

Unveiling the Organizational Communication Climate and Organizational

Dr. Alan P. Taguiam

*<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6907-5479>
Cagayan State University, Piat Campus
alanptaguiam@gmail.com*

Abstract

Organizations that foster a supportive atmosphere encourage employee engagement, the free and open flow of information, and the settlement of conflicts in a constructive manner. The purpose of this study is to investigate the organizational communication climate and employee trust at Cagayan State University in the Philippines. The descriptive-correlational method is used in this investigation. According to the findings of the investigation, the information circulating within the university is consistent. People at the university are not deceived, confused, or mislead as a result of this level of uniformity. Unreliable information is also discouraged in the university because diverse stakeholders desire to perform at their highest levels when they obtain credible information from one another. It also implies that top management and employees are capable of taking responsibility for one another's well-being, and that trust is still alive and well across the university. It follows from this conclusion that senior management and employees consider the institution to be beneficial in both their personal and professional lives.

Keyword: Communication climate, organizational trust, employees, supportive environments, personal and professional life

Introduction

Employee organizational trust is inversely related to the presence of a pleasant organizational communication climate, as demonstrated in the research. Previous research has looked into the relationship between employee communication and trust, and it has come to the conclusion that trust can be built as a result of the communication skills exhibited by the employees of an organization (Jo & Shim, 2015; Ruppel & Harrington, 2010). This body of research demonstrates that open communication is related with trust, which is a fragile construct in and of itself (Conchie and Burns 2010). Conchie and Burns (2010) discovered that good news had just a small impact on employees' trust intentions, whereas bad news has a significant

impact on their trust intentions and bias. However, open communication can be a highly successful means of developing confidence within a company's workforce.

Increasing employee trust has been shown to be a result of effective communication that encourages participation and interaction (Ni, 2017; Reina & Reina, 2009; Sanchez, 2016). The findings of this study revealed that the greater the perception that an organization values employees' input in important decision-making, and the greater the perception of trust in the organization. Thus, the involvement construct was, on average, the weakest construct for employee communication practices in the sampled organizations analyzed in this research, as demonstrated by the results of this study. When it came to an open-ended question about

the impact of employee communication in affecting employees' perceptions of their organization, the results were in the exact other direction. A common complaint was that management has been unable to listen to employee feedback or include employees' opinions into decision-making processes, which was one of the most commonly heard. Responses included statements such as "I believe that if senior management is going to solicit our ideas and opinions, they should endeavor to put some of them into action as soon as they are received." Take into consideration your employees' thoughts, guarantee that they are satisfied, and treat them in the same manner that we would like to be treated ourselves." Statements such as "We need to do more to solicit feedback from our personnel" are also included. Organizational management appears to be failing horribly in its obligation to recognize and reward the contributions of its employees, despite the fact that employees are passionately demanding this of their employers. The fact that employees provided objective estimates of their participation may, as a result, explain a tiny fraction of the variance in the association between involvement and trust. In this study, respondents reported a somewhat positive trust in the organization ($M=5.12$), which could be explained by a neutral evaluation of the participation construct. However, a neutral evaluation of the participation construct may not be sufficient to explain respondents' somewhat positive trust ($M=5.12$). A larger sample size than that utilized in this study may potentially result in more conclusive findings on the relationship between participation and trust, which would be advantageous.

Employee Trust in the Workplace

Propounded by Shockley-Zalabak, Ellis, and Cesaria (2010) "trust between employees and management is the basis of any great workplace." When constructing a methodology for assessing organizational trust and its impact on organizational success came to the same conclusion. Organizational trust exists on several levels, including the individual, the group, and the institution (Shockley-Zalabak, et al., 2010). Trust is characterized by shared goals, norms, beliefs, and behaviors that are rooted in a

culture. Communication is the foundation of trust: both internal and external audiences form views and opinions about an organization based on the messages they receive about the organization. Sharing accomplishments and disappointments with employees before the media publishes them, as well as providing accurate information and timely feedback, are all examples of communication activities that establish trust (Shockley-Zalabak, et al., 2010; Smith & Mazin, 2014). Job satisfaction, productivity, and team building are all indicators of organizational trust, which may be measured against the bottom line of a company.

