Measured Difference of Organizational Trust among Community College Employees

Blair Rhodes Ellis*

Organizational trust of employees requires a multidimensional tool to align with a multidimensional construct. The short version of the Organizational Trust Inventory (OTI), a two part and twelve question quantitative survey was distributed to employees at a multi-campus and regional community college. Descriptive characteristics of the employees such as rank, gender, campus affiliation, race, age, and tenure were used to determine whether there was a difference in organizational trust based on those characteristics. The data collected was analysed by using one-way ANOVA. The findings of the study concluded that among the characteristics reviewed, campus affiliation and rank had a significant impact on perceived organizational trust by employees.

JEL Codes: Management, Organizational Behaviour, Leadership, Managing People and Organization

1. Introduction

Trust depends on relationships (Ivancevich, Konopaske, and Matteson 2014). Within organizations the presence of relationships between employees and the organization, can also describe the presence of trust within the organization, specifically among the employee and supervisor relationship (Bromiley and Cummings 1995). Measuring trust requires the examination of relationships, and the examination of individual perspectives. Relationships and perspectives were explored in this study of community college employees (Crites, Frabrigar, and Petty 1994). Descriptive characteristics about the college employees such as rank, gender, campus affiliation, race, age, and tenure were utilized to determine whether characteristics impacted the difference on organizational trust. Additionally, this study examines the difference of employee characteristics as it relates to organizational trust in two ways – the first, between the relationships of employee and supervisor, and the second, identifying the employee perspective of the organization (Cummings and Bromiley 1996).

The data collected in this research study will answer the following research question:

1. Is organizational trust linked to employee descriptive characteristics identified as rank, gender, campus location, age and tenure?

The importance of these research findings articulates the concept of organizational trust within the industry of higher education. The instrument utilized, the Organizational Trust Inventory (OTI) has been validated in various industries,

---

*Doctoral Student of Organizational Leadership, Regent University, Virginia, United States of America, Email: blaiel1@mail.regent.edu

however, minimal information was found pertaining to the industry of higher education, and organizational trust. Utilizing community college employees as the sample population also adds a different perspective to organizational trust literature due to little research conducted on this population. The sample population was composed of a diverse grouping of individuals, which adds to the validity of the instrument, and the concept of organizational trust. The structure of the research study categorized the community college employees byrank, gender, campus affiliation, race, age, and tenure. These descriptive characteristics explored, reveal how the cognitive and affective domains encompass the psychosocial attributes of organizational trust.

This paper is organized into sections. The first section is the Introduction and explains the purpose of the study. The second section, the Literature Review, discusses the research previously conducted on the research topic, and identifies the research questions that will be addressed. The third section describes the research methods used within the study, identifies the hypotheses, and addresses the research instrumentation. The results are discussed in the fourth section, as well as how the data was analyzed. The conclusion follows the methods section and summarizes the research and discusses implications for the research conducted. Lastly the study is concluded with the section outlining the future research that can be conducted to continue to knowledge discussed in this study.

2. Literature Review

Examination of trust within organizations assist in the identification of foundational relationships and organizational perspectives (Ivancevich, Konopaske and Matteson 2014). Diverse workplaces create environments of differing perspectives and viewpoints. Due to this, organizational trust may differ based on differences within the organization and among organizational members (Hatch 2013).

Organizational culture supports the individual perspective and identity of the organization (Schein 1985). Factors that contribute to an organizational culture and identity include multinationalism, the integration of physical space, as well as individual cultural values and perspectives that contribute to the worldview of an organizational member (Schein 1985; Hatch 2013;Ivancevich, Konopaske and Matteson 2014). Additionally, the concept ofan individual's perception influences individual behaviours and actions (Kelley 1967). Based on this information, the concept of trust within this study involves two factors relationships and individual perspectives.

Trust and Relationships

Organizational trust is the result of strong relationships between the follower and leader (Taylor-Dunlop and Lester 2000). The is shown by the organizational commitment between both the leader and employee. Leaders who develop strong relationships also foster environments with strong collaboration within the organization, and experience fewer instances of tension and disengagement due to the establishment of those relationships (Zand 1972; Kouzes and Posner 1995; Taylor-Dunlop and Lester 2000; Welbourne 2007). Additionally, employee engagement within the organization is contingent on the level of organizational

commitment. This precludes that organizational trust requires the intentional effort of both follower and leader, and common desire practice participation in organizational processes and culture.

