# THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TRUST, TURNOVER INTENTIONS AND EMOTIONS: AN APPLICATION

A. Emin SERİN<sup>1</sup>
M.Onur BALKAN<sup>2</sup>

#### **Abstract**

Managerial leaders and directors are required to succeed the method of "sense" and "emotion" very well, to achieve organizational aims (Lee, 2002). Organizations need to manage all the emotions and feelings and concepts that affect persons health and performance (Gross, 1999). Business life dealing with this issue has increased in seriousness because, the effect of emotions in decision making cleared with academic studies. There is a need to find the path to the correct leadership of emotions. Emotions in the organization help to identify thoughts about the presence and desire to work (Jackson, 2006). Emotions provide information on what causes, and how it is done. The main purpose of this study, which should be considered a descriptive survey in the general sense, is to investigate the relationship between emotional expressions, trust and turnover intentions. It is hypothesized that the use of emotional expressions will affect the trust and turnover intentions. Two different surveys were used in order to measure and assess the emotions expressions, trust and turnover intentions. The survey conducted on 200 employees of the public sector institution. Data, obtained from questionnaires analyzed through the SPSS statistical packaged software. The results show that, there is a positive correlation between positive expressions and trust and turnover intentions. In addition, we couldn't found any relation between trust and turnover intentions.

Key Words: Trust, Co-worker trust, Turnover intentions, Emotions

#### Introduction

Apart from the general assumption that trust is an important lubricant of the social system and a facilitator of coordinated action among individuals, several important benefits for teams and organizations have been associated with trust (Costa, 2003, 609). Researchers argue that if an employee is in a trusting relationship, then the employee feels safe and positive, which afterward leads to higher job satisfaction. On the other hand, if there is distrust, an employee is likely to feel worry and negative effect, which results in lower job satisfaction (Knoll, Gill, 2010). Trust has been connected with perceptions of equality and precision in performance evaluations, as well as playing an important role in empowerment both of which contribute to lower levels of disagreement and augmented worker performance (Ristig, 2009, 660). Organizational effectiveness was perceived to depend on the level of organizational trust. Trust was related with useful decision-making as a result of sharing ideas, information, and feelings, organizational reliability, and increased productivity (Laschinger, 2002, 64).

The literature suggests that one antecedent to trust is employee perception whether management is competent and credible. This character-based perception of trust suggests that employees make inferences about their leader's character, such as integrity or dependability, which in turn affects their level of trust (Reychav, Sharkie, 2010, 231). The literature suggests that communicating and modeling important values and encouraging staff to adopt them and pursue a shared purpose, were practices that were likely to be antecedents to the building of trust, because management's moral values are likely to be reflected in their company's human resource policies and practices. Developing a moral and value driven collective vision aligns leader and employee actions and focuses them on the achievement of shared goals. Under this influence, employees may view leaders in an idealized way, causing them to identify with the

\_

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Asst.Prof. University of Turkish Aeronautical Association, Ankara, Turkey eminserin@hotmail.com

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Asst.Prof., Afyon Kocatepe University, Bayat Vocational School, Afyon, Turkey, onur.balkan@gmail.com

leader, trust the leader and be inspired by the vision of what can be achieved through extrapersonal effort. These authors argument is that employees are motivated to perform beyond expectations through employee trust and respect in their leader (Reychav, Sharkie, 2010, 231). Trust is a key element in an individual's decision to share knowledge (Gardener, 2003; Dirks and Ferrin, 2001) and in high trust environments, individuals and groups may be predisposed to share knowledge and act cooperatively. High trust situations also allow individuals to share their ideas without the downside risk of having these ideas subjected to ridicule (Reychav, Sharkie, 2010, 232).

