Organizational Communication Climate And Its Relationship Employee Organizational Trust: An Exploratory Study

Dr. Alan P. Taguiam
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6907-5479
Cagayan State University, Piat Campus
alanptaguiam@gmail.com

Abstract

Achieving excellent employee communication has been shown to have a significant impact on the development of employees' trust in their respective organizations. Organizational trust among employees is built on the principles of honesty, self-assurance, and good attitudes toward upper management. The quantitative design was used by the researcher in this study to collect data. It makes extensive use of the descriptive-correlational approach to data analysis, in particular. As a result, this demonstrates that they believe that the university's communication channels may be enhanced. It demonstrates that the university's internal environment for information sharing among the various stakeholders is open and amicable. Among the characteristics that they perceive as supportive of worker participation at the university are environments that allow for a free and open flow of information, as well as the settlement of constructive conflicts. Several students have expressed concern about the institution's emphasis on participation, a free and open exchange of knowledge, and constructive dispute resolution, all of which they believe are lacking. As the parties collaborate to maximize the benefits that will accrue as a result of their cooperative efforts, they are expressing mutual confidence in one another. Furthermore, it can be inferred that the employees of these institutions have confidence in the honesty, integrity, and competence of their managers. They also display a mutual belief in their own objectives and course of action.

Keywords: employee's trust, organizational trust, exploratory study, cooperative efforts, communication climate

Introduction

When establishing a theory of organization-public relations links, the communication style, content, and amount of communication are all key considerations to take into consideration (Broom et al., 2010; Grunig, 2012; Ledingham, 2013; Ledingham & Bruning, 2010; Reina & Reina, 2009; Walton, 2011). In fact, Walton identifies communication as "the most significant factor accounting for the overall behavior of an organization," according to the author. Communication acts as a strategic tool in the formation and management of organizational-public relations, according to Ledingham's

definition. In their definition of trust, Reina and Reina state that it is "a relationship marked by mutual confidence in the fulfillment of contractual responsibilities, open communication, expected competence, and the capacity to participate in unguarded engagement." The opposite of betrayal, they say, is trust. They define betrayal as "a willful or unintentional break of trust, or the impression of a breach of trust," respectively. Because of the close relationship between honesty and trust, Mayer et al. (2015) propose the following explanation:

It is determined by factors such as the consistency of the party's previous conduct, credible messages about the trustee from other parties, belief in the trustee's strong sense of justice, and the extent to which the party's actions are consistent with his or her statements. (Mayer and colleagues, 2015)

For the purposes of this article, "[Communication trust] can be defined as a person's willingness to share information with others, to be truthful, to accept responsibility for mistakes made, to maintain confidentiality, to provide and receive constructive comments, and to speak with a positive intention," as stated by Reina and Reina (2009). The manner in which we conduct ourselves in these situations demonstrates our willingness to reveal as well as the quality of that disclosure." Strangely enough, this idea is strikingly similar to the employee communication components (accountability, secrecy, involvement, and substantial information) that were investigated in this study. The principles of accountability and acknowledging mistakes are similar; yet, the concept of secrecy is diametrically opposed to transparency and telling the truth. Providing and receiving constructive feedback are analogous to the exchange of substantial knowledge, while participation is analogous to providing and receiving constructive feedback

