



**THE EFFECT OF WORKPLACE TRUST ON STAFF RESILIENCE TO CHANGE PROGRAMMES IN KENYA AIRWAYS**

**TOYWA, JOHN WANYONYI**

## THE EFFECT OF WORKPLACE TRUST ON STAFF RESILIENCE TO CHANGE PROGRAMMES IN KENYA AIRWAYS

Toywa, J., Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology (JKUAT), Nairobi Kenya

Dr. Wario, G., Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology (JKUAT), Nairobi Kenya

Accepted December 16, 2014

---

### ABSTRACT

*The world is becoming more turbulent at a faster pace than organizations are becoming resilient enough to handle that change. The aim of this study was to establish the effect of workplace trust on the resilience of employees to change programmes in Kenya Airways. The specific objectives were to establish effect of integrity of management team to staff resilience to change programmes in Kenya Airways and to determine effect of management reliability on staff resilience to change programmes in Kenya Airways. A sample size of 10%, of Kenya Airways non-managerial employees based at the company's headquarters in Nairobi, Kenya, which comprised a total of 229 employees was taken. Data was collected by means of questionnaires, and analyzed by use of descriptive statistics.*

*Based on the study findings, it was concluded that the integrity of management team significantly influence the level of employee resilience to change. Similarly, the study revealed that management reliability influence employee resilience to change. The study recommends that organizations should nurture high levels of integrity and reliability to increase the level of staff resilience to change.*

**Key words:** *Workplace Trust, Organizational Change, Resilience to Change, Management Integrity, Management Reliability, Kenya Airways*

---

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

### **1.1 Background of the Study**

The current dynamic business environment, especially in the aviation industry has put pressure on management to take radical measures to restructure and respond to the changes in order to remain competitive. Decisions such as downsizing of organizations, business process re-engineering and continuous improvement have become household management strategies to respond to change. Organizations are forced to reduce costs, improve quality of products and services, find new opportunities for growth and increase productivity. This rate of change is only expected to increase in the future (Hoopes & Kelly, 2004). When these changes occur, organizations find themselves becoming less agile and less able to rise to the opportunities offered by change because of resistance. Managers adopt 'tested' strategies for change management, such as the Kotter model (Kotter, 1996) and latest advices on managing change, yet they sometimes fail terribly to sustain the success of transformation programs. Organizations that have mastered the art of resilience embrace change, gain the commitment of stakeholders, customers and employees and move forward in a positive direction in their industry (Osborne et al, 2009; Seville, 2011). Enhancing resilience is an imperative because planned and unexpected

changes will continue to define our work and personal lives, and our ability to remain adaptive is closely linked to our ability to thrive and survive (Ceridian, 2011)

Over the past decade, the role of workplace trust in change management has attracted much research (IAHC, 2013; Olu-Daniels & Nwibere, 2014). While increasing resilience capacity is largely a personal effort by individuals, organizations can and should facilitate its growth by creating an enabling workplace environment. More importantly; a trusting environment. It is believed by many scholars and management practitioners that trust are at the heart of resilience (Mishra, 1996; Olu-Daniels & Nwibere, 2014; Rodgers & Riddle, 2014). A trusting person takes the risk knowing that the other person will not act opportunistically and take advantage of the vulnerability to consciously cause a negative consequence. This way, members of the organization will be energetic, seek to learn, want to solve problems, seek to explore, take risks, work together, feel in control and be curious; which are the key components of change resilience. This research aims at investigating the importance of trust and trust-building in enhancing personal and organizational change resilience.

### **1.2 Statement of the Problem**

Organizational change management is critical for continued growth and prosperity. If change is not managed carefully and wisely, the organization won't realize the planned benefits; and in a worst-case scenario, the business may not survive the effects of unplanned change. Some of the "hidden" costs of not managing change include high staff turnover, usually the best leave first, and employee replacement costs may escalate as time and money is spent recruiting, hurried filling of knowledge and skill gap may end up settling for less than the best. This certainly doesn't improve productivity. At the same time, when resistance to change is high, management suffers a loss of credibility and litigation and public embarrassment becomes the order of the day in the extreme, if the people side of change is handled badly. More often, managers have attempted to initiate organizational change with a good intention only to meet resistance from their own change agents, and employees. In response, and to mitigate recurrence, managers have attempted to create change readiness by focusing on the technical and procedural aspects of change management, that include: creating a clear and compelling need for change and a sense of urgency, developing a clear vision for the future, improving capacity of the sponsor, or the guiding coalition, to successfully champion the change, assessing the extent of change and reviewing the funding and resource

availability (Kotter, 2002). But even after all these measures have been taken positively, resistance to change steadily increases. This has led to the search for an explanation as to what else could be the reason.

