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Chapter 7
Findings and Discussions of Qualitative Data

7. Introduction

This chapter brings Chapter 3 (section 3.2) and Chapter 4 (section 4.1) together into a logical discussion on the perception of the community trust and commitment building process. As discussed in Chapter 3 (section 3.2), there are different schools of thought in the literature on this practice. Therefore, the main research question for the qualitative part of this study was how informative equilibrium, public consultation/participation, learning and knowledge-experience facilitate the trust and commitment building process. It is important to note that while the conceptual model (Figure 3.2) attempted to validate a significant part of the proposed competing model (Figure 3.3) through qualitative information, the results of the competing model have not been discussed in this thesis because the proposed model fits better and explains more variance of community commitment than the competing model. The modified competing model (Appendix – 7 C and Appendix – 8) explains 46% ($R^2=.46$) of the variance and has some supplementary support to the explanation of unfolding insight in terms of the knowledge generating, trust and commitment building process. However for reference purposes, the qualitative proposed model is shown in Figure 7.1 (as proposed in Figure 3.2).

![Figure 7.1: A Conceptual Framework for Trust and Commitment Building](image)

To answer the research question theorized earlier, this chapter attempts to provide an insight and in-depth understanding of the trust and commitment building process (as Figure 7.1). To achieve this objective, 12 interviews were conducted which are discussed and interpreted in this chapter with cross-case analysis and same has been related with proven model of town planning scheme mechanism, which is exemplified in chapter 8, section (8.7).

Accordingly, the goals of this chapter are to:

- Discuss the method of collecting qualitative data (Section 7.1, 7.2 and 7.3)
- Provide an in-depth interview profile along with case and code identity to explore major service provider relationships, key informant and organization dimension (Section 7.4)
• Focus briefly on each depth-interviewed case individually to reveal and gain insight into what lies behind the trust and commitment building process (Section 7.5)

• Explore findings of the qualitative data through cross-case analysis focusing on common evidence in the context of each factor in the proposed framework (Section 7.6)

• Summaries the major findings of qualitative information and verify whether the proposed underpinned theoretical argument is valid or the extent to which it is not (Section 7.7 and 7.8).

7.1. Qualitative Data Collection and Sample

The commonly used method of data collection for the quantitative information is a correspondence appraisal. For qualitative research, a technique which is more intrusive and less structured than a quantitative technique allows the interviewer to gain insight into the topic area (Jarratt, 1996). A non-directive interview, which creates a relaxed, empathic relationship between interviewer and interviewee, reduces bias in response, and the semi-structured interview allows the interviewer to uncover a specific list of hidden issues of research interest (Malhotra, 1993). This additionally enables exploration of the research phenomena of interest (Mathews, 2000) and uncovers underlying motives or attitudes toward sensitive issues (Malhotra, 2002). Therefore, for this study, a smaller sub-sample of participants was drawn for semi-structured in-depth interviews.

For qualitative interviews, purposive sampling is a non-probability sampling technique where cases were selected on the basis of judgment of the researcher that conforms to certain criteria of the respondents (Cooper and Schindler, 2001). In addition, the power of purposive sampling lies in selecting information rich cases that manifest the phenomena of interest intensely toward facilitating more insight into the theoretical construct underlined in the proposed study (Patton, 1990).

As this research looks at the impact of informative equilibrium and public consultation/participation in the trust and commitment building process, facilitating firm(s) involved in providing services from regions with similar and different informative equilibrium were considered as a major criterion of selecting a sample to facilitate comparability. Therefore, two important criteria for selecting the purposive sample were: a) at least two years servicing relationship with community and b) servicing firms are involved with servicing from regions with similar and different information (equal numbers of firms of these two categories). In addition, an endeavor was made through personal contact (in Dholera, the upcoming city and in s region both in Gujarat) to ensure all types or categories (shown in Table 7.1) of community in Gandhinagar, Gujarat (Being the head office for the both regions) was in the sample representation. This process enabled variability of sample representation in order to validate theoretical arguments proposed in this study.
Table 7.1 Types of Respondent, Their Code Number and Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent Type/Category</th>
<th>Code Number</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Only service provider</td>
<td>SP₁</td>
<td>A firm which is involved only in service provision and servicing within Gujarat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only land owner</td>
<td>LO₂</td>
<td>A firm which is involved only in land development and related infrastructure servicing/housing in Gujarat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service provider and land owner</td>
<td>SP₃ &amp; LO₃</td>
<td>The organization/firms engaged with both service provision and land development as a facilitator and deliver those services within Gujarat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community cum Facilitator</td>
<td>CF 4</td>
<td>Those who are end users and also facilitate support in local condition or for further land use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community cum main service provider/facilitator</td>
<td>CF 5</td>
<td>Those who are involved in service provision and offering services to the community. Towards procurement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for this research and adopted from Mathews (2000).

Samples were drawn for a single in-depth interview with the owner/CEO or a senior manager involved in service provision decision making to satisfy the complementary data requirement of the proposed qualitative study (Kuzel, 1992).

7.2. Practices for Qualitative Interview

There are many qualitative data collection techniques such as interviews, oral history, focus group interviews, Focus group interviews, observation approaches (Luna-Reyes and Andersen, 2003). Among these, in particular, this study used focused group discussion and followed a set research practice (Appendix 6). This practice was developed with the help of allied professionals and utilized as a guideline to obtain rich data from the relevant sources, where questions related to the issue of research lead to a series of follow-up questions. The practices were pre-tested through conducting two interviews in Dholera with the community/local people. Since the qualitative data were collected from the knowledgeable community/managers, who were fluent in Gujarati/English, translation of the interview practices was not required.

A semi-structured questionnaire was used as basic instruments for qualitative data collection. The tool covered resultant hypotheses on the process of building community trust and commitment. The questionnaire was additionally trialed to allow the respondents to tell stories regarding hypotheses linked to the commitment building process, to seek examples, and often uncovered issues that were explored counter-perceptive. This technique was also followed for clarification of terms/variables, elaboration on topic, and collection of respondent’s own words of usage which was not supported or covered by quantitative questionnaires (Luna-Reyes and Andersen, 2003). The variables, for example informative equilibrium, public consultation/participation, knowledge and experience, and trust were noted
in the questionnaire to acquire a broad view of these variables with respect to commitment to community. Thus, this describes the phenomena under investigation in this study.

7.3. Qualitative Data Analysis intuitive

This study has strived to use the model where qualitative data were collected to test theoretical arguments and analysis which follows the constant comparative method (Glaser and Strauss, 1967). Although each interviewed firm/person was termed as a unit of respondent or a single case, cross-case analysis allowed for comparison and contrast between cases (Patton, 1990).

