



# *Journal of Arts & Humanities*

## Context-Specific Dimensions of Trust in Manager, Subordinate and Co-Worker in Organizations

Ferda Erdem<sup>1</sup>, Janset Özen-Aytemur<sup>2</sup>

### ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to determine the dimensions of trust relationship among managers, subordinates and the co-workers in organizations. Using an original trust questionnaire data has been collected from 550 middle-level managers from organizations operating in different regions of Turkey. Results from both qualitative and quantitative research methods indicate that the dimensions of trust vary in organizational relationships between managers and subordinates and between co-workers and furthermore, that a culture-specific meaning is attributed to its content. This study contributes to trust literature developing three original sub-scales and also it indicates that the meaning of trust in organizational relationships is influenced by cultural context.

**Key words:** Organizational trust, Trust in co-worker, Trust in manager, Trust scale, Trust in subordinate.

Available Online: 30th October 2014

MIR Centre for Socio-Economic Research, USA.

### 1.0 Introduction

Trust is a critical element in organizational life. If trust is built into the norms of an organization, then the transaction costs in the organization diminish; volunteering for cooperation between the members, altruistic behaviours and the extra-role behaviours increase, compliance of the members with the

<sup>1</sup> Faculty of Economic and Administrative Sciences, Akdeniz University, Turkey. E-mail: aydemfr@gmail.com

<sup>2</sup> Faculty of Economic and Administrative Sciences, Akdeniz University, Turkey.

organizational rules is facilitated, conflicts are reduced (Kramer, 1999; Tyler, 2003), the need for formal agreements, opportunistic behaviour and the need for hierarchical control (Davis, Schoorman, Mayer & Tan, 2000) decrease; the perception of justice (Kickul, Gundry & Posig, 2005) is mediated and interpersonal cooperation and teamwork (Modassir & Singh, 2008) are improved. However, trust is a very complicated and fragile phenomenon and not easily established and sustained in relationships between individuals or groups, especially in postmodern organizations under pressure to be flexible and change continually. Strong human relations are probably more important than ever in organizational life.

The phenomenon of trust has been extensively explored by a cross section of social sciences including economics, sociology, psychology and organization sciences. Ebert (2009) explains that the number of studies on trust increased after 1993 peaking in 2003, and that the majority of publications relate to the fields of human resource management, marketing, strategy, and psychology. The points underlined by Ebert support the idea that organization and management sciences are strong references for the debates on trust. McKnight & Chervany (2000), on the other hand, claim that a cross-disciplinary approach is needed to explore trust because such an approach provides *a richer, better-balanced model and this is especially important to represent complex organizational phenomena*.

Organizational trust literature has expanded with an increasing number of research projects such as *the cognitive-affective differentiation of trust* (McAllister, 1995); *the nature and structure of workers' trust in management* (Clark & Payne, 1997); *communication- trust relationship in the virtual teams* (Jarvenpaa & Leidner, 1999); *the effect of the performance appraisal system on trust* (Mayer & Davis, 1999); *trust building processes* (Brashear, Boles, Bellenger & Brooks, 2003); *predictors of employee trust of their CEO* (Costigan, Insinga, Krana, Kureshov & Ilter, 2004); *managerial and organizational trust* (Hubbell & Chory-Assad, 2005); *supervisor trustworthiness and subordinates' extra-role efforts* (Lapierre, 2007); *trust in co-workers* (Tan & Lim, 2009); *trust across multiple organizational levels* (Fulmer & Gelfand, 2012), which all can be shown as examples of studies exploring various aspects of trust in organizations. Nonetheless, the studies in this field progress problematically. Firstly, there are too many analysis levels and multiple relationship types within each level. Once the nature of the relationships changes, the dimensions of trust also change. While some studies conceptualize or measure trust, they ignore some aspects and the basis of their choices is not so clear. A far greater problem is the fact that the meanings attributed to human phenomena are not the same in every socio-cultural context and thus the meaning of trust can vary. Researchers often try to measure the phenomenon by applying Anglo-Saxon trust scales on different cultures whereas it is debatable to what extent the items included in the scales measure the cultural meanings. There is no doubt that this problem not only applies to research projects on trust, but also constitutes the most crucial point in paradigm debates in social sciences. In recent years, significant evidence reinforcing the emic approach, which argues that human phenomena and concepts can only be understood by analysing their meanings in the culture they belong to, has been accumulated in the field of social sciences. Nevertheless, the phenomenon of trust has not assumed a strong position in the concerned debates.

## 2.0 Literature review

### 2.01 Trust in organizational relationships

In a relationship, trust means that one person believes in the competence and honesty of the other party as well as relying on the predictability of their behaviour (Mayer, Davis & Schoorman, 1995). The parties also develop an expectation that the other person will not cause any damage to him/her or abuse him/her (Rousseau, Sitkin, Burt & Camerer, 1998). According to Cummings & Bromiley (1996), trust is a belief “*according to which another partner (individual or group) a) makes good faith efforts to behave in accordance with any commitments both explicit or implicit, (b) is honest in whatever negotiations preceded such commitments, and (c) does not take excessive advantage of another even when the opportunity is available*”.