The researcher is convinced that some of the answers are found in workplace trust. With high levels of trust comes strong employee engagement and a collaborative, supportive work environment. In high trust organizations, people look for ways to make change work, to help each other, to solve problems, to allow themselves be challenged, and to accept change as positive. According to Kotter (2002), "In highly successful change efforts people find ways to help others see the problems or solutions in ways that influence emotions, not just thoughts. Feelings then alter behaviour sufficiently to overcome all the many barriers ..." Without trust, people will view change with cynicism, or even fear, and will be reluctant to try new things for fear of being wrong and will see unsolvable obstacles to change. In these organizations, the change plan will be ineffective; employees will not believe what senior leaders are saying, preferring instead to believe their peers and rumours. They become suspicious and do not trust any change initiative, however reasonable it may be due to lack of trust in their management. Ultimately employee resilience to change continues to be

low. A lot of research efforts have concentrated on change management techniques, and the effectiveness of such techniques. When so doing they either focus on macro level forces (Wanberg and Banas, 2000), focus mainly on tangible structural and resource allocation conditions that may have led to the resistance or on rather than social relationships and conditions, of which trust is central. Where any effort is made to address the social relationship conditions, not much attention is given to the concept of trust as an aspect that determines people's relationships, both at the inter-personal and inter-group level, and more so, not much has been done in the aviation industry (Langvardt, 2007).

This study was premised on the conviction that management does not give trust-building the importance it deserves at the right time and in effect, a lot of time is wasted and change resilience reduced due to mistrust, and especially between employees and management. If enough research is done, and the techniques of trust-building developed and implemented in organizations, resistance to the inevitable organizational change will be minimized and employees will be more resilient to change. There will be more cooperation among employees, morale will increase and employees will exert their maximum effort towards attainment of organizational objectives thus exploiting the opportunities created by

change and achieving high employee performance. This study was a step in that direction by establishing the extent to which workplace trust affects employee resilience to change programmes in Kenya Airways.

### **1.3 Objectives Of The Study**

#### **1.3.1 General Objective**

To investigate the effect of workplace trust on staff resilience to change programmes in Kenya Airways

#### **1.3.2 Specific Objectives**

- a. To establish the effect of the integrity of management team on staff resilience to change programmes in Kenya Airways
- b. To find out if management reliability has any influence on employee resilience to change programmes in Kenya Airways

### **1.4 Research Hypotheses**

#### **Hypothesis 1**

Ho: There is no significant relationship between the integrity of management and staff resilience to change programmes in Kenya Airways

#### **Hypothesis 2**

Ho: There is no significant relationship between the reliability of management and staff resilience to change programmes in Kenya Airways

## **2. LITERATURE REVIEW**

### **2.1 Dependent Variable: Resilience to Change**

The term “resilience” in organizations refers to “the ability of an organization to absorb disturbances and still retain its basic function and structure” (Walker and Salt, 2006). Resilience thinking addresses the dynamics and development of complex systems, and has three central aspects: resilience, adaptability, and transformability (Folke et al., 2010). Resilience in this context is the capacity to continually change and adapt yet remain within critical thresholds; It is the flexibility whereby people’s awareness of and sensitivity to the changes occurring in the world around them enables them to change gears and direction if necessary to accommodate the changes while remaining true to their vision and purpose. (Conner, 1991; Russell, 2003). Adaptability on the other hand is the capacity to adjust responses to changing external drivers and internal processes, and thereby allow for development along the current course. This is what Conner (1991) and Russell (2003) describe as adapting to the environment as both a survival mechanism as well as a vehicle for

enabling them to continue the pursuit of their personal goals.

Transformability is the capacity to cross thresholds into new development trajectories. Resilience is not just being persistent or robust to disturbance, but also being able to exploit the opportunities that disturbance opens up in terms of recombination of evolved structures and processes, renewal of the system and emergence of new trajectories” (Folke, 2006). Resilient individuals not only bounce back easily from setbacks and overcome adversities (Siebert, 2005) but are also strengthened and improved by adversities. (Stoltz, 2006). They can change to a new way of working and living when an old way is no longer possible without acting in dysfunctional or harmful ways. (Siebert, 2005; Reivich et al 2002)

