

ROLE OF ORGANISATIONAL TRUST AND ORGANISATIONAL JUSTICE IN ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT AMONG FRONT-LINE WORKERS

P.G. NISHANT

RESEARCH SCHOLAR, DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY, L.N. MITHILA UNIVERSITY DARBHANGA, BIHAR. EMAIL: pgnishant1989@gmail.com

R. K. MOURYA

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, B. R. B. COLLEGE, SAMASTIPUR (L. N. MITHILA UNIVERSITY, DARBHANGA) EMAIL: rkmlmnu@gmail.com

Abstract

This study aimed to examine the role of organisational trust and organisational justice in organisational commitment among front-line workers. 210 front-line workers participated in this study and were divided into two groups front line workers who work in the private sector (N=110) and front line workers who work in public sector (N=100) age ranged between 20-62 years. Participants were drawn from different organisations and institutes in Vaishali, Hajipur, Muzaffarpur, Madhubani, and Darbhanga. The participants were administered the Organisational Trust Scale developed by Nyhan and Marlowe (1997), the Organisational Justice Scale developed by Niehoff and Moorman (1993), and the Organisational Commitment Scale adopted by Tripathi, Kapoor, and Tripathi (2000). Correlation analysis found that organisational trust was significantly and positively correlated with identification with involvement ($r=.525$, $p<.01$), calculative commitment ($r=.355$, $p<.01$), and organisational loyalty ($r=.359$, $p<.001$). Overall organisational trust was found to be significantly positively correlated with overall organisational commitment ($r=.604$, $p<.001$). Results also indicate that all dimensions of organisational justice, such as distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice, were found to be significantly positively associated with Identification with Involvement, calculative commitment, organisational loyalty and overall organisational commitment. Whereas, overall organisational justice was found to be significantly positively correlated with identification with involvement ($r=.445$, $p<.01$), calculative commitment ($r=.394$, $p<.01$), organisational Loyalty ($r=.243$, $p<.01$), and overall organisational commitment ($r=.514$, $p<.01$). The results of stepwise regression analysis indicate that trust in supervisor emerged as the best predictor of all dimensions of organisational commitment and trust in organisation was also the predictor of calculative commitment. The results of stepwise regression also revealed that interactional justice emerged as the best predictor of identification with involvement and organisational loyalty, while distributive justice was also the predictor of calculative commitment, and procedural justice emerged as the best predictor of calculative commitment. Results of hierarchical multiple regression indicated that organisational justice contributed as a moderator in the relationship between organisational trust and organisational commitment. The interaction term (organisational trust $\times$ organisational justice) accounted for a significant proportion of variance in organisational commitment. This interaction term indicated that perceived organisational justice amplified organisational commitment.

Keywords: organisational trust, organisational justice, organisational commitment & front-line workers

1. INTRODUCTION

In the service industry, frontline workers are the first point of contact between an organisation and its clients; thus, their psychological relationship with the firm is a key indicator of operational success (Men et al., 2025). Front-line workers reside at a critical juncture in the service-delivery value chain, where they are typically the initial touchpoints between the organisation and its customers. They shape customers' perceptions of service quality, drive service recovery, and translate organisational guidelines into tangible experiences through frequent boundary-spanning interactions; therefore, their performance and attitudes directly affect organisational effectiveness and customer loyalty (Karatepe & Karadaş, 2012). In the current service-based economy, front-line employees represent the first and often the only connection that a company has with an external customer; thus, the commitment of these employees to the firm drives the operational success of the firm. Frontline workers like nurses, hotel staff, retail salespersons, call-centre agents, and service technicians directly shape how customers

perceive and experience quality in an organisation. Organisational Commitment is closely related to an employee's willingness to provide discretionary effort and remain with the organisation, which also embeds the organisation's key goals. It typically involves continuous interaction with others, tight deadlines, emotional load, performance monitoring, and reliance on the reporting hierarchy. As a result, Formal employment conditions, day-to-day interactions with supervisors, and the fairness of organisational systems carry weight in shaping frontline workers' attitudes toward the organisation.

Organisational commitment is widely known as a multidimensional psychological attachment between employees and their organisations. It stretches beyond an employee simply hoping to stay with the organisation, but rather embodies identification with organisational values, participation in organisational activities, and a desire to advance the interests of the organisation. In this regard, organisational commitment (OC) can be viewed as one of the most powerful work-related attitudes. It indicates how well employees identify with the organisation, how invested they are in its goals and how likely they are to stay within the organisation long term. Employees with a higher level of organisational commitment are more likely to exert effort, comply with organisational demands, and maintain their membership with the organisation during difficult times. On the other hand, weak commitment may be linked to psychological disengagement, decreased attendance, absence, dislike and willingness to quit. The organisational commitment is the psychological bond that connects employees to the organisation and manifests commonly with affective attachment, perceived costs of leaving, and an obligation to stay (Chen et al., 2015). Theoretical links among these constructs also exist; justice perceptions can signal that the organisation cares for its employees, which in turn can foster trust and enhance identification with organisational goals; as predicted by social exchange theory, trust has been shown to mediate the relationships between justice perceptions and organisational commitment (Aryee et al., 2002). While organisational commitment has often been described as affective, continuance, and normative, this study used the organisational commitment scale as measured by Tripathi, Kapoor, and Tripathi (2000). This means measures of identification based on involvement, calculative organisational commitment and organisational loyalty. Identification with involvement depicts the employee's psychological attachment to organisational aims and active participation in organisational life. Calculative Commitment: relates to an employee's rational assessment of the rewards, investments, and alternate costs of retaining an organisational membership. The term organisational loyalty indicates the desire to continue a positive, long-term relationship with the organisation and show a commitment toward the organisation. Together,, these dimensions offer a contextualized framework for studying organisational commitment among frontline workers in the Indian setting. This approach is particularly relevant for frontline workers, as their commitment may signal psychological attachment to the organisation, practical considerations underlying the continuity of the employment contract, and loyalty through repeated experience with an organisation. These dimensions do not correspond exactly to Meyer and Allen's affective, continuance, and normative commitment framework, but they correspond conceptually to the more general multidimensional approach to organisational commitment. Identification with involvement maps closely to the psychological attachment and identification emphasized in affective commitment. Calculative commitment is directly linked to the cost-benefit assessments that are associated with continuance commitment. Organisational loyalty is a long-term orientation toward the organisation that may involve dimensions of obligation, attachment, and a desire to stay. Therefore, the Tripathi et al. (2000) scale is suitable for the present research since it provides a contextual measure of commitment for Indian frontline workers without losing the multidimensionality of the construct.