Alternatively, an employee who is not engaged in organizational processes and culture, may exhibit less commitment to the organization and less trust in leadership. Inconsistency of message and, perceived unfairness of responsibilities may also affect trust among organizational members.   Many variables attribute to the establishment of organizational trust to include organizational processes, values, individual perspectives and relationships (Zand1997;Zhang and Welbourne 2007; Tsuiand Song2008; Esen 2012).

Within the context of this study the previous factors contribute to the definition of organizational trust based on the employee's perspective of the organization. It is described as the degree of comfort one individual has on another's abilities and, has mannerisms that are consistent and fair (McKnight and Chervany 2000; Vidotto, Vincentini, Argentero and Bromiley, 2008, p. 564). Additionally this study examines organizational trust based on the employee's relationship with the supervisor and is defined as an individual's belief that is shared among the group from which an individual is seen to behave in "good-faith", honours commitments, practices honesty, and does not take advantage of others despite being presented with the opportunity (Bromiley and Cummings, 1995; Vidotto, Vincentini, Argentero and Bromiley, 2008, p. 564).

Trust and Individual Perspective

Attribution theory resonates within organizations during periods of conflict, or change (Kelly 1967; Ivancevich, Konopaske and Matteson, 2014). The diversity of members also supports the environment of the diversity of interest. The diversity of interest supports the creation of political elements infused into the landscape of the organizational culture (Hatch2013). The differentiation and integration of values and beliefs within an organization result in instances of competing interest among internal and external stakeholders. The perception and implementation of leadership vary by cultural influence (House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman and Gupta 2006). Trust is suggested to develop or destroy due to the level of influence the supervisor has on the employee and the employee perspective of the organization (Cummings and Bromiley1996). Organizational culture and identity create the environment for the perspective of trust within the organization and among its leadership (Schein 1985). Organizational engagement attributes to the degree of trust from organizational members (Esen 2012).

Three specific components of trust previously described the actions, behaviours and beliefs of individuals within an organization. The individual's relationship with others influences reasoning and premeditated conduct (Crites, Fabrigar, and Petty1994). These three components articulate the interdependent impact of organizational trust on members and the impact on the organization. Additional research developed utilizing the three components of trust attributed to the creation of a research instrument, Organizational Trust Inventory, OTI (Crites, Fabrigar, and Petty 1994; Cummings and Bromiley 1996).

This quantitative instrument measures components of trust in two distinct ways. The first portion measures the relationship between the individual and supervisor. Specifically, the individual's perspective of the supervisor's behaviour, and the individual's level of comfort in the supervisor's abilities. The second portion measures the individual's perspective of the entire organization.

Higher Education Institutions as Organizations

Higher education institutions are extremely diverse organizations and possess many different cultures within its organizations. Culture determines an erudite outcome of the social experience, where artefacts, beliefs, and seen or unseen doctrine contribute to assumptions or biased truths (Schein 1985). Organizations, specifically higher education institutions have deeply embedded cultures which determine how the institution operates, teaches students, and interacts with the public (Schein 1985; Bergquist and Pawlak 2009). Leadership within the organization determines the culture of the organization, and with multiple layers of leadership within higher education institutions, multiple cultures exist within one organization. Among the multiple cultures that exist within higher education institutions each culture exists and operates within a universal culture and organizational identity (Schein 1985; Bergquist and Pawlak 2009; Ivancevich, Konopaske & Matteson 2014).

The American community college was selected for the basis of this study due to specific characteristics and traits that support the expression of multiple cultures. Community colleges were established under the open access mission. As a result, individuals regardless of education and background are welcomed to learn and develop at community colleges (Silver-Pacuilla, Perin and Miller 2013). This open access concept has increased the level of diversity within these schools. Individuals from an array of life experiences, ages, backgrounds and professions seek community colleges due to lower tuition rates, and fast options to goal achievement (Staklis 2010; Silver-Pacuilla, Perin & Miller 2013)

Change management occurs when the organizational structures, practices, technologies or activities are altered to achieve a new objective (Hashim 2013). When new structures have been implemented at adaptation for objective achievement is sought (Hashim 2013; Scott-Clayton and Rodriguez 2013). The concept of trust is vital to the efficiency of change management (Morgan and Zeffane2003). Trust within an organization has immediate contributions to employees' level of interpersonal relationships within the organization and the overall success of the organization (Lane &Bachman 1988; Morgan & Zeffane 2003). Focusing research on a college provides the researcher a diverse participant pool with varying relationships and perspectives while studying trust among its members.

