



European Journal of Educational Management

Volume 4, Issue 1, 25 – 33.

ISSN: 2642-2344

<https://www.eujem.com/>

Organizational Trust Perception and Innovative Behaviours of Teachers

Selcuk Demir* 
Şırnak University, TURKEY

Received: January 11, 2020 • Revised: April 6, 2021 • Accepted: May 20, 2021

Abstract: In this research, it has been aimed to determine the relationship between teachers' perception of organizational trust and innovative behaviours. The relational survey model was used in this study. The universe of the research has been constituted teachers in Şırnak province. The sample of the study has been formed of 151 teachers working in 35 schools, which were detachedly determined from the study universe. The data of the research have been gathered by "Individual Knowledge Form", "Organizational Trust Scale" and "Innovative Behaviour Scale". Descriptive analyses, correlation, reliability analysis and regression analyses have been performed to the data by the help of SPSS programme. Results of the regression analyses showed that participant teachers' perception of organizational trust significantly predicts their innovative behaviour. While trust in administrator and trust in shareholders dimensions of organizational trust predict innovative behaviour of teachers, on the other hand, trust in colleagues dimension doesn't predict teachers' innovative behaviours significantly. For school administrators who would like to encourage teachers to exhibit innovative behaviours, it would be beneficial to keep the perception of organizational trust at school at high levels.

Keywords: *Organizational trust, innovative behaviour, administrator, teacher.*

To cite this article: Demir, S. (2021). Organizational trust perception and innovative behaviours of teachers. *European Journal of Educational Management*, 4(1), 25-33. <https://doi.org/10.12973/eujem.4.1.25>

Introduction

Organizations are constituted to satisfy the needs and expectations of the society. Organizations that cannot comply with the changes in the needs and expectations of the society lose their efficiency and disappear their lives by getting out of date. Organizations must always refresh themselves not to lose their functionality (Basaran, 1982; Genc, 2012).

Innovation is a prerequisite for quality, efficiency and flexibility in organizations and is crucial for the permanency of organizational life (Bulbul, 2013). The cause of the innovation and competitiveness of organizations is the talent of their employees to produce and perform these innovative solutions (Anser et al., 2020; Dorenbosch et al., 2005). So as for organizations not to wear off, the knowledge, skills and attitudes of their employees should not be outdated. It is expected employees to not only renew themselves but also contribute to the innovation of their organizations. Since it requires new skills, knowledge and skills, renewal is a very hard process (Basaran, 1982). It is essential to conduct the innovation process eloquently. Individuals who are against innovation in the organization should be convinced to open up to this situation. Supportive and promotive behaviours should be displayed for the supporters of innovation (Genc, 2012). Because innovation elicits many circumstances such as uncertainty, hardship and distrust (Basaran, 1982). A significant issue here is to specify the factors that will encourage and support teachers to adopt innovative behaviors and encourage teachers to adopt innovations. Barker (2001) has expressed that the innovation process will cover many challenges and its outcomes may be unpredictable. Thereby, experiencing uncertainty and difficulties in this process may come into question for teachers. Duran and Saracoglu (2009) have clarified that uncertainty restricts people's movements and causes them anxiety. It should be obviated that this situation conduces to the restriction of productive thought and the innovation view in teachers. The significance of creating a trustful atmosphere where attendance in the decision process is backed up, ideas are appreciated, peace is sensed, relationships are healthy and it is easier to take risks comes into prominence in this context (McAllister, 1995; Rousseau et al., 1998). The more trust perception in organization, the more innovative behaviour and organizational performance will be (Celik et al., 2011; Moore et al., 1987).

* Correspondence:

Selcuk Demir, Şırnak University, Şırnak, Turkey. ✉ selcukdemirs3@gmail.com



Literature review

Organizational Trust

Trust or lack of trust is a crucial overstressed issue in organizations (Simsarian Webber, 2002). It can be encountered with many various definitions of trust. Krot and Lewicka (2012) have identified trust as the willingness of one side to remain defenceless against the actions of other side. However, Lewicki et al. (1998) have depicted the trust as the positive expectation toward the actions of others. When the definitions of reliance are analyzed, it can be noticed that trust is an affective situation between people. Moreover, if the individuals count on, they will consent to the wishes of others and think that the behaviors the others will exhibit will be beneficial for themselves (Hosmer, 1995).

The existence of a safe area within the organization facilitates employees to act in cooperation and solidarity to achieve individual and organizational goals (Mayer et al., 1995). Organizational trust is the generalization of interpersonal trust in the organization to the organization (Zaheer et al., 1998). Yilmaz (2006) has studied organizational trust in three ways as trust in administrators, colleagues and shareholders. Trust in administrator is the dependence of the teachers in the managerial activities of their administrators. Trust in colleagues is teachers' belief in the honesty and good intention of other co-workers. Trust in shareholders is the reliance of teachers in the stakeholders (students, parents) of the organization.