According to Baier (2014), trust has been ironically compared to both glue and lubricant. Trust serves as a glue that holds leaders and volunteers together, as well as organizational participants with one another. Trust is crucial for the maintenance of cohesive relationships and the development of efficient cooperation (Baier, 2014). Organizations require cohesive and cooperative connections in order to be effective and achieve common goals (Louis, Kruse, & Marks, 2016). Trust acts as a lubricant, lubricating the mechanics of an institution. Communication is made easier when there is trust. When people have faith in the words and actions of others, they are more productive (Arrow, 2014). When there is a lack of trust, tension and heat are developed, which causes the organization's work to sluggishly progress. Leaders require the trust of their followers in order to develop communication and facilitate effectiveness.

Another point of view is that trust within an organization is a conscious decision (Solomon & Flores, 2010). Trust, according to Solomon and Flores, is a subjective judgment based on evidence, but it always outweighs the evidence that would rationally support it. The trustor is motivated to take this risk out of concern for the connection. They also came to the conclusion that trust is a human virtue that can be developed through words, dialogue, commitments, and deeds. Trust is never something that comes naturally; rather, it is always the result of human effort. It may and frequently must be conscientiously cultivated rather than just assumed.

Comparing subordinates' faith in their immediate supervisors and subordinates' trust in management as antecedents to subordinate intentions and behaviors, subordinates' trust in their organizations has gotten significantly less attention. Individuals' positive expectations about the intentions and behaviors of multiple organizational members are defined as "positive expectations individuals have about the intent and behaviors of multiple organizational members based on organizational roles, relationships, experiences, and interdependencies" (Huff and Kelley, 2013). In a similar vein, Tan & Tan (2010) defined organizational trust as "the composite trust of the various constituent groups in the company."

Statement of the Problem

1. What is the employees' level of organizational trust as assessed by the designated officials, administrative staff and faculty members?

Research Methodology

Research Design

The researcher used the quantitative design in this study. Specifically, it utilized the descriptive-correlational method. The descriptive part of the study revolved around the determination of employees' level of organizational trust.

Research Instruments

This study adopted the organizational communication measures from Brad Rawlins (2009), who attempted to develop a reliable and valid measure of employee communication in understanding organizational transparency. The instrument has 32 items measuring five (5) dimensions namely; accountability (items 1-5); openness (items 6-11); participation (items 12-17); substantial information (items 18-25) and fairness (items 26-32). The response choices consisted of Likert scales ranging from 1= "Strongly disagree" to 5= "Strongly agree."

To measure organizational trust, the Organizational Trust Scale (OTS) was utilized. The OTS has been developed by Katie Delahaye Paine in 2006. The scale has six dimensions –

organizational integrity (items 1-4); organizational dependability (items 5-8); organizational control mutuality (items 9-12); organizational satisfaction (items 13-16); organizational commitment (items 17-20); and organizational communal relations (items 21-24). Like the first instrument, the response choices also consisted of Likert scales ranging from 1= "Strongly disagree" to 5= "Strongly agree."

Respondents and Sampling

The respondents of the study were the faculty members, administrative staff and officials of the university. Slovin's formula was utilized to compute for the total sample of faculty and administrative personnel. However, total enumeration was done for all the officials inasmuch as they are few. After computing for the sample size, stratified random sampling was used to determine the number of samples per campus for faculty and administrative personnel. Only the regular faculty members and administrative staff were considered in the study.

