

Full Length Research Paper

The effect of organizational support; Perception of teachers on organizational trust perception of their schools

Soner Polat

Department of Elementary Education, Education Faculty, Kocaeli University, 41300 zmit-Kocaeli, Turkey.
E-mail: spolat@kocaeli.edu.tr.

Accepted 13 August, 2017

The aim of this research is to reveal the effect of organizational support perception of teachers on the organizational trust perception of their schools who work in the primary schools. The research is a descriptive scanning model type of research. The universe of the research consists of 1637 teachers who work in the town of Kocaeli of Izmit city. The sampling of the research consists of 680 teachers working in 12 schools who have been chosen randomly. The data of the research has been collected with the organizational support perception and organizational trust scales. In the research the hypothesis which has been developed according to the institutional information and findings has been tested. In order to test the hypothesis correlation and regression analyses have been conducted. At the end of the research a highly positive ($r = 0.75$) relation between the organizational support perception and organizational trust perception has been determined. It has been discovered that organizational support perception is an effective variable in the regression of the organizational trust in a positive way.

Key words: Organizational support, organizational trust, primary school, teacher.

INTRODUCTION

Organization is a whole and system which consists of the sub and upper systems which are interrelated. Workers, who are reinforced and in every aspect endowed, are required in the system to operate in a good way. Reinforced workers need to be supported by their organizations, manager's subordinates, colleagues in order to complete their tasks in an efficient way.

Social support is also described as someone's contribution and help to the others to find solutions for the problems and feel better about themselves (Lirio et al., 2007) like it is described as the meeting of the basics of an individual such as belonging, love, appreciation, self actualization by interacting with other individuals (Ünsar et al., 2009). Eisenberger et al. (1986), explained the beliefs with the organizational support perception by stating that the workers develop general beliefs on whether their organizations support them or not (Rhoades and Eisenberg, 2002). Eisenberg et al. (1986), describe the perceptions and feelings which are towards the organizations gave importance to their workers and care

about their satisfaction. In summary organizational support perception is that the workers feel secure by being aware of the fact that their organizations are behind them.

Organizational support can demonstrate itself in shapes such as supporting the innovative ideas in the organization, providing the mandatory/necessary sources, giving specialization or movement, freedom and socio politic support (Zampetakis et al., 2009). Compliance, financial and career supports also matter in the embodiment of perceived organizational support (Kraimer, 2004; Akin, 2008). Information support in the organizations (e.g advice, suggestion) can be in the way of tool support (e.g money, material), emotional support (e.g trust, to respect) and assessment (e.g feedback) (Lirio et al., 2001).

In the creation of the organizational support perception in individuals, besides individuals' personal characteristics, the characteristics of the environment are important too. (Lirio et al., 2007). The social support in

the working place can come from colleagues, subordinates or seniors. In the embodiment of the organizational support perception that the organization workers support each other is as important as the support of management/top management. When the work stress is on the carpet, it has been seen that the most intensive social support is provided by the colleagues (Lindorff, 2001).

The director of the organization has a significant effect on the organizational support as the director is also the representative of the organization (Rhoades and Eisenberger, 2002; Eisenberger et al., 2002). According to Celep (2000), behaving in a sincere way, condoning the mistakes, encouraging risks taking, providing a trust atmosphere where the workers can express their ideas in a comfortable way are ranked as the supportive behaviours of the director.

The support which is provided in the organizations has functions like giving emotional relief by providing the needed goods/ services, providing ways to deal with problems by guiding employers, contributing the employers' personal development with feedbacks, protecting the employers from the harmful effects of stress by connections between employees (Kaner, 2003). When these functions actualize, the employees are affected in a positive way in terms of emotional and physical health (Eker et al., 2001).

In the studies which were conducted on the employees, it was observed that organizational support perception affected many organizational output (Rhoades and Eisenberger, 2002). One of the variables of organizational support perception is organizational trust. Many studies which show that organizational support perception increases organizational trust, exists (Eisenberger et al., 1986; Tan and Tan, 2000; Chen et al., 2005; Ferres et al., 2005).

Baier (1986), describes the trust as meeting the expectations of the trusting person related to the trust organization in general, Das and Teng (1998) have described that one part believes that they depend on the other and both parts possess positive and durable expectations concerning behaving in a responsible and honest way to achieve the mutual aims.

