

THE EFFECT OF ORGANIZATIONAL TRUST ON WORK ENGAGEMENT: AN APPLICATION ON LOGISTICS PERSONNEL[©]

Arş. Gör. Ramazan Özkan Yıldız^{*}

Arş. Gör. Esra Baran^{**}

Arş. Gör. İlke Sezin AYZAZ^{***}

Abstract

Organizations have to have employees who trust each other and the organization in order to reach their goals and to get ahead of their competitors. There is a close relationship between organizational trust and work engagement concepts. The increased trust of an employee to his or her company will make him/her feel part of an organization and increase the employee's commitment to work. The concept of work engagement, which

[©] This article has been presented at III. International Caucasus-Central Asia Foreign Trade and Logistics Congress, on October 19-21, 2017 in Kastamonu.

^{*} Arş. Gör., Dokuz Eylül University Maritime Faculty Department of Maritime Business Administration / Iskenderun Technical University Barbaros Hayrettin Naval Architect and Maritime Faculty Department of Maritime Business Administration, rozkan.yildiz@iste.edu.tr

^{**} Arş. Gör., Dokuz Eylül University Maritime Faculty Department of Maritime Business Administration, esra.baran@deu.edu.tr

^{***} Arş. Gör., Dokuz Eylül University Maritime Faculty Department of Maritime Business Administration / Bursa Technical University Maritime Faculty Department of Maritime Business Administration, ilke.ayaz@deu.edu.tr

means identification of the individual with his/her job and having an important place of employees' job in the individual's life plays an important role on the performance of individuals and organizations. From this point of view; in the logistics industry which has a rapidly growing, dynamic and intense structure the trust of employees to their organizations and their engagement to work has a significant importance for the companies to stay in the race. In this study, Cummings and Bromiley (1996) Organizational Trust Inventory and Schaufeli et al. (2006) Utrecht Work Engagement Scale are used to investigate the level of organizational trust and work engagement level of logistics employees and whether there is any relationship between these two concepts. Within the scope of the sample, the logistics employees participating in this research have a high level of organizational trust and work engagement. According to the findings of the research, there is a significant relationship between organizational trust and work engagement levels of logistics employees.

Key Words: Organizational Trust, Work Engagement, Logistics, Human Resources

JEL: M12, M54

ÖRGÜTSEL GÜVENİN İŞE BAĞLILIK ÜZERİNE ETKİSİ: LOJİSTİK ÇALIŞANLARINA YÖNELİK BİR UYGULAMA

Özet

Örgütler hedeflerine ulaşabilmek ve rakiplerinin önüne geçebilmek için birbirine ve kurumuna güven duyan çalışanlara sahip olmak zorundadır. Örgütsel güven ve işe bağlılık kavramları arasında yakın bir ilişki vardır. Çalışanın kurumuna duyduğu güvenin artması kendini örgütün bir parçası olarak hissetmesini ve işe bağlılığının artmasını sağlayacaktır. Bireyin işiyle özdeşleşmesi ve işinin bireyin yaşamında önemli bir yere sahip olması anlamına gelen işe bağlılık kavramı, bireylerin ve örgütlerin performansına doğrudan etki ettiği için örgütlerin başarısında oldukça önemli bir rol oynamaktadır. Bu noktadan hareketle; hızla büyüyen, oldukça dinamik ve yoğun bir yapıya sahip olan lojistik sektöründe çalışanların işe bağlılıkları ve örgütlerine duydukları güven yarışın içerisinde kalabilmek için büyük bir önem arz etmektedir. Bu çalışmada Cummings ve Bromiley (1996) Örgütsel Güven Envanteri ve Schaufeli vd. (2006) Utrecht İşe Bağlılık ölçeği kullanılarak lojistik çalışanlarının örgütsel güven ve işe bağlılık düzeyleri araştırılmış ve bu iki kavram arasında herhangi bir ilişki olup olmadığı incelenmiştir. Belirlenen örneklem kapsamında araştırmaya katılan lojistik çalışanlarının örgütsel güven ve işe bağlılık seviyeleri

oldukça yüksek çıkmıştır. Araştırmanın bulgularına göre lojistik çalışanlarının örgütsel güven düzeyleri ve işe bağlılıkları arasında anlamlı bir ilişki saptanmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Örgütsel Güven, İşe Bağlılık, Lojistik, İnsan Kaynakları

