# PEDAGOGY OF TRUST: CHOOSING COLLECTIVE TRUST INDICATORS

**Soibam Birajit Singh**

Ph.D, Assistant Professor, Department of Education, Manipur College, Imphal,

## Abstract

The paper aimed at selecting predictors from a list of 100 identified *metadata* related to collective trust. It also aimed for a systematic prioritization on predictors of trust in a pedagogical approach towards building trust. 100 (hundred) Educands (student teacher) from 5 (five) teacher training college in Imphal volunteered to respond yes or no questionnaire on the selected *metadata*. Yes score was awarded 1(one) and No with 0 (zero) score. The sum of the scores was calculated as pedagogical trust. The reliability of tested was Cronbach's $\alpha$ of 0.976 with $78.14\pm21.668$ scale statistics; the test's construct validity was also significant. The *metadata* was treated as independent, while the pedagogical trust was treated as dependant variable. Result indicated strong evidences of selecting predictors on 30 (thirty) metadata ranging '*trust is exchange*' as the first predictor $F_{(1,98)}=136.263$; $p<0.05$; Rank=1 and least rank as '*trust is patience*' with $F_{(1, 98)}=59.588$; $p<0.05$; Rank=30. Also, female Educands have more *patience* to learn trust; they know the benefits of waiting for the right time, as well as they know how to remove unwanted trouble in building trust [$\chi^2(1) = 5.992$; p-value = $0.014<0.05$]. Lastly, marital status also found sufficient evidence for selecting *humility* and *patience* as predictors of pedagogical trust, i.e. $\chi^2(2) = 6.868$; p-value = $0.032<0.05$; Humility Rank=1; $\chi^2(2)=6.142$; p-value = $0.046<0.05$; Patience Rank = 2 respectively.

**Keyword***: trust, predictors, gender, marital status*

## INTRODUCTION

The concept of trust is both *cognitive* and *affective* as it works with the conscience of the individuals. Analytically, trust is closely related to society. It makes sense naturally. Trusting is a rational concept, but the rationality of trust is a problem. The concepts of trust are conceptualized in different dimensions: *morality and solidarity,* which Durkheim's later thought of as the *collective conscience* (Durkheim, 1893). Similarly, the concept of trust was viewed as *collective action* (Allport, 1954), *civic engagement* (Almond & Verba, 1965), *natural attitude* (Schutz, 1967), *cultural capital* (Bourdiew & Passeron, 1979), *element of classification* (Beck, 1986), *social construction* (Gambetta, 1988), *social capital* (Putnam, 1995), *control supplements* (Leifer & Mills, 1996), *psychological state* (Rousseau et al. 1998), *melting pot* (Pentland, 1999), *sharing information* (Ridings et al., 2002), *leap of faith* (Möllering, 2006), *always collective* (Forsyth, et al., 2011) and so on. *Trust* may have different dimensions which contribute to the coordination of our expectations and control our interactions. The trouble of trust is that it requires an acceptance of risk. Damaged trust (mistrust) can be repaired; restoration of trust is a complicated process that requires humility and may extend over a long period. In the same vein, trust also carries the risk of betrayal. The effects of trust can become harmful as a result of insufficient trust. Hogan et al.

(1994) have indeed observed that the greatest danger to modern organizations is not external agencies but the betrayal of "*ambitious, selfish, deceitful people who care more for their advancement than the mission of the organization*" and lead us to *social trap* — a situation where individuals, groups or organizations are unable to cooperate owing to mutual distrust and lack of social capital.

Previous studies have acknowledged *trust* as one of the basic ingredients in our way of life. Some of them explored the dimensions of trust; others described relationships built on trust and few attempts to teach and learn trust, which is a neglected area in curriculum studies. The present paper tries to bridge the gap with an attempt to systematically identify the elements of trust in a step-by-step approach towards building trust. The collected elements known as *metadata* are listed alphabetically for *identifying and selecting them as predictors of trust*. They are listed as follows – 1) ability, 2) acceptance, 3) accountability, 4) adjustment, 5) admiration, 6) affection, 7) agreements, 8) alliances, 9) assurance, 10) attachments, 11) authenticity, 12) authority, 13) avoidance, 14) belief, 15) benevolent, 16) bond, 17) caring, 18) certainty, 19) charity, 20) together, 21) collaboration, 22) collective, 23) commitment, 24) communication, 25) compensation, 26) complexity, 27) confidence, 28) connection, 29) consensus, 30) control, 31) cooperation, 32) courage, 33) dependence, 34) dialogue, 35) duties, 36) empathy, 37) engagement, 38) entities, 39) equality, 40) exchange, 41) expectations, 42) experience, 43) fairness, 44) faith, 45) familiarity, 46) forgiveness, 47) foundations, 48) friendship, 49) generosity, 50) gifts, 51) goodwill, 52) honesty, 53) honour, 54) hope, 55) humility, 56) identity, 57) intentions, 58) interest, 59) interpretation, 60) investment, 61) love, 62) loyalty, 63) monitoring, 64) obedience, 65) openness, 66) participation, 67) partnership, 68) patience, 69) performance, 70) positive, 71) privacy, 72) promise, 73) protection, 74) rapport, 75) reciprocity, 76) recognition, 77) relationships, 78) reliability, 79) reputation, 80) respect, 81) responsibility, 82) risk, 83) safety, 84) satisfaction, 85) security, 86) self-interest, 87) sensation, 88) sharing, 89) skill, 90) solidarity, 91) source, 92) support, 93) surrender, 94) tolerance, 95) transparency, 96) truth, 97) understanding, 98) unity, 99) vigilance, and 100) willingness.