Lewicki et al. (1998) described organizational trust as employee's positive expectations about the policies and the applications of the organization which will affect them and the belief that the organization will support them. Mishra and Morrisey (1990) describes organizational trust as the feeling which occurs as a result of the perception related to the support provided to the employee by the organization. In another description organizational trust is described as the expectation of the employees from the organizational relations and behaviours web (Shockley-Zalabank et al., 2000). Trust in the manager is described as the belief that the manager will keep their promises and be honest and the support feeling expected from the manager (Gilbert and Tang, 1998). As it is seen, most of

the expectations in the trust descriptions depend on the support perception which includes both psychological and physiological factors.

In the literature scan conducted by Polat (2009), it has been determined that organizational trust affects many variables and have many positive outputs. It has been determined that highly organizational trust increases organizational commitment, keep the moral of the employee high, facilitates delegation of authority, decreases the absence of employees, facilitates the organizational renovation by decreasing the resistance to change, facilitates problem solving and decision taking process, increases job satisfaction, lowers the organizational stress level, facilitates showing the citizenship behaviour. Besides, organizational trust has a significant role in facilitating collaboration at schools, developing open school cultures, encouraging group commitment, school leadership and student success and increasing school quality.

As it is seen, organizational trust provides positive outputs for the organization and employees directly and indirectly. In the determination of the trust level, one of the important variables is the organizational support perceptions of the employees.

Even though there are limited studies which examine the organizational trust perception and organizational trust relationship effect on health organizations (Ferres et al., 2005), companies (Tan and Tan, 2005; Albrecht and Travaglione, 2003) and different professions in different work organizations (Chen et al., 2005) a study which explicates this relationship has not been seen in the educational organizations. The research is important for explicating the relationship between these two variables in terms of educational organizations.

ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT PERCEPTION AND ORGANIZATIONAL TRUST RELATIONSHIP

In the trust perception at least 2 groups must exist. The high degree exchanges between the individuals are based on trust and respect (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978). According to Blau's social exchange theory, the two parts which depend on each other provide something to each other mutually (Eisenberger et al., 2002). According to this theory employees provide support for their organizations as much as they receive from them (Shore et al., 1994; Eisenberger et al., 2002).

According to the informing mutual theory, the existence of a relationship based on trust in the organization facilitates exchange relation between the parts, it affects many work and employee output. The fact that the organizations take the employees into consideration and supports them prepares ground for trust and consequently the organization receives the response of this positive feeling in a positive way (Gilbert and Tang, 1988; Dirks and Ferin, 2002).

Organizational support perception assigns the foundation of trust in organizations (Eisenberger et al., 1990). The employees become more enthusiastic about constructing reliable relationships as a result of the positive expectations created by acceptable behaviours. Within the framework of exchange theory, trust helps a system which guarantees an exchange relation between the parts to occur (Rousseau, 1995) and parts widens the borders of exchange relation between the parts (Mayer et al., 1995). By means of the increase of these exchanges, the trust between the parts continues to increase gradually.

It has been determined that the employees who receive social support feel more secured and less stressful than the ones who do not receive social support (Tutar, 2000). The employees who receive the support of the organization concentrate on their jobs more and do not think about quitting their jobs (Eisenberger et al., 1990). Besides it has been found out that organizational trust is a moderator variable between organizational trust perception and many variables (Konovsky and Pugh, 1994; Broucker et al., 1997).

According to the results of this organizational and practical study, the hypothesis of the study has been formed like this: "There is positive meaningful relation between the teachers' organizational support and organizational trust perception; teachers' organizational support perception is a meaningful predictor of organizational trust."

The aim of this study is to determine the relations between the organizational support perception and organizational trust.

METHOD

Research design

This research is a descriptive relational scanning modal as it intends to determine the relation between organizational support perception and organizational trust perception.

Universe and sampling

The universe of the research consists of 1637 teachers who work in 63 official primary schools of town of Kocaeli of city of Izmit in 2009/2010 academic year. In this research private primary schools are excluded. The sampling size has been calculated with the sampling determination formula ($n = N \times (t)^2 \times p \times q / (d)^2 \times (N - 1) + (t)^2 \times p \times q$) (Ba, 2001) and sampling size has been determined as 646 teachers. From 63 schools 12 schools have been chosen randomly and 680 teachers who work in these schools have been added into the sampling of the research.

