1 Introduction: the variety of methods for the multi-faceted phenomenon of trust

Fergus Lyon, Guido Möllering and Mark N.K. Saunders

A reader who picks up this handbook will, we imagine, share the excitement and frustration about trust that thinkers have experienced for millennia and that is still felt throughout the growing community of trust researchers nowadays: how trust is one of the most fascinating and fundamental social phenomena yet at the same time one of the most elusive and challenging concepts one could study. As scholars we have to reach past the undying topicality and apparent importance of trust as we apply our research methods to this challenge, only to realize their limitations when the object of study is trust. The chapters in this handbook show that we have a broad array of methods that help us rise to the challenge of capturing at least part of the multi-faceted phenomenon of trust.

To date, an overview of the many methods that can be used for studying trust has been missing. It is our aim to provide such an overview with this handbook, while recognizing that it cannot be fully exhaustive. Through this handbook we hope to encourage trust researchers to reflect on the methods they use, to acknowledge contributions from a variety of methodological positions and to improve methods and instruments according to the specific challenges posed by trust. Our optimism in this respect is based on the relative methodological openness and pluralism we have observed in the trust research community. Perhaps more than in other fields, our research topic prevents methodological hubris as it constantly reminds us how no method can provide the perfect understanding of a phenomenon.

In line with these considerations, the editors and contributors of this volume have explored trust from a variety of directions. As trust is a concept that cannot be easily observed or even defined, the trust research community has drawn on ideas across academia to gain a better understanding of it. This book reflects on the journeys of trust researchers and through the sharing of their experiences hopes to cast light on methods for those researching trust.

The origins of this book lie in conversations the editors have had with fellow researchers coming together at international events to share their work on trust over the past 10 years and more. In particular the growing number of publications on trust, the activities of FINT (First International Network on Trust), now in its tenth year, and the newly established *Journal of Trust Research* demonstrate a diversity of methods, disciplines, traditions and nations. Our common interest in trust coincides with wide-ranging ideas on how to study it.

As research on trust matures, the opportunity arises to consider the innovative developments by trust researchers in the methods they have used in order to examine this concept. In this book, a wide range of methods for researching trust are brought together for the first time. Our selected chapters are drawn from across a range of divides, with the aim to span boundaries whether they are between disciplines, between theoretical positions, methodological traditions or geographical regions. The chapter contributors demonstrate the true international nature of the interest in trust research, reflecting research in North America, Asia, Australasia, Africa and Europe. As trust research grows and more people aim to include an element of researching trust in their work, the chapters in this book can serve as a guide through a wide range of methodological approaches.

Research on trust can be traced back at least to work in the 1960s and 1970s with a range of influential exploratory pieces (such as Deutsch, 1973; Garfinkel, 1967; Rotter, 1967; Zand, 1972). In the 1980s and 1990s there was much research on conceptual aspects, followed by a wide range of empirical and experimental studies from the late 1990s to the present (see Bachmann and Zaheer, 2006; Möllering, 2006). The chapters in this handbook explore elements of this history and identify future directions, with particular emphasis on research process and methods.

Trust research traditions have given rise to a broad range of definitional debates which are well addressed by Rousseau et al. (1998), Möllering (2006) and Dietz and Den Hartog (2006), to name just a few. Seppanen et al. (2007) in their review found that there are over 70 definitions of the concept of trust (see also Castaldo, 2007). We have therefore taken a broad definition in giving guidance to the contributors, adopting Rousseau et al. (1998: 395): ‘the psychological state comprising the intention to accept vulnerability based upon positive expectations of the intentions or behaviour of another’. However, debates on definitions in the English-language academic literature continue, paying little attention to the role of culture and language and the importance of understanding which word is used for trust, and its other interpretations (Saunders et al., 2010). In this book, we therefore recognize the diversity of trust concepts found in academic writing and readers will find variations between chapters.

This book does not aim to be a social science methods text; we accept that not all areas of research methods on trust have been included. We have tried to identify those areas that require additional attention to methods when looking at trust. We have also concentrated on the empirical elements of researching trust. We appreciate the value of theoretical and conceptual writings on trust (for example Baier, 1986; Hardin, 2002; Luhmann, 1979; Misztal, 1996; Nooteboom, 2002), but the remit we set ourselves and our fellow contributors was to look at practical concerns in empirical trust research.