These definitions deal with trust from the perspective of the parties of a relationship. However, it is necessary to analyse the context in which the relationship develops and continues for an in-depth understanding of a trust relationship. This is because a trust relationship is shaped by the characteristics of the context that the parties encounter, just like organizational trust. *Organizational trust is viewed as positive expectations individuals have about the intent and behaviours of multiple organizational members based on organizational roles, relationships, experiences, and interdependencies* (Shockley-Zalabak, Ellis & Winograd, 2000). This means that organizational trust is created in an authentic social context associated with the culture of the organization. The elements of contexts such as *specific communication networks and structures, the manner in which relationship and hierarchies are built and maintained, and the means by which tasks are achieved will influence the nature of trust that develops* (Binikos, 2008).

Undoubtedly, all these explanations are helpful in understanding trust in organizational relationships but there is a difficult phenomenon to be analysed due to its complex and problematic structure. For example, the nature of relationships varies in different organizational levels and thus the parties' expectations of a trust relationship may also vary. Therefore, the questions of which level of trust and whom to trust are important for the analysis of this phenomenon (Fulmer & Gelfand, 2012). Moreover, *to measure, understand, and explain trust, it is important to identify the dimensions of trust* (Krot & Lewicka, 2012).

## 2.02 Multitype structure of trust in organizational relationships

The dynamic of formal relationships shaped in the fields of authority and responsibility in organizational life is different from that of the informal relationships shaped in personal fields. One party in a formal relationship takes his/her position according to the level of authority she/he enjoys in relation to the other. The level of authority is asymmetrical in vertical relationships which is in favour of the manager; whereas, the parties of a lateral relationship enjoy equal authority levels. Such differences in power and authority levels between the parties also differentiate the expectations they have of each other. Thus naturally, trust between managers and employees and between co-workers gains a relationship-specific content.

The most frequently studied research topic in organizational trust literature is the trust employees have in their managers such as supervisors, managers or work-group leaders (Costigan, Ilter & Berman, 1998; Tan & Lim, 2009). *If the subordinates trust their managers, the attribution of motives will be positive* (Kramer, 1996). Tan & Tan (2000), however, argues for a holistic approach. They think that there is a spillover effect to the whole organization when a subordinate and a supervisor trust each other.

Research points to different dimensions of trust placed in the manager. Whitener, Brodt & Korsgaard (1998) explains the basic dimensions of the behaviour of a trustworthy manager as behavioural consistency, behavioural integrity, sharing and delegation of control, communication (e.g. accuracy, openness), and demonstration of concern and this constitutes the reference for many subsequent studies (Ugboro, 2003; Cardona & Elola, 2003; Hubbell & Chory-Assad, 2005; Burke, Sims, Lazzara & Salas, 2007). Likewise, ability, benevolence and integrity as the dimensions of trustworthiness developed by Mayer & Davis (1999) are the most commonly used structures in the analyses of the behaviours of a trustworthy manager (Ristig, 2009).

The less frequently studied type of trust relationship compared to research into the trust placed in managers is the trust relationship between co-workers. However, co-worker relationships have a rather richer content such as support, identity and friendship (Shin, Daly & Vera, 2007). Besides, working models based on lateral relationships in organizations (e.g. teamwork) have become more widespread, which has rendered trust more critical in co-worker relationships. One of the best-known studies on this topic was conducted by McAllister (1995). In this study, the impact of the cognitive dimension of trust in lateral organizational relationships was found to be more prominent on the organizational citizenship behaviour and performance compared to its affective dimension. The author of a recent

study Dar (2010) states that two topics are explored more in the studies on co-workers' trustworthiness: Co-workers' trustworthiness factors are ability, benevolence and integrity or co-workers' positive behaviours. However, the author emphasizes that there is still a need for further in-depth studies on co-workers' trustworthiness and that especially negative and positive behaviours as predictors of trust still need to be explored. Similarly Tan & Lim (2009) argues that the development of studies related to co-workers' trustworthiness will add a different perspective to trust literature.

Another, less explored trust structure is the trust placed by a manager in her/his subordinates. However, managers and their subordinates are the parties of a social exchange. *If either member of the dyad has a lack of trust, it is difficult to maximize the potential outcomes evolving from this relationship* (Brower, Lester, Korsgaard & Dineen, 2009). Stating that a manager needs to learn how to trust her/his subordinates as much as s/he needs to gain their trust, Connell, Ferres & Travaglione (2003) and Brower, Lester, Korsgaard & Dineen, (2009) draw attention to the fact that such an attitude affects the work outcome of a subordinate positively.

Some scholars highlight the relationship between trust and control (Andersen, 2005). Tavanti (2008) includes the views of some earlier studies in his paper relating to transactional leadership and specifies that managers face a 'trust– control' dilemma: *When the managers' trust in their subordinates reduces, they must increase their supervision and control of the activities*. Conducting one of the recent studies, Qingquan & Huimin (2010) also support this view and emphasize that *the degree of supervisor's trust in subordinate (beliefs on integrity, benevolence and ability) would positively relate to his/her desire of risk-taking from empowering behaviour*. Nevertheless, although it is claimed that a subordinate-senior relationship is based on the mutual degree of reliability, confidence, and security (Strateir, 2005), the dimensions of trust are not as clear as in the other structures.