In case analysis, Perry (1998) suggests reporting on a descriptive evaluation of each source of information and this could be considered as descriptive analysis. The analysis, however, for this study explores patterns of informative equilibrium toward facilitating public consultation/participation and learning, public consultation/participation toward learning and the knowledge generation process, and the trust and commitment building process. Further, this facilitates the mechanisms and dynamics of formulated hypotheses in a quantitative framework toward comparing proposed links by seeking more specific information in a qualitative approach. The analytical approach presents the fundamental report and respondents’ comments on the determinants (Luna-Reyes and Andersen, 2003). This also incorporates triangulation through integrating qualitative and quantitative findings (Amaratunga and Baldry, 2001) and then fulfills some of the dimensions of research expectations.

As highlighted earlier, there is no single standard approach to analyzing qualitative information; however, this study used cross case analysis. For ease of analyzing field data via cross-case analysis, data was coded into categories to facilitate comparison among/between cases toward exploring properties of each category (Douglas, 2003). The coded transcript and its side margin were used to write/note major themes of interview. The integration of categories and their properties with respect to different hypotheses were grouped together enabling comparison, discussion and interpretation of the phenomena (Seale, 1999). The five major categories/types of respondents were coded (as shown in Table 7.1, SP1 to CF5) based on the community character of servicing firms and the code numbers are used in the description and interpretation of the qualitative data analysis section. For case identification in the analysis process, cases are coded as C1 to C12. These two code numbers have been used to facilitate cross-case and cross-category analysis. The profile of the cases and their categories are discussed in the section to follow.

7.4. Qualitative Depth Interview Profile

As emphasized in section 7.1, based on the criteria of selecting knowledgeable key informants for in-depth interview, careful attempts were made to select respondents in each category. As a result, twelve villages (ten from Dholera and 2 from Bharuch) were identified from land owner and service provider categories. A key decision-maker in each village/group was deemed eligible and agreed to participate and direct the focus group discussion from community side. One respondent/group was reluctant for an interview. Each of the focus group discussion took around 30-45 minutes. Using the model of public consultation meeting practiced in preparation of Town Planning Schemes and also taking
reference from Australian Bureau of Statistics (e.g., Office of Small Business, 1999) business classification code, the discussion groups were classified as one micro, two small, four medium and five large organizations/group. The organizations and respondent/groups profiles of key respondents are summarized in Table 7.2.

Table 7.2 Interviewed Cases, Group Sizes, Major Service Provider Relationships, and Holding Job Positions of the Key Informants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Firms</th>
<th>Group Sizes</th>
<th>Relationship with Service Provider</th>
<th>Holding Position of the Key Informants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case 1 (C1)</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>14 years</td>
<td>Talati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 2 (C2)</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>7 years</td>
<td>Sarpanch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 3 (C3)</td>
<td>Micro</td>
<td>10 years</td>
<td>Chief Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 4 (C4)</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>30 years</td>
<td>Real Estate Builder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 5 (C5)</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>7 years</td>
<td>Land Developer/Land Developer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 6 (C6)</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>DSIRDA Representatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 7 (C7)</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>15 years</td>
<td>PCPIR/GIDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 8 (C8)</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>16 years</td>
<td>GIDB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 9 (C9)</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>15 years</td>
<td>GIDB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 10 (C10)</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>12 years</td>
<td>GIDC, Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 11 (C11)</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>10 years</td>
<td>GIDC, Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case 12 (C12)</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>11 years</td>
<td>GIDC, Chief Engineer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to ensure the vibrancy of qualitative data, the table 7.2 also reports the duration of community-service provider relationship, group/organization sizes, and position holding of key informants. For clarity of classification, cases are categorized according to their category classification code in Table 7.3.

Table 7.3 Categorization of Cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Category Description</th>
<th>Case Identification Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SP₁</td>
<td>Only Service Provider</td>
<td>C1, C2, C3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO₂</td>
<td>Only Land Owner</td>
<td>C4, C5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP₁ &amp; LO₂</td>
<td>Service provider and land owner</td>
<td>C6, C7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF 4</td>
<td>Community cum associate</td>
<td>C8, C9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF 5</td>
<td>Community cum Main Service provider/Facilitator</td>
<td>C10, C11, C12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each case is briefly discussed in the following section to provide an overview of background information; affiliation, capabilities and the group's involvement in bringing the whole process/activities and tasks.

7.5. Brief Case Background and Discussion

As summarized in Table 7.3, the interviewed Cases 1, 2 and 3 (C1, C2, and C3 respectively) are affiliated with the Code SP₁ where these groups/organizations are involved only in service provision within region/area. However, there are some nonconformity among these cases in terms of their community character and nature of servicing items. Case 1 is engaged in offering technical solutions for a land & infrastructure management and related arena and has maintained relationship as
The major service provider for about fourteen years. Case 2 has been servicing within region/area similar to the previous case, C2 has also been engaged with infrastructure support services from their major service provider for about seven years. Case 3 provide services that are not are introduced from a usually unlike field. While this firm is involved with servicing, the discovery is regular and is distributed in high-volumes. This group/organization has also been involved in a relationship with community in service providing for ten years.

Cases 4 and 5 belong to Code L02 where groups/organizations are involved in land enhancement /Farming. Case 4 is much more experienced in land enhancement/farming and has maintained a relationship with the major community and service provider for about 30 years. Case 5 has been servicing for land enhancement in and has maintained its relationship with the major service provider for about seven years. The key respondent was in charge of a firm with 22 professional people. The respondent graduated in business studies abroad and has been in the family business for years. This interview revealed evidence to invalidate theoretical expectations in terms of influence of trust on commitment.

The in-depth interview findings from Cases 6 and 7 (which belong to Code SP1 & L02 defined as service provider and land owner community) validate theoretical arguments and show some additional insights into the trust and commitment building process. The interviewed group in Case 6 has been involved with both service provision and land farming creativity and it has maintained a relationship with a major community for about five years. However, Case 7 has been servicing from a socially different infrastructure market and dispensing services within Gujarat it has been maintaining a relationship with the major community for about 15 years. The key informant was the general manager of this firm who has been working in the firm since its inception. The interviewed Cases 8 and 9 belong to Code CF4 and are involved with land farming & land procurement services as community- service provider. The major community of Case 8 is from a professionally similar market with about 16 years relationship. The key informant of Case 9 was an engineer working with this firm as technical consultant over the years. The firm has maintained relationship with a major service provider organization for about fifteen years. The firm has a very close reading and observation of those issues. Such a local community leaders consider local traditional feeling very intimately in the context of servicing and distributing its servicing.

Cases 10, 11 and 12 (which belong to code CF5) are acting as a community representative involved in offering all range of infrastructure services, and building infrastructure for community. Case 10 has been maintaining a relationship with the majority community. For about twelve years. C10 is offering services in infrastructure delivery. Findings of this interview are contradictory as well as inconsistent with other findings in terms of professional issues. Case 11 offers infrastructure services and has been maintaining a relationship with the end user for about ten years. Findings pertinent to the issues of informative equilibrium, public consultation/participation and learning seem quite similar to Case 10. Case 12 is also similar to the previous case in terms of its nature and involvement in regional business. The relationship with the major infrastructure service providers is about eleven years old. Findings of this interview mostly conform to the theoretical arguments except for some variation on the impact of trust on commitment.
The above brief background for each group case indicates some variations in the sample representations in the study. The cross-case analysis for each hypothesis of the conceptual model strives to integrate the findings of the in-depth interviews in the following section.

