INTERVIEW

Trust dynamics and repair: An interview with Roy Lewicki

ABSTRACT

In this article, Roy Lewicki shares his experiences and reflections on trust research from the early seminal papers through to future research opportunities. We discuss his contributions and current thinking on trust development and repair, the forms of trust, the coexistence of trust and distrust, the mechanisms of trust repair, the relationship of trust with conflict, negotiation and in current affairs (e.g. ‘alternative facts’, climate change denial). Recurrent themes are the complex nature of trust development and repair processes, the methodological challenges inherent in studying trust and distrust dynamics over time, and the value of reflective practice and developmental forums for advancing trust research. Bridging the theory-practice divide, developing more sophisticated measurement tools, and conducting interdisciplinary scholarship are identified as rich opportunities for future trust research.

Keywords: trust, trust repair, trust dynamics, theory, method, practice.

INTRODUCTION

An important aim of the *Journal of Trust Research (JTR)* is to provide a forum for reflection on the development of the field of trust research. One way we achieve this is to publish interviews with people who have significantly influenced trust research and are willing to share their insights and reflections (see Ferrin, 2015; Nooteboom, 2016; Mollering, 2015). In this paper, we summarize an interview with Roy Lewicki conducted by Nicole Gillespie, JTR Deputy Editor-in-Chief, on 26 June 2017.

Roy Lewicki’s research on trust spans interpersonal trust, trust development and repair and trust in conflict and negotiation contexts. He has contributed many seminal papers on trust including his early work on trust development and repair in work relationships (Lewicki & Bunker, 1995; 1996), his *Academy of Management Review* article on trust and distrust (Lewicki, McAllister & Bies, 1998), his *Journal of Management* paper on models of trust development (Lewicki, Tomlinson & Gillespie, 2006) and his *Academy of Management Annals* review on Trust Repair (Kramer & Lewicki, 2010). Although trust has been a key research focus over the past 20 years, Roy is also prominently known for his broader scholarship on negotiation and conflict management, as well as framing dynamics in disputes, ethical conduct in organizations, and fairness and organizational justice systems.

Roy was trained in social psychology during the 1960’s under the supervision of Morton Deutsch. His impressive academic career over the past 50 years spans faculty and visiting positions at a range of U.S. universities including Ohio State, Yale, Dartmouth College, and Duke University. Since 1987, Roy served as Abramowitz Professor of Business Ethics and Professor of Management and Human Resources at the Max Fisher College of Business, Ohio State University, and has been Emeritus in this role since 2012. Roy was the Inaugural Editor of

Academy of Management Learning and Education from 2000-2004 and has served on the Editorial Boards of many top journals including *Academy of Management Review, Journal of Management, International Journal of Conflict Management, Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes,* and our own *Journal of Trust Research*. His awards are numerous and include Elected Fellow and the Distinguished Educator Award from the Academy of Management, the Lifetime Achievement Award from the International Association of Conflict Management, as well as numerous best paper and best book awards. He is an active member of the Academy of Management (where he founded the Conflict Management Interest Group, now Division), the International Association of Conflict Management (where he served as President), the American Psychological Society, American Psychological Association, the Society for Business Ethics, and the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues.

This interview is structured into four parts. First, we explore the early motivations and influences on Roy's trust research and discuss how his first seminal papers came about. Second, we discuss the later evolution of his research, how some of the original ideas about the forms of trust developed and changed over time, as well as emerging methodological challenges in studying the dynamics of trust. Third, we discuss future research opportunities, particularly aspects of trust that are not well understood, and methodologies and forums for advancing trust research. We conclude with a discussion of the extent to which trust research informs practice and current events (e.g. 'alternative facts', climate change denial), ways to bridge the theory-practice divide and promising areas for interdisciplinary scholarship on trust. The overall themes that emerge focus on the dynamic and complex nature of trust development and repair, the significant methodological challenges inherent in studying complex trust and distrust dynamics over time, as well as the value of reflective practice and supportive developmental forums for advancing research on trust.

EARLY MOTIVATIONS AND INFLUENCES

Nicole Gillespie (NG): *Trust researchers are often intrigued to know how a person came to study trust. So my first question is what led to your interest in studying trust?*

Roy Lewicki (RL): I am a graduate of the Social Psychology Program at Teachers College, Columbia University. My advisor was Morton Deutsch and he had written three articles on trust in the late 50's and early 60s (Deutsch, 1958, 1960, 1962). The seminal ones were 'Trust and Suspicion' (1958) and 'Cooperation and Trust: Some theoretical notes' (1962). In his lab, we were doing gaming studies of various kinds to study negotiation and cooperation. After a significant stream of papers on trust using the Prisoners Dilemma and other sorts of simple games through the 1960s and early 1970s, the topic of trust generally disappeared from the research literature for almost twenty years.

Then in the early 90s, two of my fellow graduate students – Jeff Rubin and Barbara Bunker – were putting together a tribute volume to Morton Deutsch, and they were trying to include a chapter on each of the topics he had addressed in his writings. So Barbara Bunker and I decided that we would tackle trust. At about the same time, I was at Duke working with Blair Sheppard. Blair, Debra Shapiro and Lisa Cheraskin had written a paper called 'Business on a Handshake' (Shapiro, Sheppard & Cheraskin, 1992) which opened up some new and different ways of thinking about trust in organizational relationships. The combination of the conversations I was having with Barbara and with Blair led to the 1995 trust chapter (Lewicki & Bunker, 1995).