On the other hand, the most important aspect overlooked in trust studies is the likelihood that the meaning of trust might vary in different cultural contexts. Another important question encountered in the studies is the weakness of the scales in measuring the trust perceptions in different cultural contexts. However, *trust is sensitive to culture* (Hofstede, Fritz, Canavari, Oosterkamp & Sprundel, 2010). Doney, Cannon & Mullen (1998) and Yuki, Maddux, Brewer & Takemura (2005) argue that *different cognitive processes for the development of trust is based on the differences in norms, values and underlying behavioural assumptions of different national cultures*. Schoorman, Mayer & Davis (2007) point out that the studies conducted on trust for many years are now required to focus on new problems and *context-specific models* that create new dimensions for the future studies on trust. According to the authors, *culture can also affect the perception of ability, benevolence, and integrity and the importance given to each of these variables in the model*. Conducting one of the recent studies, Schumann, Wangenheim, Stringfellow, Yang, et al. (2010) draw attention to the cultural differences in people's ways of developing trust or the tendency to trust (Huff & Kelley, 2003).

This research article focuses on the trust relationships between managers- subordinates and between co-workers by developing a culture-specific scale in Turkish organizational context.

### 3.0 Method

The first stage of the research consisted of a qualitative analysis exploring the dimensions and meanings of trust in the framework of varying organizational relationships. Open-ended questionnaires were communicated via mail and e-mail to middle management working in medium and large-scale companies registered to the Industrialists and Businessmen Associations in 6 provinces in different regions of Turkey. The respondents were asked to write descriptive terms regarding the characteristics of managers, subordinates and co-workers that create trust. The reason why the middle-level managers were included in the research was that their positions within their companies enabled them to experience three types of organizational relationships. The reason why managers were chosen from different regions of Turkey was to ensure diversity that could represent the Turkish organizations.

At this stage, responses were received from 102 managers and content analysis was applied to the returned forms. The statements in the forms relating to the trustworthiness of managers, subordinates and co-workers were grouped according to criteria including “frequent repetition”, “having the same meaning” and “preserving descriptions that are specific to Turkish language”. An item pool consisting of statements based on refined original descriptions was created. Furthermore, there were some descriptions in the forms that were in harmony with the ones used in current literature on organizational trust and they were also included in the item pool. The first version of the questionnaire containing 109 items for three sub-scales (63 items for trust in managers, 24 items for trust in co-workers, 22 items for trust in subordinates) was designed according to the 5-point Likert scale.

Before the main research, a pilot research was conducted in order to test the validity of the content of the items relating to the three sub-scales (Hinkin and Schriesheim, 1989). 122 middle-level managers who were still attending the “Professional Management Certificate Programme” run by the researchers’ university and who were working in medium and large-scale companies operating in different sectors participated in the pilot research. The data obtained from the pilot research was revised by conducting descriptive analyses, internal consistency analyses and relational analyses by means of statistical software package while some of the items in the draft scale were excluded. In conclusion, a 5-point Likert scale with 72 items that measure trust in managers (40 items), in co-workers (20 items) and in subordinates (12 items) was obtained for the main research.

### 3.01 Participants

The population of the main research included middle-level managers working in different regions of the country. In order to determine the sample, the researchers first drafted a list of names and addresses of the companies that were members of the Industrialists and Businessmen Associations in 17 provinces in 7 geographical regions of Turkey as well as the medium and large-scale companies operating in Organized Industry Zones in those provinces. Then, the questionnaires containing the final version of the scale were communicated either directly to the middle-level managers of the companies via e-mail, fax, mail/cargo or through the HRM department of the companies. In this way, 1512 middle-level managers were reached and 550 questionnaires were returned. 542 forms for the sub-scale on trust in managers, 531 forms for the sub-scale on trust in co-workers and 468 forms for the sub-scale on trust in subordinates were useable. The middle-level managers were predominantly male (64%) and university graduates (66%). Those who were employed for 3 to 10 years dominated the sample (47%).

### 3.02 Data analysis

At this stage, descriptive and relational analyses were first conducted for the three sub-scales by means of SPSS software package. The average values, standard deviation and Cronbach Alpha values of the items in the scales were calculated. The items with high standard deviation were excluded. The values for correlation between the remaining items were calculated. These values showed that the items in all scales had internal consistency ( $\geq 0.50$ ) (Berthon, Ewing & Hah, 2005).

Following the descriptive and relational analyses, first explanatory factor analysis and then confirmatory factor analysis were performed by dividing 50% of the data set available in the statistical software package into two by the function ‘randomly select’ (Krzystofiak, Cardy & Newman, 1988; Hinkin, 1998). KMO for the three sub-scales (Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin) was greater than 0.90 and the total explained variances were acceptable for scale construction. With the explanatory factor analysis, the basic factors for each of three sub-scales were found. Items with a factor lower than 0.40 or items with a value greater than 0.40 but attributed to multiple factors were excluded from the scale. The resulting scale construction contained 3 factors for trust in managers; 2 factors for trust in subordinates and 3 factors for trust in co-workers (Table 1).