The college selected has an estimate of 40,000 students enrolled among four distinct campuses. The community college has obtained a new President within the past four years, who replaced another President that served in that capacity for over 15 years. The college has steadily seen a decline in student enrolment numbers over the past several years which has caused great concern to the college's funding sources and state financial support. This college like many colleges has experienced internal and external organizational change. Trust within change management among the manager and employee relationship is both economic and normative (McAllister 1995; Morgan & Zeffane 2003, p. 56).

Ellis

The community college utilized in the study consisted of four different campuses. Each campus has a Provost, who presided over the campus and reported to the college president. The institution was examined based on the different ranks of the employees and specific characteristics that may be represented by each employee. Within the context of this study, employee differences were defined by rank, gender, campus of employment, race, age, and tenure at the college. Trust within the context of this study was relative to the relationship between employee and supervisor, as well as between the employee and the college (Cummings & Bromiley 1995). Within the context of this study, two hypotheses were tested:

H1: There is a difference in organizational trust among employee and supervisor relationships

H1a: There is a difference in organizational trust among employee and supervisor relationships based on rank. (Administrative Faculty, Full-time Faculty, and Adjunct Faculty, Full-time Classified and Part-time wage).

H1b: There is a difference in organizational trust among employee and supervisor relationships based on gender (Male and Female).

H1c: There is a difference in organizational trust among employee and supervisor relationship based on campus location (Norfolk, Virginia Beach, Portsmouth and Chesapeake).

H1d: There is a difference in organizational trust among employee and supervisor relationship based on race (Hispanic-Latino/Latina, Caucasian, African American, Native American, and Asian American/Pacific Islander)

H1e: There is a difference in organizational trust among employee and supervisor relationship based on age (Silent Generation 1925-1945, Baby Boomers 1946-1964, Generation Xers 1965-1980, Millennials 1981-2000).

H1f: There is a difference in organizational trust among employee and supervisor relationship based on tenure (0-1 year, 2-5 years, 6-9 years, 10-13 years, 14-16 years, 16+ years).

H2 There is a difference in organizational trust among employee perspective of the College

H2a: There is a difference in organizational trust among employee perspective of the College based on rank. (Administrative Faculty, Full-time Faculty, and Adjunct Faculty, Full-time Classified and Part-time wage).

H2b: There is a difference in organizational trust among employee perspective of the College based on gender (Male and Female).

H2c: There is a difference in organizational trust among employee perspective of the College based on campus location (Norfolk, Virginia Beach, Portsmouth and Chesapeake).

H2d: There is a difference in organizational trust among employee perspective of the College based on race (Hispanic-Latino/Latina, Caucasian, African American, Native American, and Asian American/Pacific Islander).

H2e: There is a difference in organizational trust among employee perspective of the College based on age (Silent Generation 1925-1945, Baby Boomers 1946-1964, Generation Xers 1965-1980, Millennials 1981-2000).

H2f: There is a difference in organizational trust among employee perspective of the College based on tenure (0-1 year, 2-5 years, 6-9 years, 10-13 years, 14-16 years, 16+ years).

3. The Methodology and Model

A quantitative study of one-way ANOVA was conducted to determine whether there was a difference in organizational trust based on descriptive characteristics of employees at the four campuses of the community college in areas of rank, gender, campus, race, age, and tenure. This study will measure the level of trust among employees of the institution and provide recommendations to strengthen organizational trust of employees.

Rank was described as Administrative, Full-time faculty, or Adjunct Faculty, Full-time classified staff or Part-time wage. Gender was described as male and female. Campus was described as Norfolk, Virginia Beach, Portsmouth and Chesapeake. Race was described by using terms of Hispanic-Latino/Latina, Caucasian, African American, Native American and Asian American/Pacific Islander. Age was described by increments of years and generational terms, Silent Generation 1925-1945, Baby Boomers 1946-1964, Generation Xers 1965-1980, and Millennials 1981-2000. Lastly, tenure was identified by increments of time 0-1 year, 2-5 years, 6-9 years, 10-13 years, 14-16 years, and more than 16 years. These questions supported the research hypotheses utilizing the two factors of relationship between supervisor, and overall perspective of the organization's participants. The community college within this study was selected based on convenience. The researcher was an employee at the college and had the ability to submit proposals for research and collection of data (CozbyandBates2012).

