

The Relationship between perceived organizational support and organizational trust among male high school teachers in the city Isfahan in academic years 2011-2012

Mohsen Zamani Cheryani¹, Badri Shahtalebi² and Maryam Rahmanimanesh³

¹Department of Educational Sciences,Kkhorasgan(Isfahan)Branch,Islamic Azad University Isfahan,Iran

²Department of Educational Sciences,Kkhorasgan(Isfahan)Branch,Islamic Azad University Isfahan,Iran

³Department of Educational Sciences,Kkhorasgan(Isfahan)Branch,Islamic Azad University Isfahan,Iran

Abstract: The present study aimed to determine the relationship between perceived organizational support and organizational trust among male high school teachers in Isfahan using a descriptive-correlation method. The study population consisted of all high school male teachers in the city in academic years 2011-2012 and they were 3932 people. Using Cohen et al., Proposed table and a stratified random sampling method, proportional to the size of this study, 350 people were chosen to participate. The instruments used in this study were Aizenbergr et al., organizational support (1986) and Sashkin organizational trust inventory (1988), respectively. Face and content validity of both questionnaires were confirmed by faculty advisors and several experts. Validity of the questionnaire was .91 for institutional support questionnaire and .78 for organizational trust questionnaire using Cronbach's alpha coefficient, showing the high validity of the research instruments. In order to analyze data, descriptive statistics and inferential statistics, including Pearson correlation, ANOVA and post hoc test were used. Results of the research main question showed that there is a significant relationship between perceived organizational support and organizational trust ($0.01 > P$, $r=0.398$). The results also showed that there is a significant relationship between perceived organizational support and trust including the stability in managers behavior to different people ($0.01 > P$, $r=0.160$), the stability of the manager's behavior in different situations ($0.01 > P$, $r=0.399$), accuracy of information given by managers ($0.01 > P$, $r=0.475$), true discourse of the manager to predict future ($0.01 > P$, $r=0.405$), manager's promise and activity consistency ($0.05 > P$, $r=0.123$), true discourse of manager to predict future outcome ($0.01 > P$, $r=0.484$) and reliability of the manager ($0.01 > P$, $r=0.259$). The results showed that there is no significant relationship between perceived organizational support and Manager's stability to different people ($0.05 > P$, $r=0.006$), stability in manager's speech in various positions ($0.05 > P$, $r=0.019$) and manager speech compliant with his past behavior ($0.05 > P$, $r=0.078$). There was no significant difference between the respondents comment in any aspect of demographic factors, except of the degree of trust variable.

[Mohsen Zamani Cheryani, Badri Shahtalebi and Maryam Rahmanimanesh. **The Relationship between perceived organizational support and organizational trust among male high school teachers in the city Isfahan in academic years 2011-2012.** *Life Sci J* 2012;9(4):4125-4130]. (ISSN: 1097-8135). <http://www.lifesciencesite.com>. 614

Keywords: perceived organizational support, organizational trust, teachers, education office

Introduction

Investigating on evolution of human resource management indicates that attention to human and human indicators in the world of organization and management has been the spotlight of management experts for a long time. This attention has increased day to day so that today manpower is called organizations' customers. This means that in the new age, necessity of accountability to basic needs of staff is in the first place in every organization, because reaching organization goals depends on meeting logical, legitimate desires and goals of human resources. In this regard, one of the man issues which must be considered is paying attention to staff and

creating a supportive atmosphere. Organizational support of staff causes elevating mood and job satisfaction which are very effective and important in organization's high efficiency.

In Sundquist & Yang's viewpoints, perceived support can be investigated as one of the most important social units where people spend most of their times. Perceived organizational support is a state which based on it, one feels organization considers him as an important, useful and remarkable man and needs to his services(Sundquist&Yang,2006). According to organizational support theory, when an organization pays attention to common values and wellbeing of staff, they feel a high level of

perceived organizational support (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Staff with high level of perceived organizational support, has more commitment to organization, make effort for it and have a higher level of job satisfaction (Zampetakis et al, 2009). There is less probability to see the absence of such staff or also to secede (Eisenberger et al, 1986).

Staff, who experiences a deal amount of perceived organizational support, feels that they must play role in regard to proper attitudes and behaviors in organization so that their actions would be in direction of their desired organization's benefits, thereby makes up organization's support (Eisenberger et al, 1997).

Lamastro believes that perceived organizational support provides increasing productivity performance to help colleagues, organization progress, emotional commitment to organization and organizational citizenship behavior. Perceived organizational support is considered as the concept of social wealth. Social wealth refers to goodwill, friendship, mutual empathy, and social interaction between groups of people who form a social unit (Lamastro, 2000). The main reflection in perceived organizational support is that family, friends and colleagues are very important possessions and people will get needed support from them in necessary situations with respect to internal trust to them (Hanifan, 1916).

