

Singapore Management University Institutional Knowledge at Singapore Management University

Research Collection Lee Kong Chian School Of
Business

Lee Kong Chian School of Business

1-2018

Determinants, consequences, and functions of interpersonal trust: What is the empirical evidence?

Serena C. LYU

Shanghai University of Finance and Economics

Donald L. FERRIN

Singapore Management University, donferrin@smu.edu.sg

Follow this and additional works at: https://ink.library.smu.edu.sg/lkcsb_research

Part of the [Organizational Behavior and Theory Commons](#)

Citation

LYU, Serena C. and FERRIN, Donald L.. Determinants, consequences, and functions of interpersonal trust: What is the empirical evidence?. (2018). *Routledge companion to trust*. 65-104. Research Collection Lee Kong Chian School Of Business.

Available at: https://ink.library.smu.edu.sg/lkcsb_research/5908

This Book Chapter is brought to you for free and open access by the Lee Kong Chian School of Business at Institutional Knowledge at Singapore Management University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Research Collection Lee Kong Chian School Of Business by an authorized administrator of Institutional Knowledge at Singapore Management University. For more information, please email libIR@smu.edu.sg.

DETERMINANTS, CONSEQUENCES AND FUNCTIONS OF INTERPERSONAL TRUST WITHIN ORGANIZATIONS

What is the empirical evidence?

Serena C. Lyu and Donald L. Ferrin**

Introduction and objectives

In a 1999 review article, trust luminary Roderick Kramer observed that “Trust has . . . moved from bit player to center stage in contemporary organizational theory and research” (1999, p. 594). However, *since* 1999 the annual number of peer-reviewed articles published on trust has demonstrated a rapid upward trajectory (Ferrin, 2013). If trust research had reached “center stage” by 1999, we would have to conclude that, by 2017, trust research – probably as much as any other construct in the organizational sciences – had truly captured the attention of scholars and practitioners worldwide. Trust has moved from bit player, to center stage, and now to celebrity status.

This widespread recognition of the importance of trust has attracted a critical mass of scholars who have produced (and continue to expand) a scientific literature that provides extensive insights into the nature, determinants, consequences, and functions of trust. However, this literature is now so expansive that it is difficult for any single scholar to comprehend it. Fortunately, trust scholars have also focused on making sense of the literature in the form of systematic reviews, including both narrative (Burke et al., 2007; Costa et al., 2015; Dirks & Ferrin, 2001; Ferrin & Gillespie, 2010; Fulmer & Gelfand, 2012; Kramer & Lewicki, 2010; Lewicki et al., 2006; Searle et al., 2011) and meta-analytic (Colquitt et al., 2007; Dirks & Ferrin 2002; Kong et al., 2014; Lu et al., 2017) reviews.

Each of these reviews has had a specific focus, and aimed to address a specific set of questions, that has advanced our understanding of trust. In most of these reviews, the central aim was to provide conceptual understanding of what trust is, and how and why trust operates the way it does. To do so, these reviews assessed, analyzed, and qualitatively or quantitatively summarized

the findings and insights from a range of primary studies. The large majority of these primary studies, in turn, had typically attempted to assess a theoretically interesting question by operationalizing theoretical concepts into measurable variables, measuring those constructs empirically, assessing empirical relations among the constructs, and then drawing inferences from those empirical relationships to generate theoretical insights. Thus, the review articles reflect inferences, and in many cases inferences about inferences, ultimately drawn from concrete data in a great mass of primary studies on empirical relationships between trust and related variables. From these inferential processes, scholars have generated many valuable theoretical insights that comprise important advances in understanding the nature and operation of trust within organizational settings.

The current review aims to supplement the existing reviews by taking a different tack. Rather than attempting to draw theoretical insights from the expanse of empirical studies, we aim to focus only on the concrete and empirical, answering the question, “*What has been demonstrated, empirically, regarding the determinants, consequences, and functions of interpersonal trust within organizations?*” We believe that answering this question is valuable for at least three reasons. First, given that the field’s theoretical inferences are ultimately drawn from or justified based on primary data, it is valuable for researchers to have access to a summary of actual empirical findings. This will enable researchers to reconsider the appropriateness of existing frameworks, and also consider whether alternative theoretical framings might be suitable for making sense of the empirical literature. Second, future research will benefit from knowing what effects have already been demonstrated so that unnecessary replication can be avoided, and also to provide researchers with insight into what empirical findings can be expected or should be extended in future studies. Third, practitioners (and also scholars who aim to provide advice to practitioners) navigate a world of the literal and concrete. While we would hope that many practitioners will appreciate trust frameworks that operate at higher levels of abstraction, we contend that practitioners are more likely to be interested in specific insights (with references to the primary studies that generated those insights) into *what* constructs have been found to predict trust, *what* constructs have been found to be outcomes of trust, and *what* empirical relationships are mediated or moderated by trust. Such insights are relatively more likely to provide clear implications for action that can be better justified to senior management.

As mentioned above, practitioners navigate a world of the literal and concrete. When practitioners face a need or opportunity to build trust, or when they are asked to justify a proposed trust intervention, practitioners are likely to yearn for answers to questions such as the following: “What, specifically, predicts trust?” “What, specifically, does trust predict?” “How large are those effects?” “How much research has been conducted?” “And in what contexts has the research been conducted?” Accordingly, we expect that practitioners will find the present review to be extremely useful when designing and implementing trust-related interventions in their own organizations. That said, we also strongly encourage practitioners to read the primary studies, and to consider the limitations in internal and external validity of those studies, when planning their organizational interventions.

Accordingly, the objectives of this review are to systematically review and succinctly summarize the empirical evidence concerning determinants, outcomes, and functions of interpersonal trust within organizational settings. Our review aims to provide a distinct contribution in that it (1) focuses only on what has been found empirically (rather than summarizing theoretical perspectives); (2) is focused only on interpersonal trust within organizational settings; and (3) has a clearly defined empirical base (clearly delineated body of past research to be reviewed). We begin by describing our review methodology, starting with the definition of interpersonal trust that guided our review.

Review methodology

Interpersonal trust

The present review is focused specifically on interpersonal trust. We define “interpersonal” narrowly, but “trust” more broadly. Specifically, by “interpersonal” we refer to the trust that one individual has toward another specific individual. Therefore, we include studies that measured “trust in manager” or “trust in coworker,” but we exclude studies that measured “trust in managers,” “trust in fellow group members,” and “trust in coworkers” (e.g., Grant & Sumanth, 2009). Similarly, we exclude studies that measured “trust in employer” or “trust in management” (e.g., Robinson, 1996) because these do not refer to a specific individual. We also exclude studies that measured or manipulated interpersonal trust, but then aggregated these measures to a higher level such as the group level (e.g., Crossley et al., 2013; Dirks, 1999). And we also exclude studies that focused on propensity to trust given that the referent of trust propensity is not a specific individual, but “people” or “others” (Frazier et al., 2013).

Recently, scholars have focused increasing attention on interpersonal trust as a dyadic phenomenon (Korsgaard et al., 2015). According to Korsgaard and colleagues, mutual trust is an emergent attribute of the dyad wherein both parties come to share a given level of trust (e.g., Anderson & Thompson, 2004) whereas trust asymmetry captures the degree to which each party’s trust in the other converges (Tomlinson et al., 2009); accordingly, both are dyad-level constructs. In contrast, reciprocal trust is a process rather than a construct, in which each party is both trustor and trustee and one party’s trust may influence the other’s and vice versa (e.g., Ferrin et al., 2008). Given our definition of interpersonal trust as one individual’s trust in another specific individual, we include studies of reciprocal trust (such studies examine how one individual’s trust in another individual at a specific time point influences the second individual’s trust in the first at a later time point, and therefore both trust measures are consistent with our definition of “interpersonal”) but exclude studies of mutual trust and trust asymmetry (such studies combine two individuals’ trust toward each other into a single measure that conveys the average level or deviation in trust between the two individuals, and therefore these measures do not fit our definition of “interpersonal”).

By “trust” we refer to conceptual definitions, and their operationalizations, consistent with Mayer, Davis, and Schoorman’s (1995) perceived ability, perceived benevolence, perceived integrity, and trust (defined as willingness to accept vulnerability) constructs, McAllister’s (1995) affect- and cognition-based trust constructs (based on confident positive expectations), and variations thereon. Studies defining trust as a behavior (e.g., trust game studies), and felt trust (e.g., Lau et al., 2014) were excluded. We also exclude studies of interpersonal “distrust” and “mistrust” given emerging evidence that interpersonal distrust may be distinct from interpersonal trust (e.g., Saunders et al., 2014). Additionally, because the dynamics of interpersonal trust violations and repair are arguably distinct from those of interpersonal trust development and maintenance (Kim et al., 2004), we have excluded studies of trust violations and repair from our review.

Search methodology

We began by identifying 15 scientific journals that we believe are likely to have published high-quality, double-blind peer-reviewed empirical studies of interpersonal trust in the period from the early 1990s to present: *Academy of Management Journal*, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *Group and Organization Studies*, *Human Relations*, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *Journal of International*

Business Studies, Journal of Management, Journal of Management Studies, Journal of Organizational Behavior, Journal of Trust Research, Leadership Quarterly, Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, Organization Science, Organisation Studies, and Personnel Psychology. Then, within each journal, we performed a Web of Science search, using the search term “trust,” for the period from the early 1990s to September 2015, to identify articles to be considered for our review. Our next step was to review the abstracts for all such articles to identify any studies that were likely to have examined interpersonal trust as defined above. For any abstracts so identified, we then reviewed the article to assess whether it had in fact examined interpersonal trust as defined, and also whether it had provided empirical evidence (i.e., statistically significant findings) of determinants of trust, outcomes of trust, or evidence that trust functioned as a mediator or moderator. All studies that met those conditions were included in our review.

Our focus is on studies that provide insight into interpersonal trust within organizational settings. The majority of studies identified in our review analyzed survey and/or other data on employees in the workplace. Some studies (particularly laboratory studies) were not specifically situated within an organizational context, but nevertheless were conducted with the intent to provide insights relevant to work organizations, and are therefore included in our review.

Outline of the review

In the following sections, we first review the empirical evidence on the determinants and consequences of interpersonal trust. These are followed by a review of empirical evidence of the mediating role and moderating role of interpersonal trust. Because a mediating role implies, by definition, that interpersonal trust is also functioning as a determinant and consequence of other constructs, the findings in the Mediation section could arguably also be repeated in the Determinants and Consequences sections. However, in the interest of brevity and clarity, we only report these studies in the Mediation section. We conclude with a discussion of the implications and limitations of our review, and directions for future research.

Determinants of interpersonal trust

An interpersonal trust relationship can be considered to comprise the trustor, the trustee, the relationship between the trustor and the trustee, and the context within which they are embedded. Accordingly, the determinants of interpersonal trust can be categorized into these same four categories: trustor factors, trustee factors, relationship factors, and contextual factors. In the organizational context, the referents in interpersonal trust relationships include individuals such as a leader, a coworker, a fellow negotiator, etc. Depending on the referent, scholars have investigated different sets of determinants. Because of the large number of studies, we have organized the review by discussing each category of determinants and related trust referent in turn. Table 5.1 summarizes the specific empirical findings by study. Categories of determinants are listed in the top row. The studies are presently in chronological order so that readers can observe how the empirical research has evolved from the early 1990s to the present. We do not include the integrative reviews and quantitative meta-analyses in the table.

Trustor factors

Trustor’s propensity to trust or generalized trust has been found to facilitate interpersonal trust directly (Colquitt et al., 2007, Mayer et al., 1995), probably because individuals with high trust propensity are more willing to form new relationships prior to gaining information about the

Table 5.1 Determinants of trust by referent and category

Authors	Conceptualization ⁽¹⁾	Measure ⁽²⁾	Referent ⁽³⁾	Trustor factors	Trustee factors	Shared relation factors	Communication processes	Structural/network factors	Organizational factors	External factors
Thomas and Ravlin (1995)	Trust (Willingness to accept vulnerability "WTAV")	Bond (1983)	Foreign manager		Cultural adaptation					
Korsgaard and Roberson (1995)	General trust	Cook and Wall (1980)	Manager	Non-instrumental voice						
De Dreu et al. (1998)	General trust		Negotiation partner	Social motive; punitive capability						
Farh et al. (1998)	General trust/loyalty	Podsakoff et al. (1990)	Supervisor; the Guanxi connection							Guanxi; relational demography
Korsgaard et al. (1998)	General trust	Roberts and O'Reilly (1974)	Manager	Assertiveness; self-appraisal						
Elsbach and Eloffson (2000)	Perceived competency	McCroskey (1966)	Decision maker		Easy-to-understand language; a legitimating decision process label					
Lee et al. (2000)	General trust	Roberts and O'Reilly (1974)	Supervisor	Power distance orientation	Procedural justice					

continued . . .