The key idea in this paper was that there are different kinds of trust, and that these types changed as an interpersonal relationship developed and became more complex. In prior theoretical development, almost all of the writing had focused on a transactional kind of trust. That is, trust was conceptualized as a one-off market transaction, such as a buyer-seller exchange. We felt that the work up to this point had been primitive, and that trust had been narrowly and not clearly defined. Trust was being studied in very limited contexts, rather than enabling an understanding of how trust functions in more developmental, complex and longer term relationships. As Barbara and I began to dig more deeply into the kind of trust that was characteristic of long-term relationships, we began to believe that trust changed in form and type. We often used marriage, partnerships and long-term friendships as an example.

As we were finishing the chapter, we heard about a conference on trust that Roderick Kramer and Thomas Tyler were putting together at Stanford, and Barbara went and presented our ideas. This presentation and the feedback we received lead to the second chapter, which appeared in Kramer and Tyler's edited collection (Lewicki & Bunker, 1996).

NG: *It is interesting to note that part of the influence for your early seminal papers came from discussions with Blair Sheppard about his consulting project.*

RL: Yes. I get many of my good ideas from exchanges with students, executives, and colleagues. When someone challenges your explanation or discussion in a classroom, seminar or over a coffee, that helps you to develop and push your thinking. The development of my ideas about trust often came when people asked a question that made me think: 'You're right, we haven't really thought about that' or 'That is an interesting application' or 'Our model doesn't seem to relate to this situation.' In almost every one of the more meaningful papers and books I have done, it is because of great 'thinking partners' (often lubricated with adult beverages and plenty of napkins to write on).

NG: *I can relate to your experience. Most of my innovative ideas have come from reflecting on practice and talking through ideas with others, sometimes over a beer and a napkin. That was certainly how the work that Graham Dietz and I did on organizational trust repair first came about (Gillespie & Dietz, 2009).*

RL: Yes it frees up the heart and the head. It is a curvilinear relationship though – a little bit works well but a lot is just bad!

NG: *Your scholarly work was largely focused on conflict and negotiation for the first 20-30 years of your career. How did your prior work on conflict and negotiation shape your early thinking on trust?*

RL: The work on conflict and negotiation was relevant in the following way. In the 1960s and early 1970s, the dominant research paradigms in negotiation were simple game theoretic models. In contrast, scholars in international and labor relations were focused on negotiation in these rich, complex contexts. The work of Richard Walton and Robert McKersie was one of the first to bring these perspectives together. Walton and McKersie (1965) described four major sub-processes of a labor negotiation: distributive bargaining, integrative bargaining, intra-organizational relationships and attitudinal structuring. Their descriptions drove our early approach to the subject of trust, because their approach focused on *processes* for getting to agreement and helped to understand some of the underlying psychological dynamics of these processes. But even within their work, trust was seldom mentioned, and it was similarly neglected in other works on labor relations and international relations. Trust was a word that was 'thrown in' here and there, but not a major topic of attention.

So no one was talking about trust. Everyone was talking around trust. I thought trust is an important and critical element but everyone seemed to just wave their hands and postulate it. I became interested in understanding the impact of lies and deceptive behavior on negotiation (Lewicki, 1983); intellectually, you can't get too far into that concept without running into trust and what deception does to trust dynamics. But even I didn't relate lying and deception to its impact on trust in negotiation.

NG: *So trust was implicit in the early work, but not explicit. Then you published your landmark book chapter (Lewicki & Bunker, 1996) which to my mind was a defining moment in trust research. It outlined many fundamental insights about trust including: three forms of trust (calculus-based, knowledge based and identification based), the dynamics of violations and the evolving nature of trust, a model of trust repair, together with a bilateral understanding of the actions that both parties – violator and victim – need to engage in to repair the relationship. How did you come to such a rich understanding of the dynamics and processes of trust at this time?*

RL: As a psychologist, a lot of my teaching and work is reflective practice. I try to understand a phenomenon both from an intellectual and also from a personal point of view. So it was through personal reflection and conversations with others. How do you know if you trust somebody? What does trust look like when it is present or absent? How is trust different in various kinds of relationships? What makes it different? We used the metaphor of the children's game Chutes and Ladders to describe trust building (up the ladder) and trust breaches (down the slide). We realized that metaphor didn't work for long-term relationships which have much more complex dynamics. So writing the paper was a very intuitive approach combined with bringing in the limited existing literature. My social psychology background really helped, but it took me a long time to 'trust my intuition' in my writing rather than just staying with the existing literature.

In terms of the process on that paper, we did a lot of the work in meeting rooms, on flip charts, or over the phone. We would get a conference room with a white board and we spent all day trying to hash out our ideas. A lot of the trust repair parts of the paper came from that work. We challenged ourselves with what it would take to address trust in complex relationships. Sheppard and Deutsch were incredibly good critics, too.