In addition to adaptability and flexibility, there are other important characteristics that define individual as well as organizational resilience. Self Assurance is one such characteristic. Resilient individuals have self-confidence and a belief that they can meet any challenge with hope and realistic optimism. They understand that, while the world is complex and challenging, one has the ability to find the opportunity and to succeed. (Conner, 1991; Russell, 2003). Resilient individuals also have strong personal vision. They know what they

believe in and have a clear idea of what they want to accomplish or create in their life. This allows them to approach adversity and stress with a sense of opportunity and hope. Another characteristic of resilience is the degree to which the company is capable of self-organization. Organizations that create order and structure are more resilient because this provides them the focus and stability they need. Organization can involve setting short-term goals, thinking through their actions before taking action, and putting together action plans (Carpenter et al. 2001). According to Mallack (1998), resilient organizations design and implement effective actions to advance themselves, thereby increasing the probability of their own survival.

Members of resilient organizations share decision-making power, which usually leads to timely and effective responses. Resilient employees expend less effort in assimilating organization change and therefore have greater potential to improve productivity and quality. Resilient people have the ability to analyze problems, discover the root causes, and create lasting solutions. They are also effective at seeing the relationship of a problem to other problems within a larger system or network of deeply interdependent issues. This awareness of the bigger picture enables them to recognize the limits of their own influence and to expect

the unexpected. (Conner, 1991; Russell, 2003). Resilient organizations are also characterized by superior Interpersonal Competencies. According to Golman (1997), they demonstrate the competencies of emotional intelligence: a high level of self and social awareness and the ability to use this awareness to effectively manage themselves and their relationships with others. These competencies allow for creation of a strong relationship network within which people share ideas, problems, solutions, frustrations, and hopes. In the face of adversity and stress, resilient people call upon this network for support, affirmation, and problem solving. It is worth noting that resilient people do not just react to change. They pro-actively engage it. They tend to have an internal locus of control (Rotter, 1966) where they believe that they have the capacity and the responsibility to determine their own destiny instead of feeling powerless in a given situation. They, as a result, focus on expanding their influence over change through assertive behaviors and actions. This pro-activity enables them to preserve their self-efficacy in the face of any change.

Resilience is the essential component that helps transform the mystery of change into a manageable process (Hoopes et al, 2004). It is the hardiness that enables individuals to courageously face potentially disruptive changes and turn adversity into advantageous

opportunity (Maddi et al, 2005). At the organizational level, resilience provides safety in the midst of change; manages the emotional consequences such as anxiety and grief, and allows for learning, development and growth in times of continuous transformation (Barrett, 2004). A resilient organization is able to sustain competitive advantage over time through its capability to do two things simultaneously: delivery of excellent performance against current goals, and effective innovation and adaptability to rapid, turbulent changes in markets and technologies (Robb, 2000). In order to develop strategies for fostering resilience, it is important to understand the main barriers to resilience. Resilience is reduced in a distrustful environment where secrets, but not promises are kept. Intrigue is fostered, and backstabbing is common. Where communication is lacking, so that the rationale for decisions is not shared, expectations not clarified, and information is hoarded. If people are not empowered and are not part of the decision making process, resilience is reduced. Employees are told what to do and how to do it, and there is no mechanism for professional growth through shared responsibility. Finally general uncertainty is also a barrier to resilience. When there is uncertainty, employees do not know what direction the organization is headed. They constantly received mixed messages about the vitality and

health of the organization, and are not privy to the big picture.

One study of resilience and change merits close attention in this context: the Wanberg and Banas (2000) study. This study examined the relationship between resilience and employee openness to a series of work related re-organizational changes and concluded that greater resilience leads to a more open acceptance to changes in a reorganizing workplace. This is also in agreement with the proposition by Deevy (1995) that the basic ingredient of a resilient organization is “a committed work force that is free to give the maximum effort.” A trusting organization is one such.

#### **Independent Variable - Workplace Trust**

In the recent past, there has been a paradigm shift in the definition of trust. It has moved from emphasis on intentions and motivations to behavioral orientations where it is viewed as one party's optimistic expectations of the behavior of another when the party must make a decision about how to act under conditions of vulnerability and dependence (Hosmer, 1995). Mayer, Davis, and Schoorman (1995) describe trust as "the willingness of a party to be vulnerable to the actions of another party based on the expectation that the other party will perform a particular action important to the



trustor, irrespective of the ability to monitor or control that other party” Boon et al (1991) define “Trust” as a positive expectation that another person will not, through words, actions, or decisions, act opportunistically. This definition attributes trust to two main characteristics: familiarity and risk. Once a person trusts another, there will be willingness to take risks and make one vulnerable (Robbins, 2003). However, a trusting person takes the risk. Mishra (1996) sums up all these in a simplistic way by defining trust as "one party's willingness to be vulnerable to another party based on the belief that the latter party is (a) competent, (b) open, (c) concerned, and (d) reliable." These four dimensions operate collectively to create the perception of trust. For the purpose of this study, trust is considered in an eclectic view.