Table 5.1 Continued

<i>Authors</i>	<i>Conceptualization⁽¹⁾</i>	<i>Measure⁽²⁾</i>	<i>Referent⁽³⁾</i>	<i>Truster factors</i>	<i>Trustee factors</i>	<i>Shared relation factors</i>	<i>Communication processes</i>	<i>Structural/network factors</i>	<i>Organizational factors</i>	<i>External factors</i>
Young and Perrewe (2000)	General trust	Butler (1991)	Mentor; protégé		Social support; openness to advisement and coaching; having accomplished required work					
Chattopadhyay and George (2001)	Cognition-based trust; affect-based trust	McAllister (1995)	Peer			Work-status dissimilarity			Temporary worker-dominated groups	
Korsgaard et al. (2002)	General trust	Butler (1991)	Manager		Open communication; demonstrating concern for employee					
Malhotra and Murnighan (2002)	General trust		Partner			Binding vs. non-binding contract				
Ambrose and Schminke (2003)	Cognition-based trust; affect-based trust	McAllister (1995)	Supervisor		Interactional justice				Organic organization	

Becerra and Gupta (2003)	Perceived trustworthiness (ability, benevolence, and integrity)	Mayer and Davis (1999)	Manager	Trust propensity		Frequency of communication	Truster's and trustee's positions within organization
Ferrin and Dirks (2003)	General trust	Cummings and Bromiley (1996)	Peer				Cooperative, competitive, mixed rewards
Naquin and Paulson (2003)	General trust	Cummings and Bromiley (1996)	Negotiation partner			Online negotiation	
Perrone et al. (2003)	General trust	Rempel et al. (1985)	Purchasing manager	Role			
Brown et al. (2005)	Affect-based trust	McAllister (1995)	Supervisor	Ethical leadership			
Rao et al. (2005)	General trust	One item from Xin and Pearce (1996)	Business associate				Facilitative governments
Ferrin et al. (2006)	Perceived integrity	One item from Mayer and Davis (1999)	Coworker	Organizational citizenship behaviors			Trust transferability; structural equivalence
Levin et al. (2006)	Perceived benevolence	Johnson et al. (1996)	Supervisor and subordinate	Trustworthy behavior	Relationship length; demographic similarity; shared perspective		
de Jong et al. (2007)	Cognition-based trust; affect-based trust	McAllister (1995)	Team member	Perceived help	Task dependence		

continued . . .

Table 5.1 Continued

<i>Authors</i>	<i>Conceptualization⁽¹⁾</i>	<i>Measure⁽²⁾</i>	<i>Referent⁽³⁾</i>	<i>Truster factors</i>	<i>Trustee factors</i>	<i>Shared relation factors</i>	<i>Communication processes</i>	<i>Structural/network factors</i>	<i>Organizational factors</i>	<i>External factors</i>
Choi (2008)	Trust (WTAV)	Roberts and O'Reilly (1974)	Supervisor		Perceived justice					
Chua et al. (2008)	Cognition-based trust; affect-based trust	McAllister (1995)	Managerial peer					Economic resource, task advice, and career guidance ties; friendship and career guidance ties		
Gino and Schweitzer (2008)	General trust	Johnson-George and Swap (1982)	Student advisor/participant	Incidental gratitude; neutral emotional state; incidental anger						
Lau and Liden (2008)	Trust (WTAV; disclosure intentions)	One item from Gillespie (2003)	Coworker					Leader's trust in coworker		
Ballinger et al. (2009)	Trust (WTAV)	Mayer and Davis (1999)	Supervisor	Affective reaction to the departure of prior leader	Perceived ability	Student participant				

Hill et al. (2009)	General trust	Cummings and Bromiley (1996)			Face-to-face communication	Competitive vs. cooperative context
Johnson and Lord (2010)	Trust (WTAV)	Mayer and Gavin (2005)	Experimenter	Interdependent and independent/individual self-identities	Justice	
Norman et al. (2010)	Trust (WTAV)	Mayer and Gavin (2005)	Leader		Leader positivity; leader transparency	
Sy (2010)	Perceived integrity	Gabarro and Athos (1976)	Leader		Implicit followership theories	
Vignovic and Thompson (2010)	Cognition-based trust; affect-based trust	McAllister (1995)	Student participant/the e-mail sender		Technical language violations; etiquette violations; cultural background of email sender	
Wong and Boh (2010)	Perceived trustworthiness			Managerial peer		Network heterogeneity, non-overlapping contacts; network density

continued . . .

Table 5.1 Continued

<i>Authors</i>	<i>Conceptualization⁽¹⁾</i>	<i>Measure⁽²⁾</i>	<i>Referent⁽³⁾</i>	<i>Truster factors</i>	<i>Trustee factors</i>	<i>Shared relation factors</i>	<i>Communication processes</i>	<i>Structural/network factors</i>	<i>Organizational factors</i>	<i>External factors</i>
Yakovleva et al. (2010)	Perceived trustworthiness (ability, benevolence, and integrity)	Jarvenpaa et al. (1998)	Coworker (reciprocal trust)	Propensity to trust	Perceived trustworthiness				Co-located vs. virtual work	
Cameron and Webster (2011)	Affect-based trust	McAllister (1995)	Communication partner (reciprocal trust)		Incivility					
Kalshoven et al. (2011)	General trust	Cook and Wall (1980)	Supervisor		Ethical leader behaviors					
Jiang et al. (2011)	Cognition-based trust; affect-based trust	McAllister (1995)	Executive of overseas partner			The same cultural ethnicity				Relative firm size; firm age
Mayer et al. (2011)	Trust (WTAV) and perceived trustworthiness (ability, benevolence, and integrity)	Mayer and Davis (1999)	Supervisor		Power; influence tactics					
Chua et al. (2012)	Affect-based trust	McAllister (1995)	Managerial peer	Cultural metacognition						

Dunn et al. (2012)	Cognition-based trust; affect-based trust	McAllister (1995) and Johnson-George and Swap (1982)	Student participant		Upwards comparison; downward comparison
Lount and Pettit (2012)	General trust; perceived benevolence	Johnson-George and Swap (1982) and Mayer and Davis (1999)	Student participant	Status	Interpersonal affect regulation
Niven et al. (2012)	General trust	One item from Levin and Cross (2004)	Coworker		
Frazier et al. (2013)	Trust (WTAV)	Mayer and Gavin (2005)	Supervisor	Propensity to trust; optimism	Perceived ability, benevolence, and integrity
Saunders et al. (2014)	Trust (WTAV)	Card sort method	Manager		Managerial actions and policies relating to quality of communication and job security
Halbesleben and Wheeler (2015)	General trust	Cook and Wall (1980)	Coworker (reciprocal trust)		Social support; OCBs
Kwan et al. (2015)	Affect-based trust	McAllister (1995)	The target employee		Assumed familiarity to others

continued . . .

Table 5.1 Continued

<i>Authors</i>	<i>Conceptual-ization⁽¹⁾</i>	<i>Measure⁽²⁾</i>	<i>Referent⁽³⁾</i>	<i>Truster factors</i>	<i>Trustee factors</i>	<i>Shared relation factors</i>	<i>Communication processes</i>	<i>Structural/network factors</i>	<i>Organizational factors</i>	<i>External factors</i>
Levine and Schweitzer (2015)	General trust; perceived benevolence and integrity		Game partner		Prosocial lies					
Vogel et al. (2015)	Perceived benevolence	Tepper & Henle (2011)	Supervisor		Abusive supervision					Anglo vs. Confucian culture

Notes

- 1 In general, if fewer than 75 percent of the items in a trust scale tap into perceived trustworthiness (i.e., ability, benevolence, and integrity), cognition-based trust, affect-based trust, or trust (willingness to accept vulnerability), we classify the scale as general trust.
- 2 Indicates the scale used or adapted from. If the authors did not state the source of the measure, we leave the cell blank, indicating that the authors created the scale themselves.
- 3 We indicate in parentheses those studies that investigated reciprocal based trust on the definition by Korsgaard et al. (2014).

trustee (Mayer et al., 1995). Propensity to trust is considered to be a dispositional, stable within-person factor. People vary in their propensity to trust due to their different developmental experiences, personalities, and cultural backgrounds (Mayer et al., 1995). Colquitt and colleagues (2007) meta-analyzed the relationships among trust, propensity to trust, and trustworthiness and found that propensity to trust is positively correlated with perceptions of trustee's trustworthiness and trust itself. The effect of propensity to trust on trust in coworker has been found to be stronger when people work virtually than co-located, and trustworthiness fully mediated the influence of trust propensity on trust (Yakovleva et al., 2010). In developing and validating their propensity to trust scale, Frazier, Johnson, and Fainshmidt (2013) found that propensity to trust was significantly related to, yet distinct from, trait optimism, and that trustworthiness perceptions are the cognitive evaluations that translate one's propensity to trust to one's willingness to be vulnerable to another (i.e., trust).

In addition to trust propensity, a number of other trustor characteristics have been examined. In negotiation contexts, De Dreu, Giebels, and Van de Vliert (1998) manipulated negotiators' social motive and punitive capability and found that trust is low when cooperative negotiators have high punitive capability. Focusing on incidental emotions, Gino and Schweitzer (2008) found that people who feel incidental gratitude are more trusting than are people in a neutral emotional state, and people in a neutral state are more trusting than are people who feel incidental anger. A recent meta-analysis by Lu et al. (2017) found that trustor attributes (positive affect, negative affect, and social motives) all have significant and relatively strong relationships with interpersonal trust in dyadic negotiations. In workplace trust judgments, positive affective reactions to the departure of a prior leader had a significant positive effect on trust toward the successive leader (Ballinger et al., 2009). In a series of lab experiments, Lount and Pettit (2012) found that people with high status tended to judge others as more benevolent and thus place more trust in others. In the context of performance appraisal decisions, Korsgaard and Roberson (1995) found that non-instrumental voice of a subordinate had an impact on the subordinate's trust toward the manager. Korsgaard, Roberson, and Rymph (1998) found that subordinates who were trained to communicate assertively in an appraisal review reacted more favourably to their managers with higher levels of trust toward the manager. Leaders' implicit followership theories predicted followers' trust in leaders because these perceptions may influence the extent to which leaders exhibit more or less trusting behaviors and the extent to which followers reciprocate in kind to leaders' display of trust (Sy, 2010). In an Executive MBA student sample, Chua, Morris, and Mor (2012) found that managers with lower cultural metacognition were less likely to have developed affect-based trust in their intercultural relationships.

Trustee factors

Consistent evidence, including meta-analytic evidence (Colquitt et al., 2007), has supported the proposition advanced by Mayer et al. (1995) that trust (defined as willingness to accept vulnerability toward a referent based on confident positive expectations) is predicted by perceptions of the referent's ability, benevolence, and integrity. In the workplace, trustworthiness behaviors such as being open, discrete, receptive, and available (Korsgaard et al., 2002; Levin et al., 2006), and organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs) including voluntary help and individualized support (Ferrin et al., 2006; Young & Perrewe 2000), have been shown to influence a trustee's perceived trustworthiness and improve interpersonal trust. In the context of buyer-supplier relations, more-autonomous purchasing managers elicit higher levels of trust because they are better able to meet the positive expectations of their external counterparts by being more integrative, responsive, and competent (Perrone et al. 2003). Cameron and Webster (2011) found that individuals' incivility behaviors in a dyad could influence their interpersonal

trust in each other. Trustees' behaviors can also have mixed effects on trust. Levine and Schweitzer (2015) found that prosocial lies, and false statements told with the intention of benefiting others, increase benevolence-based trust but harm integrity-based trust.

In terms of trust in leaders, Dirks and Ferrin's (2002) meta-analytic review reported that leadership behaviors (i.e., transformational and transactional leadership) had strong effects on subordinates' trust in supervisors. Meanwhile, other types of leadership behaviors have also been shown to impact trust in leaders such as ethical leadership (Brown et al., 2005; Kalshoven et al., 2011), participative leadership (Huang et al., 2010), servant leadership (van Dierendonck, 2011), and authentic leadership (Norman et al., 2010). In addition to leadership behaviors, various other managerial behaviors have been shown to impact employees' trust. For example, Korsgaard, Brodt, and Whitener (2002) demonstrated that managers' use of open communications and demonstrating concern for employees could increase trust. In a five-month longitudinal field study of the use of influence tactics and power on the development of employee trust, Mayer, Bobko, Davis, and Gavin (2011) found that changes in trust levels were substantially related to increases in specific types of power use and influence attempts. Participative decision making also increased trust between partners in collaboration simulations (Dirks & Ferrin, 2002). Elsbach and Eloffson (2000) demonstrated that easy-to-understand language and a legitimating decision-making label could increase perceptions of competence-based trustworthiness. With a constrained card sort method and an associated in-depth interview method, Saunders, Dietz, and Thornhill (2014) found that managerial actions and policies that are related to consideration, inspiration, and quality of communication and job security have significant effects on trust. Scholars have also investigated leadership behaviors that can decrease trust. One study found that the negative effects of perceived abusive supervision on trust were stronger for subordinates within the Anglo versus the Confucian Asian culture (Vogel et al., 2015).

