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ABSTRACT

Trust is a complex concept and our understanding of what creates, sustains and builds trust within organisations is variable. The purpose of this study was to examine the antecedent factors influencing employee perceptions of trust in organisations, and this was achieved by aggregating qualitative trust data gathered from four surveys conducted in two related mining companies.

Analyses of questions that referred to trust in the ‘company’, produced one set of factors which described generalised leader behaviours and characteristics that influence employee perceptions of trust in leaders throughout their employing company. Analyses of questions that referred to employees’ trust in their immediate managers produced factors that described behaviours and characteristics influencing their perceptions of trust in the leader with whom respondents had the most intimate supervisory relationship. Many factors were common to both phases of analysis, but the most frequently described was Open and Honest Communication. Some factors were unique to the company analysis, including Managers’ Competencies, Provides Benefits, Safety Obligations, Stability of Managerial Personnel and Profit Motives. Others were unique to the immediate manager analyses and included Confidentiality, Consistency and Predictability, and Role Limitations. Similarities and differences in factors described within company analysis and immediate manager analysis were reconciled to produce six factor groupings. The different factor structure found in the company and immediate manager analyses reflect, to some extent, the impact of hierarchical distance on the basis for trust.
Mayer, Davis and Schoorman's (1995) Integrative Model of Organisational Trust was used as a starting point for factor identification and grouping because of its links to previous antecedent factor research. Several factors not represented in that model were extracted. Four factors described leaders' behaviours associated with employee trust: Managers' Competencies, Benevolence, Integrity, and Investment of Role and Task Responsibilities. Propensity to trust was present, but had two subtly different forms. Contextual Factors not represented in Mayer et al.'s, model were also extracted. These factor groups formed the components of an elaborated model of the antecedents of organisational trust.

Exploring trust at the company level as well as the immediate manager level provided important insight into trust behaviours attributed to managers and leaders of the company and those attributed to the immediate manager. Similarities and differences in company and immediate manager analysis provided a strong argument for future trust research making this distinction.
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CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 WHY STUDY TRUST?

Increased levels of organisational trust have been shown to be associated with superior organisational performance and competitive advantage. Current organisational research has demonstrated the positive influence of trust on performance, quality of communication, citizenship behaviour, problem solving, co-operation and teamwork (Baba, 1999; Dirks, 1999; Dirks & Ferrin, 2001; Edmonson, 1999; Elangovan & Shapiro, 1998; Jones & George, 1998; Whitener, Brodt, Korsgaard & Werner, 1998). Survival in the global business environment requires that companies continually respond to demands for innovation, high quality products and services, and price competition (Lane & Bachmann, 1998; Ryan & Oestreich; 1998; Sako, 1998). Responding to these demands has placed great emphasis on inter- and intra-organisational co-operation which has highlighted the role of trust in sustaining and promoting superior performance (Lane & Bachmann, 1998).

In short, companies aspire to having high trust cultures in order to facilitate superior organisational performance. The question of interest to organisations wanting to build the desired high trust culture has been: What specific behaviours contribute to high trust cultures? In response to this question researchers have investigated the antecedent conditions that facilitate trust formation (Lewicki & Bunker, 1996; Mayer, Davis & Schoorman, 1995; Whitener et al., 1998). The research reported here contributes to that body of knowledge through the analysis of qualitative interview
data to elicit antecedent factors. The Integrative Model of Organisational Trust (Mayer, Davis & Schoorman, 1995) summarised the large number of antecedent factors to produce the model components of ability, benevolence, and integrity. The behaviours described within each of these factors have been found to contribute to high trust cultures. The analysis reported here used Mayer et al.'s, model as the starting point for describing the factors elicited from the interview data.

### 1.2 Researching Trust from the Employee Perspective

Researching trust from an employee perspective is extremely important in identifying behaviours that positively and negatively influence trust (Wells & Kipnis, 2001). As employees are at the receiving end of company initiatives to build trust, their contribution to antecedent factor research is invaluable. The majority of antecedent factor research has investigated trust at the management or executive level and from white collar perspectives. There is relatively little research which specifically investigates lower level employee perceptions of trust between them and their employing organisations. More recently however, there has been an increasing research interest in employee trust in top management or ‘upward trust’ (Butler, Cantrell & Flick, 1999; Mayer & Davis, 1999). Butler et al., (1999) examined relationships among transformational leadership behaviours, upward trust and job satisfaction, whereas Mayer and Davis (1999) conducted a field study to investigate whether the implementation of a more acceptable performance management system increased trust for top management.
A fundamental criticism of antecedent factor research is the under representation of researching trust from the blue collar employee perspective. After all, trust building and trust formation are organisation wide imperatives which require co-operation and buy-in from all levels. Managers may have a different perspective from their subordinates of what is needed for a trusting relationship to develop. Firstly, managers are in a position of power in the company that is likely to afford them a greater sense of control in the relationship, given that trust is about expectations that the other will act benevolently when they exercise control over something that is influential in your life. Further, managers’ views about what is possible from the company’s side are likely to be coloured by their understanding of the constraints on the company; that is, they have access to different information that leads to different judgements about what is reasonable and what is not.

A further dimension that has not previously been explored is whether employees’ trust is influenced by proximity; that is, are the antecedent factors that influence trust different for immediate and distant leaders (those more than one level above them in the organisational hierarchy). In the present study, employees were asked to talk about what had influenced their level of trust in the company, as well as what had influenced their level of trust in their immediate manager. The questions that referred to the company tapped respondents’ perceptions about leaders throughout their organisation and, therefore provided a non-specific description of trust-related behaviours and characteristics. In contrast the questions that referred to immediate managers elicited descriptions based on their more intimate contact with trust-related behaviours and characteristics.
The primary purpose of the following investigation was to identify factors influencing employee perceptions of trust within organisations. Data collected from four cultural surveys conducted in Australian mining companies were used for this purpose. The surveys asked employees to rate their level of trust and describe what had influenced their rating. The responses, which justified the ratings, consisted of specific behavioural examples. Importantly, these behaviours produced behaviour-based factors that provided insight into the behaviours that positively and negatively influenced trust.
CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter presents a review of the trust literature by examining trust research as it has evolved from having many disintegrated lines of enquiry to become a multidimensional concept. The latter research has been concerned, in part, with the search for antecedent factors. The review concludes with a detailed discussion of the Integrative Model of Organisational Trust (Mayer et al., 1995) and how it relates to the current study.

2.1 EVOLUTION OF TRUST RESEARCH

Within the last ten years there has been a noticeable shift in the trust literature from discrete research perspectives to an integrative approach. Prior to this shift it was possible to categorise trust research according to the research perspective from which it originated (Mayer et al., 1995). These perspectives included institution-based, calculative-based, knowledge-based, value-based and cognition-based perspectives (Kramer, 1999; Worchel, 1979). The evolution to a more integrative view of trust has resulted in a multidimensional concept of trust which incorporates conceptual elements from each of the above mentioned research disciplines. Importantly, this multidimensional view of trust has contributed to more workable definitions of trust and eliminated confounds imposed by restrictive research perspectives (Kramer, 1999; Mayer et al., 1995).
2.2 RESEARCH PERSPECTIVES

In presenting a review of trust literature it is important to understand the research perspectives from which trust research originated. Having an appreciation of the discrete research perspectives assists in piecing together their contribution to the multidimensional concept of trust. Furthermore, the limited perspective taken in each approach underlines the importance of conceptualising trust from a multidimensional perspective.

Institution-based trust researchers maintain that trust reflects the security one feels about a particular situation because of guarantees, safety nets and other structures. This research perspective was supported by economists and sociologists who conceptualised trust as an institutional phenomenon existing within and between institutions (Kramer, 1999). In contrast, the calculative-based trust perspective theorises that individuals make trust choices based on rationally derived cost and benefit analyses. This research approach was introduced by economists who posited that trust formation was primarily based on the calculation of costs and benefits associated with different courses of action taken by the trustor and the trustee (Kramer, 1999; Lane & Bachmann, 1998; Lewicki & Bunker, 1996). This research perspective proposes that an individual will act rationally and will choose the course of action most likely to result in benefit.

The knowledge-based trust perspective proposes that trust develops over time as the trustor accumulates trust-relevant knowledge through interaction with the other
person (Kramer, 1999; Lewicki & Bunker, 1996). This research perspective also has links with social exchange theory and the role of obligation in the development of relationships (Blau, 1964). Trust is generated through regular exchanges, and the expansion of these relationships over time (Whitener et al., 1998).

The research perspective of cognition-based trust proposes that trust relies on rapid, cognitive cues or first impressions, as opposed to personal interactions. This perspective proposes that trust is, fundamentally, a psychological state that is defined in terms of several cognitive processes and orientations. Specifically, trust is a general attitude or expectancy about other people and the social system in which they exist, whilst imposing a state of perceived vulnerability in the trustee (Kramer, 1999). Finally, the value-based trust research perspective proposes that trust cannot develop unless individuals share common values. This perspective is based on the expectation that a trustee in a position of power will meet social obligations and exercise responsibility (Fukuyama, 1995; Kramer, 1999).

2.3 DEFINING ORGANISATIONAL TRUST

The trust research described within this review specifically focuses on trust within an organisational context. The difficulty in defining organisational trust can be attributed to the multiple research perspectives from which trust has been investigated. The fundamental ideological differences between these research perspectives have, until recently, prevented acceptance of a universal definition of trust. The progression towards an integrated approach to trust research has resulted in
increasing similarity in definitions. Table 1 lists definitions of trust which have been proposed by researchers contributing to the integration of the multiple research perspectives.

### Table 1  Current Definitions of Trust Within Organisations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mayer, Davis &amp; Schoorman (1995)</td>
<td>The willingness of a party to be vulnerable to the actions of another party based on the expectation that the other will perform a particular action important to the trustor, irrespective of the ability to monitor or control that other party.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mishra (1996)</td>
<td>The willingness to be vulnerable to another party based on the belief that the latter party is competent, open, concerned and reliable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doney, Cannon &amp; Mullen (1998)</td>
<td>A willingness to rely on another party and to take action in circumstances where such action makes one vulnerable to another party.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert &amp; Tang (1998)</td>
<td>A feeling of confidence and support in an employer, the belief that the employer will be straightforward and will follow through on commitments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McNight, Cummings &amp; Chervany (1998)</td>
<td>One believes in and is willing to depend on another party.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shockley-Zalabak, Ellis &amp; Winograd (2000)</td>
<td>Expectations individuals have about the intent and behaviours of multiple organisational members based upon organisational roles, relationships, experiences and interdependencies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of the definitions presented in Table 1 identifies two concepts common to present trust definitions. The first concept is that of a willingness to be vulnerable to another party, which evokes a level of dependency. The second concept centres on
the expectation that the trustee will act fairly and will avoid taking advantage of the situation. The definition of trust endorsed by this research investigation is that proposed by Mayer et al., (1995). The rationale for endorsing this particular definition is that, firstly, it contains the two concepts common to present definitions of trust, and secondly the definition is elicited from a model based on a rich history of research into trust. Trust is

"the willingness of a party to be vulnerable to the actions of another party based on the expectation that the other will perform a particular action important to the trustor, irrespective of the ability to monitor or control that other party."

2.4 RECENT ANTECEDENT FACTOR RESEARCH

Much of the recent trust research has investigated trust antecedents or characteristics of the trustor that lead to trust formation (Kramer, 1999; Mayer et al., 1995; Whitener et al., 1998). Antecedent factor research has proceeded through the application of social psychological theory and analysis of qualitative data to elicit antecedent factors. The use of quantitative analyses of ratings or other data is limited. A summary of research findings related to antecedent factor research is provided in Table 2. The presentation of these antecedent factors is followed by a more detailed and integrated review of the research investigations and perspectives associated with the identification of these factors.
### Table 2  Summary of Antecedent Factor Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Antecedent Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hart, Capps, Cangemi &amp; Caillouet (1986)</td>
<td>openness / congruity, shared values, autonomy / feedback</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Gabarro (1987)                               | character-based sources: integrity, motives, consistency of behaviour, openness, discretion  
                                           | competence-based sources: specific competence, business sense, interpersonal competence                                                          |
| Mishra & Morrissey (1990)                    | open communication, shared decision making, sharing of critical information, and true sharing of perceptions and feelings.                         |
| Butler (1991)                                | availability, competence, consistency, discreetness, fairness, integrity, loyalty, openness, promise fulfilment, receptivity                         |
| Mayer, Davis & Schoorman (1995)              | ability, benevolence, integrity                                                                                                                     |
| Lewicki & Bunker (1996)                      | calculus-based, knowledge-based, identification-based                                                                                               |
| Mishra (1996)                                | competence, openness, caring, reliability                                                                                                           |
| Doney, Cannon & Mullen (1998)                | cognitive trust building processes: calculative, predictive, internationality, capability and transference                                             |
| McNight, Cummings & Chervany (1998)         | disposition, institution-based trust, trusting beliefs, faith in humanity (benevolence, competence, honesty and predictability), trusting stance, cognitive processes (categorisation processes, illusions of control) |
| Whitener, Brodt, Koosgard & Werner (1998)    | managerial factors: behavioural consistency, behavioural integrity, sharing and delegation of control, communication, demonstration of concern  
                                           | organisational factors: organisational structure, human resource policies and procedure, organisational culture  
                                           | relational factors: initial interactions, expectations  
                                           | individual factors: propensity to trust, self efficacy, values                                                                                     |
| Kramer (1999)                                | dispositional trust, history-based trust, third parties as conduits of trust, category-based trust, role-based trust, rule-based trust             |
| Shokley-Zalabak, Ellis & Winograd (2000)      | competence, openness, caring, reliability, identification                                                                                           |
2.4.1 Competence-Based Factors

Competence-based factors refer to the effectiveness of leadership and the manager's ability to ensure that the organisation survives in a competitive market place. Mishra (1996) argues that perceived lack of competence affects an organisation's ability to engender trust in its employees, business partners and customers. Doney, Cannon and Mullen (1998) state that perceptions of capability are based upon whether the trustor believes that the trustee will meet their obligation as demonstrated by competence, ability and expertise. More specifically, Gabarro (1987) reports that competence-based sources of trust can be classified into specific competence, business sense and interpersonal competence. Within antecedent factor research competence-based factors highlight the importance of technical skill, interpersonal skill and expertise in influencing employee perceptions of trust.

Mishra (1996) used both inductive and deductive approaches to develop a theoretical framework of trust. The deductive approach utilised existing literature in sociology, psychology and organisational studies. The inductive approach was based on qualitative data analysis of interviews with industry executives during a period of organisational crisis. The review of the trust literature and the qualitative data analysis of interview data revealed four distinct dimensions of trust. The first of these four dimensions, competence, referred to the skill and expertise of leadership and the subsequent translation of these abilities into competitive advantage. The remaining dimensions derived from the parallel analyses, included openness, concern and reliability.
Applying a similar deductive analysis, Doney et al., (1998) utilised theories from several disciplines to identify five cognitive trust-building processes which described the different routes or pathways a trustor could take to develop trust in a target. These trust-building processes included capability, calculative, predictive intentionality and transference. The capability process reported by Doney et al., (1998) is based upon whether the trustor believes the trustee will meet their obligation as demonstrated by competence, ability and expertise. Doney et al., argue that in making a trusting decision, the trustor engages in a pattern of cognitive analysis which is influenced by their perception of the trustee’s competence. This analysis determines the trustor’s willingness to place themselves at risk.

Competence-based trust was also explored by Gabarro (1987) who conducted interviews with newly recruited managers and their subordinates. Gabarro analysed qualitative interview data to reveal three competence-based sources of trust which included specific competence, business sense and interpersonal competence. Specific competence refers to competence in specialist knowledge required to do the specific job. Business sense refers to generalised competence, for example, having a ‘good head for business’ and ‘sharp common sense’. Finally, interpersonal competence accounts for competence in working with people, that is people skills.

Using a similar methodology, Butler (1991) also identified competence as a condition of trust. Butler (1991) conducted interviews with 84 middle level managers and consulted previous studies on managerial trust to determine conditions that influence trust. The content analysis focused upon stated characteristics of trusted
and mistrusted people as well as on trust building and trust destroying incidents. Content analysis of interview data and deductive analysis of previous research identified ten conditions of trust: competence, availability, consistency, discreetness, fairness, integrity, loyalty, openness, promise fulfilment and receptivity.

2.4.2 Benevolence-Based Factors

Mayer et al., (1995) use the term benevolence to describe behaviours which demonstrate the willingness of one party to do the right thing by another party. Mishra (1996) argues that employees trust top managers in part because they believe they are concerned about their wellbeing and welfare. Similarly, Whitener et al., (1998) report that managerial trustworthiness is enhanced by the manager's demonstration of consideration and sensitivity, acting in ways that protect the interests of employees, and avoiding the exploitation of others.

The antecedent factor research has also described several related constructs, including caring, and demonstration of concern (Butler, 1991; Jarvenpaa, Knoll & Leidner, 1995; Mishra, 1996; Shokley-Zalabak, Ellis & Winograd, 2000; Whitener et al., 1998). Each of these carries the same notion embodied in the construct of benevolence, one party doing or being prepared to do good by another. Mishra (1996) identifies concern as part of a four-dimension framework of trust, where concern refers to the sincerity and caring exhibited by leadership.
Jarvenpaa et al., (1995) argue that perceptions of another team members' benevolence will have an increased effect on trust over time as the relationship develops. Jarvenpaa et al., (1995) explored antecedents of trust in a virtual team setting by using the integrated affective, cognitive and behavioural framework developed by Mayer et al., (1995). Participants included 75 teams consisting of 4 to 6 members residing in different countries. The teams interacted and worked together for a period of eight weeks. Individuals were required to complete two separate trust scales, which captured their perceptions of the attributes of other team members, after completion of several group tasks. Jarvenpaa et al., (1995) concluded that, within the early phases of teamwork, trust was predicted strongest by perceptions of other team members' integrity and ability, rather than benevolence. However, over time, and as relationships between team members developed, trust was predicted strongest by perceptions of benevolence. This research suggests that perceptions of benevolence will vary as successive interactions continue to reveal information about the benevolence of others.

Whitener et al., (1998) applied agency theory and social exchange theory to explain both managers' and employees' motivation to engage in trustworthy behaviour. Agency theory is classified as a theory of economic exchange and details how managers and employees structure relationships to protect their own interests (Eisenhardt, 1989). This perspective assumes that both managers and employees act to maximise benefits to the self and minimise risks associated with engaging in such a relationship (Eisenhardt, 1989). Although agency theory places little emphasis on
trust, it provides explanations for managerial behaviours which may influence employee perceptions of trust (Whitener et al., 1998).