I. Introduction

Logistics management is a part of the supply chain management; designs, realizes, and controls the capable, intense forward and pivots stream and limit of stock, benefits and related information between the motivation behind root and the reason for usage considering the ultimate objective to meet clients' necessities (CSCMP, 2015). It is tied in with getting things to where they should be, however is substantially more extensive than transportation (Long, 2003). Logistics implies for the most part the composed development of merchandise, administrations, and at times individuals (Wood, et al., 2002). Logistics is basic to the achievement of each organization. Once considered as vital, in the background operational movement, logistics is currently perceived as a key device for making client esteem and steadfastness (CLM, 1998). In the present global and focused business world, reasonable superiority is the essential factor for accomplishment of the organizations. The human resources have a noteworthy part to build up this sort of upper hand through utilizing workforce productively and adequately. Qualified workforce is a focused power for worldwide organizations and the capacity of those organizations to successfully contend in the worldwide commercial competition is dependent upon recognizing and choosing a sufficient number of qualified personnel (Özer-Çaylan and Yıldız, 2016). Human resources which are engaged with their work will perform efficiently and effectively and they will be eager to take initiatives for the sake of the company. Employees who developed trust to their organizations will get engaged with their works. So this situation is also essential for logistics companies.

Trust is among the most as often as possible referred to subjects of logistics concepts as the company's or employees' conviction that that organization or another party will perform activities that will bring about positive activities for the firm and workers themselves, and additionally not take abrupt activities that would bring about negative results for them (Fynes et al., 2005). Trust brings about more prominent receptiveness inside the organizations and in this manner more prominent information and valuation for each other's commitment to the relationship. Trust has some specific properties (Lin et al.,

2005):

- *Trust is setting subordinate.
- *Trust depicts the level of confidence in the reliability of an accomplice.
- *Trust depends on past understanding.
- *Partners can trade data on their separate notoriety by means of suggestions, hence supporting a notoriety system to enable settle on to confide in choices.
- *Trust isn't transitive.
- *Trust is subjective; that is, distinctive spectators may mention diverse objective facts in regards to the dependability of a similar accomplice.
- *Trust is dynamic and no monotonic. Experience and suggestions persistently increment or lessening the level of trust in another accomplice.

In spite of the fact that the research on trust underlines to concentrate on a part's qualities, for example, integrity, ability, reliability, credibility, and so on, choice to trust require different judgments in this manner trust ought to be measured from different setting subordinate viewpoints at various levels in relationship from impression of employees and organizations. The key points of view of trust in logistics firms are; characteristics trust, rational trust (cost and benefit, dynamic capabilities, technology) and institutional trust/security system. A critical contention of this idea is that trust must be dyadic. (Laequddin, 2010). Without trust, organizations basically attempt to intervene participation. Trust empowers individuals from the association group to depend on each other (Chen et al., 2011). It is contended that trust can't be constrained and ought not be volunteered, and along these lines the main methods for encouraging coordinated effort is either through unequal power-relationships or by giving motivating forces to employees. (Panayides and Lun, 2009).

Organizational Trust

Trust is the choice to depend on another gathering under a state of risk. That is, trust has two foremost constituents: dependence and risk. Risk alludes to the likelihood that the trusting party will encounter expenses or harm if the other party demonstrates dishonest. Dependence includes one's destiny being dictated by another's activities (Currall and Epstein, 2003). Trust is conceivable just when requirements exist inside the framework that implement activities that satisfy a man's trust, or slate deceitful ones (Darley, 1998).

Over the previous decade, trust has risen as the focal methods for accomplishing participation in organizational relationships. Trust is

comprehensively seen as an exceptionally powerful method for encouraging participation over a wide range of organizational relationships (Rindfleisch, 2000). Cummings and Bromiley, (1996) define trust in terms of beliefs about negotiating behavior and moderation in exploiting advantages and they claim that trust reduces transactions cost in and between organizations. According to Elgoibar et al., (2016) trust is a basic factor to manufacture intra-organizational relations and collaboration and it has constructive results at relational and group level in associations. Creating trust in associations is testing. Trust is less demanding to obliterate than to make. There are basically two purposes behind this statement. The first is the way that trust-breaking occasions are frequently more obvious and detectable than positive trust-building ones. Furthermore, trust-breaking occasions are finished up to higherly affect confide in judgments than positive occasions (Lewicki et al., 2016). Numerous researchers have recognized certain basic achievement factors in such relationships, for example, alliances and partnerships. Among the most widely recognized, and perhaps at the same time a standout amongst the most basic, is trust. Trust encourages more open correspondence, data sharing and conflict management. It has been suggested that a specific measure of trust is required as an edge condition for organizational collaboration to advance (Seppanen et al., 2007).