There are environmental and physical factors in organizations that you can or cannot express your feelings freely. However, the repression of emotions does not cause feelings to vanish, but rather an increase in aggressive. Therefore, the feelings need to manage and to cope with. In social life organization feelings means that, in distinguish to the suppression of feelings, understand them and match the feeling to situations to take advantage of it efficiently. These people who have the skills to manage their feelings are more creative (Goleman, 2000, 106). Feelings are also concerned with social aptitude because it means verbal and nonverbal communication with other people, working in a group etc. (Goleman, 2006, 73). Carussco and Salovey listed properties of administrators, who are capable or incapable of managing his own and others feelings (Carussco ve Salovey, 2010). When probing the past assessment of emotion in one dimension, recent studies have suggested that emotion construction occurred independently in two basic dimensions. These dimensions are positive and negative feelings (Gençöz, 2000, 46). Positive and negative emotions in the workplace play a key role in the decision-making and organizational conflicts (Kafetsios, 2007, 72).

# **Literature Review**

# 1. Trust in Organizations

Over the past 15 years or so, "trust" has attracted enormous interest within the social sciences. The word "trust" dates back to 13th century Middle English and has its etymological roots in older expressions denoting faithfulness and loyalty, but the phenomenon of trust is probably as old as the earliest forms of human association (Möllering et al, 2004). Although scholars agree on the magnitude of trust in sustaining effectiveness, research on this topic has been greatly affected by the lack of agreement in defining this concept (Costa, 2004, 605). In the literature on intra- and interorganizational trust, there is a outstanding diversity in conceptualizations of trust. However, central to most definitions are the notions of risk and vulnerability (Stahl, et.al, 2006, 71).

Trust is: One party's willingness to be vulnerable to another party based on the belief that the latter party is competent, open, concerned and reliable (Mishra, 1996. 265). Mayer et al. (1995, p. 712) defined trust as: the willingness of a party to be vulnerable to the actions of another party based on the expectation that the other will perform a particular action important to the trustor, irrespective of the ability to monitor or control that other party. Another common notion is that trust is influenced by past experiences and chances of future interactions, both relevant within organizations. Expectations of others' beneficial actions will be enhanced by prior experiences of such behavior (Bijlsma, Bunt, 2003, 642). We consider trust as a decision under risk, where the risk stems from the possibility of opportunistic behavior by alter. The trust is in the intention: ego trusts alter, who is capable of honoring trust but may choose not to. You trust in the intention of your friend to return the book he has borrowed (Snijders, Keren, 2001,132). Trust is an assessment of subjective probability about the actions of other people, without being able to control or evaluate the result. To put it another way it is a form of confidence based less on intensity and consistency of feeling and more on evidence (O'Brien, 1995, 118). Trust enables action without full information. It fills

in informational gaps in our calculation about others and the future, replacing detailed but bordered rational computation with judgment, perception and feeling. Trust means that you do not have to know everything to act. It enables individuals and organizations to take the continuity of social order for granted and so help them deal with the future (Norris, 2007, 141). Various studies have provided different concepts of trust. Trust relation implies the participation of at least two parties, a trustor and a trustee. The trustor is the party who places him or herself in a vulnerable situation under uncertainty. The trustee is the party on whom the trust is placed, who has the opportunity to take advantage of the trustor's vulnerability (Laeequddin et al, 2010)

When organizations embark on initiatives in order to make an important leap to higher levels of quality and profit, they usually begin with programs such as total quality management, ISO 9000 and Six Sigma. But these attempts often fall short of the expected results because of flaws in the foundation of trust upon which all change efforts must be based. By remaining focused on plans and processes alone, many managers are very slow to realize the importance of trust and are hesitant in their efforts to address it (Ertürk, 2008, 464). Trust involves the capability to delegate responsibility so that the own area of responsibility is reduced, hereby creating free capacities for other tasks. A trusting partner assumes to receive a good offer or a fair deal (Ritter, Walter, 2008, 134). Although the importance of co-worker or peer trust has been acknowledged (Ferres et al., 2004), the matter of its effect has not yet received systematic theoretical attention.

