.232*	.256*	.200*	.204*	1	.667**	.054	.562**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.093	.001	.001	.002	.020	.010	.046	.041		.000	.597	.000
EM10	Pearson Correlation	.249*	.198*	.353**	.265**	.185	.124	.047	.328**	.667**	1	-.072	.462**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.012	.049	.000	.008	.065	.218	.640	.001	.000		.478	.000
EM11	Pearson Correlation	.078	.001	-.053	-.007	.155	.116	.013	-.074	.054	-.072	1	.384**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.440	.992	.600	.945	.125	.252	.901	.466	.597	.478		.000
EM	Pearson Correlation	.493**	.613**	.599**	.584**	.715**	.635**	.555**	.566**	.562**	.462**	.384**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	