The roles of managers are extremely vital in building up trust. Deluga (1994) has indicated that whether the manager displays a fair and consistent approach in her statements, decisions and practices or not affects the trust perception that will emanate in the organization. The trust of employees in their managers has been generalized to the whole organization. As a consequence of this situation, the organizational trust level of employees will be in the ascendent (Tan & Tan, 2000).

Although it has been known that the manager role is terrific level for the constitution of trust, the participation and support of not only the manager but also all attendees in the organization have been necessitated (Cufaude, 1999). Furthermore, an effective communication atmosphere, nurturing of the members, subsidiarity and interiorization of ethical values are emphatic (Gilbert & Tang, 1998).

Innovative Behavior

Innovative behavior comprises of all process including propounding new ideas and putting these ideas into practice (Sezgin et al., 2015; Zhou, 2003). Innovativeness is in key aspect in effectuation entrepreneurship and getting a competitive edge for organizations (Dess & Lumpkin, 2005). Also, it is a process that creates resources to positively affect customer delight (Saruhan & Yildiz, 2014).

Successful innovativeness hinges upon invention, creativeness and consolidation. Invention is to exhibit something (Kreitner & Kinichi, 2009). Invention is to attain to the unknown or enhance a method by looking at what is known (Saruhan & Yildiz, 2014). Creativeness is a process of forming something new and unique. And, consolidation is, on the other hand, is the work of many people from the unit or departments around a common idea, project and purpose (Kreitner & Kinichi, 2009).

Activating the dynamic of change in organizations depends on nurturing and stimulating the creativity of the labourers (Genc, 2012). Creativeness positively acts upon the alteration and innovative talents of organizations (Simsek et al., 2011). Moreover, creativeness is one of the components of innovativeness (Kreitner & Kinichi, 2009). In another words, without creativeness, one of the components remains incomplete and innovation does not occur. Genc (2012) has put forward that individuals should have a convenient environment and psychology in order to ascertain their creative talents. People who are at ease in their organizations are more creative than these who feel unhappy. Because, those who feel well can consider in a wider point of view and produce more original ideas (Grawitch et al., 2003).

In innovative organizations, there is high level tolerance for making mistake and taking risk, even if it doesn't work, there is respect for favourable intention and special importance and reward are presented to idea producers (Schermerhorn et al., 2011). Namely, it has been encouraged to offer and test new ideas, employees are less controlled in these organizations. An organization that would like to improve its innovative aspect should give countenance to take risk, ensure to take initiative in trouble solutions, enable multiple communication and create groups that are be in an endeavor of generating creative ideas and exchanging them into innovations (Eren & Gunduz, 2002). It is explicit that since personnel in such organizations are aware that their actions are precious and there is confidence in their potentials, these employees are much braver and feel better. In short, employees are not scared of making mistake and taking risk. Simsek et al. (2011) have emphasized that creativeness develops best in a dynamic and free environment.

Organizational Trust and Innovative Behaviour

Workers may undertake great responsibilities in their organizations, on the other hand, they may take a stand against innovations and changes (Robbins & Judge, 2012). Employees' use of energy, power and abilities for innovation and change has an obvious impact on the competitiveness of the organization. In earlier researches in this context

(Tschannen-Moran, 2001; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 1998), it has been put emphasize that it is possible for employees to feel more comfortable and to spend their energy and talents on achieving organizational aims if they have a high level of trust in their organizations. Because, trust decreases conflicts and rises the harmony among employees. And, this contributes to increase in organizational performance (Limerick & Cunnington, 1993). Thus, there is a positive relationship between trust of employees in manager, friends, organizations and their work performance (Turhan et al., 2018). Also, it has been known that work performance is positively and significantly related to innovation (Caliskan & Akkoc, 2012).

It has been noticed that the studies investigating the relationship between organizational trust and innovative behavior (Ellonen et al., 2008; Sezgin et al., 2015; Ustun & Kilic, 2017; Yu et al., 2018) have predominantly been performed in organizations except from educational organizations. In literature, it has been encountered with a limited number of studies that examine organizational trust and its sub-dimensions, its relationship with innovative behavior, in particular educational organizations. It is obvious that there should be much new studies in the direction of which sub-dimensions of organizational trust are significantly related to innovative behavior or not. Filling this gap in the field with this study represents the original aspect of the research. Besides, creative thinking, being open to the innovations and implementing them are vital for educational organizations. To conclude, the success of organizations is associated with innovative business actions of their employees (Dorenbosch et al., 2005).