### 7.6. Findings of Qualitative In-Depth Interviews

This section integrates the findings and cross-case views of the focused group discussion cases based on quotations of key informants on the points they stressed and affirmed. The integrated cross-case analysis for each construct in the conceptual model provides a well-built basis for understanding the key issues involved. Although the main focus of this qualitative study is to explore the trust and commitment building process, this process has been developed by some interrelated factors. Therefore, influential factors and their magnitude of influences are discussed first in the following sub-sections based on cross-case analysis with the aid of developed matrices before concluding on the trust and commitment relationship.

#### 7.6.1 Informative Equilibrium

Informative Equilibrium was identified as being a significant driver of public consultation/participation and of the learning and knowledge building process in enhancing trust and commitment in the community-service provider relationship. Moreover, some of the respondents C8 expressed:

"Informative Equilibrium with our major service provider helps to build a service need and build relationships“.

This background statement explores some important aspects in terms of effect of informative equilibrium on overall community and local infrastructure development. The interviewed cases, however, revealed a complex situation where some of the findings validated the theoretical projections and some of them challenged the impact of informative equilibrium on public consultation/participation and learning.

**Informative Equilibrium and Public consultation/Participation:** The matrix in Figure 7.2 illustrates the level of effects of informative equilibrium on public consultation/participation. More specifically, while box-1 indicates the numbers of cases where respondents perceived the direct effect of informative equilibrium on public consultation/participation, cases in box-3 indicate no direct effect of informative equilibrium but there are some reverse effects: for example, frequent public consultation/participation may provide some motivation towards overcoming the professional barriers and gaps. Cases in box-4 indicate information equilibrium impact on public consultation/participation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informative Equilibrium</th>
<th>Public Consultation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Direct positive effect</td>
<td>2. Moderate effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2, C4, C6, C8, C9, C12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Reverse effect</td>
<td>4. No effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1, C5, C7</td>
<td>C3, C10, C11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for this study
As theorized in Chapter 3 (section 3.2), informative equilibrium between the community and service provider reduces the level of uncertainty and makes it easier for groups/organizations to communicate freely and learn from each other quickly. As presented in the above matrix, the six cases in box-1 appear to validate the theoretical expectation (Swift, 1999).

In particular, looking at the effect of informative equilibrium on public consultation/participation in box-1 (Figure 7.2), it was revealed that information can be conveyed explicitly through close interpersonal public consultation/participation methods such as either direct or indirect conversation through a personal visit or over the telephone. Focusing on these, C12, for example, highly stressed that:

"Doing business with a service provider from socially similar arena seems feasible within regional market because there is no variation in exchanging views and communicating easily using common oral and body language".

Supporting this, the statement from C8 explicitly emphasized that:

"Yes, information and public consultation/participation are interlinked because it is easy to communicate through using similar language. So that understanding and interpreting situation and resolving any issue is a big support from community perspective".

This statement highlighted community’s apprehension to understand the service provider’s language (Gujarati) and this common public consultation/participation medium helps to maximize occupational benefit through mutual understanding. These illustrations seem appropriate with Swift’s (1999) argument of social closeness and affinity as a contributory factor of common language facilitating proximal public consultation/participation.

Furthermore, the views in terms of the positive effect of informative equilibrium on public consultation/participation should also be noted here. It was found that some of the groups talked that informative equilibrium is a facilitating tool in the community servicing relationship even where the procurement of services is not required to be adopted professionally. As C2 is servicing socially non-sensitive invention from similar principles, it was perceived that:

Public consultation/participation medium play a significant role which helps to understand domestic infrastructure market. We both understand each other clearly, we can talk and express things without any hesitation, and we can exchange assistances between each other as our social association in different occasions.

This means informative equilibrium is a significant factor facilitating easy public consultation/participation in the community service provider relationship.

On the other hand, continuous public consultation/participation may help remove social barriers but it takes time for inexperienced groups/organizations. Accordingly, three cases in box-3 focused on the reverse effects of public consultation/participation on informative equilibrium which can be interpreted to support the theoretical grounding in other ways. In these cases it was perceived that more frequent public consultation/participation helped to reduce and overcome social & professional obstructions between community and service
provider. While Case 5 and 7 mildly disagreed about any impact of Informative equilibrium on public consultation/participation and argued that professional issues did not affect their public consultation/participation—rather, frequent contact and public consultation/participation helped to diminish social & professional differences—Case 1 perceived that public consultation/participation was a tool that certainly assisted in dealing with informative matters in a different scenario as well. Focusing on these assertions, C5 for example expressed the view that:

"To reduce ambiguity and uncertainty and to ease or overcome public consultation/participation barrier in a different values toward ensuring the business benefit we’re using bilingual person who is taking all responsibilities and negotiating the problems when arise. In whatever way, these would have not been matters if the service provider was from similar background or could use a common language."

Similarly, C7 stated that:

"We feel information might be a support to ease public consultation/participation in using similar language to express the actual view in mind. For example, our major service providers from different background, so we had to overcome the informative matters through public consultation/participation. Our major service providers use bilingual personnel to resolve the public consultation/participation barriers."

The use of a bilingual staff member means using a proficient communicator who plays a role to minimize language barriers. These quotes in fact support the argument that language and cultural differences affect public consultation/participation which in turn indicates that informative equilibrium facilitates public consultation/participation because public consultation/participation is affected in a different cultural & professional context.

Further, as C1 experienced the effect of public consultation/participation on informative practices in a different culture to a significant degree, the high degree of public consultation/participation enabled the firm to understand the different information and to reduce the informative gap.

This is an indication that directs face-to-face and indirect frequent public consultation/participation over the telephone between community and service provider assists in reducing socio-informative obstructions and dissimilarities in the relationship. This not only helps groups/organizations to know each other but also helps them adapt to informative issues to maintain a successful business relationship. In contrast, the three cases in box-4 stated that informative equilibrium neither has any effect on public consultation/participation nor is it a factor in the community-service provider relationship. However, cases in box 4 focused on the nature of servicing conceptions which may have social sensitivity or proximity in terms of their use or utilization, this study only emphasized the perceived impact of informative equilibrium on public consultation/participation in terms of the community-service provider relationship. Further, as discussed above, in terms of the effect of informative equilibrium on public consultation/participation, it is revealed that 50% of the key informants of the servicing groups/organizations perceived that informative equilibrium as a factor has a significant impact on their public consultation/participation. This result
provides support to the result of the competing model (Appendix-8) where it was revealed that informative equilibrium significantly influences public consultation/participation with the service provider (estimated standardized β value .49, t-value 5.07 with p ≤ .001). However, 25% of cases acknowledged that professional differences can be reduced by more frequent and efficient public consultation/participation. These cases in fact recognize that the public consultation/participation obstructions in dealing with service providers in different society can be overcome through the use of smooth-spoken employees and through face-to-face contact and frequent public consultation/participation. The remaining 25% of the key respondents indicated that informative equilibrium in the community service has no effect on public consultation/participation.