Organizational support structure is criteria based which staff evaluates organization's emotional commitment to them. Some actions such as staff needs and recognizing their abilities and actions are some of these criteria. Staff who has high level of perceived organizational support, believes that organization pays attention to them and compensates to their remarkable actions. In contrast, staff who has low level of perceived organizational support believes that organization managers do not understand them, do not know their certain needs and prefer to replace them with another (Eisenberger et al, 1986).

Generally, staff who perceives high levels of organizational support more likely will have higher commitment and job satisfaction feeling and also more readiness to do meta-role behaviors or organizational citizenship than those who feels organization does not value them a lot (Organ, 1988). Trust is also other consequences of perceived organizational support in addition to job satisfaction and commitment.

Robbins believes mutual trust among members is one of the main features of organizations which have a great performance. That is, members

believe on each other's ability and honesty a lot. Belief is a critical phenomenon which takes a lot of time to create but it is easy to undo and it is not so simple work to regain it (Robbins, 2008). In Sergiovani's viewpoint trust is necessary to ethical leadership and organization management (Sergiovani, 1992). Levin explains an assurance which is perceived by staff is a sign of effect of trust element. Also, conducted studies on trust indicate that trust is based on experience and is learnt (Levin, 1999).

Trust increases efficiency of communications and also organizational cooperation. It is also recognized as an important fundamental factor in level of efficiency or manager efficiency, staff satisfaction and their commitments and performance (Ellonen et al, 2008). Trust causes improvement and promotion of managers and staff, as in such environment, ideas is freely exchanged, and open relationships associated with respects are in organization. Humans need trust from birth to death; trust is a feeling that is required in family, school, work life and among friends (Erden & Erden, 2009).

Trust has different dimensions. In a categorization which is done by Sashkin trust has been divided to ten dimensions including "constancy in manager's behavior to different people, constancy in manager's speech to different people, constancy in manager's behavior in different situations, constancy in manager's speech in different situations, appropriateness in proposed information by manager, consistence in manager's speech with his past behavior, accuracy in manager's speech to anticipate future behavior, consistence in manager's promise, accuracy in manager's speech to participate future results, and reliability to manager" (Sashkin, 1988).

In organizations where trust is low, staff acts in a higher level of stress, are not involved in making decisions, are incriminated when wrong decisions are adapted, behave with suspicion and distrust, meets communicational barriers, does not receive honest and open information and as a result, making decision process becomes weak, decisions quality come down, staff focus on work is divested and finally efficiency is reduced. In addition, in lack of trust, innovation is also low. In such organizations, staff is scared about failing of new plans, being excommunicated by managers and colleagues (Baird & Amand, 1995). This is while Toreh believes that trust is a main core for contemporary managers' performance (Toreh, 2005). One of the most important performances of contemporary

managers is investigating on organization capital which is human resources. Some investigations have been conducted in regard to perceived organizational support and trust as effective components of internal issues in organizations. Annmalaei (2010), Saekoo et al (2011) and Ngang (2012)'s researches are some conducted ones in this field.

Research questions

Main question

Is there any relation between perceived organizational support and organizational trust among teachers of male high schools in Isfahan city?

Secondary question

Is there any relation between perceived organizational support and trust dimensions (constancy in manager's behavior to different people, constancy in manager's speech to different people, constancy in manager's behavior in different situations, constancy in manager's speech in different situations, appropriateness in proposed information by manager, consistence in manager's speech with his past behavior, accuracy in manager's speech to anticipate future behavior, consistence in manager's promise, accuracy in manager's speech to participate future results, and reliability to manager)?

Method of study, community, sample, sampling method, study tools

Method of present study is correlational – descriptive. Statistical community in this study is all teachers of male high schools in number of 3932. In present study, estimation of sample content was 350 people, using Cohen et al (2000) table. Method of sampling in this study is Stratified random method corresponding to the content. Tools used in the present study are two questionnaires on organizational support and organizational trust.

Eisenberger et al (1986) questionnaire on organizational support: this questionnaire contains 34 closed-answer questions based on Lickrate's five-degree scale. Reliability coefficient of the questionnaire was calculated in terms of Cronbach's alpha using software SPSS and was estimated 0.91.

B: Sashkin (1988) questionnaire on organizational trust: this questionnaire contains 50 closed-answer questions based on Lickrate's five-degree scale. Reliability coefficient of the questionnaire was also calculated in terms of Cronbach's alpha and was estimated 0.78.

Results

Is there any relation between perceived organizational support and organizational trust among teachers of male high schools in Isfahan city?