Organizational Trust Inventory (OTI)

The Organizational Trust Inventory (OTI) was created based on three dimensions of trust - keep commitments, negotiates honestly, and avoids taking excessive advantage. In addition, three components of belief were created - affective state, cognitive response, and intended behaviour. A matrix was developed to form questions that intersect the three components and three dimensions of trust (Bromiley & Cummings 1996). The examination of trust with these three dimensions and components assisted the articulation of the multidimensional construct of trust (Cummings & Bromiley1995; Bromiley & Cummings 1996).

The long form of the OTI consisted of items within the survey that span the three components of belief, affective state, cognitive response, and intended behavior. Through the development of those questions, composite reliability was

implemented. An average of the scores was determined for each set of component questions to create the variables for the OTI (Bromiley & Cummings 1996).

Within this study, the short form was utilized. The short form took the highest scoring questions from the affective state and the cognitive response components, from all three dimensions based on the long-term form. Intended behavior questions were discarded due to the low composite reliability found within the long-term form questions. However, the researchers believe that although intended behavior was discarded, elements of intended behavior still are present within the short form version (Bromiley & Cummings 1996).

The short form of the Organizational Trust Inventory (OTI) was utilized to measure trust among employees. The instrument consisted of two parts, each of which included questions from the two variables of affective state and cognitive response. The first portion of the instrument was comprised of questions which describe the relationship between the employee and supervisor, and reflected in Hypothesis 1a-e. The second portion of the instrument was comprised of questions which describe the employee perspective of the organization; reflected in hypothesis 2a-e (Cummings & Bromiley 1995; Bromiley & Cummings 1996; Taylor-Dunlop & Lester 2000). The instrument encompasses 12-item questionnaire with a 7-point Likert scale, 1(nearly zero), 5 (nearly 50 %), and 7 (nearly 100%).

Prior to the distribution of the instrument, the researcher submitted materials for HRSB approval. The process for approval consisted of receiving permission from the Office of Institutional Effectiveness at the community college to utilize employees as human subjects within the study. After the approval was granted, the application for HRSB approval was submitted and approved.

Responses

Testing conditions must remain uniform (Williams & Monge 2001; Girden & Kabacoff 2011). To ensure consistency, anonymity and confidentiality of the human subject participants, the community college approved the researcher to send email notification of the survey and the ability to include a link to the survey in the email. Employee distribution email lists from each of the four campuses were utilized, and those email distribution lists were placed in the blind carbon copy addressee line of the email. The email correspondence also allowed for each participant to receive the same instructions and information regarding the survey. The email provided information regarding the request for assistance, confidentiality, and time frame to take the survey which was a duration for four business days. One reminder email was sent prior to the conclusion of the survey period.

Among the four campuses, the survey was distributed to 1,000 employees. At the end of the fourth business day, the survey generated 356 responses. The percentage of the employee population who responded to the survey is 35.6%. Of the 356 responses 19 of those surveys were incomplete. Each survey question was marked as required to complete, and the 19 incomplete surveys only had the demographic questions completed, and no answers from the OTI. Those 19 incomplete surveys suggested a reactivity of 5.34%. Reactivity was expected within data collection, and this low percentage should not impact the results of the study (Cozby& Bates 2012; Creswell 2014).

The 19 incomplete responses were discarded from the data, and the other 337 responses were entered in SPSS. Once data was entered SPSS, survey questions were computed into two variables labelled affective and cognitive response. The computing of variables was conducted due to the categorical nature of the short form questions on discussed topics of affective state, cognitive response, and the three dimensions of trust (Bromiley & Cummings 1996, pg. 317).

4. The Findings

A One-way ANOVA was conducted for each descriptive factor of employees and the computed variables. The descriptive variable of gender required a t-test due to only two categories listed within gender. The post hoc Bonferroni test was implemented to determine whether a specific group contributed to significance levels (Creswell 2008; Cozby & Bates 2012).