Lastly, *Predictor selection* is the process of choosing appropriate predictors for inclusion in a model. A good model should be substantively motivated, appropriate to the inferential goal and sample size, interpretable, and persuasive (McCulloch et al. 2005). It also selects certain specified variables or aims to reduce to a set of predictors necessary and accounted for by an entire set. In essence, selection helps to determine the level of importance of each predictor variable. It also assists in assessing the effects once the other predictor variables are statistically eliminated.

## REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Some researchers have proposed factors associated with trust. They are included in the list of *metadata* for selecting predictors. Some of the reviewed predictors on trust are as follows –

Roberts & O'Reilly (1974) found that trust in their superiors was a *significant* predictor of employees' level of satisfaction with intra-organizational communication. Muchinsky (1977) found trust to be a *positive* predictor of employees' satisfaction with their pay, co-workers,

promotions, and supervision. Currall and Judge (1995) studied *psychological* predictors of behavioral intentions to engage in trusting behavior. Past trustworthiness was the most *significant* predictor of trusting behavior. It was also supported that trust in an individual manager of a firm has shown to be a *strong* predictor of trust in a partner firm as a whole, exchange in performance was a predictor of trust; it also mediated or reduced conflict and also reduced costs (Inkpen & Currall 1997; Zaheer et al. 1998). Dirks (2000) proved that trust in leadership to be a more *important* predictor of team performance than was trust in team mates. McKnight et al. (2002) found *small* predictor of trust as willingness. Pennington et al. (2003) found trust as a *strong* predictor of perceived trust in the Internet vendor. Child & Möllering (2003) found confidence as *powerful* predictors of trust in managerial actions to build trust, such as establishing personal rapport and recruitment. Langfred (2004) found monitoring as a *strong and negative* predictor of trust. McKnight et al. (2004) also found that reputation as a *significant* predictor of trusting beliefs and trusting intentions. McKnight & Chervany (2005) found *fairness* predictor on competence and benevolence in the supervisors. Tamilina (2008) found income and level of education are *strong* predictors of social trust. Davide, et al (2012) found out that experience and interaction with a given partner are the *strongest* predictors of trusting behaviour. Paliszkiewicz & Koohang (2016) focused on determining predictors of trust related to need satisfaction and found out three most *influential* predictors as benevolence, integrity and competence as trust variables. Rosalind et al. (2018) found out that fairness and professional dress were *strong* predictors of trust and loyalty.

## OBJECTIVES

The present paper aims at selecting predictors from a list of metadata related to trust. It also aims for systematic prioritisation on the elements of trust for shaping a pedagogical step by step approach in building trust.

## HYPOTHESES

H01: Predictor selection of pedagogical trust has nothing to do with the sufficient evidence of the proposed metadata on trust.

H02: Predictor selection of pedagogical trust has nothing to do with the sufficient evidence based on *gender* and *marital status* of the trustee.

## JUSTIFICATION OF THE STUDY

Various studies have recognised trust as an ingredient or a lubricant in our way of life. Trust lubricates the *wheel of commerce*, glues *organizational crises*, and increases *cooperation among the society members*. The present educational system, particularly in *Manipur* (a little-known State of India in the field of education) finds '*no'* activities for building trust in the teaching-learning process; thereby the whole educational process was too bookish and academic. Few researchers endeavored to teach and learn trust from the beginning of the lifelong learning process. The current study would be an attempt to systematically identify the *elements of trust* as *predictors* to be applied in different ways of life experiences, including educational, socio-cultural, organizational, political, and family. The identified predictors could easily lubricate the curriculum with a new interpretation towards building trust.

## METHODOLOGY

*Descriptive method* was adopted. The sample consists of 100 (hundred) Educands (student teacher) from 5 (five) teacher training college in Imphal, India. 32 male, 68 female volunteered to respond the questionnaire on the selected *metadata* on trusts. 91 were unmarried, 7 married, and 2 Educands have many spouses.

### Materials

100 metadata on trust were identified as listed above. They were converted into '*yes*' or '*no*' items by adding "*trust is ...*" Yes score were awarded 1(one) and No with 0 (zero) score. The sum of the scores was calculated as Pedagogical Trust. The reliability of the items was tested for internal consistency and found Cronbach's $\alpha$ of 0.976 with 78.14±21.668 scale statistics; the construct validity of the items was also shown for each item in Table No. 1. The metadata are treated as independent variable, while the pedagogical trust was treated as dependant variable.

### Procedure

The 100 metadata questionnaire was distributed among the participants. Their views were collected categorically in Yes or No responses. The duration of the responses was about 25~30 minutes. Under Dimension Reduction in IBM SPSS the 'Predictor Selection' analysis was performed for Ranking among the metadata. The *F*-statistic (that is, the square of a *t*-statistic with an exact *p*-value) was computed to compare rank among predictors. If a predictor is not listed in the selection, the null hypothesis is that it would have a zero coefficient if added to the model. If there is sufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis, the predictor is added to the selection.

## DATA ANALYSIS

Each selected 100 metadata was calculated for F-statistics with p-value to check the sufficient evidence of selecting as a predictor. The selected predictors are listed in rank order from $F(1,98)=136.263$; $p<0.05$; Rank=1 up to $F(1, 98)=59.588$; $p<0.05$; Rank=30 as shown in Table. No.2. Three predictors were excluded as their cases constant was > 95 times the screening check. They are *trust is acceptance*, *trust is bond*, and *trust is caring*. In simple words, they may be treated as synonymous to *trust*. Hence, H01: Null Hypothesis was rejected. The predictor selection of pedagogical trust among the male and female Educands and their marital status has sufficient evidence. Thereby, H02: Null Hypothesis was rejected. In other words, female Educands have more *patience* than male Educands towards building pedagogical trust as shown in Table No. 3. Similarly, unmarried Educands have more *humility* and *patience* in ordered as compared in between married and many spouse groups while building pedagogical trust as shown in Table No. 4.