Employee communication and trust have previously been investigated from both interpersonal and organizational perspectives (e.g., Ellis and Shockley-Zalabak, 2011; Ruppel and Harrington, 2010; Thomas et al., 2009), and there have been previous studies linking employee communication and trust from both interpersonal and organizational perspectives (e.g., Ellis and Shockley-Zalabak, 2011; Ruppel and Harrington, 2010; Thomas et al., 2009), and there have been previous studies linking employee (e.g., Shockley-Zalabak et al., 2010; Smidts et al., 2011). From the perspective of interpersonal connections, Thomas et al. investigated the role that communication plays in increasing employees' trust in their coworkers, supervisors, and higher-level managers in the workplace. As a result of categorizing employee communication into two categories, they determined that the quality of information is more significant in building trust with coworkers and supervisors, whereas the amount of information is more important in building trust with higher management. Following the findings of these studies, it has been discovered that employee organizational trust is crucial in interpersonal connections with coworkers and supervisors. "To be regarded trustworthy, superiors or managers must follow through and uphold their word and/or promises," write Hubble and Chory-Assad (2015). "In order to be called trustworthy, superiors or managers must uphold their word and/or promises." They must follow through on their commitments and make good on their pledges. Consequently, trust is based on previous relationship experiences or, at the at least, on the presumption that the person in whom one has placed confidence will continue to act in a positive manner in the future.

When employees communicate with one another, it has an impact on their degree of trust in their company.. When it comes to building trust, Sanchez (2016) emphasizes the necessity of communication. When it comes to creating and sustaining a change in culture, communication's ability to win employees' hearts and minds (and, as a result, to build trust) is what gives it its genuine strength. In turn, this results in the development of a value chain that can result in improved customer service, increased productivity, and the achievement of mission objectives However, in order to win hearts and minds, the most thorough and strategic communication planning is essential. To achieve success, a constant and comprehensive effort across a spectrum of communication channels and stakeholders, from face-to-face interaction to mass communication activity, is essential. Furthermore, it necessitates contact and participation at all stages of the process.

It provides a comprehensive description of the organization as a whole, from the boardroom to the mail department. "Trust influences and is the result of communication behaviors such as presenting correct information, providing explanations for decisions, and demonstrating genuine and appropriate openness," the authors write. Organizational communication plans that are well-executed are also connected with

increased trust." The development of employee organizational trust is the consequence of deliberate employee communication; yet, the development of employee organizational trust can aid in the acceleration of employee communication and, eventually, the success of the organization. Hon and Grunig's (2011) definition of trust can be contrasted with their own concept of trust, which includes the three aspects of integrity, dependability, and competence. The importance of employee communication as the first factor in promoting employees' trust in their organization is emphasized by Caudron (2012), who also recognizes the relevance of leadership support. Trust is defined in this study according to Hon and Grunig's (2011) OPR-based definition, which states that trust is defined as "one party's level of confidence in and desire to open oneself to the other party."

So far, we've looked at research on organizational performance and dependability, trust, and employee communication and trust in this review of the literature. On the issues of organizational culture and organizational climate, this section provides an overview of notable literature on the topics of culture and climate. Additionally, researchers are looking into the relationship between employee communication and the overall business climate. In the final section, concepts such as ethical business climate and the relationship between employee communication and ethics are discussed.

Cagayan State University serves as the context for this study, which has the purpose of determining the organizational communication environment at the university and the relationship between organizational trust in the organization and employee satisfaction with the organization. In the goal of identifying likely explanations for the problems that are arising at the institution and establishing appropriate treatments to address the difficulties, issues, and concerns that are being voiced, this research is being conducted at this time.

Statement of the Problem

1. Is there is a difference in the assessment of the three group of respondents in the use and effectiveness of communication channels in the university?
2. Is there is a difference in the assessment of the three group of respondents in the use and effectiveness of communication channels in the university?
3. Is there is a difference in the organizational communication climate and organizational trust of the university as perceived by the three group of respondents?
4. Is there is a difference in the assessment of the eight campuses on the organizational communication climate of the university and organizational trust;
5. Is there is a relationship between organizational communication climate and organizational trust in the university?

Hypotheses

Based on the problems raised in this study, the following hypotheses were tested:
1. There is a difference in the assessment of the three group of respondents in the use and effectiveness of communication channels in the university.
2. There is a difference in the assessment of the three group of respondents in the use and effectiveness of communication channels in the university.
3. There is a difference in the organizational communication climate and organizational trust of the university as perceived by the three group of respondents.
4. There is a difference in the assessment of the eight campuses on the organizational communication climate of the university and organizational trust.
5. There is a relationship between organizational communication climate and organizational trust in the university.