Trust in organizations' management has continually gained prominence in academic circles over the past four decades. The concept of trust is central to leadership. Most leadership theories point towards trust-building as a key component of effective leadership. The literature on transformational leadership for instance show that transformational leaders engage in actions that gain the trust of their followers, and which in turn result in desirable outcomes (Podsakoff et al., 1990). Transformational and charismatic leaders build

trust in their followers (Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1996). Pillai et al. (1999) suggest that transformational leaders establish a social exchange relationship with followers and build trust by demonstrating individualized concern and respect for followers (Jung & Avolio, 2000). Trust is a crucial element of the consideration dimension of effective leader behavior and leader-member exchange theory, while other studies show that promoting trust can be important for leader effectiveness (Bass, 1990).

In research, Integrity and reliability have been linked to trust (Gabarro, 1987; Ouchi, 1981). Mishra's (1996) refers to this dimension as openness, which is seen as important in assessing an individual's trustworthiness. According to Tan et al (2000) a person who is honest and truthful is likely to command more trust from others than somebody who is dishonest. Employees are most likely to hold trust in their organization when they see the organizational leadership as open and honest (Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1991; Nanus, 1989). More so while openness and sincerity are important among all levels of organizational hierarchy, it is the perception of trust in top management that has more predictive power for whether or not followers will have trust in the organization as a whole. (Ellis & Shockley-Zalabak, 1999). Other researchers have also described the importance of openness and honesty and information

received as major contributors to team success (Schutz, 1994; Shockley-Zalabak & Morley, 1994, 1997). When an organization's leadership is open and honest, it fosters effectiveness in teamwork. At an organizational level, trust is enhanced to the extent that an organization's members, from co-workers to top management, demonstrate openness and honesty with practiced self-awareness and social deftness. Integrity also implies credibility (Cooper & Sawaf, 1996; Fairholm, 1994).

Integrity is particularly important in developing *deterrence-based* trust. This is the most fragile type of trust. One violation or inconsistency completely destroys it. It is based on fear of reprisal if it is violated. People who base their trust on this relationship fear the consequences of not following through to do what they say they will do. It is the kind of trust that can only work if punishment is possible, consequences are clear and punishment is actually imposed if the trust is violated. To be sustained, the potential loss of future interaction must outweigh the potential benefit of violating expectations. It is common in new relationships. New employees for example have this type of trust with their managers. They trust their new bosses even if they have little knowledge of them. In this case the trust is created by authority held by the boss and the potential

punishment that can be imposed if one fails to perform as per job related obligations.

Reliability relates to consistency and predictability. Inconsistencies between what one says and what he does for instance will decrease trust. This dimension of trust according to Nanus (1989) is very important to managers. The reliability dimension deals with the expectation for consistent and dependable behavior. Consistency and congruency between words and actions build trust. This linkage of reliable behavior, or the matching of words to actions, to organizational trust is not new (McGregor, 1967; Ouchi, 1981). However, there have been new attempts to define it in greater specificity the individual communication behaviors and their impact on perceptions of organizational trust, satisfaction, and effectiveness. For example, Gabarro (1987) explains how trust develops in working relationships as the result of a historical pattern of reliability across events and experiences. Researchers have found the congruence between what managers do and what they expect and ask of their employees to do as having immense impact on credibility and organizational trust (Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1991; Kouzes & Posner, 1987; Nanus, 1989; Shockley-Zalabak & Morley, 1989). The themes of reliability, dependability, and consistency also permeate the level of trust between an

organization and its suppliers, customers, and business partners (Mishra, 1996).

Reliability is also frequently associated with the perceived fairness of leadership actions. Specifically, employees' trust in their leaders will be impacted by the level of perceived fairness or justice in the organizational practices or decisions, because the practices are likely to be seen as a signal of the nature of the relationship with the leader and/or the character of the leader. Researchers describe three types of justice that are relevant: distributive justice, involving the allocation of outcomes; procedural justice, dealing with the processes that lead to decision outcomes; and interactional justice, the interpersonal treatment people receive as procedures are enacted. Some scholars (Konovsky & Pugh, 1994; Brockner & Seigel, 1996) have used the group value model to suggest that procedural justice is a source of trust because it demonstrates respect for the employee and a valuation of the relationship, while others might suggest that it could be interpreted as an indicator of the leader's tendency to be fair. The literature on psychological contracts suggests that unmet expectations (a "breach;" e.g., pay raises or promotions promised but not given) will decrease trust in leaders (Robinson, 1996). Unmet expectations are likely to impact followers' trust by affecting the extent to which