## RESULTS & DISCUSSION

The present study found 30 (thirty) metadata with strong evidence of selecting predictors. They are **Trust is exchange** [$F(1,98)=136.263;p<0.05;Rank=1$ ] it means willingness to help and delegate and then accept to help (Singh & Falcone, 2001). **Trust is generosity** [$F(1,98)=113.617;p<0.05;Rank=2$ ] its human nature to believe people who give of their time,

help, or resources freely without expecting anything in return (Brown, 2018). **Trust is entities** [ F(1,98)=113.579;p<0.05;Rank=3 ] it would be calculated based on the human notion of trust, probably direct observations, past history, and careful use of recommendation and reputation (Jean-Mare, et al. 2004). **Trust is familiarity** [F(1,98)=102.506;p<0.05;Rank=4] it is an unavoidable fact of life and a solution towards a problem which is product-related experiences where repeated situations provide strong incentives for cooperative behaviour (Sommerville et al., 2006; Martínez-López, et al., 2015; Győrffy, 2018). **Trust is engagement** [F(1,98)=101.052;p<0.05;Rank=5] it is a clear and reliable service towards a community. Teachers need to trust in engagement involving the practices of reading, writing in social context (Wilkinson, et al., 2012; Timothy, 1990).

      **Trust is consensus** [F(1,98)=99.267;p<0.05;Rank=6] it is electing a true potential leader, building group dependent on removing unwanted border (Robson, 2015). **Trust is interpretation** [F(1,98)=97.325;p<0.05;Rank=7] it is the meaning given by an individual as well as by a group that influence the social system, the meaning also depends on the tools of analysis (Aizenshṭadṭ & Eisenstadt, 1995; OECD, 2017). **Trust is participation** [F(1,98)=94.671;p<0.05;Rank=8] It is a service for building a system of attachment for making decision making (Dan, 2011; Sumpf, 2019). **Trust is gifts** [F(1,98)=88.774;p<0.05;Rank=9] a form of commitment giving and building relationship, task oriented action (Rompf, 2014). **Trust is empathy** [F(1,98)=87.435;p<0.05;Rank=10] studies of empathy suggest that both knowledge and feeling are indispensable for the process of empathy. It is an understanding towards the client during the counselling, removing the unwanted feelings with therapist attitudes (Schmid & O'Hara, 2013).

      **Trust is tolerance** [F(1,98)=79.634;p<0.05;Rank=11] a combined step for measuring and creating by merging two social capitals. It represents a dynamic cohesion (Janmaat, 2013). **Trust is investment** [F(1,98)=76.938;p<0.05;Rank=12] it is management of social relationships, sharing of information and encourages members for becoming effective leaders (Mishra & Mishra, 2013; Christine, 2017). **Trust is willingness** [F(1,98)=76.791;p<0.05; Rank=13] It is taking risks to a situation, to be vulnerable, and to give discretionary powers (Baier, 1995; Thompson, 2015). **Trust is intentions** [F(1,98)=73.056;p<0.05;Rank=14] it is an analysis of systematic conditions of assessing and aligning the power. It is only the good side of intention which is considered for organizational purposes. We cannot demand that trust be reciprocated in every relationship; however, where we are investing energy and purpose in an intimate human connection (Orr, 2012; Haines, 2019). **Trust is interest** [F(1,98)=72.734;p<0.05;Rank=15] it is the quality of relationship that we understand for the common good (Kohn, 2008).

      **Trust is reciprocity** [F(1,98)=69.346;p<0.05;Rank=16] it is taking an action by two people that gives some amount of immediate benefit in return for a longer-run benefit for both. It is giving strong support for co-operation that the other will return information as well as action with a new prospect (Walker & Ostrom, 2003). **Trust is source** [F(1,98)=67.418; p<0.05;Rank=17] it is the foundation of relationship, data, information and wisdom across different domains and disciplines to give a deeper understanding of its intellectual concepts and principles (Wallace, 2007). **Trust is experience** [F(1,98)=66.940;p<0.05;Rank=18] It is faith in

the continuation to reach certain level, trust cannot be sustained in the long run unless it is verified frequently enough by the behaviour of bonding (Svendsen & Svendsen, 2009; Setola & Franceschetti, 2013). **Trust is recognition** [F(1,98)=65.907;p<0.05;Rank =19] it is an acknowledgment of knowledge-based leaders or technical or expertise and their ability to establish and accomplish organizational goals (Stewart, 2010). **Trust is honesty** [F(1,98)=63.639;p<0.05;Rank=20] the best thing about honesty is faithfulness and truthfulness, it is a source of information to remove failure and weakness (Nooteboom, 2002).

**Trust is expectations** [F(1,98)=63.389;p<0.05;Rank=21] it is favouring of partnership based on security and transparency. It is a rejection of conflicts and favouring relations, and creating symbolic meaning (McMahon & Hanley, 2010). **Trust is fairness** [F(1,98)=62.790;p<0.05;Rank=22]  It is an attribute of deciding others in a reasonable way on what is understood and accepted. People are ready to lose the reasonable way rather than accepting the gain from unfairness (Davies & Kourdi, 2010; Nguyen-Phuong-Mai, 2019). **Trust is humility** [F(1,98)=62.507;p<0.05;Rank=23] it has made the elixir to differing opinions and willing to bow to the good points and logic of others (Horsager, 2012). **Trust is charity** [F(1,98)=61.932;p<0.05;Rank =24] it is a contextual relationship between donors and charities, it also implies categorical relationship (Burt, 2014). **Trust is duties** [F(1,98)=61.255;p<0.05;Rank =25] the instrument of trust can be divided into duties and responsibilities. Duties of trust include the duty to diversity, duty to monitor, duty to administer, etc. (Robert, 2019).