Research Methods

In this study, the quantitative design was employed by the researcher. In particular, it made use of the descriptive-correlational approach of analysis. The descriptive portion of the study was concerned with determining the communication

channels that are used at the university, the level of organizational communication climate at the university, and the level of organizational trust among the university's employees, among other things. Furthermore, the descriptive component contained information on the amount to which communication channels were used, the perceived effectiveness with which they were used, as well as the enablers and impediments to an effective corporate communication climate.

There was a strong correlation between organizational communication climate and employee organizational trust in the university, as evidenced by the hypothesis tested, which was whether there is a statistically significant relationship between organizational communication climate and employee organizational trust in the university.

The research was carried out on the eight campuses of Cagayan State University located throughout the whole province of Cagayan. An assortment of universities and administrative places were utilized in the research. Postgraduate courses such as the College of Medicine and Surgery, the College of Law, and Graduate School were excluded from the scope of the research. Faculty members, administrative employees, and university authorities were among those who took part in the survey and provided feedback. In order to compute for the complete sample of faculty and administrative workers, the Slovins formula was used. However, due to the small number of authorities, a complete count was carried out for all of them. Following the calculation of the sample size, stratified random sampling was used to determine the number of samples to be collected from each campus for academic and administrative staff. In the study, only regular faculty members and administrative employees were taken into account. Those who carried an Equivalent Teaching Load (ETL) of 12 units or more were included in the list of officials.

One-way ANOVA was used to assess whether or not there were any statistically significant differences between the two groups as stated in the hypothesis. When it came to determining the statistically significant

association between corporate communication climate and employee organizational trust, the Pearson Product Moment Correlation method was used.

Finally, the hypotheses examined in the study were found to be significant at the 0.05 level of significance.

Discussion of Findings and Results

Difference in the assessments of the designated officials, administrative staff, and faculty on the use and effectiveness of communication channels in the university

Table 1 illustrates a comparison of the opinions of authorized officials, administrative staff, and academic members on the use and efficacy of communication channels at the institution, as expressed through various channels. A statistically significant difference in the usage of communication channels among university personnel is demonstrated at the 0.01 level, as evidenced by this study. Based on the computed f-ratio of 22.944 and the probability value of 0.000, this conclusion can be drawn. With respect to communication channels, the designated officials use them more than the administrative staff and faculty members. Meetings, reports, special orders, and memos are all used more by the designated officials than the administrative staff and faculty members. These communication channels are utilized by those who conduct, issue, and produce these modes of communication as a result of their involvement. The designated officials, in addition, have indicated that they make extensive use of these channels of communication, owing to the fact that they are the primary means of contact inside the university. Table 1 further shows that there is a statistically significant difference in the perceived efficacy of the communication channels by the different groups of respondents when 0.05 is used as the threshold of significance. When compared to the administrative staff and faculty members, the designated officials believe they are more effective in this situation. In addition, because they are the ones who conduct, issue, and develop these communication channels, they have found them to be successful means to usher in an organizational communication climate at the

institution, which confirm the preceding conclusion.

The faculty members were the group of respondents who gave the lowest ratings on the effectiveness of communication channels used at their university, as compared to designated

officials and administrative personnel, which is a crucial point to make at this point. When compared to the designated officials and administrative professionals, this shows that they believe that the university's communication channels need to be improved upon.

Table 2. Comparison on the assessments of the designated officials, administrative staff, and faculty members on the use and effectiveness of communication channels in the university.