**Table 1:** Results of the explanatory factor analysis related to the scales

TRUST IN MANAGER		$\alpha$	Explained Variance	Factor Loads
<b>1. Factor: Competence</b>		0.92	%26.342	
I trust my manager's knowledge about her/his job.				0.864
I trust my manager's experience.				0.854
I trust my manager's working discipline.				0.734
My manager has a good command of her/his job.				0.818
My manager organizes the work well.				0.710
My manager is successful in solving complex problems.				0.667
My manager absolutely overcomes problems we face regarding the work.				0.647
<b>2. Factor: Protectorate</b>		0.89	%23.916	
My manager is loyal.				0.683
I consider my manager to be a safe harbour to shelter.				0.634
My manager is interested in my personal problems.				0.814
My manager is interested whether I'm happy with my work or not.				0.740
My manager does not hurt me on purpose.				0.722
My manager is always sensitive to my priorities.				0.784
My manager is forgiving.				0.693
<b>3. Factor: Justice</b>		0.89	%18.171	
My manager acts fairly in handing out rewards.				0.798
What I trust most in my manager is that she's/he's fair.				0.676
My manager assesses her/his staff's performance impartially.				0.730
My manager maintains her/his impartiality when managing conflict.				0.682
My manager applies work-related rules equally to all.				0.632
KMO 0.94	General $\alpha = 0.94$	Total Explained Variance % 68		
TRUST IN SUBORDINATE		$\alpha$	Explained Variance	Factor Loads
<b>1. Factor: Competence</b>		0.86	%31.614	
I trust that my subordinate will fulfil her/his task even though I'm not supervising them				0.798
My subordinate takes ownership of her/his work.				0.765
My subordinate tries to develop herself/himself.				0.680
My subordinate does not make big mistakes relating to her/his job.				0.654
My subordinate is capable of solving problems.				0.751
I trust my subordinate's knowledge about her/his job.				0.710
I can delegate some of my responsibilities to my subordinate without any hesitation.				0.593
<b>2. Factor: Honesty</b>		0.89	%30.626	
My subordinate always respects her/his seniors.				0.717
I trust that my subordinate will not lie.				0.882
My subordinate never stabs me in the back.				0.863
My subordinate is a man/woman of his/her word.				0.827
My subordinate is always consistent in what s/he says and does.				0.724
KMO 0.90	General $\alpha = 0.89$	Total Explained Variance % 62		
TRUST IN CO-WORKER		$\alpha$	Explained Variance	Factor Loads
<b>1. Factor: Personal Trustworthiness</b>		0.91	%32.093	
I trust that my co-worker will keep her/his promise.				0.768
My co-worker is frank.				0.751
My co-worker does not lie.				0.745
I have not witnessed my co-worker acting unjustly in her/his decisions.				0.689
My co-worker behaves fairly to staff affiliated to her/him.				0.649
My co-worker is not partial in conflict.				0.695

What I trust the most in my co-worker is that s/he is fair.			0.818
I trust my co-worker so much that I can make friends with her/him.			0.713
<b>2. Factor: Competence</b>	<b>0.81</b>	<b>%18.762</b>	
I trust my co-worker's knowledge about her/his job.			0.777
I always take account of my co-worker's suggestions relating to work.			0.838
My co-worker guides her/his staff in relation to the work.			0.675
I trust my co-worker's intuitions.			0.666
<b>3.Factor: Selfishness</b>	<b>0.69</b>	<b>%12.929</b>	
My co-worker is malevolent in her/his criticism.			0.537
My co-worker puts personal interest before the group's interest.			0.852
My co-worker is proficient in tipping the scales in her/his favour whenever s/he finds the opportunity.			0.839
KMO 0.91   General $\alpha = 0.94$	Total Explained Variance % 64		

At the next stage, in order to determine to what extent the factors found explained the three trust structures, a confirmatory analysis was performed by using the second section of the data set. LISREL software package was used at this stage and the factor structures determined through the explanatory factor analysis were designed as a measurement model by using “path diagrams”. The measurement model that was created for each scale was tested by using different fit indexes. The data available in the fit indexes that were within the acceptable range is presented in Table 2. According to the results obtained at this stage, every variable can explain the factor it belongs to alone at a significant level but with a minor error margin together with the other variables.

**Table 2:** Fit Indexes for the measurement models (\*)

Trust in manager							
$\chi^2$	sd	RMSEA	GFI	AGFI	CFI	TLI	NFI
419.610	151	0.071	0.86	0.83	0.98	0.97	0.96
Trust in subordinate							
133.303	49	0,08	0.91	0.86	0.97	0.96	0.96
Trust in co-worker							
273.500	89	0.08	0.88	0.84	0.96	0.96	0.95

(\*) Chi-Square ( $\chi^2$ ); Root Mean Square Error Approximation (RMSEA); Goodness of Fit Index (GFI); Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index (AGFI); Comparative Fit Index (CFI); Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI); Normed Fit Index (NFI)

### 3.03 Findings

According to the findings: 1) The composition of the dimensions of trust is unique to the relationship between manager- subordinate and between co-workers 2) and also the meaning of dimension varies according to the type of relationship 3) the cultural perceptions influence the content of dimensions. In the light of these preliminary findings, the following considerations can be suggested for each relationship:

#### 3.3.1 Dimensions of the scale on trust in managers

The scale on trust in managers consists of three dimensions: *competence, protection and justice*. Competence was found to be the strongest aspect of trust in managers. Consisting of the elements of knowledge about the job, job experience, good command of the job, organizational skills and problem-solving performance, competence dimension is similar to the dimension found in previous studies (Mishra, 1996; Shockley-Zalaback, Ellis & Winograd, 2000; Perry & Lawrence, 2007; Ballinger, Schoorman & Lehman, 2009). If one party perceives the other as competent, this facilitates placing trust in that person (Mayer, Davis & Schoorman, 1995); and employees perceive especially the problem-solving skills of their managers as a matter of competence (Dunn, Lawson, Robertson, Underwood, et.al, 2000). In communities with high power distance, however, this expectation is stronger; managers are expected to solve all problems immediately, display wisdom and proof of detailed knowledge

(Sargut, 2001). Turkish culture is characterized by a high power distance (Hofstede, 1985) and vertical relations to which more meanings are attributed. Therefore, it is not surprising to find the competence of managers as a strong dimension of trust.

On the other hand, one of the original aspects of the scale on trust in managers is *protectorate*. Trust literature focuses on how managers should be interested in the needs of their subordinates, assist them, and protect their interests (Whitener, Brodt & Korsgaard, 1998; Hubbell & Chory-Assad, 2005). However, it was found in this study that managers were expected not only to be interested in their subordinates and to be helpful but also to protect them in ways such as “being compassionate, interested, caring and guiding” (Sargut, 2001). This can be defined as a paternalistic tendency. Particularly, it can also be suggested that the items defined in the paternalism dimension in the scale point to the expectation of a more benevolent paternalism rather than an authoritative paternalism (Pasa, Kabasakal & Bodur, 2001). Aycan, Kanungo, Mendonca, Yu, et.al., (2000) define such a relationship as follows: ...in a paternalistic relationship, the role of superior is to provide guidance, protection, nurturance and care to the subordinate, and the role of subordinate, in return is to be loyal and deferent to the superior. As a matter of fact, the studies conducted on Turkish organizations are known to report strong evidence regarding the paternalist leadership behaviours (Aycan Kanungo, Mendonca, Yu, et.al., 2000; Pasa, Kabasakal & Bodur, 2001; Pellegrini & Scandura, 2006).

The third aspect of the scale on trust in managers is justice. Organizational trust and justice relationships are well-known types of relationships in trust literature (Hubbell & Chory-Assad, 2005) and some trust scales refer to the expectation of a fair manager (Mayer & Davis 1999; Lester, 2003). However, such an expectation is rather related to the honesty dimension. Nonetheless, in this study, justice was not an item but a separate dimension, which is a new aspect in trust literature. A manager's impartiality and fairness are the main elements of the fair behaviour expectation. This finding also highlights the possibility that managers' fair behaviour might be one of the basic trust issues encountered in manager-employee relationships in Turkey.

### 3.3.2 Dimensions of the scale on trust in subordinates

Trust in subordinates that form the second dimension of the vertical organizational relationships consisted of two factors: *Competence* and *honesty*. In such trust relationships, subordinates are expected implicitly to display professionalism in areas such as competence, problem-solving skills, knowledge about the job, sense of responsibility, being open to self-development and ability to take on responsibility.

The second aspect, *honesty*, refers to the consistency of a subordinate that s/he keeps her /his words, and that s/he's trustworthy. This content is similar to the attitudes and behaviours defined in trust literature as honesty. However, the items that make this dimension interesting and original were identified. Middle-level managers describe respect subordinates show to their seniors as a condition that creates a trust environment. Although being respectful is not a direct indication of honesty, such behaviour may help one perceive a subordinate as honest and it also complements the manager's expectation of *a good subordinate model*. Expectation of respect from the subordinates corresponds to the subordinate's expectation of protection from the manager and thus it is also consistent with the abovementioned suggestion regarding paternalistic tendency.

### 3.3.3 Dimensions of the scale on trust in co-workers

Trust in co-workers that describes a horizontal organizational relationship contains both positive and negative predictors. The *Personal trustworthiness* sub-dimension contains the expectation of strong ethical aspects from co-workers such as fairness, justness, frankness, being a man/woman of his/her word. The relationship between co-workers is not a vertical hierarchical relationship; therefore, the continuity of the relationship may rely heavily on personal traits.

The content of the second factor, *competence* of co-worker, is also specific to the relationship. Competence of co-worker means that the co-worker should be someone who has knowledge about the job, who can be consulted and provide guidance, and whose intuitions can be trusted. Such expectations also point to an implicit need for respecting the co-worker.

The third dimension of the trust relationship between co-workers contains reverse items in the scale. Such items point to undesired behaviours that might seriously prevent the establishment of a trust relationship. This dimension of the relationship between co-workers means that the parties prioritize their own interests and therefore we have defined this as *selfishness*. It assumes the function of being the negative predictor of personal trustworthiness dimension that contains positive expectations. As also stated by Dar (2010), this supports the claim that studies on trust in co-workers need to explore both the negative and the positive predictors of trust. In summary, trust in co-workers is determined by job competence and strong personal traits.