NG: *Only a few years later, you published your conceptual paper on Trust and Distrust (Lewicki, McAllister & Bies, 1998). This proved to be another seminal paper. In it you proposed a theoretical framework for understanding how trust and distrust can simultaneously co-exist* *within relationships, and distinguished this multidimensional approach from prior work grounded in assumptions of unidimensionally and balance. This framework highlighted the strong emotional underpinning of trust – both in terms of positive emotions in the case of trust, and negative emotions in the case of distrust. How did that paper come about?*

RL: The work on trust was intellectually transformative for me. I had been serving as an Associate Dean for a number of years and had not done much writing; I needed a break from administrative work, but I wasn't sure what to do next. It became clear to me then that there were lots of new opportunities in the trust domain, so I decided to take a sabbatical. I had begun talking about trust with Dan McAllister and Bob Bies, both of whom I had known for years, and decided Georgetown would be a good fit for a leave of absence. Bob had been writing about revenge and 'getting even' and had been influenced by his work with Sim Sitkin on legalistic organizations. Dan had recently published his groundbreaking study on trust and affect (McAllister, 1995). As we worked together over 4-5 months, we had some very rich discussions. We became convinced that distrust was a unique and separate construct from trust, and that distrust did not simply represent the 'low end' of trust. Bob was the strongest proponent for that idea. AMR was putting together a special issue on trust, and we decided that would be our contribution. The argument was that when you got into complex relationships, rather than one-off transactional relationships, that there were things about the other party that you trusted and things about the other party that you distrusted. With my spouse, I trust her to be a wonderful caretaker of our children, but I wouldn't trust her to clean up my office – what she would think is a pile of trash and would throw out, I would think is a research paper in progress. So the fact that they could exist together and we could point to a number of examples of this, gave us the footing.

That paper went through several major revisions before AMR said that they liked it. One reviewer thought we were crazy and that the fundamental premise was wrong, that our model was based on a house of cards. And there was no data at the time to argue one way or the other. We didn't pay a lot of attention to that component of the review. We received some great criticism from Sim Sitkin, Denise Rousseau, Blair Sheppard and others that helped shape the paper.

***NG:** That is helpful to hear how much transformation happens on a paper during the review process, even for seasoned scholars. I worry that early career researchers may not appreciate just how different published papers typically are from the first submission.*

RL: Yes. At the time we did this work, I was working with Max Bazerman, Blair Sheppard and Bob Bies on multiple volumes of the Research on Negotiation and Organizations series (Lewicki, Bies, & Sheppard, 1997). All of these volumes originated from week-end conferences in which each person had 40 minutes to present a paper and 20 minutes to receive critique. There was a lot of material that came from those debates, dialogues and challenges from a lot of smart people who didn't see things the same way I did. The editors of any particular book also gave feedback to the authors in at least 1-2 rounds of revisions. There are still some specialized conferences where that happens, but in my view they don't happen as much as they did formerly. That rich exchange of ideas between scholars around a single paper – not a 15-20 minute presentation in a symposium – rather an hour - gives incredibly rich feedback. It is better than reviewer feedback in the sense that all the reviewers are in the room, and they are building on each other's ideas. There were cases where we rewrote people's papers at those conferences and that was ok because it became a much better piece of work.

NG: *I completely agree - a format where you can really focus in on a paper, even read the paper before the presentation, and stay focused on a broad topic for a couple of days, produces much richer insights, feedback and quality of ideas. We have been creating that kind of forum in the sub-themes and the former Standing Working Group on Trust (SWG 2) at the European Group of Organizational Studies (see www.egosnet.org) to help support the development of papers.*

RL: I would say that two thirds of the original papers that were presented at our conferences would have been a 'desk reject' from a journal or many of our larger professional associations. They would not even have seen the light of day from a reviewer. They were just not that well-formed and the ideas were not cleanly presented. Most of our academic journals are looking for a very narrow slice of idea development; they assume that you already have a clearly defined idea, hypotheses or propositions, and set of arguments for how to get there. Nothing in the actual work process of getting to that 'summary' is ever represented in the final paper. In contrast, in the conference format, it is accepted that people are trying out new ideas, and it is a safe space to discuss those ideas and gain feedback on them.

NG: *Returning to the distinction between trust and distrust, recent research by Reimann, Schilke & Cook (2017), provided further evidence of that distinction. Their work comparing monozygotic and dizygotic twin samples suggests that the disposition to trust has a heritable basis, whereas distrust is better explained by shared socialization. How well do you feel the distinctive aspects of trust and distrust have been incorporated into trust research? And have there been any barriers to working with both constructs?*

RL: The trust aspects have clearly been picked up both in terms of the interpersonal and inter-organizational trust literatures. The distrust construct did not get much traction for years. However, it has picked up a lot in the last 5-7 years. There have now been more qualitative and quantitative pieces examining distrust, as well as an EIASM workshop focused on it. Shiau-Ling Guo, Fabrice Lumineau and I recently published a long review article on distrust that summarizes a lot of that work (Guo, Lumineau & Lewicki, 2017).

While it is hard to keep up with all the literature, my sense is that very few studies have looked at the two constructs – trust and distrust and the dynamics between the two - in the same study. A lot of that has to do with a lack of an acceptable process for calibration. That is, how do we measure trust and distrust, and how can you calibrate when the two move together, or one overrides the other, in an iterative, time sensitive, sequential assessment? You can do pre-post but that is a primitive way to get at it. We need to find better ways to calibrate the changes in the two constructs, over time, so we can gain sound empirical measurements of those constructs and their inter-relationships. I still feel that work is a huge challenge and still needs to be done.

LATER EVOLUTION OF RESEARCH AND CHALLENGES

NG: *How have your original ideas and underlying assumptions about trust changed over time?*

RL: In terms of the papers that Bunker and I wrote, the idea of 'knowledge-based trust' has been tabled. When we were working on it, it was the hardest component to measure. We eventually decided that knowledge was a dimension of the relationship, and not a specific form or dimension of trust. We can measure 'knowledge' in terms of how well I know you, how well I can predict you, how well I can anticipate your reactions to what I do. But that is not inherent in trust. It drives the trust I have, but it is not a component of trust. We have pretty much left knowledge based trust by the wayside. In the 1998 *AMR* introductory paper, Rousseau, Sitkin and colleagues (1998) presented a simple graph on relationships, with transactional trust at one end and relational trust at the other. That is a simpler way to represent the kinds of trust we described. Our calculus-based and identification-based trust still need some work though, in terms of articulation and specification.

