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**Abstract:** Considerable researches have been done on organizational trust and commitment, only a few of them were carried by educational organizations and it is specially untapped by researchers in primary schools. This research aimed to support the proposed link between teacher’s organizational trust and commitment in primary schools as educational organizations. This study employed survey design based upon the research question. The study was carried out among 513 teachers in Golestan Province, Iran. Pearson’s correlation statistical method indicated a statistically significant and positive-high magnitude relationship between teacher’s organizational trust and organizational commitment. Moreover, statistical results indicated a positive moderate-high relationship between components of the teacher’s organizational trust and commitment. Consequently, Development of the teacher’s commitment is deeply depending on fostering the teacher’s organizational trust. Therefore, school principals should be focused on enhancement of the teacher's trust whereby they can develop the organizational commitment qualities.
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**1. Introduction**

In today’s context organizations have to be more organic, flexible, and adaptive because they need dynamic and committed work force to lead the organizations towards the expected direction. Organizational commitment is one of the widely researched areas among researchers, psychologists and human resources management practitioners (Warsi, 2009). Organizational commitment in the fields of organizational behavior and organizational psychology is, in a general sense, the employee's psychological attachment to the organization. It is employees’ attitude towards their organizations. Organizational commitment has got considerable attention in the theory and research in the last two decades because of its attempt to understand the intensity and stability of employee dedication to work organizations (Eisenberger, 1990) and linkage with desirable organizational productivity and performance.

There are different classifications about organizational commitment (Katz and Kahn, 1977; Mowday, 1982; Wiener, 1982; O’Reilly and Chatman, 1986; Allen and Myer, 1990, Yilmaz, 2008). The mostly used one among these classifications belongs to Meyer and Allen (1991) as new and multi-dimensional approach. Meyer and Allen's three-component theory of commitment are including; affective, continuance and normative commitment.

According to Meyer (2002) organizational commitment is “the force that binds an individual to a course of action of relevance to one or more targets”. Generally, higher or lower levels of commitment have been shown to be a major driver of employees staying with or leaving an organization (Shaw, 1992). Employees with sense of organizational commitment are less likely to engage in withdrawal behavior and more willing to accept change (Lverson and Buttigeig, 1998). In addition, employees are motivated and dedicated towards meeting and achieving organizational goals (Pfeffer, 1998).

According to Yilmaz (2008) there is a significant relationship between organizational commitment and organizational trust. Trusting in an organization increases the commitment (Yilmaz, 2008). Trust is essential element in constrictive human relationships (Puusa, 2006) and effective relations (Clarke, 2000) and also it is one of the most important themes in human relations and human behaviors (Yilmaz, 2008). Trust has been described as the “social glue” that can hold different kind of organizational structure together (Atkinson & Butcher, 2003) and it is important in organizational life as well as the human relations (Yilmaz, 2008). There are a wide variety of trust definitions, none of which are universally accepted (Bigley & Pearce, 1998). Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (1999)’s multidimensional approach to trust is adopted. Because, it is one of the most frequently used definitions of organizational trust and it captures the key elements of the constructs that are included in the instrument that will be used to measure trust in schools (Laka-Mathebula, 2004). In this study, we are concerned with trust of teachers as expressed towards their school in three levels as follow; trust the supervisor, trust in co-workers, and trust in the organization. Employees must build trust with both other employees and the leaders they serve for the organization to be successful (Taylor- Dunlop & Lester, 2000).

In organizations where trust is dominant, one can see open and participating atmosphere, responsible employees, productivity and organizational commitment, compromise culture, team work, high job satisfaction and participation in decisions (Buykdere and Solmus, 2006; Yilmaz, 2008). In organizations with lack of trust, employees accuse each other for any mistake, develop defense mechanisms, avoid taking responsibility, feel suspicious and jealous, make gossips, try to stay away from work and disaffirm organizational goals. In addition, there comes out decease in organizational commitment, professional satisfaction, and performance to unhappy employees and unhappy organization atmosphere (Yilmaz, 2008). Moreover, Complaints become a reason for punishments and discharge. As a result, employees feel themselves stuck in their work (Buyukdere and Solmus, 2006; Asunakutlu, 2007, Yilmaz, 2008).