#### 4.0 Discussion

The findings of this study demonstrate that the subordinate-manager-co-worker relationship that characterizes the formal relationships in organizations forms a meaningful framework for the analysis of trust. The features that make a manager, a subordinate or a co-worker trustworthy are not the same. Particularly the power asymmetry between the subordinate and manager changes the expectations of the parties in trust relationships. A subordinate needs the fulfilment of a broad range of expectations from her/his manager in order to trust them, whereas a manager has limited expectations from her/his subordinate in order to trust them. The level of authority held by the parties alters the expectations.

On the other hand, a relationship between co-workers that enjoy equal powers seems to rely on personal traits more than the other types of relationships do. It can be suggested that the similarity of the trust dynamic of a co-worker relationship to a different type of informal relationship (friendship, companionship) highlights both the positive and negative aspects of personal trustworthiness in contrast to the other types of organizational relationships. Moreover, the competence of a co-worker is also associated with the perception of mentoring. Trust in the knowledge and advice of a co-worker is associated with the peer mentoring expectation (Bryant, 2005; Bryant & Terborg, 2008). On the other hand, a co-worker guides her/his subordinates, which is a regular practice in mentoring (Fagenson-Eland, Marks & Amendola, 1997), and this function makes people trust her/him.

In conclusion, it can be argued that all these findings obtained in the study have generated convincing evidence that the dimensions and contents of trust vary in different types of organizational relationships. Furthermore, another important finding of the research is that the several dimensions of trust have a context-specific nature. In particular, the findings that indicate that subordinate-manager relationships tend to be paternalistic also demonstrate that perception of trust may vary in different cultural contexts. The perception of managers as protectors' points to a stronger sensitivity and protectorate than the expectation of drawing interest as reported in trust literature. The justice dimension of trust in managers was found to be a strong dimension. Such a dimension, however, goes beyond the limited expectation of fair behaviour, which is consistent with the finding mentioned above. Besides, the majority of companies in this country are family-owned businesses and run by their owner-managers. This enables the employees to associate the corporate practices directly with the approach and practices of the managers.

An important contribution of this research is that it has developed a specific sub-scale for trust in subordinates. Trust in managers has always been considered important in the literature on organizational trust. Nevertheless, trust in subordinates has not attracted so much attention. However, the findings of this research demonstrate that trust in subordinates as important partners of vertical organizational relationships is a different type of relationship. In this relationship, the subordinate is expected to be frank and have a high sense of mission.

Furthermore, another significant finding is the likelihood that expectation of respect to a manager might also influence the trustworthiness of a subordinate in the eyes of her/his manager. This might be an extension of the culture-specific paternalistic relationship and it is suggested that this topic should be investigated by further studies.

## 5.0 Conclusion

Organizational trust literature is still in need of new debates regarding how the complex structure of trust should be analysed. In particular, different organizational positions alter the dynamics of interpersonal relationships. Therefore, it is important to choose a relationship-specific methodology for the analysis of trust in order to understand its structure. On the other hand, it would be helpful to take account of contextual effects that shape meanings and perceptions during the analysis of strong human phenomena such as trust. The findings of this study provide evidence that the trust structure varies in different organizational relationships, the dimensions of this phenomenon and the meanings attributed to those dimensions are influenced by cultural perceptions. The scales on trust in managers, subordinates and co-workers that were developed in this study can contribute to further studies on trust relationships in organizations as original measurement tools. However, there is a need to test these dimensions further in order to understand to what extent they are context-specific as they were developed in the context of Turkish business organizations while they could be a good starting point to understand the trust relationships in those organizations. On the other hand, comparative studies to be performed by the researchers in different countries that have similar cultural features would help to enrich such measurement tools. In fact, the phenomenon of trust in the field of cross-cultural management that has been expanding since the 1980s is still a missing link in this chain.

Some limitations of this research provide inspiration for new research questions. For example, trust in informal relationships which was not investigated in this study but is an important dynamic of organizational relationships is a special type of trust and should be explored through new questions. Even though trust in co-workers provides some hints in this regard, there is a likelihood that trust in friendship relationships in organizations might be a special type of relationship. On the other hand, the content of a relationship and expectations of parties might vary in different types of organizations due to the way of doing business and cultural features. For example, interpersonal relationships in public organizations or non-governmental organizations should be analysed and defined as a separate research niche with respect to trust.

Finally, based on this research providing some findings for etic-emic discussions, it should be noted once again that there is still a need for in-depth exploratory studies although it requires a great deal of patience to analyse the human and social phenomena such as trust. Otherwise, there will be a persistent problem of inability to uncover the meanings specific to human and social phenomena and analysing the phenomena without any connection with their contexts.

## Acknowledgments

The authors wish to acknowledge TUBITAK (The Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey) who provided funding for the research stage and thank Erkan Erdemir for his contributions to the statistical analysis during the development of scale.

## References

- Andersen, J.A. (2005). Trust in managers: a study of why Swedish subordinates trust their managers. *Business Ethics: A European Review*, 14, 392-404.
- Aycan, Z., Kanungo, R.N., Mendonca, M., Yu, K., Deller, J., Stahl, G. & Khursid, A. (2000). Impact of culture on human resource management practices: A ten country comparison. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 49, 192-220.