Methodology

This part consists of research goal, research method, sample, data collections and instruments and analyzing of data.

Research Goal

In this study, it has been aimed to point out if there is a relationship between organizational trust perception and innovative behaviours of teachers. Based on the relevant literature, the hypotheses below have been brought forward in accordance with the main purpose of the research:

H1: Organizational trust perception positively predicts innovative behavior.

H2: Trust in administrator positively predicts innovative behavior.

H3: Trust in colleagues positively predicts innovative behavior.

H4: Trust in shareholders positively predicts innovative behavior.

Research Method

It has been utilized from the relational survey model in the study. The relationship between organizational trust and each sub-dimension and innovative behavior has been endeavoured to be determined by scores given to the items of the scales. The relational scanning model has revealed the existence/ absence of the relationship between the variables, whether there is a relationship between the variables, the degree of this relationship. Another side of this model is that it may hazard an opinion about the cause-effect relationship between variables (Buyukozturk et al., 2012; Fraenkel et al., 2012).

Sample

The universe of this research consists of teachers working in Şırnak province in Turkey. And research sample has been selected from universe with disproportionate sampling method. The schools in Şırnak province have been handled as a cluster. The research questionnaires have been applied to 35 of these schools, which has objectively been determined. Participants ($n = 151$); 43.7% are female ($n = 66$), 56.3% are male teachers ($n = 85$). When analyzing in terms of marital status variable, it has been seen that 53% of participant are married ($n = 80$) and 47% of them are single ($n = 71$). Participants are between the ages of 31-40, with a maximum of 41.1% ($n = 62$). The most seniority interval in which the participants have is between 70.1% and 1-10 years ($n = 107$).

Data Collection and Instruments

The research data have been obtained by the help of "Personal Information Form" "Organizational Trust Scale" and "Innovative Behavior Scale". The scores of the scales have ranged from "1: I certainly disagree" to "5: I certainly agree". Validity and reliability analysis consequences of the scales have been presented below.

"Organizational Reliability Scale", which has been utilized in this research, has been developed by Yilmaz (2006). The scale comprises of three dimensions as trust in administrator, colleagues and shareholders. Trust in administrator and trust in shareholders sub-dimensions comprise of seven items, and trust in colleagues sub-dimension comprises of 8 items. Bartlett's Test of Sphericity of the scale is significant ($X^2 = 2553.52$, $p = .00$) and Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Coefficient has been determined as .90. The variance explained by trust in administrator dimension is 27.71%, the variance of trust

in colleagues is 25.19%, the variance of trust in shareholders is 17.05% and the whole variance clarified by these three dimensions is 69.95%. Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient has been measured as .95 for trust in administrator dimension, as .81 for the dimension of trust in colleagues, as .81 for the dimension of trust in shareholders, as .93 for the whole scale.

"Innovative Behaviour Scale", which has been utilized in this study has been improved by Scott and Bruce (1994) and transliterated into Turkish by Caliskan et al. (2019). This scale containing of 6 items has a single factor structure. It has been observed that Bartlett's Test of Sphericity of Innovative Behaviour Scale is significant ($X^2 = 503.08, p = .00$). Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Coefficient is .85. The variance percentage presented by this scale, which has been used to determine the innovative behavior level of teachers, has been found as 65.37%. Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient pertaining Innovative Behaviour Scale has been calculated as .89.

When the research data is obtained by means of two or more scales, common method biases may arise here. In this study whether common method bias took place or not has been examined by favor of Harman's single factor test, which is widely used by most researchers (Aulakh & Gencturk, 2000). According to Harman's single factor test, exploratory factor analysis can be implemented with all items of the scales used in this study. If one dimension emerges or more than one dimension emerge and the variance amount explained by first factor is more than 50%, it can be said that common method bias has emanated (Podsakoff et al., 2003). Exploratory factor analysis has been performed by all items of organizational trust and innovative behaviour scales. As a consequence of exploratory factor analysis, a 5-factor structure has debouched and the percentage of variance explained by the first factor was calculated as 21.84. That's to say, it has been seen that common method bias does not comprise in this study.