Hence, the study of employee’s trust and commitment should be important to educational institutions receiving large amounts of public funds and playing an important role in the development of the skills and knowledge of employees of the future and the community as a whole. In reviewing the literature, there is little agreement as to why it is difficult to develop and sustain trust and commitment in organizational environments and what factors may positively contribute.

When teachers feel like they are helping students be successful, then they are more committed to teaching (Ross & Gray, 2006). High organizational commitment can result from a teacher who feels like they belong to the organization and have a strong connection or bond to co-workers and leaders (Martin & Epitropaki, 2001). Strong organizational commitment will cause the school culture to be strengthened and enhance the overall school atmosphere (Solvason, 2005).

Yilmaz (2008) has been studied to define the relationship between the organizational trust and organizational commitment of primary school teachers. According to the results got from this research, as long as the positive view of primary school teachers on organizational trust and its sub-dimensions increase, it becomes an increase also in organizational commitment levels. Consequently, Pearson’s correlation analysis indicated that there was medium-level, positive and significant relationship between organizational trust and its sub-dimensions and organizational commitment and its sub-dimensions.

Nyhan (2000) explored the possibility of a trust-based organizational model for public sector organizations by addressing trust outcomes as well as trust antecedents using structural equation modeling. Nyhan found that participation, feedback, and empowerment significantly predicted interpersonal trust, and interpersonal trust significantly predicted productivity and organizational commitment. According to Nyhan, these findings support prior research that trust between managers and non-managers can result in increased productivity and organizational commitment.

Cubukcu & Tarakcioglu (2010) have shown that while the factors of organizational trust have positively directed correlation with affective and normative commitment, it has emerged that it a lover level correlation with continuance commitment.

**2. Methodology**

This study employed survey design in form of co-relational cross-sectional research. The survey method has been chosen because it is regarded as the most appropriate research design to measure the perception of the respondents. Moreover, according to Gall, Borg, &Gall (2006), it was a correlation study designed to analyze the relationship between variables. The present study was carried out at the primary schools of Golestan province - Iran. The target population of this study was school teachers (male, female) on 2010-2011 school calendar. The schools were selected by simple random sampling. The necessary Cochran (1977)’s samples were computed (n= 332 teachers), but for increasing confidence level of sampling about 600 teachers considered as real sample size. Based on real sample size and proportional fraction of teachers of the cities within area study, teacher’s sample sizes of the cities were computed. The quantitative data for the study was gathered utilizing; 1) the teacher’s organizational behavior to assess the organizational trust (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 1998, Ferres, 2002, Organizational Trust Inventory) that is thought to be central to the interpersonal relationships that are characteristic of organizations, and 2) the teacher's psychological attachment to the organization as the organizational commitment (Meyer and Allen, 1991). Pearson’s correlation statistical method (n=513 respondents) was applied for determination of the strength and direction (nature) of the relationship between independent variables toward dependent variables. The Correlation coefficient only aids in determining the strength and direction (positive or negative) of the relationships; no indication is reflected on the significance of the relationship. Hence, t-test statistical method was used to analysis of interval-ratio data on differences between groups of subjects.

**3. Results**

Two characteristics of the teachers including organizational trust and organizational commitment were analyzed, descriptively. Table 1 contains descriptive data for the total and three subscales of the teacher’s organizational trust. A ranking with trust in co-workers (M=3.44, SD=1.6), trust in supervisor (M=3.25, SD=1.2) and trust in organization (M=3.18, SD=1.11) is showed in the table 1.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics for Organizational Trust Scales

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Trust scales | Mean | SD | Kurtosis | Skewness |
| Trust in co-workers | 3.44 | 1.60 | -.26 | 1.04 |
| Trust in supervisor | 3.25 | 1.20 | -.33 | .77 |
| Trust in organization | 3.18 | 1.11 | -.35 | .69 |
| Total Trust | 3.28 | 1.14 | -.84 | .76 |

In describing the application of their Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) scales, Meyer & Allen (1997) do not provide guidance about expected, desired, average, or ideal means for affective, continuance, and normative commitment. Instead, Meyer & Allen (1997) and other researchers (Dunham, Grube, & Castaneda, 1994; Hackett, Bycio, & Hausdorf, 1994; Whitener & Walz, 1993; Lee, 1992; Vardi, Wiener, & Popper, 1989; Allen & Meyer, 1997) examined whether there was a positive or negative relationship between the different types of organizational commitment and the outcomes that are being measured, as well as the pattern for those findings. The desired pattern is highest scores for affective commitment, followed by normative commitment, then continuance commitment. It is supported by findings of this research. The mean scores for current study’s data reflect that affective commitment score (M=3.18, SD=1.28) were higher than normative commitment (M=3.04, SD=1.09) and continuance commitment (M=2.95, SD=.94). Table 2 contains information for the three organizational commitment scales.