- Ballinger, G. A., Schoorman, F. D., & Lehman, D. W. (2009). Will you trust your new boss? Affective reactions to leadership succession. *Leadership Quarterly*, 20, 219–232.
- Berthon, P., Ewing, M. & Hah, L.L. (2005). Captivating company: Dimensions of attractiveness in employer branding. *International Journal of Advertising*, 24, 151-172.
- Binikos, E. (2008). Sounds of silence: Organisational trust and decisions to blow the whistle. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 34, 48-59.
- Brashear, T.G., Boles, J.S. Bellenger, D.N. & Brooks, C.M. (2003). An empirical test of trust-building processes and outcomes in sales manager–salesperson relationships. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 31, 189-200.
- Brower, H.H., Lester, S.W., Korsgaard, A.M. & Dineen, B.R. (2009). A closer look at trust between managers and subordinates: Understanding the effects of both trusting and being trusted on subordinate outcomes. *Journal of Management*, 35, 327-347.
- Bryant, S.E. (2005). The Impact of peer mentoring on organizational knowledge creation and sharing: An empirical study in a software firm. *Group & Organization Management*, 30, 319-338.
- Bryant, S.E. & Terborg, J.R. (2008). Impact of peer mentor training on creating and sharing organizational knowledge. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 20, 11-29.
- Burke, C.S., Sims, D.E., Lazzara, E.H & Salas E. (2007). Trust in leadership: A multi-level review and integration. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 18, 606–632.
- Cardona, P. & Elola, A. (2003). Trust in management: The effect of managerial trustworthy behavior and reciprocity, working paper, n. 496, website: <http://blog.iese.edu/cardona/files/2010/07/research-7.pdf>
- Clark, C.M. & Payne, R.L. (1997). The nature and structure of workers' trust in management. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 18, 205-224.
- Connell, J. Ferres, N. & Travaglione, T. (2003). Engendering trust in manager-subordinate relationships: Predictors and outcomes. *Personnel Review*, 32, 569-587.
- Costigan, R.D., Ilter, S.S., & Berman, J.J. (1998). A multi-dimensional study of trust in organizations. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 10, 303-317.
- Costigan, R.D., Insinga, R.C., Krana G., Kureshov, V.A. & Ilter, S.S. (2004). Predictors of employee trust of their CEO: a three-country study. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 16, 197-217.
- Cummings, L. L. & Bromily, P. (1996). The Organizational Trust Inventory (OTI): Development and validation. In R. Kramer & T. Tyler (Eds.), *Trust in organizations* (pp. 302-330). Thousand Oaks, Ca:Sage.
- Dar, O.L. (2010). Trust in co-workers and employee behaviours at work. *International Review of Business Research Papers*, 6, 194-204.
- Davis, J., Schoorman, D., Mayer, R. & Tan, H. (2000). The trusted general manager and business unit performance: Empirical evidence of a competitive advantage. *Strategic Management Journal*, 21, 563-576.
- Doney, P.M., Cannon, J.P. & Mullen, M.R. (1998). Understanding the influence of national culture on the development of trust. *The Academy of Management Review*, 23, 601-620.
- Dunn, S.V., Lawson, D., Robertson, S., Underwood, M., Clark, R., Valentine, T., Walker, N., Wilson-Row, C., Crowder, K. & Herewane, D. (2000). The development of competency standards for specialist critical care nurses. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 31, 339-346.
- Ebert, T. A. E. (2009). Facets of trust in relationships – A literature synthesis of highly ranked trust articles. *Journal of Business Market Management*, 3, 65-84.
- Fagenson-Eland, E.A., Marks, M.A. & Amendola, K.L. (1997). Perceptions of Mentoring Relationships. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 51, 29–42.
- Fulmer, C. A., Gelfand, M. J. (2012). At what level (and in whom) we trust: Trust across multiple organizational levels. *Journal of Management*, 38, 1167-1230.
- Hinkin, T.R. (1998). A brief tutorial on the development of measures for use in survey questionnaires. *Organizational Research Methods*, 1, 104-121.
- Hinkin, T.R. & Schriesheim, C.A. (1989). Development and application of new scales to measure the French and Raven (1959) bases of social power. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74, 561-567.
- Hofstede, G.(1985). The interaction between national and organizational value systems. *Journal of Management Studies*, 22(4), 347-357.