Data Gathering Procedure

After the dissertation proposal has been approved, the researcher sought permission from the University President to conduct the study. Then, the researcher asked permission from the Campus Executive Officers to administer the two standardized survey questionnaires, namely Organizational Communication Climate and the Organizational Trust Scale (OTS). When the approval has been obtained, the researcher personally conducted the administration of the two aforementioned questionnaires. It took the researcher about a three months to administer and retrieve fully the questionnaires.

Analysis of Data

To enable the researcher to tally, tabulate, compute, analyze and interpret the data gathered, the following statistical treatments were used:

Employees' organization trust

Arbitrary Scale	Numerical	Value
Descriptive Value		
Strongly Disagree	1.0 - 1.79	
Very Low Organizational Trust		

Disagree	1.8 - 2.59
Low Organizational Trust	
Neither Agree nor Disagree	2.6 - 3.39
Moderate Organizational Trust	
Agree	3.4 – 4.19
High Organizational Trust	
Strongly Agree	4.2 - 5.0
Very High Organizational Trust	

To determine the significant differences spelled out in the hypothesis, One-way ANOVA was used. However, Pearson Product Moment Correlation was utilized to determine the significant relationship between organizational communication climate and employee organizational trust.

Finally, the hypotheses in the study wasted at 0.05 level of significance.

Research Findings and Discussions

Level of organizational communication climate in the university along participation dimension

Table 1 depicts the level of organizational communication climate in the university in terms of the participation component, as measured by participation rates. With a descriptive value of "very good," the overall weighted mean of this dimension is 3.94, indicating that the communication atmosphere is "excellent." The presence of a "very good" organizational climate in this dimension indicates that the university places a high priority on respect and employee trust in the organization in an equal measure. This concept of participation also involves feedback, because employees' perceptions of communication effectiveness, employee voice, and satisfaction are all influenced by their participation in providing feedback about the communication system. Significantly, there are several ways in which the university administration encourages engagement in order to promote the climate of communication inside the institution. This involves the conduct of period meetings, meetings of the academic and administrative councils, as well as the implementation of other forms of feedback. Having sectoral

representatives on the CSU Board of Regents and having various Campus Faculty and Administrative Personnel Presidents participate in committees organized by the administration are both mechanisms for ensuring that the voices of each sector are heard and considered in the formulation, implementation, and evaluation of policy.

Among the indicators of participation, the statement *My university involves people like me to help identify the information I need* obtained the highest mean of 4.14 (Very good). This finding implies that CSU management engages all the employees or their representatives in providing relevant information pertaining their welfare and interests. It is in this process that they are able to elicit valuable information which become inputs for effective and meaningful decision making. In CSU, feedback mechanisms are obtained from each unit through the Anti-Red Tape Act which is a requirement for the PPB under the good governance condition. This feedback mechanism augmented by the evaluation process conducted by the management regarding the performance of the Campus Executive Officers, Deans and Directors.

The second highest mean was obtained by the statement *My university asks for feedback from people like me about the quality of its information* (4.02 – very good). This finding implies that the CSU management and its employees value and appreciate feedback as a significant part of its existence. Through this mechanism, the different managers and employees of the university build and maintain communication with one another. They all perceive effective feedback, both positive and negative, as a very helpful way to derive valuable information for decisions making. Moreover, by asking for feedback, it can actually motivate employees to perform better. The finding may also imply that employees like to feel valued and appreciate being asked to provide feedback that can help formulate organizational decisions. And feedback from subordinates, students, alumni, and stakeholders can be used to motivate to build better working relations in the university.

