

Credibility and organizational sustainability in trinity polytechnic, Uyo, Akwa Ibom state

Udeme Anthony Abaikpa

Department of Business Administration, Faculty of Management Sciences
Akwa Ibom State University, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria. Corresponding Email: udemeabaikpa@gmail.com

Emmanuel Okon Etuk

Department of Business Administration & Management, Faculty of Management Sciences
Trinity Polytechnic, Uyo, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria. Email: dmautocompanyltd@gmail.com

Cornelia David Thomas

Department of Management, Faculty of Social and Management Sciences
Ritman University, Ikot Ekpene, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria. Email: thomas.cornelia@ritmanuniversity.edu.ng

Unwana Nicholas Udoh

Department of Management, Faculty of Social and Management Sciences
Ritman University, Ikot Ekpene, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria. Email: unwananicholas@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

KEYWORDS:

Credibility, transparency,
inconsistency, accountability,
organizational sustainability..

ABSTRACT

The study examined the relationship between credibility and organizational sustainability in Trinity Polytechnic, Uyo, Akwa Ibom State. A survey research design was adopted for the study. A sample of 240 respondents was drawn from the population of 600 using Taro Yamane's scientific sampling technique. For the objectives of the study to be achieved, three hypotheses were formulated and tested. The study utilized structured questionnaire and interview as major instruments for data collection. 240 questionnaires were distributed and 200 were returned. Data collected were analyzed using simple percentage and simple regression. Results showed that, there is a significant relationship between variables of credibility such as transparency, inconsistency and accountability and organizational sustainability in Trinity Polytechnic, Uyo, Akwa Ibom State. It was recommended that, transparency policies should be continually implemented by Trinity Polytechnic, Uyo, Akwa Ibom State, Trinity Polytechnic should be consistent with the policies that drive growth and innovation. Finally, it was recommended that organizational accountability should be continually espoused by Trinity Polytechnic, Uyo, Akwa Ibom State to drive growth and innovation.

Received: 15 Mar 2022

Accepted: 10 May 2022

Available Online: 05 Jun 2022



© 2022 The authors. Licensee Scientia Academia Publishing. This is an open access article under the Creative Commons AttributionNonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0

1. INTRODUCTION

Credibility is a vital aspect of any successful organization. It is the reputation that an organization holds in the eyes of its stakeholders, including customers, employees, investors, and the general public. Credibility refers to the degree to which an organization is viewed as trustworthy and believable by its stakeholders, such as investors, customers and employees (Lukaszewski 2020). Credibility is often based on perceptions of the organization's past actions and reputation, as well as its ability to meet its commitments and deliver on its promises. The credibility of an organization is tied to its ability to deliver on its promises, maintain high ethical standards, and consistently meet the expectations of its stakeholders. A strong credibility not only enhances an organization's reputation but also drives its growth and sustainability by attracting new customers, retaining existing ones, and building trust with investors. In this day and age, building a credible and trustworthy brand is more important than ever, given the increasing competition and the constantly evolving business landscape. Transparency and accountability associated with sustainability reporting can enhance the credibility of organizations (Arena & Marconato, 2020). Several literatures suggest that there is a strong relationship between credibility and organizational sustainability, with organizations that prioritize sustainable practices and reporting being perceived as more credible by stakeholders. This can lead to a range of benefits, including greater stakeholder trust, support, and loyalty, as well as enhanced reputation in the marketplace.

1.1 Statement of the problem

Credibility - reputation of a company or an organization for honesty and expertise is an important source credibility that can influence stakeholders or general public's reactions to the trustworthiness and reliability of an organization. The credibility of an organization, however, is not just about the customers but about everything an organization says to investors, potential partners or even to their employees, and without credibility these promises can be questioned (MacDougall & Conrad 2009). Maintaining credibility requires a commitment to transparency, consistency and accountability. Companies that prioritize these values and take proactive steps to address potential issues can build and sustain their reputation over long term. However, maintaining credibility can be a significant challenge for many organizations. There are various problems associated with maintaining credibility as opined by (MacDougall & Conrad 2009) such as lack of commitment to transparency. Lack of transparency can lead to issues that can damage an organizational credibility. Lack of transparency can damage credibility. Customers, investors and employees expect their organizations to be honest and transparent about their business practices, products and services. A lack of transparency can lead to mistrust, especially if the organization is seen to be hiding information or misleading consumers. Inconsistent decision making is also identified as one of the challenges in maintaining credibility. Organizations that make inconsistent decisions or don't follow a clear decision-making process risk losing credibility. Customers and stakeholders expect organizations to make informed and consistent decisions based on data and sound reasoning. Another problem of maintaining credibility as observed by the

authors is lack of accountability. Lack of accountability can lead to a loss of credibility for an organization. Lack of accountability regarding record keeping is an important factor that can damage an organizational credibility. Lack of accountability as regards poor record keeping can cause confusion, inconsistencies and errors, leading to a loss of customer trust and confidence. For example, an organization may face reputational damage if product defects occur due to lack of accountability in maintenance practices. It is against this background that, this study was designed to examine the relationship between credibility and organizational sustainability in Trinity Polytechnic, Uyo, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria.

1.2 Objectives of the Study

The main objective of this study was to examine the relationship between credibility and organizational sustainability in Trinity Polytechnic, Uyo, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria. However, the specific objectives of this study include:

- To examine the relationship between transparency and organizational sustainability in Trinity Polytechnic, Uyo, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria.
- To examine the relationship between inconsistency and organizational sustainability in Trinity Polytechnic, Uyo, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria.
- To examine the relationship between accountability and organizational sustainability in Trinity Polytechnic, Uyo, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria.

1.3 Research Questions

From the objectives of the study, the following research questions were posed to guide the study:

- What is the relationship between transparency and organizational sustainability in Trinity Polytechnic, Uyo, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria?
- What is the relationship between inconsistency and organizational sustainability in Trinity Polytechnic, Uyo, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria?
- What is the relationship between accountability and organizational sustainability in Trinity Polytechnic, Uyo, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria?

1.4 Hypotheses

From the objectives of this study, the following research hypotheses were formulated to guide the study:

- Transparency has no significant relationship with organizational sustainability in Trinity Polytechnic, Uyo, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria.
- Inconsistency has no significant relationship with organizational sustainability in Trinity Polytechnic, Uyo, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria.
- Accountability has no significant relationship with organizational sustainability in Trinity Polytechnic, Uyo, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria.