**Trust is responsibility** [F(1,98)=61.164;p<0.05;Rank =26] It is both a specific and a general application, it is the material part of duties for fulfilling all our commitments towards building trust (Wenzel, 2014; Robert, 2019). **Trust is friendship** [F(1,98)=60.907; p<0.05;Rank =27] it cannot be expected or maintained without friendship. Friendship is healing the worry, freeing from egotism, becoming and sharing of confidence to be strong as well as weak towards the door of freedom (Maurus, 2001). **Trust is loyalty** [F(1,98)=60.618;p<0.05;Rank=28] it is showing loyal towards each other, respecting a superior order on the benevolence of his subordinates, to fulfil his order to the best of their abilities and according to his intent (Technical Report, 2000). **Trust is compensation** [F(1,98)=60.356;p<0.05;Rank=29] it is removing error through disclosure with agreement (Beitat, 2015) and lastly, **Trust is patience** [F(1,98)=59.588;p<0.05;Rank=30] to learn is to have patience, it is to choose not to be annoyed, there are benefits of waiting the right time, delay has a meaning to remove unwanted trouble (Eyre, 2011).

The present study was supported by previous studies in some of the predictor selection like **Exchange** as a *strong* predictor (Inkpen & Currall, 1997; Zaheer, et al., 1998). McKnight et al. (2002) found *small* predictor of trust as **willingness**. Previous studies of Davide, et al. (2012) strongly supported the present study by stating **experience** as the *strongest* predictors of trusting behaviour. Rosalind et al. (2018) found out that **fairness** was *strong* predictor of trust. There was statistically sufficient evidence of selecting *patience* as a predictor for building pedagogical trust between male and female Educands, i.e. $\chi^2(1) = 5.992$; p-value = 0.014<0.05. It shows female Educands have more *patience* to learn trust, they know the benefits of waiting for right time, as

well as they now how to remove unwanted trouble in building trust. Similarly, based on marital status sufficient evidence was also found for selecting humility and patience as predictors of pedagogical trust, i.e. $\chi^2(2)=6.868$; p-value = 0.032<0.05; Humility Rank=1; $\chi^2(2)=6.142$; p-value = 0.046<0.05; Patience Rank =2 respectively. Unmarried Educands have more *patience* to learn trust, know the right time, and removed unwanted trouble by considering different opinions and made suggestions with good points and logic which helps as an elixir in building trust.

## IMPLICATIONS AND LIMITATIONS

The findings of the present study may be of practical value, particularly to the policy makers, in ascertaining the importance of imparting trust-based education to the students. Some of the research areas which the future researcher can conduct may be a similar study with larger samples size and more inclusion of metadata on trust. Predictor selection on pedagogical trust can be conducted in different educational settings, socio-cultural, economic, organizational, political, family, friends and acquaintances, and so on.

The present study was not free from certain limitations like smaller sample size, generalizability, systematic bias in selecting metadata, responding categorical about the concept of trust. Despites such limitations, the present study still remain probably unexplored.

## DECLARATION

There is no conflict of interest in data collection, and procedure. No financial support for publication and data collection.

## TABLE

Table No.1 Scale statistics of the metadata selected for predictors of trust

| Items | Means | Variance | $r$ | Alpha Reliability | Construct Validity |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| trust is ability | 77.30 | 462.879 | 0.409 | 0.976 | .424** |
| trust is acceptance | 77.18 | 466.816 | 0.310 | 0.976 | .320** |
| trust is accountability | 77.27 | 464.664 | 0.324 | 0.976 | .339** |
| trust is adjustment | 77.41 | 457.921 | 0.596 | 0.976 | .614** |
| trust is admiration | 77.34 | 460.570 | 0.508 | 0.976 | .522** |
| trust is affection | 77.27 | 462.866 | 0.448 | 0.976 | .462** |
| trust is agreements | 77.31 | 463.226 | 0.377 | 0.976 | .391** |
| trust is alliances | 77.40 | 460.222 | 0.480 | 0.976 | .496** |
| trust is assurance | 77.25 | 464.230 | 0.381 | 0.976 | .393** |
| trust is attachments | 77.30 | 461.727 | 0.482 | 0.976 | .492** |
| trust is authenticity | 77.34 | 459.964 | 0.543 | 0.976 | .561** |
| trust is authority | 77.51 | 456.980 | 0.592 | 0.976 | .607** |
| trust is avoidance | 77.80 | 459.899 | 0.459 | 0.976 | .476** |
| trust is belief | 77.22 | 466.800 | 0.222 | 0.976 | .233* |
| trust is benevolent | 77.36 | 461.364 | 0.445 | 0.976 | .459** |
| trust is bond | 77.18 | 468.210 | 0.146 | 0.976 | .155 |