the leader is perceived to be dependable, honest, and/or have integrity. Reliability nurtures *identification-based trust*. This trust is the highest level of trust. It is achieved when there is an emotional connection between the parties. This type of trust causes one to be willing to act as an agent of another and substitute for the other person's interpersonal transactions. It normally exists because the parties understand each other's intentions and appreciate the others' wants and desires. When this kind of trust exists, controls are minimal in that one does not have to monitor the other because there is unquestionable loyalty. In organizations, it occasionally exists among people who have worked together for long periods of time and have a depth of experience that allows them to know each other inside out. Managers seek this kind of trust in work-teams. An organization that builds and sustains this type of trust is likely to enjoy superior performance.

### **3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

#### **3.1 Research Design**

The study adopted a descriptive and inferential research design because there is a known impact of workplace trust on employee resilience to change programmes. According to Cooper and Schindler (2001) a descriptive study deals with questions of who, what, when, where and how of the topic. Descriptive survey

research designs are used in preliminary and exploratory studies to allow researchers to gather information and summarize, present and interpret data for the purpose of clarification (Orodho, 2003). Churchill (1991) considers descriptive research to be appropriate where the study seeks to describe the characteristics of certain groups, estimate the proportion of people who have certain characteristics and make predictions. According to Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) the purpose of descriptive research is to determine and report the way things are and it helps in establishing the current status of the population under study. The design was chosen for this study due to its ability to ensure minimization of bias and maximization of reliability of evidence collected. The study aimed at collecting information from respondents on the effect of workplace trust on staff resilience to change programmes in Kenya Airways. The study used survey to gather the data and involved systematic data collection and analysis method to answer the research questions.

### **3.2 Study Sample and Sampling Procedure**

The population of interest in this study was non managerial staff members of Kenya Airways (KQ) based at Nairobi, Kenya. The research targeted staff from all departments. Kenya Airways employed 3,372 full-time staff in its Kenyan offices, distributed in 4 towns, Nairobi,

Kisumu, Mombasa and Malindi. 2,291 of these staff were non-managerial and were based in Nairobi. The Nairobi staff constituted about 77% of the entire KQ population of full-time employees. The population was divided into operational and support departments and stratified sampling technique used to sample the population along the departmental structure. It was expected that stratified sampling would make it easier to evaluate whether there are any variations in the level of trust and therefore resilience to change by staff between departments. (Cooper and Schindler, 2000). The researcher then randomly selected from within the chosen strata a 10% percent proportion of the target size. Out of the target population of 2291 staff, the researcher took a sample of 10%, which comprised a total of 229 employees as a representative sample (Mugenda and Mugenda, 2003).

a representative sample should be at least 10% of the population of interest to make an inference of the population. Simple random sampling was then used in each category as shown in table 3.2.

### **3.3 Research Instruments And Data Collection And Analysis**

Data was obtained by means of questionnaires. A questionnaire was constructed with structured questions and administered to the staff. The questionnaires were administered

randomly. The strategy used was that of asking questions that address trust first, then those that address resilience to change in a separate section. A modification of the Rusell & Rusell (2006) resilience quotient assessment questions was used so as to determine an average level of resilience for the various dimensions as well as the departments, and the organization as a whole. Trust was measured using a modification of the organization trust index (OTI) as described by International Association of Business Communicators Research Foundation (IABC). The respondents were required to indicate the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with each statement. All the statements were positive, and values were assigned to each option as follows, Strongly Agree {5}, Agree {4}, Moderately Agree {3}, Disagree {2}, Strongly Disagree {1}. Thus the analysis was based on a 1-5 scale on each item of the scale. The data was then coded and checked for any errors and omissions (Kothari, 2004). The data was tabulated and presented using frequency tables, percentages radar charts and bar charts as appropriate. Microsoft's Word program was used to generate tables and Sigma XL program used to calculate the regression models.

#### **4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

The response rate was 92%. The socio-demographic data was analyzed in terms of

departments, supervisory responsibility, years of service and gender of the respondents. This information was vital in that it helped to understand the perceptions held by people of different demographic background. The mean of all respondents was then taken to find the overall response.

##### **4.1 Overall Level of Staff Resilience to Change Programmes**

The overall level of staff resilience to change programmes was analyzed using the mean of all the responses for the different dimensions of resilience. The level of resilience was: strong 66% (Strongly Agree and Agree); average 28% (Moderately Agree) and weak 6% (Disagree and Strongly Disagree).