Researchers have distinguished trust as a noteworthy part of effective business rehearse given the new types of relations both between and inside associations. Trust impacts connections among people and associations yet has been a slippery idea to characterize and measure (Vidotto et al., 2008). Following their investigations about the effect of trust in organizations, Cummings and Bromiley built up an instrument that measures individual or aggregate convictions among the individuals from a party, as per which another individual or party keep responsibilities, arrange sincerely and does not take unreasonable preferred standpoint when the open door is accessible (Ranca and Iordanescu, 2012).

Work Engagement

Work engagement is a standout amongst the most well-known terms in both the scholastic and expert literatures. Moreover, engagement is one of the extensively utilized terms by counseling firms. Such a testing, quickly evolving, focused, and innovative business condition similarly as todays requires going some additional miles for the parties, organizations and employees. When we put the financial emergencies and all the vulnerability on the conditions above, unmistakably there is extraordinary weight on associations and workers. Along

these lines, the welfare of employees is influenced from this term and work engagement is a piece of this welfare (Rothmann et al., 2005: 55).

There are various diverse meanings of work engagement in the literature. Work engagement is characterized as a steady, positive full of feeling motivational condition of satisfaction (Maslach et al. 2001: 417). As indicated by Demerouti and Cropanzano, (2010) work engagement is proposed to be valuable for both the individual and the organization as it is relied upon to impact how people do their function and satisfy their work errands. In other definition, work engagement is characterized as a positive, satisfying, business related perspective that is portrayed by force, commitment, and assimilation (Schaufeli et al., 2002). Power is described as demonstrating elevated amounts of vitality and having mental adaptability while working, the intentionality of one's to contribute push to work, and constancy additionally even with troubles. Devotion is connected with being emphatically associated with one's work and feeling a feeling of criticalness, energy, motivation, pride, and test (Schaufeli and Bakker, 2004). What's more, the last one, assimilation is described by being completely thought and joyfully possessed in one's work, whereby time passes quick and one experiences issues with disconnecting oneself from work (Bakker et al, 2003).

Organizational Trust and Work Engagement

Dynamically, trust is considered as a basic settling in the compelling operation of the organization. The creating criticalness of trust starts from the way that it achieves wide and expansive focal points for individuals, parties and organizations. Trust can broaden social capital in the going with three courses, by (Chugtai and Buckley, 2009: 574):

- * mitigating exchange costs inside the association through upgraded joint effort and collaboration;
- * increasing friendliness of employees which thus can prompt more philanthropic and pro-social practices;
- * and encouraging concession to those in expert which infers that managers don't need to always legitimize their activities and practices to their subordinates.

One might say that trust is the determinant of good connections and congruity between individuals. Trust is a sentiment accepting and drawing in without dread, dithering or doubt. Putting stock in the work, tolerating the qualities and targets of the work is critical as far as work engagement. Work engagement can be viewed as a critical factor in expanding the execution of

the employee and, in this way, the organization's level of effectiveness (Gülbahar, 2017: 149).

The connection amongst trust and engagement could be clarified by the social exchange theory. The social exchange theory is prefaced on the conviction that the social setting of the organization, including the view of trust by its individuals, shapes the relationship that exists between the organization and the workers. Employees have a tendency to respond the treatment they get from the organization in a way they seem to be reasonable (Ugwu et al., 2014: 382). As indicated by Lin (2010) work engagement development is a perplexing procedure attributable to the hidden idea of the forerunners of corporate citizenship and the go between of organizational trust. It is vital to remember that work engagement isn't recently absolutely determined by employees' close to home needs, yet in addition by the social needs refined by the organization. Hassan and Ahmed (2011) claims that organizational trust prompts wide and various advantages for people who are occupied with specific associations. Past studies have exhibited that expansion in trust result specifically or by implication in more positive working environment practices and mentalities like organizational commitment and employees' work engagement. Employees working in a trustable organization liable to see more assets in their workplace, which would drive them to be more occupied with their work. For instance, when employees trust that their boss and associates are skilled they feel sure that they can depend on their director and colleagues to give technical support when they to experience work related issues (Chughtai and Buckley, 2008: 63). According to Agarwal (2014) employees who feel engaged and display engagement behavior are taking some initiatives in doing so. This may be because engagement involves investing one's energy in pursuit of organizational goals. Unless employees trust their organizations, they will not be motivated to engage with their task. According to Tabak and Hendy (2016) if employees gains trust on their organizations they usually get engaged to their organizations and they display positive attitudes and attentiveness to others' needs.