In addition to leadership behaviors, researchers have consistently found positive relationships between organizational justice, ethical behaviors, and trust (Dirks & Ferrin, 2002, Colquitt & Rodell, 2011). Beyond the main effects of organizational justice (i.e., distributive, procedural, and interactional justice) on interpersonal trust (Dirks & Ferrin, 2002), several contingency models have recently been tested. In a sample of Hong Kong employees, researchers found that the relationship between procedural justice and trust in supervisor was higher for those with low power-distance orientations (Lee et al., 2000). Ambrose and Schminke (2003) found that the relationship between interactional justice and supervisory trust was stronger in organic organizations as compared to mechanistic organizations. Choi (2008) found that employees' perceptions of the fairness of their supervisor moderated the relationship between the perceived justice of a particular event and their trust in managers. Other researchers have investigated the mechanisms underlying the relationship between justice and trust. By manipulating justice in a laboratory experiment, Johnson and Lord (2010) found that the effects of justice on trust were mediated by the activation of interdependent and independent/individual self-identities.

Scholars have also studied how culture influences employees' trust in leaders and partners. Responses from employees in the US subsidiaries of Japanese manufacturing firms confirmed that cultural adaptation by a foreign manager was negatively related to internal causal attributions for the manager's behavior, and those attributions were directly related to participants' intentions to trust (Thomas & Ravlin, 1995).

To conclude, trustee factors in terms of perceived ability, benevolence, and integrity play critical roles in determining interpersonal trust levels. Work behaviors that indicate an individual's trustworthiness also promote trust. Specifically, for trust in supervisors, leadership behaviors, leaders' decision-making behaviors, organizational justice, and cultural adaptation behaviors have been demonstrated to increase trust.

Relationship factors

Relationship factors are elements shared between trustor and trustee. They can be categorized into the relationship itself, shared similarity, relationship interdependence, exchange processes, and communication processes between trustor and trustee. First, several studies have considered the effects of relationship length on trust. A recent meta-analysis found that the correlation between trust and relationship duration is on average positive but small, suggesting the presence of unobserved moderators (Vanneste et al., 2014). Using relationship length as the moderator, Levin, Whitener, and Cross (2006) found that trustworthiness perceptions were related to demographic similarity in newer relationships, to trustworthiness behaviors in more established relationships, and to shared perspective in more mature relationships.

Second, the degree of similarity between trustor and trustee is also likely to impact trust (Fulmer & Gelfand, 2012). For example, interpersonal trust was found to be higher when individuals perceived guanxi and relational demography (i.e., similarities between individuals) (Farh et al., 1998), and when the trustor and trustee shared cultural-ethnic similarity (Jiang et al., 2011). Trust in peers (internal workers) was lower when individuals perceived work-status dissimilarity in temporary-worker-dominated groups (Chattopadhyay & George, 2001). In addition, Kwan et al. (2015) studied the mere exposure effect – objects, ideas or people more frequently encountered in the physical or social environment are usually more positively evaluated. They found this effect altered individuals' assumed familiarity to others and influenced affect-based trust when participants had the motivation to be connected to their peers (Kwan et al., 2015).

Third, different interdependent relationships between trustor and trustee also influence the trust between them. For example, Malhotra and Murnighan (2002) found that non-binding contracts lead to personal attributions for cooperation and thus may provide an optimal basis for building interpersonal trust. Considering different task-interdependent relations, de Jong, Van der Vegt, and Molleman (2007) found that when both team members are highly dependent on each other, an increase in task dependence was associated with higher levels of perceived help from and interpersonal trust in the team member.

Fourth, scholars have recognized that trust development may spiral between trustor and trustee in that trust promotes cooperative behaviors, which in turn promotes trust between individuals in a relationship. Several empirical studies have modeled such spiraling between two parties. With a dyadic design, Ferrin, Bligh, and Kohles (2008) found strong support in a laboratory setting for a trust-cooperation spiral between individuals in which an individual's cooperative behavior influenced the partner's trust perceptions which in turn influenced the partner's cooperative behaviors. Similarly, Halbesleben and Wheeler (2015) modeled and empirically demonstrated a reciprocal resource gain spiral between pairs of coworkers and found support that a coworker's organizational citizenship behaviors towards individuals (OCBIs) leads to an individual's perceived social support, which in turn leads to trust and OCBIs toward that coworker, and vice versa.

The communication processes between the trustor and trustee also influences trust. Relative to face-to-face (FTF) negotiations, online negotiations were found to be related to lower levels of trust (Naquin & Paulson, 2003; Lu et al., 2017). Meanwhile, researchers have found that in online communications, participants formed negative trustworthiness perceptions of the sender of an e-mail containing technical language violations and etiquette violations (Vignovic & Thompson, 2010). Yet, scholars have also found that communication medium interacts with organizational context and time to influence trust because individuals gather additional information from others over time, and consequently the difference in trust between FTF and online communications decreases (Hill et al., 2009). Beyond the medium itself, communication

processes also moderate the effects of other predictors on trust. As communication frequency increases, the trustor's general attitudinal predisposition towards peers becomes less important and the trustor's and trustee's positions within the organization become more important as determinants of perceived trustworthiness (Becerra & Gupta, 2003). Meanwhile, communications that regulate interpersonal affect by improving others' affect have been found to be associated with individuals' perceptions of friendship and trust (Niven et al., 2012). The relationship between positive affect and trust was stronger in online versus FTF negotiations (Lu et al., 2017).

Contextual factors

Contextual factors reflect a broad set of potential determinants of trust. This category of factors is based on the understanding that the interpersonal trust relationship is embedded in a larger context including other relationships around the focal relationship (i.e., the network), the organizational context, and the environment that is external to organizations.

Social network analysis studies have found that different network characteristics impact interpersonal trust. Network characteristics such as trust transferability (i.e., the extent to which trustor and trustee share a common trusted third party) and structural equivalence (i.e., the similarity in the relationships the trustee and trustor have and do not have with others in a network) have been found to promote interpersonal trust (Ferrin et al., 2006). Trust in a coworker was found to be affected by the extent to which the coworker is trusted by the leader (Lau & Liden, 2008). Different ties between trustor and trustee have different implications for trust: task advice and career guidance ties have been found to lead to cognition-based trust while friendship and career guidance ties lead to affect-based trust (Chua et al., 2008). And, managers whose advocates (i.e., third parties) have many non-overlapping contacts, high network density, and high network heterogeneity have higher peer reputations for trustworthiness (Wong & Boh, 2010).

Organizational context has also been found to impact interpersonal trust, primarily through reward structures. A cooperative reward structure has been found to encourage teamwork and promote trust, while a competitive reward structure encourages individual efforts (Hill et al., 2009). Ferrin and Dirks (2003) found that the presence of cooperative reward structures fostered higher levels of interpersonal trust than did competitive reward structures via the effects of goal structures on participants' actual behaviors, perceived motives, and perceived performance. Reward structures of many organizations routinely compare employees with each other by ranking employees or publicly recognizing an employee for special achievement (Dunn et al., 2012). Given the frequency of such comparisons, Dunn, Ruedy, and Schweitzer (2012) investigated how comparisons with someone whose performance is superior to one's own (upward comparisons) and comparisons with someone whose performance is inferior to one's own (downward comparisons) influence trust. They found that upward comparisons harm affective trust and downward comparisons harm cognitive trust (Dunn et al., 2012).

Factors external to the organizations can also exert an impact on interpersonal trust. Negotiators from the loose culture trust one another more than negotiators from the tight culture (Lu et al., 2017). Considering firm size and age in shaping intra-cultural and intercultural trust, Jiang et al. (2011) found that firm age was positively associated with Chinese senior executives' affect-based trust for the senior executive of the same cultural ethnicity at overseas partner firms. Rao et al. (2005) conducted structured interviews with managers from China, Hong Kong, Thailand, and the United States and asked them to identify three business associates and rate each relationship. They assigned country-specific facilitative government index scores to each respondent and found that a facilitative government that provides structures to facilitate business transactions can lead to higher levels of interpersonal trust in business associates (Rao et al., 2005).

In sum, it is clear that trustee factors, trustor factors, relationship factors, and contextual factors do impact interpersonal trust. Mayer et al.'s (1995) conceptual model provided a crucial roadmap for how trustor's propensity to trust and the perceived trustworthiness of the trustee were expected to impact trust. However, their model provided relatively less insight into trustor factors other than trust propensity, relationship factors or contextual factors, or upstream variables that might influence trust via perceived ability, benevolence, or integrity. The research reviewed in this section has provided extensive insight into other trustor factors, and upstream, relationship, and contextual factors. These empirical findings highlight a need for conceptual frameworks that can model how interpersonal trust is influenced by the broad range of trustor, upstream, relationship, and contextual factors that have been uncovered in empirical research.

Consequences of interpersonal trust

Interpersonal trust has been found to have generally positive effects on a wide range of attitudinal and behavioral workplace outcomes. The behavioral outcomes can be categorized into knowledge sharing, cooperation, communication, attachment (e.g., commitment; intention to quit or stay) and performance (e.g., job performance; OCBs) (Fulmer & Gelfand, 2012). Most studies on the relationship between trust in interpersonal referents and individual outcomes have focused on trust in leader. Table 5.2 summarizes the specific empirical findings by study, again presenting them in chronological order so that readers can observe how research has evolved over time. Categories of consequence are listed in the top row. We again do not include integrative reviews and quantitative meta-analyses in the table.

Several empirical studies have confirmed that trust in leader or manager influences attitudinal outcomes such as job satisfaction and work engagement (Cunningham & MacGregor, 2000; Moorman et al., 2013; Yang & Mossholder, 2010), satisfaction with the leader and ratings of leader justice (Holtz, 2015; Holtz & Harold, 2009). Quantitative meta-analyses have also confirmed that trust in leader increases belief in the information from the leader and commitment to decisions (Dirks & Ferrin, 2002). Both trust in leader and trust in coworker can increase risk-taking preferences (Colquitt et al., 2007). In addition, Zapata, Olsen, and Martins (2013) suggested and found that leaders' perceptions of employee trustworthiness (benevolence and integrity) positively affected interpersonal and informational justice that the employee received from the leader through the social exchange mechanisms of felt obligation and trust.

Interpersonal trust in peers (e.g., a coworker, a peer manager) has also been found to promote knowledge exchange and knowledge creation (Chung & Jackson, 2011). In the mentor-protégé relationship, mentor's trust is related to career-related support, psychosocial support, and role modeling received by the protégé (Wang et al., 2010). And in a study of dormant ties, Levin, Walter, and Murnighan (2011) found that the perceived benevolence of dormant tie contacts is related to receipt of useful information.

Trust also plays an important role in conflict resolution within the workplace. Research has found that when mediating a dispute between two peers, participants sent more rapport-building messages when the trust exhibited between two disputants was low (Ross & Wieland, 1996). Interpersonal trust is also related to smoother negotiation and reduced conflict in buyer-supplier relationships (Zaheer et al., 1998). In two experiments and two field studies, De Cremer and Tyler (2007) consistently found that trust in an authority increases people's willingness to cooperate with the authority across a wide range of social situations.

In terms of attachment, trust in leader is likewise positively related to organizational commitment and negatively related to intention to quit (Brower et al., 2008; Costigan et al., 2013; Cunningham & MacGregor, 2000; Dirks & Ferrin, 2002; Moorman et al., 2013; Harris et al., 2014; Thau et al., 2007; Yang & Mossholder, 2010).

Table 5.2 Consequences of trust by referent and category

<i>Authors</i>	<i>Conceptual-ization⁽¹⁾</i>	<i>Measure⁽²⁾</i>	<i>Referent</i>	<i>Attitudes and preferences</i>	<i>Knowledge sharing and organizational learning</i>	<i>Communication, cooperation, and conflict</i>	<i>Attachment (commitment and turnover)</i>	<i>Performance</i>
McAllister (1995)	Cognition-based trust; affect-based trust		Peer					Need-based monitoring; affiliative citizenship behavior; assistance citizenship behavior; performance
Ross and Wieland (1996)	General trust	Experimental manipulation	Peer			Rapport-building messages sent by mediator		
Zaheer et al. (1998)	General trust	Rempel and Holmes (1986)	Contact person of supplier			Eased negotiation and reduced conflict	Absence, intention to quit	
Cunningham and MacGregor (2000)	Predictability, perceived benevolence and fairness		Supervisor	Job satisfaction				
Premeaux and Bedeian (2003)	General trust		Supervisor					Speaking up
Mayer and Gavin (2005)	Perceived trustworthiness (ability, benevolence, and integrity); Trust (WTAV)	Mayer and Davis (1999)	Plant manager					In-role performance; OCBs

De Cremer and Tyler (2007)	General trust	Manipulated (in two experiments); Tyler and Huo (2002) (in two field studies)	An authority	Willingness to cooperate with the authority	
George and Zhou (2007)	Cognition-based trust	McAllister (1995)	Supervisor		Creativity
Thau et al. (2007)	General trust	Cook and Wall (1980) and Robinson and Rousseau (1994) (in study 2)	Supervisor	Intention to stay	Antisocial work behavior
Brower et al. (2008)	Trust (WTAV)	Mayer and Davis (1999)	Manager; subordinate	Intention to quit	Individual-directed OCBs; organization-directed OCBs; in-role performance
Holtz and Harold (2009)	General trust	Robinson and Rousseau (1994)	Supervisor	Overall justice perception	
Wang et al. (2010)	Cognition-based trust; affect-based trust	McAllister (1995)	The protégé	Mentoring functions received by the protégé	
Yang and Mossholder (2010)	Cognition-based trust; affect-based trust		Supervisor	Job satisfaction	Affective organizational commitment
Chung and Jackson (2011)	General trust	Burt (1992) and Sparrowe et al. (2001)	Coworker	Knowledge creation	In-role and extra-role performance

continued . . .