| Items | Means | Variance | r | Alpha Reliability | Construct Validity |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| trust is caring | 77.18 | 465.482 | 0.468 | 0.976 | .476** |
| trust is certainty | 77.36 | 460.334 | 0.503 | 0.976 | .518** |
| trust is charity | 77.46 | 457.180 | 0.603 | 0.976 | .622** |
| trust is collaboration | 77.26 | 461.063 | 0.594 | 0.976 | .605** |
| trust is collective | 77.29 | 460.531 | 0.574 | 0.976 | .588** |
| trust is commitment | 77.25 | 464.189 | 0.384 | 0.976 | .397** |
| trust is communication | 77.28 | 462.749 | 0.442 | 0.976 | .453** |
| trust is compensation | 77.50 | 456.758 | 0.606 | 0.976 | .617** |
| trust is complexity | 77.53 | 458.817 | 0.497 | 0.976 | .514** |
| trust is confidence | 77.23 | 464.320 | 0.411 | 0.976 | .423** |
| trust is connection | 77.19 | 465.408 | 0.427 | 0.976 | .437** |
| trust is consensus | 77.41 | 455.962 | 0.700 | 0.975 | .709** |
| trust is control | 77.55 | 460.109 | 0.431 | 0.976 | .449** |
| trust is cooperation | 77.26 | 462.255 | 0.508 | 0.976 | .520** |
| trust is courage | 77.22 | 463.830 | 0.476 | 0.976 | .487** |
| trust is dependence | 77.41 | 460.547 | 0.457 | 0.976 | .474** |
| trust is dialogue | 77.54 | 458.918 | 0.490 | 0.976 | .504** |
| trust is duties | 77.44 | 457.340 | 0.606 | 0.976 | .620** |
| trust is empathy | 77.44 | 456.006 | 0.675 | 0.975 | .687** |
| trust is engagement | 77.47 | 455.120 | 0.702 | 0.975 | .713** |
| trust is entities | 77.51 | 454.293 | 0.724 | 0.975 | .733** |
| trust is equality | 77.39 | 459.432 | 0.529 | 0.976 | .543** |
| trust is exchange | 77.54 | 453.463 | 0.753 | 0.975 | .763** |
| trust is expectations | 77.49 | 456.636 | 0.616 | 0.975 | .627** |
| trust is experience | 77.38 | 457.814 | 0.626 | 0.975 | .637** |
| trust is fairness | 77.35 | 458.614 | 0.611 | 0.976 | .625** |
| trust is faith | 77.24 | 462.891 | 0.502 | 0.976 | .514** |
| trust is familiarity | 77.50 | 454.758 | 0.705 | 0.975 | .715** |
| trust is forgiveness | 77.32 | 460.947 | 0.507 | 0.976 | .520** |
| trust is foundations | 77.33 | 459.476 | 0.584 | 0.976 | .599** |
| trust is friendship | 77.27 | 460.563 | 0.608 | 0.976 | .619** |
| trust is generosity | 77.32 | 457.432 | 0.721 | 0.975 | .733** |
| trust is gifts | 77.37 | 457.104 | 0.675 | 0.975 | .689** |
| trust is goodwill | 77.28 | 461.699 | 0.512 | 0.976 | .526** |
| trust is honesty | 77.27 | 460.442 | 0.616 | 0.976 | .627** |
| trust is honour | 77.27 | 460.926 | 0.583 | 0.976 | .595** |
| trust is hope | 77.26 | 462.154 | 0.515 | 0.976 | .528** |

| Items | Means | Variance | r | Alpha Reliability | Construct Validity |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| trust is humility | 77.34 | 458.792 | 0.612 | 0.976 | .624** |
| trust is identity | 77.32 | 459.533 | 0.593 | 0.976 | .603** |
| trust is intentions | 77.38 | 457.571 | 0.639 | 0.975 | .654** |
| trust is interest | 77.43 | 456.854 | 0.638 | 0.975 | .653** |
| trust is interpretation | 77.57 | 454.530 | 0.694 | 0.975 | .706** |
| trust is investment | 77.54 | 455.604 | 0.649 | 0.975 | .663** |
| trust is love | 77.26 | 461.790 | 0.541 | 0.976 | .555** |
| trust is loyalty | 77.22 | 462.254 | 0.611 | 0.976 | .618** |
| trust is monitoring | 77.53 | 457.181 | 0.576 | 0.976 | .589** |
| trust is obedience | 77.31 | 461.186 | 0.504 | 0.976 | .516** |
| trust is openness | 77.30 | 460.172 | 0.581 | 0.976 | .593** |
| trust is participation | 77.36 | 457.000 | 0.692 | 0.975 | .701** |
| trust is partnership | 77.34 | 459.217 | 0.587 | 0.976 | .601** |
| trust is patience | 77.27 | 460.623 | 0.604 | 0.976 | .615** |
| trust is performance | 77.47 | 458.090 | 0.553 | 0.976 | .568** |
| trust is positive | 77.21 | 464.491 | 0.447 | 0.976 | .458** |
| trust is privacy | 77.48 | 461.424 | 0.384 | 0.976 | .400** |
| trust is promise | 77.27 | 464.522 | 0.333 | 0.976 | .346** |
| trust is protection | 77.27 | 461.149 | 0.567 | 0.976 | .577** |
| trust is rapport | 77.52 | 457.000 | 0.588 | 0.976 | .600** |
| trust is reciprocity | 77.50 | 456.273 | 0.630 | 0.975 | .644** |
| trust is recognition | 77.35 | 458.432 | 0.622 | 0.975 | .634** |
| trust is relationships | 77.28 | 461.658 | 0.515 | 0.976 | .526** |
| trust is reliability | 77.28 | 461.880 | 0.500 | 0.976 | .510** |
| trust is reputation | 77.38 | 458.925 | 0.565 | 0.976 | .580** |
| trust is respect | 77.23 | 464.138 | 0.426 | 0.976 | .435** |
| trust is responsibility | 77.24 | 461.477 | 0.612 | 0.976 | .620** |
| trust is risk | 77.55 | 460.795 | 0.398 | 0.976 | .418** |
| trust is safety | 77.35 | 460.795 | 0.485 | 0.976 | .498** |
| trust is satisfaction | 77.36 | 460.112 | 0.516 | 0.976 | .526** |
| trust is security | 77.31 | 463.166 | 0.381 | 0.976 | .397** |
| trust is self-interest | 77.50 | 460.616 | 0.418 | 0.976 | .433** |
| trust is sensation | 77.36 | 459.808 | 0.533 | 0.976 | .546** |
| trust is sharing | 77.33 | 461.092 | 0.487 | 0.976 | .503** |
| trust is skill | 77.46 | 458.008 | 0.561 | 0.976 | .571** |
| trust is solidarity | 77.48 | 459.848 | 0.461 | 0.976 | .461** |
| trust is source | 77.40 | 457.475 | 0.627 | 0.975 | .638** |

