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Trust Development

Trust is demonstrated most clearly in situations of risk and vulnerability.

A critical developmental confronted during the first year of life is trust versus mistrust - Erikson

If caregivers are sensitive and responsive to their infant’s needs, the infants develop a secure attachment - Bowlby & Ainsworth

Trust in infancy sets the stage for a lifelong expectation that the world will be a good and pleasant place in which to live.
Overview: Research on Trust

I. Mapping the Terrain of Multinational Trust (3 Nations Study). Air Force Research Laboratory (AFRL).


ICRI-HASS Conference
2-4th June 2021

Mapping the Terrain of Multinational Trust

AIR FORCE RESEARCH LABORATORY (AFRL) AWARDED GRANT (FA8650-04-D-6405)

HELEN ALTMAN KLEIN, WRIGHT STATE UNIVERSITY
MEI-HUA LIN, SUNWAY UNIVERSITY
NORMA M. MILLER, UNIVERSIDAD TECNOLOGICA DE PANAMA
Trust and Factors Influencing Trust

Trust & Trustworthiness (Mayer et al., 1995)

Trust- the willingness of a party (trustor) to be vulnerable to the actions of another party

(A) the qualities that enable trustees to have domain-specific influences

(B) the beliefs that trustees act at the best interest of the trustors

(I) the beliefs that trustees uphold principles that trustors deem acceptable

Cultural Related Frameworks

Hofstede’s Variables (Hofstede, 1980)

❖ Power Distance - extent to which members of a group expect an uneven distribution of power
❖ Individualism/Collectivism - degree to which societies are integrated into groups and their perceived obligations and dependence on groups.
❖ Tolerance for Uncertainty - extent to which one would tolerate uncertainty and ambiguity.

The Cultural Lens Model (Klein, 2004a, 2004b; Klein & McHugh, 2005)

❖ describes propensities that govern whether an interaction will result in a match or a mismatch.
❖ unexpected or incorrectly interpreted communications will reduce trust.
Research Aim

1. To compare national groups on their judgments of trust.
2. To assess the degree to which variables such as cultural background affect the way people judge the trustworthiness of others.

Method

❖ Qualitative Study
❖ N=120 (40 Malaysia; 40 Panama; 40 USA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1: Participant Demographics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respondent Characteristic</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language of Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male:female ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (year) mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Klein, Lin, Miller, Militello, Lyons, & Finkeldey, 2019
Preliminary Interviews to identify contexts for the Trust Challenges

Developed and Standardized Interview Protocol

Finalizing data collection procedures and Trust Interview Protocol

Development of Trust Interview Codebook

Data Collection: Interview

Data Coding & Themes Extraction

Data Analysis

Language Translation of Materials

8 contexts for the Trust Challenges

❖ School/teamwork
❖ School/teacher
❖ Work
❖ Social
❖ Danger
❖ Stranger
❖ Home/family decisions
❖ Personal decisions
23 factors were included in connection with trust

Trustworthiness - ABI

Cultural Factors

Affect

Identification

Status

Non Verbal

Key Findings

1. ABI were found in all three cultures, supporting the generality of Mayer’s trust framework.
   - **Benevolence**: important for Panamanians and the US participants.
   - The dimensions varied across different challenges.

2. Factors beyond the three Mayer’s trustworthiness factors.
   - **Interdependence, Power Distance, and Dialectical Reasoning** were more important for the **Malaysians**. Findings were consistent with research on Western vs. East Asian cultural patterns.
   - **Affect** and **Nonverbal communication** were higher with **Panamanians**.
Key Findings

3. The importance of factors vary across contexts:
❖ **Ability** was often cited in work situations but came up infrequently in the context of trusting a stranger.
❖ For both the School/Teamwork and the School/Teacher, the top factor was **Interdependence/Team**.
❖ For the Work and the Social situations, **Affect** was more frequently cited than Ability.
❖ **Physical Status** was the second most frequently cited factor in the Danger situation and the most frequently cited in the Stranger situation.

Trust judgments are tightly connected to situational constraints, and that the concept of “trust” is not a culture universal that can be understood in the same way regardless of national group.

---

Lesson Learned

Identifying cultural dimensions - based on past research but be flexible to new emerging themes - the same dimension may have positive or negative effect

Developing interview scenarios - explore various contexts as both context and national groups together influence trustworthiness assessments.