II. AIMS, SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

This research aims to examine organizational trust and work engagement levels of logistics employees and also aims to investigate the impact of organizational trust on work engagement. In this reserch, Cummings and Bromiley (1996) Organizational Trust Inventory (OTI) and Schaufeli et al. (2006) Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES-9) are used. The questionnaire form consists of three parts. First part contains demographic characteristics of the

respondents; the second part includes the OTI 5-Likert scale items and finally UWES-9 5-Likert items constitute the third part.

The research has been conducted with the employees of logistics firms which are located in Izmir between July and September 2017. The sample of the research is Izmir based and Association of International Forwarding and Logistics Service Providers (UTİKAD) member logistics firms. With convenient sampling method 11 firms have been selected from total 22 Izmir based UTİKAD member logistics firms. The regarded permissions have been taken from these firms and the questionnaire application conducted with their employees. The total population of 22 firms is 513 employees and the 11 firms which are volunteered to participate in the research constitute a population of 247 employees. With a 47,4 % respond rate total 117 usable questionnaire forms were collected. The data gathered from the surveys are analyzed with SPSS 20.0. In the analysis of data; reliability analysis (Cronbach's Alpha), descriptive statistics and also for the test of the research hypothesis, regression analysis have been used.

III. FINDINGS

Table 1 shows the demographic characteristics of the respondents.

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents

Gender	Number (n)	Percentage (%)
Male	60	51,3
Female	57	48,7
<i>Total</i>	117	100
Age	Number (n)	Percentage (%)
22-27	48	41,0
28-33	40	34,2
34-39	17	14,5
40 and more	12	10,3
<i>Total</i>	117	100
Education	Number (n)	Percentage (%)
High School	5	4,3
Associate Degree	5	4,3
Bachelor Degree	92	78,6
Post Graduate Degree	15	12,8
<i>Total</i>	117	100

Most of the respondents are bachelors. The majority of the respondents in the distribution according to the departments constitute the operation department with 56 people and the marketing and sales department with 30 people. With 56 respondents 1-4 year experienced personnel form the biggest portion of the sample.

According to the reliability analysis results in Table 2, the organizational trust inventory with 12 items has a value of 0,943 Cronbach's alpha. Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES-9) includes 9 items and has a Cronbach's alpha value of 0,965. These results suggest that both scales have high reliability.

Table 2. Reliability Statistics of the Scales

Scales	Number of Items (n)	Cronbach's Alpha
Organizational Trust Inventory	12	0,943
Utrecht Work Engagement Scale	9	0,965

In Table 3, findings of descriptive statistics of frequency, mean and standard deviation of organizational trust statements are found. The majority of the statements has high average value (4.00 and above), it can be concluded that the organizational trust level of employees is high. Table 3.4 shows the frequency, mean and standard deviation descriptive statistics of work engagement statements. Most of the statements has high average value (4.00 and above), so that it is possible to interpret that the engagement of the employees to the work is high.

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics of Organizational Trust Inventory Items

Organizational Trust Inventory Items		1 (SD)		2 (D)		3 (NN)		4 (A)		5 (SA)		Mean	Standard Deviation
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
1	I think the people in the organization I am employed at tell the truth.	1	0,9	11	9,4	17	14,5	52	44,4	36	30,8	4,2991	1,0526
2	I think that the organization I am employed at meets its negotiated obligations.	4	3,4	3	2,6	16	13,7	54	46,2	40	34,2	4,0513	0,9454
3	In my opinion, the organization I am employed at is reliable.	2	1,7	7	6,0	2	1,7	41	35,0	65	55,6	4,3675	0,9153
4	I think that the people in the organization I am employed at succeed by stepping on other people. (R)*	4	3,4	7	6,0	12	10,3	38	32,5	56	47,9	4,1538	1,0554
5	I feel that the organization I am employed at tries to get upper hand. (R)*	6	5,1	10	8,5	20	17,1	38	32,5	43	36,8	3,8718	1,1562
6	I think that the organization I am employed at takes advantage of its employees' problems. (R)*	3	2,6	9	7,7	8	6,8	33	28,2	64	54,7	4,2479	1,0496
7	I feel that the organization I am employed at negotiates with its employees honestly.	4	3,4	8	6,8	18	15,4	42	35,9	45	38,5	3,9915	1,0626
8	I feel that the organization I am employed at will keep its word.	3	2,6	9	7,7	16	13,7	44	37,6	45	38,5	4,0171	1,0337
9	I think the organization I am employed at does not mislead us.	2	1,7	8	6,8	9	7,7	48	41,0	50	42,7	4,1624	0,9555
10	I feel that the organization I am employed at tries to get out of its commitments. (R)*	2	1,7	8	6,8	11	9,4	39	33,3	57	48,7	4,2051	0,9873
11	I feel that the organization I am employed at negotiates joint expectations fairly.	5	4,3	5	4,3	20	17,1	42	35,9	45	38,5	4,0000	1,0586
12	I feel that the organization I am employed at takes advantage of its employees who are vulnerable. (R)*	4	3,4	7	6,0	7	6,0	31	26,5	68	58,1	4,2991	1,0526