Analyzing of Data

One item in the organizational trust scale is the reverse item. Hence, it has been inverted. The data have been examined from the stand point of skewness and kurtosis, the assumption of normality and the existence of linear relationships between variables. Coefficient of skewness has been calculated as -.07 for organizational trust scale and kurtosis coefficient is .46. Skewness coefficient of innovative behavior scale is .11, kurtosis coefficient has been assessed as -.43. For the skewness-kurtosis coefficient values are between ± 2 , it can be told that the normality assumption is met (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2014). The z values obtained by dividing the kurtosis and skewness values by the standard error have been perused in order to obtain stronger evidence about whether the normality assumption has been fulfilled. In medium-sized samples ($50 < n < 300$), a z value higher than 3.29 has indicated that the distribution of the sample is not normal (Kim, 2013). In organizational trust scale, the z values attaining by dividing skewness values by measured standard error has been found as 1.15; the z values attaining by dividing kurtosis values by measured standard error has been obtained as -1.75. In innovative behavior scale, the z values acquiring by dividing skewness values by measured standard error is -1.07; the z values attaining by dividing kurtosis values by measured standard error has been seen as 0.27. Hence, it has been come into conclusion that the z values are lower than 3.29 and normality assumption has been ensured.

After discerning that the conditions for regression have been provided, simple and multiple linear regression analyzes have been provided. In regression analysis, innovative behaviours of teachers have been taken as independent variable.

Findings/ Results

Descriptive Analysis and Correlation

The results of descriptive analysis and correlation have been presented in Table 1 below.

Table 1. Descriptive analysis and correlation values for organizational trust and its dimensions and innovative behavior

Research variables	\bar{X}	SD	Std. Error	1	2	3	4	5
1. Administrator	4.05	.77	.06	1				
2. Colleagues	3.35	.78	.06	.63**	1			
3. Shareholders	3.44	.58	.04	.30**	.55**	1		
4. Trust	3.59	.69	.04	.80**	.92**	.70**	1	
5. Innovative	3.98	.56	.04	.44**	.43**	.39**	.51**	1

*p < .05, **p < .01

Notes: Administrator: Trust in administrator, Colleagues: Trust in colleagues, Shareholders: Trust in shareholders, Trust: Organizational trust, Innovative: Innovative behavior

According to Table 1, the teachers' ideas about trust in administrators, colleagues, shareholders and in entire organization and innovative behavior are upper medium level (4: I agree). When examining the views about sub-dimensions of organizational trust, it has been observed that teachers' trust in their administrators is the most and their colleagues is the least. In consequence of correlation, the relationship between the perceptions of teachers concerning organizational trust ($r = .51, p < .01$), trust in administrator ($r = .44, p < .01$), in colleagues ($r = .43, p < .01$),

and in stakeholders ($r = .39, p < .01$) and their innovative behavior perceptions has been found to be moderate, positive and significant.

Regression Analysis of Organizational Trust and Innovative Behaviour

The simple regression analysis values applied to predict innovative behavior by organizational trust have been shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Regression analysis results of organizational trust and innovative behavior

Model	Predictor variables	B	Std. Error	β	t	p
1 st Step (enter)	(constant)	4.54	.33		13.18	.00
	gender (dummy)	.27	.09	.24	2.86	.00
	age	-.23	.01	-.32	-1.82	.07
	seniority	.01	.01	.26	1.51	.13
2 nd Step	(constant)	2.75	.38		7.21	.00
	gender (dummy)	.15	.08	.13	1.76	.08
	age	-.01	.01	-.27	-1.72	.08
	seniority	.00	.01	.13	.86	.38
	Organizational trust	.47	.06	.50	6.95	.00

Dependent variable innovative behaviour
R² change = .297

When scrutinizing the regression analysis findings in Table 2, after controlling gender, age and professional seniority in 1st step, the organizational trust perceptions of teachers have been attached to the model in 2nd step. In consequence of the analysis, it has been beheld that organizational trust perception significantly predicts innovative behavior ($\beta = .50^{**}, p < .01$). The 23.3% of variance in teachers' innovative behaviors has been explained by organizational trust perception ($\Delta R^2 = .233; p < .01$). The more organizational trust perceptions of teachers are, the more their innovative behaviors will be.

Multiple Regression Analysis of Sub-Dimensions of Organizational Trust and Innovative Behavior

The values for the multiple linear regression analysis that the prediction of innovative behavior by trust in administrator, colleagues and shareholders can be denoted in Table 3 below.