Out of the several precursors of organisational commitment, organisational trust and organisational justice has evolved as significant relational resource. Importantly, such reliance may come with high turnover among these employees; therefore, further understanding of how organisational trust relates to their long-term commitment and retention is needed (Li, Wang, & Chan, 2025). Organisational trust is employees' willingness to be vulnerable to the actions of organisational authorities or supervisors based on the expectation that the trustor will act competently, reliably, ethically, and in the trustor's legitimate interest. Trust is not a one-dimensional construct in workplace settings. Because of supervisors' behaviour, interpersonal credibility, and support given on a regular basis, employees may trust their immediate supervisors level, while their trust related beliefs about the policies, integrity and dependability of the organisation remain broader. Organisational trust is a basic psychological mechanism that buffers the stressors of high-pressure service environments and, as a result, strengthens the individual-institution affective bond (Cho & Park, 2011; Yılmaz et al., 2024). This psychological foundation, grounded in social exchange theory, leads employees to view the organisation as trustworthy and just (Akkaya, 2020; Kim, 2025) and strengthens employees' identification with corporate goals and values. In addition to its structural mechanisms, a climate of high organisational trust increases emotional sustainability by encouraging greater autonomy among front-line workers and the adoption of genuine deep-acting strategies during service encounters to mitigate some of the psychological exhaustion that may be caused by rigid emotional display policies (Wang et al., 2018; Yagil, 2014). Conversely, without such trust, front-line staff may feel their psychological contract disintegrate, leading to declining task performance and a greater propensity for withdrawal behaviour from the organisation (Farndale et al., 2011). Hence, creating a more transparent climate of authentic leadership and perceived justice is a good solution for enhancing employees' bond with their organisation (Gonzalez-Canovas et al., 2024; Yuan et al., 2021). Existing literature confirms a positive relationship between organisational trust and organisational commitment. The meta-analytic review by Dirks and Ferrin (2002) found

significant associations between trust in leadership and several important employee outcomes, such as job satisfaction, organisational commitment, and citizenship behaviour. Their findings suggest that employees who trust organisational leaders are more likely to hold favourable attitudes toward their organisation. In the context of frontline work, supervisory trust may be especially important because supervisors represent the organisation in employees' everyday work experiences.

Organisational justice refers to employees' perceptions of fairness within the workplace. It is commonly conceptualized as comprising distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice. Distributive justice refers to the perceived fairness of organisational outcomes, including salary, incentives, workload, promotion, recognition, and benefits. Procedural justice concerns the fairness, consistency, neutrality, transparency, and ethical quality of the procedures through which decisions are made. Interactional justice concerns the quality of interpersonal treatment employees receive from supervisors and organisational representatives, including dignity, courtesy, honesty, sensitivity, and adequate explanation of decisions (Niehoff & Moorman, 1993). For frontline workers, justice perceptions are likely to be especially consequential because they repeatedly encounter decisions concerning workload, work schedules, performance expectations, rewards, leave, transfers, customer-related pressure, and supervisory feedback. Employees who perceive that organisational rewards are fairly distributed, decisions are reached through transparent procedures, and supervisors treat them respectfully may be more likely to develop a favourable orientation towards the organisation. Conversely, perceptions of arbitrary decision-making, unequal treatment, disrespectful communication, or inequitable distribution of benefits may weaken trust and diminish employees' willingness to remain committed. The relationship between organisational trust, organisational justice, and organisational commitment can be explained using social exchange theory. This viewpoint suggests that employment partnerships are give-and-take partnerships. Employees reciprocate constructive attitudes and behaviours when they feel that they too are being treated well in terms of fairness, respect and support, and receive honest communication that the organisation is willing to put in the effort to take care of them. Organisational justice conveys to the employee that she is a valued member and treated fairly and trust expresses the belief that the supervisor and the organisation will behave in a reliable manner in future interactions. Collectively, these perceptions could lead to greater identification, commitment, and loyalty from employees.

Studies have also shown that trust acts as a psychological mediator between fairness perceptions and employee behavior. Aryee, Budhwar and Chen (2002) conducted a study that examined a social-exchange model, in which the mediation effect of trust on the relation between organisational justice and employees' work outcomes was verified. Their findings suggest that when employees perceive fair and respectful organisational treatment, they are more likely to develop trust in the organisation, which in turn leads to positive work-related judgments. This evidence relates directly to the present study because it reinforces the argument that organisational justice and organisational trust should not be viewed as independent predictors of commitment.

The role of organisational justice in amplifying commitment has also been confirmed in the Indian and South Asian organisational setting. Bakhshi et al. (2009) found a positive association between employee perception of distributive, procedural and interactional justice and organisational commitment. They discovered that when resources were allocated, decisions were made and employees were treated fairly and respectfully, then employees were more favourably disposed toward the organisation. In the same vein, Ponnu and Chuah (2010) reported that organisational justice is significantly associated with organisational commitment, as well as the employees' intentions to quit among workers in Malaysia. Employees who view the organisation as a fairer place to work tend to be more committed and less likely to consider quitting. Their study showed this. It is well known that different dimensions of justice can have differently sized effects. Distributive justice was significantly more associated with personal and outcome-related evaluations like pay satisfaction, while procedural justice had a stronger correlation with organisation-oriented outcomes, as found by McFarlin and Sweeney (1992). This distinction is especially beneficial to understand the present study, given that distributive justice can be expected to affect frontline workers' calculative commitment through their judgement of salary, incentives, benefits, workload, and promotion opportunities (Quick et al., 2010). Yet, because procedural justice reflects the legitimacy, consistency, and trustworthiness of organisational decision-making, it may have a larger link to organisational commitment.