Note: SD: Strongly Disagree, D: Disagree, NN: Neither agree nor disagree, A: Agree, SA: Strongly Agree.
(R)* Reverse Questions were reflected (i.e; 1=5, 2=4, 3=3, 4=2, 5=1) before competing scale scores.

Table 4. Descriptive Statistics of Utrecht Work Engagement Scale Items

Utrecht Work Engagement Scale Items		1		2		3		4		5		Mean	Standard Deviation
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
1	At my work, I feel bursting with energy.	2	1,7	7	6,0	16	13,7	41	35,0	51	43,6	4,1282	0,9785
2	At my job, I feel strong and vigorous.	2	1,7	5	4,3	17	14,5	42	35,9	51	43,6	4,1538	0,9433
3	I am enthusiastic about my job.	3	2,6	6	5,1	14	12,0	39	33,3	55	47,0	4,1709	1,0025
4	My job inspires me.	3	2,6	5	4,3	20	17,1	38	32,5	51	43,6	4,1026	1,0033
5	When I get up in the morning, I feel like going to work.	5	4,3	11	9,4	23	19,7	35	29,9	43	36,8	3,8547	1,1467
6	I feel happy when I am working intensely.	3	2,6	8	6,8	22	18,8	28	23,9	56	47,9	4,0769	1,0840
7	I proud of work that I do.	1	0,9	3	2,6	17	14,5	36	30,8	60	51,3	4,2906	0,8715
8	I am immersed in my work.	2	1,7	2	1,7	12	10,3	46	39,3	55	47,0	4,2821	0,8494
9	I get carried away when I am working.	2	1,7	3	2,6	19	16,2	35	29,9	58	49,6	4,2308	0,9320

Table 5 details organizational trust levels according to the demographic characteristics of the employees. The average value of the organizational trust levels of female employees is 4,2456, while the male employees are 3,9819. The associate degree graduates' employees have the highest organizational trust average value.

Table 5. Organizational Trust Levels of Respondents According to Demographic Characteristics (1/2)

Gender	Scale	n	Mean	Standard Deviation
Male	Organizational Trust Level	60	3,9819	0,8261
Female	Organizational Trust Level	57	4,2456	0,7596
Age	Scale	n	Mean	Standard Deviation
22-27	Organizational Trust Level	48	4,0451	0,8894
28-33	Organizational Trust Level	40	4,2438	0,6955
34-39	Organizational Trust Level	17	4,0147	0,8641
40 and more	Organizational Trust Level	12	4,0625	0,7081
Education	Scale	n	Mean	Standard Deviation
High School	Organizational Trust Level	5	3,8000	0,7467
Associate Degree	Organizational Trust Level	5	4,6000	0,456
Bachelor Degree	Organizational Trust Level	92	4,0534	0,8323
Post Graduate Degree	Organizational Trust Level	15	4,4000	0,8019
Department	Scale	n	Mean	Standard Deviation
Documentation	Organizational Trust Level	22	4,3712	0,6904
Marketing and Sales	Organizational Trust Level	30	4,0833	0,8173
Operation	Organizational Trust Level	56	3,9881	0,8415
Top Management	Organizational Trust Level	9	4,3241	0,6620
Position	Scale	n	Mean	Standard Deviation
Assistant Specialist	Organizational Trust Level	38	3,8596	0,8806
Specialist	Organizational Trust Level	41	4,2825	0,7194
Department Manager	Organizational Trust Level	23	4,2391	0,7244
Area Manager/Branch Manager	Organizational Trust Level	6	4,4861	0,3136
Director	Organizational Trust Level	9	3,8056	0,9682

Table 5. Organizational Trust Levels of Respondents According to Demographic Characteristics (2/2)