Data collection tools

The data of the research has been collected with organizational support perception scale and organizational trust scale. Likert scale has been graded as 5 spaced between 1 (I definitely do not agree) and (I completely agree).

Teachers' organizational support perceptions have been measured

with the organizational support perception scale developed by Eisenberg et al. (1986). The scale with 14 components consists of one factor. The scale's Cronbach alfa coefficient has been calculated as 0.88.

Organizational perception has been measured with the organizational trust scale developed by Daboval, Comish, Swindle and Gaster (1994). The adaptation of the scale with 21 components has been made by Kamer (2001). In the applied factor analysis, it has been seen that the scale is one dimensional and the Cronbach's alpha coefficient of the scale has been calculated as 0.96.

Collection and distribution of the data

The teachers who work in 12 schools in the sampling group have been given the measurement tools and one week later they were collected back. Out of 680, 618 of the tools were given back and 608 of them have been processed and used in the data analysis. 45% of the teachers whose data has been analyzed are male and the rest is female.

Data analysis

In the research to determine the levels of organizational support perception and organizational trust on the teacher, arithmetic means has been taken into consideration. When the arithmetic means are interpreted, the gaps have been valued as: 1.00 – 1.79 "very low", 1.80 – 2.59 "low", 2, 60 – 3, 39 "medium", 3.40 – 4.19 "high", 4.20 – 5.00 "very high". To examine the relation between organizational support and organizational trust of the teacher, correlation analysis has been made. When the correlation coefficients are assessed, if the correlation coefficient is between 0.70 and 1.00, it has been interpreted as "high", between 0.69 and 0.30 it has been interpreted as "medium", and if it is 0.29 and below it has been interpreted as related to "low" level (Büyükoztürk, 2005) and when it gets closer to 0.00, it has been interpreted as irrelevant. To control the effect of the organizational support perception on the organizational trust a regression analysis has been applied.

FINDINGS

The arithmetic means related to the organizational support and trust perception of the teachers are given in Table 1. When the teachers' organizational support perception is on medium level ($x = 2.96$), organizational trust is on high levels ($x = 3.57$). In the study where Arslan (2009) measured the organizational trust perception of teachers of the vocational schools, the organizational trust perception of the teachers was on high level ($x = 4.01$).

It is seen that there is a high level, positive relationship between the organizational support perception and organizational trust of the teachers (Table 2). As it is seen, there is a high level relationship between organizational support and trust. The results of the regression analysis is related to the organizational support perception of the teachers predict organizational trust are given in Table 2.

The organizational support perception of the teachers is an important predictor of the organizational trust. ($R = 0.745$, $R^2 = 0.555$, $p < 0.01$). The organizational support perception of the teachers explains approximately 56% of

Table 1. The arithmetic means and standard deviation related to the organizational support and trust perception of the teachers.

Variable	n	x	Ss
Organizational support perception	730	2.96	0.97
Organizational trust	730	3.57	0.93

Table 2. The results of the regression analysis related to that the organizational support perception of the teachers predict organizational trust.

Model 1		Predicted variable: Organizational trust				
Predictor variable	B	ShB	β	t	r	p
Constant	1.454	0.074		19.701		0.000
Organizational support perception	0.715	0.024	0.745	30.139	0.75	0.000
R = 0.745	R ² = 0.555					
F(1,729)= 908,380	p = 0.000					

the variance in the trust variable.

While in the research conducted by Tan and Tan (2000) on the companies, the effect of the organizational support perception on the organizational trust was found as $\beta = 0.43$, in the research of Albrecht and Travaglione (2003) it was found as $\beta = 0.26$.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In this research which searches the relation between the organizational support perception and organizational trust and the effect of the organizational support perception on the organizational trust, a very positive relation between the organizational support perception and the organizational trust. Besides, it is seen that organizational support perception is a significant predictor of the organizational trust. This finding shows consistency with the findings of other research (Tan and Tan, 2000; Chen et al., 2005; Ferres et al., 2005).