Table 5.2 Continued

<i>Authors</i>	<i>Conceptualization⁽¹⁾</i>	<i>Measure⁽²⁾</i>	<i>Referent</i>	<i>Attitudes and preferences</i>	<i>Knowledge sharing and organizational learning</i>	<i>Communication, cooperation, and conflict</i>	<i>Attachment (commitment and turnover)</i>	<i>Performance</i>
Gao et al. (2011)	General trust	Robinson and Rousseau (1994)	Leader					Employee voice
Levin et al. (2011)	Perceived benevolence	Levin and Cross (2004) and Levin et al. (2006)	Dormant tie contact		Receipt of useful knowledge			
Palanski and Yammarino (2011)	Perceived integrity (behavioral integrity)	Simons et al. (2007)	Leader					Followee job performance
Costigan et al. (2013)	Cognition-based trust; affect-based trust	McAllister (1995)	Supervisor				Turnover intentions	
Li and Tan (2013)	Cognition-based trust; affect-based trust	McAllister (1995)	Supervisor					Job performance

Zapata et al. (2013)	Perceived trustworthiness (benevolence, and integrity); trust (WTAV)	Mayer and Davis (1999)	Employee	Leader interactional justice rule adherence
Moorman et al. (2013)	Perceived integrity; general trust	Roberts and O'Reilly (1974) (in study 2)	Leader	Leader effectiveness
Harris et al. (2014)	Trust (WTAV)	Robinson and Rousseau (1994)	Leader	Intention to quit Turnover intentions
Holtz (2015)	Initial trustworthiness perception	Huang and Murnighan (2010)	Individual in scenario	Newcomer creativity; task performance

Notes.

- 1 In general, if fewer than 75 percent of the items in a trust scale tap into perceived trustworthiness (i.e., ability, benevolence, and integrity), cognition-based trust, affect-based trust, or trust (willingness to accept vulnerability), we classify the scale as general trust.
- 2 Indicates the scale used or adapted from. If the authors did not state the source of the measure, we leave the cell blank, indicating that the authors created the scale themselves.

Trust has also been empirically associated with a range of performance outcomes: job performance, OCBs, creativity, and proactive behaviors. For example, manager's perceived trustworthiness and resultant trust in manager have been shown to increase employee in-role performance and OCBs (Mayer & Gavin, 2005). Yang and Mossholder (2010) distinguished trust in supervisor from trust in management and found affect-based trust in supervisor was a significant predictor of in-role and extra-role work behaviors. Perceived leader behavioral integrity has been confirmed to promote follower job performance (Palanski & Yammarino, 2011). Moorman et al. (2013) also found that perceived leader behavioral integrity and resultant trust in leaders lead to leader effectiveness, and subordinates' lower intentions to quit, higher job satisfaction and work engagement. Li and Tan (2013) provided evidence that trust in supervisor affected subordinates' performance via promoting psychological availability and psychological safety.

When developing the cognition-based and affect-based trust scale, McAllister (1995) found that cognition-based trust led to affect-based trust in peers, which in turn impacted manager need-based monitoring, affiliative citizenship behavior, and assistance citizenship behavior. Meanwhile, an employee's level of trust in supervisor was found to be negatively related to antisocial work behaviors via attachment to the organization (Thau et al., 2007). Brower et al. (2008) investigated the role of trust from both manager and subordinate perspectives and found strong support for the effect of the manager's trust in subordinate on subordinates' behavior and intentions, beyond the effect of trust in the manager. They further found a significant joint effect of trust in the manager and trust in the subordinate on individual-directed OCBs (Brower et al., 2008).

Trust has also been linked with creativity. Employee creativity has been found to be higher when supervisors provide a supportive environment in which trust in the supervisor is high (George & Zhou, 2007). Similarly, newcomer creativity is high when a newcomer's trust in the leader is high because increased levels of trust likely result in more receptive newcomers and contribute to an overall context that is conducive to creativity (Harris et al., 2014).

Research has also demonstrated that trust in supervisor can promote voice or speaking-up behaviors (Gao et al., 2011; Premeaux & Bedeian, 2003). Gao et al. (2011) further demonstrated that the relationship between leader trust and employee voice became more positive when empowering leadership was higher rather than lower.

In addition to the consequences mentioned above, a recent meta-analysis on trust in negotiations found that interpersonal trust predicts higher joint outcomes and outcome satisfaction (Kong et al., 2014). Results also found that trust had a positive relationship with integrative behaviors, which had a negative relationship with the trustor's outcome; in contrast, trust had a negative relationship with distributive behaviors, which had a positive relationship with the trustor's outcome.

Overall, research on interpersonal trust has documented a number of valuable benefits of trust. Interpersonal trust in various referents including the leader, coworker, and negotiation partner has been demonstrated to promote a wide range of desirable work and other outcomes. The literature on consequences of interpersonal trust is extensive and includes a number of narrative and meta-analytic reviews (Dirks & Ferrin, 2001; Dirks & Ferrin, 2002; Fulmer & Gelfand, 2012; Burke et al., 2007; Searle et al., 2011; Costa et al., 2015).

One key component of the Mayer et al. (1995) model of organizational trust is the moderating factor of perceived risk: the effect of an individual's trust in another (defined as willingness to accept vulnerability) on the individual's risk-taking in the relationship is posited to interact with perceived risk. Specifically, when the individual perceives risk to be high, even

a very high level of trust may not predict risk-taking in the relationship, whereas when the individual perceives risk to be low, even a low level of trust may predict risk-taking in the relationship. Considering how elemental this moderation proposition is to the Mayer et al. model, we were surprised that our review failed to identify any studies that had empirically validated the moderation effect. This absence of research is particularly surprising when contrasted with the extensive research supporting the other elements of the model, which were validated meta-analytically by Colquitt et al. (2007). Thus, one important direction for future research is to empirically validate the moderating effect of perceived risk.

The mediating role of interpersonal trust

In this section, we review studies that have hypothesized and found support for predictions that interpersonal trust will mediate the effect of some predictors on some outcomes. The support is typically established using empirical tests such as those provided by Baron and Kenny (1986) or Sobel (1982), or bootstrapping (Preacher & Hayes, 2008), path modeling, or latent variable structural equation modeling. We only report significant or marginally significant effects. As will be seen in this review, a relatively large number of studies have hypothesized and found mediation. By reviewing them, we can gain insight into the question, “In what empirical relationships does interpersonal trust provide a valuable mediating role?”

It is important to note that the seminal model of organizational trust advanced by Mayer and colleagues (Mayer et al., 1995) posits a mediation effect: The effects of the trustor’s perceptions of the trustee’s ability, benevolence and integrity on the trustor’s risk-taking in a relationship are mediated by the trustor’s trust, defined as willingness to accept vulnerability. Strong and robust support for this mediation effect has been provided in meta-analytic form (Colquitt et al., 2007). We do note, however, that the first step of the mediation effect posited and validated by these researchers is a path from trust perceptions to trust intentions, both of which are trust-related cognitive states existing within the trustor. In the remainder of this section, we would like to expand beyond this particular mediated effect to inquire into how trust (whether a perception, expectation, or intention as defined earlier in this paper) may mediate other empirical relations.

Stream 1: Mediating role of trust in relationships between leaders’ behaviors and followers’ work-related attitudes and behaviors. Our review highlighted two broad streams of mediation effects (Table 5.3). The first stream reflects what can now be considered a critical mass of studies that have hypothesized and supported the fundamental prediction that a leader’s behaviors influence a range of followers’ work-related attitudinal and behavioral outcomes via the follower’s trust in the leader. A first set of these studies found support for the effects of transformational and transactional leadership. In two independent samples of US-based employees and their supervisors, Pillai, Schriesheim, and Williams (1999) found that the effect of supervisors’ transformational leadership behaviors on subordinates’ OCBs was mediated by subordinates’ trust in the supervisor; they further found support for a three-step mediation effect in which the effects of transformational leadership influenced trust via subordinates’ perceptions of organizational procedural justice, with trust then ultimately influencing OCBs. In a US-based lab study, Jung and Avolio (2000) found that confederates’ transformational and transactional leadership behaviors influenced followers’ performance quality and satisfaction with the leader via trust in the leader. In a sample of American employees and their supervisors, Rubin, Bommer, and Bachrach (2010) found that supervisors’ operant behaviors (contingent reward, noncontingent reward, and noncontingent punishment, but not contingent punishment), predicted

Table 5.3 Interpersonal trust as a mediator

<i>Authors</i>	<i>Conceptualization⁽¹⁾</i>	<i>Measure⁽²⁾</i>	<i>Referent</i>	<i>Predictors</i>	<i>Attitudinal outcomes</i>	<i>Behavioral outcomes</i>
STREAM 1: MEDIATION OF THE EFFECTS OF LEADER BEHAVIORS ON SUBORDINATES' ATTITUDINAL AND BEHAVIORAL OUTCOMES						
Pillai et al. (1999)	Perceived ability	Nyhan & Marlowe Jr. (1997)	Supervisor	Transformational leadership; transactional leadership; procedural justice	Satisfaction with the leader	OCBs
Jung and Avolio (2000)	General trust	Podsakoff et al. (1990)	Supervisor	Transformational leadership; transactional leadership	Job satisfaction	Task performance; helping behavior
Yang et al. (2009)	Affect-based trust; cognition-based trust	Podsakoff et al. (1990, 1996)	Supervisor	Procedural justice	Job satisfaction	OCBs
Rubin et al. (2010)	General trust	Podsakoff et al. (1990, 1996)	Supervisor	Operant leadership (contingent reward; noncontingent reward; noncontingent punishment)	Perceived charisma (Study 2); perceived legitimacy (Study 2)	OCBs (Study 3)
Van Dijke et al. (2010)	General trust	Scott (1983)	Fellow organizational participant (Study 2); supervisor (Study 3)	Procedural justice	Perceived charisma (Study 2); perceived legitimacy (Study 2)	OCBs (Study 3)
Khazanchi and Masterson (2011)	Perceived integrity	Robinson (1996)	Supervisor	Interpersonal justice; informational justice	Normative commitment; uncertainty	LMX; information sharing, creativity
Colquitt et al. (2012)	Affect-based trust; cognition-based trust	McAllister (1995)	Supervisor	Distributive justice; procedural justice; interpersonal justice	Affective organizational commitment	OCBs; job performance
W. Zhu et al. (2013)	Affect-based trust; cognition-based trust	McAllister (1995)	Supervisor	Transformational leadership	Affective organizational commitment	OCBs; job performance
Chen et al. (2014)	Affect-based trust	McAllister (1995)	Supervisor	Paternalistic leadership (benevolence; morality)	Affective organizational commitment	In-role performance; OCBs
Y. Zhu and Akhtar (2014)	Affect-based trust; cognition-based trust	McAllister (1995)	Supervisor	Transformational leadership	Affective organizational commitment	Helping behavior

STREAM 2: OTHER MEDIATED EFFECTS

Author(s) (Year)	Construct	Source	Context	Mediator	Outcome
Simons et al. (2007)	Perceived integrity (behavioral integrity)		Manager	Employee race (black vs. non-black)	Employees' trust in manager; interpersonal justice perceptions; organizational commitment; intent to stay
Ferrin et al. (2008)	Perceived integrity	Cummings and Bromiley (1996)	Partner in a lab simulation	Partner's cooperation	Actor's cooperation
Rafaeli et al. (2008)	General trust		Stranger	Recognizability of an organizational logo	Initial compliance with a request made by a stranger
Hofmann et al. (2009)	Affect-based trust		Co-worker	Formally-designated role (helping role)	Employees' intent to seek help
Mislin et al. (2011)	Perceived benevolence and perceived integrity (combined into a single factor)	Mayer and Davis (1999)	Negotiation counterpart	Negotiator's mood (positive vs. neutral); contract incentives from counterpart	Negotiators' contract implementation
Sonenshein et al. (2011)	Perceived ability and integrity (combined into a single factor)	Mayer and Davis (1999)	Borrower	Borrowers' verbal accounts	Lending decisions
Kacmar et al. (2012)	General trust	Treadway et al. (2004)	Supervisor	Relationship conflict between supervisor and employee	Subordinates' OCBs
Ladegard and Gjerd (2014)	General trust	Dietz and Den Hertog (2006); Mayer and Davis (1999); Mayer and Gavin (2005)	Subordinate	Leadership coaching intervention	Subordinates' perceived empowerment; turnover intent
Reiche et al. (2014)	Affect-based trust	McAllister (1995)	Subordinate	Subordinates' OCBs	Managers' trustworthy behavior

Notes.