1.5 Significance of the Study

This study is significant since the findings and recommendations may contribute to the growing literature in credibility and organizational sustainability. The study may assist management and leadership of Polytechnic education, particularly Trinity Polytechnic, Uyo, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria to look inward and pay proper attention to factors that could improve their credibility image, thus, compete favorably with their counterparts within the industry. The results of this study may inform the management and leadership of all higher institutions in Nigeria and related professionals on the factors that can influence organizational sustainability. The study may be of benefit to students who may wish to carry out further studies in the related area of interest. Finally, the findings of this study may serve as a source of reference material for future researches in the related field.

1.6 Scope of the Study

The study sought to examine the relationship between credibility and organizational sustainability in Trinity Polytechnic, Uyo, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria. Unit scope: The unit scope for this study was at the micro level. The study focused on 240 respondents of Trinity Polytechnic, Uyo, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria. Content scope: The content scope of this study was confined to literature on credibility and organizational sustainability. The explanatory variables of credibility (independent variable) were transparency, inconsistency and accountability. The explanatory variable of dependent variable was organizational sustainability. Geographical scope: The geographical scope of this study focused on staff of Trinity Polytechnic, Uyo, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria.

2. REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 Concept of Credibility

Generally, the term “credibility” is one of the broad and intuitive Greek and Latin concepts that could be traceable far back to the beginning of academic rhetorical debates (McCroskey & Young 1981). Its Latin connotation ‘credo’ which means “I trust or believe” has the same root origin as credit or credibility (Kouzes & Posner 2011). There are many different views of the term-credibility but mainly, all of the concepts and definitions of credibility are related with trust, believability and reliability of various things. Jiang, Henneberg & Naude (2011) defines credibility as the belief that the partner keeps its word and fulfils promised role obligations. In a related study, Maathuis (2004) defines credibility as a concept which is linked to the sender and refers to the degree to which an object is considered to be a reliable source of information, products, services, and other matters. The concept of credibility is one of the newly introduced business terms that has been researched by many scholars over the years. The concept of credibility in relation with businesses was introduced not so long ago. Credibility in business can be defined as the degree to which an organization is perceived to be trustworthy, honest, reliable and able to deliver on its promises. It encompasses the collective beliefs and opinions held by internal and external stakeholders about an organization's ability to design and deliver products and services. credibility is closely linked to reputation and is an important factor in building and maintaining strong relationships with customers, employees, investors, and other stakeholders. A credible company is one that is seen as dependable, transparent, and deserving of trust.

Today, there are few researches investigating credibility from business and point of view and connecting it with real life situations. MacDougall and Conrad (2009) argue that without credibility, everything an organization says to investors, potential partners or even their employees can be questioned. The authors aver that, it is so important to maintain credibility in order to sufficiently manage the expectations of different actors such as shareholders, customers, partners, investors, employees, etc. According to Rehme & Svensson (2011) trusted and reliable interactions of an organization with its various stakeholders can lead to increased and improved credibility and ultimately organizational sustainability.



Fig. 1. Credibility and Organizational sustainability Model

(Researcher 2023)

There may be a positive relationship between credibility and organizational sustainability when examining factors such as increased customer loyalty, positive word-of-mouth, and improved stakeholder relationships. As noted in several literature, variables of credibility such as consistent and effective coordination of decisions and excellent and transparent customer service may contribute to organizational sustainability (MacDougall & Conrad 2009, Rehme & Svensson 2011). However, more discussion on the relationship between credibility and organizational sustainability represented in the above model were discussed thus:

2.1.1 Transparency and Organizational sustainability

Even though not every organization can be completely transparent, many of them cannot deny the benefits of organizational transparency. One of the reasons every organization should strive to be more transparent is trust. Poldner, Kolk & Criado-Jimenez (2018) argue that transparency and trust are essential in promoting sustainable entrepreneurship, and that sustainable ventures must strive to establish and maintain credibility. When organizations freely share information and encourage their leaders to do the same, employees tend to consider them more trustworthy. Several researches have shown that transparency can have a positive impact on organizational performance and sustainability, as it helps build trust with stakeholders and improve decision-making processes (Darwish & Lakhtaria 2011). The authors argue that, effective and transparent communication can lead to better organizational performance and sustainability. Supporting this notion, Rawlins (2009, Schnackenberg & Tomlinson 2014) aver that transparency in an organization can improve employee trust and responsibility, thus bring about organizational sustainability. Similarly, (Mills, Han, Robbins & Weary 2018) posit that workplace transparency can bring about accountability and growth. Centivany (2014) describes the characteristic of a transparent organization to involve communication of organizational goals with clarity and honesty, regular feedback, and respect for superior opinions. Wehmeier and Raaz (2012) argue that transparency in an organization is not only important among co-workers but is a key to organizational sustainability and healthy relationships between managers and their employees. Schnackenberg and Tomlinson (2014) believe that, sustaining a transparent working relationship by employees may require providing honest feedback. Fung (2013) believes that, when the leaders and other stakeholders of an organization act in a transparent manner, the organizations benefit in several ways. This benefit may be evident in faster problem solving, better teamwork, healthy working relationships, trust and, ultimately, improved performance and growth (Danker 2013). Conversely, performance can suffer from a lack of organizational transparency which may hamper the achievement of organizational sustainability (Berggren & Bernstein 2007).

2.1.2 Inconsistency and Organizational sustainability

The relationship between organizational inconsistency and sustainability is a complex and multifaceted one, with a range of factors influencing the outcome. Some studies suggest that inconsistency within an organization can hinder growth and its sustainability, as it can lead to confusion and lack of direction (Bhuiyan & Siengthai 2013). For example, one study found that inconsistent communication from leaders can create a lack of commonality among organizational members, resulting in reduced readiness for change (Young 2008). Another study identifies by (Lang, Schlauderer, & Narasimhan 2017) identifies negative outcomes in terms of irregularity and inconsistency in orders as a potential challenge to organizational sustainability. On the other hand, the authors opine that, there may be some instances where inconsistency can promote growth. For example, an organization that is flexible and adaptable may be better able to navigate changes in the market or external environment, leading to growth opportunities.