Affective Results

The results of the ANOVA indicated that the dependent variable, rank, was significant among survey questions that included Affective State components. The data reflects that the rank or the category of employment had a significant impact on trust among the relationship between employee and supervisor. The Bonferroni post hoc test confirmed significance in rank, and narrowed the category of employment to classification, 4, also known as Adjunct Faculty as the contributing category for its significance. Significance was determined with a value that was less than .05 (Creswell 2008; Cozby& Bates 2012). Employees did show a difference in trust of supervisors by rank and campus, based on questions that covered the affective state component of belief (Bromiley & Cummings 1996).

Table 1: Difference in Organizational Trust by Rank of Employee – Affective State

ANOVA
Affective* Rank

			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	(Combined)		1269.902	4	317.476	4.099	.003
	Linear Term	Unweighted	629.711	1	629.711	8.131	.005
		Weighted	835.032	1	835.032	10.783	.001
		Deviation	434.870	3	144.957	1.872	.134
Within Groups			25710.958	332	77.443		
Total			26980.861	336			

Table 2: Bonferroni Test to Confirm Difference in Organizational Trust by Rank – Affective State

Multiple Comparisons
Dependent Variable: Affective
Bonferroni

(I) Rank	(J) Rank	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	2	.11630	1.55281	1.000	-4.2718	4.5044
	3	-.26672	1.61606	1.000	-4.8336	4.3001
	4	-4.41497*	1.55638	.048	-8.8132	-.0168
	5	-3.09458	1.75207	.783	-8.0458	1.8566
2	1	-.11630	1.55281	1.000	-4.5044	4.2718
	3	-.38302	1.42979	1.000	-4.4235	3.6574
	4	-4.53127*	1.36198	.010	-8.3801	-.6824
	5	-3.21088	1.58190	.432	-7.6812	1.2594
3	1	.26672	1.61606	1.000	-4.3001	4.8336
	2	.38302	1.42979	1.000	-3.6574	4.4235
	4	-4.14825*	1.43367	.041	-8.1997	-.0968
	5	-2.82786	1.64403	.863	-7.4737	1.8180
4	1	4.41497*	1.55638	.048	.0168	8.8132
	2	4.53127*	1.36198	.010	.6824	8.3801
	3	4.14825*	1.43367	.041	.0968	8.1997
	5	1.32038	1.58540	1.000	-3.1598	5.8006
5	1	3.09458	1.75207	.783	-1.8566	8.0458
	2	3.21088	1.58190	.432	-1.2594	7.6812
	3	2.82786	1.64403	.863	-1.8180	7.4737
	4	-1.32038	1.58540	1.000	-5.8006	3.1598

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Table 3: Difference in Organizational Trust by Campus – Affective State

Affective *Campus

			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	(Combined)		625.011	3	208.337	2.632	.050
	Linear Term	Unweighted	363.689	1	363.689	4.595	.033
		Weighted	460.518	1	460.518	5.819	.016
		Deviation	164.493	2	82.247	1.039	.355
Within Groups			26355.849	333	79.147		
Total			26980.861	336			

The variable of campus was also determined significant with a value less than .05 during the ANOVA. However, the Bonferroni post hoc test did not indicate a specific campus that contributed to a significant difference in trust among campuses.

Table 4: Bonferroni Test to Confirm Difference in Organizational Trust by Campus – Affective State

Multiple Comparisons
Dependent Variable: Affective
Bonferroni

(I) Campus	(J) Campus	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	2	-.65873	1.25314	1.000	-3.9847	2.6673
	3	-3.43506	1.40360	.089	-7.1604	.2903
	4	-2.60286	1.58907	.614	-6.8204	1.6147
2	1	.65873	1.25314	1.000	-2.6673	3.9847
	3	-2.77633	1.28687	.190	-6.1918	.6392
	4	-1.94413	1.48697	1.000	-5.8907	2.0025
3	1	3.43506	1.40360	.089	-.2903	7.1604
	2	2.77633	1.28687	.190	-.6392	6.1918
	4	.83221	1.61580	1.000	-3.4563	5.1207
4	1	2.60286	1.58907	.614	-1.6147	6.8204
	2	1.94413	1.48697	1.000	-2.0025	5.8907
	3	-.83221	1.61580	1.000	-5.1207	3.4563

Gender was analysed by T-test. Two factors, male and female supported that the t-test method would best describe levels of significance in relation to trust. The t-test indicated no significance of gender.