- 1 In general, if fewer than 75 percent of the items in a trust scale tap into perceived trustworthiness (i.e., ability, benevolence, and integrity), cognition-based trust, affect-based trust, or trust (willingness to accept vulnerability), we classify the scale as general trust.
- 2 Indicates the scale used or adapted from. If the authors did not state the source of the measure, we leave the cell blank, indicating that the authors created the scale themselves.

trust in the supervisor, which in turn influenced employees' OCBs. In a study of employees and their supervisors in Mainland China, W. Zhu, Newman, Miao, and Hooke (2013) found that affect-based trust in the leader mediated the positive effects of supervisors' transformational leadership behaviors on subordinates' affective organizational commitment, OCBs, and job performance, whereas cognition-based trust in the leader mediated a negative effect of transformational leadership on job performance. And in a sample of employees and their supervisors in Mainland China, Y. Zhu and Akhtar (2014) found that both affect- and cognition-based trust toward the leader mediated the effect of supervisors' transformational leadership behaviors on subordinates' helping behaviors; a moderated mediation analysis further indicated that the effects of affect- and cognition-based trust on helping behavior differed according to the level of subordinates' prosocial motivation.

A second set of studies found support for the mediated effects of leaders' justice behaviors. In a sample of Taiwan-based employees and their supervisors, Yang, Mossholder, and Peng (2009) found that the effect of supervisors' procedural justice behaviors on subordinates' helping behaviors was mediated by subordinates' affect-based trust in the supervisor, whereas the effects of supervisors' procedural justice behaviors on subordinates' job satisfaction and task performance were mediated by subordinates' cognition-based trust in the supervisor. In a laboratory experiment conducted to replicate field findings of Netherlands-based employees and their supervisors, and uncover mediating mechanisms, van Dijke, De Cremer, and Mayer (2010) found that trust in a fellow organizational member mediated the effect of the member's procedural justice behaviors on the trustor's perceptions of the member's charisma and legitimacy; however, this effect held only for high-power members, not low-power members; in a follow-up field study of US employees and their supervisors, employees' trust in their supervisors mediated the effects of supervisors' procedural justice behaviors on subordinates' OCBs. Analyzing data from a sample of Indian employees and their supervisors, Khazanchi and Masterson (2011) presented a structural equation model indicating multiple stages of mediation in which supervisors' informational and interpersonal justice behaviors influenced employees' trust in their supervisors, which in turn influenced leader-member exchange, then employee information sharing, and then employee creativity. And in a study of US-based employees, Colquitt et al. (2012) found that both affect- and cognition-based trust (ABT and CBT) mediated the effects of three forms of justice (distributive, procedural, and interpersonal) on job performance. The authors presented a three-step mediation model in which justice behaviors influenced ABT and CBT; ABT then influenced normative commitment while CBT influenced uncertainty, and then normative commitment and uncertainty influenced job performance.

Finally, one study examined the role of trust in mediating the effect of yet another leadership behavior – paternalistic leadership – on employee outcomes. In a study aimed at studying leadership behaviors in the Confucian Chinese context, using a sample of employees and their supervisors in Taiwan, Chen et al. (2014) found that subordinates' affect-based trust toward their supervisors mediated the effects of supervisors' benevolence and morality behaviors (but not authoritarianism behaviors) on subordinates' in-role performance and OCBs.

In sum, we see a sizeable number of empirical studies demonstrating that employees' trust in the leader mediates the effects of leadership behaviors on employees' work-related attitudes and behaviors. We further note that these studies have been situated in a variety of research settings (field and lab), in very distinct cultures (Western, Chinese, Indian), using different data sources (employee report, supervisor report, archival). This consistency of findings over the diversity of research settings, country/cultural contexts, and methods, lends considerable weight to the notion that the effects are robust.

Stream 2: Other mediating effects. The ‘second stream’ of studies is probably better characterized as multiple rivulets rather than a single stream. Extending the theme from above which focused on the effects of trustees’ behaviors (specifically, leadership behaviors), a first group of studies has examined the mediated effects of a much broader range of trustee factors, including employees’ OCBs, partners’ cooperative behaviors, borrowers’ verbal accounts in a lending context, counterparts’ contract terms in a negotiation context, formal roles granted to a fellow employee, and the subtle symbols of credibility (logos on t-shirts) accompanying a compliance request.

In an 18-country field study of managers and their subordinates, Reich et al. (2014) found that the effects of subordinates’ OCBOs (OCBs directed toward the organization) and OCBs (OCBs directed toward peers) on managers’ trustworthy behavior was mediated by managers’ trust in the subordinates. As mentioned above, in a lab study, Ferrin, Bligh, and Kohles (2008) found that an actor’s trust in a partner mediated the effect of the partner’s cooperative behavior on the actor’s cooperative behavior, and these dynamics spiraled back and forth between actor and partner over time. Following a field study that indicated that borrowers’ verbal accounts (e.g., explanations, acknowledgments, denial) influenced lenders’ decisions on whether or not to loan funds, Sonenshein, Herzenstein, and Dholaki (2011) conducted a laboratory experiment to explore the psychological mechanisms that might explain the effect; they found that verbal accounts influence lenders’ perceptions of borrowers’ trustworthiness, which in turn influence lending decisions. In a laboratory study exploring the factors that would influence negotiators to accept risky terms in the implementation of a negotiated agreement, Mislin, Campagna, and Bottom (2011) found that individuals’ trust toward their counterpart mediated the effects of contract form (incentives for implementation). In a study of US-based employees, Hofmann, Lei and Grant (2009) found that employees’ decisions to seek help from a particular coworker were predicted by the coworker having a formally-designated helping role, and the effect was mediated by the employee’s affect-based trust toward the coworker. And in a laboratory setting, Rafaeli, Sagy, and Derfler-Rozin (2008) found in two separate studies (Studies 2 and 4) that individuals were more likely to comply with a request (e.g., to taste some food; make a monetary donation) made by a stranger if the stranger was wearing a shirt with a familiar logo (vs. no logo); the effect was mediated by individuals’ trust toward the stranger.

Yet another set of mediation studies has focused not on trustee factors, but on a range of trustor factors that can influence downstream variables via trust: the trustor’s race, the trustor’s mood, and training received by the trustor. In a sample of America- and Canada-based employees rating their managers, Simons et al. (2007) found that black employees (as compared to non-black employees) reported lower levels of trust in their manager, interpersonal justice perceptions, satisfaction, organizational commitment, and intent to stay with the organization, and the effect of race on these outcomes was mediated by behavioral integrity, i.e., employees’ perception of the alignment of their manager’s words with his or her deeds. Mislin and colleagues’ study (cited above) further found that the negotiator’s mood (positive vs. neutral) impacted contract implementation via the negotiator’s trust in the counterpart. And in a field quasi-experimental study of the effects of a leadership coaching intervention in a Norway-based sample of leaders and their subordinates, Ladegard and Gjerde (2014) found that the coaching intervention increased leaders’ trust in their subordinates, which in turn increased subordinates’ perceived empowerment and decreased their turnover intentions.

Finally, one mediation study has considered how trust may mediate the effect of a dyadic factor on downstream outcomes. Specifically, in a study of US-based employees and their supervisors, Kacmar, Bachrach, Harris and Noble (2012) found that the effect of supervisor-

employee conflict on employees' task-focused OCBs was mediated by employees' trust in supervisors.

Thus, in contrast to the first stream of studies examining how trust mediates the effect of leadership behaviors, this second stream reflects a much broader line of inquiry. Although there certainly is not a critical mass of studies in any one area, the evidence provides enticing hints that trust may mediate the effects arising from a very broad range of trustor, trustee, and dyad factors. These effects may occur with trust in strangers as well as known parties, in reaction to trustee symbols in addition to behaviors, and as a result of trustors' individual race, mood, and training. The studies have been situated in a broad range of contexts, and have examined a broad range of outcomes. Clearly this is an area of inquiry that is likely to burgeon in the years ahead.

In conclusion, scholars have devoted considerable attention to understanding the mediating role of trust. Ample evidence now exists that leadership behaviors influence work-related outcomes via subordinate trust. And numerous studies point to exciting new possibilities, and suggest important new directions for future research into how trust may mediate other important effects.

The moderating role of interpersonal trust

In this section, we review studies that have hypothesized and provided empirical evidence that interpersonal trust moderates the effect of a predictor variable on an outcome variable. Note that in this section we are interested only in those studies in which interpersonal trust interacted with another predictor variable, *and* the authors hypothesized that trust was acting as the moderator, not the independent variable. Studies in which trust was hypothesized to be the predictor, not the moderator, have already been reported in the Consequences section, above.

The distinctions between trust as a main effect, versus trust as a moderator, were articulated by Dirks and Ferrin (2001), who made the case that in "strong situations" (where there are strong norms, guidelines, incentives, etc. for behavior), trust was relatively more likely to moderate the effects of other predictors, whereas in "weak situations" trust was relatively more likely to function as a main effect predictor. Dirks and Ferrin provided a broad review of empirical studies on trust (with a focus including but not limited to interpersonal trust) that found somewhat inconsistent and relatively weak support for trust as a main effect, and more consistent support (though with a much smaller number of studies) for moderation effects.

Our review identified only a small number of studies in which interpersonal trust was both hypothesized and found to have had a moderation effect (Table 5.4). In a laboratory study of a dyadic decision-making simulation involving knowledge sharing between partners, Quigley, Tesluk, Locke, and Bartol (2007) found that the positive effect of an individual's task self-efficacy on his or her setting of higher goals was stronger when the individual trusted his or her partner. In a study of US-based employees and their supervisors (previously discussed above regarding its mediation findings), Kacmar and colleagues (2012) separately found that the negative effect of conflict among employees on employees' task-focused OCBs was weaker for employees who had higher trust in their supervisor. In a study of Mainland China-based employees and their supervisors, Zhang and Zhou (2014) found support for a three-way interaction in which the effect of supervisors' empowering leadership behaviors on employees' creative self-efficacy and creativity were stronger for employees who reported higher levels of trust in their leader and higher uncertainty avoidance. This effect was replicated in a second sample (from different occupational groups and a different industry) of Mainland China-based employees and their supervisors. Finally, in a sample of US- and Taiwan-based employees and their supervisors, Cheng

Table 5.4 Interpersonal trust as a moderator

<i>Authors</i>	<i>Conceptualization⁽¹⁾</i>	<i>Measure⁽²⁾</i>	<i>Referent</i>	<i>Predictors</i>	<i>Attitudinal outcomes</i>	<i>Behavioral outcomes</i>	<i>Description</i>
Quigley et al. (2007)	Perceived trust-worthiness (ability, benevolence, integrity)		Partner in a dyadic decision-making simulation	Self-efficacy on the task		Goal setting	Interpersonal trust strengthened the positive effect of task self-efficacy on setting of higher goals
Kacmar et al. (2012)	General trust	Treadway et al. (2004)	Supervisor	Relationship conflict among employees		Employee's OCBs	Trust in the leader weakened the negative effect of relationship conflict on employee OCBs
Zhang and Zhou (2014)	Affect-based trust		Supervisor	Empowering leadership	Creative self-efficacy	Creativity	The effect of empowering leadership behaviors on employees' creative self-efficacy and creativity was strengthened for employees with high trust in the leader and high uncertainty avoidance
Cheng et al. (2015)	Perceived integrity	Craig and Gustafson (1998)	Supervisor	Perceived supervisor support	Commitment to the supervisor		For US- (Taiwan-)based employees, high (low) trust in the leader strengthened the effect of perceived supervisor support on commitment to the supervisor

Notes.

- 1 In general, if fewer than 75 percent of the items in a trust scale tap into perceived trustworthiness (i.e. ability, benevolence, and integrity), cognition-based trust, affect-based trust, or trust (willingness to accept vulnerability), we classify the scale as general trust.
- 2 Indicates the scale used or adapted from. If the authors did not state the source of the measure, we leave the cell blank, indicating that the authors created the scale themselves.

et al. (2015) found support for a three-way interaction in which trust in the leader moderated the positive effect of supervisor support on employee commitment to the supervisor. In the US sample, trust in the leader strengthened the relationship, whereas in the Taiwan sample trust in the leader weakened the relationship. In all of the studies reviewed in this paragraph, a variable other than trust was hypothesized to be the exogenous variable, and the authors hypothesized and found that that exogenous variable interacted with trust to impact downstream variables, thus providing evidence of the moderating effect of trust.

In sum, the empirical evidence suggests that interpersonal trust moderates the effects of a range of predictors, specifically trustors' attitudes (self-efficacy), group factors (conflict among coworkers) and trustee behaviors (empowering leadership and supervisor support). What is perhaps most surprising about the review findings is that such a relatively small number of studies has expressly hypothesized and found moderation effects for interpersonal trust. In fact, a considerably larger number of studies has provided empirical evidence that interpersonal trust interacts with other factors; however, most of those studies have positioned trust as a predictor rather than a moderator. We speculate that the tendency of researchers to position trust as a main effect rather than a moderator is due to the strong recognition of the importance of trust, and the groundswell of research on trust over the last two decades. Because of the prominence of trust, researchers may have demonstrated a greater interest in studying the direct consequences (benefits) of trust (and how they might differ depending on contextual or other factors) than on the indirect effects of how trust might influence the impact of other predictors. This being the case, we would like to make the observation that most organizational contexts are in fact "strong situations" in which trust is probably already playing a moderating role by facilitating or hindering the effects of countless other organizational factors. Consequently, trust may play a much broader role in organizations than is currently recognized. Thus, the role of interpersonal trust as a moderator represents an important and promising avenue for future research.