2.1.3 Accountability and Organizational sustainability

Organizational accountability could be viewed as the concept of holding individuals and groups accountable for their actions within an organization. It involves developing a culture of responsibility and transparency, where each employee and team member is held responsible for their actions and outcomes. Organizational accountability can take many different forms, from implementing clear policies and procedures to instituting regular checks and balances to ensure compliance with regulations (Setiawan, Singh & Romijn, 2017). The authors identify benefits of organizational accountability to include increased transparency, better decision making, improved risk management, and higher levels of trust and cooperation within teams. By creating a culture of accountability within an organization, employees will be more likely to take ownership of their work and strive for excellence, leading to improved performance and increased efficiency. Additionally, by being held accountable for their actions, employees will be less likely to engage in unethical behavior or make decisions that do not align with the organization's goals and values. Effective implementation of organizational accountability requires a structured approach, with clear policies and procedures in place to guide and monitor behavior (Florio, Pellegrin & Sirtori, 2014). They posit that, accountability requires buy-in from all levels of the organization, from senior leaders to front-line employees. Regular monitoring and reporting are essential for ensuring accountability, and audits and reviews can help identify areas for improvement and measure progress over time. Organizational accountability is essential for any organization seeking to achieve its goals and maintain a reputation for ethical conduct. By fostering a culture of accountability, organizations can improve performance, reduce risk, and build trust with stakeholders. Organizational accountability can be activated by creating a culture of workplace transparency in the organization. Organizational accountability is a philosophy that should be espoused by every organization that yearns for a critical framework to drive growth and innovation.

2.1.4 Organizational Sustainability

Organizational sustainability has become an increasingly important topic in recent years, as businesses, nonprofits, and governments seek to balance economic growth with social and environmental responsibility. According to Elkington (1994), sustainable development should aim to meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. One approach to achieving organizational sustainability is to consider a wide array of environmental economic and social factors when making business decisions (Gladwin et al., 1995). The authors believe that, by considering these factors, organizations can build a sustainable future for themselves and future generations. For example, (Curran et al., 2005, Chen et al., 2010) aver that businesses can use life cycle assessments to evaluate the environmental impact of their products or services and can work to reduce their carbon footprint by adopting renewable energy sources. However, there is no gainsaying that, credibility and organizational sustainability are closely related. Credibility is a crucial factor in promoting organizational sustainability, and several cited authors have explored the relationship between the two concepts. In their study, (Nikolas,

Arnold & Haring 2016) found that an organizational sustainability reporting is perceived as more credible by stakeholders when the company is seen as having a long-term commitment to sustainability and engages in proactive communication with stakeholders.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design

This study utilized survey research design. The choice of this research design was considered appropriate because it provided the researcher the opportunity of gathering data from a representative population of the study.

3.2 The Study Area

This study was conducted in Trinity Polytechnic, Uyo, Akwa Ibom State. Akwa Ibom State is in the South-South zone of Nigeria with its capital at Uyo.

3.3 Population of the Study

A population is any group of individuals that has one or more characteristics in common and that are of interest to the researcher. Therefore, the target population of this study was 600 including staff and students.

3.4 Sample Size/Sampling Technique

As a result of the inability of the researcher to effectively study the entire staff population of the selected study area, a representative number of 240 was chosen as sample size population. The sample size was calculated using Taro Yamane's scientific formula which is given as:

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + N(e)^2}$$

Where:

N	=	Population
1	=	constant
e	=	Level of significance
n	=	sample size
n	=	$\frac{600}{1 + 600(0.05)^2}$
n	=	$\frac{600}{1 + 600(0.0025)}$
n	=	$\frac{600}{1 + 1.5}$
N	=	$\frac{600}{2.5}$
N	=	240

3.5 Sources of Data Collection

Data for this research work were collected through two sources – primary and secondary sources. The primary data were obtained by the researcher through questionnaire administration and personal interviews. Secondary data were obtained from published reports, books, journals, newspapers, magazines and internet.

3.6 Instrument for Data Collection

The instrument for data collection was “Credibility and Organizational Sustainability Questionnaire” (COSQ). The Questionnaire was divided into two sections. Section A and section B. Section A sought for information on the demographic data of the respondents. Section B of the questionnaire comprised 20 items to measure transparency, inconsistency and accountability in using information as independent variables and 5 questions on organizational sustainability. The Questionnaire was structured using a modified five – point Likert - typed scales ranging from Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Disagree (D), Strongly Disagree (SD) and Neutral (N). This method was used because of its advantage of ensuring identical responses for the same items from all the respondents. Besides, it would give the respondents a wider opportunity to express their level of agreement, disagreement or neutrality on credibility and organizational sustainability.

3.7 Validity of Research Instrument

The validity is basically concerned on how a research instrument measures what it intended to measure (Field 2005). Consequently, the researcher was concerned with the degree to which the instrument measure credibility and organizational sustainability. Face validity of the questionnaire was established in order to make sure that the questionnaire items appeared to take care of relevant information in the area of interest. Each sub - section in the questionnaire had five items which would be reviewed by the experts and all ambiguous items would be removed and those found relevant were retained. The experts certified that the instrument was face valid and should be used for the study. Their opinions helped to strengthen the quality of the instrument.

3.8 Reliability of the Instrument

A test is said to be reliable if it measures what it is supposed to measure consistently (Huck 2007). For the purpose of this work, internal consistency of the questionnaire was established and determined by Cronbach's Alpha (CA).

Table 1. Cronbach's Alpha (CA) result of the variables of the study

Variables	No. of research construct/Items	Computed CA reliability test values
Transparency	5	0.784
Inconsistency	5	0.851
Accountability	5	0.864
Organizational sustainability	5	0.812

Source: Researcher's Computation (2023).

As shown above, the CA values for all variables were above the benchmark of 70%. This implies that the variables used for this study are declared reliable for used for further statistical analysis, the result of which is considered valid and reliable.

3.9 Method of data collection/administration of the instrument

Data collection was done in the sampled study area with the assistance of the heads of unit/department. The staff and students were informed of this activity and the need to give honest responses to the instructions that, data collected would be used and treated confidentially for academic research purposes only.

3.10 Methods of data analysis

Considering the nature of data collected, the statistical methods adopted for data analysis were simple percentages and regression. The data were analyzed with the help of a statistical tool using SPSS.

4. DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

4.1 Data Presentation

The data collected from field survey are presented under this section.

4.1.1 Summary of Questionnaire Administered

In this section, the questionnaires administered to the respondents were collected and presented as shown in Table 1 below:

Table 2. Summary of Questionnaire Administered and Retrieved

Questionnaires	Number of questionnaires	Percentage (%)
Total questionnaires served	240	100
Total useful questionnaires Returned	200	83.33
Total not Returned	40	16.67

Source: Field Survey Data, 2023

Data presented in Table 1 above indicates that out of the total of 240 questionnaires distributed, 200 questionnaires representing 83.33% were useful questionnaires returned, 40 questionnaires representing 16.67% were not returned. Based on the responses, 200 correctly and completely filled questionnaires representing were used for analysis and results interpretation.

4.1.2 Respondents' Demographics Analysis

It is importance to know the types, nature, class, and kinds of respondents whose opinions were used in this research.