Finally, the third highest mean was obtained by the statement, *My university*

provides detailed information to people like me (4.00 – very good). This finding implies that CSU management gives detailed information to all its stakeholders. They do not keep information that may deceive their subordinates or keep them unaware about significant matters or events in the university. Also, they provide detailed information pertaining to the university's performance, challenges, issues and problems. They also provide detailed information regarding the financial status,

undertakings and the profitability of its income generating projects. This can be readily seen in the financial report submitted to COA as well as report of accomplishments submitted to the Board of Regents as well as other regulatory bodies such as Department of Budget and Management (DBM), Commission on Higher Education (CHED), Commission on Audit (COA) and National Economic and Development Authority (NEDA)

Indicators	Designated Officials		Administrative Staff		Faculty		Overall Category Mean	
	Wtd. Mean	D.V.	Wtd. Mean	D.V.	Wtd. Mean	D.V.	Wtd. Mean	D.V.
My university asks for feedback from people like me about the quality of its information.	4.02	VG	4.05	VG	4.00	VG	4.02	VG
My university involves people like me to help identify the information I need.	4.15	VG	4.10	VG	4.16	VG	4.14	VG
My university provides detailed information to people like me.	4.07	VG	3.92	VG	4.02	VG	4.00	VG
My university makes it easy to find the information people like me need.	4.02	VG	3.80	VG	3.78	VG	3.87	VG
My university asks the opinions of people like me before making decisions.	4.13	VG	3.61	VG	3.51	VG	3.75	VG
My university takes the time with people like me to understand who we are and what we need	4.18	VG	3.74	VG	3.57	VG	3.83	VG
Category Mean	4.10	VG	3.87	VG	3.84	VG	3.94	VG

Legend:

1.00 – 1.79	Poor
1.80 – 2.59	Fair
2.60 – 3.39	Good
3.40 – 4.19	Very Good
4.20 – 5.00	Excellent

Level of organizational communication climate in the university along substantial information dimension

The level of organizational communication climate in the university along substantial information dimension is illustrated in Table 2. The overall weighted mean of this dimension is 4.06 with a descriptive value of “very good” communication climate. The “very good” organizational climate along this dimension connotes that information circulating in the university are adequate. It also means that there is no discrepancy between the information the employees wished to receive and the information that they actually received.

The indicators of substantial information reveals that the statement *My university presents information to people like me in language that is clear* obtained the highest mean of 4.30 (Very good). Because of this discovery, the terms used in all of the information provided to the many stakeholders within the institution are clear, simple to comprehend and understandable by the intended audience or readership of the content. It could also indicate that the CSU administration is an excellent communicator because they believe that having well-organized thoughts

conveyed in comprehensive and cohesive words and paragraphs is not enough. The writer must also consider his or her writing's overall style, tone, and clarity, and tailor these characteristics to the intended audience. Such an understanding leads to greater cooperation and, as a result, more effective action in all aspects of the university's operations.

The statement which registered the second highest mean is *My university provides information that is easy for people like me to understand* (4.18 – very good). This finding indicates that the reports, memoranda, special orders issued by the management are worded in a language that is direct, common or plain. In this way, information is presented in a way that helps the stakeholders of the university understand it the first time.

The last statement which obtained the highest mean is *My university provides information that is reliable* (4.15 – very good). Such finding signifies that the information circulating in the university is consistent. With such consistency, people in the university are not misinformed, confused or misled. It also connotes that unreliable information is unwanted in the university because different stakeholders want to work at their best when they receive credible information from each other.

Table 8. Level of organizational communication climate in the university along

substantial information dimension as assessed by the officials, administrative staff and faculty members

Indicators	Designated Officials		Administrative Staff		Faculty		Overall Category Mean	
	Wtd. Mean	D.V.	Wtd. Mean	D.V.	Wtd. Mean	D.V.	Wtd. Mean	D.V.
My university provides information that is relevant to people like me.	4.13	VG	3.98	VG	3.86	VG	3.99	VG
My university provides information	3.98	VG	3.91	VG	4.00	VG		VG

that could be verified by an outside source, such as an auditor.							3.96	
My university provides information that can be compared to previous university's performance.	4.18	VG	3.69	VG	3.66	VG	3.84	VG
My university provides information that is complete.	4.13	VG	3.88	VG	3.85	VG	3.95	VG
My university provides information that is easy for people like me to understand.	4.24	E	4.09	VG	4.21	E	4.18	VG
My university provides accurate information to people like me.	4.16	VG	4.10	VG	4.13	VG	4.13	VG
My university provides information that is reliable.	4.09	VG	4.03	VG	4.33	E	4.15	VG
My university presents information to people like me in language that is clear.	4.22	E	4.33	E	4.35	E	4.30	E
	4.14	VG	4.00	VG	4.05	VG	4.06	VG