When the results of this research on the educational area are compared to the results of the research conducted in health organizations (Ferres et al., 2005) and companies (Tan and Tan, 2005; Albrecht and Travaglione, 2003), it is seen that the relationship between organizational support perception and organizational trust is stronger in health and educational organizations than in companies. It is seen that the effect of the organizational support perception on the organizational trust in the organizations which are included in service sector is higher. In the educational organizations where its workers and raw goods are human in the increase of organizational trust perception the quality of the interpersonal relationships has an importance. In the educational organizations, that the director- teacher-support staff relationship has a logrolling quality has a

significant effect in the creation of organizational trust. Thanks to this support, the workers of the educational organization who feel secured by being affected positively they complete their tasks in a better way. This situation without any doubt will affect the students' success directly and contribute to organization's being efficient and productive.

In the studies related to confidence of the teacher, it is indicated that the helpfulness and supporting are the most expected characteristics of trust from a director (Tschannen-Moran and Hoy, 1998). Especially the supportive, caring and sensitive approaches are related with the trust on management and school (Kernan and Hanges, 2002; Mayer et al., 1995). The fact that the school directors give opportunities to the teachers to try innovations while they are working will increase the self confidence of the teachers (Brewster and Railsback, 2003).

Trust is a spiritual source for the school development (Bryk and Schneider, 2003; Brewster and Railsback, 2003). In educational institutions trust in an internal matter of effective relations. Therefore the importance of the trust variable has to be realized and the ways to increase trust at schools should be searched (Tschannen-Moran and Hoy, 1998).

As it is cited in the theoretical part of the research, organizational trust affects many organizational and individual output directly and indirectly. Thus the studies which will increase the organizational trust perception of the teacher are required. One of the ways of increasing the organizational trust is to strengthen the organizational support perception of the teachers. Compared to the other shareholders of the school, directors are more important. At that point, the school director has a significant role as the director support is attributed to the organization.

First of all at schools, directors have to create a culture and atmosphere based on the support. Fulfilling the need of appreciation, affection and reference, giving the concordance support when they first begin at school or at work, helping them when they face difficulties, supporting the innovative ideas, providing the materials and sources they need, giving the financial support, giving them the liberty of movement leaning against their proficiency, supporting and encouraging them to carve out a career for themselves, giving them kind and constructive feedbacks concerning their jobs, being there for them when they face emotional difficulties can increase the organizational support perception of the teachers. Thereby the teacher whose organizational support perception increases will attract trust to their organization more.