In particular, there has not been enough work on identification-based trust. Particularly, as we see more and more identity based conflict around the world and in the political sphere, in racial terms, in gender terms, in all kinds of ways. The concept of identification-based trust is still strong in my mind, but it needs to be conceptualized in a tighter way as a unique component.

Finally, measures of trust and trustworthiness based on Mayer, Davis and Schoorman's (1995) conceptual model have become a dominant standard in the research literature. I am pleased to see some convergence on a common definition of these constructs. More work needs to be done though, particularly on the components of trustworthiness, to determine whether there are other components, and to link these constructs back to our broader conceptualizations of types of trust and of trust and distrust.

***NG:** So do you see calculus based trust at one end of the continuum and identification-based trust at the other end of the continuum, with many relationships falling somewhere in between these two extreme ends? Would that be a fair characterization of your current thinking?*

RL: That is a good question. I think my answer would be "no" because it is not 'either/or', but rather it is 'yes/and.' And that hasn't been modelled. Let me give you an example. Early in a relationship, much of the trust may be transactional but at the same time, there may be some identity dimensions which I intuitively, instinctively latch onto. You are of the same race, gender, nationality, cultural or professional background. So I may give you some immediate trust even though I have no transactional basis upon which to do so. We may know very little about each other, but I am going to make a lot of assumptions about you based on a whole bunch of nonverbal and intuitive signals and cues that I am getting. This is what Kramer (1996) highlights when he talks about intuitive trust and the 'intuitive auditor'. At the other end of the spectrum, there is a lot of trust that can be based on history, common identity – think about family - our experiences, our children etc. But there are still some transactional components there. As I said, I trust my wife to care for my children but not to clean up my study. So I certainly wouldn't describe it as 'either/or'. I would describe it as 'yes/and'. The component elements are different at the beginning, the middle and at the end. That is harder to represent, although I believe it captures the reality better.

***NG:** So rather than distinct forms of trust, relationships can have elements of calculus and identification based trust co-existing at the same time, similar to how they can have elements of trust and distrust co-existing?*

RL: Yes. In our distrust paper (Lewicki et al., 1998), we talked about trust and distrust as bands/components, and that relationships had different kinds of bandwidth. Meaning that deeper, more complex or long term relationships have a much more complex set of component bands, but they are not all trust and they are not all distrust. There are elements of each in the dynamic, and a balance across the elements. This conceptualization again creates some really interesting and unique measurement issues. You can provide ample evidence of this phenomenon with cases and examples, but it is hard to capture with more precise calibrations.

NG: *So resolving some of the significant measurement and methodological challenges is an important way to deepen insight and gain more traction in understanding the co-existing components and dynamics of trust and distrust. You mentioned that even in a relationship characterized by high identification based trust, distrust can still occur. How sustainable do you see those kinds of relationships?*

RL: A high trust, low distrust relationship is what makes betrayal so traumatic. Suddenly the other person is behaving completely different from what I predicted, and I don't know where that came from. My immediate reaction is not only surprise, but I also experience a loss of face, because I realize how naïve I have been to believe that you were so fully trustworthy, but now unworthy of trust. We argue that even in the healthiest possible relationship, there always ought to be some elements of suspicion and caution. That is, you should be updating and revising your judgement of the other's trustworthiness. Do I understand what is happening and how this relationship may be changing? If things are changing and you can't make sense of it, in a healthy relationship, you talk that out. For example, "…you are spending more time away from home." "You aren't talking at the dinner table anymore. What's on your mind?" "You seem angry at me? What happened?" Hopefully, a good conversation works that out. What is traumatic is if all of a sudden that gets surprised on you one day and you didn't see it coming. I would imagine that those are the hardest relationships to repair. That kind of dynamic is personally traumatizing and therefore much more difficult to fix.

NG: *You emphasized the importance of having some kind of early intervention when trust is going off track and being able to talk about changes in the relationship before it escalates to significant distrust. That reminds me of a recent paper by Stevens and colleagues (2015) in our special issue of Organization Studies on Organizational Trust, Failures and Repair. That paper used a longitudinal, dyadic approach and found that an effective path to maintain optimal trust was through 'recalibration practices', wherein small deviations are addressed before damage to trust occurs. In our introductory paper (Bachmann, Gillespie & Priem, 2015), we further identified that practice and process-based approaches are particularly well suited for advancing understanding of trust repair processes over time (see Möllering, 2013). Those approaches, when applied to trust, would suggest that trust is continually created, recreated and enacted in relationships everyday as we engage in trust practices (see also Dietz, 2011). Do you think the practice and process based approaches hold promise for understanding trust dynamics?*

RL: Yes that could well be.

NG: *We talked about how your early work was focused on negotiation and conflict. I'm curious to understand how your work on trust and conflict co-evolved over time. And relatedly, how well you feel the trust literature informs the practice of conflict management?*

RL: I have been researching trust now for the past 20 years and I tend to see conflict dynamics through a trust lens. What is contributing to conflict escalation, and conversely conflict reduction? What does it take to get parties back to the table? In many cases, I don't see practitioners who are doing restorative, peace building or mediation work, worrying enough about rebuilding trust and what it takes to do that. This is clearly a problem of connecting theory with practice. While we have written a lot to each other (i.e. other scholars), I don't think there is a rich interplay between what we know about trust and how that can advise mediators, arbitrators and parties involved in relationship building. I can't think of a nice, clean, prescriptively-oriented piece that gets to that.