# 1.1. Co-Worker Trust

The success of modern organization closely related to their ability to promote and manage effective team working (Erdem, 2003, 229). A large number of studies have shown that trust between members has a positive impact on mutual support, teamwork, attitude, communication, innovation, psychological contract, knowledge transfer and conflict management, employees behavior, group cohesion, decision fairness, organizational citizenship behavior, organizational efficiency, job satisfaction and other relationship (Wang, Lu, 2012, 129). Trusting a supervisor, employees feel vulnerable because supervisors have substantial influence over resource allocation and thus are in a position to make decisions that have a considerable impact on the subordinates. For instance, subordinates must rely on their supervisor for work assignments, performance evaluations, and opportunities for promotion. As a result, it is anticipated that when trusting a supervisor, employees might be particularly concerned with whether or not their supervisor is friendly, caring, and helpful, and thus high in benevolence; and consistent, credible, and true to their word, and thus high in integrity (Knoll, Gill, 2011, 316) Trends in the modern workplace, such as decentralization and the popularity of work teams, require an increased level of interaction and task interdependence among peers at work. These work arrangements increase employees' vulnerability to peers, because such situations require the greater cooperation of peers to complete work tasks and might also require the sharing of sensitive or personal information (Knoll, Gill, 2011, 316). Co-worker trust concerns confidence that one's colleagues are competent and will act in a just, dependable and ethical manner. It assumes that co-workers will support their peers and will not take advantage of them by preservation information. Co-worker trust also leads employees to act on the basis that they have confidence in the words and actions of their peers (Ferres, Connel, Travaglione, 2004, 610). When developing an instrument that measured trust in management and trust in peers, Cook and Wall (1980) found that job satisfaction also had a positive relationship with trust at the peer level, as did organizational identification and organizational involvement (Ferres, Connel, Travaglione, 2004,610).

## 2. Turnover Intentions

While economists have generally not examined turnover intentions, there are many studies of the determinants of turnover intentions in organizational behavior and social psychology (Smyth et al., 2009, 192). Employee turnover intention has been a significant matter for management for many years (Devrimci, Çiçekli, 2013,158). Employee turnover is defined as the cessation of membership in an organization by an individual who received monetary compensation from the organization (Mobley, 1982, 10). According to Macnall and friends (2010), individuals experiencing more positive emotions about their work should experience higher job satisfaction and lower turnover intentions. Highly skilled personnel have a strong tendency to leave their current employer to work for another organization. Turnover of highly killed staff members means that companies incur substantial costs associated with recruiting and re-skilling, and hidden costs associated with difficulties completing projects and disruptions in team (Chen, 2008, 23). Researchers typically differentiate two types of negative turnover - voluntary and involuntary. Voluntary turnover is initiated by the employee, i.e., an employee quits the organization, while involuntary turnover is initiated by the organization, i.e., an employee is "laid off" due to downsizing. While both forms of turnover are unwelcome, voluntary turnover is potentially more challenging for organizations (Michel, 2007, 40). The relationship between training and development has been developed in the literature but contradictory outcomes described in literature defining the part of training and its impacts on employee turnover creates the complicated relationship. For example the low rate of training programs in organizations may lead to poor job performance and higher employee turnover rate. On other side, the organizations which have proper training program for the development of their employees, enjoying high success ratio and lower level of employee turnover. Employees might feel grateful to show greater commitment and less encouragement to leave the organization (Jehanzeb et al, 2013, 84).

## 3. Emotions

Organizational leaders and managers are required to manage the process of "feeling" and "emotion" very well, to achieve organizational objectives (Lee, 2002: 3). Organizations need to manage all the emotions and feelings and concepts that affect individual health and performance (Gross, 1999:551). Business life dealing with this issue has increased in seriousness because, the effect of emotions in decision making cleared with academic studies. There is a need to find the path to the correct leadership of emotions (Baltas, 2006: 11). Emotions in the organization help to identify thoughts about the presence and desire to work (Jackson, 2006:185-186). Emotions provide information on what causes, and how it is done. Suppress feelings prevents the achievement of this information. Most people hear discomfort about understand their own moods and manage the issue in a positive way. They deny or suppress their feelings from time to time (Barutçugil, 2004: 81). There are various reasons for this. To be "to the desired structure, the appropriate person" in organizations or in the social life, feelings of the individual shaped by teachers, managers, bosses and so on, starting from the beginning of school years. Apart from this, the individual took place in military or organizations that he could not express his feelings and more stringent rules applied (Stearns, 1986:3). There are environmental and physical factors in organizations that you can or cannot express your feelings freely (Wassermann, 2000:23). However, the suppression of emotions does not cause feelings to disappear, but rather an increase in violent. Therefore, the feelings need to manage and to cope with. In social life managing feelings means that, in contrast to the suppression of feelings, understand them and match the feeling to situations to take advantage of it efficiently. These people who have the skills to manage their feelings are more productive (Goleman, 2000: 73). Feelings are also concerned with social intelligence because it means verbal and nonverbal communication with other people, working in a group etc.