##### **4.2 Relationship between the Integrity of Management and Employees Resilience to Change Programmes**

Regression analysis was used to test the null hypothesis (Ho) which stated that there is no significant relationship between the integrity of management and staff resilience to change programmes; The level of significance was set at .05 (the standard for most scientific experiments). The sigma excel output was as follows:

**Table 4.1 Model Summary  
(Integrity)**

R-Square	82.03 %
R-Square Adjusted	76.04 %
S (Root Mean Square Error)	16.695

**Table 4.2 Parameter  
Estimates (Integrity)**

Predictor Term	Coefficient	SE Coefficient	T	P	VIF	Tolerance
Constant	-31.579	21.290	-1.483	0.2346		
Management Integrity	1.748	0.472473	3.700	<b>0.0343</b>	1	1

**Regression Model:**

$$y = 1.748x - 31.57$$

Where:

y = Employee Resilience to Change

x = Management Integrity

The R-Square or regression coefficient value is 82.03%, adjusted to 76% and a P value of 0.0343, which is less than the critical P value of 0.05 that would qualify acceptance of the null hypothesis at 95% confidence level.

From this analysis therefore, there is a significant positive relationship between management integrity and employee resilience to change programmes. According to the results, at least 76% of employee resilience to change is explained by management integrity. A maximum of 24% is due to other factors not included in the model. This result is consistent

with the propositions of PWC (2013) who analyze the relationship between integrity and business resilience. They identify four dimensions of integrity: Alignment, Awareness, Agility and Ability, that “provide a practical context in which organisations can challenge themselves over the role of integrity and business ethics in forming a buffer or springboard for resilience.”

**4.3 Relationship between Management Reliability and Employee Resilience to Change**

In this analyzing the relationship between management reliability and staff resilience to change programmes, the null hypothesis (Ho) stated that there is no significant relationship between the reliability of management and staff resilience to change programmes. The level of significance was set at .05 The sigma excel output was:

**Table 4.3 Model Summary**  
(Reliability)

R-Square	88.78%
R-Square Adjusted	85.05%
S (Root Mean Square Error)	13.188

**Table 4.4 Parameter Estimates**  
(Reliability)

Predictor Term	Coefficient	SE Coefficient	T	P	VIF	Tolerance
Constant	-6.828	11.662	0.585499	0.5993		
Management Reliability	1.158	0.237557	4.873	<b>0.0165</b>	1	1

**Regression Model**

$$y = 1.157x - 6.828$$

Where:

y = Employee Resilience to Change

x = Management Reliability

The R-Square or regression coefficient value is 88.78%, adjusted to 85.05% and a P value of 0.0165. Based on these results, it was concluded that there is a significant positive relationship between the reliability of the management team and employee resilience to change programmes. The model indicates that at least 85.1% of employee resilience to change is affected by management reliability. The remaining 14.9% is due to other factors not included in the model. The respondents who agreed to the dimension of reliability also agreed to the dimensions of change resilience.

Reliability deals a lot with the expectation for consistent and dependable behavior. Inconsistencies and incongruencies decrease trust (McGregor, 1967; Ouchi, 1981). According to Gabarro (1987) trust develops in working relationships as the result of a historical pattern of reliability across events and experiences. When studying the behavior of executives and top management, scholars see the congruence between what they do and what they expect and ask of their employees as having immense impact on credibility and organizational trust (Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1991; Kouzes & Posner, 1987; Nanus, 1989; Shockley-Zalabak & Morley, 1989). Reliability therefore is critical to the level of trust between not only management and staff, but also among staff and among managers. This in effect influences resilience to change (Mishra, 1996)

**5. Conclusions And Recommendations**

**5.1 Conclusions**

The study sought to establish the relationship between workplace trust and employee resilience to change by analyzing management integrity and reliability and their effects on change resilience. The findings show that both management integrity and management reliability positively affect the level of employee resilience to change. Employees were able to tell their immediate supervisors when things

are going wrong, free to disagree with my immediate supervisors, and had a say in decisions that affected their job. They believed that their immediate supervisors kept confidences, and because of this they considered that their supervisors had a high level of integrity. At the same time, the level of resilience to change was also high with over 68% of them either strongly agreeing or agreeing. The P value of 0.0343 confirms a significant relationship between management integrity and change resilience. Reliability of the management team had a positive effect on employee resilience to change programmes to the tune of 85.1%. Employees felt that their immediate supervisors follow through with what they say. They also felt that their immediate supervisors behave in a consistent manner from day to day and that the top management keeps their commitments to employees. Most of the respondents also agreed that their immediate supervisors keep their commitments to team members. This is also translated into high resilience levels in a positive relationship. Based on this, it is concluded here that reliability of management has a direct impact on employee resilience to change.