NG: *Yes, it is very much required. The importance of trust for negotiation and conflict resolution processes was picked up in a recent Special Issue of JTR on trust and negotiation. Tony Kong, Don Ferrin, Robert Lount and Mara Olekalns (2017) cite a recent meta-analysis that found less than 25 studies examining the antecedents of trust in negotiations, and only 38 studies on trust and negotiation effectiveness. That stands in considerable contrast to the meta-analysis that Bart de Jong, Kurt Dirks and I recently published (2016) on team trust and team performance – which had over 112 independent samples. Why do you think the empirical exploration of trust in negotiations has been quite slow and sporadic?*

RL: I think there are two problems here. Like most of the literature on trust, these studies use a snapshot model, looking at antecedents or consequences at one time point. These are not dynamic models. They are static models where X leads to Y, but it doesn't indicate that X can also lead to Y prime which leads to Z prime, which contradicts Y. So most of those studies draw a nice boundary that can be captured in a paper. But what happens after that? What is the next window? Some of us have been talking about the role of turning points in conflict or negotiation and how we study turning points. And to me, trust dynamics would be an integral part of a turning point. But we just don't capture enough to see how trust varies if someone tells a lie, or asks for more than they rightfully deserve, or if they fail to keep a promise. That needs to be studied but it is not captured by the static models.

NG: *It is interesting that you raise the issue of turning points. In our special issue introductory paper (Bachmann et al., 2015), we talk about the related concept of tipping points. We intuitively know, as reflective practitioners, that there are moments in time that tip or turn a relationship and yet, we have not studied this idea enough. What causes tipping points? How can they be recovered from? It appears to be a rich area for future investigation on trust and relationship maintenance and repair.*

FUTURE TRUST RESEARCH, METHODS AND PUBLICATION OUTLETS

NG: *That leads into thinking about future research. You have written several influential review articles that have focused on trust repair (Dirks, Lewicki & Zaheer, 2009; Kramer & Lewicki, 2010; Lewicki & Brinsfield, 2017). Are there particular aspects of the trust repair process that you feel are under-researched or not well understood?*

RL: In our 2009 review, we identified the three mechanisms through which repair is attempted (e.g. attributional, social equilibrium and structural). We talked about the existing research in each of those areas, such as verbal statements, compensation and penance, and structural arrangements such as legalistic ways to prevent distrust from occurring. But what we don't understand is whether any of those actually work, and over what time period. So in terms of long term trust repair, there just isn't much good work studying relationships over a long period of time to calibrate and understand how these actions to rebuild trust play out. We predicted that trust repair would take longer and would take more serious work than trust building, because now there are distrust elements in the relationship.
Again, we have measurement issues here, in terms of examining the long term impact of trust dynamics and repair. The snapshot nature of much of the research is still a big problem, as we highlighted back in our 2006 review (Lewicki, Tomlinson & Gillespie, 2006). We are becoming quite prescriptive about what works based on very short term, narrow windows to examine those impacts. So much of this research is highly speculative because actual 'trust repair' is never measured. So if I say that I'm sorry and I fully apologize, does that return trust to the previous level? Is saying sorry enough, or do I also need to provide roses and candy? That repair dynamic and the calibration of that over time is a sorely needed piece to make any good sense of the prescriptive advice that is out there.

NG: *You have talked a lot about the challenges of measuring trust dynamics and the repair process. What methodologies and research designs do you think are best suited to study trust repair?*

RL: We need long term panel studies with examination of cases and periodic interventions over a period of time to be able to gather information about levels of trust and distrust. Ideally, we would also have control groups next to the panel study, where the interventions didn't occur (otherwise we are creating Heisenberg effects, in which the intervention changes the phenomenon). So we need comparative cases to be able to judge the effects of the repair cases.
Natural field studies are also important. Trust repair needs to be studied in actual, real, unsimulated relationship contexts—between friends and partners, between leaders and their organizations. Several times a week, the news media features a celebrity, sports figure, CEO or elected official who is apologizing for some misdeed, gaffe, lie or even fraud and other crimes. Yet we never really know whether any of these apologies or efforts at penance actually change people's minds and alter their trust levels—over the short or long term. This work needs to be done.

NG: *Where do you see the balance and focus between qualitative and quantitative methods in the study of trust repair?*

RL: The effective measurement of trust decline and the effect of any given action on trust repair are hard to capture with paper and pencil measures. Using surveys interspersed with interviews over time is a better approach. So going back and forth between qualitative studies of trust and distrust through interviews and cases as they evolve over time, and then integrating the qualitative dimensions and concepts that emerge into more precise and complex deductive measures. Also, more sophistication is needed in developing the neurobiological (hormonal, etc.) measures of trust that can be evaluated independent of 'conscious' response.

When examining trust, it is important to break the trust construct down into its component pieces. So rather than just asking, 'How much do you trust the other party now? And how much do you distrust them?' Instead asking: 'What did they do that increased your trust?' So getting at the 'what' and the 'why' to identify, at least in the respondent's eyes, the actions that are causing the change in trust level. The work by Peter Kim, Don Ferrin, Cecily Cooper and Kurt Dirks (Kim, Ferrin, Cooper & Dirks, 2004) on competence vs integrity based trust violations has received a lot more attention. It implies that integrity violations are much harder, if not impossible, to repair compared to competence violations. But we really don't know that over time. That really needs good empirical work.