Masterson et al. (2000) elaborated that various forms of justice could affect each social-exchange relationship differently. In terms of implications, they reveal that procedural justice is more critical to the employee-organisation relationship, whereas interactional justice is more critical the employee-supervisor relationship. That is an important distinction that matters quite a bit to frontline workers. The findings suggest that fair procedures can work to foster employees' trust in the organisation as an institution and that respectful and dignified treatment from supervisors can reinforce employees' identification with the organisation and their organisational loyalty. The broader importance of justice perceptions has been confirmed through meta-analytic research. Cohen-Charash and Spector (2001) found that organisational justice is associated with numerous employee outcomes, including organisational commitment, job satisfaction, trust, performance, and withdrawal-related attitudes. Similarly, Colquitt et al. (2001) demonstrated that distributive, procedural, interpersonal, and informational justice are

empirically distinct dimensions and are differently related to employee attitudes and behaviours.

The present study is grounded in the premise that frontline workers' organisational commitment is shaped by both relational and structural features of the work environment. Frontline employees work at the intersection of organisational systems and service recipients; consequently, they frequently encounter supervisory decisions, work-allocation practices, performance expectations, reward systems, and interpersonal interactions. Accordingly, their commitment is probably contingent not only on direct material benefits but also on the trust they place in their supervisors and organisation, and a belief that organisational practices are fair. Previous studies have reported that organisational trust and organisational justice were both related to employee attitudes and commitment independently. Still, the combined role of these two at the frontline worker level has been explored in few studies, remaining largely unexplored in the Indian organisational setting. This study explores the roles of both organisational trust and organisational justice as complementary predictors of organisational commitment. It also potentially examines whether organisational justice moderates the association between organisational trust and organisational commitment. This moderating view is in itself theoretically important and interesting in that it creates a framework wherein positive trust is more likely to be transmuted into long-term organisational commitment if employees believe that organisational policies and supervisory practices are fair. This study encompasses multiple criteria (trust in supervisor, trust in organisation, distributive justice, procedural justice, interactional justice) to provide a better insight into the psychological processes by which frontline workers feel heightened identification through involvement, calculative commitment, organisational loyalty, and organisational commitment.

Objectives of the study: In view of gaps in the existing literature, the present study was designed to address the following objectives:

1. To examine the role of organisational trust and organisational justice in organisational commitment among front-line workers.
2. To examine the moderating role of organisational justice in the relationship between organisational trust and organisational commitment among front-line workers.

Hypotheses of the study: In the light of the findings of previous studies and theoretical background, the following hypotheses were framed:

1. Dimensions of organisational trust would be positively correlated with organisational commitment as well as would predict organisational commitment.
2. Dimensions of organisational justice would be positively correlated with organisational commitment as well as would predict organisational commitment.
3. Overall organisational trust and overall organisational justice would be positively correlated with overall organisational commitment as well as would predict overall organisational commitment.
4. Organisational justice would moderate the relationship between organisational trust and organisational commitment among front-line workers.

METHODS

Design: The present study based on a correlational design. In this study, the dimension of organisational trust was tapped as the predictor variable; the dimension of organisational commitment was measured as the criterion variable; and the dimension of organisational justice was measured as the moderator variable.

Sample: Based on purposive sampling technique, 210 front line workers (Mage=37.34years, SD=8.69) participated in this study and were divided into two groups front line workers who work in privet sector (N=110) and front line workers who work in public sector (N=100) age ranged between 20-60 years. Participants were selected from different Organisations and institutes in Vaishali, Hajipur, Muzaffarpur, Madhubani, and Darbhanga.

Measures: The following psychometric Measures were employed in the present study:

Organisational Trust Inventory -This scale was developed by Nyhan and Marlowe (1997). It is consisted of 12 items measuring two dimensions of organisational trust: Trust in Supervisor and Trust in Organisation. The trust in supervisor dimension has 8 items, and the trust in organisation dimension has 4 items. The Cronbach's alpha of the scale is 0.97, indicating high internal consistency..

Organisational Justice Scale - A modified version of the organisational justice scale developed by Niehoff and Moorman (1993) was used in the present study. This scale consists of 20 items measuring three dimensions of organisational justice. The dimensions are distributed justice (5 items), procedural justice (6 items) and interactional justice (9 items). Cronbach's alpha of the scale is 0.92, indicating high internal consistency.

Organisational Commitment Scale- Tripathi, Kapoor and Tripathi's (2000) scale of organisational commitment was used to measure three dimensions, namely, identification with involvement, calculative organisational

commitment, and organisational loyalty. It is a 5-point scale consists of 8-items (responses ranging from 1 to 5, 1 means strongly disagree and 5 means strongly agree). Internal consistency of the subscales and total scale is good (Cronbach's alphas = .75 to .83).

Procedure: Participants were contacted via their organisations and institutions. Following their consent to participate, participants completed the relevant scales. Respondents were told they should respond honestly and that their responses would only be used for research purposes. A correlation between organisational trust, organisational justice and organisational commitment was examined using Pearson's product-moment correlation. For instance, we performed stepwise regression analysis to find out which dimensions of organisational trust and organisational justice can serve as significant predictors of the organisational commitment of frontline workers. Further, hierarchical moderation regression analysis was done to explore the organisational justice as moderator the relationship between organisational trust and organisational commitment. Analyses of the data were computed through SPSS version 27.00. The obtained results are presented in tables 1 to 5.