(Goleman, 2006: 106-109). Carussco and Salovey listed properties of administrators, who are capable or incapable of managing his own and others feelings (Carusso ve Salovey, 2010:107).

# **Development of Hypotheses**

Emotional expressions trust and turnover intentions are topics of particular interest to organizations. This study aims to link emotional expressions trust and turnover intentions.

H1: There is a positive correlation between co-worker trust and positive emotional expressions.

H2: There is a positive correlation between trust in management and positive emotional expressions

H3: There is a positive correlation between turnover intentions and positive emotional expressions.

H4: There is a negative correlation between trust and turnover intentions.

## Method

In this research we aim to find the relationship between trust, turnover intentions and emotions. To test the assumption, tree scales were conducted. The contributors in the current study comprised 200 employees from a public institution in Turkey. The institution included nearly 400 employees completely and participants were selected arbitrarily. Questionnaires were spread by the researcher to every participant in different sessions in all of the institution. When the returned questionnaires were examined, 32 were invalid. As a result, a total of 168 valid responses were used in the research. Data produced in this study were collected by survey. The survey consisted of three measures. In the first part questions about the trust in general and co-worker trust levels of employees; in the other two parts questions designed to measure turnover intentions and emotional expressions were asked. Trust and co-worker trust and turnover intentions scale was adopted from various researchers: mcAllister (1995) ,Larzelere and Huston (1980), Shockley-Zalabak et al. (2000), cordero 2009, jenkis 1993, kranzs et al 1995, chui, francesco 2002. The measure included 47 items, each item was answered via a five-point Likert scale ranging from "1=strongly disagree" to "5=strongly agree." In the present study, the Cronbach's a coefficient for the scale was .928. Emotional expressions were measured by a scale taken from King and Emmon (1990), the translation and adaptation of the scale to Turkish was made by Kuzucu(2011). The measure included 15 items, each item was answered via a seven-point Likert scale ranging from "1=strongly disagree" to "5=strongly agree." In the present study, the Cronbach's a coefficient for the scale was .821. To ensure the validity and reliability of the study variables, explanatory factor analysis was conducted by using SPSS software.

The emotional expression scale yielded one factor upon factor analysis. The factor named "positive", and it explained 68.07% of the variance. The trust and turnover intentions measure produced five factors upon factor analysis. The first factor named "Co-worker trust", explained 22.71% of the total variance. The second factor was named "Trust in management", and it explained 19.54% of the variance. "Intention to leave", the third factor with a variance of 13.87 %, was followed by "Competence" (12.18%), and "Communication" (9.40%). The factors all together explained 77.72% of the variance. KMO Bartlett's Test of Sphericity was .741.

| Compo | onent           |                     |                    |               |             |       |
|-------|-----------------|---------------------|--------------------|---------------|-------------|-------|
|       | Co-worker trust | Trust in management | Intention to leave | Competence Co | mmunication | Postv |
| S30   | .913            |                     |                    |               |             |       |
| S29   | .903            |                     |                    |               |             |       |
| S31   | .868            |                     |                    |               |             |       |
| S33   | .810            |                     |                    |               |             |       |
| S39   | .769            |                     |                    |               |             |       |
| S18   |                 | .791                |                    |               |             |       |
| S15   |                 | .790                |                    |               |             |       |
| S21   |                 | .788                |                    |               |             |       |
| S19   |                 | .732                |                    |               |             |       |
| S14   |                 | .730                |                    |               |             |       |
| S23   |                 | .730                |                    |               |             |       |
| S44   |                 |                     | .939               |               |             |       |
| S45   |                 |                     | .931               |               |             |       |
| S43   |                 |                     | .898               |               |             |       |
| S26   |                 |                     |                    | .829          |             |       |
| S40   |                 |                     |                    | .815          |             |       |
| S41   |                 |                     |                    | .729          |             |       |
| TT    |                 |                     |                    |               | .771        |       |
| S2    |                 |                     |                    |               | .754        |       |
| S58   |                 |                     |                    |               | 3.          | 356   |
| S59   |                 |                     |                    |               | 3.          | 337   |
| S51   |                 |                     |                    |               | .7          | 780   |