Social exchange theory details the role of obligation in the development of relationships (Blau, 1964). During a social exchange, obligation is invoked when an individual voluntarily provides a benefit to another (Blau, 1964). Trust is generated through regular obligation exchanges, and the expansion of these relationships over time (Whitener et al., 1998). These researchers reported five factors specific to the manager that influenced employee perceptions of managerial trustworthiness. These factors were demonstration of concern, behavioural consistency, behavioural integrity, sharing and delegation of control, and communication.

2.4.3 Integrity-Based Factors

Integrity refers to the trustor's perception that the trustee will act honestly and will adhere to set principles that the trustor deems acceptable (Jarvenpaa et al., 1995; Mayer et al., 1995). Butler (1991) analysed the content of interview data from middle level managers and consulted previous studies on managerial trust to reveal fairness as a condition of trust. Within antecedent factor research, integrity is also associated with trust antecedents of open communication, consistency of behaviour or predictability, confidentiality and the exercise of discretion. Gabarro (1987) refers to these behaviours as character-based sources of trust, whereas Hart, Capps, Cangemi and Caillouet (1986) describe these behaviours using the term openness/congruity.
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The link between open communication and trust is well documented within current organisational trust research (Mishra & Morrisey, 1990; Mishra, 1996; Whitener et al., 1998). Open communication refers to leveling with the person and being honest in the discussion of problems. Hart et al., (1986) argue that open communication, as it relates to trust, is comparable to the Safety Needs component of Maslow's (1970) hierarchy of needs. Whitener et al., (1998) state that managerial trustworthiness is enhanced by the communication of accurate information, explanation for decisions and openness, as well as telling the truth and keeping promises. Mishra (1996) also confirms that employees are more likely to hold trust in the organisation if they perceive the organisational leadership as open and honest.

Hart et al., (1986) developed an instrument to measure trust and a model that illustrated the dynamics of trust. The researchers surveyed 1700 employees to elicit definitions of trust and experiences that affected their trust towards the organisation. Using critical incidence methodology, respondents were asked to describe an actual work experience that (a) established trust, and (b) caused lack of trust. Employee responses were factor analysed to reveal three dimensions and twelve subcomponents of organisational trust. The three dimensions included openness / congruity, shared values and autonomy / feedback.

The integrity-based factor of openness / congruity consists of variables relating to fairness and openness of management. Hart et al., (1986) argue that the need for openness and congruity is the first step to establishing an environment in which trust can exist and develop. Comparable to Maslow’s hierarchy of needs, behaviours
associated with openness / congruity create a secure environment in which employees make accurate predictions based on reliable information.

Mishra and Morrissey (1990) determined ways managers could develop and increase trust by surveying the attitudes and perceptions of managers towards trust in employee/employer relationships. The survey asked questions related to: the identification of trust; factors that bred trust; who was responsible for trust building efforts; advantages and disadvantages of trust; the influence of trust on organisational effectiveness; and the influence of managerial style on trust-building efforts.

Survey results concluded that the factors that determined trust included: open communication; shared decision-making; sharing of critical information; and sharing of trust perceptions and feelings. The identification of trust was determined by asking managers to rank four definitions of trust. Trust was overwhelmingly viewed as a belief in the integrity, character and ability of others. Managers also reported that it was their primary responsibility to build mutual trust and filter it down to employees. The six most popular advantages of trust cited by managers included improved communication, greater predictability, dependency and confidence; reduction in employee turnover; openness and willingness to accept criticism non-defensively; repeat business; and reduced friction amongst employees. Alternatively, the one reported disadvantage of trust was the managers’ fear of losing their authority. The survey also concluded that managers believed organisational ineffectiveness was confounded by widespread distrust. Trust therefore contributed to organisational effectiveness by promoting: increased productivity and growth; credibility; repeat
business and customer loyalty; and effective decision making. Finally the survey concluded that there was no single managerial style clearly associated with increased organisational trust.

Consistency of behaviour enables employees to better predict a manager's future behaviour (Gabarro, 1987). Whitener et al., (1998) argue that employees are more willing to take risks when a manager's behaviour is predictable and consistent. Furthermore, trust is enhanced when employees observe consistency between what managers said they would do and what managers actually did. Mishra (1996) describes this dimension as reliability, which refers to employees' expectations of consistent and dependable behaviour from managers. Similarly, Mishra (1996) argues that consistency and congruency between word and actions results in increased feelings of trust.

Lewicki and Bunker (1996) coined the term knowledge-based trust to describe trust behaviours resulting from predictability of behaviour. This type of trust is founded upon regular communication and exchange of information between parties. Lewicki and Bunker argue that predictability enhances trust even if the individual is deemed untrustworthy because, to some extent, when and how untrustworthiness occurs can be predicted. Lewicki & Bunker's research conclusions were drawn from deductive analysis of previous antecedent factor research.

Similarly Doney et al., (1998), who utilised theories from several disciplines to identify and describe five cognitive trust building processes, refer to this dimension
as a predictive process which involves analysis of consistency as demonstrated by previous action. The predictive and knowledge-based processes can also be aligned with Kramer's (1999) history-based concept of trust which accounts for increases and decreases in trust between two parties over time.

2.4.4 Autonomy-Based Factors

Whitener et al., (1998) identified sharing and delegation of control as an important antecedent factor that influences employee perceptions of trust in their manager. Based on agency and social exchange theory, the authors argue that employees are more likely to be trusting of managers if they are consulted and involved in decision-making processes. The act of sharing control demonstrates that the manager has significant trust and respect for the employee.

Whitener et al., (1998) also identified two relational factors that encourage managerial trustworthy behaviour. The first factor, initial interactions, describes how the strength of the relationship between manager and employee is determined to a large extent by the manager's initial impression of the employees' capabilities. Therefore, employees' initial job performance will encourage or discourage trustworthy behaviour on the part of their manager. The second relational factor, expectations, describes how a manager's willingness to exhibit trustworthy behaviour is determined by beliefs or expectations as to whether the employee will reciprocate the exchange. Hart et al., (1986) use the term autonomy/feedback to describe similar autonomous behaviours. Using critical incident methodology and
corresponding qualitative data analysis, the survey revealed that perceptions of trust were associated with employee participation, job freedom and reinforcement of autonomous behaviours.

2.4.5 Individual Factors - Dispositional Trust, Self-Efficacy and Values

Dispositional trust refers to an individual's general predisposition to trust other people. Whitener et al., (1998) state that some individuals are more likely to trust because they have a predisposition to trust, and Kramer (1999) argues that individual differences regarding degree of trust stem from early trust experiences. Kramer reports that disposition to trust influences managers' expectations about employee behaviour. Managers who exhibit a high propensity to trust expect their employees to reciprocate. This expectation influences the managers' motivation to engage in trustworthy behaviour. Baldwin's (1992) work on relational schemas is further evidence to support the notion that early trust experiences generalise later on to workers' trust for their organisation and managers. Baldwin (1992) argues that employees internalise their relationships resulting in the creation of internal cognitive structures (relational schema), which influence an employee's experience of relationships and their sense of self.

McNight, Cummings and Chervany (1998), who investigated the factors and processes that cause two organisational parties to form relatively high trust relationships during an initial interaction, also identify predisposition to trust as important. As initial trust cannot be based on experience with, or first hand
knowledge of, the other party, it must therefore be based on the trustor’s disposition to trust, or institutional cues that enable one person to trust another without first hand knowledge. McNight et al.’s, model identifies two types of disposition to trust, faith in humanity and trusting stance. Faith in humanity is grounded in the belief that others are typically well meaning and reliable. Trusting stance on the other hand postulates that regardless of whether people are reliable or not, one will obtain better interpersonal outcomes by dealing with people as though they are well meaning and reliable.

Cognitive processes involved in McNight et al.’s, initial trust formation model include categorisation processes such as unit grouping, reputation and stereotyping, and illusions of control which result in people assuring themselves that things are under their personal control. Trusting beliefs are also identified as other cognitive processes at work and include the imposition of beliefs such as benevolence, competence, honesty and predictability. In contrast to these findings from cross-sectional research and literature review, Albrecht (2001) reports that disposition does not influence trust in senior management over time. However, he reports that trustors’ emotional responses to trustees do influence their level of trust and behavioural intentions.

As well as predisposition to trust, Whitener et al., (1998) also identify self-efficacy and values as individual factors influencing whether a manager is likely to engage in trustworthy behaviour. If a manager believes he / she does not have the ability to perform certain tasks this will reflect on his / her ability to do the task. Although this
appears not to be a strong argument, Whitener et al. (1998) argue that the manager who experiences low self-esteem regarding his/her ability to delegate control will find it hard to employ participative management processes. With regards to values, managers who possess transcendent (benevolent) values are more likely to engage in trustworthy behaviour. This behaviour may include demonstrating concern, behaving consistently and behaving with integrity.

2.4.6 Contextual Factors

Whitener et al., (1998) argue that there are organisational factors which impact upon managerial trustworthiness. These contextual factors include organisational structure, human resource policies and procedures, and organisational culture. From an agency perspective, the degree to which the organisation seeks to control and monitor employees significantly dictates the degree of control managers exert over the actions of employees. With regards to organisational structure, Whitener et al., (1998) maintain that the development of trustworthy behaviour is constrained by high control organisations with a high degree of centralisation and formalisation. Alternatively, greater decentralisation and lower formalisation fosters the development of trustworthy behaviour by facilitating open communication and delegation of decisions.

Whitener et al., (1998) further maintain that the development of trust is facilitated by performance appraisal systems and policies that are perceived to be fair and accurate by employees. Fair and accurate human resource policies also encourage managers to
behave consistently towards subordinates. Finally, Whitener et al., (1998) state that organisational culture creates an environment where certain behaviours are encouraged. Through social learning processes managers observe how to respond to others as well as learn what behaviours are rewarded and punished. Organisational culture can therefore indirectly influence managerial trustworthy behaviour via communication styles, coordination and decision making.

### 2.4.7 Types of Trust Development

Lewicki and Bunker (1996) argue that knowledge-based trust is preceded by calculus-based trust and succeeded by identification-based trust. The authors report that these three antecedents of trust are linked in a sequential iteration when two parties enter into a new working relationship. Achievement of trust at the calculus-based level enables progression to trust development at the knowledge-based level and then trust at the identification-based level. Calculus-based trust is described as an economic calculation which is ongoing and market orientated. The level of trust is ascertained by determining the costs associated with creating and sustaining the relationship versus the costs of severing the relationship. Similarly, Doney et al., (1998) report the existence of a calculative process which sees the trustor weigh up the costs and benefits associated with making a ‘trusting decision’.

In contrast to the sequential iteration of trust detailed by Lewicki & Bunker (1996) which applies to more permanent stable work groups, Meyerson, Weick & Kramer (1996) developed the concept of ‘swift trust’, which exists when temporary teams are
formed to complete a common task with a finite life span. Individuals who form part of temporary teams typically have specialist skills and a clearly defined role in terms of achieving the goals of the team. Members of temporary teams typically come from several different organisations, and import their expectations of trust from settings with which they are familiar (Jarvenpaa & Leidner, 1998; Meyerson et al., 1996). Identification-based trust is grounded upon the identification with the other’s desires and intentions. Identification-based trust permits the development of mutual understanding and reciprocity. Doney et al., (1998) refer to this as an intentionality process which identifies the cognitive influence of having trustor and trustee share similar values and beliefs. Similarly, Hart et al., (1986) use the term Shared Values to describe variables including mutual respect and integrated goals.

Shokley-Zalabak et al., (2000) built on the work of Mishra (1996) by adding a fifth dimension termed identification. Similar to Doney et al., (1998) and Hart et al., (1986), these researchers posited that if members identify with an organisation they are more likely to report higher levels of trust. This dimension recognises the importance of employees associating with the goals, values and norms of the organisation. Shokley-Zalabak et al., argue that employees who identify with the organisation are more likely to attribute higher levels of trust to the company.
2.4.8 Further Bases of Trust

In addition to disposition to trust and history-based trust, Kramer (1999) argues that third parties as conduits of trust, category-based trust, role-based trust and rule-based trust also exist within organisations. Third parties as conduits of trust is considered an important condition of trust as third parties are influential go betweens that have the ability to convey trust relevant information. Category-based trust is perpetuated as a result of membership within a particular category, where trust is presumed as a result of membership to this category. Doney et al., (1998) describe a similar trust mechanism termed transference, which sees trust transferred from a trusted source to another group or party with which the trustee has had little or no experience. In this situation the trustee draws on proof sources to verify trustworthiness. Proof sources can be likened to institution based trust influences such as professional membership.

Role-based trust is formed on the basis that a person who occupies a specific role within the organisation commands the relative degree of trust associated with that role. Finally, rule-based trust is founded upon a shared understanding regarding a specific system of rules that determine the appropriateness of behaviour (Kramer, 1999).

2.4.9 Critique of Antecedent Factor Research

Given the similarities in research methodologies and factor identification outlined in the previous review, it seems logical to critique the body of antecedent factor
research at this point. The two most significant areas for critique are firstly, the limited quantitative validation of the factors, and secondly the focus on manager's perceptions of factors influencing trust, and subsequent minimal contribution from employees at lower levels within the organisational hierarchy.

Hart et al., (1986) attempted to quantify the existence of antecedent factors by factor analysing responses to critical incidents that established trust, and caused lack of trust. Aside from Hart et al.'s, (1986) quantitative factor identification, the majority of antecedent factor research has involved both deductive and inductive methodologies. Deductive approaches to factor identification involve the application of existing theories to explore factors and build on existing frameworks. Although the deductive approach has contributed greatly to antecedent factor research it relies heavily on pre-existing theories, which to some degree limits the discovery of new factors from new data. Inductive approaches to factor identification involve qualitative data analysis of interview data, which although legitimate and useful, is influenced by the researchers interpretation of events and imposition of beliefs when analysing the data. Although thematic analysis and deductive approaches have positively contributed to antecedent factor research, the quantitative validation of antecedent factors would provide more rigor and result in wider acceptance of the importance of these factors in trust building and trust formation.

The focus on researching trust at the management or executive level is another significant criticism of antecedent factor research. As was explained earlier the reliance on deductive and inductive approaches has resulted in this body of research
being dominated by management’s views on trust. Marginalising the employee’s perspective is problematic as managers may have a different view of what is needed to form a trusting relationship. Furthermore, management's level in the hierarchy of the organisation predisposes them to information, regarding company constraints or business strategy, which is not available to the employee. It is therefore reasonable to conclude that management and employees may make different judgments about what is reasonable and what is not. For this reason researching trust from the employee perspective is a key direction for future trust research.


Mayer et al., (1995) developed a model of dyadic trust that focused on an organisational setting involving two parties, a trusting party (trustor) and a party to be trusted (trustee). The rationale behind the development of the model was to integrate research from multiple disciplines into a model of trust antecedents and outcomes. The Integrated Model of Organisational Trust is presented in Figure 1.
The researchers identified three characteristics of the trustee that resulted in that person being more or less trusted. These characteristics were collectively referred to as 'trustworthiness', and included ability, benevolence and integrity. These trust antecedents were identified through deductive analysis of the trust literature, specifically, antecedent factor research. Ability referred to the skills and competencies that enabled the trustee to exercise influence in a particular context. Benevolence referred to the extent to which the trustee was willing to act in the interests of the trustor. Finally, integrity referred to the trustor's perception that the trustee would act honestly and adhere to set principles that the trustor deems acceptable. Mayer et al., (1995) also identified the trustor’s propensity to trust as an antecedent condition to trust formation. Propensity to trust captured the personality orientated and developmental influences impacting upon trust formation.
Within the trust model, risk is separated into two distinct forms. The first is termed risk taking in a relationship and refers to risks associated with a specific, identifiable relationship. Risk taking in a relationship differentiates the outcomes of trust from general risk taking behaviours. The second type of risk is that of perceived risk, which refers to the trustor’s likelihood of gains or losses outside of the relationship. The researchers proposed that level of trust was comparable to level of perceived risk in the situation. On the bases of this proposition, the researchers concluded that if the level of perceived risk is higher than the level of trust, the trustor will engage in risk taking in the relationship. Alternatively, if the level of trust is higher than perceived risk the trustor will engage in risk taking in the relationship. The concept of risk identified by Mayer et al., (1995) assimilates closely with work by Rusbult & Van Lange (2003) and Rusbult, Wieselquist, Foster & Witcher (1999). These authors explored the concept of interdependence in close relationships as it relates to reward and cost analysis. The findings of this research posited that commitment and trust play central roles in shaping motivation and behaviour in ongoing relationships.

In their explanation of the Integrative Model, Mayer et al., (1995) emphasised the importance of contextual factors, such as the stakes involved, the balance of power in the relationship, the perception of the level of risk, and the alternatives available to the trustor. These contextual influences and their relationship or influence on trust were not represented within the model. Importantly, the study reported here seeks out those contextual influences by researching trust from an employee perspective.
Limitations of the integrative model have been well documented, both by its authors and by other academic researchers. Firstly, the model’s focus is limited to trust of a specific trustor for a specific trustee. Its contribution to understanding trust in a social system is, therefore, beyond the scope of the model (Mayer et al., 1995). Secondly, the model depicts trust as unidirectional; i.e. from the trustor to the trustee, and does not examine the development of mutual trust between parties. Another criticism is that the model is only applicable to an organisational context, therefore limiting its application to other contexts (Mayer et al., 1995; Wekselberg, 1996).

In addition to these criticisms, Tinsley (1996) argues that integrity and benevolence should be separated from ability (capability) and combined with other ethically-based factors to form a concept of trust. Capabilities therefore represent an independent concept that exists outside the definition of trust. Tinsley (1996) argues that making this distinction is useful as organisational stakeholders have more of an understanding of how to evaluate capabilities. Furthermore, the development of capabilities is better understood and accepted than is ethical development. In response to this criticism Mayer, Davis and Schoorman (1996) argue that ability, benevolence and integrity have an additive quality in determining the level of trust. Mayer et al., (1996) argue that in making a trusting decision, the trustee will consider all of these three factors. Mayer et al., (1996) do however recognise that the separation of ethical aspects and capabilities can be useful in addressing certain research questions but that this separation is not applicable to their model of trust antecedents and outcomes.
Despite these limitations, the integrative quality of this model makes it a useful and advantageous framework from which to align and report factors influencing employee perceptions of trust in the company and trust in the immediate manager. Furthermore, the Mayer et. al’s, (1995) model is the most contemporaneous model available which identifies antecedents based on a rich history of research into trust. For the purpose of aligning the present study with the Integrative Model, trustor refers to the employee and trustee refers to either the company or the employee’s immediate manager. The present study focuses on the model components of Ability, Benevolence, Integrity and Trustor’s Propensity to Trust. The role of risk and outcomes are beyond the scope of this investigation.