RESULTS

Table 1. Correlation Coefficients of Organisational Trust (Dimensions and Overall) and Organisational Commitment (Dimensions and Overall)

Organisational Commitment	Identification with Involvement	Calculative Commitment	Organisational Loyalty	Overall Organisational Commitment
Organisational Trust				
Trust in Supervisor	.544**	.277**	.332**	.577**
Trust in Organisation	.165	.259**	.178*	.270**
Overall Organisational Trust	.525**	.355**	.359**	.604**

*p<.05; **p<.001

Results displayed in the table indicate that supervisor dimension of organisational trust was found significantly positively correlated with identification with involvement (dimension of organisational commitment) ($r=.544$, $p<.01$), calculative commitment (dimension of organisational commitment) ($r=.277$, $p<.01$), organisational loyalty ($r=.332$, $p<.01$) and organisational commitment (overall) ($r=.577$, $p<.001$). Trust in organisation was found significantly positively correlated with calculative commitment (dimension of organisational commitment) ($r=.259$, $p<.01$), organisational loyalty (dimension of organisational commitment) ($r=.178$, $p<.05$), and organisational commitment (overall) ($r=.270$, $p<.001$). Overall organisational trust was found significantly positively correlated with identification with involvement (dimension of organisational commitment) ($r=.525$, $p<.01$), calculative commitment (dimension of organisational commitment) ($r=.355$, $p<.01$) and organisational loyalty ($r=.359$, $p<.001$). Overall organisational trust was found significantly positively correlated with organisational commitment (overall) ($r=.604$, $p<.001$).

Table 2. Correlation Coefficients of Organisational Justice (Dimensions and Overall) and Organisational Commitment (Dimensions and Overall)

Organisational Justice (Dimensions and overall)	Identification with Involvement	Calculative Commitment	Organisational Loyalty	Overall Organisational Commitment
Distributive justice	.321**	.154*	.159*	.314**
Procedural Justice	.340**	.297**	.143*	.377**
Interactional Justice	.384**	.406**	.246**	.481**
Overall Organisational Justice	.445**	.394**	.243**	.514**

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

Results displayed in the table indicate that distributive justice was found significantly positively correlated with identification with involvement ($r=.321$, $p<.01$), calculative commitment ($r=.154$, $p<.05$), organisational Loyalty ($r=.159$, $p<.05$) and overall organisational commitment ($r=.314$, $p<.01$). Procedural justice was found significantly

positively correlated with Identification with Involvement (dimension of organisational commitment) ($r=.340$, $p<.01$), calculative commitment (dimension of organisational commitment) ($r=.297$, $p<.01$), organisational Loyalty (dimension of organisational commitment) ($r=.143$, $p<.05$) and organisational commitment (overall) ($r=.377$, $p<.01$). Interactional justice was found significantly positively correlated with Identification with Involvement (dimension of organisational commitment) ($r=.384$, $p<.01$), calculative commitment (dimension of organisational commitment) ($r=.406$, $p<.01$), organisational Loyalty (dimension of organisational commitment) ($r=.246$, $p<.01$) and organisational commitment (overall) ($r=.481$, $p<.01$). Overall organisational justice was found significantly positively correlated with Identification with Involvement (dimension of organisational commitment) ($r=.445$, $p<.01$), calculative commitment (dimension of organisational commitment) ($r=.394$, $p<.01$), organisational loyalty (dimension of organisational commitment) ($r=.243$, $p<.01$) and organisational commitment (overall) ($r=.514$, $p<.01$).

Table 3: Results of stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis using Dimensions of Organisational Trust as Predictor Variables and Organisational Commitment as Criterion

Predictors	R	R ²	Adjusted R ²	R ² Change	F Change	F
Criterion Variable: Identification with Involvement						
Trust in Supervisor	.544	.296	.290	.296	49.59***	49.59***
Criterion Variable: Calculative Commitment						
Trust in Supervisor	.277	.077	.069	.077	9.835**	9.83**
Trust in Organisation	.361	.130	.115	.053	7.135**	8.740***
Criterion Variable: Organisational Loyalty						
Trust in Supervisor	.332	.110	.103	.110	14.595***	14.595***
Criterion Variable: Overall Organisational commitment						
Trust in Supervisor	.577	.333	.327	.333	58.780***	58.780***
Trust in Organisation	.613	.376	.365	.043	8.123*	35.226***

** $p<.001$; *** $p<.0001$

Results of stepwise regression analysis reveal that trust in supervisor and trust in organisation are contributors to dimensions of organisational commitment (Table-2) revealed that trust in supervisor emerged as the best predictor of all dimensions of organisational commitment, explaining a total variance of approximately 7.7% to 33% of the various domains of organisational commitment. Trust in organisation was also the predictor of calculative commitment.

Table 4: Results of Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis using Dimensions of Organisational Trust as Predictor Variables and Organisational Commitment as Criterion

Predictors	R	R ²	Adjusted R ²	R ² Change	F Change	F
Criterion Variable: Identification with Involvement						
Interactional Justice	.384	.147	.143	.147	35.932***	35.932***
Distributive Justice	.425	.180	.172	.033	8.357**	22.780***
Procedural Justice	.447	.200	.188	.019	4.951*	17.127***
Criterion Variable: Calculative Commitment						
Interactional Justice	.406	.165	.161	.165	41.132***	41.132***
Criterion Variable: Organisational Loyalty						
Interactional Justice	.246	.061	.056	.061	13.413***	13.413***
Criterion Variable: Overall Organisational commitment						
Interactional Justice	.481	.232	.228	.232	62.695***	62.695***

Procedural Justice	.507	.257	.250	.026	7.174**	35.865***
--------------------	------	------	------	------	---------	-----------

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

Results of stepwise regression analysis reveal that interactional justice, procedural justice and distributive justice are contributors to dimensions of organisational commitment (Table-2) revealed that Interactional Justice emerged as the best predictor of identification with involvement, Calculative Commitment and organisational loyalty, explaining a total variance of approximately 6.1% to 16.5% of the various domains of organisational commitment. Procedural justice emerged as the predictor of identification with involvement, explaining a total variance of approximately 1.9%. Distributive justice was also the predictor of identification with involvement, explaining a total variance of approximately 3%. Interactional Justice emerged as the best predictor of overall organisational commitment, explaining a total variance of approximately 23.2%. Results of stepwise regression analysis also indicated that procedural justice emerged as the another important predictor of overall organisational commitment, explaining a total variance of 2.6%. Overall, Table 4 indicates that interactional justice was the most consistent and influential predictor of organisational commitment among frontline workers. It predicted identification with involvement, calculative commitment, organisational loyalty, and overall organisational commitment. Distributive justice and procedural justice made additional contributions only to identification with involvement, whereas procedural justice also made an additional contribution to overall organisational commitment.