Table (1) correlation coefficient between perceived organizational support and organizational trust

Perceived organizational support			
Statistical indicator			
	Correlation coefficient	Square of the Correlation coefficient	Significance level
Organizational trust	** 0.398	0.158	0.001
P< 0.01			

The data in table (1) shows that correlation coefficient between perceived organizational support and organizational trust is meaningful. According to coefficient of identification (r^2),

variance of perceived organizational support and organizational trust was 15.8%.

2. Is there any relation between perceived organizational support and trust dimensions?

Table (2) correlation coefficient matrix between studied variables

Variables	Correlation coefficient	Square of the Correlation coefficient	Significance level
constancy in manager's behavior to different people P< 0.01	** 0.160	0.026	0.005
constancy in manager's speech to different people P< 0.05	- 0.006	0.000	0.916
constancy in manager's behavior in different situations P< 0.01	** 0.399	0.159	0.001
constancy in manager's speech in different situations P< 0.05	0.019	0.000	0.746
appropriateness in proposed information by manager P< 0.01	** 0.475	0.226	0.001
consistence in manager's speech with his past behavior P< 0.05	0.078	0.006	0.178
accuracy in manager's speech to anticipate future behavior P< 0.01	** 0.405	0.164	0.001
consistence in manager's promise P< 0.05	** 0.123	0.015	0.033
accuracy in manager's speech to participate future results P< 0.01	** 0.484	0.234	0.001
reliability to manager P< 0.01	** 0.259	0.067	0.001

Discussion

Analyzing the data indicated that there is a relation between perceived organizational support and most of the components and job trust dimensions (accuracy in manager's speech to anticipate future, constancy in manager's behavior in different situations, reliability to manager, constancy in manager's behavior to different people, accuracy in manager's speech to anticipate future behavior, appropriateness in proposed information by manager, consistence in manager's promise) except these dimensions (constancy in manager's speech to different people, constancy in manager's speech in different situations, consistence in manager's speech with his past behavior). Therefore, it can be mentioned that job trust increases by increasing the level of organizational support. On the other hand,

managers who are more supportive can create a more reliable atmosphere. This conclusion is in the same direction of Annamalai, Saekoo et al and Ngang studies. The result of Annamalai's study states that there is a positive and strong relation between organizational trust and job satisfaction with job performance (Annamalai, 2010). According to their study, Saekoo et al indicated that there is a positive relation between perceived organizational support and trust, and perceived organizational support impacts on trust, but perceived organizational support does not impact job commitments as much as trust (Saekoo et al, 2011). Ngang's study results indicated that ninety percent of the studied high schools have a desired level of organizational trust and there is a positive and so strong relation between perceived organizational

support and trust which is about .075(Ngang,2012).

This study results showed that there is a positive and meaningful relation between perceived organizational support and constancy in manager's behavior to different people, in this case, staff considers manager behavior fair and just and without any exemption for some staff and concludes that Criterion governs in their respective organization, therefore their trust to manager will increase in dimension of behavioral constancy. Also, there was a positive and meaningful relation between perceived organizational support and manager's behavior constancy in different situations. Lacking of incoherence between manager actions in different situations, appropriateness between speech and perseverance are features that lead to staff trust on manager. Supportive managers are usually those who have enough recognition about the situation, have analytical skills avoid from wishful statements, monitoring in behavior and action and put improvement patterns based on thought. According to this study, there is a positive and meaningful relation between perceived organizational support and appropriateness in manager's proposed information. It is obvious that efficiency and effectiveness duties need accurate, in time, clear and exact information. Therefore, managers cannot support their staff but prevent providing them with information. As, any kind of growth, development and alignment with organization goals depends on related organizational information. There is a positive and meaningful relation between perceived organizational support and accuracy in manager's speech to anticipate future. Accuracy in manager's speech to anticipate future is of abilities which represent the level of manager's honesty and personal commitment. Managers, who have a higher level of this ability, have certainly more acceptability and reliability among their staff. It is obvious, the more commitments and promise a manager has, the more reliability he has among their staff.

There was a positive and meaningful relation between perceived organizational support and consistence in manager's promise. One of the most useful and the simplest ways of encouraging reliability is meeting commitments by manager. The process of leading staff to meeting commitments and doing tasks in their best way requires having high commitment by managers and those who have power. In addition, there was a positive and meaningful relation between

perceived organizational support and accuracy in manager's speech to anticipate future results. Managers who have prospective science can usually anticipate future changes, warn consequences of actions. Manager's experiences and sources as well as proficiency provide this perspective for staff that managers anticipated realistically and can anticipate future results based on managerial awareness without speculation. There was also a positive and meaningful relation between perceived organizational support and reliability. Staff who has usually organizational support, trusts on manager's honesty and upright and act completely in a valuable and secure manner and is appreciated by manager. When staff feels that manager supports them, pays attention to them, neglects their mistakes, assists them in difficulties, and understands their logical long absences and emphasizes on their role, trusts on manager more, as a result, consider this supportive atmosphere as an element of trust.