| Items | Means | Variance | $r$ | Alpha Reliability | Construct Validity |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| trust is support | 77.27 | 461.654 | 0.532 | 0.976 | .544[**] |
| trust is surrender | 77.55 | 460.068 | 0.433 | 0.976 | .449[**] |
| trust is together | 77.27 | 462.906 | 0.445 | 0.976 | .456[**] |
| trust is tolerance | 77.42 | 456.589 | 0.659 | 0.975 | .670[**] |
| trust is transparency | 77.29 | 460.612 | 0.568 | 0.976 | .579[**] |
| trust is truth | 77.25 | 462.573 | 0.504 | 0.976 | .514[**] |
| trust is understanding | 77.23 | 464.745 | 0.376 | 0.976 | .390[**] |
| trust is unity | 77.25 | 462.008 | 0.547 | 0.976 | .558[**] |
| trust is vigilance | 77.50 | 458.313 | 0.530 | 0.976 | .543[**] |
| trust is willingness | 77.28 | 459.618 | 0.652 | 0.975 | .663[**] |

[**]. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). [*]. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table No. 2 Predictor Statistics on metadata of trust

| Selected Predictor | Rank | Unadjusted Sig. | F | df1 | df2 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| trust is exchange | 1 | .000 | 136.263 | 1 | 98 |
| trust is generosity | 2 | .000 | 113.617 | 1 | 98 |
| trust is entities | 3 | .000 | 113.579 | 1 | 98 |
| trust is familiarity | 4 | .000 | 102.506 | 1 | 98 |
| trust is engagement | 5 | .000 | 101.052 | 1 | 98 |
| trust is consensus | 6 | .000 | 99.267 | 1 | 98 |
| trust is interpretation | 7 | .000 | 97.325 | 1 | 98 |
| trust is participation | 8 | .000 | 94.671 | 1 | 98 |
| trust is gifts | 9 | .000 | 88.774 | 1 | 98 |
| trust is empathy | 10 | .000 | 87.435 | 1 | 98 |
| trust is tolerance | 11 | .000 | 79.634 | 1 | 98 |
| trust is investment | 12 | .000 | 76.938 | 1 | 98 |
| trust is willingness | 13 | .000 | 76.791 | 1 | 98 |
| trust is intentions | 14 | .000 | 73.056 | 1 | 98 |
| trust is interest | 15 | .000 | 72.734 | 1 | 98 |
| trust is reciprocity | 16 | .000 | 69.346 | 1 | 98 |
| trust is source | 17 | .000 | 67.418 | 1 | 98 |
| trust is experience | 18 | .000 | 66.940 | 1 | 98 |
| trust is recognition | 19 | .000 | 65.907 | 1 | 98 |
| trust is honesty | 20 | .000 | 63.639 | 1 | 98 |
| trust is expectations | 21 | .000 | 63.389 | 1 | 98 |

| Selected Predictor | Rank | Unadjusted Sig. | F | df1 | df2 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| trust is fairness | 22 | .000 | 62.790 | 1 | 98 |
| trust is humility | 23 | .000 | 62.507 | 1 | 98 |
| trust is charity | 24 | .000 | 61.932 | 1 | 98 |
| trust is duties | 25 | .000 | 61.255 | 1 | 98 |
| trust is responsibility | 26 | .000 | 61.164 | 1 | 98 |
| trust is friendship | 27 | .000 | 60.907 | 1 | 98 |
| trust is loyalty | 28 | .000 | 60.618 | 1 | 98 |
| trust is compensation | 29 | .000 | 60.356 | 1 | 98 |
| trust is patience | 30 | .000 | 59.588 | 1 | 98 |

Table No. 3 Predictor Statistics on metadata of trust based on variable Gender

| Male | Female | Chi-Square | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 32 | 68 | Rank | Unadjusted Sig. | Value | df |
| trust is patience | | 1 | .014 | 5.992 | 1 |

$\chi2(1)=5.992$; p-value = 0.014<0.05; only predictor.

Table No. 4 Predictor Statistics on metadata of trust based on variable Marital Status

| Unmarried | Married | Many Spouse | Chi-Square | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 91 | 7 | 2 | Rank | Unadjusted Sig. | Value | df |
| trust is humility | | | 1 | .032 | 6.868 | 2 |
| trust is patience | | | 2 | .046 | 6.142 | 2 |

$\chi^2(2)=6.868$; p-value = 0.032<0.05; first predictor *humility*.

$\chi^2(2)=6.142$; p-value = 0.046<0.05; second predictor *patience*.