Table 5. Summary of Hierarchical Moderation Regression Analysis for Organisational Justice as Moderator in the relationship between Organisational Trust and Organisational Commitment.

Variable	R	R ²	ΔR^2	F	ΔF	B
Step1						
organisational trust	.350	.122	.122	28.998***	28.998***	.350***
Step2						
organisational justice	.524	.275	.152	39.227***	43.528***	.453***
Step3						
organisational trust $\times$ organisational justice	.548	.300	.025	29.406***	7.355**	.167**

** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Hierarchical multiple regression was used to explore the hypothesis that organisational justice as moderator the relationship between organisational trust and organisational commitment. Scores of the organisational justice and organisational trust were centered based on recommendations by Frazier et al. (2004), and cross product terms were calculated, which represented the interaction between the predictor (organisational trust) and the moderator (organisational justice). Variables were entered into the regression in three steps: Step 1 included organisational trust as a predictor of organisational commitment, Step 2 added organisational justice and Step 3 added the cross product term (organisational trust $\times$ organisational justice) as a predictor of organisational commitment. A statistically significant change at Step 3 is considered evidence of a moderation effect (Baron & Kenny, 1986; Frazier et al., 2004). Results found a significant main effect for organisational trust accounting for 12.2% of the variance in overall organisational commitment, $R^2 = .122$, $F(1, 208) = 28.998$, $p < .001$ in Step 1. The addition of organisational justice in Step 2 accounted for 27.50% of the variance in organisational commitment which is a significant change in the prediction, $\Delta R^2 = .152$, $\Delta F(1, 207) = 43.528$, $p < .001$. In step 3, the interaction term (organisational justice $\times$ organisational trust), which accounted for a significant proportion of variance (30%) in organisational commitment, $\Delta R^2 = .025$, $\Delta F(1, 206) = 7.355$, $p < .01$, $\beta = .167$, $p < .01$. This interaction term was indicating that perceived organisational justice served as amplifier for organisational commitment. It is observed that when organisational justice interacts with organisational trust there is significant and positive impact on employee organisational commitment.

DISCUSSION

The present study examined the role of organisational trust and organisational justice in organisational commitment among frontline workers. More specifically, it investigated the relationships of trust in supervisor, trust in organisation, distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice with identification with involvement, calculative commitment, organisational loyalty, and overall organisational commitment. The study also examined whether organisational justice moderated the relationship between organisational trust and overall

organisational commitment. The findings provide substantial support for the proposition that both trust and justice are important psychological resources for strengthening frontline workers' commitment to their organisations. Overall organisational trust was positively and significantly correlated with identification with involvement ($r = .525, p < .001$), calculative commitment ($r = .355, p < .001$), organisational loyalty ($r = .359, p < .001$), and overall organisational commitment ($r = .604, p < .001$). The magnitude of the association between overall organisational trust and overall organisational commitment was the strongest among the correlations reported in the study. This finding suggests that if frontline workers see their supervisors and organisations as credible, trustworthy and reliable they tend to have organisational identification, have positive assessment of continued membership and loyalty to the organisation. This is consistent with social exchange theory, which suggests that employees respond with positive work attitudes and behaviours when the organisation treats them well. Frontline workers trust their supervisors and organisations; this trust creates a better sense of psychological security and confidence in the employment relationship for the frontline workers. This kind of confidence can spur employees to be more engaged in organisational activity and to be committed to continuing their association with the organisation. Furthermore, the current findings support a meta-analytic review (Dirks & Ferrin, 2002) that found positive relationships between leadership trust and organisational commitment, job satisfaction, and citizenship behaviour.

The first hypothesis proposed that the dimensions of organisational trust would be positively associated with and predict organisational commitment. This hypothesis was substantially supported, although the pattern differed across the dimensions of trust. Trust in supervisor was significantly and positively correlated with identification with involvement ($r = .544, p < .001$), calculative commitment ($r = .277, p < .001$), organisational loyalty ($r = .332, p < .001$), and overall organisational commitment ($r = .577, p < .001$). In contrast, trust in organisation was significantly associated with calculative commitment ($r = .259, p < .001$), organisational loyalty ($r = .178, p < .05$), and overall organisational commitment ($r = .270, p < .001$), but its association with identification with involvement was not statistically significant. The relatively greater influence of trust in supervisor is especially relevant in the context of frontline work. Those who work on the frontline primarily interact with their immediate supervisors who are the organisation for them: Supervisors assign work, set expectations, give feedback, resolve complaints, assess performance, and provide access to organisational resources. As a result, supervisors could turn into the most visible face of company power. Competent, trustworthy, fair, and supportive supervisors may elicit the identification of employees with the goals of the organisation and develop loyalty to the organisation. It is consistent with the research of Nyhan and Marlowe (1997), who distinguished between three-dimensions of trust: supervisor- and organisation- in a way that it acknowledges employees can have distinct trust perceptions regarding their supervisor and the organisation as a whole.

The regression findings further strengthen this interpretation. This interpretation is bolstered by the regression results. Findings: Trust in supervisor was found to be the utmost and only strong predictor of identification with involvement (29.6%); it also predicted organisational loyalty, and explained 11.0% of the variance. Findings of the study suggest that supervisor trust is most relevant to the relational part of commitment. When employees internalize reliability, integrity, support, and mutuality from their daily supervisor interactions, they are more likely to be psychologically connected with the organisation and less likely to leave that organisation. Trust in supervisor was also the first predictor of calculative commitment followed with 7.7 % of the variation. At the second step, trust in organisation added a further 5.3% of variance. The two dimensions accounted for 13.0% of the variance in calculative commitment. This finding implies that the likelihood that frontline workers stay in the job derives its power from their level of trust in the supervisor and their faith that the organisation as a larger organisation is doing what one expects organisation to do. Trust in organisation might be especially important in determining employees' views of organisational stability, policy consistency, job security, and the credibility of long-term organisational commitments.