The study findings indicate that 2nd, 4th and 6th questions of the study on presence of a positive and meaningful relation between perceived organizational support and components of organization reliability are not validated. There was not a meaningful relation between perceived organizational support and constancy in manager's speech to different people. Investigating the results seems managers do not have speech constancy with others by two personal or organizational reasons. Personally, some reasons such as being fickle, lack of independence in different affairs, quick and hasty decisions, lack of expertise, lack of access to accurate, updated and exact information, and organizationally, some reasons such as over centralization, being ad hoc in some rules and regulations, having political attitude, lack of reliability and make action in risky circumstances can cause such conditions. A set of these conditions leads fading manager's constancy in speech and weakens staff trust in this dimension. In present study, there was not a meaningful relation between perceived organizational support and constancy in manager's speech in different situation, the reason seems lay in selection mechanism of manager. In structural dimension, selection mechanism of manager seems in educational units has some inefficiency in recent years which is result of unusual politicization in government organizations and moving away from the meritocratic.

References

- Annamalai T. 2010. The mediating effects of perceived organizational support on the relationships between organizational justice, trust and performance appraisal in Malaysian secondary schools. *European Journal of Social Sciences*-Volume 13. Number 4:623-632.
- Baird A, Amand R. 1995. Trust within the organization. *Management*, Issue 1.
- Cohen L, Manion L & Morrison. 2000. *Research methods in Education*-by Routledge Falmer. 5th edition 36.
- Eisenberger R, Huntington R, Hutchison S, Sowa D. 1986. Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 71. Available from: www.apa.org/pubs/journals
- Eisenberger R, Cummings J, Armeli S, Lynch PD. 1997. "Perceived Organizational Support, discretionary treatment, and job satisfaction", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(5), 812-820. Available from: www.elsevier.com.
- Ellonen R, Blomqvist K, Puumalainen K. 2008. The role of trust in organizational innovativeness. *European Journal of Innovation Management* vol. 11, No. 2, pp: 160-181. Available from: <http://www.emeraldinsight.com>.
- Erden A, Erden H. 2009. Predicting organizational trust level of school managers and teachers at elementary schools. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences* 1. pp: 2180-2190. Available from: <http://www.elsevier.com>.
- Hanifan LJ. 1916. The rural school community center. *Annals of American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 67:130-137.
- Lamastro V. 2000. Commitment and Perceived Organizational Support. *National Forum*, V 13, N. 3. <http://nationalforum.com/toc/10e3.html>.
- Levin SL. 1999. Development of an instrument to measure organizational trust. Doctoral dissertation, The George Washington University, dissertation abstract International, 60-02 A. 481.
- Ngang TK. 2012. Relationship between perceived organizational support and trust with teachers' commitment. *Universiti Sains Malaysia* 11800 Minden Penang, Malaysia.
- Organ DW. 1988. *Organizational citizenship behavior: the good soldier syndrome*. Lexington Books. Available from: <http://www.elsevier.com/locate/jwb>.
- Rhoades L, Eisenberger R. (2002) Perceived Organizational Support: A review of the literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 87(4), 608-714. Available from: www.apa.org/pubs/journals
- Robbins SP. 2002. *Organizational behavior*. New Delhi: Practice, Hall of India.
- Saekoo A. 2011. Examining the effect of trust, Procedural justice, Perceived organizational support, commitment, and job satisfaction in Royal Thai Police. *Journal of Academy of Business and Economics Publisher*.
- Sergiovanni C, Starr R. 1992. *Supervision human perspectives*. 3rd edition, New York: McGraw Hill Inc.
- Sundquist K, Yang M. 2006. Linking social capital and self-related health: A multilevel analysis of 11,175 men and women in Sweden. *Health and Place*, 13, 324-334.
- The visionary leaders. *Trainer guide, organizational design and development* Sashkin. 1988. New York.
- Toreh N. 2005. Identifying factors associated with organizational citizenship behavior and organizational performance. Master's Thesis, Pajuh Qom University of Tehran University.
- Zampetakis LA, Beldekos P, Moustakis VS. 2009. "Day-to-day" entrepreneurship within organization: The role of trait Emotional Intelligence and Perceived Organizational Support. *European Management Journal* 27, 165-175. Available from: www.elsevier.com.