Table 3. Summary of Respondents' Gender

Demographics	Physiognomies	Frequency	percentage
Gender	Male	126	63.0
	Female	74	37.0
	Total	200	100.0

Source: Field Survey Data (2023).

Table 3 revealed that 126 respondents representing 63% were male, while 74 respondents representing 37% were female. This indicates that majority of the respondents were male. This does not presume the fact that using more men in the study will in any way affect the analysis and findings of the study. This is because the opinions expressed are highly likely to represent general position or opinion concerning the research issues and not depending on feminine or masculine opinion or position.

Table 4. Summary of Respondents' Age

Demographics	Physiognomies	Frequency	percentage
Age	18 – 30Years	16	8.0
	31 – 40 Years	58	29.0
	41 and above Years	126	63.0
	Total	200	100.0

Source: Field Survey Data (2023)

Table 4 shows that 16 respondents representing 8% were aged 18-30 years, 58 respondents representing 29% were aged 31-40 years, 126 of the respondents representing 63% were aged 41 and above years.

Table 5. Summary of Respondents' Qualification

Demographics	Physiognomies	Frequency	percentage
Qualification	SSCE/GCE	18	9.0
	OND/NCE	26	13.0
	HND/BSc	38	19.0
	MSc./MBA	54	27.0
	PhD	64	32.0
	Total	200	100.0

Source: Field Survey Data (2023)

Table 5 indicates that 18 respondents representing 9% were holders of SSCE/GCE. 26 respondents representing 13% were holders of OND/NCE, 38 respondents representing 19% were holders of HND/BSc while 54 respondents representing 27% were holders of MSc/MBA. 64 respondents representing 32% were holders of PhD qualification.

Table 6. Summary of Respondents' Rank

Demographics	Physiognomies	Frequency	percentage
Rank	Management Staff	50	25.0
	Senior Staff	88	44.0
	Junior Staff	62	31.0
	Total	200	100.0

Source: Field Survey Data (2023)

Table 6 shows that 50 respondents representing 25% were management staff. 88 respondents representing 44% were senior staff, 62 respondents representing 31% were junior staff.

Table 7. Summary of Respondents' Work Experience

Demographics	Physiognomies	Frequency	percentage
Work Experience	1 – 3 years	34	17.0
	4 – 7 years	64	32.0
	8 and above years	102	51.0
	Total	200	100.0

Source: Field Survey Data (2023)

Table 7 revealed that 34 respondents representing 17% have 1-3 years working experience. 64 respondents representing 32% have 4-7 years working experience, 102 respondents representing 51% have 8 and above years working experience. The disparities in respondents' demographics or physiognomies do not presuppose the fact they would in any way affect the analysis and findings of the study. This is because the opinions expressed are highly likely to represent general position or opinion concerning the research issues and not depending or tying to a particular respondent physiognomy.

4.2 Data Analysis

The responses to the various questions on the items measuring each construct are presented and analyzed, in this section. As presented in each table, the responses to the questions on the items measuring research construct or opinions and the analysis is carried out based on the research objectives and to determine the position of the respondents on each Likert scale.

4.2.1 Transparency

The first objective was on the relationship between transparency and organizational sustainability in Trinity Polytechnic, Uyo, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria.

Table 8. Analysis of items and research constructs on transparency

Research Statement/ Items	SA (5)	A (4)	D (3)	SD (2)	N (1)
My organization is very trusted for its transparency role in their operational relationship with its stakeholders.	68(34.0%)	22(11.0%)	52(26.0%)	28(14.0%)	0(0%)
My organization is known for freely sharing information and encouraging their leaders to do the same.	106(53.0%)	40(20.0%)	16(8.0%)	8(4.0%)	0(0%)
My organization's performance and sustainability are hinged on its effective transparent communication.	16(8.0%)	102(51.0%)	20(10.0%)	14(7.0%)	0(0%)
My organization earns trust by its employees due to her clear and honest communication of organizational goals and objectives.	98(49.0%)	34(17.0%)	36(18.0%)	6(3.0%)	0(0%)
My organization is known to always promote a transparent working relationship with employees by providing honest feedback.	50(25.0%)	74(37.0%)	22(11.0%)	18(9.0%)	0(0%)

Source: Field Survey Data, 2023

Table 8 revealed that 68 respondents representing 34.0% strongly agreed that their organization is very trusted for its transparency role in their operational relationship with its stakeholders and 22 respondents representing 11.0% also agreed to the claims. However, 52 respondents representing 26.0% disagreed to the claim and 28 respondents representing 14.0% strongly disagreed to the claim. Also, it was also shown that 106 respondents representing 53.0% strongly agreed that their organization is known for freely sharing information and encouraging their leaders to do the same and 40 respondents representing 20.0% also agreed to the claims. However, 16 respondents representing 8.0% disagreed to the claim and 8 respondents representing 4.0% strongly disagreed to the claim. Furthermore, it was also shown that 16 respondents representing 8.0% strongly agreed that their organization's performance and sustainability are hinged on its effective transparent communication and 102 respondents representing 51.0% also agreed to the claims. However, 20 respondents representing 10.0% disagreed to the claim and 14 respondents representing 7.0% strongly disagreed to the claim. Additionally, it was shown that 98 respondents representing 49.0% strongly agreed that their organization earns trust by its host employees due to her clear and honest communication of organizational goals and objectives and 34 respondents representing 17.0% also agreed to the claims. However, 36 respondents representing 18.0% disagreed to the claim and 6 respondents representing 3.0% strongly disagreed to the claim. It was found also that 50 respondents representing 25.0% strongly agreed that their organization is known to always promote a transparent working relationship with employees by providing honest feedback and 74 respondents representing 37.0% also agreed to the claims. However, 22 respondents representing 11.0% disagreed to the claim and 18 respondents representing 9.0% strongly disagreed to the claim. However, at this level, until statistically and scientifically tested, negative, positive or significant relationship can only be assumed but not claimed between each explanatory variable and the explained variable.

4.2.2 Inconsistency

The second objective was on the relationship between inconsistency and organizational sustainability in Trinity Polytechnic, Uyo, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria.