Legend:

1.00 – 1.79 Poor

1.80 – 2.59	Fair
2.60 – 3.39	Good
3.40 – 4.19	Very Good
4.20 – 5.00	Excellent

Level of organizational communication climate in the university along fairness dimension

Table 3 depicts the level of organizational communication climate in the institution in terms of the fairness dimension, as measured by the fairness scale. A descriptive value of "very good" communication climate is obtained from the overall weighted mean of this dimension, which is 4.15. The presence of a "very good" organizational climate in this area indicates that the institution values impartial and just treatment or behavior that is free of prejudice or discrimination. In addition, it suggests that the university adheres to the principle of equality in delivering knowledge to all students, as this is the lifeblood of effective teamwork and increased production. Workers who believe they are being treated fairly, according to Organ (2008), will be more likely to have good attitudes toward their work, outcomes, and supervisors than those who do not believe they are being handled fairly.

Among the indicators of fairness, the statement *My university can be relied on to keep its promises to employees* obtained the highest mean of 4.21 (excellent). The excellent mean obtained by this statement reveals that the faculty and administrative personnel put full

trust and confidence in the management as to the promises they provide. They keep their commitments and they deliver them at the right time. For example, employees are being thankful to the management for the incentives they provide them such as bonuses from Collective Negotiations Agreement, Sports allowance and other regular bonuses provided by the government.

The next highest mean was obtained by the statement *Whenever my university makes an important decision, I know it will consider the decision's impact on employees* (4.19 –very good). This finding implies that the management decides not always at their interests and agenda but also for the general welfare of the employees. The interests of the employees are given primordial consideration whenever the management makes decisions. In addition, management also understands that employees will be in a position to make decisions when they are supported in realizing their individual goals.

The third highest mean was obtained by the statement *My university treats employees fairly and justly* with a mean of 4.16 (very good). This finding signifies that the employees feel that there is equality and objective treatment provided by the management. It may also imply that the organizational policies and procedures of the university conform with employment laws provided by Civil Service Commission and the Department of Labor and Employment.

Table 3. Level of organizational communication climate in the university along fairness dimension as assessed by the officials, administrative staff and faculty members

Indicators	Designated Officials		Administrative Staff		Faculty		Overall Category Mean	
	Wtd. Mean	D.V.	Wtd. Mean	D.V.	Wtd. Mean	D.V.	Wtd. Mean	D.V.
My university treats employees fairly and justly.	4.18	VG	4.13	VG	4.16	VG	4.16	VG
Whenever my university makes an important decision, I	4.27	E	4.20	E	4.10	VG		VG

know it will consider the decision's impact on employees.							4.19	
My university can be relied on to keep its promises to employees.	4.22	E	4.15	VG	4.27	E	4.21	E
My university takes the opinions of employees into account when making decisions.	4.29	E	4.06	VG	4.04	VG	4.13	VG
I feel very confident about my university's abilities to accomplish what it says it will do.	4.22	E	4.03	VG	4.00	VG	4.08	VG
Sound principles guide my university's behavior.	4.13	VG	4.19	VG	4.12	VG	4.15	VG
My university does not mislead its employees.	4.18	VG	4.00	VG	4.16	VG	4.11	VG
Overall Weighted Mean	4.21	E	4.11	VG	4.12	VG	4.15	VG

Legend:

1.00 – 1.79	Poor
1.80 – 2.59	Fair
2.60 – 3.39	Good
3.40 – 4.19	Very Good
4.20 – 5.00	Excellent

Level of organizational trust in the university along satisfaction dimension

Table 4 shows the level of organizational trust in the university, as measured by the officials, administrative staff, and faculty members, as well as the satisfaction with the university's services. Data show that the total weighted mean of this dimension is 4.33, with a descriptive value of "very high" organizational trust as the result of the analysis. According to this result, CSU employees and leaders have a positive attitude toward one

another since positive assumptions about the relationship are reinforced. Both enjoy pleasure or a pleasant emotional state toward one another as a result of being satisfied and pleased with one's employment or job experiences. That they are satisfied with their positions in terms of communication, fringe benefits and working conditions as well as the nature of the work is another requirement. Also revealed are their personal progress, policies and procedures, advancement chances, recognition, security, and supervision, as well as their overall satisfaction. Trombetta and Rogers (2012) came to the conclusion that superiors' and subordinates' willingness to communicate openly has a favorable impact on employees' job satisfaction while having a negative impact on employees' level of commitment.

The statement which registers the highest mean is *Most people like me are happy in their interactions with this university* (4.39 – Very high). This finding connotes that superiors and subordinates relate between and among each other in a healthy and effective way. They show emotional attachment with each other and they create, manage and attend activities and events cooperatively. Leaders and subordinates promote effective communication strategies to help each other resolve disputes quickly. They interact productively, work together to analyze the root causes of problems, identify the nature of the issues and propose possible solutions.

The next statement which obtained the highest mean is *I am happy with this university* (4.34 – Very high). Such finding implies that leaders and subordinates enjoy their life in the university as a whole. They enjoy each other's company and each one contributes to greater happiness for a greater number of people. According to Fisher (2003) performance and happiness go hand in hand in making an

organization successful. With both an appropriate performance management system and a positive approach to influencing people that increases happiness, an organization's key results can more likely be achieved and sustained.

The statement registering the third highest mean is *Both the university and people like me benefit from the relationship* (4.31 – very high). This finding connotes that everyone is benefiting from the effective and healthy relationship in the university. Everyone is concerned about improvements in human and environmental well-being rather than personal interest and hidden agenda. They all share information and work together to ensure that organizational goals and needs are addressed with minimum effort.

Table 4. Level of organizational trust in the university along satisfaction dimension as assessed by the officials, administrative staff and faculty members

Indicators	Designated Officials		Administrative Staff		Faculty		Overall Category Mean	
	Wtd. Mean	D.V.	Wtd. Mean	D.V.	Wtd. Mean	D.V.	Wtd. Mean	D.V.
I am happy with this university.	4.33	VH	4.44	VH	4.26	VH	4.34	VH
Both the university and people like me benefit from the relationship.	4.44	VH	4.33	VH	4.15	H	4.31	VH
Most people like me are happy in their interactions with this university.	4.51	VH	4.42	VH	4.24	VH	4.39	VH
Generally speaking, I am pleased with the relationship this university has established with people like me.	4.49	VH	4.12	H	4.17	H	4.26	VH
Category Mean	4.44	VH	4.33	VH	4.21	VH	4.33	VH

Legend:

1.00 – 1.79	Very low
1.80 – 2.59	Low
2.60 – 3.39	Moderate
3.40 – 4.19	High
4.20 – 5.00	Very High

Level of organizational trust in the university along commitment dimension

The level of organizational trust in the university along commitment dimension as assessed by the officials, administrative staff and faculty members is presented in Table 5. The data show that the overall weighted mean of this dimension is 4.26 with a descriptive value of “very high” organizational trust. This finding conveys that the different stakeholders in the university believe that the relationship they have in the university is worth spending energy to maintain and promote. They have psychological attachment to the university and feel that they fit in and, feel they understand the goals of the organization. They want to stay in the university and feel that leaving the university would have disastrous consequences, and feel a sense of guilt about the possibility of leaving.