The results of the data analysis support the acceptance of H1a, and H1c; there is a difference in organizational trust among the relationship between employee and supervisor based on rank and campus. The following hypotheses were rejected:

H1b: There is no difference in organizational trust among employee and supervisor relationships based on gender (Male and Female).

H1d: There is no difference in organizational trust among employee and supervisor relationship based on race (Hispanic-Latino/Latina, Caucasian, African American, Native American, and Asian American/Pacific Islander).

H1e: There is no difference in organizational trust among employee and supervisor relationship based on age (Silent Generation 1925-1945, Baby Boomers 1946-1964, Generation Xers 1965-1980, Millennials 1981-2000).

H1f: There is no difference in organizational trust among employee and supervisor relationship based on tenure (0-1 year, 2-5 years, 6-9 years, 10-13 years, 14-16 years, 16+ years).

Cognitive Response Results

The significance of each dependent variable was compared to computed variable, cognitive response. The results of the ANOVA indicated that the dependent variable, rank was the only significant item of cognitive response.

Table 5: Difference in Organizational Trust by Rank – Cognitive Response

ANOVA
CognitiveResponse *Rank

			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	(Combined)		1128.809	4	282.202	3.898	.004
	Linear Term	Unweighted	527.457	1	527.457	7.285	.007
		Weighted	697.646	1	697.646	9.635	.002
		Deviation	431.163	3	143.721	1.985	.116
Within Groups			24038.194	332	72.404		
Total			25167.003	336			

Table 6: Bonferroni Test to Confirm Organizational Trust by Rank – Cognitive Response

Multiple Comparisons
Dependent Variable: Cognitive Response
Bonferroni

(I) Rank	(J) Rank	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	2	-.58700	1.50145	1.000	-4.8300	3.6560
	3	-.55853	1.56260	1.000	-4.9743	3.8573
	4	-4.64968*	1.50490	.022	-8.9024	-.3969
	5	-2.87441	1.69411	.907	-7.6618	1.9130
2	1	.58700	1.50145	1.000	-3.6560	4.8300
	3	.02847	1.38249	1.000	-3.8784	3.9353
	4	-4.06268*	1.31693	.022	-7.7842	-.3412
	5	-2.28741	1.52957	1.000	-6.6099	2.0350
3	1	.55853	1.56260	1.000	-3.8573	4.9743
	2	-.02847	1.38249	1.000	-3.9353	3.8784
	4	-4.09115*	1.38625	.034	-8.0086	-.1737
	5	-2.31588	1.58965	1.000	-6.8081	2.1763
4	1	4.64968*	1.50490	.022	.3969	8.9024
	2	4.06268*	1.31693	.022	.3412	7.7842
	3	4.09115*	1.38625	.034	.1737	8.0086
	5	1.77526	1.53296	1.000	-2.5568	6.1073
5	1	2.87441	1.69411	.907	-1.9130	7.6618
	2	2.28741	1.52957	1.000	-2.0350	6.6099
	3	2.31588	1.58965	1.000	-2.1763	6.8081
	4	-1.77526	1.53296	1.000	-6.1073	2.5568

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

The dependent variable, rank, was found to be significant with a value of less than .05. When significance levels were compared to the Bonferroni post hoc test, category 4, or Adjunct Faculty was determined as the contributing factor to significant difference in trust by rank. The information found from the data suggest that rank of employees has a significant contributor to an employee's trust of the College. Hypothesis 2ais accepted that, there is a difference in organizational trust among employee perspective of the college based on rank

A t-test was also conducted on gender and cognitive response, the findings indicated that there was no difference in trust based on gender. The following hypotheses were rejected:

H2b: There is no difference in organizational trust among employee perspective of the College based on gender (Male and Female).

H2c: There is no difference in organizational trust among employee perspective of the College based on campus location (Norfolk, Virginia Beach, Portsmouth and Chesapeake).

H2d: There is no difference in organizational trust among employee perspective of the College based on race (Hispanic-Latino/Latina, Caucasian, African American, Native American, and Asian American/Pacific Islander).