Variables/Groups	Mean	SD	F-ratio	Probability
Use of Channels				
Designated Officials	31.87	4.26		
Administrative Staff	28.85	4.02		
Faculty members	28.24	3.16	**22.944****	**0.000**
Effectiveness on the communication Channels				
Designated Officials	33.76	3.88		
Administrative Staff	32.65	3.32		
Faculty members	32.44	3.29	**3.442***	**0.033**

**= significant at 0.01 level
*= significant at 0.05 level

<u>Difference in the assessments of the designated officials, administrative staff, and faculty on the organizational communication climate and organizational trust in the university</u>

Organizational communication climate and organizational confidence in the institution are compared in Table 2 based on the opinions of authorized officials, administrative personnel, and faculty members who work at the university. It demonstrates that there is a statistically significant difference between the organizational climate of the university as perceived by these two groups of respondents at the 0.01 level. In this case, the f-ratio is 17.079 and the probabilityvalue is 0.000, as calculated by the computer. The designated officials had a more positive perception of the organizational climate at the institution than their counterparts, according to the responses from the various categories. This finding may be explained by the fact that cultivating an organizational climate is more of

an obligation and duty on the part of the designated officials than it is on the part of the administrative staff and faculty. As a result, they believe that the internal atmosphere of information sharing among thevarious stakeholders at the university is open and friendly. Their perceptions of supportive environments at the university include surroundings that encourage worker participation, a free and open flow of information, as well as the resolution of constructive conflicts.

Meanwhile, the same table demonstrates that there is a statistically significant difference at the 0.01 level in the perception of the university's organizational trust by these two groups of survey participants, according to the results. This is demonstrated by the f-ratio of 10.551 and the probability value of 0.000 that were obtained. Organizational trust is a function of management rather than subordinates, in the same way that communication environment is a function of management. As a result, designated officials

have given the university a higher rating for organizational trust than their competitors. Organizational trust is a managerial responsibility, much as is the climate of communication in the organization. So, they believe and feel that they treat the employees

fairly, that they provide affective and cognitive trust, that they display empathy, identification, and friendship; or they just believe and feel that they want to be trusted because they honestly want to be trusted.

Table 2. Comparison on the assessments of the designated officials, administrative staff, and faculty on the organizational communication climate and organizational trust in the university.

Variables/Groups	Mean	SD	F-ratio	Probability
Organizational Climate				
Designated Officials	130.42	11.01		
Administrative Staff	124.34	9.77		
Faculty members	122.73	7.63	**17.079**	**0.000**
Organizational Trust				
Designated Officials	104.05	7.98		
Administrative Staff	100.26	6.45		
Faculty members	99.85	5.52	**10.551**	**0.000**

**= significant at 0.01 level

Difference in the assessment of therespondents on the organizational communication climate and organizational trust in the university

According to the authorized authorities, administrative personnel, and faculty members, the organizational communication climate and organizational trust at the university were compared in Table 3. The results are presented by campus. It demonstrates that there is a statistically significant variation at the 0.01 level in the assessment of the communication climate of the university between the eight campuses. This is reflected in the computed f-ratio of 2.972and the probability value of 0.005, both of which are positive. Aparri, Lasam, and Piat Campuses score the university's communication climate significantly higher than the other campuses, which is significant. This conclusion implies that employees and officials from these campuses regard the culture at the institution to be conducive to open and honest exchange of information. Most likely, the communication

style of the Campus Executive Officers and College Deans on these campuses fosters a supportive climate that encourages worker involvement, the free and open exchange of information, and the settlement of constructive conflicts.

However, the Andrews and Lallo Campuses received the lowest ratings for the university's organizational communication climate, according to the survey results. Employees and administrators from these campuses report that the communication climate on their campuses, as well as the communication climate at the university as a whole, is defensive, with employees keeping their opinions to themselves and making cautious statements. Participation, free and open exchange of knowledge, and constructive dispute resolution are perceived as less encouraging at the institution, according to these students. Because they are more exposed to the challenges, problems, and concerns that are plaguing the institution, the organizational communication climate on the Andrews Campus

receives a lower grade than on the other campuses in the university. Because of the employees' proximity to the university's highest-ranking administrators, they receive this information almost promptly, something that does not happen very often on campuses that are not under the control of the Central Administration.