The statement which registers the highest mean is *Compared to other universities, I value my relationship with this university more* (4.30 – Very High). This finding implies that top management and employees treasure their company and that they collaborate at the highest levels, build relationships based on respect and understanding, and work with our partners to

deliver success time after time. They treat each other as equals as they strive to build strong and long-lasting relationships with everyone they work with. It may also mean that every candidate and employer feels respected and valued, and that their commitment to partnering with one is not to the detriment of another.

The next statement which obtained the highest mean is *I feel that this university is trying to maintain a long-term commitment to people like me* (4.29 – Very high). This finding connotes that top management and employees keep institutional memory within the university. They infuse each other with high morale making them to be loyal and remain in the university for longer time. They foster camaraderie, trust, and caring -- the stuff they need to keep them going and sustained for the long run.

The statement registering the third highest mean is *There is a long-lasting bond between this university and people like me* (4.23 – Very high). This finding implies that the university go above and beyond expectations to ensure the highest level of employee satisfaction. They are able to combine top quality service and organizational interest. This harmonization of employee and organizational interests build a rapport with top management and employees, which in turn creates employee loyalty and long-lasting relationships with the university.

Table 5. Level of organizational trust in the university along commitment dimension as assessed by the officials, administrative staff and faculty members

Indicators	Designated Officials		Administrative Staff		Faculty		Overall Category Mean	
	Wtd. Mean	D.V.	Wtd. Mean	D.V.	Wtd. Mean	D.V.	Wtd. Mean	D.V.
I feel that this university is trying to maintain a long-term commitment to people like me.	4.42	VH	4.20	VH	4.25	VH	4.29	VH
There is a long-lasting bond between this	4.31	VH	4.20	VH	4.18	H	4.23	VH

university and people like me.								
Compared to other universities, I value my relationship with this university more.	4.31	VH	4.35	VH	4.25	VH	4.30	VH
I feel a sense of loyalty to this university.	4.38	VH	4.10	H	4.18	H	4.22	VH
Category Mean	4.36	VH	4.21	VH	4.22	VH	4.26	VH

Legend:

1.00 – 1.79	Very low
1.80 – 2.59	Low
2.60 – 3.39	Moderate
3.40 – 4.19	High
4.20 – 5.00	Very High

Level of organizational trust in the university along communal relations dimension

On the basis of evaluations by university authorities, administrative staff and faculty members, Table 6 shows how much organizational trust exists at the institution on the dimension of communal relations. Data show that the total weighted mean of this dimension is 4.29, with a descriptive value of "extremely high" organizational trust as the result of the analysis. Management and subordinates provide benefits to one another because they are concerned about the welfare of the other – even if they receive nothing in exchange for their efforts. It also implies that senior management and staff are capable of taking personal responsibility for one another's well-being. Most significantly, parties do so with no conditions attached. The authors of Hon and Grunig (2009) argue that communal interactions with family, friends, and acquaintances help people attain their broader goals more effectively. Additionally, organizations profit from developing a reputation for being concerned about communal ties, as they experience less opposition and more support from their constituents over the long term.

The statement which registers the highest mean is *I consider this university to be*

very helpful to my growth (4.47 – Very high). This finding implies that top management and employees find the university to be useful in their personal and professional life. They see themselves growing in these aspects which yields to satisfaction and commitment in their organization. A good example of growth in the university is the faculty and staff development offered to all its employees. Trainings, seminars and conferences are also provided which update the competencies of the employees to improve their work in the university.

The next statement which obtained the highest mean is *This university helps people like me without expecting anything in return* (4.27 – Very high). This finding signifies that there is unconditional relationship between management and employees in the university. Help, benefits and cooperation are given on the basis of genuine concern for the welfare of their colleagues.