Trust in supervisor accounted for 33.3% of the variance in overall organisational commitment, and of 4.3% additional variance in variance trust in organisation. The two dimensions of trust combined explained a 37.6% variance in overall organisational commitment. This is a significant finding and highlights the strong relationship between frontline worker organisational commitment and trust-based relationships in the workplace. The finding is consistent with Mayer, Davis, and Schoorman's (1995) conceptualization of trust as the acceptance of vulnerability by employees based upon positive expectations about the intentions and behaviors of others. Encoded in the organisational life, such positive expectations may allow the worker to continue to be engaged (even under situations of uncertainty, stress, or dependency on managerial decisions).

The second hypothesis proposed that the dimensions of organisational justice would be positively associated with and predict organisational commitment. This hypothesis was supported. All three dimensions of organisational justice distributive, procedural, and interactional justice were significantly and positively related to identification with involvement, calculative commitment, organisational loyalty, and overall organisational commitment. In addition, overall organisational justice demonstrated significant positive correlations with identification with involvement ($r = .445, p < .01$), calculative commitment ($r = .394, p < .01$), organisational loyalty ($r = .243, p < .01$), and overall organisational commitment ($r = .514, p < .01$). The findings of this investigation reveal that

frontline workers perceiving fairness in the distribution of benefits, fairness in decision-making processes, and fair interpersonal treatment are more likely to fulfill higher levels of organisational commitment. The results are supported by Bakhshi, Kumar, and Rani (2009), who found that organisational justice perceptions related positively to organisational commitment in the India work context. Furthermore, they are consistent with the findings of Cohen-Charash and Spector (2001) meta-analytic and Colquitt et al. (2001) showed that justice perceptions have consistent associations with a number of important work attitudes such as organisational commitment, satisfaction, trust, citizenship behaviour and withdrawal-related outcomes.

Results of regression analysis indicated that there was a distinct character of the predictive role of each of the three dimensions of organisational justice. Interactional justice was the most robust initial predictor of identification with involvement, accounting for 14.7% of the variance. Distributive justice explained 3.3% variance, and procedural justice explained an additional 1.9%. In sum, the three justice dimensions accounted for 20.0% of the variance in identification with involvement. The results indicate that when frontline workers experience respectful and dignified treatment from supervisors, perceive outcomes as equitable, and believe that organisational decision making is guided by fair procedures, they are likely to identify with the organisation. Its especially strong effect of interactional justice on identification with participation is theoretically important. Interactional justice is related to whether employees are treated generally with dignity, politeness, honesty, sensitivity, and respect, and whether the employees are provided adequate explanations for decisions that impact them. Treating people respectfully may determine whether frontline workers feel like they belong to the organisation, given their frequent exposure to high demands and direct supervision. On the other hand, supervisors' listening supports in workers' psychological identification with organisations when the survey results are effectively communicated with clarity and respect. This leads to employees participating in the organisation activities.

Interactional justice was further emerged as the single significant predictor of calculative commitment and organisational loyalty. The result suggests that respectful treatment could both inform employees' emotional and relational orientation towards the organisation and also their pragmatic evaluation of maintaining membership in the organisation. When people feel they will be treated with dignity and fairness in their everyday work, they may be more likely to stay with an organisation. This interpretation aligns with Masterson et al. (2000) identified interpersonal fairness as one of the most significant factors in influencing employees' exchange relations with immediate supervisors. For overall organisational, interactional justice was the best predictor and explained 23.2% of the variance. The additional 2.6% explained variance captured by procedural justice brought the total explained variance to 25.7%. This result supports the perspective that the interpersonal aspect of organisational justice is an important precursor of frontline workers global commitment, but the distinct contribution of procedural justice indicates a need for more than just respectful treatment. The overall commitment of employees is further increased when the organisational decision-making is through transparent, consistent and objective processes.

The findings on procedural justice are noteworthy. It was highly associated with all aspects of organisational commitment, however it only entered in the regression equation for commitment by identification with involvement and for overall organisational commitment. This suggests that procedural justice has a broad association with commitment, even where its unique predictive contribution may overlap with interactional and distributive justice. Employees may perceive practices regarding promotion, rewards, performance appraisal, work allocation, grievance procedures, leave, and punishment as evidence of an organisation's legitimacy and trustworthiness. Thus, fair procedures may enhance organisational commitment through a reduction of uncertainty and the communication of respect for employees' rights and interests. This does not say anything of the results regarding so-called distributive justice. Overall, distributive justice was positively related to each dimension of commitment, and it provided a significant incremental influence to identification with involvement. This finding implies that the psychological engagement of frontline workers with the organisation is partially dependent on whether they perceive outcomes like rewards, workload, recognition, benefits and promotion opportunities as fair. Fundamentally, distributive justice is most akin to employees' outcome-oriented judgments while procedural justice is more strongly related to organisation-focused attitudes (McFarlin & Sweeney, 1992). The current study expands this perspective by demonstrating that amongst frontline workers, distributive justice helps foster organisational identification as long as it works in the context of interactional and procedural fairness.

The third hypothesis proposed that organisational trust and organisational justice would be positively associated with organisational commitment and would contribute to its prediction. Results from the correlation and regression analyses generally support this proposition. Overall organisational trust and overall organisational justice had statistically significant positive relations with all the dimensions of organisational commitment. Organisational trust had a greater correlation with overall organisational commitment. Results were that procedural justice and distributive justice were more strongly correlated with overall organisational justice, suggesting trust may be particularly relevant for frontline workers general organisational attachment. However, justice was also a meaningful contributor, particularly interactional justice and procedural justice.