## **5.2 Recommendations**

Based on the findings of this study, it is recommended that organizations explore the various methods of promoting integrity so as to increase workplace trust. Firstly, establish and maintain integrity. It is the foundation of trust in any organization. Integrity must begin at the top and then move down. This means, among other things, keeping promises and always telling the truth, no matter how difficult it might be. If its people have integrity, an organization can be believed. Secondly, communicate vision and values. Communication is important, since it provides the artery for information and truth. By communicating the organization's vision, management defines where it's going. By communicating its values, the methods for getting there are established. There should be an unambiguous congruence between what managers tell the world and the way they behave. People should believe that their leaders demonstrate integrity and lead by example. Employees should feel confident and appreciated enough to bring their true selves to work. People at every level genuinely know what doing it right means and believe that doing it right will deliver better business. The organization should have a consistent decision making framework addressing ethical and business integrity issues. Management ought to measure the decision-making effectiveness and



ethical behaviours of staff and the business as part of future-proofing of integrity.

. Lastly, as management, do what's right, regardless of personal risk. We all know intuitively what's "right" in nearly every situation. Following this instinctive sense, and ignoring any personal consequences will nearly always create respect from those around us. From this respect will come trust.

### **5.3 Suggestions for Further Research**

This study considered only one aviation related organization, which is a dominant firm in the Kenyan Aviation industry. Future research should investigate workplace trust and change resilience in other forms of organization, especially manufacturing organizations, corporate and NGOs. The target respondents in

this study were non-managerial employees at the company's headquarters. This may have denied the research the opportunity to get a comparative study of how workplace trust affects change resilience in all organizational cadres and in sub-stations. It would be useful to collect data from other employment cadres, especially management and contractual staff, from across different organizations and locations to analyze the comparative trend.

This study only considers integrity competence, reliability of management, and the concern of management for employees as measures of workplace trust. This list could be extended to consider other determinants and indicators of Workplace trust as well as the determinants of employee resilience to change programmes.

## REFERENCES

1. Allen, M.; Yen W. (1979). *Introduction to Measurement Theory*. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.
2. Argyris, C. (1962). *Interpersonal competence and organizational effectiveness*. Homewood, IL: Dorsey Press.
3. Berkes, F., Colding, J., Folke, C. (2003). *Navigating Social–Ecological Systems: Building Resilience for Complexity and Change*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.
4. Boon, S. D. and Holmes, J. G. (1991). "The Dynamics of Interpersonal Trust: Resolving Uncertainty in the Face of Risk," in Hinde, R. A. and Groebel, J. (eds), *Cooperation and Pro-social Behaviour*. Cambridge, UK. Cambridge University Press.
5. Boss, R.W. (1978). "Trust and Managerial Problem-Solving Revisited." in *Group and Organizational Studies*, 3 331-342.
6. Boulding, K. (1956). "General systems theory – the skeleton of science". *Management Science*, 2(1), 197-208.
7. Bridges, William (1991). *Managing transitions*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc.
8. Brockner, J., & Seigel, P. (1996). Understanding the interaction between procedural and distributive justice: The role of trust. In R. Kramer & T. Tyler (Eds.), *Trust in organizations* (pp 390-413)
9. Brooks, Robert, and Sam Goldstein (2004). *The power of resilience: achieving balance, confidence, and personal strength in your life*. New York: McGraw-Hill, Contemporary Books.
10. Brower, H. Schoorman, F. D., & Tan, H. (2000). A model of leadership: The integration of trust and leader-member exchange. *Leadership Quarterly*, 11, 227-250.
11. Butler, J.K., Jr (1991). "Towards Understanding and Measuring Conditions of Trust: Evolution of Conditions for Trust Inventory." *Journal of Management*, 17 643-663.
12. Connor, Daryl R. (1992). *Managing at the speed of change*. New York: Villard Books, Random House.
13. Dirks, K., & Ferrin, D. (2001). The role of trust in organizational settings. *Organization Science*, 12, 450-467.
14. Dubrovsky, V. (2004). "Toward system principles: general system theory and the alternative approach". *Systems Research and Behavioral Science*, 21(2), 109-122.
15. Elangovan, A. R., & Shapiro, D. L. (1998). "Betrayal of Trust in Organizations." *Academy of Management Review*, 23 547-566.
16. Ellis, K., & Shockley-Zalabak, P. (1999) "Communicating with Management: Relating Trust to Job Satisfaction and Organizational Effectiveness." Paper presented at National Communication Association Convention, Chicago, IL, November, 1999.