Furthermore, the same table demonstrates that there is a statistically significant difference at the 0.01 level in the assessment of the eight campuses on the organizational trust in the institution by students. Clearly, the Aparri and Gonzaga campuses placed a larger value on the university's organizational trust than did the other campuses. The high level of organizational trust demonstrated by the Aparri and Gonzaga campuses demonstrates that they believe the activities of university authorities and workers are free of self-interest. A mutual expression of confidence exists between the parties as they work together to maximize the benefits that will result from cooperative activity. Another implication is that the personnel at these institutions have faith in the honesty, character, and competency of their administrators. They

also demonstrate reciprocal faith in their own goals and actions.

The Andrews and Lallo campuses, on the other hand, gave the university the lowest ratings in terms of organizational trust. In light of this conclusion, it can be concluded that employees and authorities on these campuses have a lower level of trust in their employer. Several students say that the officials at their college and university do not demonstrate much charity, dependability, competency, honesty, or openness to them or their peers. They express skepticism about their decisions, cynicism in their motives, and skepticism about all of their assertions. The communication atmosphere at these universities, in contrast to their peers, was rated lower on average by students on these campuses. So it may be concluded that those who regarded the organizational communication climate at their university as less favorable tend to build less organizational trust as a result of their experience.

Table 3. Comparison on the organizational communication climate and organizational trust in the university as assessed by the designated officials, administrative staff, and faculty grouped by campus

Variables/Groups	Mean	SD	F-ratio	Probability
Organizational Communication Climate				
Piat Campus	126.29	7.53		
Andrews Campus	121.25	8.33		
Carig Campus	124.77	9.07		
Lallo Campus	123.21	8.32		
Lasam Campus	126.41	10.31		
Sanchez Mira Campus	124.57	9.13		
Gonzaga Campus	124.65	11.51		
Aparri Campus	126.94	9.37	**2.972****	**0.005**
Organizational Trust				
Piat Campus	101.81	5.66		

Andrews Campus	98.30	5.68		
Carig Campus	100.95	5.67		
Lallo Campus	98.55	5.25		
Lasam Campus	101.59	6.85		
Sanchez Mira Campus	100.81	6.69		
Gonzaga Campus	102.06	8.06		
Aparri Campus	102.83	6.93	**4.198****	**0.000**

**= significant at 0.01 level

Relationship between organizational communication climate and organizational trust in the university

In the study, it was anticipated that there is a relationship between organizational climate and overall organizational climate. Table 4 shows that the hypothesis is rejected at the 0.05 level of significance and at the 0.01 level of significance. This is due to the fact that the correlation coefficient computed is 0.325, whereas the likelihood is 0.000. This research demonstrates that organizational trust is influenced by the climate of the organization in which it exists. The greater the level of organizational civic conduct demonstrated by teachers, the greater their level of commitment. Several studies have found that when both parties, the top management and its staff, are open to other points of view in decision-making, trust in management increases (Mishra & Morrissey, 2010; McCauley & Kuhnert, 2012; Meznor & Nigh, 2015). As Kandlousi and colleagues (2010) demonstrated, when employees are satisfied with the communication within their business, they develop trust, a positive attitude, and a sense of belonging that helps them become more engaged. Furthermore, it is the job of the managers to oversee and administrate the communication process as a whole. Furthermore, Chia (2015) stated that "trust and commitment are the byproducts of processes and policies that are designed to make the relationship satisfactory for both parties, such as open, appropriate and clear communication that is delivered at the appropriate time and in the appropriate manner." Trust can be established through effective communication (Mishra & Mishra, 2014), which includes openness and concern on the part of the communicator. When it comes to organizational communication, it is expected to have a significant impact on the degree to which employees trust their managers and the organization's uppermost echelon, as well as on their level of dedication to the organization.

Table 4. Relationship between organizational climate and organizational trust in the university.