Organisational justice would moderate the relationship between organisational trust and organisational commitment was the fourth hypothesis. This hypothesis was supported. Hierarchical regression analysis results are summarized in previous table (Table 2). This finding suggests that employees who perceive their organisation and its management as trustworthy, honest, reliable, and caring for well-being were more committed to the organisation. When organisational justice was added into the model at Step 2, the predictive power of the model increased significantly. The variance explained in organisational commitment increased from 12.2% to 27.5 % ($R^2 = .275$), and a further 15.2% of variance accounted for ($\Delta R^2 = .152$, $\Delta F(1,207) = 43.528$, $p < .001$). And a significant positive impact of organisational justice on organisational commitment ($\beta = .453$, $p < .001$). Findings reveal that employees do perceive fair organisational outcomes, procedures, manager behaviors, and communication; these perceptions contribute greatly to an employee's commitment. That organisational justice significantly contribute to job performance indicate that employees are not only concerned about how much trust they have in an organisation but also whether they are being treated fairly. An equitable reward, promotions, workload distribution, assessment of performance, decision making procedures and human treatment indicates that the organisation cares about and trusts their employees. Such positive perspectives are expected to lead to employees reciprocating with loyalty, better identification and a desire to stay with the organisation. This finding is in line with the research conducted by Bakhshi, Kumar & Rani (2009), which found that the organisational justice perceptions by the employees to significantly predict organisational commitment. Most importantly, Step 3 showed support for the moderating hypothesis regarding organisational justice. The inclusion of the interaction term between organisational trust and organisational justice contributed to a 2.5% variance in organisational commitment ($\Delta R^2 = .025$, $\Delta F(1,206) = 7.355$, $p < .01$, $\beta = .167$, $p < .01$). The full model explained 30.0% of the variance in organisational commitment ($R^2 = .300$, $F(3,206) = 29.406$, $p < .001$). The interaction contributes a statistically significant and theoretically meaningful increase in explained variance, although it is modest. In organisational research, however, interaction effects typically account for lower proportions of variance than main effects because they capture indirect associations rather than direct associations.

The positive interaction effect indicates that organisational justice enhances the positive relationship between organisational trust and organisational commitment. Thus, organisational justice plays a strengthening role in the relationship between trust and commitment. The positive relationship between organisational trust and organisational commitment will be stronger when employees feel a high level of organisational justice. Employees are likely to develop the highest levels of commitment when they trust the organisation and believe its policies, decisions, and managerial practices are fair. This is a conceptually important finding. This finding endorsing the social-exchange perspective is in line with Aryee et al. (2002) they focus was also put on the closeness of the relationship of organisational justice, trust and positive work attitude. Trust represents the employees feeling confidence in the trustworthiness and honesty of the organisation while justice basically provides actionable and tangible proof that organisation acts fairly. When trust is back by fair procedures and respect, employees receive a consistent internal signal that the organisation is worthy of their loyalty. On the other hand, where empathy exists in the organisation, employees whose contributions are compensated unfairly in promotions, rewards, performance evaluations, or decision-making will not develop this commitment. Perceived injustice may nullify or diminish the positive psychological effects of trust since it can lead to feelings of dissatisfaction and even exclusion from, as well as a failure to share the same trust in others, among organisational members. Thus, the results provide evidence of organisational justice as an important moderator of the relationship between organisational trust and organisational commitment. The positive effect of organisational trust on commitment seems to be even better when the organisational environment is perceived to be fairly favorable in this regard by employees. It suggests that companies cannot think of trust-building programs as a means of boosting employee commitment. They have to be transparent, unbiased, reliable and kind with their policies and managerial practices, as well.

In summary, the current study evidenced organisational trust and organisational justice as complementary psychological resources during the prediction of organisational commitment among frontline workers from an Indian context. The most prominent trust-based predictor was supervisors; it was the most significant area of trust-based predictors for both identification with involvement and overall commitment. Interactional justice was the strongest predictor based on justice ethos for identification with involvement, calculative commitment, organisational loyalty and overall commitment. Moreover, procedural justice had an incremental role in predicting identification with involvement and organisational commitment, while distributive justice accounted for identification with involvement. These findings suggest that no single organisational factor determines frontline workers' commitment and that the experience of trustworthy leadership, equitable outcomes, fair processes, and respectful interpersonal treatment shape their commitment together.

CONCLUSION

The study concludes that organisational trust and organisational justice are potential antecedents of organisational commitment of frontline workers. Trust in supervisor was particularly important in reinforcing identification with

involvement, organisational loyalty, and general organisational commitment. Trust in the organisation can also be increased by cognitive calculative commitment and calculative commitment and ultimately organisational commitment. Each dimension of organisational justice had a positive association with organisational commitment. In summary, interactional justice was the strongest and most consistently important predictor, and procedural justice supplemented the prediction of identification with involvement and general commitment." Moreover, the moderation findings indicated that organisational trust relates more strongly to organisational commitment through the organisational justice process. Thus, the level of commitment is expected to be maximum when both trust and justice are experienced by employees in the workplace.

IMPLICATIONS

Organisations should build employee trust through supervisory competence, integrity, reliability and concern for employee welfare. Supervisors need to communicate updates and feedback clearly, listen to workers' concerns, and do so in a respectful manner when explaining decisions. However, it is also similarly important for organisations to put in place transparent processes for things like performance appraisal, promotion, incentives, distribution of work, sanction of leave, transfer and grievance handling. Where rewards, recognition, benefits, and career opportunities are fairly distributed as well. Because justice strengthens the impact of trust on commitment, organisations should pursue a combination of leadership practices that promote trust as well as human resource policies that promote justice.

LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE SUGGESTIONS

In the study we utilized a cross sectional correlational design, and therefore no causal conclusions can be drawn. Also, there is a risk of common-method bias and socially desirable responding as it relies on self-report measures. Moreover, Since it was a cross-sectional correlational study of design, it means no cause-and-effect conclusions can be made. Self-report measures may be more likely to have suffered from common-method bias and socially desirable responding. Additionally, the sample was purposively selected from selected district of Bihar restricting the generalizability of the findings. Future research should explore larger and diverse samples, contrast public and private-sector employees, and implement longitudinal or mixed-method designs. Researches can also check upon job satisfaction, perceived organisational support, leadership style, psychological safety, work engagement, burnout, turnover intention, and organisational citizenship behaviour. Finally, the moderation analysis should be supplemented with an interaction plot and simple-slopes analysis in the final manuscript to clearly demonstrate how organisational justice changes the relationship between organisational trust and commitment.