Table 1 Factor Analysis

Table 2 presents the mean and standard deviations of all measures and the correlation coefficients between the variables. These results indicated statistically a positive correlation between Co-Worker trust and positive emotions (r=.201, p<.01), a positive correlation between trust in management and positive emotions (r=.163, p<.05), a positive correlation between intention to leave and positive emotions (r=-.242, p<.01).

| Correlations |                     |        |                   |        |       |       |                   |  |  |  |  |
|--------------|---------------------|--------|-------------------|--------|-------|-------|-------------------|--|--|--|--|
|              |                     | 1      | 2                 | 3      | 4     | 5     | 6                 |  |  |  |  |
| 1            | Pearson Correlation | 1      | .000              | .000   | .000  | .000  | .201**            |  |  |  |  |
|              | Sig. (2-tailed)     |        | 1.000             | 1.000  | 1.000 | 1.000 | .009              |  |  |  |  |
| 2            | Pearson Correlation | .000   | 1                 | .000   | .000  | .000  | .163 <sup>*</sup> |  |  |  |  |
|              | Sig. (2-tailed)     | 1.000  |                   | 1.000  | 1.000 | 1.000 | .034              |  |  |  |  |
| 3            | Pearson Correlation | .000   | .000              | 1      | .000  | .000  | .242**            |  |  |  |  |
|              | Sig. (2-tailed)     | 1.000  | 1.000             |        | 1.000 | 1.000 | .002              |  |  |  |  |
| 4            | Pearson Correlation | .000   | .000              | .000   | 1     | .000  | 077               |  |  |  |  |
|              | Sig. (2-tailed)     | 1.000  | 1.000             | 1.000  |       | 1.000 | .323              |  |  |  |  |
| 5            | Pearson Correlation | .000   | .000              | .000   | .000  | 1     | 055               |  |  |  |  |
|              | Sig. (2-tailed)     | 1.000  | 1.000             | 1.000  | 1.000 |       | .481              |  |  |  |  |
| 6            | Pearson Correlation | .201** | .163 <sup>*</sup> | .242** | 077   | 055   | 1                 |  |  |  |  |
|              | Sig. (2-tailed)     | .009   | .034              | .002   | .323  | .481  |                   |  |  |  |  |

<sup>\*\*.</sup> Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

**Table 3 Correlations** 

<sup>\*.</sup> Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Thus, hypotheses 1: (There is a positive correlation between co-worker trust and positive emotional expressions.) and hypotheses 2: (There is a positive correlation between trust in management and positive emotional expressions), hypotheses 3: (There is a positive correlation between turnover intentions and positive emotional expressions) were accepted. Hypotheses 4: (There is a negative correlation between trust and turnover intentions), was rejected.

#### Conclusion

One of the objectives of the present study was to fill the gap the literature of emotion and emotional expressions in correlations among trust and turnover intentions. These results indicated statistically a positive correlation between trust (co-worker trust) and positive emotions (r=.201, p<.01), a positive correlation between trust in management and positive emotions (r=.163, p<.05), a positive correlation between intention to leave and positive emotions (r=.242, p<.01).