The chapters are aimed at both new and established researchers. They will appeal to those new to trust who wish to explore possible methods as well as those who have been researching trust from a particular tradition interested in considering alternatives. The knowledge and understanding of research methods on trust is dissipated across the broad, multidisciplinary community of trust researchers, necessitating considerable detective work by those interested. This book seeks to draw together into one volume the wealth of research-method experience gained by trust researchers.

Each chapter summarizes the state of the art of an element of trust research as perceived by the authors. We have encouraged contributors to inspire others and give a flavour of this diversity of trust research rather than provide a full review. We believe that no one method – whether quantitative or qualitative, used on its own or in conjunction with others – is stronger or weaker than another. Rather, we ask our readers to consider each in its own context. For this reason, every contributor has presented their own experience of using a particular method. In each chapter, researchers examine different methodological issues and particular methods and share their experiences of what works, what does not work, their challenges and innovations. These reflections are central to the ethos of the book and distinguish it from other methods handbooks. We are not aiming to be definitive but sharing, because as researchers we learn by experimentation.

Part I of the book identifies conceptual issues and empirical approaches to researching them. The chapters by Roderick M. Kramer (Chapter 2) and Roy Lewicki and Chad Brinsfield (Chapter 3) consider how trust can be measured, raising points that are subsequently developed in chapters throughout the book, most notably in the chapter on quantitative measures by Nicole Gillespie (Chapter 17). The chapter by Bart Nooteboom (Chapter 4) introduces further measurement and conceptual challenges, particularly in cases when there is complex interaction between agents. He uses simulations to demonstrate the importance of trust and benevolence. The following two parts demonstrate qualitative and quantitative methods to researching trust at different scales: micro, meso and societal.

Part II of the book looks at qualitative methods and Part III examines quantitative methods, although many chapters demonstrate how qualitative and quantitative methods may be mixed in the same study. The final part draws conclusions for the future of trust research, the chapter by Katinka Bijlsma-Frankema and Denise Rousseau (Chapter 24) identifying future challenges for trust research.

CONCEPTUALIZING TRUST

As shown in later chapters, the current literature on the concept of trust can be divided in a number of ways. In each of these, trust research focuses on a particular element, often related to what is considered a suitable research subject within the disciplines of the researchers involved. These are not competing elements, rather they represent different ways in which to approach the exploration of trust. Six clusters can be identified and are examined in more detail below:

1.1 Antecedents

There has been much research on the preconditions for trust, building on the work of Mayer et al. (1995), who proposed that trust can be predicted by different factors of trustworthiness such as ability, benevolence and integrity. Drawing on organizational behaviour research and psychology, attention has been given to examining the differences between issues of trustworthiness, propensity to trust and trusting behaviour (Dietz et al., 2010). There is a wide range of survey measures, ranging from the consequences of trust, to trustworthiness and trusting attitudes. However, as Nicole Gillespie points out (in Chapter 17), there is a need to distinguish trust from perceived trustworthiness and a need to consider the willingness to be vulnerable.

1.2 Processes of Building Trust

Research on trust-building draws on a wide range of disciplines. Roy Lewicki and Chad Brinsfield (Chapter 3) provide an overview of the role of laboratory-based experimental strategies using simulation games to understand the underpinnings of trust judgements. Donald N. Ferrin, Michelle C. Bligh and Jeffrey C. Kohles (Chapter 18) also show the importance of seeing trust as interdependence, as explained by Rousseau et al. (1998). They note that much research has shied away from this, with methodologies assuming independent actors rather than examining dyadic relations where trust in one partner affects trust held by the other party. Field research on building trust has been an important element of the literature on trust and is explored in chapters by Friederike Welter and Nadezhda Alex (Chapter 5) and Malin Tillmar (Chapter 10) as well as others. Such approaches can focus on the personal relationships but may examine the institutional context as well, such as the political, legal and economic framework, and even the informal rules that make up culturally specific institutions.