Variables	Correlation Coefficient	Probability	Statistical Inference
Organizational Climate and Organizational Trust	0.325	0.000	Significant at 0.01

Conclusion

The pleasant organizational communication climate of the university has a significant impact on the organizational trust of its employees and officials, as well as on the university's reputation. The pleasant communication atmosphere and strong organizational trust, on the other hand, are regarded differently by the designated officials, administrative staff, and faculty members, as well as by the various university campuses. Finally,

there is a substantial correlation between the climate of organizational communication and organizational confidence in the organization. A more positive climate for corporate communication in the workplace leads to increased trust within the organization.

Recommendations

On the basis of the aforementioned findings and conclusions, the following recommendations are presented:

1. The different campuses and colleges of the university must sustain their favorable organizational communication climate and high organizational trust as these are beneficial to the development of the university;
2. The university, campus and college officials must utilize the high organizational trust and favorable communication climate of the employees as this can ensure the success and realization of the school's goals and mission;
3. A similar study must be conducted relating organizational trust with professional commitment as well as communication climate with organizational productivity.

References

Ahmed, K.Z. and Bakar, R.A. (2013), "The association between training and organizational commitment among white-collar workers in Malaysia", International Journal of Training and Development, Vol. 7 No. 3, pp. 166-185.

Allen DG, Shore LM, Griffeth RW (2013). The role of perceived organizational support and supportive human resource practices in the turnover process. J. Mgt. 29(1): 99-103.

Allen, T. D., & Rush, M. C. (2012). The effects of organizational citizenship behavior on performance judgments: A field study and a laboratory experiment. Journal of Applied Psychology, 83(2), 247–260

Allen, D. G., Shore, L. M., & Griffith, R. W. (2013). The role of perceived organizational support and supportive human resource practices in the turnover process. Journal of Management, 29(1), 99-118.

Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (2011). Affective, Continuance, and Normative Commitment to the Organization: An Examination of Construct Validity. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 49(3),252-276.

Aselage, J., & Eisenberger, R. (2013). Perceived organizational support and psychological contracts: A theoretical integration. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 24(5), 491–509

Baran, B., Shanock, L. R., & Miller, L. 2012. Advancing organizational support theory into the twenty-first century world of work. Journal of Business and Psychology, 27: 123-147.

Blau, P. M. (2011). Exchange and power in social life. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction. Konovsky, M. A., & Pugh, S. D. (2014). Citizenship behavior and social exchange. Academy of Management Journal, 37, 656–669.

Buchanan, B., II. (2014). "Building organizational commitment: The socialization of managers in work organizations". Administrative Science Quarterly, 2014. 19, 533-546.

Bolat, O. İ., Bolat, T. ve Seymen, O. A. (2009). Güçlendirici lider davranışları ve örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışı arasındaki ilişkinin sosyal mübadele kuramından hareketle incelenmesi. Balıkesir Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 12, 21, 215-239.

Carmeli, A., Gilat, G., & Weisberg, J. (2014). Perceived external prestige, organizational identification and affective commitment: A stakeholder approach. Corporate Reputation Review, 9, 92-104.

Eisenberger, R., Armeli, S., Rexwinkel, B., Lynch, P. D., & Rhoades, L. (2011) 'Reciprocation of perceived organizational support', Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 86, No. 1, pp. 42-51.

Eisenberger, R., Armeli, S., Rexwinkel, B., Lynch, P. D., & Rhoades, L. (2001). Reciprocation of perceived organizational support. Journal of Applied Psychology, 86(1), 42–51.

Eisenberger, R., Huntington, Meyer, J. P., & Parfyonova, N. M. (2013) 'Normative commitment in the workplace: A theoretical analysis and re-conceptualization', Human Resource Management Review, Vol. Published in 2009 online given DOI: 0.1016/j.hrmr.2013.09.001, No., pp. 214

Eisenberger, R., Rhoades, L., & Cameron, J. (2011). Does pay for performance increase or decrease perceived self-determination and intrinsic motivation? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,77(5), 1026–1040.