Discussion

Objectives and limitations of the review

Our aim has been to address the question, "*What has been demonstrated, empirically, regarding the determinants, consequences, and functions of interpersonal trust within organizations?*" To address this question, we conducted a systematic review of empirical research conducted on interpersonal trust since the early 1990s, published in 15 of the most prominent journals in the organization sciences.

Before discussing the general findings and implications, it is worthwhile to consider the limitations of our review. First, as stated at the outset, this review is intentionally atheoretical; it aims to describe only what has been demonstrated empirically, and therefore does not develop or inform any higher-level conceptual understanding of the operation of trust. We view this as a unique strength as well as a limitation of our review, as we hope our focus on the empirical evidence will help scholars keep sight of, and better access, the raw material from which our theoretical understandings have been built; we also hope it will help practitioners identify the specific ways in which trust is likely to impact organizational outcomes and the specific ways in which trust may be built.

Second, we limited our review to 15 journals that we identified as being likely to publish high-quality empirical studies on interpersonal trust within organizational settings. The selection of these 15 journals was a subjective judgment. One disadvantage of this approach is that we are certain to have omitted studies that were published in other journals, some of which were reviewed elsewhere (e.g., in Fulmer & Gelfand, 2012). One advantage is that the bounds of

our search are clearly delineated, and therefore we were better able to avoid researcher judgment (and potential bias) in inclusion/exclusion decisions. A second advantage is that our review entirely comprises double-blind peer reviewed articles of moderate to very high standard.

Third, we have included only those studies that reported a statistically significant (or marginally significant) empirical effect. We did not systematically search for articles that reported null effects. Therefore, it is likely that null effects are under-represented in our review due to the file drawer problem (Rosenthal, 1979). Typically, meta-analytic reviews include search procedures to identify and include studies more likely to have null effects (such as contacting authors for unpublished work and including doctoral dissertations) and statistical procedures to reduce the effect of publication bias; however, these are recognized as imperfect responses to the file drawer problem. Narrative reviews typically do not utilize such procedures. Therefore, our review is similar to other narrative reviews, and less similar to meta-analyses, in its potential under-representation of null effects. Finally, by including only those articles that reported statistically significant effects, we omitted empirical studies that were qualitative, inductive, or otherwise took empirical approaches that did not involve quantitative hypothesis testing.

Fourth, for ease of explication, in discussing the articles we often used causal language that would not be justified based on the degree of internal validity of the studies reviewed. (This is particularly the case in our discussion of the findings of field studies). Our causal language expresses the likely direction of causality as discussed by the original authors and/or implicit in the nature of the empirical relationship studied, not our conclusion about whether causality has been demonstrated empirically.

Review findings and future research directions

What has been empirically demonstrated regarding determinants of interpersonal trust? As can be seen in the above review, a wide range of antecedents has been investigated across different referents. First, some common antecedents have been examined across different referents such as trustees' demonstration of concern or helping behaviors (Ferrin et al., 2006; Korsgaard et al., 2002) and shared similarity between trustor and trustee (Jiang et al., 2011; Farh et al., 1998). There is also a potential that antecedents applied to one referent can be examined with another referent. For example, Niven et al. (2012) found that communications that regulate interpersonal affect by improving others' affect have been found to be associated with individuals' perceptions of friendship and trust in specific coworker. Whether interpersonal affect regulation influences trust levels in the leader-member relationship is worthy of future research. Table 5.1 also illustrates that there is substantial potential that antecedents applied to trustor can be examined with trustee. For example, the cultural metacognition of managers has been found to impact their trust in partners in intercultural collaboration tasks (Chua et al., 2012). Whether the trustee's cultural metacognition impacts trust or not is worthy of investigation. In addition, we were able to identify some empirical papers that investigated the spiral development of trust between trustor and trustee (Ferrin et al., 2008; Halbesleben & Wheeler, 2015). Understanding the reciprocity between trustor and trustee is important to understand the self-reinforcing cycle of trust development. We recommend and look forward to much more research identifying how trust develops and cycles between individuals.

What has been empirically demonstrated regarding outcomes of interpersonal trust? Research on consequences of interpersonal trust has focused on a range of valuable work outcomes including job satisfaction, knowledge sharing and creation, cooperation, commitment, attachment, and performance. Indeed, interpersonal trust has positive effects on these desirable work behaviors and outcomes. In general, we observed that a number of frequently-studied outcomes of trust have been examined across different referents. For example, the effect of trust on citizenship

behavior has been studied in the context of trust toward supervisors (Brower et al., 2008) and peers (McAllister, 1995). This research is useful for exploring and extending the generalizability of existing knowledge. We recommend that future research also examine the effect of trust on outcomes that may be unique to a specific referent or context. For example, Wong et al. (2010) focused on the role of trust in the organizational socialization process by exploring how trust impacts specific mentoring functions received by the protégé. We also observed that in studying the consequences of interpersonal trust, a number of empirical studies had operationalized interpersonal trust as trust in multiple individuals (e.g., trust in coworkers) rather than trust in a single individual (trust in a coworker). Consistent with our inclusion/exclusion criteria set out above, we excluded such papers from our review because they cannot be considered to study interpersonal trust. We would like to further emphasize our view that trust in multiple individuals is a fundamentally different construct from trust in a single individual, and these two constructs are likely to have different outcomes and different developmental processes. Researchers should use caution when applying “interpersonal trust” theories to constructs that are not interpersonal in nature, or, instead, appropriately tailor the interpersonal trust theories for application to situations in which the trustee is multiple individuals rather than a single individual.

What has been empirically demonstrated regarding the mediating role of interpersonal trust? First, a critical mass of studies has provided what we consider to be robust evidence that trust in a leader mediates the effects of leadership behaviors (particularly transformational, transactional, and justice behaviors) on a range of work-related follower outcomes (performance, OCBs, satisfaction, commitment, turnover intent, etc.). Thus, trust should be considered an important mechanism through which leadership behaviors influence desired employee-level outcomes. Second, authors have branched out in a number of different directions, providing initial evidence that interpersonal trust mediates a wide range of other effects. As just a few examples, interpersonal trust transmits one party’s cooperation to another’s cooperation (Ferrin et al., 2008), transforms employees’ OCBs into managerial trustworthy behavior (Reiche et al., 2014), converts a leadership coaching intervention into followers’ perceived empowerment and reduced turnover intent (Ladegard & Gjerde, 2014), and transmits the effects of employees’ race on their job satisfaction, commitment, and turnover intent (Simons et al., 2007). Based on these findings, we recommend and look forward to much more research identifying how and where trust plays an important mediating role.

Finally, what has been empirically demonstrated regarding the moderating role of interpersonal trust? A relatively large number of studies in our review reported that interpersonal trust had interacted with other variables to predict downstream outcomes. However, these findings more often reflect a hypothesized main effect of trust rather than a hypothesized moderated effect. That said, a handful of studies reported trust’s moderating effect. For instance, trust in supervisor suppressed the negative effect of employee relationship conflict on OCBs (Kacmar et al., 2012), enhanced the effect of empowering leadership behaviors on creativity (Zhang & Zhou, 2014), and both enhanced and suppressed (depending on culture) the effect of supervisor support on employees’ commitment to the supervisor (Cheng et al., 2015). We believe that scholars have perhaps focused insufficient research attention on how trust may moderate the effects of other predictor variables in the organizational context. An exploration of the moderating effects of trust is likely to reveal that trust has much more widespread effects within organizational settings, most likely enhancing or hindering the effects of many other motivators, leadership behaviors, and other organizational factors, on valued employee and organizational outcomes. We strongly encourage such future research.

Although we did not specifically set out to assess the measurement of trust, we did document the measures used. The trust literature is fortunate to have a good range of well-validated measures

(see McEvily & Tortoriello, 2011 for a review of the best-validated trust measures). Consequently, we were dismayed to see that so many studies in our review used operationalizations of trust that were outdated and/or poorly validated. Future research should use the measures identified by McEvily and Tortoriello. Researchers should use a different measure only if they can make the case that the different measure is conceptually distinct from the measures identified by McEvily and Tortoriello, or has superior psychometric properties. Peer reviewers should hold authors to these standards.

We were also curious to identify studies that had focused on trust development processes. We expected that trust development studies could take at least two forms. First, studies might examine how an individual's trust in another person changes in level or nature over time (e.g., as proposed by Lewicki & Bunker, 1996). Supporting this model, Levin, Whitener, and Cross (2006) found that trustworthiness perceptions were related to demographic similarity in newer relationships, to trustworthiness behaviors in more established relationships, and to shared perspective in more mature relationships. Second, studies might examine how trust is transmitted from one person to another over time. Supporting this model, Ferrin, Bligh, and Kohles (2008) found a positive spiral between individuals in a lab setting in that one individual's trust promotes cooperation, which increases the other person's trust, in a self-reinforcing cycle. And in a field setting, Halbesleben and Wheeler (2015) found support for a reciprocal resource gain spiral in which a coworker's OCBs lead to an individual's perceived social support, which in turn leads to trust and OCBs toward that coworker (Halbesleben & Wheeler 2015). In sum, our review uncovered some initial evidence supporting two core models of trust development, but research on trust development remains in its infancy. Further research is sorely needed.

It is well recognized that laboratory experimental studies offer high levels of internal validity but very limited external validity, whereas field survey studies offer some external validity but minimal internal validity (Stone-Romero, 2011). Our review revealed a reasonable balance of field surveys and laboratory experiments. Assuming the strengths of one compensate for the weaknesses of the other, we can derive some comfort that the scientific literature as a whole provides findings that meet some minimal level of internal and external validity. However, the literature is sorely lacking in field experiments and quasi-experiments, which are unique in their ability to simultaneously deliver relatively high levels of internal and external validity *within a single study* (Stone-Romero, 2011). And from a practical perspective, field experiments and quasi-experiments provide much more direct insights into the effectiveness of trust-related interventions in work organizations. Our review uncovered only one field quasi-experiment (Ladegard & Gjerde, 2014). Given the obvious scientific and practical advantages of field experiments and quasi-experiments, we strongly encourage trust researchers to increase their use of field experimental research.

Practical implications

As mentioned above, practitioners navigate a world of the literal and concrete. When practitioners face a need or opportunity to build trust, or when they are asked to justify a proposed trust intervention, practitioners are likely to yearn for answers to questions such as the following: "What, specifically, predicts trust?" "What, specifically, does trust predict?" "How large are those effects?" "How much research has been conducted?" "And in what contexts has the research been conducted?" Accordingly, we expect that practitioners will find the present review to be extremely useful when designing and implementing trust-related interventions in their own organizations. That said, we also strongly encourage practitioners to read the primary studies, and to consider the limitations in internal and external validity of those studies, when planning their organizational interventions.

Conclusion

Concluding this review, we would like to express a degree of awe at the sheer number of double-blind peer-reviewed studies published on interpersonal trust since the early 1990s. The fact that trust research has now moved from bit player to center stage to celebrity status reflects an enormous investment of time, effort, and passion on the part of researchers, an enormous investment of time and effort from research participants, and an impressive financial investment on the part of universities. The fact that these investments have been made reflects a broad recognition of both the importance of trust and the trust challenges that we face in organizations and in society. Having generated this body of scientific knowledge, it is equally important that the knowledge be put into practice. We hope that this review, focused as it is on the operational level, will be useful to those putting research into practice as well as those further advancing the science of trust.

Note

* Both authors contributed equally to this review.

References

- Ambrose, M. L., & Schminke, M. (2003). Organization structure as a moderator of the relationship between procedural justice, interactional justice, perceived organizational support, and supervisory trust. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*(2), 295–305.
- Anderson, C., & Thompson, L. L. (2004). Affect from the top down: How powerful individuals' positive affect shapes negotiations. *Organizational Behavior & Human Decision Processes, 95*(2), 125–139.
- Ballinger, G. A., Schoorman, F. D. & Lehman, D. W. (2009). Will you trust your new boss? The role of affective reactions to leadership succession. *The Leadership Quarterly, 20*(2), 219–232.
- Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51*(6), 1173–1182.
- Becerra, M., & Gupta, A. K. (2003). Perceived trustworthiness within the organization: The moderating impact of communication frequency on trustor and trustee effects. *Organization Science, 14*(1), 32–44.
- Bond, M. H. (1983). Linking person perception dimensions to behavioral intention dimensions: The Chinese connection. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 14*(1), 41–63.
- Brower, H. H., Lester, S. W., Korsgaard, M. A., & Dineen, B. R. (2008). A closer look at trust between managers and subordinates: Understanding the effects of both trusting and being trusted on subordinate outcomes. *Journal of Management, 35*(2), 327–347.
- Brown, M. E., Treviño, L. K. & Harrison, D. A. (2005). Ethical leadership: A social learning perspective for construct development and testing. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 97*(2), 117–134.
- Burke, C. S., Sims, D. E., Lazzara, E. H., & Salas, E. (2007). Trust in leadership: A multi-level review and integration. *The Leadership Quarterly, 18*(6), 606–632.
- Burt, R. S., (1992). *Structural holes: The social structure of competition*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Butler, J. K. (1991). Toward understanding and measuring conditions of trust: Evolution of a conditions of trust inventory. *Journal of Management, 17*(3), 643–663.
- Cameron, A.-F., & Webster, J. (2011). Relational outcomes of multicommunicating: Integrating incivility and social exchange perspectives. *Organization Science, 22*(3), 754–771.
- Chattopadhyay, P., & George, E. (2001). Examining the effects of work externalization through the lens of social identity theory. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*(4), 781–788.
- Chen, X. P., Eberly, M. B., Chiang, T. J., Farh, J. L., & Cheng, B. S. (2014). Affective trust in Chinese leaders: Linking paternalistic leadership to employee performance. *Journal of Management, 40*(3), 796–819.
- Cheng, C. Y., Jiang, D. Y., Cheng, B. S., Riley, J. H., & Jen, C. K. (2015). When do subordinates commit to their supervisors? Different effects of perceived supervisor integrity and support on Chinese and American employees. *The Leadership Quarterly, 26*(1), 81–97.