1.3 The Context Shaping Trust-building

The chapters on trust-building demonstrate the importance of understanding culture and recognize the danger of assuming context away. Trust has been shown to be a process that is deeply embedded in social relations (Granovetter, 1985). Friederike Welter and Nadezhda Alex (Chapter 5) use a field study to examine how trust is part of entrepreneurial activity and how this is shaped by the cultural and regulatory context. Using a very different strategy – laboratory experiments – Davide Barrera, Vincent Buskens and Werner Raub (Chapter 19) examine how the concept of embeddedness can be brought into such controlled environments. Research on how context shapes trust is not without its challenges. Roderick M. Kramer (Chapter 2) describes the small and subtle context specific behaviours, both verbal and non-verbal cues, in trust-building.

1.4 Decision-making Processes in Trust

Linked to research on the antecedents of trust and the trust-building processes is a set of literature that debates the decision-making processes of trust. Distinctions can be drawn from those who examine trust as a rational choice or calculation (Williamson, 1993) in contrast to studies that take a wider view of trust that also includes the actions that are routinized, intuitive, habitual and often not explicitly stated (Kramer, 1996; Lyon, 2005; Möllering, 2006; Nooteboom, 1999). In this book, Richard L. Priem and Antoinette A. Weibel (Chapter 20) study the decision-making in trust, recognizing the importance of understanding when individuals face cognitive and emotional constraints. Similarly, Bart Nooteboom (Chapter 4), shows that, with incomplete contracts, calculative self-interest cannot explain everything and so there is a need to include other elements, such as benevolence.

1.5 Implications and Uses of Trust

There is a plethora of comparative studies that aim to compare organizations, individuals and the impact of different degrees of types of trust on performance or social outcomes. Research on consequences of trust in business and management has examined the effect on financial performance (Zaheer and Harris, 2005), alliances or innovation (Nooteboom, 2002), while there has been other research looking at the effect of trust on health outcomes and other aspects of human interaction (for example Brownlie et al., 2008).

These outcomes of trust can be examined at a range of scales, distinguishing between the micro, organizational/inter-organizational and societal levels (Bachmann and Zaheer, 2006; Nooteboom, 2002). In this book we present three conceptual chapters, each focusing on one of these scales. Friederike Welter and Nadezhda Alex (Chapter 5) look at the micro scale of interpersonal entrepreneurial relations. Boris F. Blumberg, Jose M. Pieró and Robert A. Roe (Chapter 6) look at a meso scale with networks of social capital, when researching inter-organizational relationships. There are also debates about the extent to which there is trust between organizations as entities themselves or between individuals within each organization (McEvily et al., 2003; Zaheer et al., 1998). At a societal scale, Eric M. Uslaner (Chapter 7) examines the applicability of surveys that ask about the degree of generalized or moralistic trust that people have in others who are not known to them.

1.6 Lack of Trust, Distrust, Mistrust and Repair

The final cluster of research focuses on distinctions made between lack of trust, distrust and mistrust. Research on the consequences of trust has also included the downside of trust when individuals put themselves at risk (McEvily et al., 2003) or over-trust (Goel and Karri, 2006) that can lead to trust violations (Lewicki and Bunker, 1996; Dirks et al., 2009). Boris F. Blumberg, Jose M. Pieró and Robert A. Roe (Chapter 6) show how trust can be eroded through lack of use or can suffer a radical loss if there is opportunism. Roy J. Lewicki and Chad Brinsfield (Chapter 3) discuss how trust is not always advantageous and can be misplaced. Furthermore, drawing on previous work (Lewicki et al., 1998), they point out that trust and distrust are independent constructs that can be held in the same relationship for different facets of that relationship. This leads to a further stream of research on relationship repair following violation, but the lack of longitudinal research has limited the insights in this area to date.