The statement registering the third highest mean is *I feel that this university does not take advantage of people who are vulnerable* (4.26 – Very high). This finding implies that management and subordinates do not use the weakness or unfavorable circumstance of each other to do things that are favorable to them. They always consider the favorable interest of each other by balancing their decisions and actions in favor of each other. They consider a win-win situation in all things that they do so that everyone will be happy and fulfilled in the organization.

Table 6. Level of organizational trust in the university along communal relations

dimension as assessed by the officials, administrative staff and faculty members

Indicators	Designated Officials		Administrative Staff		Faculty		Overall Category Mean	
	Wtd. Mean	D.V.	Wtd. Mean	D.V.	Wtd. Mean	D.V.	Wtd. Mean	D.V.
This university is very concerned about the welfare of people like me.	4.31	VH	3.98	H	4.18	H	4.16	H
I feel that this university does not take advantage of people who are vulnerable.	4.47	VH	4.09	H	4.21	VH	4.26	VH
This university helps people like me without expecting anything in return.	4.45	VH	4.22	VH	4.15	H	4.27	VH
I consider this university to be very helpful to my growth	4.53	VH	4.43	VH	4.44	VH	4.47	VH
Category Mean	4.44	VH	4.18	H	4.25	VH	4.29	VH

Legend:

1.00 – 1.79 Very low
 1.80 – 2.59 Low
 2.60 – 3.39 Moderate
 3.40 – 4.19 High
 4.20 – 5.00 Very High

Conclusions

Because of this alignment of employee and organizational objectives, senior management and employees have a strong working connection, which in turn fosters employee loyalty and long-term partnerships with the university. It also implies that senior management and staff are capable of taking personal responsibility for one another's well-being. Furthermore, university administrators do not retain material that could be used to deceive their subordinates or keep them unaware of key

topics or events occurring at the university in which they serve.

Recommendations

1. University may give incentives to their employees that would boost their morale through monetary recognitions, certificates and plaques.
2. University may conduct seminars and workshops for their employees that would fit their specialization.

Literature Cited

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 of Marketing*, 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.
- Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (2012). Organizational citizenship behaviors and sales unit effectiveness. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 31(3), 351-363.
- Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (1995). An examination of substitutes for leadership within a levels-of-analysis framework. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 6(3), 289-328.
- Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (1997). Impact of organizational citizenship behavior on organizational performance: A review and suggestion for future research. *Human Performance*, 10(2), 133-151.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., & Bommer, W. H. (2013). Meta-analysis of the relationships between Kerr and Jermier's substitutes for leadership and employee job attitudes, role perceptions, and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81(4), 380-399.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., & Bommer, W. H. (2014). Transformational leader behaviors and substitutes for leadership as determinants of employee satisfaction, commitment, trust, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 22(2), 259.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., & Hui, C. (2013). Organizational citizenship behaviors and managerial evaluations of employee performance: A review and suggestions for future research. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, 11(1), 1-40.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Moorman, R. H., & Fetter, R. (2010). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 1(2), 107-142.

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B., & Bachrach, D. G. (2011).

Organizational citizenship behaviors: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for future research. *Journal of Management*, 26(3), 513–563.

Porter, L.W.; Steers, R.M.; Mowday, R.T.; & Boulian, P.V. (2014) Organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover among psychiatric technicians. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1974, 59, 603-609.

Randall, M. L., Cropanzano, R., Bormann, C. A., & Birjulin, A. (2013). Organizational politics and organizational support as predictors of work attitudes, job performance, and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 20(2), 159–174.

Randal, A. E. & Jaussi, K. S. (2011). Functional background identity, diversity, and individual performance in cross-functional teams. *Academy of Management Journal*, 46, 763-774.

Rhoades, L., Eisenberger, R. and Armeli, S. (2011), “Affective commitment to the organization: The contribution of perceived organizational support”, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 86 No. 5, pp. 825-836.

Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2012). Perceived organizational support: A review of the literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 698–714.