Implications for Practitioners

- **Macropegognition** - consider culture and context in team coordination and trust judgment
- **Cultivating Trust**
- **Trust in Automation**
Trust and Distrust Relationship
Trust and distrust relationship vary across personal, team, and organization contexts
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**Objectives**

I: Explores the concept of distrust in relation to trust.
- Whether the role of distrust is similar to that of trust in affecting work outcomes. (Qualitative Study)

II: Explores the mechanisms (mediations) between trust & work outcomes. (Quantitative Study)

III: Explore the antecedents of trust on 2 levels: (i) Upper level (ii) Individual level. (Quantitative Study)
Research Designs

Qualitative Study
Interview focusing on understanding the processes of trust and distrust at personal, team, and organization levels.

Quantitative Study
Recruited participants from various sectors and industries in Malaysia and they were asked to complete a comprehensive survey.

Participants

- Inclusion criteria: (i) at least 18 years old (ii) worked in an organization; (iii) had experience working in a team.
  - N=20 participants (8 males; 12 females). M = 29.05 years old (SD = 7.55).
  - Each interview lasted about 60-90 minutes.

- Inclusion criterion: (i) at least 18-year-old (ii) currently living and working in Malaysia (iii) worked with current team for at least three months.
  - N=343 employees (N=66 teams) with team size ranging from 3 to 14 (Average team size = 5.20).

Results: Qualitative Study

- Nvivo software
- Themes:
  1) Relationship of trust and distrust
  2) Antecedents to trust and distrust (at personal, team, and organizational level)
  3) Outcomes of trust and distrust (at personal, team, and organizational level)
  4) Strategies of trust repair
Results: Relationship between Trust-Distrust

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Personal setting (n=14)</th>
<th>Team setting (n=27)</th>
<th>Organization setting (n=6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antithetical Model</td>
<td>High distrust</td>
<td>Low trust</td>
<td>High trust</td>
<td>Antithetical 21.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialectical Model</td>
<td>High distrust</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>High trust</td>
<td>Dialectical 26.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context-Dependent Model</td>
<td>High distrust</td>
<td>Low trust</td>
<td>High trust</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This multi-dimensional view of trust and distrust, illustrates that trust and distrust can coexist at the same time.

Table 1. Models presented in Lewicki et al. (1998)

Result: Antecedents

Table 2. Percentage based on frequency of antecedents appearing in the transcripts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal (%)</th>
<th>Team (%)</th>
<th>Organizational (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>Mistrust</td>
<td>Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction (14.7)</td>
<td>Benevolence (21.5)</td>
<td>Benevolence (29.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benevolence (13.7)</td>
<td>Predictability (13.5)</td>
<td>Ability (25.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrity (12.6)</td>
<td>Situational (11.9)</td>
<td>Situational (15.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affect (11.6)</td>
<td>Interaction (9.2)</td>
<td>Integrity (7.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability (11.1)</td>
<td>Reciprocity (9.2)</td>
<td>Affect (4.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational (9.5)</td>
<td>Ability (8.6)</td>
<td>Identification (3.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification (5.8)</td>
<td>Trust (7.4)</td>
<td>Predictability (3.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status (5.8)</td>
<td>Trust Propensity (4.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust Propensity (4.7)</td>
<td>Identification (2.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Different antecedents from trust and distrusts across different settings:

- Benevolence is important in both trust and distrust situations.
- Influence of trustworthiness depends on settings:
  - Personal: Ability not as important.
  - Team: integrity is less important.
  - Work settings: ability and benevolent are important.
Results: Outcomes & Trust Repair

❖ The willingness of the trustee to self-improve on his/her work competency, open communication, and be professional are subjective indicators of the trustee’s serious efforts to address the violation of trust.

❖ Trustors displayed **defensive and cautious** behaviors (e.g., skepticism, monitoring, and inhibition) with violation of trust.
Objectives

I: Explores the concept of distrust in relation to trust.
❖ Whether the role of distrust is similar to that of trust in affecting work outcomes. (Qualitative Study)

II: Explores the mechanisms (mediations) between trust & work outcomes. (Quantitative Study)

III: Explore the antecedents of trust on 2 levels: (i) Upper level (ii) Individual level. (Quantitative Study)

Colquitt and colleagues (2007)

- Ability
- Benevolence
- Integrity

Trust Propensity

Trust

Risk Taking
- the willingness to be vulnerable

Task Performance
- a set of actions that has a direct impact on the accomplishment of a given task

OCE
- efforts of organizational members to advance or promote the work organization, its image and its goals

Counter-productive Behavior
- behaviors that detract from the goals of the organization by harming the well-being of coworkers or the organization
Mediating Variables

Team Communication
- sharing and exchanges of information among team members
- Better at solving problems (job performance) (Cheung et al., 2013).