2.6 SUMMARY

The integrative approach to trust research has incorporated conceptual elements from the discrete research perspectives of institution-based, calculative-based, knowledge-based, value-based and cognition-based trust. This integrative approach to trust research has contributed to more workable definitions of trust whilst diminishing the confounds imposed by restrictive research perspectives. Recognition of the value and workability of the integrative approach has been followed by extensive research efforts that have concentrated on investigating antecedent conditions that promote trust formation.

Mayer et al., (1995) identified three characteristics of the trustee that resulted in that person being more or less trusted. These characteristics were collectively referred to
as ‘trustworthiness’, and included ability, benevolence and integrity. Similar trust antecedents have been identified within current trust research (See Table 2). Therefore, it is hypothesised that employees will describe behaviours associated with the antecedent factors of Ability, Benevolence, Integrity and Trustor’s Propensity.

There appears to be minimal research which investigates perceptions of trust between lower level employees and their employing organization (Wells & Kipnis, 2001). This study addresses this by investigating trust from the lower perspective in the organisational power relationship. This study also examines the influence of proximity; that is, that there may be differences in the factors influencing trust in immediate managers and the managers throughout the company. Intertwined with the influence of proximity is the knowledge-based perspective, which proposes that trust develops over time through interaction. Therefore, it is hypothesised that factor differences in the company and immediate manager analyses are a function of the degree of exposure to the specific behaviour, frequency of interaction and resulting depth of relationship.

The aims of the current investigation were as follows:

1. To identify factors, and associated behaviours and characteristics, which positively and negatively influence employee perceptions of trust in their employing company.
2. To identify factors, and associated behaviours and characteristics, which positively and negatively influence employee perceptions of trust in their immediate manager.

3. To test antecedent components of the Integrative Model of Organisational Trust proposed by Mayer et al., (1995) using findings from trust in the company analysis and trust in the immediate manager analysis.
CHAPTER 3  METHODOLOGY

The qualitative data in the present study was obtained from interview transcripts collected by a psychologist contracted to complete four surveys within two different organisations. The surveys were conducted with predominantly lower level employees during 1994, 1995, 1996 and 1997. These data were analysed and reported to the companies by the consultant at the time of each survey. The reports described the current climate, and made recommendations about building and sustaining employer / employee relationships in the companies. At the end of each survey, the data were retained with the future aim of conducting in-depth analyses to elicit the factors influencing employer / employee relationships in the companies. Amongst the questions were several about trust. It is the qualitative data generated by these questions that has been analysed in this study.

3.1 PARTICIPANTS

Participants within each of the surveys were employed by two independent mining organisations at three different work sites (See Table 3). Both companies operated within remote parts of Australia employing predominantly male, non-indigenous Australians. Organisation A and Organisation B also had the same international parent company and operated within similar organisational structures and management philosophies.
Table 3  Survey Year, Participant Numbers and Organisation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Year</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>441</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 DESCRIPTION AND DEVELOPMENT OF SURVEYS

The four surveys discussed within this study were conducted as appreciative inquiries which sought to gain information about the assumptions underlying people’s behaviour, the myths, stories and meaning that employees derived from company actions (Elliot, 1999). These surveys also sought to explore the feelings, attitudes and values, which motivated people to behave as they did. In all cases, the surveys contained questions about trust amongst a larger set of questions. The responses to the trust questions were extracted from the larger pool of survey responses for the analyses reported here.

All four surveys were commissioned by the General Manager of each site following discussion with the consultant. The consultant’s involvement in all of the surveys enabled the trust specific questions to remain consistent across years and across organisations. The combination of survey data from the four surveys was warranted for a variety of functional reasons. Firstly, the surveys contained similar question content and structure. Secondly, the surveys were conducted within a four-year
timespan within two different organisations and it was thought that this would add variety to the set of factors identified as antecedents to trust.

The 1994 Survey was conducted within organisation A and investigated how people at all levels within the organisation were affected by the changes resulting from the introduction of a program that offered employees workplace contracts. These contracts effectively allowed employees to become members of the salaried staff and reduced union involvement in setting employment conditions through collective bargaining. The survey provided an opportunity for the company to obtain information about trust in the company. The Survey therefore provided important information about employees’ experiences of the Program and identified actions that the company might take in the future to improve elements of the change process.

The 1995 Survey was conducted within organisation B and investigated aspects of organisational culture across the whole of operations. The primary purpose of the survey was to investigate the impact of workplace changes that had been implemented to improve relations between employees and management. The context for the survey and key question areas were elicited from these discussions.

The 1996 Survey also conducted within organisation B, provided information pertaining to the context of site closure and employment uncertainty. Business process redesign had forecasted the inevitable closure of the site. The survey was conducted to investigate various strategies which had been implemented to reduce the negative impact of site closure. Although it might seem unusual to measure trust
at this particular time the closure of any one Business Unit has an impact on how employees at other Business Units feel about the company.

The 1997 Survey was similar to the 1995 Survey in that it covered the whole of operations and focused on key question areas elicited from discussions between the consultant and the General Manager. The 1997 Survey provided an opportunity for the company to gain information about trust within the context of recent downsizing and the closure of the operation. The structure and content of survey items also provided an opportunity for employee responses to be compared with those from the 1995 Survey.

### 3.2.1 Trust in Company Questions

The survey data referring to trust consisted of rating scale responses and descriptions of what led the person to make the scale responses he/she did. The questions referring to trust in the company in general were presented as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all trusting</td>
<td>A little trusting</td>
<td>Moderately trusting</td>
<td>Very trusting</td>
<td>Extremely trusting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Could you tell me what has influenced the level of trust you have in the company?
### 1995 Culture Survey

Where on this scale would you put your level of trust in [the company] right now?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all trusting</td>
<td>A little trusting</td>
<td>Somewhat trusting</td>
<td>Moderately trusting</td>
<td>Extremely trusting</td>
<td>I haven't formed an opinion about it</td>
<td>I don't know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Could you tell me what has influenced the level of trust you have in the company?

### 1996 Closure Survey

Where on this scale would you put your level of trust in [the company] right now?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all trusting</td>
<td>A little trusting</td>
<td>Somewhat trusting</td>
<td>Moderately trusting</td>
<td>Extremely trusting</td>
<td>I haven't formed an opinion about it</td>
<td>I don't know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Could you tell me what has influenced the level of trust you have in the company?

### 1997 Culture Survey

Where on this scale would you put your level of trust in [the company] right now?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all trusting</td>
<td>A little trusting</td>
<td>Moderately trusting</td>
<td>Highly trusting</td>
<td>Extremely trusting</td>
<td>I haven't formed an opinion about it</td>
<td>I don't know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Can you tell me what has influenced the level of trust you have in [the company]?
3.2.2 Trust in Immediate Manager Questions

The questions referring to trust in immediate managers were presented as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1996 Closure Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Where on this scale would you put your level of trust in your immediate manager/supervisor/superintendent/manager/GM/MD right now?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all trusting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Can you tell me what has influenced the level of trust you have in your immediate manager/supervisor/superintendent/manager/GM/MD?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1997 Culture Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Where on this scale would you put your level of trust in your immediate manager/supervisor/superintendent/manager/GM/MD right now?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all trusting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Can you tell me what has influenced the level of trust you have in your immediate manager/supervisor/superintendent/manager/GM/MD?

3.2.3 Management of the Rating Scale Anchor Differences

The qualitative analyses examined respondents’ descriptions associated with low, moderate and high trust. The rating scale items were recategorised to permit the
logical combination of the qualitative survey data attached to each scale point into these groupings. Comparison of these somewhat differently anchored scales was feasible because each survey consisted of a 5-point likert-type structure. Scale points 6 and 7 on the 1995, 1996 and 1997 Survey scale were treated as a 'non rating' data sub-set. Scale anchors 'haven’t formed an opinion yet' and 'I don’t know' were not considered within the analysis, as they contributed no definitive behaviours that positively or negatively influenced trust. For the 1994 Survey and 1996 Survey there were no observed ratings of 'haven’t formed an opinion yet' and 'I don’t know'. With regards to the 1995 Survey and 1997 Survey there was a total of five reported 'non rating' data.

Specifically, the recategorisation involved collapsing scale points across anchors with convergent meanings. Scale anchors were collapsed into three categories to allow corresponding qualitative responses to be analysed logically. Scale anchors of 'not at all trusting' (1994, 1995, 1996, 1997) and 'a little trusting' (1994, 1995, 1996, 1997) were collapsed to elicit information about specific factors that had a negative influence on trust. Scale anchors of 'somewhat trusting' (1995, 1996) and 'moderately trusting' (1994, 1995, 1996, 1997) were collapsed to elicit information about specific factors that had a mixed influence on trust. The scale anchors of 'extremely trusting' (1994, 1995, 1996, 1997) and 'very trusting' (1994) were collapsed to tap into specific factors that had a positive influence on trust.
3.3 QUALITATIVE DATA

Data collection involved a series of face-to-face semi-structured interviews that elicited ratings of employees’ levels of trust in their leaders, and the incidents that influenced their level of trust. The interview technique enabled the consultant psychologist to gain access to, and an understanding of, behaviours, activities and events related to perceptions of trust in the company and trust in the immediate manager. The flexibility of this interview technique enabled the interviewer to seek clarification if the respondent’s answer was vague or unclear (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998). To ensure participants remained anonymous the personal and role details of the employees were not stored with the transcript, and the report to the companies contained statements about group themes not individual comments.

3.3.1 Sequence of Qualitative Data Analysis

The study consisted of two distinct phases of analysis. Phase 1 elicited a set of factors influencing employee perceptions of trust in the company, with trust in the company referring to trust in leader behaviours across all levels of the organisation. Phase 2 elicited a series of factors influencing employee perceptions of trust in their immediate manager.

The primary purpose of Phase 1 analysis was to aggregate trust data from the four surveys to investigate factors influencing employee perceptions of trust in the
company. Phase 1 of the analysis examined the frequency of scale ratings and corresponding qualitative responses for 'trust in the company' from the four surveys.

Phase 2 analysis aggregated trust data from the 1996 and 1997 Surveys to investigate factors influencing employee perceptions of trust in the immediate manager. Phase 2 examined the frequency of scale ratings and corresponding qualitative responses for 'trust in the immediate manager'. Questions about immediate managers only appeared in these two surveys; 38 employees were interviewed in the 1996 Survey and 150 employees were interviewed in the 1997 Survey.

3.3.2 Coding Strategy

The interview records were content analysed, and then coded and subjected to a particular analysis scheme (which in this case utilised May et al.’s, model) (Miles & Hubermann, 1994). This inductive approach resulted in the emergence of themes during analysis, which is considered both a legitimate and useful qualitative data analysis technique (Miles & Hubermann, 1994; Creswell, 1998; Taylor & Bogdan, 1998). For example data associated with high trust ratings was grouped together and coded for common issues and themes, thereby resulting in the emergence of key behaviours which contributed to high levels of trust. This methodology was also applied for moderate and low trust ratings. Factor reliability was determined through the coding strategy which was applied by the researcher and her supervisor. Reliability was further enhanced by using a pre-existing framework, which was derived from the integration of current trust research perspectives (Patton; 1990;
Creswell, 1998). The panel consisted of the psychologist who undertook the surveys, the researcher and her supervisor.

The initial coding strategies used within Phase 1 of the investigation built a framework for analysis of Phase 2 data. Although each phase was coded independently, factor nomenclature was purposefully kept consistent for participant responses that reported similar behaviours. This consistency enabled meaningful comparisons to be made between company analysis and immediate manager analysis.

Qualitative data analysis was conducted using QSR NUD*IST-Vivo software. The use of this software enabled the complexity and volume of the survey data to be managed effectively. Importantly, this software provided the opportunity to pursue new understandings and theories about the data through coding, shaping and modelling (Fraser, 1999; Richards, 1999).

Each participant’s response was imported into the QSR NUD*IST-Vivo software as a unique document. Trust scale responses were entered as attributes for each document and were used to guide analysis and group together participants with similar trust scale responses. This enabled the qualitative data to be grouped according to high, low and moderate trust levels, with these categories used as the primary grouping variables for participant responses. This attribute grouping enabled each category of responses to be coded for common issues and themes (Creswell, 1998; Richards, 1999). Throughout the thematic analysis common themes were characterised by people reporting the same things in different ways. Using the
NUD*IST Vivo software provided the means by which to track the emergence of these themes in a large volume of data.

A profile of factors was elicited for each trust level that was similar across levels. In order to capture the complete set of trust responses for each factor, the final presentation of each factor, where applicable, consisted of high, low and moderate trust responses. Participant responses that did not appear to contribute to understanding trust influences were grouped into a separate category alongside the non-rating data subsets. These responses were re-examined for significance once factors elicited from company analysis and immediate manager analysis had been established. Appropriate responses were added to factor data where appropriate. The remaining responses were not included in further analysis and discussion as they did not contribute any meaningful data to the analysis.


CHAPTER 4 RESULTS

The company analysis and immediate manager analysis are provided within this section. Importantly, this chapter describes in detail associated factor behaviours and characteristics that positively and negatively influence employee perceptions of trust. Throughout the analysis it was apparent that some of the factors were not described in behavioural terms; rather, many consisted of respondents' conclusions, judgements and beliefs. This is particularly true for factors that have been identified as either contextual factors or employee factors.

Factor descriptions for each phase of analysis begin with a statement identifying the factor and the trust level(s) against which the behaviours and characteristics were described. Factors are presented in order of greatest volume of associated data. Description of the specific factors commences with a discussion of high trust behaviours, followed by low trust and then moderate trust behaviours and characteristics. The moderate trust level responses most frequently contained behaviours and characteristics that were also present at high and low trust levels.

4.1 LINKING FINDINGS TO PREVIOUS TRUST RESEARCH

The link with previous trust research occurs at two junctions, those being the Integrative Model of Organisational Trust proposed by Mayer et al., (1995) and previous antecedent factor research. Throughout the Results section, factors and associated behaviours are aligned with components of the Integrative Model (Mayer
et al., 1995). Figure 2 shows the components against which these factors are aligned. Factor alignment with the Model is depicted by a diagrammatic representation preceding the description of each factor.

Fig 2: Components of the Integrative Model of Organisational Trust Relevant to the Current Study
4.2 **PHASE 1: COMPANY-RELATED FACTORS**

4.2.1 **Trust Levels, Related Factors, & Frequency of Participant Responses**

Analysis of the qualitative data accompanying participants’ responses to their ratings of trust revealed thirteen factors associated with perceptions of trust in the company. Trust levels, related factors and the frequency of participant responses are presented in Table 4.

**Table 4  Frequency of Responses by Factor and Trust Level - Company**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>High Trust</th>
<th>Moderate Trust</th>
<th>Low Trust</th>
<th>Total Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open and Honest Communication</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Treatment</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honouring Commitments</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propensity to Trust</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment of Role and Task Responsibilities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit Motives</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Competencies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides Support</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Uncertainty</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability of Managerial Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides Benefits</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Obligations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business / Decision Making Competencies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2.2 Open and Honest Communication

Respondents described behaviours that identified Open and Honest Communication as influencing their level of trust in the company. The behaviours associated with this factor appeared in high, low and moderate trust responses. Open and Honest Communication was aligned with the Integrity component of the Integrative Model of Organisational Trust (Mayer et al., 1995).

Employees reported high levels of trust when they were kept informed about what was going on within the organisation. High trust was also associated with open (‘upfront’) and honest communications. High trust behaviours were described by the following employee responses:

*[It’s about] being part of the planning process and understanding what the MD [Managing Director] is up to and his objectives. That is, knowledge of what’s going on equals trust.*
I know that I can always get an answer to any query and if I can't there are probably good reasons for me not to...I've never been lied to...

They [the company] say everything and tell us what they know. They have gone out of their way to inform us.

They [the company] put out little cards telling us what is going on. They have been really honest with us and are telling us all that they are being told...

They have been very truthful about the problems the site is going through...they didn't leave us to turn up at work one day to find out we didn't have a job. They tell us what they know...

I found that if I ask a question, the answer I get is the truth, warts and all...

Employees reported low levels of trust when they were lied to and believed they had purposefully been kept ill informed of what was happening within the company. Low trust behaviours were described by the following employee responses:

[We’re] continually lied to three or four times a week... They tell you one thing one day and another the next.
[There is a] lack of information. They only tell us what they want us to know. We get it [information] on the grapevine. They then tell you it's true. It's going back to the old days of treating us like mushrooms.

When they do things, they give you a little information and rumours start. They never give us the full picture; that's why the rumours start.

At the moment there is a lot of information around which management aren't divulging. We are becoming a far less open and honest company...they are not telling us the details...

Moderate trust responses described behaviours previously identified within both the high and low trust responses. The following employee responses associated with moderate trust ratings provide descriptions of further leaders' behaviours that build trust.

[There is] openness about anything that goes on. [There is] no behind closed doors.

For me personally they have regular reviews to see how you are coping and that we are informed of things.
In contrast, the following employee responses accompanying moderate trust ratings provide descriptions of further leaders’ behaviours associated with lower trust.

*When the strike was on we heard things from the media first...*

*Ninety-five percent of mistrust is related to the communication...*

*They really don’t keep you informed. They don’t fill you in. There is no communication from top to bottom. If they were more open and honest about what they want, then they’d get more respect.*

*[It’s about] the misinformation they give us. Sometimes they tell us one thing and then later on something totally different to what they have told us happens.*

*They never tell you what they are going to do until they’ve done it.[It is] the way they perform and tell people. They have got all these systems but never explain to you what is going to happen.*

The Open and Honest Communication factor describes behaviours associated with keeping employees accurately informed of what is happening within the organisation. This includes knowing something about the activities and objectives of top management, and the business problems faced by the organisation. Employees reported high levels of trust when the company kept them informed about how things were going, and what was transpiring by being provided with regular information
updates. Employees who reported high trust had the perception that the information they received was frank and as complete as was possible, given the circumstances.

In contrast, employees reported low levels of trust when they perceived that the company had lied. This perception was created, for example, when the company provided information that was later contradicted or proved to be wrong. Low trust was also associated with the perception that the company provided employees with selective ‘watered down’ information. Employees reported that withholding information from them (‘treating them like mushrooms’) increased the spread of rumour and ‘grape-vine’ information. Low trust was further associated with the company failing to inform employees of what was happening until after they had taken some action.