Table 9. Analysis of items and research constructs on inconsistency

Research Statement/ Items	SA (5)	A (4)	D (3)	SD (2)	N(1)
My organization always experiences commonality among organizational members as a resulting of inconsistent communication from leaders.	36(18.0%)	76(38.0%)	38(19.0%)	2(1.0%)	0(0%)
My organization always experiences confusion and lack of direction due to inconsistent policies.	90(45.0%)	50(25.0%)	18(9.0%)	12(6.0%)	0(0%)
My organization is not sustainable due to irregularity and inconsistency in decision making.	32(16.0%)	76(38.0%)	38(19.0%)	30(15.0%)	0(0%)
Inconsistency promotes growth in your organization.	66(33.0%)	44(22.0%)	24(12.0%)	16(8.0%)	0(0%)
Inconsistency hinders growth and sustainability in my organization.	98(49.0%)	38(19.0%)	26(13.0%)	10(5.0%)	0(0%)

Source: Field Survey Data, 2023

Table 9 revealed that 36 respondents representing 18.0% strongly agreed that their organization always experiences commonality among organizational members as a resulting of inconsistent communication from leaders and 76 respondents representing 38.0% also agreed to the claims. 38 respondents representing 19.0% disagreed to the claim and only 2 respondents representing 1.0% strongly disagreed to the claim. Also, 90 respondents representing 45.0% strongly agreed that their organization always experiences confusion and lack of direction due to inconsistent policies and 50 respondents representing 25.0% also agreed to the claims. 18 respondents representing 9.0% disagreed to the claim and 12 respondents representing 6.0% strongly disagreed to the claim. 32 respondents representing 16.0% strongly agreed that their organization is not sustainable due to irregularity and inconsistency in decision making and 76 respondents representing 38.0% also agreed to the claims. 38 respondents representing 19.0% disagreed to the claim and 30 respondents representing 15.0% strongly disagreed to the claim. 66 respondents representing 33.0% strongly agreed that inconsistency promotes growth in their organization and 44 respondents representing 22.0% also agreed to the claims. 24 respondents representing 12.0% disagreed to the claim and 16 respondents representing 8.0% strongly disagreed to the claim. 98 respondents representing 49.0% strongly agreed that inconsistency hinders growth and sustainability in their organization and 38 respondents representing 19.0% also agreed to the claims. 26 respondents representing 13.0% disagreed to the claim and

10 respondents representing 5.0% strongly disagreed to the claim. At this level, until statistically and scientifically tested, negative, positive or significant relationship can only be assumed but not claimed between each explanatory variable and the explained variable.

4.2.3 Accountability

The third objective was on the relationship between accountability and organizational sustainability in Trinity Polytechnic, Uyo, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria.

Table 10. Analysis of items and research constructs on evaluation of accountability

Research Statement/ Items	SA (5)	A (4)	D (3)	SD (2)	N(1)
My organizational is known for accountability through the development of a culture of responsibility and transparency.	30(15.0%)	60(30.0%)	58(29.0%)	24(12.0%)	0(0%)
My organization is reputed for accountability due to its implementation of regular checks and balances.	104(52.0%)	48(24.0%)	22(11.0%)	0(0.0%)	0(0%)
There are higher levels of trust and cooperation within teams in my organization due to accountability culture.	32(16.0%)	92(46.0%)	30(15.0%)	10(5.0%)	0(0%)
The increased efficiency and performance in my organization is due to proper accountability.	34(17.0%)	44(22.0%)	38(19.0%)	10(5.0%)	0(0%)
There are less unethical behaviors in my organization due to management's attention on accountability reports.	94(47.0%)	64(32.0%)	24(12.0%)	30(15.0%)	0(0%)

Source: Field Survey Data, 2023

Table 10 revealed that 30 respondents representing 15.0% strongly agreed that their organizational is known for accountability through the development of a culture of responsibility and transparency and 60 respondents representing 30.0% also agreed to the claims. 58 respondents representing 29.0% disagreed to the claim and 24 respondents representing 12.0% strongly disagreed to the claim. Also, 104 respondents representing 52.0% strongly agreed that their organization is reputed for accountability due to its implementation of regular checks and balances and 48 respondents representing 24.0% also agreed to the claims. 22 respondents representing 11.0% disagreed to the claim and no respondent strongly disagreed to the claim. 32 respondents representing 16.0% strongly agreed that there are higher levels of trust and cooperation within teams in their organization due to accountability culture and 92 respondents representing 46.0% also agreed to the claims. 30 respondents representing 15.0% disagreed to the claim and 10 respondents representing 5.0% strongly disagreed to the claim. 34 respondents representing 17.0% strongly agreed that the increased efficiency and performance in their organization is due to proper accountability and 44 respondents representing 22.0% also agreed to the claims. 38 respondents representing 19.0% disagreed to the claim and 10 respondents representing 5.0% strongly disagreed to the claim. 94 respondents representing 47.0% strongly agreed that there are less unethical behaviors in their organization due to management's attention on accountability reports and 64 respondents representing 32.0% also agreed to the claims. 24 respondents representing 12.0% disagreed to the claim and 30 respondents representing 15.0% strongly disagreed to the claim. At this level, until statistically and scientifically tested, negative, positive or significant relationship can only be assumed but not claimed between each explanatory variable and the explained variable.

4.2.4 Organizational Sustainability

The dependent variable was organizational sustainability in Trinity Polytechnic, Uyo, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria.

Table 11. Analysis of items and research constructs on organizational sustainability

Research Statement/ Items	SA (5)	A (4)	D (3)	SD (2)	N(1)
My organization is seen to be sustainable due to the fact that, it always meets the present needs of its staff and stakeholders.	60(30.0%)	56(28.0%)	39(18.0%)	2(1.0%)	0(0%)
There is a high level of economic and social growth and development in my organization.	104(52.0%)	48(24.0%)	8(4.0%)	6(3.0%)	0(0%)
My organization is environmentally friendly and sustainable for all staff and stakeholders.	36(18.0%)	102(51.0%)	10(5.0%)	8(4.0%)	0(0%)
My organization is reliable enough to meet the present and future needs of its staff and stakeholders.	108(54.0%)	36(18.0%)	44(22.0%)	10(5.0%)	0(0%)
My organization has a long-term commitment with its stakeholders.	68(34.0%)	62(31.0%)	20(10.0%)	16(8.0%)	0(0%)

Source: Field Survey Data, 2023

Table 11 revealed that 60 respondents representing 30.0% strongly agreed that their organization is seen to be sustainable due to the fact that, it always meets the present needs of its staff and stakeholders and 56 respondents representing 28.0% also agreed to the claims. 39 respondents representing 18.0% disagreed to the claim and 2 respondents representing 1.0% strongly disagreed to the claim. 104 respondents representing 52.0% strongly agreed that there is a high level of economic and social growth and development in their organization and 48 respondents representing 24.0% also agreed to the claims. 8 respondents representing 4.0% disagreed to the claim and 6 respondents strongly disagreed to the claim. 36 respondents representing 18.0% strongly agreed that their organization is environmentally friendly and sustainable for all staff and stakeholders and 102 respondents representing 51.0% also agreed to the claims. 10 respondents representing 5.0% disagreed to the claim and 8 respondents representing 4.0% strongly disagreed to the claim. 108 respondents representing 54.0% strongly agreed that their organization is reliable enough to meet the present and future needs of its staff and stakeholders and 36 respondents representing 18.0% also agreed to the claims. 44 respondents representing 22.0% disagreed to the claim and 10 respondents representing 5.0% strongly disagreed to the claim. 68 respondents representing 34.0% strongly agreed that their organization has a long-term commitment with its stakeholders and 62 respondents representing 31.0% also agreed to the claims. 20 respondents representing 10.0% disagreed to the claim and 16 respondents representing 8.0% strongly disagreed to the claim.