Organizational Commitment
- Degree of attachment employees have
- Enhances job performance (Lee et al., 2010).
- Affects OCB – committed employees are more likely to engage in OCB (Sjahruddin & colleagues, 2013).
- Reduces CWB - employees’ attachment toward the organization & its members (Thau & colleagues, 2007).

Antecedents of Trust

Level 1

- Individual Trust Popularity
- Perceived Trustworthiness of Team
- Cynicism

Antecedents
- Distrust

Process
- Trust
  - Team Communication
  - Risk Taking
  - Task Performance

Outcomes
- OCB
- Counter-Productive Behaviour
- Citizenship Behaviour
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Research Model: Comprehensive Model of Trust

Research Designs

Qualitative Research
Interview focusing on understanding the processes of trust and distrust at personal, team, and organization levels.

Quantitative Research
recruited participants from various sectors and industries in Malaysia and they were asked to complete a comprehensive survey.

Participants

❖ Inclusion criteria: (i) at least 18 years old (ii) worked in an organization; (iii) had experience working in a team.
❖ N=20 participants (8 males; 12 females). M age = 29.05 years old (SD = 7.55).
❖ Each interview lasted about 60-90 minutes.

❖ Inclusion criterion: (i) at least 18-year-old (ii) currently living and working in Malaysia (iii) worked with current team for at least three months.
❖ N=343 employees (N=66 teams) with team size ranging from 3 to 14 (Average team size = 5.20).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Team Trust Climate</td>
<td>Copenhagen Psychosocial Questionnaire (COPSOQ II) (Pejtersen, Kristensen, Borg, &amp; Bjorner, 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Team Leadership</td>
<td>Leadership LMX-7 (Graen &amp; Uhl-Bien, 1995)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Individual Trust Propensity</td>
<td>General Trust Scale (Yamagishi &amp; Yamagishi, 1994)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Perceived Trustworthiness Towards Team</td>
<td>Trustworthiness Scale (Mayer &amp; Davis, 1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Mistrust</td>
<td>Organizational Cynicism Questionnaire (Brandes, Dharwadkar, &amp; Dean (1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Team Communication</td>
<td>Team Communication (Schultz, Israel, &amp; Lantz, 2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Organizational Commitment</td>
<td>T M Employee Commitment Survey (Meyer, Allen, &amp; Smith, 1993)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. OCB</td>
<td>Organizational Citizenship Behavior Scale (Lee &amp; Allen, 2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. CWB</td>
<td>Interpersonal &amp; Organizational Deviance Scale (Bennet &amp; Robinson, 2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Team Cultural Composition</td>
<td>Highly mixed cultural team vs lower mixed cultural team</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Results:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Team Trust Climate</td>
<td>$Y = 0.20^{**}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Leadership</td>
<td>$Y = 0.23^{***}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Trust Propensity</td>
<td>$\beta = 0.38^{***}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevented Total In the Team</td>
<td>$\beta = 0.42^{***}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Performance</td>
<td>$\beta = 0.33^{***}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCB</td>
<td>$\beta = 0.36^{***}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWB</td>
<td>$\beta = 0.37^{***}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingroup-Outgroup</td>
<td>$\beta = 0.02$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counterproductive Work Behavior</td>
<td>$\beta = 0.26$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Citizenship Behavior</td>
<td>$\beta = 0.29$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34
Key Findings

- **Organizational context** matters in influencing the trust in team. Higher level context of Trust Climate and Leadership positively influence trust in team.
- At individual level, individual trust propensity and trustworthiness influence perceived trust in teams.
- Team communication and team commitment mediates perceived trust in teams and work outcomes with the exception of CWB.
- Distrust is negatively related to task performance and positively related to counterwork behavior.
  - Pathways to positive vs. negative work behavior could be explain through trust and distrust.
- Extension of Colquitt et al. (2007) to include team processes as mediators.

Research Applications

- Leadership Development
- Trust Development in Organization
- Multinational Collaboration
  - Cross-Cultural Training – Trust Development
  - Multinational Teamwork
- Human-Machine Trust
  - Human-Robot Teaming/Interaction
  - The Use of Drone Technology in Disaster Management
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