Open and honest communication builds trust because employees feel that the company considers their need or desire to be kept informed of what is happening within their workplace. These data suggest that employees perceive the absence of open and honest communication as a signal that the company has something to hide and is in some way acting deceptively to their detriment.
Respondents described behaviours that identified Fair Treatment as influencing employee perceptions of trust in the company. The behaviours associated with this factor appeared in high, low and moderate trust response categories. Fair Treatment was aligned with the Integrity component of the Integrative Model of Organisational Trust (Mayer et al., 1995).

Employees reported high levels of trust when they perceived that the company had treated them fairly. These behaviours were described by the following employee responses:

*They [the company] have treated me fairly. I’ve done well...I’ve worked hard for them and come out all right.*
They [the company] have always done the right thing by me...

They gave me a job...they gave me a fair go, I'm not complaining about anything. They treated me all right.

It's about the way they have treated me since I've been here. They encourage you...I've never been so well off in all my life...

I don't know too many companies that would look after its people the way they do ...

The biggest influence on me in recent times was the way they handled the other site closure. I would like to think that one day, if necessary, they would repeat the way that was handled...

In contrast, low trust responses were associated with behaviours that were perceived to be unfair. Specifically, employees reported low trust resulting from unfair treatment, such as other people being given jobs because they belonged to a particular group ("jobs for the boys"), being blamed for something they didn't do, and overt discrimination between different types of workers. Low trust behaviours were described by the following employee responses:
[It's about] the things blokes who work here have to do. They get called out in the middle of the night with no overtime and they were threatened with bad performance reviews if they didn’t do it...

I've almost left a couple of times. I don't like the way they manage and promote people... If you are on good terms with the people you report to then you can get on in the company...

He abused me, found out he was wrong and didn’t apologise.

We can’t work as a team if the Fair Treatment system is not the same. They discriminate between staff and award workers.

I was forced by the company to join the union before they would give me a ticket...

Moderate trust responses described similar behaviours to those articulated in high and low trust responses. Employees who recorded high trust responses reported having no dissatisfaction with how they were treated. Moderate trust responses also identified the influence of integrity and fair treatment by fellow employees as increasing trust. These behaviours were described by the following employee responses:
[My level of trust’s] a lot higher than other people’s because of a problem I had a while back. I had a first and final notice...we were lead to believe we were doing what was right. I was terminated... But I was reinstated... that influenced the strength of my trust.

[It’s about] how I get treated. I’ve got no hassles with management or supervisors...

They haven’t done anything wrong by me so far... They haven’t done anything to get me not to trust them...

Basically they are honest the people I deal with. I have a lot of trust in the people I work with.

I feel that I can confide in my workmates and be open with them...I know I’m getting a fair hearing and the best feedback they can give me.

In contrast, low trust behaviours included inconsistent application of policies amongst workers, and coercion. The following employee responses accompanying moderate trust ratings provide descriptions of further leaders’ behaviours associated with lower trust.
I used to work in emergency services. One of the guys there applied for a job as a supervisory plumber. He asked if his job was safe. He was told yes and two weeks later he was gone...

Policies don’t apply to everyone. The housing policy is really bad. Some people come to town and get a newly painted and carpeted house and some people have been here for 15 years and can’t get their house painted or carpeted.

There is no consistent behaviour towards employees... If you don’t kick up a fuss you don’t get what you’re entitled to...

Several times I’ve seen unequal treatment of people. It depends on who you are...

The agreements were coerced... I was told I wouldn’t get any overtime unless I accepted ...

The Fair Treatment factor includes behaviours associated with the company ‘doing the right thing’ by its employees. Employees reported high levels of trust when they believed they had been given a ‘fair go’ and had been treated equitably by the company. One employee also reported how his employment with the company had been terminated and then reinstated, and how this event had increased his level of trust in the company. In contrast, employees reported low trust levels when they
perceived that their working conditions had been threatened. Respondents reported threats to their personal outcomes around performance reviews and the availability of work and overtime, if they did not acquiesce to company demands regarding employment agreements or task assignments. Low levels of trust were also associated with discrimination between staff and award workers, inconsistent policy application and other people being given jobs because they belonged to a particular group.

4.2.4 Honouring Commitments

Respondents described Honouring Commitments as a factor influencing their perception of trust in the company. The behaviours associated with this factor appeared in high, low and moderate responses, but there were very few high trust statements. Honouring Commitments was aligned with the Integrity component of the Integrative Model of Organisational Trust (Mayer et al., 1995).
High trust responses described behaviours which demonstrated the honouring of commitment to employees’ well being, even in the event of the closure of business. One respondent also reported that the company keeping its word had positively influenced their level of trust. These behaviours were described by the following employee responses:

*Just a general feeling that they are trying to do what’s right...they have to put people off and I think they are doing this as best they can...*

*The biggest influence on me in recent times is the way they handled the [other site] closure. I would like to think that one day, if necessary, they would repeat the way that was handled...I was very impressed.*

*They have kept their word as far as the salary package is concerned.*

Employees reported lower levels of trust when the company failed to follow through on previous commitments, agreements, arrangements and promises. These behaviours were described by the following employee responses:

*I’ve come to expect them not to do the things they say they will do...They promise but don’t deliver...When you see it you’ll believe it.*
They told us we could buy our houses and that isn’t happening...

They [the company] say there is a trial but they just bring it in.

They said they would not change anything or have redundancies – then they did...

People went on the salary agreement because we believed our conditions would not change. Now they are taking our conditions away each year...

I’ve asked for training in certain areas. They have said yes, but 12 to 18 months later I’m still waiting...

A training opportunity was offered to me and then withdrawn for no particular reason.

Moderate trust responses described behaviours that negatively influenced trust. These behaviours were similar to those identified within low trust responses. Employees reported lower levels of trust when the company failed to follow things through and honour promises. These behaviours were described by the following employee responses:
There are times when they say something is important and should be done and then something comes up to prevent that from happening...Trust is doing what you say you’ll do.

Most things happen that they say but not all of the time. You have to wait to believe it. They do change their minds on some things and I don’t like that. You couldn’t trust anything that they said. They caused a lot of stress and the way that they do things is really shameful. They told us [employees] about the 12-hour shifts in the mine and said everyone would go on this shift. [Now] we are not sure who is. Higher management creates a story to explain why they didn’t follow through...

They seem to have trouble following things through – there are a lot of going nowhere projects around the place...

The Honouring Commitments factor includes behaviours associated with following through on agreed commitments. Employees reported high levels of trust when the company kept its promise, specifically with regard to the salary review. In contrast, employees reported low levels of trust when the company made promises and did not deliver on those promises or, if they were delivered, then gradually changed or eroded them. Actions leading to low trust included making statements about the future that proved, eventually, to be wrong. Low trust levels were associated with a
perceived lack of commitment to statements that had been made about general employment conditions, personal benefits or opportunities, and work projects.

Continual failure to fulfil commitments made employees sceptical of promises, new initiatives and projects introduced by the company. Employees reported that trust was negatively influenced when the company continually made promises and ‘didn’t follow through’. One employee reported that he would ‘believe it when he saw it happen’. This perception of the company has far reaching implications for change management initiatives which require the ‘buy in’ of the workforce for successful implementation. This finding also has implications for the way companies should communicate about the future. People will have varying views about how long a ‘promise’ of ‘no change’ is viable for – does it mean no change this quarter, this year, for 10 years? There will be people who expect that it will be a long-term promise, and people who have a poor appreciation of the fluidity of the market place and international business. It is, therefore, important for companies to communicate clearly how long they are talking about; i.e. “no changes forecast in the next 6 months, given that things remain relatively stable.”
4.2.5 Propensity to Trust

The analysis revealed Propensity to Trust as an employee factor influencing perceptions of trust in the company. The responses associated with Propensity to Trust appeared within high, low and moderate trust categories. This factor was aligned with the Trustor’s Propensity component of the Integrative Model of Organisational Trust (Mayer et al., 1995). Respondent descriptions consisted of judgements about what the company did or did not do rather than specific behavioural examples. Propensity to Trust was identified as an employee factor because responses were attributable to individual differences in willingness to trust.

The Propensity to Trust factor was comprised of two distinctive aspects, that is, two subgroups of like responses. The first of these aspects described individual differences in willingness to trust. Both Mayer et al., (1995) and Whitener et al., (1998) identified the existence of predisposition to trust as an antecedent factor.
Kramer (1999) also reported that individual differences regarding degree of trust stemmed from early trust experiences. This aspect is described by the following employee responses which appeared within the moderate trust response category. These respondents talked about how they would never completely trust the company, no matter what it did to create, sustain and build trust.

*But you never trust any company 100%.*

*[You] always have a niggly doubt about a few.*

*I don’t ‘extremely’ trust anybody. I think it’s my personality. I will trust people but I’m always weary. That’s my safety mechanism...*  

The second aspect of Propensity to Trust includes responses associated with the past experiences of employees. Respondents described the influence that length of tenure with the company and past knowledge of how the company operates had on trust. Interestingly, respondents in the high trust level did not allude to the 1991 organisational restructure, which dominated responses in the low and moderate trust categories. These behaviours were identified by the following employee responses:

*I work for them. I’ve been living here and working for them for a long time.*
I trust the company as I’ve worked for them for many years and I know them.

Low trust responses consisted of statements associated with the past treatment of employees during a period of organisational restructure in 1991. Employees were citing this event as a major influence on their levels of trust even though it had happened years before the surveys. This factor was identified by the following employee responses:

Five years ago they decided to clean out the deadwood. They got rid of the guys that worked hard. They were my friends. They pushed them out with very little explanation and understanding.

I was involved in the redundancy issues a few years ago and prior to that I trusted them....

I was here in 1991 when they sacked a lot of people on staff, not for doing things wrong, they just got called in and sacked...

I suppose it goes back to 1991 when I came to the conclusion that it was everyone for himself...nothing had happened since then to change my view...
My father-in-law was retrenched in 1991. It was a real knife in my guts how it was done. Things have never quite been the same since then.

I have seen people treated harshly in the past... I'm thinking of the 1991 redundancies...these things stay in your mind...

Moderate trust responses consisted of similar statements identified within the low trust category. These reported trust levels were influenced by the 1991 restructure. These behaviours were identified by the following employee responses:

I've had a few ups and downs and I've seen things happen about the place. The change in 1991 when a heap of people got sacked - I couldn't understand why. Some of the men were excellent in their jobs; they were good mates – that knocked me down a bit.

[I rate trust in the company] at the lower end based on past performance. I was here in 1991 when they sacked a lot of people...history is hard to overcome.

It was a few years ago, but when the redundancies came up, the way that was done to our salary members was a bit ruthless. It makes you cautious. You start to look for an ulterior motive as to why they are doing things.
I was here in 1991 when they got rid of a lot of people. The way the changes were done, there was no negotiation; you just did as you were told.

Moderate trust responses also described the influence of what other employees within the organisation had reported about their past experiences. These behaviours were described by the following employee responses:

...I've been influenced by tradesmen who feel badly done by...

Everything people say has me trusting away from [the company]...

I'm new here...as a new starter you talk to other blokes about the company...

These data were indicative of how long employees used particular evidence (experiences of, or stories about past behaviour) to form their judgements of trust. The statements about stories told by other people highlighted the role of social influences; that is, the influence of other people's trust levels and what they say about their trust in the company. Specifically, employees reported that their level of trust in the company was affected by not only their own past experiences but also those of others.

The Propensity to Trust factor consisted of two distinct aspects. The first aspect contained responses which described individual differences in willingness to trust.
The second aspect of this factor consisted of responses which identified the influence of past treatment of employees and the extent to which people were able to rebuild their trust after a damaging event. Some employees reported high levels of trust based on their broad, positive past experience with the company. In contrast, other employees reported low levels of trust as the result of a significant past event – the 1991 restructure. These responses provided generalised descriptions about the event and how employees had been treated. The detail in these responses suggests this event was extremely powerful in influencing employee perceptions of trust.

4.2.6 Investment of Role and Task Responsibilities

Respondents described behaviours that identified Investment of Role and Task Responsibilities as influencing their perception of trust in the company. The behaviours associated with this factor appeared within high and moderate trust responses. Investment of Role and Task Responsibilities did not appear to align with
any of the antecedent components of the Integrative Model of Organisational Trust (Mayer et al., 1995).

Employees reported high levels of trust when they were given responsibility and the opportunity to make decisions on important tasks. High trust behaviours were described by the following employee responses:

*They [the company] trust me to be responsible.*

*Three quarters of the time we work unsupervised...we are given responsibility for our job...*

Moderate trust responses described similar behaviours to those identified by employees who reported high levels of trust. Level of responsibility and the opportunity to make decisions about important tasks were described by the following employee responses:

*They [the company] trust me with more responsibility. They made me feel wanted.*

*The company trusts you with important tasks. They trust you to make decisions on important tasks.*
When they put me [on an] unsupervised shift I felt that they put trust in me.

[If we have] got a problem then we look at it. Input is welcomed and valued.

Providing employees with responsibility, and the scope and authority to make decisions positively influences their trust in the company. Employees reported that their trust levels increased because the company invested responsibilities for decision making and control of the work in them. This resulted in employees feeling trusted themselves and, in turn, they trusted the company because of that.

4.2.7 Profit Motives

[Diagram showing a flowchart related to profit motives]

Respondents identified Profit Motives as a contextual factor influencing their perceptions of trust in the company. Specifically Profit Motives referred to the
organisation’s primary industry motivation – that of making a profit. Profit Motives did not appear to align with any of the antecedent components of the Integrative Model of Organisational Trust (Mayer et al., 1995). The responses associated with Profit Motives appeared in low and moderate trust responses.

Low trust responses described behaviours associated with the company’s focus on return to shareholders. Employees talked about how they were considered merely as a resource. Employees also perceived that decision-making was based on ‘cold, hard’ economic facts rather than what was good for the workforce. These behaviours were described by the following employee responses:

_They are only here to make profit and get their unit costs down. If they can do away with me or reduce my pay and conditions they will...there’s more responsibility to their shareholders than to me._

_Any major company hides behind its shareholders. It’s an easy explanation for hard decisions...you just realise you’re a resource._

_It’s the fact that they are motivated by profit, that’s why I don’t trust them...the question of profit is upper most in their minds._

_The company’s viewpoint is entirely based around profit and the people that work for them are pawns in the game..._
Employees who rated their trust level as moderate similarly talked about the company's primary motivation as being that of making a profit. Specifically, employees talked about the company putting its own interests ahead of 'employee welfare'. One respondent also acknowledged the difficulty in guaranteeing profit and ensuring employee welfare.

*Our ultimate aim is merely to make profit and that will mean at some stage anyone in the organisations best interests could be put aside for needing a profit. I've never seen anything that would demonstrate that they would put a persons interest before that of profit – that's why I'm not extremely trusting.*

*They're in business to make dollars....*

*[It's about] profit, that's why we are here...* 

*....Obviously the company has its own interests at heart versus worker care....it's a fine line to be trodden by the company.*

*I wouldn't rate them 'highly trusting' because they are out to make money and cut costs where possible...*

*I think companies are motivated by issues that mean that their workforce is often a secondary consideration.*
The presence of profit driven behaviours in moderate and low trust responses suggests that some employees were accepting of the company's need to provide for shareholder profit, whereas others were not. Those employees who responded within the low trust category appeared not to understand the company's profit motive. With regards to moderate trust responses, understanding, or acknowledgment of the risk, caused employees to be make moderate judgments rather than high as they were aware that profits, not their well-being, came first in the company's considerations.

4.2.8 Technical Competencies

Respondents described behaviours that identified Technical Competencies as influencing their level of trust in the company. This factor was aligned with the Ability component of the Integrative Model of Organisational Trust (Mayer et al., 1995).
Technical Competencies described behaviours associated with the specialised aspects of leaders’ roles, including supervising the day to day technical work of employees. The behaviours associated with this factor appeared only within the moderate trust category and specifically described behaviours associated with perceived inexperience of management and lack of supervisory skill. These behaviours were described by the following employee responses:

[It is] the way that our departments run. One of the bosses doesn’t do what he is supposed to do. He’s never really done his job properly.

[I have] no trust in middle level management. Some of the supervisors are very bad.

In the past there have been some awful supervisors...

The level of management compared to a few years ago is a worrying thing. Managers don’t have the experience [of mining].

Employees reported low trust as a result of the perceived inexperience of management, and lack of supervisory skill. These responses highlight the importance of employee perceptions that their managers have the experience and competence in the areas of supervision and departmental management. Employees depend upon managers to run the organisation effectively so that their employment remains
secure. If employees see that some managers or leaders are not competent, then their trust in the company as a whole may be reduced.

4.2.9 Provides Support

Respondents described behaviours that identified Provides Support as a factor influencing their level of trust in the company. Provides Support was aligned with the Benevolence component of the Integrative Model of Organisational Trust (Mayer et al., 1995). This factor described behaviours associated with demonstration of concern which appeared within high and moderate trust levels.

Employees who reported high levels of trust described how the company ‘looked after’ its employees by supporting them through transfers as well as assisting employees to manage issues in their home lives. One respondent also talked about the support the company had provided during imminent site closure. High trust behaviours were identified by the following employee responses:
They have looked after me once or twice when I needed it. I had an operation on my neck four years ago and while I was in hospital an occupational therapist and a safety nurse said I should expect to get sacked but when I got back to work I was given a job in planning on a temporary basis....

They have been good to us...we came here with three young kids. [Our] boys are now good tradespeople and our daughter went through uni.

They have looked after me with my transfers....

They get involved with the workers. If there are problems at home they help.... You have help when you need it.

They have done an incredible job preparing us for what is going to happen...they have given us so much support we'd be fools not to trust them...

Moderate trust responses described behaviours similar to those described within high trust responses.

They look after their employees. They seem to be a company that looks after their employees.
I've seen examples of times when people have been well looked after.

They have done a lot for me and I respect them for that. They have treated me well and I have prospered out of them...I have a steady job and live in a great social environment...

They have always looked after me ... the people are interested in what you want to do and learn.

Trust was experienced when management provided support, regardless of whether the support was provided to sustain the long term relationship or assist employees through the ending of employment with the company. Employees reported higher levels of trust when the company went the extra distance to ensure they were supported in their home and work lives. For example, one employee reported that his trust level was positively influenced when the company supported him through injury and provided him with a job on his return to work. The company was aware that the nature of the injury meant that the employee could not return to normal duties, therefore, he was provided with another job, which further assisted his rehabilitation. These actions made employees feel that the company was concerned about all aspects of their life, not just those directly related to work tasks.
4.2.10 Future Uncertainty

Future Uncertainty was identified as a contextual factor influencing employee perceptions of trust in the company. The statements associated with this factor were apparent within high, low and moderate trust response categories. Future Uncertainty did not appear to align with any components of the Integrative Model of Organisational Trust (Mayer et al., 1995).