4.3 Descriptive Statistics

This analysis is conducted to assess the descriptive properties of the research variables in order to ascertain if the data possess requisite characteristics for statistical analysis. These analyses involve descriptive statistics such as the mean, standard deviation, minimum, maximum as well as skewness and kurtosis. This statistic discloses the characteristics of the research variables principally in terms of variance or closeness of the data points to the mean. The ultimate is to determine the degree of variability of the data away from the mean. A high variability indicates high degree of variance and high potential of non-normality of the data thus leading to unreliable estimate. It is desired that the dataset has low level of variability. Table 11 presents the result of this statistics.

Table 12. Descriptive Statistics Result

	N Statistic	Minimum Statistic	Maximum Statistic	Mean Statistic	Std. Deviation Statistic	Skewness Statistic	Std. Error	Kurtosis Statistic	Std. Error
Transparency	200	1	5	3.01	1.439	.231	.241	-1.385	.478
Inconsistency	200	1	5	3.53	1.029	-.252	.241	-.867	.478
Accountability	200	1	5	3.07	1.297	-.047	.241	-1.238	.478
Organizational sustainability	200	1	5	3.07	1.297	-.047	.241	-1.238	.478
Valid N (listwise)	200								

Source: Researcher's Computation (2023) from SPSS Output.

From the result in Table 12, all mean values fall in between the maximum and minimum values of 5 and 3.53 respectively and that is desirable. Again, the standard deviations values for all variables are less than 2, which indicate low variance and is desirable. This shows that the data points of the variables are clustered around the mean and is highly likely to be the true position of the opinions expressed and the parameters estimated with this data set is highly likely to have less or minimal error.

4.4 Test of Hypotheses

This section presents the test result of the hypotheses developed to guide the conduct of this study. This test was performed with simple regression statistics. The first hypothesis (H_{01}) was that transparency has no significant relationship with organizational sustainability in Trinity Polytechnic, Uyo, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria.

Table 13. Regression Results for hypothesis one

Dependent Variable Organizational sustainability	Coef.	Std. Error	t-stat	p-value
Model Parameters				
Const.	3.480	.248	14.018	.000
Transparency	.113	.074	2.0926	.033
Model Characteristics				
F-Stat	2.297			
R-Square	.093			
Adj. R ²	.073			
D-W Stat.	1.546			

Source: Researcher's Computation (2023) from SPSS Output.

The test of the null hypothesis (H_0) against the alternate hypothesis (H_1) is that H_0 is rejected if the calculated p-value is less than 0.05 (5%) level of significance. From the Table 12 above, since the calculated p-value of 0.033 is less than 0.05 (5%) level of significance, the researcher rejected the null hypothesis and accepted the alternative hypothesis, which states that transparency has a significant relationship with organizational sustainability in Trinity Polytechnic, Uyo, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria. A coefficient of 0.113 implies that transparency has a positive linear relationship with organizational sustainability. Also, as shown by the t-value of 2.926, this would mean that transparency led to 2.926% increase in organizational sustainability in Trinity Polytechnic, Uyo, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria. The f-stat value (2.297) which is significant at 1% level implies that the model returning this result is correct and valid. The R² value of 0.93 implies that the model explains a total of 93% of the variation in the dependent variable while 7% of the variation is explained by variables not included in the model.

The second hypothesis (H_{02}) was that inconsistency has no significant relationship with organizational sustainability in Trinity Polytechnic, Uyo, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria.

Table 14. Regression Results for hypothesis two

Dependent Variable Organizational sustainability	Coef.	Std. Error	t-stat	p-value
Model Parameters				
Const.	3.333	.319	10.452	.000
Inconsistency	.103	.022	4.6818	.000
Model Characteristics				
F-Stat	5.781			
R-Square	.118			
Adj. R ²	.083			
D-W Stat.	1.592			

Source: Researcher's Computation (2023) from SPSS Output.

The test of the null hypothesis (H_0) against the alternate hypothesis (H_1) is that H_0 is rejected if the calculated p-value is less than 0.05 (5%) level of significance. From the Table 13 above, since the calculated p-value of 0.000 is less than 0.05 (5%) level of significance, the researcher rejected the null hypothesis and accepted the alternative hypothesis, which states that inconsistency has a significant relationship with organizational sustainability in Trinity Polytechnic, Uyo, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria. A coefficient of 0.103 implies that inconsistency has a positive linear relationship with organizational sustainability. Also, as shown by the t-value of 4.6818, this would mean that inconsistency led to 4.6818% increase in organizational sustainability in Trinity Polytechnic, Uyo, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria. The f-stat value (5.781) which is significant at 1% level implies that the model returning this result is correct and valid. The R² value of 0.118 implies that the model explains a total of 11.8% of the variation in the dependent variable while 88.2% of the variation is explained by variables not included in the model.

The third hypothesis (H_{03}) was that accountability has no significant relationship with organizational sustainability in Trinity Polytechnic, Uyo, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria.

Table 15. Regression Results for hypothesis three

Dependent Variable	Coef.	Std. Error	t-stat	p-value
Organizational sustainability				
Model Parameters				
Const.	4.745	.315	15.051	.000
Accountability	.175	.082	2.13415	.031
Model Characteristics				
F-Stat	3.599			
R-Square	.035			
Adj. R ²	.026			
D-W Stat.	1.546			

Source: Researcher's Computation (2023) from SPSS Output.