These categorizations may not do justice to the wide range of research, much of which aims to draw together the different elements outlined above. Some studies try to capture trust very broadly while others are only interested in a particular element of trust, because their main interest is in another concept. Hence, Möllering (2006) distinguishes between studies with trust as a central concern as opposed to those that examine it as a peripheral aspect. Moreover, some studies set out to study the concept from the start while others include trust as it emerges from a more inductive process or as an explanatory variable (see Möllering, 2006). It may be late in the research process when researchers stumble across the concept and decide to examine it in more detail (for example Sitkin and Stickel, 1996). When trust was not part of the original research design or was considered merely a control variable, perhaps one cannot expect as much methodological care and rigour as if it were at the core of the study. We hope that the overview given in this handbook, though, will also be useful to those for whom trust is peripheral, at least as they start out.

This section has examined the different approaches to conceptualizing the issues surrounding the concept of trust. These could be referred to as the ontological issues. It is not the purpose of this book to focus on ontology; rather, our aim is to shed light on the methodological issues behind research in each approach. In this way, this book is more about the epistemological challenges, although we recognize that this cannot be considered without clarity in ontology. The next section examines some of the methodological issues in more detail. In deciding on a structure, we have adopted the widely used division of qualitative and quantitative. Within this we acknowledge that trust research can and does mix both, either through drawing on different methods to examine different aspects sequentially, or by explicitly developing methods that use both qualitative and quantitative methods concurrently (Teddlie and Tashakkori, 2010). Examples of the latter include the card sort methods (Miriam Muethel, Chapter 12, and Mark N.K. Saunders, Chapter 11) or repertory grid methods (Reinhard Bachmann, Chapter 13, and Melanie J. Ashleigh and Edgar Meyer, Chapter 14).

QUALITATIVE METHODS

Traditions of qualitative research have been particularly important for shedding light on the processes of building trust and theory-building. Qualitative methods are found in both the inductive approaches of building theories, as in the chapters by Malin Tillmar on ethnography (Chapter 10) and by Reinhard Bachmann on the repertory grid technique (Chapter

13), and in deductive approaches that aim to test theories using qualitative data, such as in the chapter by Roderick M. Kramer (Chapter 2). In this section we explore some of the methods used in trust research, recognizing that there is much in common with issues in qualitative research more generally.

The inductive approach allows for more open and less structured data collection methods that might enable new concepts to emerge that were not previously found in the literature. Ethnographic methods have had a long tradition of such research but have only received limited use in trust research. Malin Tillmar (Chapter 10) shows how these methods may achieve insights and access to sensitive data that may involve learning the language in order to understand the facets of trust in different cultures. Through cross-case comparisons in two countries, she goes on to show how valuable insights can be made of one's own culture.

The use of qualitative methods also allows respondents to define what they mean by trust, and as Reinhard Bachmann (Chapter 13) shows, there is a need to question the assumptions of universality frequently found in many frameworks of trust. This is important in cross-cultural research that recognizes that people from different cultures and languages may develop and apply trust constructs in different ways. Melanie J. Ashleigh and Edgar Meyer, Robert Münscher and Torsten M. Kühlmann, and Calvin Burns and Stacey Conchie (Chapters 14, 16 and 22) examine how trust constructs differ according to culture.

With the depth of information required in qualitative research, access to subjects for an extended period of time becomes an issue. While qualitative research on trust can involve a large number of shorter interviews, many methods set out in the book require that the participants provide over an hour of their time. In some organizations, people can be instructed to take part, but in others there is the need to build up trust and relationships with the participant. The chapter by Fergus Lyon (Chapter 8) explores this in detail, showing how interviewees in his research made comparisons between the relationship with the researcher and their own practices of building trust in business. Access is a greater challenge when dealing with sensitive issues. Mark N.K. Saunders (Chapter 11) shows how methods, such as the use of card sorts, can be used to break the ice and build rapport prior to conducting in-depth interviews. Malin Tillmar (Chapter 10) found that if she was seen in the communities in which she was working and demonstrated that she was making an effort to integrate (such as by learning the language), respondents would tell her more.

Similarly, access becomes a crucial issue when dealing with what some refer to as 'hard-to-reach groups', often involved in more informal activities or even illegality. Friederike Welter and Nadezhda Alex (Chapter 5) examine entrepreneurs' cross-border trade that had elements of sensitivity relating to getting through customs, and Christine Goodall's chapter (Chapter 9) on trust between new arrivals and settled communities explores how she gained access to people who would otherwise be very suspicious of people asking about this topic.