The data associated with this factor identified the influence of ‘communication’ and ‘company fairness’ on future certainty. High trust responses described behaviours and characteristics associated with open communication which alleviated future uncertainty. High trust aspects of this factor were identified by the following employee responses:
The [current] management team, from what I have seen, seem to be fairly open with communication of the direction of the company and the future.

They do tell us what’s going on, and sometimes I know where they are coming from, but there is a bit of uncertainty with the redundancies.

I was impressed with how they did their best to help us find new roles but there was still uncertainty about where you are going and who will be left.

They have done alright by me so far, however there is uncertainty in the future and that brings it [trust] back a peg or two.

Uncertainty creates mistrust. Even though they have said something you have to wait until it happens.

Employees described loss of trust in the company when communication regarding the future of their role and direction of the company was not forthcoming. These characteristics were described by the following employee responses:
The changing direction that this organisation is taking tends to provide a level of uncertainty and with that goes some level of trust.

You don't know if you'll have a job next week. It's about the uncertainty of the times.

The amount of drastic changes that are going on at the moment makes me a bit less trusting.

So many changes are going on. You're not really sure what's going on. You hear lots of stories before you hear the actual facts.

[There is] uncertainty at the moment. We haven't got clear definition of the structure we're heading towards. [There is] uncertainty as to what the future holds.

There are some things that are not clear at this point and my level of trust might be slightly lower at this moment. I don't know if the business itself knows the direction of the company.
The level of uncertainty with which we are asked to manage the company is high, and I don't observe any attempt to reduce that uncertainty. Some of the uncertainty is clearly externally driven but I believe it is the obligation of management to manage that uncertainty to allow it [the company] to function as well as it can.

Future Uncertainty described statements associated with decision-making inconsistencies and absence of clear company direction. Employees reported low levels of trust as the result of changes to agreed decisions and the detrimental influence this had on their ability to make future life plans. Employees talked about how future uncertainty continually threatened their commitment to the company. Respondents also talked about how the recent wave of redundancies that had contributed to these feelings of uncertainty.

4.2.11 Stability of Managerial Personnel
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Respondents described behaviours that identified Stability of Managerial Personnel as a factor influencing their perception of trust in the company. The statements associated with this factor appeared in low and moderate trust responses. Stability of Managerial Personnel was not aligned with any selected components of the Integrative Model of Organisational Trust (Mayer et al., 1995).

Employees reported low levels of trust associated with the constant change of management. Low trust was described by the following employee response:

*Because I've been here for lots of years and I've seen the changes...A manager starts the change, gets half way through it and is then moved on....then another person comes.*

Moderate trust responses described behaviours similar to those articulated within the low trust response. These employees identified the detrimental effects of having a constantly changing, unstable management team. These behaviours were identified by the following employee responses:

*I think people move around too quickly... they may be committed to their team and the people but they move on and things that you bring up with them, well the new people are not committed...*

*[There is] a lot of swapping around of managers. Every time a new GM comes everything changes...*
...There needs to be a stable management. You can't have a mobile management that throws things out the door. If that's the case what happens is at the whim of the person who takes over.

With the chopping and changing, people don't have time to develop trust...

It comes back to the fact that in three years I've had three Superintendents and four General Mangers...

Stability of Managerial Personnel includes behaviours associated with a constantly changing management. Employees reported lower levels of trust resulting from a constantly changing and unstable management. Employees voiced their frustration at having to continually start new programs and initiatives only to have them altered or discontinued as the result of new management strategy.

4.2.12 Provides Benefits
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Figure 13: Company Factor – Provides Benefits
Respondents described behaviours that identified Provides Benefits as a factor influencing their level of trust in the company. Provides Benefits was aligned with the Benevolence component of the Integrative Model of Organisational Trust (Mayer et al., 1995).

The behaviours associated with this factor were identified within high and moderate trust levels and described behaviours associated with the provision of employee benefits. High trust behaviours were identified by the following employee responses:

*I've got housing and I've got what I wanted. I get looked after…*

*[It's about] the money they offer their employees. The money they spend on safety, benefits, study allowances and cheap accommodation…*

Moderate trust responses described behaviours similar to those described within high trust responses. These employees talked about how ‘doing that bit extra’ in terms of employee benefits and support schemes, had a positive influence on trust. These behaviours were described by the following employee responses:

*I harassed the company to give me a job…They gave me a house when my kids came over…they were helpful with furniture…they’ve been good to me. I think anyone who wants help will get it.*
They adopted modern trends such as the forced savings plan. I had a secretary who was recently retrenched. I knew my manager went to a lot of effort to get her another job...it seems they do look after their people.

High trust was associated with the provision of housing support and ensuring that the employee’s family had settled into residence. Providing this support is crucial to reducing the anxiety experienced by new employees in these organisations, which operate in remote locations that are far from most employees’ pre-existing support networks, such as family. Similar to Provides Support the act of providing these benefits made employees feel that the company was concerned about all aspects of their life.

4.2.13 Safety Obligations
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Figure 14: Company Factor – Safety Obligations
Respondents described behaviours that identified Safety Obligations as a factor influencing their perception of trust in the company. Although associated factor data was limited, reporting of these behaviours is important as they contributed to employee trust levels. Safety Obligations was aligned with the Integrity component of the Integrative Model of Organisational Trust (Mayer et al., 1995).

High trust behaviours were identified by the following employee responses:

As far as building trust, it [my trust in the company] was about a consistent approach to safety reviews...that’s what lead me to be more trusting.

....safety is their number one thing.... They are very safety orientated...

They don’t expect you to do dangerous things. They have the right tools for the job and they have good documentation and safety. It’s the safest company I’ve worked for.

Safety Obligations identified the company’s commitment to safety as an important influence on reported trust levels. Employees reported high trust levels as a result of the company’s focus on safety initiatives and safety reviews. Given that it came to mind when the question was asked, these employees reported that safety was an important determinant of their level of trust. Given the high-risk environments, in
which these employees worked, it is not surprising Safety Obligations behaviours was mentioned in the highly trusting response category.

4.2.14 Business / Decision Making Competencies
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Figure 15: Company Factor – Business / Decision Making Competencies

Respondents described behaviours that identified Business / Decision Making Competencies as influencing their level of trust in the company. The factor Business / Decision Making Competencies was aligned with the Ability component of the Integrative Model of Organisational Trust (Mayer et al., 1995). This factor identified business sense and decision making competencies as influencing levels of trust.

Business / Decision Making Competencies described behaviours associated with managers' ability to make the right business decisions and successfully grow the business. These behaviours were identified within high, low and moderate trust levels. The high trust response described behaviours associated with the perceived
ability of management to make the right business decisions to ensure viability of the company. These behaviours were described by the following employee response:

*I trust my chain of management... to make the right business decisions and successfully grow the business to make it profitable and meaningful.*

In contrast, low trust was associated with an inability to make the right business decisions in order to keep the site operational and profitable. These behaviours were described by the following employee response:

*The closure of the site makes you think about the trust you put in managers, because it was such a million dollar part of [the company]...it went down the tube pretty fast and it makes you wonder if they are capable of running the place.*

Employees reported high trust in management when they believed their immediate manager had the capability to make the right commercial business decisions. In contrast, lower levels of trust were associated with perceived inexperience and poor decision-making skills. These responses highlight the importance of employee perceptions that their managers have experience and competence in the area of decision making. In a similar vein to the Technical Competencies factor, employees depend upon managers to run the organisation effectively so that their employment remains secure.
4.3 PHASE 2: TRUST IN IMMEDIATE MANAGER FACTORS

This section of the report describes in detail factors and associated behaviours that influence employees' perception of trust in their immediate manager. The data making up these factors was obtained from the 1996 and 1997 Survey. In contrast to the preceding set of factors, Immediate Manager Factors were made up of data specifically relating to immediate manager behaviours and characteristics. This is in contrast to the generalised leader behaviours and characteristics described within the 'trust in company' factors.

4.3.1 Trust Levels, Related Factors, & Frequency of Participant Responses

Analysis of the qualitative data accompanying participant responses to their ratings of trust in their immediate manager revealed ten factors associated with perceptions of trust in their immediate manager. Trust levels, related factors and frequency of participant responses are presented in Table 5.

Because when you compare the two sets of total frequencies for each factor 28% of the cells have expected frequencies below five, all factors that appeared in only one set of data, either the company analysis of the immediate manager analysis. The remaining factors that appeared in both sets of data provided a 7 x 2 matrix of frequency data for a Chi Square test of independence. The analysis showed that the distributions were significantly different Chi Square = 121.99; df = 6; p<0.001.
Provides Support, Fair Treatment, Honouring Commitments, and Propensity to Trust were significant contributors to that result.

Table 5  Frequency of Responses by Factor and Trust Level – Immediate Manager

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>High Trust</th>
<th>Moderate Trust</th>
<th>Low Trust</th>
<th>Total Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open and Honest Communication</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides Support</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Limitations</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency and Predictability</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidentiality</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment of Role and Task Responsibilities</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Treatment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honouring Commitments</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Uncertainty</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propensity to Trust</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion of each factor follows the same format as the Phase 1 analyses. The factor descriptions provided here cover the qualitative data associated with high, low and moderate trust response categories so that all aspects can be explored. Similarities and differences in behaviours identified within and between response categories are discussed. Explanation of the factor concludes with a summary of all associated factor data.
4.3.2 Open and Honest Communication

Respondents described behaviours that identified Open and Honest Communication as a factor influencing perceptions of trust in their immediate manager. This factor appeared in high, low and moderate trust responses and was aligned with the Integrity component of the Integrative Model of Organisational Trust (Mayer et al., 1995).

High trust levels were associated with honest communication. These behaviours were described by the following employee responses:

*There is no behind the door agenda.*
He’s straight up front. He doesn’t muck around. If he has a beef he tells you and if he likes what you’re doing he tells you. He’s the sort of person I like to work for.

I find him [my immediate manager] open. He speaks his mind and I feel that we are kept informed about all the things he is able to keep us informed of.

He’s open and frank. He doesn’t hide anything.

She has always demonstrated honesty and communicated information as it becomes available, rather than trying to insulate or protect her workers from change.

He will actually listen and talk. He’s not rude or arrogant. I like that in a person...

[It’s about] the way she behaves. I trust she is honest when she tells me things.

He’s honest – you get an honest answer. He doesn’t dodge the issues. He trusts me.
... I can rely on him to answer a question. If he can give an answer he will. He has integrity.

Low trust responses identified behaviours associated with not being told the full picture and incongruous communication content. Participant responses describing these behaviours are presented as follows:

I'm not sure we are getting the full picture. I think there are things that aren't being told to the workers at this time...we don't know whether we are going to keep going or stop.

Analysis of moderate trust responses revealed behaviours that were associated with high and low trust. Behaviours having a positive effect on trust were similar to those behaviours identified in the high trust response group; i.e., keeping employees informed.

In the last month he has told us a lot more than what other people have been told [by their managers].

With what's going on with [the site closure] and the uncertainty she has kept us very well informed. We are talking about jobs being on the line and feel very confident she will contact us as soon as she can.
He'll tell us about things that affect us all. He won't beat about the bush with it.

[It's about] good communication. The feeling I get from him [my immediate manager] personally – he is fairly open. He talks to people about how they are doing; he picks you up when you are doing well. When you are going wrong he tells you then, he doesn't wait until the end to nail you...

In contrast, behaviours having a negative influence on trust were similar to those identified within the low trust response category; i.e., deliberately withholding information.

He doesn't always say what he means.

He has just squeezed into the moderate rating. The biggest concern I have is that we can have a discussion with him and I can believe that we share a view and I understand that view. Later on he will take a position that is contrary to that. His recollection of events also differs.

The Open and Honest Communication factor includes behaviours associated with keeping employees informed and ensuring communication content is accurate. Employees reported high levels of trust when their immediate manager kept them informed by providing them with the full picture. Specifically, employees referred to
the absence of hidden agendas, managers being direct (not ‘beating about the bush’) and the free flow of information as behaviours which fostered trust. As a result of open communication employees reported that myths were dispelled and rumours were quashed.

Providing open and honest feedback about performance also positively influenced levels of trust. Open and honest communication about performance benefits both the employee and the company, as the employee enhances their skills and the company reaps the rewards of improved performance. Managers who provide feedback and exercise the authority of their role sensitively enhance team members’ trust.

In contrast, employees reported decreased levels of trust when their immediate manager failed to provide them with ‘big picture’ information. Employees believed that they were not being told everything because the manager had something to hide. Low trust levels were also associated with inconsistent communication content. These employees reported low trust levels because they had observed the manager communicating information to another party, which was incongruous with what they had been told.
4.3.3 Provides Support
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Figure 17: Immediate Manager Factor – Provides Support

Respondents described behaviours that had provided them with support, as influencing their perception of trust in their immediate manager. The behaviours associated with this factor appeared in high, low, and moderate trust responses and were aligned with the Benevolence component of the Integrative Model of Organisational Trust (Mayer et al., 1995).

High trust responses identified behaviours which positively influenced employees’ levels of trust. Employees reported high levels of trust when their immediate manager backed them up and shared responsibility for team mistakes. High trust levels were also evident when employees felt able to approach their immediate manager for assistance on a personal level. These behaviours were described in the following employee responses:
If you come in with a real concern, he'll back you 200% there and then...

He's very supportive. There have been a few incidents where he has supported me in adversity...He'll sit and talk with me about things he wouldn't normally talk to people about. He trusts me and I trust him.

He [my immediate manager] sticks up for you. We get in trouble all the time. He says what he means and that suits me fine. I don't have any mistrust.

He [my immediate manager] asks how you are going from a family point of view – he'll help you out.

She's very willing to listen to me and has been a good help ever since I went on maternity leave. She is interested in what I want and is doing things for me before I go on leave. I trust she will take care of me.

I can appreciate the pressures and some of the considerations he has in making decisions. [It's about] the things he does. He's supportive in a tight situation and I trust him not to put me down behind my back.

If I needed his support or assistance I feel it would always be there.
He did a lot to get me my position. He's done a lot to encourage me and I've had some problems in the last few months. He's helped me heaps.

[It's about] her level of support for us. She listens to our ideas, understands our grievances and she is approachable. If I had a problem I could go straight to her.

There have been instances where he has been extremely helpful to me on a personal and work related level and this has led to an increase in my trust.

He is extremely people orientated and genuinely concerned for people – especially at this time. There is a lot of energy and focus on people, their welfare and their well-being at the moment.

I had a bad year through ill health. She [my immediate manager] was very approachable...I was away for four months and when I came back she was there for me.

Low trust responses identified behaviours associated with a perceived lack of support from immediate managers and his/her failure to act in the interests of the employee.
These behaviours were the opposite of those behaviours identified in the preceding response category and were identified by the following employee response:

_The man has no backbone. He doesn’t stand up for us. You need a manager that’s willing to back you up if you get yourself into trouble._

_He won’t._

Moderate trust responses identified similar behaviours to those articulated by employees who reported low levels of trust. These employees also identified avoidance of taking responsibility as a specific behavioural example demonstrating lack of support.

_Sometimes I feel I have to be really careful not to put a foot wrong. While I report to J he often forgets me… I don’t remember him asking how I was going. I report to him, so if he is not looking out for me, then who is. He looks after his managers but I feel pushed [aside]._

_More recently there has been a couple of times when he has left me feeling very exposed and I feel that to be very disconcerting. It causes me to be much more cautious. I’m less likely to count on him than I used to be._

The Provides Support factor includes behaviours associated with the provision of assistance on personal and work related issues. High trust responses describe the immediate manager as being people orientated and genuinely concerned for
These behaviours were the opposite of those behaviours identified in the preceding response category and were identified by the following employee response:

*The man has no backbone. He doesn’t stand up for us. You need a manager that’s willing to back you up if you get yourself into trouble.*

*He won’t.*

Moderate trust responses identified similar behaviours to those articulated by employees who reported low levels of trust. These employees also identified avoidance of taking responsibility as a specific behavioural example demonstrating lack of support.

*Sometimes I feel I have to be really careful not to put a foot wrong. While I report to J he often forgets me… I don’t remember him asking how I was going. I report to him, so if he is not looking out for me, then who is. He looks after his managers but I feel pushed [aside].*

*More recently there has been a couple of times when he has left me feeling very exposed and I feel that to be very disconcerting. It causes me to be much more cautious. I’m less likely to count on him than I used to be.*

The Provides Support factor includes behaviours associated with the provision of assistance on personal and work related issues. High trust responses describe the immediate manager as being people orientated and genuinely concerned for
employees’ wellbeing and professional development. In contrast, employees reported decreased levels of trust when their immediate manager did not back them up and did not appear concerned about their wellbeing.

The need to balance work responsibilities with family and personal commitments has arisen from changes in workforce demographics, legal requirements, business and labour market influences and equity considerations (Breakspear, 1998; Bourke, 2000). Importantly, this factor identifies the need for immediate managers to be approachable and sympathetic to personal issues that affect an employees ability to function at work.

4.3.4 Role Limitations
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Figure 18: Immediate Manager Factor – Role Limitations

The present study identified Role Limitations as a factor influencing employee perceptions of trust in their immediate manager. Employees acknowledged that their
immediate managers had to conform to company practices and were not responsible for company decisions that were made at a higher level. These behaviours were described within high, low and moderate responses and did not appear to align with antecedent components of the Integrative Model of Organisational Trust (Mayer et al., 1995).

Employees’ who reported high trust levels acknowledged that their immediate managers’ role and position within the organisational structure dictated many of the behaviours they exhibited. High trust responses were associated with the following responses:

*He [my immediate manager] is an honest person even though he has to see things from both sides. He’s like the meat in the sandwich. You know he tries to hold the company stance even when he doesn’t believe it.*

*In terms of the way he [my immediate manager] interacts with me, it’s more about the context and environment in which he’s working. I’m not sure he has the final decision. His decisions have been overruled by people higher up.*

*I know there are things he can’t tell me and I understand that. I know he can’t tell me everything.*
Low trust responses described behaviours similar to those identified within the high trust responses. Employees reported low levels of trust as result of company influence on decision making and actions of the immediate manager. Low trust ratings were associated with the following employee responses:

*In general the company doesn’t know where it’s going. He’ll tell you one thing and then have to retract it the day after. It’s not him personally but that’s just how it is.*

*[It’s about] the decision changes more than anything. You get told one thing one week and something else the next but you can’t link that to him personally. I reckon outside work he is probably a pretty trusting sort of fellow but he has to tell us these things.*

Moderate trust responses identified similar behaviours to the high and low trust responses. Employees articulated that their immediate managers were just ‘pawns’ and ‘puppets’ and had ‘no authority’ to exhibit more trusting behaviours. Moderate trust levels were described by the following employee responses:

*I don’t feel that information is carried right down to us. I hope this doesn’t come back on my immediate manager. I don’t know if it’s his fault or not.*
It’s hard; he’s got no authority. He has to go to people above him. The poor buggers are only pawns. They have such strict criteria they can’t do anything. So when I gave my rating its not reflective of him. I believe that he’s like a puppet with not very good intentions. He has come down through the hierarchy of the company. I believe they have intentions that are harmful to myself and other workers…

The Role Limitations factor acknowledges the predicament of managers whose decision making latitude and behaviours are restricted by organisational structure and those with higher authority. High, low and moderate trust responses identified common influences on level of trust. Employees who reported high levels of trust acknowledged their immediate managers’ predicament at being ‘the meat in the sandwich’; that is, having to hold the company stance even when they did not believe in the actions being taken. These employees also recognised that decisions were made by people higher up, thus restricting their managers’ latitude to make decisions. For these employees, high trust ratings were made independent of company influence.