Informative Equilibrium and Learning, Knowledge and Experience: The case classification matrix in Figure 7.3 illustrates the effects of informative equilibrium on learning and knowledge generating process. Similar to the previous matrix, boxes-1, 2, and 3 and 4 specify the respective cases' level of perception on the effect of informative equilibrium on learning, knowledge, and experience. The theoretical argument suggests that groups/organizations initially aim community from similar background which facilitates learning processes to gain knowledge and experience in their community-service provider relationship (Karlsen et al., 2003). In practice, the key informants were divided into three groups where some of them agreed and validated the theoretical expostulation explicitly, others perceived the effects as moderate, and some of them did not realize any such impact.

Table 7.5 Informative Equilibrium – Learning, Knowledge and Experience Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informative Equilibrium</th>
<th>Learning, Knowledge and Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Direct</td>
<td>C2, C4, C6, C12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Moderate</td>
<td>C1, C5, C7, C9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Reverse</td>
<td>C3, C8, C10, C11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. No effect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for this study

As revealed and illustrated in Figure 7.3 (box-1), four cases (C2, C4, C6 and C12) representing different categories of community (Code SP1, LO2, SP1 & LO2 and CF5) perceived direct implications of informative equilibrium on the learning, knowledge and experience gathering process. In particular, C12 supported the theoretical arguments on the effect of informative equilibrium on the learning and knowledge building process. The key informant of this case stated that:

---

6 It should be noted that while learning, knowledge and experience were used in the proposed conceptual model separately and also in the protocol, respondents were reluctant to differentiate these terms and focused on a very close single term non-discriminately. Therefore, learning and knowledge and experience are explained and discussed as one converged construct of analysis in this thesis.
When we started our business, first we selected a local potential service provider and we understood their information flow and business practices that helped a lot together ideas and knowledge about service, quality judgment, development, etc."

This discussion revealed that local language-based public consultation/participation makes contact, discussion, explanation, and interpretation of all related issues easier. The above illustrations also clearly hint that learning, knowledge and experience gathering is based on intention and tacit knowledge is experiential which is generated through learning by doing, by direct and indirect interactions and observation as well as practices. These lend support to the theoretical arguments of the learning and knowledge building process in the community-service provider relationship (Boyce, 2001).

Similarly, the informant in Case 2 presented the argument that:

"As mentioned earlier, informative equilibrium definitely facilitates to know and understand each other easily. It is possible to explain any matter easily. I can understand my service provider's behavior and he can understand not only my behavior as a part of community but also can guess of our local infrastructure market."

This clearly suggests that informative equilibrium plays a facilitating role to the learning and building knowledge and gathering experience, proximally, and allows the groups/organizations to move freely toward gaining reciprocal occupational benefits.

Furthermore, as shown in box-2 of Figure 7.3, four cases (C1, C5, C7 and C9) from four different categories of community (Code SP1, LO2, SP1 & LO2 and CF4) spoke of the moderate impacts of informative equilibrium on the knowledge and experience gathering process. This means that this community perceived that informative equilibrium has no direct influence on the learning and knowledge building process in the community-service provider relationship but this may be a supportive stimulus in this process to assess and strengthen the relationship. For example; C5 expressed that:

"Informative issues cannot be ignored because this can play a facilitating role in public consultation/participation and might be helpful for knowledge building."

This is an indication that informative equilibrium facilitates public consultation/participation which assists parties to learn and build knowledge in the community-service provider relationship. Identically, C7 highlighted that informative equilibrium might be a support in easing the learning and knowledge building process in the community service relationship.

It is apparent that informative equilibrium between community and service provider may be instrumental to learning and gathering experience through a continuing relationship.

On the other hand, the four cases in box-4 of Figure 7.3 (C3, C8, C10, C11) from three different categories (SP1, CF4 and CF5) hold a decisive view regarding no effect of informative equilibrium on learning, gathering knowledge and experience in an community-service provider relationship. For example, C3 has been servicing
solely from a different culture and gathered practical business knowledge initially from other professional business organizations as an employee, C8 is involved with multi-modal corporate and employs qualified experienced professionals in each and every division of the company, and C10 and C11 are involved in 100% back-to-back community servicing involving qualified professionals also. C3 distinctly stressed a position which disapproves the theoretical approach. He said:

“In our case, we are well aware of corporate management, informative issues, and characteristics, so that we are not facing any problem with that; and culture is not a tool for us to learn and knowledge building in this process at all in our occupational involvement”.

This statement clearly hint that informative equilibrium is neither a factor nor thought-through by such community as an assisting tool for building knowledge and gathering experiences in the present community service context.

Finally it is revealed that, overall, 33.33% of the key informants’ emphasized informative equilibrium as a helping tool and 33.33% saw it as a moderate tool in the learning and knowledge building process through easy interactions in similar community. This learning and knowledge building is a motivation to extending and doing business in cross-informative infrastructure market as well. This result imparts support for the result of the modified competing model (Appendix - 8) where it was revealed that informative equilibrium between community and service provider a significant predictor of community knowledge and experience (estimated standardized $\beta$ value .19, t-value 2.23 with p ≤ .05). Nevertheless, 33.33% of the key informants repealed the theoretical arguments in this respect.

**Informative Equilibrium and Trust:** It is important to note that while the proposed conceptual model did not predict a direct effect of informative equilibrium on trust, the focused group discussion revealed an additional insight into this effect. The matrix in Figure 7.4 illustrates the level of effects of informative equilibrium on trust as expressed by the key respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informative Equilibrium</th>
<th>Trust</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Direct positive effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C4, C6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Reverse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By the way of discussing how informative equilibrium plays a role in building trust and commitment, respondents of Case 4 and Case 6 emphasized the direct implication of informative equilibrium on trust in the community-service provider relationship. For example, C4 was very open in describing the issue briefly, as follows:

“Doing business in socially similar infrastructure market there is no question about payment because we trust them and they trust us for our long relationship – just place the demand – invention starts, but doing
business in different community – first confirm their payment – then invention will be started – this is our experience.”

Accordingly, C6 elaborated that:

“A similar business principle also helps to do business with trust because all business customs are clear to each other.”

These statements supported Conway and Swift’s (2000) assessment of informative closeness or affinity as the determinant of trust depending on the informative values and attitudes. The indirect impact, however, conceded by some of the key informants, is that informative equilibrium assists in public consultation/participation and learning and knowledge building toward enforcing trust. The above analyses and interpretation affirmed that informative equilibrium has both a direct and indirect effect on trust.