Sector Experience	Scale	n	Mean	Standard Deviation
Less than 1 year	Organizational Trust Level	7	4,0357	0,8005
1-4 years	Organizational Trust Level	45	4,0426	0,9004
5-9 years	Organizational Trust Level	35	4,1810	0,6677
10-14 years	Organizational Trust Level	15	4,1444	0,7588
15 years and more	Organizational Trust Level	15	4,1500	0,9026
Working Year in Organization	Scale	n	Mean	Standard Deviation
Less than 1 year	Organizational Trust Level	25	4,3067	0,7433
1-4 years	Organizational Trust Level	56	3,9554	0,8705
5-9 years	Organizational Trust Level	22	4,2386	0,6497
10 years and more	Organizational Trust Level	14	4,1786	0,7877

Table 6 details the level of work engagement according to the demographic characteristics of the employees.

Table 6. Work Engagement Levels of Respondents According to Demographic Characteristics (1/2)

Gender	Scale	n	Mean	Standard Deviation
Male	Work Engagement Level	60	4,1815	0,8744
Female	Work Engagement Level	57	4,1033	0,8715
Age	Scale	n	Mean	Standard Deviation
22-27	Work Engagement Level	48	3,9676	0,9770
28-33	Work Engagement Level	40	4,2472	0,7402
34-39	Work Engagement Level	17	4,2288	0,9690
40 and more	Work Engagement Level	12	4,3796	0,5926
Education	Scale	n	Mean	Standard Deviation
High School	Work Engagement Level	5	3,8667	0,8292
Associate Degree	Work Engagement Level	5	4,7556	0,4331
Bachelor Degree	Work Engagement Level	92	4,0749	0,9161
Post Graduate Degree	Work Engagement Level	15	4,4519	0,5236

Table 6. Work Engagement Levels of Respondents According to Demographic Characteristics (2/2)

Department	Scale	n	Mean	Standard Deviation
Documentation	Work Engagement Level	22	4,1515	0,8610
Marketing and Sales	Work Engagement Level	30	4,0667	1,0231
Operation	Work Engagement Level	56	4,1349	0,8349
Top Management	Work Engagement Level	9	4,4321	0,5731
Position	Scale	n	Mean	Standard Deviation
Assistant Specialist	Work Engagement Level	38	3,7690	0,9337
Specialist	Work Engagement Level	41	4,2791	0,7154
Department Manager	Work Engagement Level	23	4,4348	0,8527
Area Manager/Branch Manager	Work Engagement Level	6	4,5370	0,4787
Director	Work Engagement Level	9	4,0988	1,0591
Sector Experience	Scale	n	Mean	Standard Deviation
Less than 1 year	Work Engagement Level	7	4,0317	0,9786
1-4 years	Work Engagement Level	45	3,9827	0,9314
5-9 years	Work Engagement Level	35	4,1143	0,8028
10-14 years	Work Engagement Level	15	4,5778	0,5684
15 years and more	Work Engagement Level	15	4,3111	0,9615
Working Year in Organization	Scale	n	Mean	Standard Deviation
Less than 1 year	Work Engagement Level	25	4,3111	0,8057
1-4 years	Work Engagement Level	56	3,9603	0,9868
5-9 years	Work Engagement Level	22	4,1919	0,6650
10 years and more	Work Engagement Level	14	4,5000	0,6190

The work engagement levels of the male and female employees to is very close to each other. It has been determined that the work engagement level of employees in the age group 22-27 is lower than those in the other age groups. This finding can be explained by the fact that the employees in this age group are newly introduced into the business life and in a transition period.

H₁: Organizational trust has a significant positive effect on work engagement.

H₁ hypothesis was tested by regression analysis. The dependent variable is work engagement and the independent variable is organizational trust. H₁

hypothesis was supported according to the analysis results. There is a positive (β : 0,737) and significant ($\text{sig.}<0,05$) effect of organizational trust on the work engagement.

Table 7. Results of Regression Analysis for the Effect of Organizational Trust on Work Engagement

Independent Variable	Dependent Variable Work Engagement		
	β	t	Sig.
Organizational Trust	0,737	11,680	0,00*
F	136,430		0,00*
R ²	0,543		
Adj. R ²	0,539		

IV. CONCLUSION

Organizational trust and work engagement are popular organizational behavior subjects among the researchers. Both concepts have very important impacts for organizations and also employees. Trust in the organization affects the employees' performance positively by increasing the commitment level of employees to their work. This situation is reflected in the organizations' human capital as an added-value. To the best of authors knowledge, there is not a similar study examining the relationship between organizational trust and work engagement in the context of logistics sector. Therefore, with this research it has been aimed to contribute to this existing gap in the literature.