Employees who reported low levels of trust focused upon the company influence on decision making. Whilst these employees’ recognised the predicament of their immediate managers, their reported trust levels were the result of company actions, specifically changes in the outcomes of decision making. Even though these employees were asked to rate their level of trust in their immediate manager they could not separate company influence from actions of their immediate manager.
4.3.5 Consistency and Predictability

Respondents described behaviours that identified Consistency and Predictability as influencing employee perceptions of trust in their immediate manager. Behaviours associated with Consistency and Predictability appeared in high and moderate trust response categories. This factor was aligned with the Integrity component of the Integrative Model of Organisational Trust (Mayer et al., 1995).

Employees reported high levels of trust when they were able to predict the behaviours and actions of their immediate manager. These responses were quite different because they did not describe specific behaviours; rather they described the positive influence of having known and worked with the manager for long periods of time. This factor was characterised by the following employee responses:
I haven't seen anything that makes me mistrust and a definition of trust I've heard is that they are predictable. I know the way my immediate manager will work.

You know what to expect from him [my immediate manager]...

I've known him [my immediate manager] for a long time. I know how he operates.

Well, I've known him for 24 years and he has never done anything that would change my mind about trusting him.

It's my initial perception. I've worked with G [my immediate manager] for three and a half years.

We have shared a destiny up until now. [It’s about] the depth of our relationship and familiarity.

Moderate trust responses described behaviours associated with changes in decision making and inconsistent actions. In contrast to high trust responses, employees who had known their immediate manager for a short period of time reported moderate trust levels. Moderate trust was characterised by the following employee responses:
I say that level of trust because it has only been 10 months. With each of them the relationship is still forming and the same is true of their trust in me. It’s a developing relationship...

I haven’t had a lot of contact with him because he’s new. It [trust] comes back to the overall picture. I suppose I’m putting him into the basket with the upper management structure. I don’t have enough contact with him to make a personal assessment, so I lump him in with other management.

Mainly because I haven’t had the time with him yet. I don’t expect him to do any bad thing to me.

The problem is I’ve only worked for him for 6 months, so we are still developing our level of trust.

There are times when we want things done and he’ll do it, and other times when he won’t...It depends on what sort of mood he’s in, but everyone’s like that. Sometimes you really can trust him and sometimes it’s not worth it.

He jumps all over the place with a lot of things. He says one thing one day and changes his mind the next....
[It's about] changing back and forth with ideas. He says we'll do it this way so we go down that path. He forgets and changes his mind.

Consistency and Predictability included behaviours associated with being able to predict the behaviour of the immediate manager and knowing what to expect from him in specific situations. Employees who reported high levels of trust talked about having constant dealings with their immediate manager and knowing how they operated based on this experience. Employees who rated highly trusting also identified the importance of depth of relationship and familiarity. In contrast, moderate trust responses identified the influence of having known the immediate manager for only short periods of time. Employees who rated moderate trust levels talked about how the relationship was still developing. As a result of this developing relationship, one respondent reported that he 'lumped' trust in his immediate manager with his perceived trust in upper management.
4.3.6 Confidentiality
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Figure 20: Immediate Manager Factor – Confidentiality

Respondents described behaviours that identified Confidentiality as a factor influencing their perceptions of trust in their immediate manager. This factor appeared in high, low and moderate trust responses and was aligned with the Integrity component of the Integrative Model of Organisational Trust (Mayer et al., 1995).

Employees reported high levels of trust when they could confidently confide in their manager. High trust was also reported when the managers used discretion when communicating sensitive issues. These behaviours were described by the following employee responses:

*You can tell her things in confidence and she keeps them confidential.*
I’ve confided in her a few times and I knew that it did not go any further.

Since he has been here, I have had personal issues and issues with my people. He has kept these in confidence and treated them the way I asked him to treat them. I have no reason not to trust him.

Whatever I’ve hit him with, personal or business, he’s kept it to himself and acted to rectify the situation to my benefit, not his.

Low trust levels described behaviours associated with breaches in confidentiality and lack of discretion when talking about others. Low trust behaviours were described by the following employee responses:

[It’s about] a lot of things, like going through people’s documents and their in trays when its not theirs. He’ll talk about people in the team in front of other members of the team...

Moderate trust level responses aligned with behaviours described within the low trust level responses. These employees similarly identified breaches in confidentiality as negatively influencing levels of trust.

I wouldn’t trust him with my personal details.
[My immediate manager] told everyone in the world about my entry and winning the competition even though I said I didn’t want anyone to know – it makes it harder for me with the boys.

The Confidentiality factor includes behaviours associated with not disclosing confidential information and exercising discretion when communicating sensitive information. Employees reported higher levels of trust when they had confidence in their immediate manager’s ability to keep information confidential. High trust behaviours described the immediate manager’s integrity in being able to keep personal and business issues private. Employees reported that their trust had been increased by successive encounters, which required the immediate manager to keep confidences.

In contrast, employees reported lower levels of trust when their immediate manager violated confidentiality. Talking about people and specific events in front of team members was also cited as a behaviour, which decreased trust. Low trust levels were also associated with breaching confidence by going through people’s documents and previewing information that was not intended for viewing by that party.
4.3.7 Investment of Role and Task Responsibilities

Respondents described behaviours that identified Investment of Role and Task Responsibilities as influencing employee perceptions of trust in their immediate manager. This factor identified the need for trusting behaviours to be displayed by both the employee and the immediate manager in order for it to develop. The behaviours associated with this factor appeared in high and moderate trust responses. Similar to Phase 1 analysis, (see p. 64) this factor did not appear to align with antecedent components of the Integrative Model of Organisational Trust (Mayer et al., 1995).

High trust levels were associated with employees and immediate managers who displayed trust in each other. Displays of trust included providing employees with a level of responsibility and allowing them to contribute ideas and offer suggestions. High trust responses were associated with the following behaviours:
He [my immediate manager] has shown a lot of trust in me and my work.

He [my immediate manager] uses me as a sounding board. He trusts me. I trust him in part because of that.

He has trusted me so I can trust him.

He is asking our opinions which means he trusts us. That leads me to trust him.

We’ve got good rapport. We relate well. We are building up a trusting two-way relationship.

Moderate trust level responses were comprised of both positive and negative associated behaviours. Behaviour positively influencing trust were similar to those identified in the high trust responses; i.e., the immediate manager trusts an employee’s ability, which in turn influences their trust in the immediate manager. Behaviour negatively influencing trust were the opposite of the positive behaviours. These behaviours were described by the following employee responses:

I think it’s a two-way thing. He has just recently displayed a level of trust in my abilities. If he doesn’t trust my abilities it puts you off balance. You think twice about what they say.
...

_He doesn’t trust me so I tend to be wary back._

_There are things going on that I need to know about. He says he doesn’t know about them but I hear from others that he does. I’m annoyed that he doesn’t trust me....If he can’t trust me I shouldn’t be working for him._

The Investment of Role and Task Responsibilities factor comprises behaviours associated with building a two-way relationship through mutual trusting actions. Employees who reported increased levels of trust talked about how their immediate manager showing trust in them had influenced their feelings of trust towards their manager. In contrast, managers who did not display trust in their employees negatively influenced employees’ levels of trust. Specific actions which negatively influenced trust included not disclosing information and not displaying trust in the employees’ ability to do the work.
Respondents described behaviours related to Fair Treatment, as influencing their perceptions of trust in their immediate manager. This factor appeared in high, low and moderate trust responses. Although behaviours describing this factor were few it was still important to document their positive influence on level of trust in the immediate manager. Fair Treatment was aligned with the Integrity component of the Integrative Model of Organisational Trust (Mayer et al., 1995).

High trust responses described behaviours associated with equitable treatment of employees and leading by example. Employees reported high levels of trust when their immediate manager ‘did the right thing by them’ and treated them fairly. Furthermore, employees reported high levels of trust when their immediate manager led by example. These behaviours were described by the following employee responses:
...He'll do the right thing for the people under him...

...Just the way he [my immediate manager] treats me...

I've worked with him [my immediate manager] before. He wouldn't expect other people to do something he wouldn't do himself.

Employees reported lower levels of trust when they believed that they had been treated unjustly in day-to-day interactions with their immediate manager. These behaviours were described by the following employee responses:

They [management] tried shifting me off the shift. The current mine manager thought people shouldn't be on the same shift as someone they are having a personal relationship with. I would lose seven thousand dollars a year on the new shift. It goes against all their “Working Together” crap. I asked them to look up the anti-discrimination act and review his own “Working Together” propaganda.

I've seen him do things that do not encourage trust. I can think of mistakes where he has treated me badly and he has also treated others quite badly. My manager tried to fire a guy and failed because the decision was stopped at a higher level.
...He'll do the right thing for the people under him...

...Just the way he [my immediate manager] treats me...

I've worked with him [my immediate manager] before. He wouldn't expect other people to do something he wouldn't do himself.

Employees reported lower levels of trust when they believed that they had been treated unjustly in day-to-day interactions with their immediate manager. These behaviours were described by the following employee responses:

They [management] tried shifting me off the shift. The current mine manager thought people shouldn't be on the same shift as someone they are having a personal relationship with. I would lose seven thousand dollars a year on the new shift. It goes against all their “Working Together” crap. I asked them to look up the anti-discrimination act and review his own “Working Together” propaganda.

I've seen him do things that do not encourage trust. I can think of mistakes where he has treated me badly and he has also treated others quite badly. My manager tried to fire a guy and failed because the decision was stopped at a higher level.
When I finished up he cut my role allowance back the day before I finished. I'd just completed seven nights. He wouldn't let me go earlier and he had the money to let me go...He marked me down in the salary review.

Moderate trust responses described behaviours similar to those identified within low trust responses. These behaviours were described by the following employee responses:

*He could shaft us but he doesn't.*

*John doesn't treat us as 'them and us', we are a team and that's it.*

The Fair Treatment factor includes behaviours associated with equitable treatment and leading by example. Employees reported higher levels of trust when they believed they had been treated fairly and their immediate manager had the integrity to 'do the right thing'. High trust was also associated with leading by example and not expecting subordinates to do tasks that the manager would not do himself. Managers who lead by example demonstrate that they are not above performing the task, thus reducing the divide between 'us and them'. Furthermore, leading by example highlights the managers' understanding of the task and what it involves.
When I finished up he cut my role allowance back the day before I finished. I'd just completed seven nights. He wouldn't let me go earlier and he had the money to let me go...He marked me down in the salary review.

Moderate trust responses described behaviours similar to those identified within low trust responses. These behaviours were described by the following employee responses:

*He could shaft us but he doesn’t.*

*John doesn’t treat us as ‘them and us’, we are a team and that’s it.*

The Fair Treatment factor includes behaviours associated with equitable treatment and leading by example. Employees reported higher levels of trust when they believed they had been treated fairly and their immediate manager had the integrity to ‘do the right thing’. High trust was also associated with leading by example and not expecting subordinates to do tasks that the manager would not do himself. Managers who lead by example demonstrate that they are not above performing the task, thus reducing the divide between ‘us and them’. Furthermore, leading by example highlights the managers’ understanding of the task and what it involves.
4.3.9 Honouring Commitments

Respondents described behaviours that identified Honouring Commitments as a factor influencing perceptions of trust in their immediate manager. The behaviours associated with this factor appeared within high trust responses and were aligned with the Integrity component of the Integrative Model of Organisational Trust (Mayer et al., 1995).

Employees reported high levels of trust when their immediate manager followed through on previous commitments, promises and agreed decisions. These behaviours were identified by the following employee responses:

*When he’s promised something he has delivered. When he’s said something he’s followed through....*
He [my immediate manager] is a bit down on experience but whatever he says, he will do.

He [my immediate manager] has followed through on his statements. He hasn’t reversed any decisions without consultation.

If he says he’s going to do something he does it. He comes through. He’s one of the superintendents that does that.

Within the Honouring Commitments factor, employees reported high levels of trust when their immediate manager followed through on previous commitments. The effect of having the immediate manager changing decisions has implications for employee commitment. The consequence of failure to honour commitments is that employees become unresponsive to new initiatives and projects introduced by management. Of greater detriment is the effect of these behaviours on cultural change initiatives, which are being introduced by businesses globally in an effort to increase competitiveness and viability (Lane & Bachmann, 1998). Honouring commitments is crucial to business survival as the described behaviours have implications for employee trust and employee commitment to making the desired changes.
4.3.10 Future Uncertainty

Respondents described behaviours associated with future uncertainty, as influencing their perception of trust in their immediate manager. Although associated data were limited, the contextual nature of this factor warranted its inclusion within this study. Similar to Phase 1 analysis (see p. 74) this factor did not appear to align with antecedent components of the Integrative Model of Organisational Trust (Mayer et al., 1995).

An uncertain future and the prospect of retrenchments had decreased the level of trust in the immediate manager. Similar to the Investment of Role and Task Responsibilities factor, Future Uncertainty is context based and not the result of immediate manager behaviours. Future Uncertainty was described by the following employee response:
It's moderately [trusting] now. A month ago it would have been highly [trusting]. I guess now that the decision is out, things are more open. But the future is hard to trust because in lots of ways I have to rely on John [my immediate manager] to say whether I can get retrenchment or whether he can help me find a job.

4.3.11 Propensity to Trust

[Diagram: Immediate Manager Factor – Propensity to Trust]

The present study identified Propensity to Trust as an employee factor influencing employee perceptions of trust in their immediate manager. Propensity to Trust referred to those employees who reported a predisposition towards never fully trusting the organisation under any circumstances. Only one respondent in the highly trusting response category described propensity. Although associated data was limited it was still important to report Propensity to Trust, due to the exploratory
nature of this investigation. This factor was described by the following employee response:

> To be extremely trusting of anyone is to be naive, as no one is absolutely trusting. Highly is the highest I'd rate my relationship with anyone.

Although this factor did not describe any specific behaviour it did identify the influence of a pre-existing disposition not to highly trust the immediate manager. For this respondent, level of trust in their immediate manager was not only influenced by the manager’s behaviour, but also by an underlying tendency not to be absolutely trusting. Propensity to Trust was classified as an employee factor because its influence was born from developmental and past experiences unique to the individual.
CHAPTER 5  DISCUSSION

Factors elicited in the company and immediate manager analyses are discussed in terms of their alignment with the Integrative Model of Organisational Trust (Mayer et al., 1995) as well as their links with previous antecedent factor research. This chapter concludes with the presentation and discussion of an extended model of antecedents to organisational trust, Factors Influencing Employee Perceptions of Trust Within Organisations.

Analysis of the qualitative data accompanying ratings of trust revealed sixteen factors influencing employee perceptions of trust in the company and trust in the immediate manager. The primary difference between company and immediate manager responses was the employees’ direct experience of the behaviour they described. Company analysis examined generalised leader behaviours and characteristics observed or reported by others throughout all levels of the organisation. In comparison, immediate manager analysis investigated more intimately observed behaviours and characteristics of immediate managers. Within both phases of analysis there were some factors which consisted of conclusions or judgement statements. Table 6 lists factors common to both phases of analysis and those unique to company analysis and immediate manager analysis. Common factors were those in which respondents described similar behaviours underpinning their trust in the company and immediate managers.
Table 6  Common Factors, Unique Company Analysis Factors and Unique Immediate Manager Analysis Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTORS</th>
<th>COMPANY</th>
<th>IMMEDIATE MANAGER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provides Support</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open and Honest Communication</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Treatment</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honouring Commitments</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment of Role and Task Responsibilities</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Uncertainty</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propensity to Trust</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Competencies</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business / Decision Making Competencies</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides Benefits</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Obligations</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability of Managerial Personnel</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit Motives</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidentiality</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency and Predictability</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Limitations</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The factors that appeared in both sets of data provided a 6 x 2 matrix of frequency data for a Chi Square test of independence. The analysis showed that the distributions were significantly different Chi Square = 392.36; df = 5; p<0.001. Managers’ Competence, Benevolence, Context, and Propensity to Trust were significant contributors to that result.
Table 7  Frequency of Factors Found in the Company and Immediate Manager Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTORS</th>
<th>COMPANY</th>
<th>IMMEDIATE MANAGER</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managers’ Competence</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benevolence</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrity</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment of Role and Task Responsibility</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propensity to Trust</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>619</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.1 ALIGNMENT BETWEEN THE INTEGRATIVE MODEL & FACTORS IN THE CURRENT STUDY

5.1.1 Factors Aligned with Ability

Figure 26: Ability-Based Factors and Alignment with the Integrative Model of Organisational Trust (Mayer et al., 1995).
The factors Technical Competencies and Business / Decision Making Competencies were aligned with the ability component of the Integrative Model of Organisational Trust (Mayer et al., 1995). Within the Integrative Model, Ability referred to the skills and competencies that enabled managers (the trustees) to exercise influence in a particular context. In a similar vein, the factors described in this study identified both technical competencies, and business sense / decision making competencies as influencing employee perceptions of trust in the company. Given the description of competence-based behaviours within these factors, the Ability component of Mayer et al.’s, (1995) model will be termed Managers’ Competencies.

High trust was associated with the perception that management had the ability to make the right business decisions. Conversely, low trust was associated with the employees’ perception that management had made the wrong business decisions. Responses also revealed cues by which employees judged management competence. Employees reported low levels of trust when they perceived that their managers lacked good quality past experience, and skills in decision-making, departmental management and supervising team members.

Previously reported trust antecedents that identified similar behaviours to those described within Managers’ Competencies have included antecedent factors such as competence, ability and capability (Butler, 1991; Doney et al., 1998; Gabarro, 1987; Jarvenpaa et al., 1995; Mayer et al., 1995; Mishra, 1996). Within previous trust research competence, ability and capability have been expressed in terms of
perceived skill, business sense, interpersonal competence, effectiveness of leadership, and expertise.