17. Folke, C. (2006). Resilience: the emergence of a perspective for social–ecological systems analyses, *Global Environmental Change*.
18. Folke, C. S; Carpenter, T; Elmqvist, L; Gunderson, C.S; Holling and Walker, B. (2002) Resilience and Sustainable Development: Building Adaptive Capacity in a World of Transformations.
19. Foster, J. (2005). "From simplistic to complex systems in economics". *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 29, 873-892.
20. Gambetta, D. (Ed.). (1988). *Trust: Making and breaking cooperative relations*. New York, NY: Basil Blackwell Inc.
21. Garmezy, Norman (1991). Resiliency and vulnerability to adverse developmental outcomes associated with poverty. In *American Behavioral Scientist*.
22. Holsmar, L.T "Trust: The Connecting link Between Organizational Theory and Philosophical Ethics" in *Academy of Management Review*. April 1985 pg. 393.
23. Jones, G. R., & George, J. M. (1998) "The Experience and Evolution of Trust: Implications for Cooperation and Teamwork." *Academy of Management Review*, 23 531-546.
24. Katz, D., and R. Kahn. (1978). *The Social Psychology of Organizations*. (2nd Edition). New York: Wiley.
25. Kotter, John P. (2002). *The Heart of Change: Real-Life Stories of How People Change Their Organizations*, Harvard Business School Press, p. x.
26. Lewicki, R.J., McAllister, D.J., & Bies, D.J. (1998) "Trust and Distrust: New Relationships and Realities." *Academy of Management Review*, 23: 438-458.
27. Macgregor, J.H. Davis and F.D. Schoorman " An Integrative Model of Organizational Trust, " in *Academy of Management Review* July 1995 Pg. 7 – 12.
28. Mayer R.C, Davis J.H. and Schoorman F.D. (1995) An Integrative Model of Organizational Trust in *Academy of Management Review* 20:3, 709-734
29. Mayer, R.C., Davis, J. H., & Schoorman, F.D. (1995) "An Integrative Model of Organizational Trust." *Academy of Management Review*, 20: 709-734.
30. Melcher, A. (1975). *General Systems and Organization Theory: Methodological Aspects*. Kent State University Press
31. Melcher, A. (1975). *General Systems and Organization Theory: Methodological Aspects*. Kent State University Press
32. Mishra, A.K. & Spreitzer, G.M. (1998) "Explaining How Survivors Respond to Downsizing: The Roles of Trust, Empowerment, Justice, and Work Redesign." *Academy of Management Review*, 23: 567-588.
33. Mishra, A.K. (1996) "Organizational Responses to Crisis: The Centrality of Trust." In *Trust in Organizations: Frontiers of Theory and Research*. R.M. Kramer & T.R. Tyler, Eds. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage,

34. Oaks, CA: Sage. Bridges, William (1991). *Managing transitions*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc.
35. Reivich, Karen, and Andrew Shatté (2002). *The resilience factor: 7 essential skills for overcoming life's inevitable obstacles*, New York: Broadway Books, Random House.
36. Russell, Jeffrey, and Linda Russell (1998). *Managing change*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.
37. Russell, Jeffrey, and Linda Russell (2003). *Leading change training*. Alexandria, VA: ASTD Press.
38. Russell, Jeffrey, and Linda Russell (2005). An integrative model for leading change in organizations. In *The 2005 Pfeiffer Annual- Consulting*. San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
39. Shrode, W., and D. Voich, Jr. (1974). *Organization and Management: Basic Systems Concepts*. Homewood: Irwin Inc.
40. Spector, MD; Jones, GE (2004) - *The Journal of social psychology*, Heldref Publications
41. Tan, H. H and Tan, C. S. F. "Towards the Differentiation of Trust in Supervisor and Trust in Organization," in *Genetic, Social, and General Psychology Monographs*, May 2000, pp. 241 – 260.
42. Wainer, H., & Thissen, D. (2001). True score theory: The traditional method. In H. Wainer and D. Thissen, (Eds.), *Test Scoring*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum
43. Zaheer A., McEvily B., Perrone, V. (1998), Does Trust Matter? Exploring the Effects of Interorganizational and Interpersonal Trust on Performance in *Organization Science*, vol. 9, No. 2, March-April, 141-159