NG: *You are an author or editor of 40 books, including the leading academic textbook on negotiation. One of the most cited papers on trust repair is your 1996 book chapter with Barbara Bunker which according to Google Scholar has been cited over 3000 times. Your book, 'Making Sense of Intractable Environmental Conflicts', won the Best Book Award from the International Association of Conflict Management. What is your perspective on the value of books and book chapters compared to journal articles?*

RL: I greatly prefer book chapters because this kind of writing can occur in a much more open intellectual space. The major journals significantly overvalue tightly defined and packaged empirical studies, or well packaged highly 'testable' theories. These are the two types of publications that are heavily valued by academic promotion and hiring committees (at least in the US). But there is a rich open space in the world of communicating research that isn't defined by either of these two approaches and that allow for thinking more broadly, thinking cross-disciplinary, and thinking in a forum where the costs are lower for being wrong, off-target or incomplete. Where people can speculate, can explore, can put out a half finished thought that others can elaborate. So book chapters allow you a lot more freedom and open space to be speculative because they are meant to be idea generating and inductive.

Some of the best work in the negotiation, conflict management and trust domains has been in books that evolved from conferences and symposia where ideas were freely batted around (and often significantly improved by audience comments and critique—among the current leaders in the field). Several of the theoretical and empirical papers started with conferences, working sessions and proactive intellectual dialogue. I infinitely prefer to work in this space.

However, it is not great advice for faculty at the start of their career to publish in book chapters. It is far more difficult for book chapters to get noticed, they are given less 'credit', and it's harder to build a case for promotion and tenure around them. That is because the citation rate of books is lower and most promotion and tenure committees are not capable of judging seminal ideas, and so they rely on journal ranking lists to evaluate quality and don't count book chapters. As an example, Mayer, Davis and Schoorman (1995), published in the same year as Lewicki & Bunker

(1995, 1996), have over 16,000 cites. While their paper has had a huge impact on trust research, where it appeared also gave it great initial credibility.

INFORMING CURRENT PRACTICE AND TRANSDISCIPLINARY SCHOLARSHIP

NG: *You suggested that some of the best scholarship comes from observing and making sense of what is happening in the real world – by being a reflective practitioner. What do you make of the increasing discussion of 'alternative facts' in news reporting particularly since Trump's rise to power? Does trust play a role in those dynamics?*

RL: The boundary between truth, hard facts, soft facts, alternative facts and outright LIES has become completely blurred. Truth has become so politically polarized (and the compromise middle is such a dirty word) that people are no longer bothered about the distinctions. Truth used to be a standard by which we would judge an individual's trustworthiness. What is remarkable is that in the USA, in the past 12-18 months, that has eroded. It hasn't bothered enough people, which is both surprising and incredibly distressing. People now judge someone from an identity point of view and then use that judgment to decide whether what they are saying is the truth or not the truth, in contrast to judging the other by their words, their transparency and openness, and doing what they say they will do. Ten, fifteen, twenty years ago, someone who lied as consistently as some of our political officials do, would be totally discredited. But that no longer seems to be the case. It shows a transformation that continues to widen the gap between two sides. We no longer judge whether what someone says is right or not, we judge whether they are on our side or the other side. It is red vs blue, Republican vs Democratic, it is which news media you watch and pay attention to.
As applied to Trump, there is 35% of the population who believe and trust him regardless of what he says. They watch one particular news channel and read self-reinforcing things on the web that support his point of view. There are a lot of people who distrust him and always challenge what he says, and watch totally different news channels. It is interesting what happens in the middle of the political spectrum, and which way they are being pulled or pushed. That is my crude assessment of why there are all these 'alternative facts' and 'alternative realities' which are not based on hard data, but are nevertheless strongly believed by some percentage of the population. That transfers to other kinds of leaders, too – corporate leaders and leaders in other contexts.

NG: *It is dangerous when there is no shared accepted standard for evaluating facts or truth. What I hear you describing is a regression into in-groups and out-groups, with social categorization processes clearly evident: people identifying with and trusting their in-group and distrusting the out-group. It is disturbing.*

RL: Yes, because the credibility of information is not judged by whether it is accurate, rather the credibility of information is judged by who said it. People don't take the time to verify. There is so much information overload out there, and so many different arguments, and so many people who claim to be telling the truth but aren't. It makes it hard for people to verify it. In the work that Barbara Gray and I did on environmental disputes (Lewicki, Gray, & Elliott, 2003), this was true of some of the most polarized environmental conflicts that we looked at. Unfortunately, we didn't study trust very much as a component of those dynamics But in many of the intractable environmental disputes, that was exactly what was going on; it was not a matter of whether they were the right facts, it was more a question of who was offering the facts. The very fact that you are on the other side, and I don't like you and I don't trust you, means that anything that you say cannot be right.

NG: *Yes. A relatively recent phenomenon is that people now, more than ever, can tailor the news they receive (often on their mobile device) and only be exposed to media outlets and perspectives that reinforce their existing beliefs and attitudes. In contrast, in the past, people were more exposed to the same news broadcasts. In this new age of tailored media, confirmation bias (the tendency of people to search for and interpret evidence selectively, to reinforce their current beliefs or attitudes) and attitude polarization are likely to be stronger. This continual reinforcement with limited challenge is likely to contribute to attitudes and perspectives becoming more entrenched over time.*

RL: Yes. Take the climate change debate. The fact that there is a significant proportion of the public and several national leaders who deny that climate change is happening, despite all the evidence and concurrence by science on the contrary, is scary. This is a good example of that dynamic. The people that deny it believe they have alternative facts and they are not going to listen to anyone else's facts, whether they are 'scientifically' proven or not. Trust in truth and science as the objective standard is becoming politicized and hence 'less trustable'.