- Choi, J. (2008). Event justice perceptions and employees' reactions: Perceptions of social entity justice as a moderator. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(3), 513–528.
- Chua, R. Y. J., Ingram, P., & Morris, M. W. (2008). From the head and the heart: Locating cognition- and affect-based trust in managers' professional networks. *Academy of Management Journal*, 51(3), 436–452.
- Chua, R. Y. J., Morris, M. W., & Mor, S. (2012). Collaborating across cultures: Cultural metacognition and affect-based trust in creative collaboration. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 118(2), 116–131.
- Chung, Y., & Jackson, S. E. (2011). Co-worker trust and knowledge creation: A multilevel analysis. *Journal of Trust Research*, 1(1), 65–83.
- Colquitt, J. A., Scott, B. A., & LePine, J. A. (2007). Trust, trustworthiness, and trust propensity: A meta-analytic test of their unique relationships with risk taking and job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(4), 909–927.
- Colquitt, J. A., & Rodell, J. B. (2011). Justice, trust, and trustworthiness: A longitudinal analysis integrating three theoretical perspectives. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54(6), 1183–1206.
- Colquitt, J. A., LePine, J. A., Piccolo, R. F., Zapata, C. P., & Rich, B. L. (2012). Explaining the justice–performance relationship: Trust as exchange deepener or trust as uncertainty reducer? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97(1), 1–15.
- Cook, J., & Wall, T. (1980). New work attitude measures of trust, organizational commitment and personal need non-fulfilment. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 53(1), 39–52.
- Costa, A. C., Ferrin, D. L. & Fulmer, C. A., (forthcoming). Trust at work. In: N. Anderson, D. S. Ones, H. K. Sinangil, & C. Viswesvaran (eds.), *Handbook of industrial, work, and organizational psychology*. 2nd ed. London: Sage.
- Costigan, R. D., Insinga, R., Berman, J. J., Kranas, G., & Kureshov, V. A. (2013). The significance of direct-leader and co-worker trust on turnover intentions: A cross-cultural study. *Journal of Trust Research*, 3(2), 98–124.
- Craig, S. B., & Gustafson, S. B. (1998). Perceived leader integrity scale: An instrument for assessing employee perceptions of leader. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 9(2), 127–145.
- Crossley, C. D., Cooper, C. D., & Wernsing, T. S. (2013). Making things happen through challenging goals: Leader proactivity, trust, and business-unit performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 98(3), 540–549.
- Cummings, L. L., & Bromiley, P., (1996). The Organizational Trust Inventory (OTI): Development and validation. In: R. M. Kramer, and T. R. Tyler (eds.), *Trust in organizations: Frontiers of theory and research*. (pp. 302–330). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Cunningham, J. B., & MacGregor, J. (2000). Trust and the design of work: Complementary constructs in satisfaction and performance. *Human Relations*, 53(12), 1575–1591.
- De Cremer, D., & Tyler, T. R. (2007). The effects of trust in authority and procedural fairness on cooperation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(3), 639–649.
- De Dreu, C. K. W., Giebels, E., & Van de Vliert, E. (1998). Social motives and thrust in integrative negotiation: The disruptive effects of punitive capability. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83(3), 407–422.
- de Jong, S. B., Van der Vegt, G. S., & Molleman, E. (2007). The relationships among asymmetry in task dependence, perceived helping behavior, and trust. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(6), 1625–1637.
- Dietz, G., & Den Hartog, D. N. (2006). Measuring trust inside organisations. *Personnel Review*, 35(5), 557–588.
- Dirks, K. T. (1999). The effects of interpersonal trust on work group performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84(3), 445–455.
- Dirks, K. T., & Ferrin, D. L. (2001). The role of trust in organizational settings. *Organization Science*, 12(4), 450–467.
- Dirks, K. T., & Ferrin, D. L. (2002). Trust in leadership: Meta-analytic findings and implications for research and practice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 611–628.
- Dunn, J., Ruedy, N. E., & Schweitzer, M. E. (2012). It hurts both ways: How social comparisons harm affective and cognitive trust. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 117(1), 2–14.
- Elsbach, K. D., & Elofson, G. (2000). How the packaging of decision explanations affects perceptions of trustworthiness. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(1), 80–89.
- Farh, J.-L., Tsui, A. S., Xin, K., & Cheng, B. S. (1998). The influence of relational demography and Guanxi: The Chinese case. *Organization Science*, 9(4), 471–488.
- Ferrin, D. L., & Dirks, K. T. (2003). The use of rewards to increase and decrease trust: Mediating processes and differential effects. *Organization Science*, 14(1), 18–31.

- Ferrin, D. L., Dirks, K. T., & Shah, P. P. (2006). Direct and indirect effects of third-party relationships on interpersonal trust. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*(4), 870–883.
- Ferrin, D. L., Bligh, M. C., & Kohles, J. C. (2008). It takes two to tango: An interdependence analysis of the spiraling of perceived trustworthiness and cooperation in interpersonal and intergroup relationships. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 107*(2), 161–178.
- Ferrin, D. L., & Gillespie, N., (2010). Trust differences across national-societal cultures: Much to do, or much ado about nothing? In: M. N. K. Saunders, D. Skinner, G. Dietz, N. Gillespie, & R. J. Lewicki (eds.), *Organizational trust: A cultural perspective*. (pp. 42–86). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Ferrin, D. L. (2013). On the institutionalisation of trust research and practice: Heaven awaits! *Journal of Trust Research, 3*(2), 146–154.
- Frazier, M. L., Johnson, P. D., & Fainshmidt, S. (2013). Development and validation of a propensity to trust scale. *Journal of Trust Research, 3*(2), 76–97.
- Fulmer, C. A., & Gelfand, M. J. (2012). At what level (and in whom) we trust: Trust across multiple organizational levels. *Journal of Management, 38*(4), 1167–1230.
- Gabarro, J. J., & Athos, J., (1976). *Interpersonal relations and communications*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Gao, L., Janssen, O., & Shi, K. (2011). Leader trust and employee voice: The moderating role of empowering leader behaviors. *The Leadership Quarterly, 22*(4), 787–798.
- George, J. M., & Zhou, J. (2007). Dual tuning in a supportive context: Joint contributions of positive mood, negative mood, and supervisory behaviors to employee creativity. *Academy of Management Journal, 50*(3), 605–622.
- Gillespie, N. (2003). Measuring interpersonal trust in work relationships. *Australian Journal of Psychology, 55*, 124–124.
- Gino, F., & Schweitzer, M. E. (2008). Blinded by anger or feeling the love: How emotions influence advice taking. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93*(5), 1165–1173.
- Grant, A. M., & Sumanth, J. J. (2009). Mission possible? The performance of prosocially motivated employees depends on manager trustworthiness. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*(4), 927–944.
- Halbesleben, J. R. B., & Wheeler, A. R. (2015). To invest or not? The role of coworker support and trust in daily reciprocal gain spirals of helping behavior. *Journal of Management, 41*(6), 1628–1650.
- Harris, T. B., Li, N., Boswell, W. R., Zhang, X. A., & Xie, Z. (2014). Getting what's new from newcomers: Empowering leadership, creativity, and adjustment in the socialization context. *Personnel Psychology, 67*(3), 567–604.
- Hill, N. S., Bartol, K. M., Tesluk, P. E., & Langa, G. A. (2009). Organizational context and face-to-face interaction: Influences on the development of trust and collaborative behaviors in computer-mediated groups. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 108*(2), 187–201.
- Hofmann, D. A., Lei, Z. K., & Grant, A. M. (2009). Seeking help in the shadow of doubt: The sensemaking processes underlying how nurses decide whom to ask for advice. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*(5), 1261–1274.
- Holtz, B. C. (2015). From first impression to fairness perception: Investigating the impact of initial trustworthiness beliefs. *Personnel Psychology, 68*(3), 499–546.
- Holtz, B. C., & Harold, C. M. (2009). Fair today, fair tomorrow? A longitudinal investigation of overall justice perceptions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*(5), 1185–1199.
- Huang, L., & Murnighan, J. K. (2010). What's in a name? Subliminally activating trusting behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 111*(1), 62–70.
- Huang, X., Iun, J., Liu, A., & Gong, Y. (2010). Does participative leadership enhance work performance by inducing empowerment or trust? The differential effects on managerial and non-managerial subordinates. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 31*(1), 122–143.
- Jarvenpaa, S. L., Knoll, K., & Leidner, D. E. (1998). Is anybody out there? Antecedents of trust in global virtual teams. *Journal of Management Information Systems, 14*(4), 29–64.
- Jiang, C. X., Chua, R. Y., Kotabe, M., & Murray, J. Y. (2011). Effects of cultural ethnicity, firm size, and firm age on senior executives' trust in their overseas business partners: Evidence from China. *Journal of International Business Studies, 42*(9), 1150–1173.
- Johnson-George, C., & Swap, W. C. (1982). Measurement of specific interpersonal trust: Construction and validation of a scale to assess trust in a specific other. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 43*(6), 1306–1317.

- Johnson, J. L., Cullen, J. B., Sakano, T., & Takenouchi, H. (1996). Setting the stage for trust and strategic integration in Japanese-U.S. cooperative alliances. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 27(5), 981–1004.
- Johnson, R. E., & Lord, R. G. (2010). Implicit effects of justice on self-identity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(4), 681–695.
- Jung, D. I., & Avolio, B. J. (2000). Opening the black box: An experimental investigation of the mediating effects of trust and value congruence on transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21(8), 949–964.
- Kacmar, K. M., Bachrach, D. G., Harris, K. J., & Noble, D. (2012). Exploring the role of supervisor trust in the associations between multiple sources of relationship conflict and organizational citizenship behavior. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 23(1), 43–54.
- Kalshoven, K., Den Hartog, D. N., & De Hoogh, A. H. B. (2011). Ethical Leadership at Work questionnaire (ELW): Development and validation of a multidimensional measure. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 22(1), 51–69.
- Khazanchi, S., & Masterson, S. S. (2011). Who and what is fair matters: A multi-foci social exchange model of creativity. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 32(1), 86–106.
- Kim, P. H., Ferrin, D. L., Cooper, C. D., & Dirks, K. T. (2004). Removing the shadow of suspicion: The effects of apology versus denial for repairing competence- versus integrity-based trust violations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(1), 104–118.
- Kong, D. T., Dirks, K. T., & Ferrin, D. L. (2014). Interpersonal trust within negotiations: Meta-analytic evidence, critical contingencies, and directions for future research. *Academy of Management Journal*, 57(5), 1235–1255.
- Korsgaard, M. A., & Roberson, L. (1995). Procedural justice in performance evaluation: The role of instrumental and non-instrumental voice in performance appraisal discussions. *Journal of Management*, 21(4), 657–669.
- Korsgaard, M. A., Roberson, L., & Rymph, R. D. (1998). What motivates fairness? The role of subordinate assertive behavior on manager's interactional fairness. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83(5), 731–744.
- Korsgaard, M. A., Brodt, S. E., & Whitener, E. M. (2002). Trust in the face of conflict: The role of managerial trustworthy behavior and organizational context. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(2), 312–319.
- Korsgaard, M. A., Brower, H. H., & Lester, S. W. (2015). It isn't always mutual: A critical review of dyadic trust. *Journal of Management*, 41(1), 47–70.
- Kramer, R. M. (1999). Trust and distrust in organizations: Emerging perspectives, enduring questions. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 50, 569–598.
- Kramer, R. M., & Lewicki, R. J. (2010). Repairing and enhancing trust: Approaches to reducing organizational trust deficits. *Academy of Management Annals*, 4, 245–277.
- Kwan, L. Y. Y., Yap, S., & Chiu, C. -Y. (2015). Mere exposure affects perceived descriptive norms: Implications for personal preferences and trust. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 129(1), 48–58.
- Ladegard, G., & Gjerde, S. (2014). Leadership coaching, leader role-efficacy, and trust in subordinates. A mixed methods study assessing leadership coaching as a leadership development tool. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 25(4), 631–646.
- Lau, D. C., Lam, L. W., & Wen, S. S. (2014). Examining the effects of feeling trusted by supervisors in the workplace: A self-evaluative perspective. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 35(1), 112–127.
- Lau, D. C., & Liden, R. C. (2008). Antecedents of coworker trust: Leaders' blessings. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(5), 1130–1138.
- Lee, C., Pillutla, M., & Law, K. S. (2000). Power-distance, gender and organizational justice. *Journal of Management*, 26(4), 685–704.
- Levin, D. Z., & Cross, R. (2004). The strength of weak ties you can trust: the mediating role of trust in effective knowledge transfer. *Management Science*, 50(11), 1477–1490.
- Levin, D. Z., Whitener, E. M., & Cross, R. (2006). Perceived trustworthiness of knowledge sources: The moderating impact of relationship length. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(5), 1163–1171.
- Levin, D. Z., Walter, J., & Murnighan, J. K. (2011). Dormant ties: The value of reconnecting. *Organization Science*, 22(4), 923–939.
- Levine, E. E., & Schweitzer, M. E. (2015). Prosocial lies: When deception breeds trust. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 126(1), 88–106.