**REFERENCES:**

Aizenshtadt, S. N. & Eisenstadt, S. N. (1995). *Power, trust, and meaning: essays in sociological theory and analysis.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Allport, G.W. (1954). *The Nature of Prejudice*, Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Almond, G. A., and Verba, S. (1965). *The Civic Culture*. Boston, MA: Little, Brown and Company.

Baier, A. (1995). *Moral Prejudices: Essays on Ethics*. UK: Harvard University Press.

Beck, U. (1986). *Risikogesellschaft. Auf dem Weg in eine andere Moderne* [*Risk Society. Towards a New Modernity*]. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp.

Beitat, K. (2015). *Trust and Incidents: The Dynamic of Interpersonal Trust between Patients and Practitioners*. Germany: Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden.

Bourdieu, P. & Passeron. (1979). The Forms of Capital. In J. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research of the sociology of education*. New-York: Greenwood.

Brown, B. (2018). *Dare to Lead: Brave Work. Tough Conversations*. UK: Ebury Publishing.

Burt, C. D. (2014). *Managing the Public's Trust in Non-profit Organizations*. Germany: Springer.

Child, J. & Möllering, G. (2003). Contextual confidence and active trust development in the Chinese business Environment. *Organization Science*, 14(1), 69–80.

Christine M. W. (2017). Online Education: Higher Education Savior or Selling Our Souls to the Devils? In Aneil Mishra (Eds.) *Restoring Trust in Higher Education: Making the Investment Worthwhile Again*. (2017). United States: ABC-CLIO.

Currall, S.C. and Judge, T.A. (1995). Measuring trust between organizational boundary role persons. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Process*, 64(2), 151–70.

Dan Fenn Jr. (2011). What, then, is the job of the government leader? In Terry, N., Peter R., Grant, R. (Eds.) *The Trusted Leader: Building the Relationships that Make Government Work.* US: SAGE Publications.

Davide, B., Vincent, B. & Werner, R. (2012). Embedded trust: the analytical approach in vignettes, laboratory experiments and surveys. In Lyon, F., Mollering, G., & Saunders, Mark N.K. (Eds.). *Handbook of Research Methods on Trust*. UK: Edward Elgar.

Davies, J., & Kourdi, J. (2010). *The Truth about Talent: A Guide to Building a Dynamic Workforce, Realizing Potential and Helping Leaders Succeed*. Germany: Wiley.

Dirks, K.T. (2000), Trust in leadership and team performance: Evidence from NCAA basketball. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 1004–12.

Durkheim, E. (1893). *The Division of Labor in Society*. Trans. W. D. Halls, NY: Free Press.

Eyre, S. (2011). *Patience: The Benefits of Waiting*. United States: Zondervan.

Forsyth, P.B., Adams, C.M., Hoy, W. K. (2011). *Collective Trust: Why schools Can't Improve Without It.* Columbia University: Teachers College Press.

Győrffy, D. (2018). *Trust and Crisis Management in the European Union: An Institutionalist Account of Success and Failure in Program Countries*. Germany: Springer International Publishing.

Gambetta, D. (1988). Can we trust trust? In D. Gambetta (ed.), *Trust; Making and Breaking of Cooperative Relations*, Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 213–37.

Haines, S. (2019). *The Politics of Trauma: Somatics, Healing, and Social Justice*. United States: North Atlantic Books.

Hogan, R., Curphy, G. & Hogan, J. (1994). What we know about leadership: Effectiveness and personality. *American Psychologist*, 49, 493–504.

Horsager, D. (2012). *The Trust Edge: How Top Leaders Gain Faster Results, Deeper Relationships, and a Stronger Bottom Line*. United States: Free Press.

Inkpen, A.C. & Currall, S.C. (1997). International joint venture trust: An empirical examination. In Paul, W. B. & Peter, J. K. (Eds.). *Cooperative Strategies, North American Perspectives*, San Francisco, CA: The New Lexington Press.

Janmaat, J. G. (2013). *The Dynamics and Social Outcomes of Education Systems*. United Kingdom: Palgrave Macmillan.

Jean-Mare, S., Stephen, F., Christian D.J., Elizabeth, G. & Young C. (2004). End-to-End Trust Starts with Recognition. In Dieter, H., Werner, S., Markus, U., Gunter, M. (Eds.). *Security in Pervasive Computing*: First International Conference,

Kohn, M. (2008). *Trust: Self-Interest and the Common Good*. UK: OUP Oxford.

Leifer, R. & P.K. Mills. (1996). An information processing approach for deciding upon control strategies and reducing control loss in emerging organizations. *Journal of Management*. 22, 113–37.

Langfred, C.W. (2004). Too much of a good thing? Negative effects of high trust and individual autonomy in self-managing teams. *Academy of Management Journal*, 47(3), 385–99.

Martínez-López, F. J., Aguilar, R., Molinillo, S., & Anaya, R. (2015). *Online Brand Communities: Using the Social Web for Branding and Marketing.* Germany: Springer International Publishing.

Maurus, J. (2001). *Liberation from Life S Shadows*. India: Better Yourself Books.

Mishra, K. E., & Mishra, A. (2013). *Becoming a Trustworthy Leader: Psychology and Practice.* UK: Routledge.

McCulloch, C. E., Shiboski, S. C., Glidden, D. V., Vittinghoff, E. (2005). *Regression Methods in Biostatistics: Linear, Logistic, Survival, and Repeated Measures Models*. Germany: Springer New York.

McKnight, D.H., Choudhury, V. & Kacmar, C.J. (2002a). Developing and validating trust measures for e-commerce: An integrative typology. *Information Systems Research*, 13(3), 334–59.