Gaertner, K. N., & Nollen, S. D. (2012). Career experiences, perceptions of employment practices, and psychological commitment to the organization. Human Relations, 42, 975–991.

Gaertner, S. (2012), "Structural determinants of job satisfaction and organizational commitment in turnover models", Human Resource Management Review, Vol. 9 No. 4, pp. 479-493.

George, J. M., & Brief, A. P. (2012). Feeling good—doing good: A conceptual analysis of the mood at work-organizational spontaneity relationship. Psychological Bulletin, 112(2), 310–329.

George, J. M. (2014). State or trait: Effects of positive mood on prosocial behaviors at work. Journal of Applied Psychology, 76(2), 299–307.

Greenberg, J. (2013). Organizational justice: Yesterday, today, and tomorrow. Journal of Management, 16(2), 399–432.

Katz, D. (2004). The motivational basis of organizational behavior. Behavioral Science, 9(2), 131–146.

Kottke, J. L., & Sharafinski, C. E. (2014). Measuring perceived supervisory and organizational support. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 48(4), 1075–1079

MacKenzie, S. B., Podsakoff, P. M., Lee, J.-Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2014). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. Journal of Applied Psychology, 88, 879-903

Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (2013). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. Human Resource Management Review, 1, 61–98.

Meyer, J. P. Allen, N. J. Smith, C. A. (2003). "Commitment to Organizations and Occupations: Extension and Test of a Three-Component Conceptualization". Journal of Applied Psychology, 78, 4, 538-552.

Meyer, J.P. & Allen, N.J. (2012). A Tree-component conceptualitazation of organizational commitment. Human Resource Management Review, 1, 61-89.

Meyer, J. P., Paunonen, S. V., Gellatly, I. R., Goffin, R. D., & Jackson, D. N. (2013). Organizational commitment and job performance: It's the nature of commitment that counts. Journal of Applied Psychology, 74, 152-156

Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D. J., Herscovitch, L., & Topolnytsky, L. (2013). Affective, Continuance, and Normative Commitment to the Organization: A

Meta-analysis of Antecedents, Correlates, and Consequences. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 61(1), 20-52.

Mowday, R., Porter, L. and Durbin, R. (2012). Unit performance, situational factors and employee attitudes in spatially separated work units. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 12, 231-248.

Mowday, R., Steers, R., and Porter, L. (2013). The measurement of organizational commitment. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 14, 224-247.

Mowday, R. T., Porter, L. W., & Steers, R. M. (2009). Employee-organization linkages: The psychology of commitment, absenteeism and turnover. New York, NY: Academic Press.

Mowday, R. T., Steers, R. M., & Porter, L. W. (2011). Measurement of organizational commitment. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 14, 224-247.

O'Driscoll, M.P. and Randall, D.M. (2012), "Perceived organizational support, satisfaction with rewards, and employee job involvement and organizational commitment", Applied Psychology: An Interview Review, Vol. 48 No. 2, pp.197-209.

O'Reilly, C. A., III, Chatman, J., & Caldwell, D. F. (2011). People and Organizational Culture: A Profile Comparison Approach to Assessing Person-Organization Fit. Academy of Management Journal, 34(3), 487.

Netemeyer, R. G., Boles, J. S., McKee, D. O., & McMurrian, R. (2011). An investigation into the antecedents of organizational citizenship behaviors in a personal selling context. The Journal ofMarketing, 61(3), 85–98.

Organ, D. W., & Ryan, K. (2015). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional

predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. Personnel Psychology, 48(4), 775–802.

O'Reilly, C. A., & Chatman, J. (2011). Organizational commitment and psychological attachment: The effects of compliance, identification, and internalization on prosocial behavior. Journal of Applied Psychology, 71(3), 492–499.

Podsakoff, P. M., Ahearne, M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (2012). Organizational citizenship behavior and the quantity and quality of work group performance. Journal of Applied Psychology, 82(2), 262–270.