Table 2: Descriptive statistics for organizational commitment scales

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Commitment scales | Mean | SD | Kurtosis | Skewness |
| Affective commitment | 3.18 | 1.28 | -.36 | .89 |
| Continuance commitment | 2.95 | .94 | -.06 | .76 |
| Normative commitment | 3.04 | 1.09 | -.24 | .87 |
| Total Organizational Commitment | 3.06 | .96 | -.31 | .90 |

In this section, Pearson Product – Moment Correlation statistical methods were used for testing the research hypotheses and investigating the associated relationship between in-depended (trust) and depended (commitment) variables.

The result (Table 3) indicated a statistically significant relationship between components of the teacher’s organizational trust and organizational commitment at 99% of the confidence level. The statistical significant relationship is positive -high magnitude between teacher’s organizational trust, teacher’s organizational commitment (r= .753\*\*, p<.01), and teacher’s affective commitment (r= .717\*\*, p<.01), respectively. In addition, result indicated a positive- moderate magnitude relationship between teacher’s organizational trust and teacher’s continuance commitment (r= .634\*\*, p<.01), and normative commitment (r= .603\*\*, p<.01). In other word, it can be said that 56.7%, 51.4%, 40.1%, and 36.3% of total variance of organizational commitment, affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment arise from organizational trust, respectively. Moreover, results indicated a positive with moderate relationship between teacher’s organizational commitment and teacher’s trust in co-worker (r= .694\*\*, p<.01), teacher’s trust in organization (r= .657\*\*, p<.01), and teacher’s trust in supervisor (r= .599\*\*, p<.000), respectively. In other word, it can be said that 48.1%, 43.1%, and 35.8% of total variance of organizational commitment arise from trust in co-worker, trust in organization, and trust in supervisor, respectively. Consequently, findings of this research are supported by Yilmaz (2008) and Cubukcu & Tarakcioglu (2010), high level of teacher’s trust (in co-worker, organization, and supervisor) is positively affecting their organizational commitment.

Table 3: Pearson's correlation coefficient between teacher’s organizational trust and organizational commitment

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Commitment | TC TS TO TT | | | |
| Affective commitment | .655\*\* | .581\*\* | .624\*\* | .717\*\* |
| Continuance Commitment | .578\*\* | .495\*\* | .569\*\* | .634\*\* |
| Normative commitment | .570\*\* | .475\*\* | .513\*\* | .603\*\* |
| Total organization commitment | .694\*\* | .599\*\* | .657\*\* | .753\*\* |

TC=trust in co-worker, TS=trust in supervisor, TO=trust in organization, TT=total trust, \*\*=correlation is significant at .01 level

**4. Conclusions**

One of the important subjects affected by organizational trust is organizational commitment (Yilmaz, 2008). Literatures show that the relationship between organizational trust and commitment is untapped by researchers in primary schools.This research aimed to determine the relationship between the primary school teachers' organizational trust and commitment. Employees having high organizational commitment show much more effort in realizing their duties and organizational aims (Yilmaz, 2008). Results indicated that 48.1%, 43.1%, and 35.8% of total variance of organizational commitment arise from trust in co-worker, trust in organization, and trust in supervisor, respectively. Research finding is supported by Yilmaz (2008) and Cubukcu & Tarakcioglu (2010); teacher’s trust is positively affecting their organizational commitment. Consequently, human resources managers should remain focused on increasing teachers' organizational trust and commitment for teachers' efficiency and school greater outputs. While a great deal of research has occurred in the area of commitment over the past decade, the new research only suggests that there is a lot more to be done and many very promising avenues to pursue. We hope that our results and comments in this paper can be a catalyst for some of this research.
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