McKnight, D.H. & Thatcher, J.B. (2004). *Trust in technology: Development of a set of constructs and measures.* Working paper, Michigan State University.

McKnight, D.H. & Chervany, N.L. (2005). What builds system trouble shooter trust the best – Experiential or Non-experiential factors? *Information Resources Management Journal*.

McMahon, D., & Hanley, R.P. (2010). *The Enlightenment: Critical Concepts in Historical Studies*. United Kingdom: Routledge.

Möllering, G. (2006). *Trust: Reason, Routine, Reflexivity*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Muchinsky, P.M. (1977). Organizational communication: Relationships to organizational climate and job satisfaction. *Academy of Management Journal*, 20(4), 592–607.

Nguyen-Phuong-Mai, M. (2019). *Cross-Cultural Management: With Insights from Brain Science*. United Kingdom: Taylor & Francis.

Nooteboom, B. (2002). *Trust: Forms, Foundations, Functions, Failures, and Figures*. United Kingdom: Eward Elgar.

OECD. (2017). *Guidelines on Measuring Trust*. France: OECD Publishing.

Orr, E. R. (2012). *Living With Honour: A Pagan Ethics*. UK: John Hunt Publishing.

Schutz, A. (1967). *The Phenomenology of the Social World*. (Trans.) Walsh, G. & Lehnart, F., Evanston. IL: Northwestern University.

Paliszkiewicz, J. & Koohang, A. (2016). *Social Media and Trust: A Multinational Study of University Students*. Santa Rosa California: Informing Science Press.

Pentland, B.T. (1999). Building process theory with narrative: from description to explanation. *Academy of Management Review*. 24(4), 711–24.

Pennington, R., Wilcox, H.D. & Grover, V. (2003). The role of system trust in business-to-consumer transactions. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 20(3), 197–226.

Putnam, R. (1995). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community.* New York: Simon and Schuster.

Ridings, C.M., D. Gefen & B. Arinze. (2002). Some antecedents and effects of trust in virtual communities. *Journal of Strategic Information Systems*. 11(3–4),271–95.

Robsonde, O.A. (2015). *Group Trust in Distributed Systems and its Relationship with Information Security and Cyber Security*. Unpublished Thesis Degree of Doctor. Universidad Complutense de Madrid.

Robert, H. S. (2019). Fiduciary Principles in Trust Law. In Robert, S., Paul B. M., & Evan J. C. (Eds.). *The Oxford Handbook of Fiduciary Law*. UK: Oxford University Press. .

Roberts, K.H. and O'Reilly, C.A. (1974). Information filtration in organizations: Three experiments. *Organizational Behavior & Human Performance*, 11(2), 253–65.

Rompf, S. A. (2014). *Trust and Rationality: An Integrative Framework for Trust Research*. Germany: Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden.

Rosalind H. S., Ann-Marie I. N., & Sim, B. S. (2018). *The Routledge Companion to Trust*. United Kingdom: Taylor & Francis.

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

Sommerville, I., Hardstone, G., Rouncefield, M., & Clarke, K. (2006). *Trust in Technology: A Socio-Technical Perspective*. Netherlands: Springer.

Stewart, B. (2010). *Cultural Leadership: The New Chemistry of Leading Differently*. United Kingdom: Lulu.com.

Sumpf, P. (2019). *System Trust: Researching the Architecture of Trust in Systems*. Germany: Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden.

Schmid, P. F., & O'Hara, M. (2013). *The Handbook of Person-Centred Psychotherapy and Counselling*. United Kingdom: Palgrave Macmillan.

Singh, M., & Falcone, R. (2001). *Trust in Cyber-societies: Integrating the Human and Artificial Perspectives*. Germany: Springer Berlin Heidelberg.

Setola, R., & Franceschetti, G. (2013). *Effective Surveillance for Homeland Security: Balancing Technology and Social Issues*. United Kingdom: CRC Press.

Svendsen G. T. & Svendsen G. L. H. (2009). *Handbook of Social Capital: The Troika of Sociology, Political Science and Economics*. United Kingdom: Edward Elgar.

Tamilina, L. (2008). Welfare States and Social Trust: 'Crowding-Out' Dilemma. In Rino, F., Munindar P.S., Jordi, S.P., & Suzanne, B. (Eds). *Trust in Agent Societies:* 11th International Workshop, TRUST 2008, Estoril, Portugal, May 12 -13, 2008. Revised Selected and Invited Papers. (2008). Germany: Springer.

Technical Report. (2000). United States: *U. S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences*.

Thompson, R. A. (2015). *Counseling Techniques: Improving Relationships with Others, Ourselves, Our Families, and Our Environment*. United Kingdom: Taylor & Francis.

Timothy, S. (1990). *Reading and Writing Together: New Perspectives for the Classroom*. United States: Christopher-Gordon.

Walker, J., & Ostrom, E. (2003). *Trust and Reciprocity: Interdisciplinary Lessons for Experimental Research*. United States: Russell Sage Foundation.

Wallace, D. P. (2007). *Knowledge Management: Historical and Cross-disciplinary Themes*. United Kingdom: Libraries Unlimited.

Wenzel, K. (2014). *The Art of Redirection: A Children'S Book, for Adults*. UK: Xlibris.

Wilkinson, C., Vajda, S., Shore, Y., Hofer, N., & Sarkissian, W. (2012). *Kitchen Table Sustainability: Practical Recipes for Community Engagement with Sustainability*. United Kingdom: Taylor & Francis.

Zaheer, A., McEvily, B. & Perrone, V. (1998). Does trust matter? Exploring the effects of inter-organizational and interpersonal trust on performance. *Organization Science*, 9(2), 141–59.

a