- Hofstede, G., Fritz, M., Canavari, M., Oosterkamp, E. & Sprundel, G. (2010). Towards a cross-cultural typology of trust in B2B food trade. *British Food Journal*, 112, 671-687.
- Hubbell, A.P. & Chory-Assad, R.M. (2005). Motivating factors: perceptions of justice and their relationship with managerial trust. *Communication Studies*, 56, 47-70.
- Huff, L. & L. Kelley (2003). Levels of organizational trust in individualist versus collectivist societies: A seven nation study. *Organization Science*, 14, 81-90.
- Jarvenpaa, S.L., Leidner, D.E. (1999). Communication and trust in global virtual teams. *Organization Science*, 10, 791-815.
- Kickul, J., Gundry, L. K., Posig, M. (2005). Does trust matter? The relationship between equity sensitivity and perceived organizational justice. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 56, 205-218.
- Kramer, R.M. (1996). Divergent realities and convergent disappointments in the hierarchical relation: trust and the intuitive auditor at work. In Kramer, R.M. and Tyler, T.R. (Eds.), *Trust in Organisations: Frontiers of Theory and Research* (pp. 216–246). London: Sage.
- Kramer, R. M. (1999). Trust and distrust in organizations: Emerging perspectives, enduring questions. *American Psychological Review*, 50, 569-598.
- Krot, K. & Lewicka, D., 2012, The Importance of Trust in Manager-employee Relationships. *International Journal of Electronic Business Management*, 10, 224-233.
- Krzystofiak, F., Cardy, R.L. & Newman, J. (1988). Implicit personality and performance appraisal: The influence of trait inferences on evaluation behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 73, 515-521.
- Lapierre, L.M. (2007). Supervisor trustworthiness and subordinates' willingness to provide extra-role efforts. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 37, 272–297.
- Lester, S. W. (2003). In the eyes of the beholder: The relationship between subordinates' felt trustworthiness and their work attitudes and behaviors. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 10, 17-33.
- Mayer, R.C., Davis, J.H., & Schoorman, F.D. (1995). An integrative model of organizational trust. *Academy of Management Review*, 20, 709-734.
- Mayer, R.C. & Davis, J.H. (1999). The effect of the performance appraisal system on trust for management: A field quasi-experiment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84, 123-136.
- McAllister, D.J. (1995). Affect- and cognition-based trust as foundations for interpersonal cooperation in organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38, 24-59.
- McKnight, D. H. & Chervany, N. L. (2000). What is trust? A conceptual analysis and an interdisciplinary model, In Chung, M. H. (Eds.) *Proceedings of the Americas Conference on Information Systems*, (pp.827-833), Long Beach, California.
- Mishra, A.K. (1996). Organizational responses to crisis: The centrality of trust. In Kramer, R. M. ve Tyler, T (Eds.) *Trust in Organizations*, Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Modassir, A.&Singh, T. (2008). Relationship of emotional intelligence with transformational leadership and organizational citizenship behavior. *International Journal of Leadership Studies*, 4, 3-21.
- Pasa, S., H. Kabasakal & M. Bodur (2001). Society, organisations, and leadership in Turkey. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 50, 559–589.
- Pellegrini, E. K. & Scandura, T. A. (2006). Leader-member exchange (LMX), paternalism and delegation in the Turkish business culture: An empirical investigation. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 37, 264-279.
- Perry, R. W. & Lawrence, D. M. (2007). Organizational trust, trust in the chief executive and work satisfaction. *Public Personnel Management*, 36, 165-178.
- Qingquan, P. & Huimin, W. (2010). Effects of trust, risk and managerial self-efficacy on leader empowering behavior, paper presented in *Logistics Systems and Intelligent Management, International Conference*.
- Ristig, K. (2009). The impact of perceived organizational support and trustworthiness on trust. *Management Research News*, 32, 659–669.
- Rousseau, D., Sitkin, S., Burt, R. & Camerer, C. (1998). Not so different after all: A cross discipline view of trust. *Academy of Management Review*, 23, 393-404.
- Sargut, S. (2001). *Kültürlerarası Farklılaşma ve Yönetim*, Ankara: İmge Yayınevi.
- Schoorman, F. D., Mayer, R. C., & Davis, J. H. (2007). An integrative model of organizational trust: past, present and future. *Academy of Management Review*, 32, 344-354.

- Schumann, J.H., Wangenheim, F.V., Stringfellow, A., Yang, Z., Praxmarer, S., Jimenez, F.R., Blazevic, V., Shannon, R.M., Shainesh G. & Komor, M. (2010). Drivers of trust in relational service exchange: understanding the importance of cross-cultural differences. *Journal of Service Research*, 13, 453-468.
- Shin, R., Daly, B. & Vera, E. (2007). The relationships of peer norms, ethnic identity, and peer support to school engagement in urban youth. *Professional School Counseling*, 10, 379-388.
- Shockley-Zalaback, P., Ellis, K. & Winograd, G. (2000). Organizational trust: What it means, why it matters. *Organization Development Journal*, 18, 35-48.
- Strateir, K.L. (2005). The effects of supervisors' trust of subordinates and their organization on job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *International Journal of Leadership Studies*, 1 86-101.
- Tan, H.H. & Lim, A.K.H. (2009). Trust in coworkers and trust in organizations. *The Journal of Psychology*, 143, 45-66.
- Tan, H.H. & Tan, C.S. (2000). Toward the differentiation of trust in supervisor and trust in organization. *Genetic, Social & General Psychology Monographs*, 126, 241-261.
- Tavanti, M. (2008). Transactional leadership In A. Marturano, J. Gosling (Eds.) *Leadership: The Key Concepts*, (pp.166-170), London and New York: Routledge.
- Tyler, T.R. (2003). Trust within organization. *Personnel Review*, 32, 556-568.
- Ugboro, I.O. (2003). Influence of managerial trust on survivors' perceptions of job insecurity and organizational commitment in a post restructuring and downsizing environment. *The Journal of Behavioural and Applied Management*, 4, 230-253.
- Whitener, E.M. Brodt, S. & M.A Korsgaard. (1998). Managers as initiator of trust: An exchange relationship framework for understanding managerial behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, 23, 513-530.
- Yuki, M., Maddux, W.W., Brewer, M.B. & Takemura, K. (2005). Cross-cultural differences in relationship- and group-based trust, *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 31, 48-62.