7.6.2 Public Consultation

Public consultation/participation was conceptualized as being a significant influential factor in the learning and knowledge building process which generates trust towards building commitment in the community-service provider relationship. More significantly, while servicing groups/organizations are utilizing a variety of methods of public consultation/participation (for example, direct visit as face-to-face contact, phone) to communicate information with their major service provider, the specific use of methods depends on the nature of the message being transmitted (Larson and Kulchitsky, 2000). Documentary statements, compensation terms, delivery schedules, invention lists and offers are transmitted through written documents either using official letter/mail. In terms of effectiveness of public consultation/participation, some of the cases stressed face-to-face public consultation/participation because it allows for a variety of cues including immediate feedback, and personal focus (Cannon and Homburg, 2001).

In terms of public consultation/participation content, community highlights the professional changes, benefits, terms and conditions, and negotiations as regular matters for public consultation/participation. However, more specifically, almost all servicing groups/organizations stressed delivery options, price, quality, quantity, timely delivery, payment terms and conditions as matters raised in their regular frequent public consultation/participation. In addition, if any problem arises they use the telephone and mobile phone to talk or send message letter, or they organize a visit to resolve the issue. For example, on being asked, C6 agrees that:

“More specifically, we have been emphasizing on timely delivery and compensation terms in our regular frequent public consultation/participation and if any problem arises we talk to the community through telephone or we visit their place promptly to resolve the issue.”

Further, C3 specified that:

“We are communicating lots of information through written mail, for example; compensation, possibilities, changes, invention availability, providing services, delivery schedules. But for immediate action we establish project/field office – this is a significant tool in apprising community around the occupational domain.”
Most importantly, it is also revealed and noted that most of the key informants stressed timely delivery as part of their regular public consultation/participation content with their major service provider. It is also revealed that most of the servicing groups/organizations use the mailing frequently; however, when resolving any urgent issue, they use the project/field office for immediate action.

More importantly, the interviews revealed some additional insights along with validating the theoretical underpinnings in the context of the impact of public consultation/participation on the learning and knowledge building process. Inefficient public consultation/participation can be a problem, and public consultation/participation competency can resolve any problem in the relationship. In this regard, for example, C1 highlighted that:

"Look, public consultation/participation are the root of all success in occupation, especially in regional business. Public consultation/participation are the heart of any business. In either way, learning, knowledge, gathering experience, trust building, or commitment building all is incited by public consultation/participation."

Similarly, C11 also stated that:

"The business world is becoming smaller through Public consultation/anticipation. Consultation also helps to know the infrastructure market, service sources, invention, community and service provider, compensation, development, demand and supply everything."

These illustrations and statements clearly imply the significance of public consultation/participation in regional business as well as the community-service provider relationship.

Public consultation/Participation and Learning, Knowledge and Experience: The developed matrix in Figure 7.5 explores the nature of effects of public consultation/participation on the learning and knowledge building process in the community-service provider relationship. More precisely, it is found in Figure 7.5 that all cases in box-1 (Matrix 7.2) validate and provide support to the theoretical argument in terms of the effect of public consultation/participation on the learning and knowledge building process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public consultation</th>
<th>Learning, Knowledge and Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Direct</td>
<td>C1, C2, C3, C4, C5, C6, C7, C8, C9, C10, C11, C12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Moderate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Reverse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. No effect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for this study

Towards exploring the effects, for example, the respondent of C2 briefly stated that:

"Yes, we do agree, public consultation/participation is the main tool in general to learn and gather knowledge of regional business through
broadly either written public consultation/participation or verbal public consultation/participation.

More apparently C3 stated that:

"Yes, we reciprocate our knowledge through public consultation/participation and we learn a lot of things about our occupation, invention, infrastructure market and also overall business organization."

Again focusing on the learning and knowledge gathering process through public consultation/participation from a cross-informative infrastructure market, C6 elaborated that:

"We never prefer talk to our service provider through telephone, but we're communicating with them through written public consultation and through direct visit to negotiate and resolve our professional issues. This helps to know each other in terms of business capabilities, strengths, personality, possibility of business, business practices. They also visit us occasionally. This process enhances sharing views and ideas and also helps to learn and gather experience.

Overall, the above discussion clearly indicates that public consultation/participation has a significant impact on the knowledge gathering process which additionally furnishes support to the result of the competing model (Appendix - 8) as complementary (estimated standardized β value .21, t-value 2.66 and p < .01). Furthermore, as some of the cases (for example C3 and C10) highlighted, the direct public consultation/participation either through visits or using phone call provides the richest immediate feedback (Larson and Kulchitsky, 2000) where frequently used public consultation/participation also helps to solve complex issues in the relationship.

Public consultation/participation and Trust: The qualitative in-depth interviews extracted an additional insight in connection with the direct effect of public consultation/participation on trust while it was overlooked in the proposed model. This impact is theoretically validated in the quantitative part of this thesis as well. Four cases (C4, C6, C7 and C9) from different categories of community (as shown in box-1 of Figure 7.6 below) provided significant evidence of this impact.

Table 7.8 Public Consultation – Trust Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Consultation</th>
<th>Trust</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C4, C6, C7, C9</td>
<td>1. Direct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Reverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. No effect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for this study

While these cases are also in Figure 7.5, box-1 to reveal the effect of public consultation/participation on learning, knowledge and experience, this regrouping of cases in figure 7.6, box-1 denotes that public consultation/participation has both direct and indirect implications in building the community-service provider relationship. These cases then validate the conceptual assertion that the frequent
and high quality relevant, timely, and reliable public consultation/participation facilitate learning and knowledge building toward generating trust (Boyce, 2001; 2003). Supporting the impact of public consultation/participation on trust argument, for example, C6 stated that:

"More public consultation/participation – more understanding – more trust. If they [community/authorities] reply in reasonable time to our queries we feel satisfied and our trust increases."

Emphasizing and supporting this reasoning, C7 considered that:

"Public consultation/participation is the root of success in our servicing business. This helps to make an investment initially which followed a series of investment to build trust because this process includes confidence, trustworthiness, truthfulness, sincerity and final shape is commitment."

This discussion suggests that public consultation/participation in the community-service provider relationship is not only a significant driver of the learning and knowledge building process but also an important consequential factor of trust building. No other cases expressed any strong conviction with regard to this argument but at the same time none suggested any disagreement to this. Either way, this finding is in line with the result of the modified proposed model (Chapter 6, Table 6.1) where public consultation/participation is found to have a significant impact on trust ($\beta$ value .24, t-value 3.29 and $p \leq .001$) as well.

**Public consultation/Participation and Commitment:** In terms of public consultation/participation as a driver of commitment, all cases (C1 and C12) in Figure 7.7, box-1 appears to agree that public consultation/participation has both direct and indirect effects on commitment.

![Table 7.9 Public Consultation – Commitment Matrix](attachment:table7.9.png)

**Table 7.9 Public Consultation – Commitment Matrix**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Consultation</th>
<th>Commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1-C12</td>
<td>5. Direct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. Reverse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. No effect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for this study

To explore this direct impact, C5 for example stated that:

"Ok, as we understand, again public consultation/participation, yes, it is the main tool for both facilitating learning and knowledge gathering in community service provider relationship and also helps to build commitment."