Table 3. The Multiple regression analysis outcomes of sub-dimensions of organizational trust and innovative behavior

Model	Predictor variables	B	Std. Error	β	t	p
1 st Step (enter)	(constant)	4.54	.33		13.18	.00
	gender (dummy)	.27	.09	.24	2.86	.00
	age	-.02	.01	-.32	-1.82	.07
	seniority	.01	.01	.26	1.51	.13
2 nd Step (stepwise)	(constant)	2.58	.40		6.43	.00
	gender (dummy)	.17	.08	.15	2.00	.04
	age	-.02	.01	-.32	-2.00	.04
	seniority	.01	.01	.18	1.19	.23
	Trust in administrator	.27	.05	.38	5.18	.00
	Trust in shareholders	.24	.07	.25	3.40	.00

Dependent variable innovative behaviour
* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

In multiple regression analysis in Table 3, along with controlling gender, age and professional seniority in 1. step, trust in administrators, trust in colleagues and trust in shareholders has been added into the model in 2nd step (with stepwise). According to regression analysis consequences, trust in administrator ($\beta = .27^{**}, p < .01$) and trust in shareholders ($\beta = .25^{**}, p < .01$) dimensions meaningfully predict innovative behavior sense. Since the dimension of trust in colleagues hasn't significantly predict the innovative behavior variable ($\beta = .07^{**}, p = .46$), it has been eliminated from the model. The 19.3% of variance in innovative behavior variable has been explained by trust in administrator ($\Delta R^2 = .193; p < .01$), 5% of it has been elucidated by trust in shareholder dimension ($\Delta R^2 = .05; p < .01$). The rise in the level of trust in administrator and shareholders has increased the innovative behaviours, too.

In Table 4 below, it has been seen that the three of suggested hypothesis in this study has been accepted and one of them has not been accepted.

Table 4. Hypotheses accepted and not accepted in the research

Hypothesis	accepted / not accepted
H1	accepted
H2	accepted
H3	not accepted
H4	accepted

In research, it has been seen that H1, H2, H3 hypothesis have been confirmed and H4 hasn't been confirmed.

Discussion

It has been found out at this research that teachers' organizational trust perceptions uprise their innovative behaviours. This finding of the research has been backed up with previous research findings. Ustun and Kilic (2017) have elicited that organizational trust has a positive impact on employees' innovation orientation and risk-taking tendency. Moreover, also in other studies (Barczak et al., 2010; Ellonen et al., 2008; Erat, 2020; Yu et al., 2018); it has been detected that organizational trust has a positive effect on innovative behavior. Lashley (1995) has alleged that the trust atmosphere in organizations strengthens their responsibility consciousness. From this point of view, it has been thought that teachers will undertake responsibilities in producing and implementing innovations in their schools. Employees' trust in their organizations is positively correlated to their work performance (Yorulmaz & Karabacak, 2020). It is also known that work performance is positively and closely related to innovative behavior (Caliskan & Akkoc, 2012). Namely, from this point of view, since trust in their organization can enable them to take risk, undertake more responsibility and make more innovations in their organizations, it has been inferred that organizational trust and innovative behavior may correlate to each other. These situations are naturally related to work performance.

It has been detected in this study that trust in administrators of teachers exalts their innovative behaviours. Similarly, Erat (2020) has evinced that teachers' trust in their administrators positively affects innovative behaviours. Kmieciak (2020) has proved that trust in manager has positive impact on idea generation and idea realization dimensions of innovative business behaviour. Distinctly from these research findings, Sezgin et al. (2015) have found in their research with employees in 7 different sectors (textile, service, software, electronics, construction, plastic, mineral/ natural resources) that there is no meaningful relationship between trust in management and innovative business behavior. Tan and Tan (2000) have enlightened that employees generalise their trust in manager to the entire organization. It has been understood that trust in manager is important for constituting organizational trust. However it is known that organizational trust is related to innovative behaviour.

It has been clarified in this research that colleague confidence of teachers has not a distinctive effect on their innovative actions. When viewing on earlier research results (Kmieciak, 2020; Sezgin et al., 2015), it has been established that trust in colleagues does not have a significant impact on innovative actions. That's to say, the outcome that trust in colleagues has no significant effect on business behaviour has been supported by other research results. Kmieciak (2020) has stressed that the fear of employee about seeing negative reaction will hamper constituting innovative solutions. Same researcher has brought forward that in such circumstances, trust in manager is more important than trust in colleagues. Kmieciak (2020) has expressed that the reason of this is the main person creating trust perception in organizations is managers.

Innovativeness is a process including being innovative, in another saying, creating new ideas alongside implementing them into the life (Sezgin et al., 2015). Hence, school administrators should firstly provide a trustful environment that enables teachers to emerge and develop their creative abilities so as to display innovative behaviours. Weng et al. (2010) have asserted in this context that trust in the business environment has an important role to generate an innovative atmosphere, and this confidence can be improved by the relationship between manager and his subordinates.

Adair (2015) has submitted that managers should present a decisive manner about innovation. Besides, Adair (2015) has stressed on the importance of developing instructions and behaviour styles, which will contribute to the powerful relationships, in order to emerge new and original ideas, instead of strict rules. So and so, it has been known that the interaction between school administrator and teachers is related to organizational trust (Kiranli Gungor, 2018). Creating organizational trust sensation in school circumstance contributes teachers to produce new ideas and take risks to practise innovations.