REFERENCES

1. Akkaya, B. (2020). Linking organizational commitment and organizational trust in health care organizations. *Organizacija*, 53(4), 306-318. <https://doi.org/10.2478/orga-2020-002>
2. Aryee, S., Budhwar, P. S., & Chen, Z. X. (2002). Trust as a mediator of the relationship between organizational justice and work outcomes: Test of a social exchange model. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23(3), 267-285. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.138>
3. Bakhshi, A., Kumar, K., & Rani, E. (2009). Organizational justice perceptions as predictor of job satisfaction and organization commitment. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 4(9), 145-154. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijbm.v4n9p145>
4. Chen, S.-Y., Wu, W.-C., Chang, C.-S., Lin, C.-T., Kung, J.-Y., Weng, H., Lin, Y.-T., & Lee, S.-I. (2015). Organizational justice, trust, and identification and their effects on organizational commitment in hospital nursing staff. *BMC Health Services Research*, 15(1), 363. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-015-1016-8>
5. Cho, Y. J., & Park, H. (2011). Exploring the Relationships Among Trust, Employee Satisfaction, and Organizational Commitment. *Public Management Review*, 13(4), 551-573. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2010.525033>
6. Cohen-Charash, Y., & Spector, P. E. (2001). The role of justice in organizations: A meta-analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 86(2), 278-321. <https://doi.org/10.1006/obhd.2001.2958>
7. Colquitt, J. A., Conlon, D. E., Wesson, M. J., Porter, C. O. L. H., & Ng, K. Y. (2001). Justice at the millennium: A meta-analytic review of 25 years of organizational justice research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 425-445. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.425>
8. Dirks, K. T., & Ferrin, D. L. (2002). Trust in leadership: Meta-analytic findings and implications for research and practice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 611-628. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.4.611>
9. Farndale, E., Ruiten, J. V., Kelliher, C., & Hailey, V. H. (2011). The influence of perceived employee voice on Organizational commitment: An exchange perspective. *Human Resource Management*, 50(1), 113-129. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.20404>
10. Frazier, P. A., Tix, A. P., & Barron, K. E. (2004). Testing moderator and mediator effects in counseling psychology research. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 51(1), 115-134.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.51.1.115>

11. González-Cánovas, A., Trillo, A., Bretones, F. D., & Fernández-Millán, J. M. (2024). Trust in leadership and perceptions of justice in fostering employee commitment. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 15, 1359581.

<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1359581>

12. Karatepe, O. M., & Karadas, G. (2012). The effect of management commitment to service quality on job embeddedness and performance outcomes. *Journal of Business Economics and Management*, 13(4), 614-636.

<https://doi.org/10.3846/16111699.2011.620159>

13. Li, Q., Wang, S., & Chan, K.-S. (2025). Exploring the Relationship Between Organizational Trust and Frontline Employees' Turnover Intention: The Mediating Role of Organizational Commitment. *Journal of Sustainable Management and Social Progress*, 1(2), 1-7. <https://doi.org/10.64229/g05ap515>

14. Masterson, S. S., Lewis, K., Goldman, B. M., & Taylor, M. S. (2000). Integrating justice and social exchange: The differing effects of fair procedures and treatment on work relationships. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(4), 738-748. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.85.4.738>

15. Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H., & Schoorman, F. D. (1995). An integrative model of organizational trust. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(3), 709-734. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1995.9508080335>

16. McFarlin, D. B., & Sweeney, P. D. (1992). Distributive and procedural justice as predictors of satisfaction with personal and organizational outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal*, 35(3), 626-637.

<https://doi.org/10.2307/256489>

17. Men, L. R., Yue, C. A., Cho-Li, Q., & Nam, G. (2025). Building Bridges of Trust: The Role of Perceived Organizational Support, Supervisory Communication, and Coworker Relationships in Enhancing Frontline Employee Support. *International Journal of Business Communication*.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/23294884251359239>

18. Niehoff, B. P., & Moorman, R. H. (1993). Justice as a mediator of the relationship between methods of monitoring and organizational citizenship behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36(3), 527-556.

<https://doi.org/10.2307/256591>

19. Nyhan, R. C., & Marlowe, H. A., Jr. (1997). Development and psychometric properties of the Organizational Trust Inventory. *Evaluation Review*, 21(5), 614-635. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0193841X9702100505>

20. Ponnu, C. H., & Chuah, C. C. (2010). Organizational commitment, organizational justice and employee turnover in Malaysia. *African Journal of Business Management*, 4(13), 2676-2692.

<https://academicjournals.org/journal/AJBM>

21. Quick, J. C., Cooper, C. L., Gibbs, P. C., Little, L. M., & Nelson, D. L. (2010). Positive organizational behavior at work. *International review of industrial and organizational psychology*, 25(1), 253-291.

22. Tripathi, R., Kapoor, S., & Tripathi, N. (2000). Organizational Commitment Scale. Publication details should be reported exactly as provided in the original scale manual or source document.

23. Wang, W., Huang, S., Yin, H., & Ke, Z. (2018). Employees' Emotional Labor and Emotional Exhaustion: Trust and Gender as Moderators. *Social Behavior and Personality An International Journal*, 46(5), 733-748.

<https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.6745>

24. Yagil, D. (2014). Trust in the supervisor and authenticity in service roles. *Journal of Service Management*, 25(3), 411-426. <https://doi.org/10.1108/josm-09-2012-0199>

25. Yilmaz, H., Durmuşcelebi, C., & Arslan, S. (2024). The role of organizational trust in shaping commitment and reducing turnover intention in aviation. *Journal of Aviation*, 8(3), 385-394.

<https://doi.org/10.30518/jav.1548032>

26. Yuan, Y., Kong, H., Baum, T., Liu, Y., Liu, C., Bu, N., Wang, K., & Yin, Z. (2021). Transformational leadership and trust in leadership impacts on employee commitment. *Tourism Review*, 77(5), 1385-1399.

<https://doi.org/10.1108/tr-10-2020>