This means public consultation/participation have both direct and indirect implications on commitment where trust is not mediating this process. Similarly, as stated by the respondent of C12:

"Whatever you say in business relationship, public consultation/participation is the main thing either in developing knowledge or
These statements affirmed that public consultation/participation has an additional drive to not only enhance the knowledge gathering process but also assist in increasing commitment in the community servicing relationship. Nevertheless, this finding is congruous with the modified proposed model's result (Table 6.1) where public consultation/participation are found to have a significant influence on commitment (β value .15, t-value 2.39 and p ≤ .05).

In sum, more remarkably, it should be noted that the impact of public consultation/participation on learning and knowledge building corroborated the theoretical argument and additionally signifies its impact on trust and commitment as well. This is only because of the different perceptions of the key informants in this process. However, as some of the cases were found to have recognized its direct effects on trust as well as on commitment, they perceived that trust or commitment may strengthen the relationship through the process to maximize long-term relative advantage in the relationship.

7.6.3 Learning, Knowledge and Experience

The occupational history literature dwells on the learning and knowledge building process towards enhancing trust in implementing parties (Boyce, 2001) and further implies commitment in the community-service provider relationship. Envisaging this assertion, the present study strived to explore how servicing groups/organizations of a developing region are gaining their knowledge and to what extent this process helps to build trust as well as commitment. It is contended that knowledge and experience is a single close term and that each is an output of learning (Etemad and Lee, 2003). The key informants of interviewed groups/organizations however perceived and interpreted these terms as one integral concept. Therefore, these synonymous interlinked terms are used in this thesis as a single converged factor towards simplifying the discussion and to investigate into the unfolding knowledge development process and its impacts as perceived by the key informants.

Focusing on the learning and knowledge gathering process in the community service provider relationship, C1 for example explained that:

"We have learned the detailed subject knowledge such as quality, capacity, and handling procedure, technical attributes of the yields from our major service provider through direct and indirect contact and visiting his business place (GPCPSIRDA/DSIRDA/GIDC office)."

Further C2 elaborated that:

"We got support from our service provider at the early stage of our initiative that helped us to gather the invention knowledge. They gave us all relevant ideas and taught us technical things of the services. They also visited our office in region. Through the way, we have learnt a lot from our relationship.

Respondent of C9 focused,

In our occupational industry with community, we are speaking, resolving, and overcoming lots of unexpected matters like handling volatile infrastructure market situation, price fluctuation, and compensation due
to sudden strike through our intellectuality. This way we are learning and gathering knowledge from the relationship.

It has emerged from the illustrations above that the learning and knowledge gathering process is enhanced by communicating directly with the service provider/community. It was also revealed that community learning and knowledge content includes invention, quality specification, infrastructure market demand, technical attributes of the services, handling procedure, competitive environment, bargaining and negotiation, and rules. It is clear that some learning and knowledge gathering techniques are generated from the long-term business interactions. For example, C10 explained that:

*In each and every contract there may be something to know and new idea may generate for example; negotiation process helps to accept any quality on discount basis and problems solving efficiency is a technical matter in committed relationship that equalize the cost and benefit toward maximizing long-term relationship.*

This indicates that learning and knowledge building is an interacting process towards building commitment in the community -service provider relationship. Furthermore, it can be asserted from the in-depth interviews that experiential knowledge can be learned through personal experience while tacit knowledge is experiential which also develops through teach (Spender, 1992). Supporting this, for example, C6 specifies that:

"Yes, as we understand, tacit knowledge is experiential based on both learning-by-doing and face-to-face direct interactions."

The perceived interactions and effects of knowledge and experience on trust and commitment are discussed in the following subsections.

**Learning and Knowledge and Trust:** In box-1 of the matrix in Figure 7.8 it is shown that five cases (C1, C6, C7, C8 and C11) support the direct impact of community learning and knowledge on trust but there is no other possible dimension suggested in the interviews.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7.10 Learning, Knowledge and Experience – Trust Matrix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning, Knowledge and Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Direct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1, C6, C7, C8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Reverse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for this study

As conceptualized, these five cases in box-1 from different types of service categories clearly indicated that learning and knowledge is a factor that enhances trust in the community-service provider relationship. Validating the grounded theoretical coherency, it was the view of C1, for example, that:
"These learning and overall knowledge are the supportive streams and invisible matter that obviously help to build confidence and trust to the service provider but it takes long time."

This clearly suggests that knowledge and experience as a multidimensional invisible asset helps in building confidence and generating trust as well. More clearly, C7 stated that:

"Learning and knowledge whatever you say, this is also a helping tool to build trust because knowledge as intellectual property enabled us to judge the service provider’s honesty, sincerity, prompt action and his intelligence also."

This means that knowledge is an intellectual property to assess the service provider trustworthiness in their community relationship.

This is an indication that knowledge is a significant factor for evaluating trust in the community-service provider relationship. However, the aforementioned cases are expressed unanimously and lend support to the theoretical reasoning from a different context. This suggests that the learning and knowledge competencies of investing parties are instilling their trust (Boyce, 2001) specifically instilling community trust to service provider in the present context. This result is suggestive of the result of the competing model (β value .24, t-value 4.03 and p ≤ .001) where it was revealed that a higher degree of community knowledge and experience leads to a highly significant influence on community trust of the service provider.

**Learning and Knowledge and Commitment:** Similar to the previous matrix, in box-1 of Figure 7.9, six cases indicate that learning and knowledge has also a direct effect on community commitment. One case (C5) (in box-2) suggests a moderate effect of community knowledge on commitment. This case (C5) indicated that knowledge sometimes may be a factor in assessing commitment in the community-service provider relationship which implies a supportive indication on the proposed influence. This focus on direct influences of learning and knowledge on community commitment lends support to the theoretical argument.

**Table 7.11 Learning, Knowledge and Experience – Commitment Matrix**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning, Knowledge and Experience</th>
<th>Commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Direct</td>
<td>C1, C2, C3, C6, C7, C8, C10, C12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Moderate</td>
<td>C5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Reverse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. No effect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for this study

For example, C2 said that:

"This process helps to build commitment and ultimately trust to continue the business relationship."
The interviews clearly indicated that learning and experiencing practical business is multidirectional in the community-service provider relationship, which ultimately increases both parties’ commitment to each other.

This statement clearly suggests that a community’s knowledge enables the firm to evaluate the service provider and to be a committed community as well. Validating the above argument with a slightly varying assessment of the ultimate effect, C12 stated that:

"Knowledge and learning has no scale to measure, but as a business professional we think there should have some basic ideas what we have gathered from many different sources to start and continue services. On the other way, as they indicate, yes, knowledge can help to assess both parties’ commitment and also service provider’s trust”.