Conclusion

Teachers' organizational trust perceptions promotes their innovative behaviours. While trust in administrators and colleagues of teachers increase their innovative behaviours, trust in colleagues does not increase. All of assumptions proposed in this research except H4 have been confirmed.

School administrators should constitute a convenient atmosphere for teachers to freely express their ideas, support their efforts, push them to take risk, stimulate for undertaking responsibility and ensure them to live in harmony. Also, it is crucial that change and innovation can prevent it from becoming a worrisome occasion for teachers and promote innovation. It is apparent that a conscious administrative mentality towards dominating trust culture at school is important to create these stated situations. Research findings have shown the importance of maintaining and improving organizational trust to be generated innovative work behaviours.

Recommendations

Another study, which examining the relationship between organizational trust-its sub-dimensions and innovative behavior specific to educational organizations, is needed to be done. Thus, more consistent results can be gained regarding the relationships between the sub-dimensions of organizational trust and innovative work behaviors of teachers. It is essential for further researches to determine the variables that positively affect innovative work behavior, which is defined as the source of organizational success.

It is weighty that administrator should create an available psychological atmosphere at school in order to stimulate teachers for creating new ideas, alteration and implementing these new ideas. Administrators require to become consistent in their words and behavior, and have an equitable approach to administrative issues such as resource allocation and conferment. To be decisive about producing new ideas and putting them into practices is extremely important for administrators. Innovation may end with failure; administrator should accept such a risk probability. Administrators do not let this risk to prevent the ideas in regards to generating innovation. It is essential for administrators to give confidence on the subject of taking risk and producing innovation to the teachers.

Limitations

The basic limitations of this research are that the study has been designed in a single province, with a limited sample group and only with a quantitative design. When analyzing the literature, innovative behavior has been found to have many premises. Nevertheless, in this study, the innovative behavior of teachers has been explained by only one variable. And, that represents the other limitation of this research.

References

- Adair, J. (2015). *Yenilikçi liderlik* [Innovator leadership] (S. Uyan, Trans.). Babiali Culture Publishing.
- Anser, M. K., Yousaf, Z., Khan, A., & Usman, M. (2020). Towards innovative work behavior through knowledge management infrastructure capabilities: Mediating role of functional flexibility and knowledge sharing. *European Journal of Innovation Management*. Advanced Online Publication. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJIM-09-2019-0250>
- Aulakh, P., & Gencturk, E. (2000). International principal-agent relationships: control, governance and performance. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 29, 521-538.
- Barczak, G., Lassk, F., & Mulki, J. (2010). Antecedents of team creativity: An examination of team emotional intelligence, team trust and collaborative culture. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 19(4), 332-345. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8691.2010.00574.x>
- Barker, A. (2001). *Yenilikçiliğin simyası* [Alchemy of innovativeness] (A. Kardam, Trans.). MESS Publishing.
- Basaran, I. E. (1982). *Orgütsel davranış* [Organizational Behaviour]. Ankara University Faculty of Education Publishing.
- Bulbul, T. (2013). Yenilik yönetimi [Management of innovation]. In H. B. Memduhoglu & K. Yilmaz (Ed.), *Yönetimde yeni yaklaşımlar* [New approaches in management] (pp. 31-51). Pegem Academy Publishing.
- Buyukozturk, S., Cakmak, E. K., Akgun, O. E., Karadeniz, S. V., & Demirel, F. (2012). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri* [Scientific research methods]. Pegem A.
- Caliskan, A., & Akkoc, I. (2012). Girişimci ve yenilikçi davranışın iş performansına etkisinde çevresel belirsizliğin rolü [The Effects of entrepreneurship behavior and innovative behavior on job performance: Mediating role of environmental uncertainty]. *Çag University Journal of Social Sciences/ Çag Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 9(1), 1-28.
- Caliskan, A., Akkoc, I., & Turunc, O. (2019). Yenilikçi davranış: Bir ölçek uyarlama çalışması [Innovative behaviour: A study of scale adaptation]. *International Journal of Economics and Administrative Sciences/ Uluslararası İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi*, 5(1), 94-111. <https://doi.org/10.29131/uiibd.562196>