- Lewicki, R. J., & Bunker, B. B., (1996). Developing and maintaining trust in work relationships. In R. M. Kramer, & T. R. Tyler (eds.), *Trust in organizations: Frontiers of theory and research*. (pp. 114–139). Thousand Oaks, CA, US: Sage Publications.
- Lewicki, R. J., Tomlinson, E. C., & Gillespie, N. (2006). Models of interpersonal trust development: Theoretical approaches, empirical evidence, and future directions. *Journal of Management*, 32(6), 991–1022.
- Li, A. N., & Tan, H. H. (2013). What happens when you trust your supervisor? Mediators of individual performance in trust relationships. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 34(3), 407–425.
- Lount, R. B., Jr., & Pettit, N. C. (2012). The social context of trust: The role of status. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 117(1), 15–23.
- Lu, C., Kong, D. T., Ferrin, D. L., & Dirks, K. T. (2017). What are the determinants of interpersonal trust in dyadic negotiations? Meta-analytic evidence and implications for future research. *Journal of Trust Research*, 7(1), 22–50.
- Malhotra, D., & Murnighan, J. K. (2002). The effects of contracts on interpersonal trust. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 47(3), 534–559.
- Mayer, R. C., Bobko, P., Davis, J. H., & Gavin, M. B. (2011). The effects of changing power and influence tactics on trust in the supervisor: A longitudinal field study. *Journal of Trust Research*, 1(2), 177–201.
- Mayer, R. C., & Davis, J. H. (1999). The effect of the performance appraisal system on trust for management: A field quasi-experiment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84, 123–136.
- Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H., & Schoorman, F. D. (1995). An integrative model of organizational trust. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(3), 709–734.
- Mayer, R. C., & Gavin, M. B. (2005). Trust in management and performance: Who minds the shop while the employees watch the boss? *Academy of Management Journal*, 48(5), 874–888.
- McAllister, D. J. (1995). Affect- and cognition-based trust as foundations for interpersonal cooperation in organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(1), 24–59.
- McCroskey, J. C. (1966). Scales for the measurement of ethos. *Speech Monographs*, 33(1), 65–72.
- McEvily, B., & Tortoriello, M. (2011). Measuring trust in organisational research: Review and recommendations. *Journal of Trust Research*, 1(1), 23–63.
- Mislin, A. A., Campagna, R. L., & Bottom, W. P. (2011). After the deal: Talk, trust building and the implementation of negotiated agreements. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 115(1), 55–68.
- Moorman, R. H., Darnold, T. C., & Priesemuth, M. (2013). Perceived leader integrity: Supporting the construct validity and utility of a multi-dimensional measure in two samples. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 24(3), 427–444.
- Naquin, C. E., & Paulson, G. D. (2003). Online bargaining and interpersonal trust. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(1), 113–120.
- Niven, K., Holman, D., & Totterdell, P. (2012). How to win friendship and trust by influencing people's feelings: An investigation of interpersonal affect regulation and the quality of relationships. *Human Relations*, 65(6), 777–805.
- Norman, S. M., Avolio, B. J., & Luthans, F. (2010). The impact of positivity and transparency on trust in leaders and their perceived effectiveness. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 21(3), 350–364.
- Nyhan, R. C., & Marlowe, H. A. (1997). Development and psychometric properties of the Organizational Trust Inventory. *Evaluation Review*, 21(5), 614–635.
- Palanski, M. E., & Yammarino, F. J. (2011). Impact of behavioral integrity on follower job performance: A three-study examination. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 22(4), 765–786.
- Perrone, V., Zaheer, A., & McEvily, B. (2003). Free to be trusted? Organizational constraints on trust in boundary spanners. *Organization Science*, 14(4), 422–439.
- Pillai, R., Schriesheim, C. A., & Williams, E. S. (1999). Fairness perceptions and trust as mediators for transformational and transactional leadership: A two-sample study. *Journal of Management*, 25(6), 897–933.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S., & Bommer, W. (1996). Transformational leader behaviors and substitutes for leadership as determinants of employee satisfaction, commitment, trust and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 22(2), 259–298.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Moorman, R. H., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 1(2), 107–142.

- Preacher, K., & Hayes, A. (2008). Asymptotic and resampling strategies for assessing and comparing indirect effects in multiple mediator models. *Behavior Research Methods*, 40(3), 879–891.
- Premeaux, S. F., & Bedeian, A. G. (2003). Breaking the silence: The moderating effects of self-monitoring in predicting speaking up in the workplace. *Journal of Management Studies*, 40(6), 1537–1562.
- Quigley, N. R., Tesluk, P. E., Locke, E. A., & Bartol, K. M. (2007). A multilevel investigation of the motivational mechanisms underlying knowledge sharing and performance. *Organization Science*, 18(1), 71–88.
- Rafaeli, A., Sagy, Y., & Derfler-Rozin, R. (2008). Logos and initial compliance: A strong case of mindless trust. *Organization Science*, 19(6), 845–859.
- Rao, A. N., Pearce, J. L., & Xin, K. (2005). Governments, reciprocal exchange and trust among business associates. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 36(1), 104–118.
- Reiche, B. S., Cardona, P., Lee, Y.T., Canela, M.Á., Akinnukawe, E., Briscoe, J.P., . . . & Grenness, T. (2014). Why do managers engage in trustworthy behavior? A multilevel cross-cultural study in 18 countries. *Personnel Psychology*, 67(1), 61–98.
- Rempel, J. K., Holmes, J. G., & Zanna, M. P. (1985). Trust in close relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 49(1), 95–112.
- Rempel, J. K., & Holmes, J. G. (1986). How do I trust thee? *Psychology Today*, 20(2), 28–34.
- Roberts, K. H., & O'Reilly, C. A. (1974). Measuring organizational communication. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 59(3), 321–326.
- Robinson, S. L. (1996). Trust and breach of the psychological contract. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41(4), 574–599.
- Robinson, S. L., & Rousseau, D. M. (1994). Violating the psychological contract: Not the exception but the norm. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 15(3), 245–259.
- Rosenthal, R. (1979). The file drawer problem and tolerance for null results. *Psychological Bulletin*, 86(3), 638–641.
- Ross, W. H., & Wieland, C. (1996). Effects of interpersonal trust and time pressure on managerial mediation strategy in a simulated organizational dispute. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81(3), 228–248.
- Rubin, R. S., Bommer, W. H., & Bachrach, D. G. (2010). Operant leadership and employee citizenship: A question of trust? *The Leadership Quarterly*, 21(3), 400–408.
- Saunders, M. N. K., Dietz, G., & Thornhill, A. (2014). Trust and distrust: Polar opposites, or independent but co-existing? *Human Relations*, 67(6), 639–665.
- Scott, D. (1983). Trust differences between men and women in superior-subordinate relationships. *Group and Organization Studies*, 8(3), 319–336.
- Searle, R., Weibel, A., & Den Hartog, D. N., (2011). Employee trust in organizational contexts. In: G. P. Hodgkinson & J. K. Ford (eds.), *International review of industrial and organizational psychology 2011* (Vol. 26, pp. 143–191). Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons.
- Simons, T., Friedman, R., Liu, L. A., & McLean Parks, J. (2007). Racial differences in sensitivity to behavioral integrity: Attitudinal consequences, in-group effects, and “trickle down” among Black and non-Black employees. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(3), 650–665.
- Sobel, M. E., (1982). Asymptotic confidence intervals for indirect effects on structural models. *Sociological Methodology*, 13, 290–312.
- Sonenshein, S., Herzenstein, M., & Dholakia, U. M. (2011). How accounts shape lending decisions through fostering perceived trustworthiness. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 115(1), 69–84.
- Sparrowe, R. T., Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., & Kraimer, M. L. (2001). Social networks and the performance of individuals and groups. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44(2), 316–325.
- Stone-Romero, E. F. (2011). Research strategies in industrial and organizational psychology: Non-experimental, quasi-experimental, and randomized experimental research in special purpose and nonspecial purpose settings. In S. Zedeck (ed.), *APA handbook of industrial and organizational psychology: Building and developing the organization* (Vol. 1, pp. 37–72). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Sy, T. (2010). What do you think of followers? Examining the content, structure, and consequences of implicit followership theories. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 113(2), 73–84.
- Tepper, B. J., & Henle, C. A. (2011). A case for recognizing distinctions among constructs that capture interpersonal mistreatment in work organizations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 32(3), 487–498.
- Thau, S., Crossley, C., Bennett, R. J., & Sczesny, S. (2007). The relationship between trust, attachment, and antisocial work behaviors. *Human Relations*, 60(8), 1155–1179.

- Thomas, D. C., & Ravlin, E. C. (1995). Responses of employees to cultural adaptation by a foreign manager. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 80*(1), 133–146.
- Treadway, D. C., Hochwarter, W. A., Ferris, G. R., Kacmar, C. J., Douglas, C., Ammeter, A. P., & Buckley, M. R. (2004). Leader political skill and employee reactions. *The Leadership Quarterly, 15*(4), 493–513.
- Tyler, T. R., & Huo, Y. J., (2002). *Trust in the law: Encouraging public cooperation with the police and courts*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.
- van Dierendonck, D. (2011). Servant leadership: A review and synthesis. *Journal of Management, 37*(4), 1228–1261.
- van Dijke, M., De Cremer, D., & Mayer, D. M. (2010). The role of authority power in explaining procedural fairness effects. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 95*(3), 488–502.
- Vanneste, B. S., Puranam, P., & Kretschmer, T. (2014). Trust over time in exchange relationships: Meta-analysis and theory. *Strategic Management Journal, 35*(12), 1891–1902.
- Vignovic, J. A., & Thompson, L. F. (2010). Computer-mediated cross-cultural collaboration: Attributing communication errors to the person versus the situation. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 95*(2), 265–276.
- Vogel, R. M., Mitchell, M. S., Tepper, B. J., Restubog, S. L., Hu, C., Hua, W., & Huang, J. C. (2015). A cross-cultural examination of subordinates' perceptions of and reactions to abusive supervision. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 36*(5), 720–745.
- Wang, S., Tomlinson, E. C., & Noe, R. A. (2010). The role of mentor trust and protégé internal locus of control in formal mentoring relationships. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 95*(2), 358–367.
- Wong, S. -S., & Boh, W. F. (2010). Leveraging the ties of others to build a reputation for trustworthiness among peers. *Academy of Management Journal, 53*(1), 129–148.
- Xin, K. R., & Pearce, J. L. (1996). Guanxi: Connections as substitutes for formal institutional support. *Academy of Management Journal, 39*(6), 1641–1658.
- Yakovleva, M., Reilly, R. R., & Werko, R. (2010). Why do we trust? Moving beyond individual to dyadic perceptions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 95*(1), 79–91.
- Yang, J., & Mossholder, K. W. (2010). Examining the effects of trust in leaders: A bases-and-foci approach. *The Leadership Quarterly, 21*(1), 50–63.
- Yang, J., Mossholder, K. W., & Peng, T. K. (2009). Supervisory procedural justice effects: The mediating roles of cognitive and affective trust. *The Leadership Quarterly, 20*(2), 143–154.
- Young, A. M., & Perrewé, P. L. (2000). What did you expect? An examination of career-related support and social support among mentors and protégés. *Journal of Management, 26*(4), 611–632.
- Zaheer, A., McEvily, B., & Perrone, V. (1998). Does trust matter? Exploring the effects of inter-organizational and interpersonal trust on performance. *Organization Science, 9*(2), 141–159.
- Zapata, C. P., Olsen, J. E., & Martins, L. L. (2013). Social exchange from the supervisor's perspective: Employee trustworthiness as a predictor of interpersonal and informational justice. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 121*(1), 1–12.
- Zhang, X., & Zhou, J. (2014). Empowering leadership, uncertainty avoidance, trust, and employee creativity: Interaction effects and a mediating mechanism. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 124*(2), 150–164.
- Zhu, W., Newman, A., Miao, Q., & Hooke, A. (2013). Revisiting the mediating role of trust in transformational leadership effects: Do different types of trust make a difference? *The Leadership Quarterly, 24*(1), 94–105.
- Zhu, Y., & Akhtar, S. (2014). How transformational leadership influences follower helping behavior: The role of trust and prosocial motivation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 35*(3), 373–392.