REFERENCES

- Akin M (2008). The effects of organizational support, social support and work/family conflicts on life satisfaction. *Erciyes University Inst. Soc. Sci. J.*, 25(2): 141-170.
- Albrech S, Travaglione A (2003). Trust in public-sector senior management. *Int. J. Hum. Resour. Manage.*, 14(1): 76-92.
- Arslan MM (2009). Perceptions of technical and industrial vocational high school teachers about organizational trust. *J. Theory Pract. Educ.*, 5(2): 274-288.
- Baier AC (1986). Trust and antitrust. *Ethics*, 96(2): 231-260.
- Bass BM (1985). *Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectation*. New York: Free Press.
- Bas T (2001). *Questionnaire: How to Prepare Questionnaire, How to Apply, How Assessed*. Ankara: Seckin Publications.
- Brewster C, Railsback J (2003). *Building trusting relationships for school improvement. Implications for principals and teachers*. Portland OR: Northwest Regional Educational Lab.
- Brockner J, Siegel P, Daly J, Tyler T, Martin C (1997). When trust matters: The moderating effect of outcome favorability. *Admin. Sci. Q.*, 42: 558-583.
- Bryk AS, Schneider B (2003). Trust in schools: A core resource for school reform. *Educ. Leadersh.*, 60(6): 40-45.
- Burns JM (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Buyukozturk S (2005). *For Social Sciences Handbook of Data Analysis*. Ankara: Pegema Publications.
- Celep C (2000). In *Education Organizational Commitment and Teachers'*. Ankara: Ani Publications.
- Chen ZX, Aryee S, Leec C (2005). Test of a mediation model of perceived organizational support. *J. Vocat. Behav.*, 66: 457-470.
- Daboval J, Comish R, Swindle B, Caster W (1994). A trust inventory for small businesses. *Small Businesses Symposium*, <http://www.sbaer.uca.edu/docs/proceedings/94swi031.txt>.
- Das TK, Teng BS (1998). Between trust and control: developing confidence in partner cooperation in alliances. *Acad. Manage. Rev.*, 23 (3): 491-512.
- Dirks KT, Ferrin DL (2002). Trust in leadership: Meta-analytic findings and implications for research and practice. *J. Appl. Psychol.*, 87(4): 611-628.
- Eisenberger R, Fasolo P, Davis-LaMastro V (1990). Perceived organizational support and employee diligence, commitment, and innovation. *J. Appl. Psychol.*, 75: 51-59.
- Eisenberger R, Huntington R, Hutchison S, Sowa D (1986). Perceived organizational support. *J. Appl. Psychol.*, 71: 500-507.
- Eisenberger R, Stinglhamber F, Vandenberghe C, Sucharski I, Rhoades L (2002). Perceived supervisor support: Contributions to perceived organizational support and employee retention. *J. Appl. Psychol.*, 87: 565-573.
- Eker D, Akar H, Yaldiz H (2001). Factorial structure, validity, and reliability of revised form of the multidimensional scale of perceived social support. *Turk. J. Psychiatr.*, 12 (1): 17-25.
- Ferres N, Connell J, Travaglione A (2005). The effect of future redeployment on organizational trust. *Strat Change*, 14: 77-91.
- Gilbert JA, Tang TLP (1998). An examination of organizational trust antecedents. *Pub. Pers. Manage.*, 27: 321-338.
- Kamer M (2001). *Organizational trust, organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior effects* (Unpublished master's thesis). Marmara University Institute of Social Sciences.
- Kaner S (2003). *Family support scale: Factor structure, reliability and validity studies*.
- Kernan MC, Hanges PJ (2002). Survivor reactions to reorganization: Antecedents and consequences of procedural, interpersonal, and informational justice. *J. Appl. Psychol.*, 87: 916-928.
- Konovsky MA, Pugh SD (1994). Citizenship behavior and social exchange. *Acad. Manage. J.*, 37: 656-669.
- Kraimer M (2004). An examination of perceived organizational support as a multidimensional construct in the context of an expatriate assignment. *J. Manage.*, 30(2): 209-237.
- Lewicki RJ, McAllister DJ, Bies RJ (1998). Trust and distrust: New relationships and realities. *Acad. Manage. Rev.*, 23: 438-459.
- Lindorff M (2001). Are they lonely at the top? Social relationships and social support among Australian managers. *Work Stress*, 15(3): 274-282.
- Lirio P, Lituchy TR, Monserrat SI, Olivas -Lujan MR (2007). Exploring career-life success and family social support of successful women in Canada, Argentina and Mexico. *Career Dev. Int.*, 12(1): 28-50.
- Mayer RC, Davis JH, Schoorman FD (1995). An integrative model of organizational trust. *Acad. Manage. Rev.*, 20(3): 709-734.
- Mishra J, Morrissey MA (1990). Trust in employee/employer relationships. A survey of West Michigan managers. *Public Pers. Manage.*, 19(4): 443-463.
- Polat S (2009). *Organizational Trust*. New York: Pegema Publishing.
- Rhoades L, Eisenberger R (2002). Perceived organizational support: A review of the literature. *J. Appl. Psychol.*, 87: 698-714.
- Rousseau DM (1995). *Psychological Contracts in Organizations: Understanding Written and Unwritten Agreements*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Shockley-Zalabak P, Ellis K, Winograd G (2000). Organizational trust, what it means, why it matters. *Org. Dev. J.*, 18:35-48.
- Shore LM, Tetrick LE, Sinclair RR, Newton LA (1994). Validation of a measure of perceived union support. *J. Appl. Psychol.*, 79: 971-977.
- Tan HH, Tan CS (2000). Toward the differentiation of trust in supervisor and trust in organization. *Genet. Soc. Psychol. Monogr.*, 126(2): 241-260.
- Tschannen-Moran M, Hoy WK (1998). Trust in schools: A conceptual and empirical analysis. *J. Educ. Admin.*, 36(3/4): 334-352.
- Tutar H (2000). *Crisis and stress in Environment Management Kriz ve Stres Ortaminda Yonetim*, Istanbul: Hayat Publications.
- Unsar S, Sadirli SK, Demir M, Zafer R, Erol Ö (2009). University Students' Social Support Levels and Influencing Factors. *Dokuz Eylul University Electronic. J. Nurs.*, 1(1): 17-29.
- Zampetakis LA, Beldekos P, Moustakis VS (2009). Day-to-day entrepreneurship within organisations: The role of trait emotional intelligence and perceived organisational support University of Glasgow. *Eur. Manage. J.*, 27(3): 165-175.