NG: *That raises the question of what responsibility we as trust researchers have to disseminate the knowledge that we create to the 'real world', so that it makes a practical difference. How well do you feel that trust research is informing practice in the field?*

RL: Badly. I think that much of the research is esoteric—true, some of it needs to be—but it has low public appeal. We need to find better ways to communicate relevant research into practice, and we need information brokers to help us do that. The people that need our research findings certainly aren't reading the research journals. And the people that are producing this research often don't understand how to get their information into the hands of those who need to read it. By 'brokers', I mean people who are able to rework a research study into something that the public can access, into a television clip or a blog, a newspaper article or an interview. It needs to be in small sized bites; nobody wants the big complex aspects anymore. For example, you may be aware that *Negotiation and Conflict Management Research* published an apologies article by Bob Lount, Beth Polin and me last year (Lewicki, Polin & Lount, 2016). We actually got lots of media attention on that because the Ohio State University news bureau liked it and pushed it out into news wires, newspaper, blogs and TV markets. Having the University news service behind it was as important as the article, because journals do not promote anything and the public media doesn't get into the journals because they can't understand them. Bridges between the researchers and the practitioners using various kinds of intermediaries is really important.

NG: *That suggests the need for more translational work that is accessible to the mainstream and media services. Should trust researchers write shorter, translational pieces aimed at practitioners?*

RL: Yes, yes! But I think they are going to need help to make those pieces interesting and appealing. I'm always fascinated when I get interviewed by the local news media, and then I watch the story that they put together. They never start with the research findings. They start with a case, a situation, a problem or a particular individual, and then they weave back into one or two snippets from the research idea and then they go on to say more about the case or the individual. So the public consumption is packaged differently than how we package research communication with each other. Researchers would benefit from knowing how to write and package short articles in this form.

***NG:** That is an opportunity we are exploring for JTR – to have a periodic translational research piece. The final question then: Some would say that a deep understanding of trust requires either interdisciplinary research or an exchange between different disciplines studying trust. While your traditional training is in psychology, your work has both acknowledged and reviewed trust scholarship from a broad range of disciplines and perspectives. To what extent do you believe interdisciplinary research is required to further the study of trust?*

RL: I believe it is absolutely critical. Trust is a tool to help us understand behavioral processes in different contexts – political, social, economic, legal, organizational etc. It is not an end in itself. It is a tool for getting parties together. So understanding those interdisciplinary approaches gives us feedback on how complete and robust our own ideas are. For example, we need more work between the law and the legal domain, and trust. I also think anthropology has a lot to contribute to understanding broader trust constructs, and we need to learn more about methods from anthropology. Economics and psychology are always going to be coming from different assumptions; however, there is a lot of bridge work that has been done by the decision science people. I mentioned earlier the work in neurobiology, which I think is the next big breakthrough opportunity for trust research, as long as we can help individuals without a biology/chemistry background read and understand the research.

***NG:** When you mention methods from anthropology, are you referring to ethnographic work?*

RL: Yes but I would also include cross-cultural research, in the broadest sense of the term. The international studies people have looked at this a bit but I don't think we really understand to what extent the way we define trust is consistent with other civilizations. We need a richer look at that.

***NG:** Absolutely. I recall when Don Ferrin and I did a review of the literature examining trust across cultures (Ferrin & Gillespie, 2010), we were very surprised at how little work had been done examining trust across cultures. There has been more work since; however, given the significant practical importance of understanding how to build trust across cultures, it still appears to be a fertile area for future research.*

RL: Yes there is still much to be done. While I believe trust is fundamentally a psychological construct, interdisciplinary research will be critical in advancing the field.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

According to Roy Lewicki, trust is a complex and dynamic psychological construct that has multiple co-existing components that evolve and change over time. Future research needs to employ more longitudinal and processual paradigms, develop more sensitive measurement tools and adopt mixed-method approaches to deepen understanding of the dynamics of trust breakdown and repair over time. The field of trust research also critically requires more interdisciplinary scholarship, with rich opportunities occurring at the junction of trust research with law, neurobiology, anthropology and cross-cultural studies. There is also much scope for trust research to better inform practice. Adopting the stance of 'reflective practitioner' and enabling open forums for testing, developing and publishing new ideas, are important ways to advance future trust theory and research.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The *Journal of Trust Research* thanks Roy Lewicki for participating in the interview and generously sharing his candid reflections and insights.

NOTES ON CONTRIBUTOR

Nicole Gillespie is Associate Professor of Management at the University of Queensland Business School and International Research Fellow at the Centre for Corporate Reputation, Oxford University. Nicole's research focuses on the development and repair of organizational and stakeholder trust, particularly in challenging contexts such as during organizational change, technological disruption, mega-projects and after trust failures. Her research also examines trust in teams and leadership and the measurement of trust. Nicole's research appears in leading journals such as *Academy of Management Review*, *Journal of Management*, *Organization Studies*, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *Business Ethics Quarterly* and *Human Resource Management*. She is Deputy Editor-in-Chief of the *Journal of Trust Research* and on the editorial board of *Leadership Quarterly*.