H2e: There is no difference in organizational trust among employee perspective of the College based on age (Silent Generation 1925-1945, Baby Boomers 1946-1964, Generation Xers 1965-1980, Millennials 1981-2000).

H2f: There is no difference in organizational trust among employee perspective of the College based on tenure (0-1 year, 2-5 years, 6-9 years, 10-13 years, 14-16 years, 16+ years).

5. Conclusion

The implications of the study suggest that there is a difference in trust among employees and supervisors as it pertains the employee's rank or category of employment. In addition, the data indicates that the rank of the employee determines the degree of trust at the college. Data collected within this study also gives the college information as to how the supervisors of the college are perceived, and what levels of support are needed at the campus and college level to strengthen trust among employees. Higher levels of trust within an organization yield higher levels of productivity (Cummings & Bromiley 1995; Zand 1995). The dependent variables of race, age, gender, and tenure showed no difference in trust which suggest that the institution may have supportive programs associated to diversity and inclusive work environments. The Bonferroni post hoc test, was able to identify Adjunct Faculty as the classification of employees that should be revisited and explored further. In addition, the campus locations did show a significance among the affective scores which may require additional research to determine what factors are contributing to the difference in trust by campus location.

This study explored the concept of trust within the multiple layers of a college by distributing the Organizational Trust Inventory (OTI) to employees of the college. The responses to the survey indicated that there was a difference in trust of employees and supervisors among the different campuses. The responses also indicated that there was a difference in trust of employees with the college based on employee rank. This information was analysed by One-Way ANOVA which examined the difference between trust and rank, gender, campus, race, age, and tenure of employees at the college. Additional research on trust within this institution is recommended to determine the degree of support needed to examine the contributing factors that caused trust to differ between rank and campus. Future research is also suggested to be conducted at different higher education institutions to determine whether differences of trust among employee rank is evident at other institutions. If rank is a contributing factor to trust within higher education institutions, then executives may have the ability to improve conditions to enhance trust among employees.

Understanding how organizational trust is perceived in higher education institutions contributes to the body of knowledge by regarding higher education institutions as organizations. Identifying employees of these organizations have psychosocial effects on the organizational culture and values. More adjunct faculty or part-time faculty within higher education institutions are employed than full-time faculty. This suggests that a larger quantity of employees at the organization have a perceived distrust within the organization. Implications of this distrust could result in the quality of work demonstrated, which is the quality of instruction provided for college students. Studying higher education institutions as organizations can add wealth to the study of organizations and enhance how higher education institutions function and serve. The reporting of new findings as indicated in the fourth section of this paper express the need to continue to explore the organizational cultures and structures that exist within higher education institutions.

Limitations of this research include participant follow-up. A few questions presented within the OTI would have provided more insight with a few qualitative questions posed to a small focus group. The focus group would have been specifically helpful for the determination of campus affiliation and perceived organizational trust. The Portsmouth campus participants may have been able to provide clarity based on the quantitative results found.

Future research is recommended to continue with the findings of this study and determine whether adjunct faculty distrusting their organization attributes to burnout or increase of turnover. Additionally, a longitudinal study can be considered to determine if the value of the students' education changes based on the perceived level of trust the faculty has within the institution.

References

Aziz, F. & Shah, P. M. A., 2011, *Organizational Trust Inventory (OTI),* s.l.: s.n.

Bergquist, W. & Pawlak, K., 2008, *Engaging the Six Cultures of the Academy: Revised and Expanded Edition of the Four Cultures of the Academy.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bromiley, P. & Cummings, L. L., 1995, Transactions cost in organizations with trust. In: *Research on negotiations in organizations.* Greenwich: JAI Press, Pp. 219-247.

Crites, S. L., Fabrigar, L. R. & Petty, R. E., 1994, Measuring the affective and cognitive properties of attitudes: Conceptual and methodological issues.. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin,* Pp. 619-634.

Cummings, L. L. & Bromiley, P., 1996, The Organizational Trust Inventory (OTI): Development and validation. In: *Trust in organizations.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, Pp. 302-330.