McNight et al., (1998) analysed interview data from managers and their subordinates to reveal three sources of competence-based trust, two of which were described within the Managers’ Competencies factor. The first source of trust, Specific Competence was defined as competence in specialist knowledge required to do their specific job. The second source of trust, Business Sense, referred to generalised competence such as ‘good head for business’ and ‘sharp common sense’. Mishra (1996) similarly recognised that perceived competence described behaviours of a manager which ensured the organisation’s ability to survive in a competitive marketplace.

The Managers’ Competencies factor also aligns with Doney et al.’s, (1998) capability process by which willingness to trust is based on whether the trustor believes that the trustee will meet their obligation as demonstrated by competence, ability and expertise. The frequency with which competence, ability and capability have been reported as trust antecedents suggests that competence-based behaviours exercise a significant influence over perceptions of trust. However, Albrecht (2001) reported that trustee competence was only indirectly related to trust.

The Managers’ Competencies factor was unique to the company analysis and is comprised of employee responses based on their perception of generalised leader technical and business / decision making competencies. The absence of competency-
based factors within the immediate manager analysis suggests that employee perceptions of managers’ competence was not founded on intimacy or relationship development, but rather on their calculation of the likelihood that the manager would meet their obligations as demonstrated by competence, ability and expertise (Doney et al., 1998; Kramer, 1999; McNight et al., 1998). This difference may also be consistent with Albrecht’s finding that the relationship is indirect. That is, the measures used in his study enquired about trust in known people, rather than ‘the company’. Albrecht’s (2001) finding of an indirect relationship is echoed in the findings of this investigation, as managers’ competence appears only to be important in the absence of direct knowledge.

5.1.2 Factors Aligned with Benevolence
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Figure 27: Benevolence-Based Factors and Alignment with the Integrative Model of Organisational Trust (Mayer et al., 1995).
The Provides Support and Provides Benefits factors describe similar behaviours such as demonstration of concern, promoting employee well being and provision of employee benefits. These behaviours were benevolent acts, which justified alignment of Provides Support and Provides Benefits with Mayer et al.'s, (1995) Benevolence. The absence of reported definitions of 'caring' and 'demonstration of concern' suggests that prior researchers have been unclear about what these antecedents look like in the workplace; that is, what behaviours contribute to expressions of caring and demonstration of concern. The Provides Support and Provides Benefits factors go some way to describing these behaviours.

The factors of Provides Support and Provides Benefits were aligned with the Benevolence component of the Integrative Model of Organisational Trust (Mayer et al., 1995). The Provides Support factor was described within company and immediate manager analysis, whereas the Provides Benefits factor was only evident within company analysis. This finding suggests that the two types of Benevolence, Provides Support and Provides Benefits, have different impacts on employee trust. The absence of Provides Benefits within immediate manager analysis suggests that employees are aware that benefits don’t actually come from their immediate manager, but are usually provided by the company. Therefore employees don’t credit their immediate manager with providing benefits. It could also suggest that immediate leaders who simply provide benefits without providing support are not as effective because people don’t connect the trust-generating value of benefits to the leaders with whom they have close contact.
The Provides Support and Provides Benefits factors describe similar behaviours such as demonstration of concern, promoting employee well being and provision of employee benefits. These behaviours were benevolent acts, which justified alignment of Provides Support and Provides Benefits with Mayer et al.'s, (1995) Benevolence. The absence of reported definitions of ‘caring’ and ‘demonstration of concern’ suggests that prior researchers have been unclear about what these antecedents look like in the workplace; that is, what behaviours contribute to expressions of caring and demonstration of concern. The Provides Support and Provides Benefits factors go some way to describing these behaviours.

The factors of Provides Support and Provides Benefits were aligned with the Benevolence component of the Integrative Model of Organisational Trust (Mayer et al., 1995). The Provides Support factor was described within company and immediate manager analysis, whereas the Provides Benefits factor was only evident within company analysis. This finding suggests that the two types of Benevolence, Provides Support and Provides Benefits, have different impacts on employee trust. The absence of Provides Benefits within immediate manager analysis suggests that employees are aware that benefits don’t actually come from their immediate manager, but are usually provided by the company. Therefore employees don’t credit their immediate manager with providing benefits. It could also suggest that immediate leaders who simply provide benefits without providing support are not as effective because people don’t connect the trust-generating value of benefits to the leaders with whom they have close contact.
Mayer et al., (1995) defined Benevolence as the extent to which the trustee was willing to ‘do good’ by the truster. With reference to other antecedent factor research, the Provides Support and Provides Benefits factors align with previously identified trust antecedents of demonstration of concern, benevolence and caring (Jarvenpaa et al., 1995; Mayer et al., 1995; McNight et al., 1998; Mishra, 1996; Whitener et al., 1998). Mishra (1996) defined concern as the sincerity and caring exhibited by leadership, and posited that employees trust top management in part because they believe they are concerned about their wellbeing and welfare. Whitener et al., (1998) reported that managerial trustworthiness was enhanced by the manager’s demonstration of consideration and sensitivity for employees, acting in ways that protect the interests of employees, and avoiding exploitation. The importance of providing support and benefits is also acknowledged by the work of Eisenberger, Cummings, Arnell & Lynch (1997) and Rhoades & Eisenberger (2002) who report that perceived organisational support has a positive effect on the commitment of employees.

High trust behaviours associated with Provides Support included providing assistance with rehabilitation after injury, providing support with problems at home and shared responsibility for team mistakes. In contrast, low trust was associated with a perceived lack of support from the immediate manager and avoidance of managerial responsibility. With reference to Provides Benefits, high trust was associated with the provision of material supports such as housing support, family assistance, and monetary provisions such as rewards, savings plans and study allowances. Similar to Managers’ Competencies, Provides Benefits was derived from
employees' perception of generalised leader behaviours, not from specific interactions with their immediate manager. Associating levels of trust with the provision of benefits is very much a calculative process as employees weigh up the benefits associated with entering and continuing employment with the company (Doney et al., 1998).

5.1.3 Factors Aligned with Integrity

The factors of Open and Honest Communication, Honouring Commitments, Fair Treatment, Safety Obligations, Confidentiality, and Consistency and Predictability were aligned with the Integrity component of the Integrative Model of Organisational Trust (Mayer et al., 1995). The first three of these factors were identified within both company and immediate manager analysis. Safety Obligations was identified within the company analysis, whereas Confidentiality and Consistency and Predictability were unique to the immediate manager analysis (See Table 6).
5.1.3.1 Open and Honest Communication

The Open and Honest Communication factor is comparable to the trust antecedents of openness, open communication and honesty reported in previous trust research (Butler, 1991; Gabarro, 1987; Hart et al., 1986; McNight et al., 1998; Mishra, 1996; Mishra & Morrissey, 1990; Whitener et al., 1998). Gabarro (1987) identified openness as a character-based source of trust. Openness was defined as levelling with the person and being honest in the discussion of problems. Mishra (1996) similarly concluded that employees were more likely to hold trust in the organisation if they perceived the organisational leadership as open and honest. Cufaude (1999) identified three specific properties of communication that contributed to trust formation. These properties included the frequency of communication; the timeliness
of communication; and the forthrightness of communication. Similarly, Hart et al., (1986) described a series of communication properties that contributed to increased trust in the company. These properties included openly sharing information, communicating with accuracy, and communicating organisational goals, all of which were behaviours described within the present study.

In line with previous research, employees reported high levels of trust when they were kept informed of what was going on within the organisation. Behaviours of open and honest communication included providing honest answers to employee queries, holding regular meetings and updates, and avoiding ‘behind closed doors’ agendas. The distribution of information cards, communication of truthful information about site closure and providing truthful answers to questions ‘warts and all’ were reported as high trust behaviours. One respondent simply reported that having knowledge about what was going on equalled trust. In contrast, low trust responses described behaviours associated with being given incorrect information, and the perception that the company was withholding information. These employees also talked about a ‘culture of secrecy’ which contributed to rumour, suspicion and mistrust.

Open and honest communication builds trust because employees feel that the company considers their need or desire to be kept informed of what is happening within their workplace. These data suggest that employees perceive the absence of open and honest communication as a signal that the company has something to hide.
5.1.3.2 Honouring Commitments

The Honouring Commitments factor described within the current investigation can be likened to the previously identified trust antecedents of integrity and promise fulfilment (Butler, 1991; Gabarro, 1987; Jarvenpaa et al., 1995; Mayer et al., 1995; Whitener et al., 1998). Integrity and promise fulfilment were associated with the perception of honesty in the relationship and consistency between what was said would be done and what was actually done. Conway and Briner (2002) report that the relative importance of the promise contributes significantly to emotional reactions following broken and exceeded promises. Honouring Commitments was used to describe the factor because managers can’t always make promises come true, but they can always honour their commitment to trying to make them happen, and to helping people understand when commitments can’t be fulfilled.

Within the present study failure to honour commitments was characterised by low trust behaviours such as making promises and failing to deliver, and committing to actions that never came to fruition. Descriptions included saying one thing and doing another, and reneging on overtime or benefit commitments. The continual failure to honour commitments caused employees to become unresponsive to initiatives and projects introduced by management. In contrast, high trust responses described behaviours such as honouring commitments to employee wellbeing during site closure, and following through on agreed salary commitments. Within this study failure to honour commitments resulted in employees becoming unresponsive to new initiatives and projects thus thwarting efforts to increase the viability and
competitiveness of the company. Essentially, honouring commitments is crucial to business survival as change initiatives rely upon employee trust and employee commitment to making the desired changes.

5.1.3.3 Fair Treatment

Behaviours associated with the Fair Treatment factor included perceived equal treatment of different employee groups, leading by example, and fair treatment of employees during periods of organisational restructure and site closure. This factor was common to both phases of analysis and aligned with the Integrity component of the Integrative Model of Organisational Trust (Mayer et al., 1995). High trust behaviours included being treated equitably and being given a fair go. One employee reported that his level of trust in the company increased after he was reinstated when the charge that led to his dismissal was discovered to be unfounded. Similarly, high trust behaviours included being treated fairly and being looked after by the company in trying economic times. This factor was further characterized by behaviours which saw immediate managers lead by example and openly demonstrate their understanding of work tasks and what they involved.

Low trust responses described behaviours which involved employees being coerced into performing work tasks, signing agreements and becoming union members. Low trust was also associated with acts of perceived discrimination, including deliberate staff and award worker friction, inconsistent application of company policy and allocation of jobs based on group membership. With regards to the provision of
benefits, employees also reported that there was perceived discrimination between staff and award employees that caused the latter group to get fewer or poorer provisions.

Aligning Fair Treatment with other trust antecedents is difficult because of the absence of a definition of fairness in previous trust research literature. Butler (1991) listed fairness as a condition of trust but did not elaborate on the behaviours within the content analysis which led to identification of this factor. In terms of factor association, Fair Treatment aligns with the broader antecedent factor of integrity, defined by Mayer et al., (1995) as the trustor’s perception that the trustee will act honestly and adhere to set principles that the trustor deems acceptable. Specific examples of acting honestly/dishonestly and adherence/deviation from ‘acceptable’ principles were described within the Fair Treatment factor. Cunningham & MacGregor (2000) also reported fairness as a factor by which employees determine whether or not their supervisor can be trusted.

Although aligning Fair Treatment with other antecedent factors proves difficult it is important to make the link between behaviours described within this factor and organisational justice research. Organisational justice describes the role of fairness in the workplace and focuses on the processes by which employees perceived whether or not they had been treated fairly (Ayree, Budhwar & Chen, 2002; Hartman, Yrle & Galle, 1999; Lee, 2001; Tyler, 1989; Pillai, Williams & Tan, 2001). More recently, organisational justice has been found to be an important predictor of trust (Elovainio, Kivimaki & Vaherta, 2002; Pillai et al., 2002). Furthermore, Flaherty and Pappas
(2000) report that perceptions of procedural justice positively influence employees’ commitment to the organisation.

Organisational justice consists of two aspects, procedural and distributive justice. Although other dimensions have been explored the literature supports the conceptualisation of organisational justice as two-dimensional. Distributive justice is defined as the perceived fairness of the outcome (Chan, 2000; Pillai et al., 2001; Viswesvaran & Ones, 2002). In contrast, procedural justice examines employee reactions to the procedures used to determine a specific outcome. Employee perceptions of trust in the company and trust in the immediate manager were influenced by the way in which things were done, that is, procedural justice. This finding is also supported by Pillai et al., (2002) and Viswesvaran and Ones (2002).

5.1.3.4 Safety Obligations

The Safety Obligations factor was aligned with the Integrity component of the Integrative Model of Organisational Trust (Mayer et al., 1995). The identification of these behaviours within high trust responses suggests that, for a limited number of respondents, the companies’ focus on safe work practices had a very significant influence on their levels of trust. High trust levels were associated with the companies’ commitment to providing a safe workplace and the recent focus on safety initiatives and safety reviews.
Employees working within high-risk environments expect that the organisation will provide them with a safe working environment. This expectation can be likened to the ‘set principles’ referred to in Mayer’s (1995) definition of integrity. Hart et al., (1986) listed ‘providing safe working conditions’ as a sub-component of the Openness / Congruity factor. The authors offered little explanation of the provision of safe working conditions except to comment that it was a safety need and aligned with the safety needs element of Maslow’s (1970) Motivational Needs Hierarchy. The limited trust research conducted from an employee perspective may explain why this factor is typically not represented in existing models of organisational trust. Soliciting trust data from a management or executive perspective is unlikely to tap into Safety Obligation behaviours as managers may rarely find themselves performing technical, high-risk tasks.

The Safety Obligations factor was unique to the company analysis. Employees expect that the organisation will provide them with a safe working environment and for a few employees the calculation of whether the company provided this safety had a significant influence on trust. The responses associated with this factor were based upon calculative processes rather than direct interaction with the immediate manager.

5.1.3.5 Confidentiality

Confidentiality was unique to the immediate manager analysis and was aligned with the Integrity component of the Integrative Model of Organisational Trust (Mayer et al., 1995). This factor described behaviours associated with keeping confidences and
exercising discretion when communicating sensitive information. Confidentiality can be likened to the antecedent factor of discretion, defined by Gabarro (1987) as the perception that confidences will not be violated.

Higher levels of trust were reported by employees who had confidence in their immediate manager's ability to keep information confidential. High trust was also reported when immediate managers demonstrated their ability to keep confidences during successive interactions. In contrast, employees reported low levels of trust when confidentiality had been violated. Specific low trust behaviours included talking inappropriately about people and specific events in a public forum, and going through documentation that was not intended for viewing by that party.

Confidentiality was classified as an Integrity factor because employees held expectations that their immediate manager would keep confidences and exercise discretion. Similar to Safety Obligations, confidentiality in an employee/Immediate manager relationship is very much a ‘set principle’ (Mayer et al., 1995). That is, employees expect to be able to disclose personal and work-related information without fear that it will become public knowledge. Violations of these expectations resulted in the reporting of lower levels of trust, whereas adherence to confidentiality principles were associated with high trust.
5.1.3.6 Consistency and Predictability

The Consistency and Predictability factor was a unique immediate manager factor that highlighted the influence of congruous and expected behaviours on levels of trust. This factor was aligned with the integrity component of the Integrative Model of Organisational Trust (Mayer et al., 1995) because levels of trust were associated with the ‘set principle’ of consistency and predictability of immediate manager behaviours.

Consistency and Predictability can be likened to the antecedent factors of consistency of behaviour and reliability. Gabarro (1987) described consistency of behaviour as reliability and predictability of managers’ behaviours. Similarly, Whitener et al., (1998) and Cunningham and MacGregor (2000) report that behavioural consistency enabled employees to better predict the manager’s future behaviour and subsequently they were more willing to take risks. The factor of reliability as defined by Mishra (1996) likewise referred to employees’ expectations of consistent and dependable behaviour. Consistency and Predictability is also comparable to the cognitive trust-building predictive process described by Doney et al., (1998) which involves the analysis of consistency as demonstrated by previous action.

High trust was associated with being able to predict the behaviour of the immediate manager and knowing what to expect from him/her in specific situations. Employees who reported lower trust levels talked about having known their immediate manager for only short periods of time. These employees recognised that the relationship
between them and their immediate manager was still developing. These results suggest that until there has been sufficient contact between the employee and their immediate manager, employee trust will be based on his or her perceptions, beliefs or calculations about managers in general. Therefore, it is important that immediate managers quickly build a relationship with new team members in order for knowledge-based trust to replace calculus-based trust.

Confidentiality, and Consistency and Predictability were unique to immediate manager analysis. These factors described specific immediate manager behaviours that influenced trust. In support of this finding Cunningham & MacGregor (2000) reported that workers trust in their supervisor was composed of three elements, one of which was predictability. The responses associated with these factors were based upon the employees’ knowledge of their immediate managers’ behaviours resulting from frequent interaction and the development of relationships. Lewicki & Bunker (1996) reported the ‘stagewise evolution of trust’ which explains the gradual development of trust in professional relationships from calculus-based, to knowledge-based, to identification-based trust. Calculus-based trust is based on consistency of behaviour and clear consequences for violations of trust. Relationship building begins with this form of trust and progresses to knowledge-based trust when the employee has enough information about their immediate manager to understand them, and accurately predict their behaviour. Identification-based trust, which takes the longest time to develop, is evident when parties effectively understand, agree and empathise with each other (Lewicki & Bunker, 1996). The moderate and high trust data associated with these factors are aligned with the progression from calculus-
based trust to knowledge-based trust. Identification-based trust, which is evident in few professional relationships, is not easily recognisable within these data.

5.1.4 Factors Aligned with Propensity
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**Figure 29: Propensity to Trust and Alignment with the Integrative Model of Organisational Trust (Mayer et al., 1995).**

Propensity to Trust was aligned with the Trustor’s Propensity component of the Integrative Model of Organisational Trust (Mayer et al., 1995). Mayer et al., (1995) described propensity as a general willingness to trust others based upon developmental experiences, personality types and cultural backgrounds. This factor was evident within company and immediate manager analyses and consisted of two distinctive aspects. The first aspect included responses associated with individual differences in willingness to trust. Employees talked about how they would never
completely trust the company, no matter what it did to create, sustain and build trust. The second aspect included responses associated with past treatment of employees and the effect of past company actions on employees’ levels of trust. Employees who reported high levels of trust drew on their broad, past experience with the company. In contrast, other employees reported low levels of trust resulting from a small number of significant past experiences or events. Implicit in these responses is that some employees based their trust on broad evidence and, perhaps, reassessed their level of trust as damaging events receded into the distant past. Other employees based their trust on specific events and did not reassess their level of trust as time went by.