- Celik, M., Turunc, O., & Begeirbas, M. (2011). The role of organizational trust, burnout and interpersonal deviance for achieving organizational performance. *International Journal of Business and Management Studies*, 3(2), 179-189.
- Cufaude, J. (1999). Creating organizational trust elusive. Fragile. Essential. *Association Management*, 7(51), 26-34.
- Deluga, R. J. (1994). Supervisor trust building, leader-member exchange and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 67, 315-326. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.1994.tb00570.x>
- Dess, G. G., & Lumpkin, G. T. (2005). The role of entrepreneurial orientation in stimulating effective corporate entrepreneurship. *The Academy of Management Executive*, 19(1), 147-156.
- Dorenbosch, L., van Engen, M., & Verhagen, M. (2005). On-the-job innovation: The impact of job design and human resource management through production ownership. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 14(2), 129-141. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1476-8691.2005.00333.x>
- Duran, C., & Saracoglu, M. (2009). Yeniligin yaraticilikla olan iliskisi ve yeniligi gelistirme sureci [The relationship between innovation and creativity and development of innovation process]. *Journal of Management and Economy/ Yonetim ve Ekonomi*, 16(1), 57-71.
- Ellonen, R., Blomqvist, K., & Puumalainen, K. (2008). The role of trust in organisational innovativeness. *European Journal of Innovation Management*, 11(2), 160-181. <https://doi.org/10.1108/14601060810869848>
- Erat, S. (2020). Bilgi paylasimi ve orgutsel guvenin, yenilicilik davranisi ve bireysel performans etkisi: Meslek lisesi ogretmenleri uzerine bir arastirma [Information sharing and the effect of organizational trust on innovation behavior and individual performance: A research on vocational high school teachers]. *International Review of Economics and Management*, 8(1), 124-145. <https://doi.org/10.18825/iremjournal.756072>
- Eren, E., & Gunduz, H. (2002). Is cevresinin yaraticilik uzerindeki etkileri ve bir arastirma [The effect of work environment on creativity and a research]. *Journal of Dogus University/ Dogus Universitesi Dergisi*, 5, 65-84.
- Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2012). *How to design and evaluate research in education*. McGraw-Hill.
- Genc, N. (2012). *Yonetim ve organizasyon* [Management and organization]. Seckin Publishing.
- Gilbert, J. A., & Tang, T. (1998). An Examination of Organizational Trust Antecedents. *Public personnel management*, 27(3), 321-338. <https://doi.org/10.1177/009102609802700303>.
- Grawitch, M. J., Munz, D. J., Elliot, E. K., & Mathis, A. (2003). Promoting creativity in temporary problem-solving groups: The effects of positive mood and autonomy in problem definition on idea-generating performance. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 7(3), 200-213. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1089-2699.7.3.200>
- Hosmer, L. T. (1995). Trust: The connecting link between organizational theory and philosophical ethics. *The Academy of Management Review*, 20(2), 379-403. <https://doi.org/10.2307/258851>
- Kim, H.-Y. (2013). Statistical notes for clinical researchers: Assessing normal distribution (2) using skewness and kurtosis. *Restorative Dentistry & Endodontics*, 38, 52-54. <https://doi.org/10.5395/rde.2013.38.1.52>
- Kiranli Gungor, S. (2018). Lider-uye etkilesimi ile orgutsel guven arasindaki iliski [The relationship between leader member exchange and organizational trust]. *Turkish Studies Educational Sciences*, 13(19), 1147-1162. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7827/TurkishStudies.14181>
- Kmieciak, R. (2020). Trust, knowledge sharing, and innovative work behavior: empirical evidence from Poland. *European Journal of Innovation Management*. Advanced Online Publication. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJIM-04-2020-0134>
- Kreitner, R., & Kinichi, A. (2009). *Organizational behavior* (9th ed.). Mc Graw-Hill.
- Krot, K., & Lewicka, D. (2012). The importance of trust in manager-employee relationships. *International Journal of Electronic Business Management*, 10, 224-233.
- Lashley, C. (1995). Towards an understanding of employee empowerment in hospitality services. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 7(1), 27-32.
- Lewicki, R., McAllister, D., & Bies, R. (1998). Trust and distrust: New relationships and realities. *The Academy of Management Review*, 23, 438-459. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1998.926620>
- Limerick, D., & Cunnington, B. (1993). *Managing the new organization: A blueprint for networks and strategic alliances*. Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Mayer, R., Davis, J., & Schoorman, F. (1995). An integrative model of organizational trust. *The Academy of Management Review*, 20(3), 709-734. <https://doi.org/10.2307/258792>
- McAllister, D. J. (1995). Affect- and cognition-based trust as foundations for interpersonal cooperation in organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(1), 24-59. <https://doi.org/10.2307/256727>