This suggests that knowledge has dual power to influence and assess community-service provider commitment and evaluate service provider’s trust in the community-service provider relationship. This is a supplementary finding of this analysis in terms of the impact of knowledge on trust and commitment. This is because of different perceptions of the key informants in the proposed links and processes. However, this finding (Figure 7.9) in terms of the impact of knowledge and experience on community commitment is integral to the result of quantitative analysis of the competing model (Appendix-8).

Apart from the illustration and brief discussions, it is revealed that most of the key informants specified the learning and knowledge content along with trust aspects and further commitment as a long-term relationship. It can also be inferred that knowledge competency of the community might be a stimulus to assess community commitment primarily and further their service provider trust in the relationship.

7.6.4 Trust and Commitment

In the process of explaining and fostering trust and commitment, the two most important behavioral aspects in regional business, the in-depth interviews disclosed some practical perceptual relevant information that is important to note as part of the supportive stream of this analysis. Some representative sample illustrations on community-service provider relationship are used in the following sections.

Developing Relationship: In the relationship development process, a lot of effort along with a long history of continuation was considered to be important. For example, C2 described:

“We have turned our operating initially from very small to currently with a large capacity, we followed them day after day, side by side their vision, long-term intension. Once we realized that they also watched and assessed us and our local infrastructure market, our capabilities, efforts to continue the relationship and gradually relationship has been developed over the time.”

Supporting this process of developing relationship, C5 further added that:

“The Community and service provider relationship is a long-term matter that depends on commitment and trust specifically first you have to develop your level of commitment then trust will be established and as a
result of this business will run through over the period – just on your term.”

Similarly, C3 illustrated that:

“Our relationship with major service providers/community is very good because it has been developed on the basis of our regular long-term connections, now we know each other, we know about ability, feasibility, capacity, stability that’s why relationship develops such a way and this is very well. This is on the basis of integrity, on the basis of continuation and this is also a reciprocal issue from both sides.”

These comments suggest that relationship development between community and major service providers a matter of long-term continuous but gradual efforts. This process further develops commitment and trust as relationship output and ties up the community and service provider in a strong successful enduring relationship. This hints that a long-term committed relationship may enhance their long-term business success.

Turning to maintaining the relationship, it is considered that once a relationship is developed with the major service provider, a continuous effort is also needed to maintain it.

In the context of ultimate dependent factors in the proposed framework, respondents are divided. The perceptual opinion apparently explored interacting as well as reverse effects of trust on commitment in the community-service provider relationship. Therefore, based on the arguments and illustrations of the key informants, the interactions and effects of trust on commitment and, conversely, the effects of commitment on trust are discussed in the section to follow.

Trust as a Driver of Commitment: As shown in Figure 7.10 (box-1), it emerges those five cases (C1,c2, c3 C6, to C12) from different categories of servicing groups/organizations asserted and affirmed trust as a factor in stimulating and developing commitment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trust</th>
<th>Commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Direct</td>
<td>2. Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1, C2,C3,C6, to C12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Reverse</td>
<td>4. No effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4, C5,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed for this study

In this process, however, more categorically, the respondent of C6 claimed that these two factors are inter-dependent. Further, in the final stage of group discussion with the key informants, it emerged that trust develops over time, and commitment is the outcome of trust which helps both the community and service provider work together smoothly. On being asked, the key informant of C6 expressed the view that:
"Once we have verified the quality of our delivery in front of our community, they asked us “don’t you trust us?” Actually we were checking service quality (span) but as a matter of fact it was a case of their trustworthiness (written and practical). The relationship is now turned to word of mouth which you can say commitment.”

The key respondent of C4 similarly stated that:

“If trust is established then commitment will work automatically for long. In building trust – you have to remove selfish attitude from your mind and if you want to develop committed relationship you have to be trusted.”

This is the examples of how trust is working and how commitment is established in an occupation as well as in the community-service provider relationship.

The respondent of C11 noted that:

“Although service provider trust plays a significant role in building commitment to community, it has taken long time to develop through verification and observation on their trustworthiness.”

As the cases in Figure 7.10 (box-1) indicate, trust is an important factor in developing community commitment in the community-service provider relationship. This lends support to the vast majority of the conceptual and empirical evidence in the literature (for example, Coote et al., 2003; Zineldin and Jonsson, 2000). This finding is also agreeable with the results of the proposed (Table 6.1) and competing models (Appendix - 8).

**Commitment as an Influential factor of Trust:** Contrary to the groundwork theoretical statements, two cases shown in Figure 7.10 (C4, C5) from different service categories (as box 3) indicated that commitment is a driving tool in the community-service provider relationship to establish trust (with reverse effect).

Supporting and exploring this direction and effects, for example, C2 stated that:

“Simply we should say, instant public consultation/participation, proper document, experience and 100% sincerity are root of achieving high level of commitment, which needs a long-time and over the period commitment build up in our relationship and now we trust them in any manner of our occupational trade.”

This indicates that commitment develops in a gradual process and plays a strong role in establishing trust in the community service provider relationship. The respondent

In C2 further emphasized that:

“Once commitment is build up, trust will automatically be increased, and if the service providers committed to you, you can trust them also.”

Similarly, C3 expressed a focus on commitment first and provided strong arguments:

“Commitment and trust both are complementary words in business relationship where commitment is useful thing that tie up the community and service provider by their works.”

Accordingly, C10 stated that:
"If we maintain our commitment accordingly from both sides then trust increases, it is not a matter of one day relationship, it is matter of long-term interaction after a series of interaction and fulfilling the commitment, then trust has developed."

The key informants of C12 said that:

"As we understand commitment is the measure of relationship which is tested in each and every convention and trust may be at the matured level of relationship that establishes gradually with maintaining long-term commitment."

This means commitment is a long-term perspective in the community-service provider relationship which helps to evaluate and build trust in the relationship. As this case involves a 100% service oriented organization engaged in both servicing and facilitating growth, the most delicate aspect of this case is to maintain dual commitment i.e. commitment to the service provider and commitment to their community. Therefore, they are very much concerned with their service provider commitment to them because it has an effect on their commitment to the community. In this regard, the key informant stated:

"We think commitment is a reciprocal but indivisible matter in regional occupation because that should be considered and matched from both sides."

Similarly, the respondents of Case 11 particularly made mention that:

"As we are involved in both using and service providing, we are maintaining dual commitment. Our major service provider’s commitment is to maintain quality, timely delivery and our commitment to them is to disburse the payment promptly. Further, our additional commitment is to delivery of the services to our prominent community which is totally dependent on our major service provider’s commitment."

In sum, the above discussion based on key informants’ comments provides rich information on the effect of trust on commitment and, conversely, on the effect of commitment on trust. As 58% of the respondents perceived that the ultimate dependent factor is trust in the relationship. The conclusion on the process of building trust and commitment in the community service provider relationship is drawn in the following section after synthesizing the cross case analysis.

7.7. Overall Synthesis of Cases

The major findings of the cross case analysis are synthesized in this section (in Table 7.4) by combining the emergent qualitative reasoning and by using symbolic identification of cases and codes in summary form. The direct and indirect flow and interactions evidenced how conceptual inferences are developing in practice in the community service provider relationship. The in-depth interviews/group discussions have partially supported most of the theoretical reasoning and discovered some hidden information in the community service provider relationship which contrasted with some of the proposed arguments.