REFERENCES

Bachmann, R., Gillespie, N. & Priem, R. (2015). Repairing Trust in Organizations and Institutions: Toward a Conceptual Framework. *Organization Studies, 36 (9)*, 1123-1142.

De Jong, B., Dirks, K., & Gillespie, N. (2016). Trust and Team Performance: A Meta-Analysis of Main Effects, Moderators and Covariates. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 101 (8), 1134-1150.

Dietz, G. (2011) Going back to the source: Why do people trust each other? *Journal of Trust Research*, 1 (2), 215-222.

Deutsch, M. (1958). Trust and Suspicion. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 2(4), 265-279

Deutsch, M. (1960). Trust, trustworthiness, and the F scale. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, Vol 61(1), 138-140.

Deutsch, M. (1962). Cooperation and trust: Some theoretical notes. In Jones, M.R. (Ed). *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation*. Oxford: Nebraska Press (pp. 275-320).

Dirks, K. T., Lewicki, R. J., & Zaheer, A. (2009). Repairing relationships within and between organizations: Building a conceptual foundation. *Academy of Management Review, 34*(1), 68-84.

Ferrin, D.L. (2015) Insights and observations on the decision to trust in both science and practice: Interview with Robert F. Hurley. *Journal of Trust Research*, 5:2, 184-198, DOI: 10.1080/21515581.2015.1072543

Ferrin, D. & Gillespie, N. (2010). Trust differences across national-societal cultures: Much to do, or much ado about nothing? In M. Saunders, D. Skinner, G. Dietz, N. Gillespie, & R.J. Lewicki (Eds). *Organizational Trust: A cultural perspective.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp. 42-86

Gillespie, N. & Dietz, G. (2009). Trust repair after an organization-level failure. *Academy of Management Review, 34* (1), 127-145.

Guo, S.L., Lumineau, F. & Lewicki, R.J. (2017). Revisiting the Foundations of Organizational Distrust. *Foundations and Trends in Management*, 1 (1), 1-88.

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., Lount, R.B., Olekalns, M. & Ferrin, D.L. (2017) Advancing the scientific understanding of trust in the contexts of negotiations and repeated bargaining. *Journal of Trust Research*, 7:1, 15-21.

Kramer, R. M. (1996). Divergent realities and convergent disappointments in the hierarchical relation: Trust and the intuitive auditor at work. In R. M. Kramer & T. R. Tyler (Eds.), *Trust in Organizations: Frontiers of Theory and Research* (pp. 216-245). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kramer, R. M., & Lewicki, R. J. (2010). Repairing and Enhancing Trust: Approaches to Reducing Organizational Trust Deficits. *The Academy of Management Annals, 4*(1), 245 - 277.

Lewicki, R.J. (1983) Lying and deception: A behavioral model, with applications to negotiation. In M. Bazerman and R.J. Lewicki. Negotiating in Organizations. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Lewicki, R.J., Bies, R.H. and Sheppard, B.H. (1997). *Research on Negotiation in Organizations*. Vol. 6. Greenwich, CT: JAI Publishing.

Lewicki, R. J., & Bunker, B. B. (1995). Trust in relationships: A model of development and decline. In B. B. Bunker, J. Z. Rubin, & Associates (Eds.), *Conflict, cooperation, and justice: Essays inspired by the work of Morton Deutsch* (pp. 133–173). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

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: Sage.

Lewicki, R. J., & Brinsfield, C. (2017). Trust repair. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 4*, 287-313.

Lewicki, R.J., Gray, B. & Elliott, M. (2003). Making Sense of Intractable Environmental Conflicts: Concepts and Cases. Washington D.C.: Island Press.

Lewicki, R. J., Polin, B. & Lount, R. B. (2016). An exploration of the structure of effective apologies. *Negotiation and Conflict Management Research,* 9: 177–196.

Lewicki, R. J., McAllister, D. J., & Bies, R. J. (1998). Trust and distrust: New relationships and realities. *Academy of Management Review, 23*(3), 438-458.

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.

Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H., & Schoorman, F. D. (1995). An integrative model of organizational trust. *Academy of Management Review, 20*(3), 709-734.

McAllister, D. J. (1995). Affect- and cognition-based trust as foundations for interpersonal cooperation in organizations. *Academy of Management Journal, 38*(1), 24-59.

Möllering, G. (2013). Process Views of Trusting and Crises. In: Bachmann, R., Zaheer, A. (Eds.) *Handbook of Advances in Trust Research*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 285-305.

Möllering, G. (2015). The practical wisdom of trust: An interview with Bart Nooteboom. *Journal of Trust Research*, 5(2), 170–183. DOI: 10.1080/21515581.2015.1070731

Reimann, M., Schilke, O., & Cook, K. S. (2017). Trust is heritable, whereas distrust is not. *PNAS, early view*. doi:www.pnas.org/cgi/doi/10.1073/pnas.1617132114

Rousseau, D. M., Sitkin, S. B., Burt, R. S., & Camerer, C. (1998). Not so different after all: A cross-discipline view of trust. *Academy of Management Review, 23*(3), 393-404.

Shapiro, D. L., Sheppard, B. H. and Cheraskin, L. (1992). Business on a Handshake. *Negotiation Journal*, 8: 365–377.

Stevens, M., MacDuffie, D. P., & Helper, S. (2015). Reorienting and recalibrating inter-organizational relationships: Strategies for achieving optimal trust. Organization Studies, 36(9), 1237–1264.

Walton, R.E. & McKersie, R.B. (1965). *A Behavioral Theory of Labor Negotiations.* New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.