We expected to find statistically significant correlations between more variables. The main finding of this study is that the emotional expressions have positive correlation between trust and turnover intentions. We can consider "positive expression" has a positive effect on "coworker trust". On the other hand we can consider "positive expression" also has a positive impact on "trust in management" and "intention to leave". In the current study we expected to find positive emotional expressions has a significant effect on trust level and intentions to leave. The findings showed that one positive impression management factor has a positive correlation between trust and turnover intentions. Results also showed that we had a significant evidence of positive attitudes in work environment effects relationships between management and among the employees. Positive attitudes towards employees also effects their intention to leave

Without any doubt, these findings are limited by the sample and the assessment instruments used in the present study. This research conducted on public institution employees in Turkey; the findings might not be transferable to other organizations. Thus, it is recommended that further researches can be conducted on different sectors and also in different countries for the generalizability of the results. The fact that the present sample is composed of only 200 personnel is another drawback of this study.

#### References

Baltaş, Zuhal (2006), Duygusal Zekâ, İstanbul: Remzi Kitapevi.

Barutçugil, İsmet (2004), Organizasyonlarda Duyguların Yönetimi, İstanbul: Kariyer Yayınları.

Bijlsma, Katinka M., Gerhard G. van de Bunt, (2003), Antecedents of trust in managers: a "bottom up" approach, Personnel Review, Vol. 32 Iss: 5 pp. 638 - 664

Chen, Nan-Fu, (2008), Causal Relationship Analysis Between Leadership Behavior, Organizational Commitment, Job Satisfaction, And Turnover Intentions For Employees Of College Athletic Departments In Taiwan, United States Sports Academy, Doctoral Dissertation

Costa, Ana Cristina, (2003), Work team trust and effectiveness, Personnel Review, Vol. 32 No. 5, pp. 605-622

Devrimci, Aylin Boztok, Elif Çiçekli, (2013), A Qualitative Study on the Antecedents of Turnover Intentions in A Turkish Company, The Journal of American Business Review, Cambridge, Vol. 1, Num. 2, pp:158-164

Erdem, Ferda, (2003), Optimal Trust and Teamwork: from groupthink to team think, Work Study, Vol:52, Number: 5, pp:229-233

Ertürk, Alper, (2008), A trust-based approach to promote employees' openness to organizational change in