In this research, firstly, the organizational trust and work engagement level of logistics sector employees were examined. The results of the research revealed that the perceptions of logistics employees about their organizational trust and engagement to their work are considerably high. According to demographic characteristics, the highest organizational trust levels in respect to distribution in groups are belong to; female (gender), 28-33 years old (age), associate degree (education), documentation and top management (department) and area manager/branch manager (position) participants. The work engagement levels of the male and female employees to is very close to each other. The highest work engagement levels in respect to distribution in groups are belong to those respondents; 40 and more years old (age), associate degree (education), top management (department), manager

(position), 10-14 years (sector experienced), 10 years and more (working years).

According to analysis of the research, it has been determined that there is a positive and significant effect of organizational trust on the work engagement. This result has been supported the findings of similar previous researches (Chughtai, and Buckley, 2008; Lin, 2010; Agarwal, 2014; Ugwu, et al., 2014; and Gülbahar, 2017). Thus, it is possible to say that an employee with a high level of organizational trust will be more likely to be engaged in her/his work.

There have been some limitations faced during this research process. The primary and the most coercive limitation of the study was the time constraint. The research first planned to reach all the employees of İzmir-based UTİKAD member logistics firms. But only 117 office employees from 11 logistics firms could be included in the research due to the time constraint and their seasonal workload. The research could be enhanced by spreading the sample throughout the country without being bound to a particular region. And also some mediating variables such as empowerment and organizational citizenship behaviors etc. between the organizational trust and work engagement could be investigated.

REFERENCES

- Agarwal, A. U. (2014). Linking Justice, “Trust and Innovative Work Behaviour to Work Engagement”, *Personnel Review*, 43(1), 41-73. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-02-2012-0019>.
- Bakker, A.B., Demerouti, E., and Schaufeli, W.B. (2003). “Dual Processes at Work in a Call Centre: An Application of the Job Demands a Resources Model”, *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 12, 393-417.
- Chen, J. V., Yen, D. C., Rajkumar, T. M., and Tomochko, N. A. (2011). “The Antecedent Factors on Trust and Commitment in Supply Chain Relationships, *Computer Standards & Interface*”, 33(3), 262–270.
- Chughtai, A. A. and Buckley, F. (2008). “Work Engagement and its Relationship with State and Trait Trust: A Conceptual Analysis”, *Journal of Behavioral & Applied Management*, 10(1), 47-71.
- Chughtai, A. A. and Buckley, F. (2009). “Linking Trust in the Principal to School Outcomes: The Mediating Role of Organizational Identification and Work Engagement”. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 23(7), 574-589. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09513540910990816>.
- CLM-Council of Logistics Management. (1998). *Careers in Logistics*. Booklet, Illinois,USA. <http://academic.rcc.edu/logisticsmanagement/PDF/Careers%20In%20Logistics%20by%20CSCMP.pdf>.(15.08.2017).
- CSCMP-Council of Supply Chain Management Professionals. (2015). *CSCMP’s Definition of Logistics Management*, <https://cscmp.org/about-us/supply-chain-management-definitions>, (25.08.2017).
- Cummings, L. L. and Bromiley, P. (1996). “The Organizational Trust Inventory (OTI): Development and Validation”, Roderick Kramer and Tom Tyler, Eds., *Trust in Organizations: Frontiers of Theory and Research*, 302-330.
- Currall, S. C. and Epstein, M. J. (2003). “The Fragility of Organizational Trust: Lessons from the Rise and Fall of Enron”. *Organizational Dynamics*, 32(2), 193-206.