In terms of the informative equilibrium effect on public consultation/participation in the community service provider relationship, the major findings in 50% of cases
representing all categories appear to suggest that community is a supportive factor for not only easing public consultation/participation but also for directly influencing it. However, three cases (cases 1, 5 and 7) show a mediating counter-effect of public consultation/participation that helps the groups/organizations to understand each other. These cases suggest that more frequent direct and indirect public consultation/participation can help to reduce informative barriers to maintain long-term relationships. By contrast, three cases (cases 3, 10 and 11) suggested a complete variation of the effect of informative equilibrium on public consultation/participation and demonstrate that informative equilibrium is neither a factor towards facilitating public consultation/participation nor a major factor in the community service relationship. The inference from these cases indicate that they are experienced enough to efficiently communicate business issues in different cultures.

The major findings of 67% cases (cases 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9 and 12) representing all categories of community indicate that informative equilibrium is a facilitating tool for learning as well as knowledge-experience gathering from a socially proximal infrastructure market/service provider.

Table 7.13 Summary Report of Cross-Case Analysis based on Codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables and Emerged Paths</th>
<th>Code SP1</th>
<th>Code LO2</th>
<th>Code SP1 &amp; LO2</th>
<th>Code CF4</th>
<th>Code CF5</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INFEQ → PC</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>C7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFEQ → PC</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>C6</td>
<td>C8, C9</td>
<td>C12</td>
<td>Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFEQ → LEKNEX</td>
<td>C1, C2</td>
<td>C4, C5</td>
<td>C6, C7</td>
<td>C9</td>
<td>C12</td>
<td>Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFEQ → TRUST</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>C6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC → LEKNEX</td>
<td>C1, C2, C3</td>
<td>C4, C5</td>
<td>C6, C7</td>
<td>C8, C9</td>
<td>C10, C11, C12</td>
<td>Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC → TRUST</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>C6, C7</td>
<td>C9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC → COMMIT</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td></td>
<td>C12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEKNEX → TRUST</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>C6, C7</td>
<td>C11</td>
<td></td>
<td>Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEKNEX → COMMIT</td>
<td>C2, C3</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>C8, C9</td>
<td>C10, C12</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRUST → COMMIT</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>C6, C7</td>
<td>C11</td>
<td></td>
<td>Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMIT → TRUST</td>
<td>C2, C3</td>
<td>C5</td>
<td>C8, C9</td>
<td>C10, C12</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Expected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend: INFEQ = Informative equilibrium, PC = Public consultation/Participation, LEKNEX = Learning and Knowledge and Experience, TRUST = Trust, and COMMIT = Commitment.
The theoretical assertion on the effect of community-service provider on the learning and knowledge-experience gathering process revealed unanimous complementary support as well as validation from all cases. Added to these, four cases (cases 4, 6, 7 and 9) perceived that while public consultation/participation has an indirect effect through knowledge and experience, it has a direct effect on trust. Similarly, two cases (cases 5 and 12) suggest that public consultation/participation has a direct effect on community commitment in addition to an indirect effect as expected.

In terms of the effect of learning and knowledge-experience, respondents are divided into two groups. As it was expected, five cases (42% cases 1, 4, 6, 7 and 11) approved the theoretical reasoning and suggested that learning and knowledge building process has a direct influence on increasing trust to build long-term commitment in the major service provider relationship. In contrast, seven cases (58% cases 2, 3, 5, 8, 9, 10 and 12) suggested a variation of the effect of knowledge on commitment and the ultimate effect on trust. To these informants, trust is the outcome of commitment, and commitment is developing through the proximal public consultation/participation between a party that facilitates learning, knowledge building, and maintaining the relationship with the major service provider. As these cases explicitly suggest, commitment plays a strong mediating role through knowledge and experience in building trust in the continuing relationship. Notwithstanding, the organization maintains commitment and a long-term relationship with the major service provider on the basis of mutual understanding. Similarly, Case 9, 10 and 12 lend support to the ultimate effect and suggests that public consultation/participation helps groups/organizations to learn and gather experience toward developing commitment, confidence, and, ultimately, trust.

Overall, it is revealed from the above discussion that the knowledge and experience gathering process in the community and service provider relationship is mostly (67%) facilitated by informative match. However, as it was expected and emphasized, this process is supported completely (100%) by public consultation/participation between the community and service provider in both similar and different communities. Most of the cases focus on the learning and knowledge development process by direct and indirect interaction, formal and informal training, and development of professional spirit which support the arguments drawn from the business history literature (Boyce, 2001). Moreover, beyond expectation, the commitment building process is mostly (67%) enhanced by the knowledge and experience of the community where it is developed partially (42%) by the trust of the service provider. The following section summarizes the cross-case analysis and presents a revised framework based on qualitative depth interview findings.

7.8. Overall Summary of the Case Analyses

The major findings are integrated in Table 7.4 by combining emerged qualitative reasoning and by using symbolic identification of cases and codes in summary form. The direct and indirect flow and interactions evidenced in Figure 7.11 show how conceptual inferences are developed in practice in the community service provider relationship. As the perceptions of the key informants indicated, there is no unanimous support for the theoretical arguments in the proposed trust and
commitment building process. For example, the summarized cross-case analysis reveals that three cases (C1, C5, and C7) even suggested that informative equilibrium is reversely influenced by public consultation/participation towards reducing informative impediment. This means that effective and frequent public consultation/participation in the community service provider relationship reduces informative barriers and strengthens the relationships in different cultures through informative understanding.

Apart from these findings, it is found that informative equilibrium is a direct and indirect (through knowledge and experience) influential factor in the process of building trust as well. Referring to the impact of public consultation/participation on learning and knowledge building, the findings are consistent across cases to support the theoretical reasoning.

However, the direct effects of public consultation/participation on trust and on commitment are also perceived, and the effects of learning and knowledge are diverted into two directions: trust and commitment, which partly deviate from the proposed model. Furthermore, in the final stage of this framework, respondents are divided into two groups in terms of the cause and effect of trust and commitment. While five cases support the proposed trust commitment relationship, respondents of seven cases argued for the reverse relationship. The overall results and revealed path directions are shown in the following derived qualitative model, Figure 7.11.

Figure 7. 2 Derived Qualitative Model Based on In-depth Data: Trust and Commitment Building Process

Path Legend: ➔ Predicted Paths - - - - -> Derived New Paths directions and Cs indicated how many numbers of cases support the paths

It can be concluded from the above discussion that informative equilibrium facilitates public consultation/participation, the learning and knowledge building process, and also trust. Similarly, public consultation/participation enhances the learning and knowledge generation process toward facilitating trust and commitment directly and indirectly. Community knowledge and experience ultimately influences their trust and commitment to service provider. Finally, the qualitative findings revealed that trust and commitment are interrelated factors