- Turkey, International Journal of Manpower, Vol. 29 Iss: 5 pp. 462 483
- Ferres, Natalie, Julia Connel, Anthony Travaglione, (2004), Co-worker trust as a social catalyst for constructive employee attitudes, Journal of Managerial Psychology, Vol. 19 No. 6, pp. 608-622
- Gençöz, Tülin (2000), "Pozitif ve Negatif Duygu Ölçeği Geçerlilik ve Güvenirlik Çalışması", Türk Psikoloji Dergisi, 2000, Cilt: 15, Sayı: 46.
- Goleman, Daniel (2000), "Duygusal Yeterlilik", Executive Excellence, Ocak 2000, s.21.
- Goleman, Daniel (2006), Sosyal Zekâ, İnsan İlişkilerinin Yeni Bilimi, İstanbul: Varlık Yayınları.
- Gross, J.J.(1999), Emotion Regulation: Past, present, future. Cognition and Emotion.
- Jackson, Paul (2006), Developments in Work and Organizational Psychology: Implications for International Business.p.185-186
- Jehanzeb, Khawaja, Anwar Rasheed & Mazen F. Rasheed, (2013), Organizational Commitment and Turnover Intentions: Impact of Employee's Training in Private Sector of Saudi Arabia, International Journal of Business and Management; Vol. 8, No. 8, pp:79-90
- Kafetsios, Konstantinos (2007), "Emotional Intelligence and Emotion Regulation on Affect at Work and Job Satisfaction, Work Organization and Emotion." p.72
- Kuzucu, Yaşar (2011), Adaptation of the Emotional Expression Questionnaire: Validity and Reliability Studies
- Laeequddin, Mohammed, B.S. Sahay, Vinita Sahay, K. Abdul Waheed, (2010), Measuring trust in supply chain partners' relationships, Measuring Business Excellence, Vol. 14 Iss: 3 pp. 53 69
- Laschinger, Heather K. Spence, Joan Finegan and Judith Shamian, (2002), The Impact Of Workplace Empowerment, Organizational Trust On Staff Nurses' Work Satisfaction And Organizational Commitment, Advances in Health Care Management, Volume 3, pages 59-85.
- Larzelere, C.R. and Huston, T.L. (1980), "The dyadic trust scale: toward understanding interpersonal trust in close relationships", Journal of Marriage and the Family, Vol. 42 3, August, pp. 595-604.
- Lee, David (2002), How Employee emotions affects your organization's ability to complete
- McAllister, D.J. (1995), "Affect- and cognition-based trust as foundations for interpersonal cooperation in organizations", Academy of Management Journal, Vol. 38, pp. 24-59.
- Macnall, Laurel A., Aline D. Masuda, Jessica M. Nicklin, (2010), Flexible Work Arrangements, Job Satisfaction, and Turnover Intentions: The Mediating Role of Work-to-Family Enrichment, The Journal of Psychology, 144(1), 61–81
- Michel, John W., (2007), Investigating The Impact Of Climate Perceptions And Employee Self-Efficacy On Customer Service Behaviors And Turnover Intentions: A Social Exchange Perspective, University at Albany, State University of New York, School of Business Organizational Studies Program, Doctoral Dissertation
- Mishra, A. (1996), "Organizational response to crisis", in Kramer, R.M. and Tyler, T.R. (Eds), Trust in Organisations: Frontiers of Theory and Research, Sage Publications, London, p:256
- Mobley, W. H. (1982). Employee turnover: Causes, consequences, and control. Reading: Addison-Wesley.
- Möllering, Guido, Reinhard Bachmann and Soo Hee Lee, (2004), Understanding organizational trust foundations, constellations, and issues of operationalisation, Journal of Managerial Psychology Vol. 19 No. 6, pp. 556-570
- Norris, Nigel, (2007), Evaluation and Trust, Dilemmas of Engagement: Evaluation and the New Public Management Advances in Program Evaluation, Volume 10, 139–153
- O'Brien, Rita Crauise, (1995), "Employee involvement in performance improvement: a consideration of tacit knowledge, commitment and trust", Employee Relations, Vol. 17 Iss: 3 pp. 110 120
- Reychav, Iris, Rob Sharkie, (2010),"Trust: an antecedent to employee extra-role behavior", Journal of Intellectual Capital, Vol. 11 Iss: 2 pp. 227 247
- Ristig, Kyle, (2009), The impact of perceived organizational support and trustworthiness on trust, Management Research News, Vol. 32 Iss: 7 pp. 659 669
- Ritter, Thomas, Achim Walter, (2008), Functions, Trust, And Value In Business Relationships, Creating and

#### Bilgi Ekonomisi ve Yönetimi Dergisi / 2014 Cilt: IX Sayı: II

- Managing Superior Customer Value Advances in Business Marketing and Purchasing, Volume 14, 129–146
- Salovey, Peter, CARUSO, David, (2010), Yönetimde Duygusal Zekâ, (cev. S.Kaymak), İstanbul: Crea Yayıncılık
- Shockley-Zalabak, P., Ellis, K. and Winograd, G. (2000), "Organizational trust: what it means, why it matters", Organization Development Journal, Vol. 18 No. 4, pp. 35-48.
- Smyth, Russel, Qingguo Zhai and Xiaoxu Li, (2009), Determinants of turnover intentions among Chinese off farm migrants, Econ Change Restruct, 42, pp:189–209
- Snijder, Chiris, Gideon Keren, (2001), Do you trust? Whom do you trust? When do you Trust?, Advances in Group Processes, Volume 18, pages 129-160.
- Stahl ,Gunter K., Chei Hwee Chua and Amy L. Pablo, (2006), Antecedents Of Target Firm Members' Trust In The Acquiring Firm's Management: A Decision-Making Simulation, Advances in Mergers and Acquisitions, Volume 5, 69–89
- Stearns, P.Z.(1986), Anger: The Struggle For Emotional Control In America's History. Chicago: University Of Chicago Press.
- Wang, Hongli, Yunbo Lu, (2012),"Trust governance based on active interpersonal strategy", Nankai Business Review International, Vol. 3 Iss: 2 pp. 128 144
- Wasserman, V.Rafaeli (2000), Aesthetic Symbols as Emotional Cues: Sage Publications.