- Darley, J. (1998). "Trust in Organizations: Frontiers; of Theory and Research", *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 8(2), 319-335.
- Demerouti, E., and Cropanzano, R. (2010). "From Thought to Action: Employee Work Engagement and Job Performance", In A. B. Bakker, and M. P. Leiter, Eds.), *Work engagement: A Handbook of Essential Theory and Research*, New York: Psychology Press.
- Elgoibar, P., Euwema, M. and Munduate, L. (2016). *Building Trust and Constructive Conflict Management in Organizations*, Switzerland: Springer.
- Fynes, B., Voss, C. and De Búrca S. (2005). "The Impact of Supply Chain Relationship Quality on Quality Performance", *Int. J. Production Economics*, 96 (3), 339-354.
- Gülbahar, B. (2017). "The Relationship between Work Engagement and Organizational Trust: A Study of Elementary School Teachers in Turkey", *Journal of Education and Training Studies*, 5(2), 149-159. DOI: 10.11114/jets.v5i2.2052.
- Hassan, A. and Ahmed, F. (2011). "Authentic Leadership, Trust and Work Engagement", *International Scholarly and Scientific Research & Innovation*, 5(8), 1036-1042.
- Lewicki, R., Elgoibar, P. and Euweman, M. (2016). "The Tree of Trust: Building and Repairing Trust in Organizations", Elgoibar, Patricia, Euwema, Martin and Munduate, Lourdes, Eds., *Building Trust and Constructive Conflict Management in Organizations*, Switzerland: Springer, 93-118.
- Lin, C. P. (2010). "Modeling Corporate Citizenship, Organizational Trust, and Work Engagement Based on Attachment Theory", *Journal of Business Ethics*, 94, 517-531. DOI: 10.1007/s10551-009-0279-6.
- Lin, F., Sung, Y. and Lo, Y. (2005). "Effects of Trust Mechanisms on Supply-Chain Performance: A Multi-Agent Simulation Study", *International Journal of Electronic Commerce*, 9(4), 91-112.
- Long, D. (2003) *International Logistics: Global Supply Chain Management*, New York City – USA: Springer.
- Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W. B., and Leiter, M.P. (2001). "Job Burnout." *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 397-422.

- Laequddin, M., Sahay, B.S., Sahay, V. and Abdul Waheed K. (2010) "Measuring Trust in Supply Chain Partners' Relationships", *Measuring Business Excellence*, 14 (3), 53-69.
- Özer Çaylan, D. and Yıldız, R. Ö. (2016). "An Evaluation on the Personnel Selection Criteria for Third Party Logistics Companies in Turkey: A Qualitative Research". *ODÜ Sosyal Bilimler Araştırmaları Dergisi (ODÜSOBİAD)*, 6(14), 59-81.
- Panayides, P. M. and Lun, Y. H. V. (2009). "The Impact of Trust on Innovativeness and Supply Chain Performance", *International Journal of Production Economics*, 122(1), 35-46. Doi: 10.1016/j.ijpe.2008.12.025.
- Ranca, C. A. and Iordanescu, E. (2012). "Assessment of Organizational Trust: Preliminary Data for Romanian Adaptation of the Organizational Trust Inventory Short Form. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*", 78, 436-440.
- Rindfleisch, A. (2000). "Organizational Trust and Interfirm Cooperation: An Examination of Horizontal Versus Vertical Alliances", *Marketing Letters*, 11(1), 81-95.
- Rothmann, S., L. J. Steyn and K. Mostert. (2005). "Job Stress, Sense of Coherence and Work Wellness in an Electricity Supply Organization". *South African Journal of Business Management*, 36(1), 55-63.
- Schaufeli, W.B., Salanova, M., Gonzá'lez-Roma', V. and Bakker, A.B. (2002), "The Measurement of Engagement and Burnout and: A Confirmative Analytic Approach", *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 3, 71-92.
- Schaufeli, W.B. and Bakker, A.B. (2004). "Job Demands, Job Resources, and their Relationship with Burnout and Engagement: A Multi-Sample Study", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25, 293-315.
- Seppanen, R., Blomqvist, K. and Sundqvist, S. (2007). "Measuring Inter-Organizational Trust-A Critical Review of the Empirical Research in 1990–2003", *Industrial Marketing Management*, 36, 249-265.
- Tabak, F. and Hendy, N. T. (2016). "Work Engagement: Trust as a Mediator of the Impact of Organizational Job Embeddedness and Perceived Organizational Support", *Organization Management Journal*, 13(1), 21-31. DOI: 10.1080/15416518.2015.1116968.
- Ugwu, F. O., Onyishi, I. E. and Roriguez-Sanchez, A. M. (2014). "Linking Organizational Trust with Employee Engagement: The Role of

Psychological Empowerment”, *Personnel Review*”, 43(3), 377-400.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-11-2012-0198>.

Vidotto, G., Vicentini, M., Argentero, P. and Bromiley, P. (2008). “Assessment of Organizational Trust: Italian Adaptation and Factorial Validity of the Organizational Trust Inventory”, *Social Indicators Research*, 88(3), 563-575.

Wood, D.F., Barone, A., Murphy, P. and Wardlow, D. (2002) *International Logistics*, New York – USA: American Management