The second aspect of Propensity to Trust has not previously been discussed within current trust research. Trust research reports propensity in terms of developmental experiences, personality types and cultural backgrounds (Mayer et al., 1995; Whitener et al., 1998). This study suggests that organisational experiences manifest in a similar way to developmental experiences to influence the individual’s disposition to trust and their willingness to consider new and more recent evidence as a basis for trust. The responses contained within this aspect of the Propensity to Trust factor demonstrate the influence of a significant negative past event on reported levels of trust some years later.
5.1.5 Factors Not Represented in the Integrative Model

5.1.5.1 Investment of Role and Task Responsibilities
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Figure 30: Investment of Role and Task Responsibilities and Alignment with the Integrative Model of Organisational Trust (Mayer et al., 1995).

Investment of Role and Task Responsibilities includes behaviours associated with providing employees with some level of responsibility for decision-making thus building a two-way relationship through mutual trusting actions. This factor was evident within the company analysis and immediate manager analysis. Employees reported high levels of trust when they were trusted to be responsible and work unsupervised on shift, as well as make decisions on important tasks. Employees
reported that the act of being given responsibility was a strong indication that their immediate manager and the company as a whole trusted or had faith in their ability to perform the task.

Investment of Role and Task Responsibilities is comparable to previously reported trust antecedents of autonomy / feedback and sharing and delegation of control. Autonomy / Feedback was identified by Hart et al., (1986) and included variables related to employee participation, job freedom and reinforcement of autonomous behaviour. Similarly, Whitener et al., (1998) reported that employees were more likely to be trusting of managers if they were consulted and involved in decision-making processes. The act of sharing control demonstrates that the manager had significant trust and respect for the employee.

The trust mechanism in Investment of Role and Task Responsibilities is based upon regular exchanges and the expansion of relationships over time, i.e., knowledge-based trust (Kramer, 1999; Whitener et al., 1998). Within this factor trust building is threatened by a constantly changing management and lack of opportunity to develop trust-relevant knowledge. Investment of Role and Task Responsibilities describes how restrictions on responsibility and decision-making prevents employees from demonstrating their competence and building trust-relevant knowledge in the eyes of the company and their immediate manager.
5.1.5.2 Stability of Managerial Personnel

Stability of Managerial Personnel was a unique company factor that identified the detrimental effects of having an unstable or changeable management team. This factor did not align with relevant components of the Integrative Model of Organisational Trust (Mayer et al., 1995). Low trust was associated with constant changes in management and the influence of these changes on the continuation and support of existing programs and initiatives. Employees reported that having a ‘mobile management’ impaired their ability to develop relationships with management.
The responses associated with this factor identified the links between length of time having known the manager, opportunity for relationship development and level of trust. Importantly, this factor has implications for company policies regarding retention of managers, and the need to actively manage the impact on trust as familiar managers leave and unfamiliar managers arrive. The mechanism of trust identified in the Stability of Managerial Personnel is based upon regular exchanges and the expansion of relationships over time, i.e., knowledge-based trust (Kramer, 1999; Whitener et al., 1998). Similar to the preceding factor, trust building is threatened by a constantly changing management and lack of opportunity to develop trust-relevant knowledge.
5.1.5.3 Profit Motives

Figure 32: Profit Motives and Alignment with the Integrative Model of Organisational Trust (Mayer et al., 1995).

Profit Motives includes respondents' conclusions and judgements associated with company motivation to make a profit at the expense of employee welfare. This factor was unique to company analysis and was not comparable to components within the Integrative Model of Organisational Trust (Mayer et al., 1995).

Employees reported lower levels of trust as the result of the company's focus on profit and shareholder return. Low trust was also associated with employee
perceptions that the company would put the interests of the shareholders before those of the workforce. Employees believed they were a 'secondary consideration' and just 'pawns' in the game. Although the majority of these responses appeared within the moderate trust response category, it was evident that the motivation for profit exerted a negative influence on employee trust. A possible explanation for the moderate rating of these responses is attributable to employee awareness that the company needed to remain profitable and make economically based decisions in order to survive. The Profit Motives factor did not describe behaviours, rather it contained conclusions and judgement statements which identified a contextual influence that moderated levels of trust in the company.
Future Uncertainty consisted of employee responses that identified the influence of context on perceptions of trust in the company. This factor was unique to the company analysis and did not align with components of the Integrative Model of Organisational Trust (Mayer et al., 1995). High trust responses described the role of open communication in alleviating uncertainty. In contrast, low trust responses described how decision changes and unclear company direction left them feeling...
confused and unable to make future plans. Employees also talked about how future uncertainty had threatened their ability to commit to the organisation.

Future Uncertainty was precipitated by events surrounding organisational restructure and redundancy. Similar to Profit Motives, this context-specific factor highlights the moderating influence of future uncertainty on employee perceptions of trust. Importantly, Profit Motives and Future Uncertainty highlight the influence of context on employee perceptions of trust, and draw attention to the absence of representation of context-specific factors within Mayer et al.'s, (1995) model.
5.1.5.5 Role Limitations

The Role Limitations factor was unique to immediate manager analysis and acknowledged the predicament of immediate managers within the broader organisational context. These employees recognised that the behaviours of their immediate managers were not always attributable to individual actions, but rather were dictated by organisational systems, structure and policies.
Employees who reported high trust levels acknowledged the immediate managers’ predicament and the fact that decisions were made by people higher up the organisational hierarchy. Low trust respondents focused upon the company influence on decision-making and could not separate company influence from the actions of their immediate manager. The identification of this factor suggests that some employees possessed the insight to distinguish between specific actions of the immediate manager and those imposed by the organisation. Acknowledgment of this insight is not apparent within trust literature, as this factor is context specific.

Within the Profit Motives factors employees’ perceived that the primary company motivation was to make a profit, and that this may occur at the expense of employee welfare. This factor resulted from employees’ consideration of generalised leader behaviours. In counterpoint, the Role Limitations factor described employees’ acknowledgment that organisational systems, structure and policies dictated their immediate manager’s actions.

Detailed examination of associated responses for these two factors suggests that there is some moderating variable that can explain factor differences in company and immediate manager analysis. The Profit Motives factor is a function of employee perceptions of generalised company behaviours. In contrast, the Role Limitations factor is a function of employee perceptions of trust in their immediate manager based on frequent interaction. Thus, it is plausible that the observed difference in these factors is attributable to the intimacy and frequency of interaction.
The Profit Motives factor exists at the calculus-based level where relationship building begins and trust is based on consistency of behaviour and clear consequences for violations of trust (Kramer, 1999). In contrast, Role Limitations exists at the knowledge-based level where trust develops as a result of regular communication and exchange of information between parties (Kramer, 1999).

5.2 AN EXTENDED MODEL OF THE ANTECEDENTS OF ORGANISATIONAL TRUST

Figure 33 presents an extended model of the antecedents of organisational trust, Factors Influencing Employee Perceptions of Trust Within Organisations. Explanation of this model begins with a discussion of factor differences in company and immediate manager analyses and concludes with a justification of factor terminology and a description of model components. The nature of this research does not allow for conclusions about the direction of causality. The arrows represented of this model are adapted from the Mayer et al. (1995) model.
Fig 35: Factors Influencing Employee Perceptions of Trust Within Organisations
It is hypothesised that factor differences in the company and immediate manager analyses were a function of the degree of exposure to the specific behaviour, frequency of interaction and resulting depth of relationship. This hypothesis suggests that factors unique to the company analysis were derived from employees’ perceptions of generalised leader behaviours and characteristics. These perceptions may be activated by a calculative process whereby employees weigh up the costs and benefits associated with making a ‘trusting’ decision. For example, employees’ perceptions of Managers’ Competencies is based on their calculation of the likelihood that managers will meet their obligation as demonstrated by competence, ability and expertise (Doney et al., 1998; Lewicki & Bunker, 1996). A similar trust mechanism may have operated for the remaining unique company analysis factors, where perceptions were based upon a calculation of trust rather than direct experience of the behaviours.

Unique immediate manager factors were derived from employees’ direct and intimate experience of interactions with their immediate manager. The mechanisms underlying these perceptions were driven by knowledge and consistency of behaviour as demonstrated by previous actions (Doney et al., 1998; Lewicki & Bunker, 1996). Factors present in both analyses include Provides Support, Open and Honest Communication, Honouring Commitments, Fair Treatment, Investment of Role and Task Responsibilities, and Future Uncertainty.
Within this extended model of organisational trust, the mechanism that distinguishes calculus-based factors from knowledge-based factors is labelled Hierarchical Distance. Hierarchical Distance represents the degree of exposure to the specific behaviour and frequency of interaction which influences the development of trust. Common factors appear not to be influenced by Hierarchical Distance as respondents described similar behaviours in responses to questions about their trust in the company and immediate managers. However, because the Company questions did not ask respondents to distinguish between immediate managers and managers further up the organisational hierarchy, the influence of distance is unclear for these factors. The notion of hierarchical distance is supported by McAllister (1995) who states that some level of cognition-based trust is necessary for affect-based trust to develop.

Within the extended model of organisational trust, individual factors are aligned with Ability, Benevolence, Integrity and Propensity as depicted in the Integrative Model of Organisational Trust (Mayer et al., 1995). Managers' Competencies is used rather than Ability, as this term more accurately represents the technical and business / decision making competencies described by employees. Benevolence and Integrity remain within the model to represent the factors of Provides Support and Benefits, Safety Obligations, Open and Honest Communication, Honouring Commitments, Fair Treatment, Confidentiality and Consistency and Predictability.
Propensity is represented by Propensity to Trust and the two aspects of Disposition to Trust and Disposition to Consider New Evidence. Disposition to trust aligns with Mayer et al.'s, (1995) and Whitener et al.'s, (1998) Propensity factor. This antecedent factor is a mediating factor that influences trust.

The Investment of Role and Task Responsibilities component and the Contextual Factors component were unique to this investigation. Investment of Role and Task Responsibilities includes behaviours associated with providing employees with some level of responsibility for decision-making. The contextual component encompasses the factors Stability of Managerial Personnel, Profit Motives, Future Uncertainty and Role Limitations. Mayer et al., (1995) acknowledged the influence of context on consequences of trust and assessment of trust antecedents, but did not represent contextual factors within the Integrative Model of Organisational Trust (Mayer et al., 1995). The responses contained within these factors were based on judgements and conclusions drawn by the employee, rather than actual observed behaviours.
CHAPTER 6 CONCLUSION

6.1 CRITIQUE OF THIS STUDY

This study used data from semi-structured interviews conducted in two related mining companies to investigate factors influencing employee perceptions of trust within organisations. Methodological shortcomings that need to be addressed within future research investigations include the imposition of interviewer beliefs, question structure and quality of behavioural descriptions, absence of member checks, and demographics of the sample. This critique describes the impact of these limitations, and how they can be addressed.

The integrative quality of Mayer et al.'s, (1995) dyadic model made it a useful framework from which to report factors influencing employee perceptions of trust in the company and trust in the immediate manger. In critiquing this study it should be noted that the model was used to summarise the trust relationship between employees and the company, which is not purely a dyadic relationship. It is also important to consider why factors appeared in this study were not present in the Mayer et al. (1995) model. The primary reason for these differences can be attributed to the data management processes. The Mayer et al. (1995) model summarised antecedent factors research and reduced the data to present an integrative model. The data management process within this study was more austere and sought to explore in detail behavioural descriptions.
Furthermore, the extent to which the results of this study can be generalised to other organisations should be considered. This study involved employees from two separate businesses that operate within a larger organisation. Given that the two organisations surveyed operate with similar management philosophies it is important to be cautious about generalisation to other organisations. Rigorous testing of the model in future research is therefore strongly encouraged. It is also important that future research considers exploring the quantitative validation of these factors.

It is important to acknowledge that the imposition of the interviewer’s beliefs and values may have influenced the recording of data. The interviews were recorded by hand, and the consultant reports that she recorded them as close to verbatim as was possible. However, because writing is a slower process than speaking, highly accurate written records of interviews are difficult to achieve. The recording was, therefore, guided to some extent by what the interviewer thought was important. The imposition of interviewers’ beliefs and values is a common shortcoming of research of this nature. Future research might be able to better manage this bias by verbatim transcription of interviews using audio tape recordings. Where recording is not desirable, increasing interviewer awareness of belief imposition, and using multiple interviewers for triangulation purposes would be recommended. It is also important to acknowledge the influence of historical or era effects given that the surveys were conducted over a period of four years and this could have affected levels or types of trust amongst workers in the sample. It is also important to acknowledge the
possibility of 'feedback effects' associated with informing managers and workers about levels and types of trust existing within the organisation.

Other limitations to this study include the interview question structure and quality of behavioural descriptions. When asked to explain their 'trust in the company' rating, employees' were not explicitly asked to exclude those behaviours of the immediate manager. Therefore, trust in the company analysis is likely to have included behaviours of immediate managers. Secondly, some responses were not behavioural; rather they were judgement statements and conclusions drawn by respondents. (It should be noted that Contextual and Trustor Factors were legitimately non-behavioural as they described the organisational environment and the influence of individual differences in willingness to trust.) Where leader behaviour factors contained few behavioural descriptions, the provision of a behavioural definition of that factor was hampered. These factors should be considered as provisional and require further investigation in order to establish their influence on employee perceptions of trust. These factors were reported because of the exploratory nature of this study and the fact they remain interesting. In terms of factor formations it should be noted that the researcher and her supervisor explored the behavioural descriptions in the context of Mayer et al.'s, (1995) pre-existing framework. In critiquing the methodology of this study factor reliability could have been more rigorous if a panel of experts had been engaged to review factor formations.
Factor reliability also needs to be mentioned in terms of factor formations. Due to the volume of associated factor data engaging a panel of experts to review the factor formations ensured the reliability of factors elicited from company and immediate manager analysis.

To address these methodological shortcomings, future research needs to ensure that employees discuss behaviours of their immediate manager and those of the company as discrete influences. This will enable the analyses of specific company behaviours and specific immediate manager behaviours. Furthermore, the semi-structured interview format should be used to the interviewer’s advantage to seek clarification when the respondent’s answer is vague, unclear or not strictly behavioural. Having an understanding of trust behaviours described within this study will assist the interviewer in clarifying behaviours and discovering new behaviours. Mastery of this technique is therefore crucial in the future pursuit of recording high quality behavioural descriptions.

The absence of member checks is also a methodological shortcoming as employees were not provided with the opportunity to judge the accuracy and credibility of these findings. This approach involves taking data, analyses, interpretations and conclusions back to the employee so that they may provide alternate language, critical observations and interpretations (Creswell, 1998). The difficulty in applying member checks is attributable to the use of pre-existing data. Future research can
eliminate this limitation by ensuring that member checks form an integral part of the research methodology.

Another methodological issue that warrants consideration is the demographics of the sample. The interviews were conducted with predominantly lower level employees in two Australian mining organisations. Employees working within this environment were primarily male; therefore, this study represents trust perceptions of lower level male employees. Future research could address this shortcoming by extending the sample to include a greater percentage of lower level female employees. Examining differences in what male and female employees attend to in ‘trusting’ may provide for interesting discussion. Furthermore, as the demographic make-up of the management in these organisations was also predominantly male, future research could examine employee perceptions of trust in organisations that have a significant number of women in management positions. Future research may also want to investigate the concept of entitativity and its influence on group cohesion and trust. High entitativity is associated with organisations whose employees share common values and common outcomes through teamwork. In contrast low entitativity is associated with organisations whose employees work independently, have diverse backgrounds and receive rewards based upon individual efforts (Hamilton, Sherman & Lickel, 1998; Lickel, Hamilton, Wieczorkowska, Lewis, Sherman & Uhles; 2000).
6.2 SUMMARY

Antecedent factor research has involved the application of social psychological theory as well as analysis of qualitative data to elicit antecedent factors. Whilst it has provided important insights into conditions that promote trust formation, the limited enquiry into the perspective of low hierarchical level employees means that there is a relatively poor understanding of the trust-related meaning that these employees make of managers' behaviour.

The Integrative Model of Organisational Trust (Mayer et al., 1995) summarised the majority of antecedent factor research and, thus, provided a useful framework in which to examine factors elicited within the present study. Sixteen factors were elicited from company and immediate manager analysis to form an extended model of the antecedents to organisational trust, Factors Influencing Employee Perceptions of Trust Within Organisations.

Differences in factors elicited in company and immediate manager analysis were discussed in terms of Hierarchical Distance, which represented the mechanism that distinguished calculus-based factors from knowledge-based factors. Many of the factors elicited from company analysis were aligned with calculus-based trust as employee perceptions of generalised leader behaviours were based upon a calculation of trust rather than direct experience of the behaviours. In contrast, factors described within immediate manager analysis were derived from employees'
direct and intimate experiences of interactions with their immediate manager, and were thus based on knowledge and consistency of behaviour as demonstrated by previous actions.

This study addressed shortcomings of current organisational trust research by investigating predominantly lower level employee perceptions of trust between them and the managers of their employing organisation. The behavioural-based focus of this research provides important clarity about how a leader needs to behave. The behaviours contained within the factors provide explicit descriptions which can be used to develop leaders who contribute to high trust cultures. Furthermore, these descriptions provide clarity for companies about what employees attend to in ‘trusting’.

This study also examined the possible influence of proximity, which was revealed in factor differences in company and immediate manager analysis. Differences in company and immediate manager factors suggest that hierarchical distinction warrants further investigation in future research of this nature. Importantly, this distinction highlights the progression from calculus-based to knowledge-based trust and the influence this has on employee perceptions of trust within organisations and subsequent relationship development.

Future research of this nature needs to focus on the clarification of common factors and impact of hierarchical distance on trust. There also needs to be an increasingly
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vigilant pursuit of behavioural descriptions which better characterise trusting behaviours. Future research could contribute greatly to antecedent factor research by characterising relationships and investigating behaviours contributing to the identification-based trust (the third and highly desirable iteration of trust reported by Lewicki & Bunker, 1996). Furthermore, research of this nature needs to be extended to include trust perceptions of lower and middle level female employees in organisations where there are a significant number of women in management positions.

Another interesting issue that warrants consideration in future research is the influence of work groups on trust. Moreland & Levine (2000) report that most employees are more committed to their work groups, than the organisation. Similarly, Edmonson (1999) presents a model of team learning that suggests shared beliefs held by members of a team mediate interpersonal risk taking. Given the growing reliance on team structures within contemporary organisations, it appears critical that trust within work teams be further investigated.
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