The test of the null hypothesis (H_0) against the alternate hypothesis (H_1) is that H_0 is rejected if the calculated p-value is less than 0.05 (5%) level of significance. From the Table 14 above, since the calculated p-value of 0.031 is less than 0.05 (5%) level of significance, the researcher rejected the null hypothesis and accepted the alternative hypothesis, which states that accountability has a significant relationship with organizational sustainability in Trinity Polytechnic, Uyo, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria. A coefficient of 0.175 implies that accountability has a positive linear relationship with organizational sustainability. Also, as shown by the t-value of 2.13415, this would mean that accountability led to 2.13415% increase in organizational sustainability in Trinity Polytechnic, Uyo, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria. The f-stat value (3.599) which is significant at 1% level implies that the model returning this result is correct and valid. The R^2 value of 0.35 implies that the model explains a total of 35% of the variation in the dependent variable while 85% of the variation is explained by variables not included in the model.

5. DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS

In the first hypothesis, transparency maintained positive relationship with organizational sustainability as seen in the positive coefficient of 0.113. Based on the results, it was found that transparency has a significant relationship with organizational sustainability in Trinity Polytechnic, Uyo, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria. This finding is consistent with the finding of Darwish & Lakhtaria (2011) that transparency have a positive impact on organizational performance and sustainability, as it helps build trust with stakeholders and improve decision-making processes. In the second hypothesis, inconsistency maintained positive relationship with organizational sustainability in the second hypothesis as seen in the positive coefficient of 0.103. Based on the results, it was found that inconsistency has a significant relationship with organizational sustainability in Trinity Polytechnic, Uyo, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria. This finding is inconsistent with the finding of Bhuiyan & Siengthai (2013) that inconsistency within an organization can hinder growth and its sustainability, as it can lead to confusion and lack of direction. In the third hypothesis, accountability maintained positive relationship with organizational sustainability in the third hypothesis as seen in the positive coefficient of 0.175. Based on the results, it was found that accountability has a significant relationship with organizational sustainability in Trinity Polytechnic, Uyo, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria. This finding is consistent with the finding of Setiawan, Singh & Romijn (2017) that accountability as a tool of checks and balances, improves compliance with regulations and sustainability.

6. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The key objective of this study was to examine the relationship between credibility and organizational sustainability in Trinity Polytechnic, Uyo, Akwa Ibom State. The specific objectives of the research were to examine the relationship between transparency and organizational sustainability in Trinity Polytechnic, Uyo, Akwa Ibom State; examine the relationship between inconsistency and organizational sustainability in Trinity Polytechnic, Uyo, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria and examine the relationship between accountability and organizational sustainability in Trinity Polytechnic, Uyo, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria. Three hypotheses were formulated and tested in this study. Bearing in mind the nature of this study, the researcher employed the use of survey research design in which primary data was obtained through questionnaire administration. Data for this study was obtained from both primary and secondary sources. Primary data was obtained through a structured questionnaire. The questions are closed-ended, and directed to collect relevant data from the staff and students of Trinity Polytechnic, Uyo, Akwa Ibom State. Secondary sources were information from existing literatures such as relevant textbooks, internet source. The researcher employed tables and simple percentage method to analyze the research questions. However, the simple regression technique was used to test hypotheses. The findings of the study were summarized below:

- Transparency has a significant relationship with organizational sustainability in Trinity Polytechnic, Uyo, Akwa Ibom State.
- Inconsistency has a significant relationship with organizational sustainability in Trinity Polytechnic, Uyo, Akwa Ibom State.
- Accountability has a significant relationship with organizational sustainability in Trinity Polytechnic, Uyo, Akwa Ibom State.

6.1 Conclusion

The study examined the relationship between credibility and organizational sustainability in Trinity Polytechnic, Uyo, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria. All the independent variables were significant in explaining the changes in organizational sustainability. By implication, it was found that all the independent variables maintained positive and significant relationship with organizational sustainability in Trinity Polytechnic, Uyo, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria. This finding is in line with the finding of Nikolas, Arnold & Haring (2016) that an organizational sustainability reporting is perceived as more credible by stakeholders when the company is seen as having a long-term commitment to sustainability and engages in proactive communication with stakeholders. Based on the findings of this study, it was concluded that there is a positive and significant relationship between credibility and organizational sustainability in Trinity Polytechnic, Uyo, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria.

6.2 Recommendations

- Transparency policies should be continually enforced or implemented in Trinity Polytechnic, Uyo, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria as transparency and trust are essential tools in promoting organizational sustainability.
- Trinity Polytechnic should be consistent with the policies that encourages organizational sustainability and growth.
- Organizational accountability should be continually espoused by Trinity Polytechnic, Uyo, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria to drive growth and innovation.

7. REFERENCES

- Arena, M., & Marconato, G. (2020). Sustainability reporting and firms' economic performance: Evidence from Italy. *Sustainability*, 12(20), 8658.
- Berggren, E., & Bernstein, R. (2007). Organizational transparency drives company performance. *Journal of Management Development*, 26, 411-417.
- Bhuiyan, N. U., & Siengthai, S. (2013). Perceived organizational chaos and embeddedness: Implications for employee turnover