- Moore, S. F., Shaffer, L. S., Pollak, E. L., & Taylor-Lemcke, P. (1987). The effects of interpersonal trust and prior commons problem experience on commons management. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 127*(1), 19–29.
- Podsakoff, P., MacKenzie, S., Lee, J.-Y., & Podsakoff, N. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *The Journal of applied psychology, 88*, 879-903. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879>
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2012). *Orgutsel davranis* [Organizational Behaviour]. (I. Erdem, Trans. ed.). Nobel Academy Publishing.
- Rousseau, D. M., Sitkin, S.B., Burt, R.S., & Camerer, C. (1998). Not so different after All: A cross-discipline view of trust. *Academy of Management Review, 23*, 393-404. <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMR.1998.926617>
- Saruhan, S. C., & Yildiz, M. L. (2014). *Insan kaynaklari yonetimi: Teori ve Uygulama* [Human resources management: Theory and application]. Beta Publishing.
- Schermerhorn, J. R., Hunt, J. G., Osborn, R. N., & Uhl-Bien, M. (2011). *Organizational Behavior*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Scott, S. G., & Bruce R. A. (1994). Determinants of innovative behaviour: A path model of individual innovation in the workplace. *Academy of Management Journal, 37*(3), 580- 607. <https://doi.org/10.2307/256701>
- Sezgin, O. B., Ucar, Z., & Duygulu, E. (2015). Guven, yenilikci is davranisi iliskisinde bilgi paylasiminin aracilik rolu [The mediating role of knowledge sharing on the relationship between trust and innovative work behaviour]. *Journal of Faculty of Management/ Isletme Fakultesi Dergisi, 16*(2), 1-20. <https://doi.org/10.24889/ifede.268156>
- Simsarian Webber, S. (2002). Leadership and trust facilitating cross-functional team success. *Journal of Management Development, 21*(3), 201-214. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02621710210420273>
- Simsek, S., Akgemci, T., & Celik, A. (2011). *Davranis bilimlerine giris ve orgutlerde davranis* [Introduction to behavioral sciences and behavior in organizations]. Gazi Bookstore.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2014). *Using multivariate statistics* (New international ed.). Pearson Education Limited.
- Tan, H. H., & Tan, C. S. F. (2000). Toward the differentiation of trust in supervisor and trust in organization. *Genetic, Social, and General Psychology Monographs, 126*(2), 241–260.
- Tschannen-Moran, M. (2001). Collaboration and the need for trust. *Journal of Educational Administration, 39*(4), 308-331. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EUM0000000005493>
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, W. K. (1998). Conceptual and empirical analysis of trust in schools. *Journal of Educational Administration, 36*(4), 334-352. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09578239810211518>
- Turhan, M., Koprulu, O., & Helvaci, I. (2018). Orgutsel guven ile bireysel is performansi arasindaki iliski [Relationship between organizational trust and individual job performance]. *Research Journal of Politics, Economics and Management/ Siyaset, Ekonomi ve Yönetim Araştırmaları Dergisi, 6*(5), 47-55.
- Ustun, F., & Kilic, K. C. (2017). Orgute duyulan guvenin orgutsel yenilik yoneliimi ve risk alma davranisi uzerine etkisi [Effects of organizational trust on organizational innovation orientation and risk taking behavior]. *Academic Review of Economics and Administrative Sciences/ Omer Halisdemir Universitesi Iktisadi ve Idari Bilimler Fakultesi Dergisi, 10*(2), 228-238.
- Weng, Q., McElroy, J. C., Morrow, P. C., & Liu, R. (2010). The relationship between career growth and organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 77*(3), 391-400. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2010.05.003>
- Yilmaz, K. (2006). Guven olcegi gecerlik ve guvenirlik calismasi. *Sakarya University Journal of Education Faculty/ Sakarya Universitesi Egitim Fakultesi Dergisi, 11*, 69-80.
- Yorulmaz, M., & Karabacak, A. (2020). Liman calisanlarinda orgutsel guven ile is performansi arasindaki iliski: Is tatmini ve orgutsel baglilikin rolu [The relationship between organizational trust and job performance in port employees: The role of job satisfaction and organizational commitment]. *Balkan and Near Eastern Journal of Social Sciences/ Balkan ve Yakın Dogu Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 6*(2), 121-130.
- Yu, M. C., Mai, Q., Tsai, S.- B., & Dai, Y. (2018). An empirical study on the organizational trust, employee-organization relationship and innovative behavior from the integrated perspective of social exchange and organizational sustainability. *Sustainability, 10*(3), 864-877. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su10030864>
- Zaheer, A., McEvily, B., & Perrone, V. (1998). Does trust matter? Exploring the effects of interorganizational and interpersonal trust on performance. *Organization Science, 9*(2), 141–159. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.9.2.141>
- Zhou, J. (2003). When the presence of creative coworkers is related to creativity: Role of supervisor close monitoring, developmental feedback, and creative personality. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*, 413-422. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.3.413>