Doron, G. et al., 2007, 'We Do Not See Things as They Are, We See Them as We Are: A Multidimensional Worldview Model of Obsessive Compulsive Disorder,'*Journal of Cognitive Psychotherapy: An International Quarterly, Vol. 21, No. 3, Pp. 217-231.*

Esen, E., 2012, The Role of Trust on the Relationship Between Organizational Engagement and Corporate Reputation,*Journal of Management & Economics, Vol. 19, No. 1, Pp. 47-58.*

Gunkel, M., Schlaegel, C. & Taras, V., 2016, Cultural Values, Emotional Intelligence, and Conflict Handling Styles: A Global Study,*Journal of World Business,Vol. 54, No. 4, Pp. 568-585.*

Hair, J. F. J., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J. & Anderson, R. E., 2010,*Multivariate Data Analysis,*Upper Saddle River: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Hashim, M., 2013, Change Management,*International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences, Vol.3, No. 7, Pp. 1-6.*

Hatch, M. J., 2013, *Organization Theory: Modern, Symbolic, and Postmodern Perspectives.* Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.

Hoppe, M. H., 2007, *Culture and Leader Effectiveness: The GLOBE Study,* s.l.: s.n.

Hoppe, M. H. & Eckert, R., 2014,*Leader Effectiveness and Culture: The GLOBE Study,* s.l.: Center for Creative Leadership.

House, R. et al., 2006, Culture, Leadership and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies,*The Journal of Applied Christian Leadership, Vol. 1, No. 1, Pp. 55-71.*

Ivancevich, J. & Konopaske, R., 2014,*Organizational Behavior.* 10th ed. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Kouzes, J. & Posner, B., 1995,*The Leadership Challenge.* California: Jossey-Bass Inc..

Kura, K. M., Shamsudin, F. M. & Chauhan, A., 2016, Organisational Trust as Mediator Between Perceived Organisational Support and Constructive Deviance. *International Journal of Business and Society, Vol. 17, No. 1, Pp. 1-18.*

McAllister, D., 1995, Affect and cognition based trust as a foundation for interpersonal cooperation in organizations. *Academy of Management Journal, Vol. 38, No. 1, Pp. 24-59.*

McKnight, D. & Chervany, N., 2000, The meanings of trust. *Carlson School of Management, MIS Research Center, University of Minnesota,* Pp. 96-104.

Morgan, D. E. & Zeffane, R., 2003, Employee involvement, organizational change and trust in management,*International Journal of Human Resource Management, Vol. 14, No. 1,* Pp. 55-75.

Nyhan, R. & Marlowe, H. J., 1997, Development and pyschometric properties of the organizational trust inventory, *Evaluation Review, Vol.21, No. 5,* Pp. 614-635.

Pirju, I. S. & Danhut, M. B., 2013, The Confucian Asian Cluster,*Acta Universitatis Danubius,* Pp. 31-40.

Schein, E. H., 1985, *Organizational Culture and Leadership.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Scott-Clayton, J. & Rodriguez, O., 2012, *Development, discouragement or diversion. New Evidence on the effects of college remediation - Working Paper No. 18328,* Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.

Silver-Pacuilla, H., Perin, D. & Miller, B., 2013, Introduction to Special Issue of Community College Review: Skills and Trajectories of Developmental Education Learners. *Community College Review, Vol. 41, No. 2, Pp. 111-117.*

Staklis, S., 2007, *Profile of undegraduate students,* Washington, DC.: National Center for Education Statistics.

Taylor-Dunlop, K. & Lester, P. E., 2000, *The Development of an Instrument to Measure Organizational Trust,* New Orleans: American Research Association.

Vidotto, G., Vicentini, M., Argentero, P. & Bromiley, P., 2008, Assessment of Organizational Trust: Italian Adaptation and Factorial Validity of the Organizational Trust Inventor, Pp. 563-575.

Welbourne, T. M., 2007, Employee Engagement: Beyond The Fad And Into the Executive Suit, *Executive Form,* Pp. 45-51.

Zand, D. E., 1972, Trust and Managerial Problem Solving, *Administrative Science Quarterly, Vol. 17, No. 2, Pp. 229-239.*

Zhang, A. Y., Tsui, A. & Song, L., 2008, How Do I Trust Thee? The Employee-Orientation Relationship Supervisory Support, and Middle Manager Trust in the Organization, *Human Resource Management, Vol. 47, No. 1, Pp. 111-132.*