- intentions in Bangladesh. *The Journal of Developing Areas*, 47(2), 257-273.
- Centivany, A.L. (2016). Understanding organizational responses to innovative deviance: A case study of Hathitrust. PhD Thesis, University of Michigan.
- Chen, Y. S., Lai, S. B., & Wen, C. T. (2010). The influence of green innovation performance on corporate advantage in Taiwan. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 94(3), 353-361.
- Curran, M. A., Mann, M., & Norris, G. (2005). Life cycle environmental and economic decision making for sustainability. *Journal of Industrial Ecology*, 9(4), 21-36.
- Danker, M. (2013). Understanding stakeholder activism, managing transparency risk. In D. Crowther & G. Aras (Eds.), *The governance of risk (pp.33-72)*. Bradford, UK: Emerald Group.
- Darwish, A & Lakhtaria, K (2011). The Impact of the New Web 2.0 Technologies in Communication, Development, and Revolutions of Societies. *Journal of Advances in Information Technology*, Vol. 2, no. 4, November 2011. DOI:10.4304/jait.2.4.204-216.
- Elkington, J. (1994). Towards the sustainable corporation: Win-win business strategies for sustainable development. *California management review*, 36(2), 90-100.
- Field, A. P. (2005). *Discovering Statistics Using SPSS*, Sage Publications Inc.
- Florio, M., Pellegrin, J., & Sirtori, E. (2014). *Research intensive clusters and regional innovation systems: A case study of Mechatronics in Apulia*. Milan.
- Fung, A. (2013). Infotopia: Unleashing the democratic power of transparency. *Politics & Society*, 41, 183-212
- Gladwin, T. N., Kennelly, J. J., & Krause, T. S. (1995). Shifting paradigms for sustainable development: Implications for management theory and research. *Academy of management Review*, 20(4), 874-907.
- Huck, S. W. (2007). *Reading Statistics and Research*, United States of America, Allyn & Bacon.
- Jiang, Z., Henneberg, S. C. & Naude, P. (2011). Supplier relationship management in the construction industry: the effects of trust and dependence. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, 27(1), pp. 3-15.
- Kouzes, J. M. & Posner, B. Z. (2011). *Credibility*. 2nd ed. San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons.
- Lang, A., Schlauderer, S., & Narasimhan, R. (2017). Mitigating supply chain risks through sustainability practices: A study of the effects of sustainability practices on supplier financial performance. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 26(7), 893-907.
- Lukaszewski, J. E. (2020). What your CEO needs to know about reputation risk and crisis Management. *Studia Medioznawcze* 3:151- DOI:10.33077/uw.24511617.ms.2015.62.536.
- Maathuis, O., Rodenburg, J. & Sikkel, D. (2004). Credibility, Emotion or Reason? *Reputation Review*, 6(4), pp. 333-345.
- MacDougall, D. & Conrad, J. (2009). Credibility: your most important asset. *Nature biotechnology*, 27(10), pp. 1-3.
- McCroskey, J. C. & Young, T. J. (1981). Ethos and credibility: the construct and its measurement after three decades. *Central States Speech Journal*, Volume 32.
- Mills, K.E, Han, Z., Robbins J., & Weary D.M (2018). Institutional transparency improves public perception of lab animal technicians and support for animal research. *PlosOne*, 13(2), E0193262.
- Nikolas, A., Arnold, M., & Haring, N. (2016). What determines stakeholder response to corporations' sustainability reporting? The interface between symbolic and substantive features. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 133, 1075-1087.
- Poldner, K., Kolk, A., & Criado-Jimenez, I. (2018). Sustainable entrepreneurship, innovation, and business models: Integrative approaches and examples of transformative societal change. Routledge.
- Rawlins, B. (2009). Give the emperor a mirror: Toward developing a stakeholder measurement of organizational transparency. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 21, 71-99.
- Rehme, J. & Svensson, P. (2011). Credibility-driven entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship And Innovation*, 12(1), pp. 5-15.
- Schnackenberg, A.K., & Tomlinson, E.C (2014). Organizational transparency: A new perspective on managing trust in organization–Stakeholder relationships. *Journal of Management*, 42(7).
- Setiawan, A.D., Singh, R. & Romijn, H.A. (2017). Embedding accountability throughout innovation process in the green economy: The need for an innovative approach. In T. Taufik, I. Prabasari, I. A. Rineksane, R. Yaya, R. Widowati, R. Putra, S. Riyadi, P. Harsanto (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Sustainable Innovation*, 17, 147-158.
- Wehmeier, S., & Raaz, O. (2012). Transparency matters. The concept of organizational transparency in academic discourse. *Public Relation Inquiry*, 1, 337-366.
- Young, R. E. (2008). Environmental management systems and sustainability: contradictions and benefits. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 16(1), S1-S9.

APPENDIX 1

Please read carefully each of the statements below and tick () to indicate your agreement or disagreement to each item. Each item has to do with the level of green environmental management and community sustainability. The level or degree of your responses are: Strongly agree (SA), Agree (A), Disagree (D), Strongly Disagree (SD) and Neutral (N).

S/N	CREDIBILITY DIMENSION	SA	A	D	SD	N
A	Transparency					
1	My organization is very trusted for its transparency role in their operational relationship with its stakeholders.					
2	My organization is known for freely sharing information and encouraging their leaders to do the same.					
3	My organization's performance and sustainability are hinged on its effective transparent communication.					
4	My organization earns trust by its employees due to her clear and honest communication organizational goals and objectives.					
5	My organization is known to always promote a transparent working relationship with employees by providing honest feedback.					
B	Inconsistency					
6	My organization always experiences commonality among organizational members as a resulting of inconsistent communication from leaders.					
7	My organization always experiences confusion and lack of direction due to inconsistent policies.					
8	My organization is not sustainable due to irregularity and inconsistency in decision making.					
9	Inconsistency promotes growth in your organization.					
10	Inconsistency hinders growth and sustainability in my organization.					
C	Accountability					
11	My organization is known for accountability through the development of a culture of responsibility and transparency.					
12	My organization is reputed for accountability due to its implementation of regular checks and balances.					
13	There is higher levels of trust and cooperation within teams in my organization due to accountability culture.					
14	The increased efficiency and performance in my organization is due to proper accountability.					
15	There are less unethical behaviors in my organization due to management's attention on accountability reports.					
D	ORGANIZATIONAL SUSTAINABILITY DIMENSION					
16	My organization is seen to be sustainable due to the fact that, it always meets the present needs of its staff and stakeholders.					
17	There is a high level of economic and social growth and development in my organization.					
18	My organization is environmentally friendly and sustainable for all staff and stakeholders.					
19	My organization is reliable enough to meet the present and future needs of its staff and stakeholders.					
20	My organization has a long-term commitment with its stakeholders.					

Regression outputs for hypothesis one**Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	D-Wat Stat.
1	.151 ^a	.093	.073	1.066	1.546

a. Predictors: (Constant), Transparency

ANOVA^a

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	2.612	1	2.612	2.297	.133 ^b
	Residual	111.428	98	1.137		
	Total	114.040	99			

a. Dependent Variable: Organizational sustainability

b. Predictors: (Constant), Transparency

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	3.480	.248		14.018	.000
	Transparency	.113	.054	.151	2.0936	.033

a. Dependent Variable: Organizational sustainability

Regression outputs for hypothesis two**Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	D-Wat Stat.
1	.134 ^a	.118	.083	.946	1.592

a. Predictors: (Constant), Inconsistency

ANOVA^a

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	1.593	1	1.593	5.781	.185 ^b
	Residual	87.647	98	.894		
	Total	89.240	99			

a. Dependent Variable: Organizational sustainability

b. Predictors: (Constant), Inconsistency

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	3.333	.319		10.452	.000
	Inconsistency	.103	.022	.134	4.6818	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Organizational sustainability

Regression outputs for hypothesis three**Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	D-Wat Stat.
1	.188 ^a	.035	.026	1.035	1.546

a. Predictors: (Constant), Accountability

ANOVA^a

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	3.853	1	3.853	3.599	.061 ^b
	Residual	104.907	98	1.070		
	Total	108.760	99			

a. Dependent Variable: Organizational sustainability

b. Predictors: (Constant), Accountability

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	4.745	.315		15.051	.000
	Accountability	.175	.082	.188	2.1342	.031

a. Dependent Variable: Organizational sustainability