While interviewing has dominated much qualitative research, there is a wide range of other methods as well. Malin Tillmar (Chapter 10) shows that observation is an element of ethnography that can yield important results as it shows what people are doing, rather than what they are claiming to be doing, or wanting the researcher to think they are doing. Robert Münscher and Torsten M. Kühlmann (Chapter 16) use the critical incident technique to focus on key moments in cross-cultural management within firms, using observations to gather data that complement interview-based data. Gerard Breeman (Chapter 15) uses the careful analysis of historical records and diaries, letters and other texts to understand trust, in what he refers to as the hermeneutic method.

There is also innovative work on researching non-linguistic approaches; pauses, silences and laughter, all of which are important indicators of how people respond to questions (Lyon, 2005). This is invariably lost in written responses to questions. There is also research on the role of emotions, shown through voiced utterances, emphasis, pitch and speaking speed. This presents challenges for coding and analysis although transcripts may capture it. Benjamin Waber and colleagues (Chapter 23) write on trust between medical staff when the subject has no time to stop, and they show how this can be coded, quantified and explored.

QUANTITATIVE METHODS

A wide range of quantitative trust scales and measures, highlighted earlier, have been explored using surveys of 'real-world situations' or through laboratory experiments. Whilst this diversity has allowed trust research to grow, the lack of convergence and replication is striking (see the review by McEvily and Tortoriello, 2011). Nicole Gillespie (Chapter 17) shows that a lack of common questions can limit the extent of replication in different contexts and cultures. She proposes a common set of psychometric measurements of trustworthiness and trusting behaviour that can be widely used for comparative purposes.

Questionnaire surveys have been used to explore all elements of trust research. Research on societal generalized trust has been common across a wide range of countries. Similar questions have been used, thereby allowing cultural comparisons to be made about trusting attitudes or moralistic trust (asking 'can people be trusted?'). Eric M. Uslaner (Chapter 7) examines the challenges of such questions, including how they might be interpreted in different cultures and how responses could be shaped by the ordering of questions in surveys. However, he also notes a consistency of responses, over time and between questions, suggesting that the established 'trust questions' are rigorous.

While much research has focused on the elements of trusting behaviour, other surveys focus on trust related to interaction with a specific person or actor, with valuable information collected on patterns of how trust can be built up. Rosalind H. Searle (Chapter 21) shows that a diary method can be used to collect data using structured questions to allow comparisons between people and changes over time. However, as for other research on trust, she is sensitive to the challenges of using the word 'trust' in surveys as it can change behaviour.

Other approaches look at measuring the frequency of trusting interactions and their nature. The methods of card sorting, ranking and repertory grid analysis (Chapters 11, 12, 13 and 14) show that there can also be a mixing of quantitative and qualitative methods and, consequently, an element of quantification of results. Using multiple quantitative methods can provide quantitative data such as recording the responses of individuals after they have read a vignette or a particular case study provided by the researcher (see Chapter 19 by Davide Barrera, Vincent Buskens and Werner Raub).

Laboratory experiments have been particularly important in trust research as a way to explore basic cognitive processes in a controlled setting. Roderick M. Kramer shows the power of such research in examining trust, particularly when it can be combined with other methods outside of the laboratory. Roy J. Lewicki and Chad Brinsfield (Chapter 3) review some of the interactive experiments or trust games that look at individual behaviour. Donald L. Ferrin and colleagues (Chapter 18) follow up on this work by looking at dyads, that is both sides of the relationship, recognizing that each side in a trust relationship is not working independently, whether they are co-workers, leaders/followers or partners in a joint venture.

Innovative approaches to laboratory experiments are also being developed in trust research. Calvin Burns and Stacey Conchie (Chapter 22) examine the more tacit side of trusting relationships that might not be evident from surveys or verbal responses. They measure the strength of associations related to trust concepts by calculating the time taken to respond to stimuli. Similarly, Roy J. Lewicki and Chad Brinsfield (Chapter 3) refer to the intuitive trust based on facial characteristics. There are also insights from neuro-economics, which has examined the roles of hormones such as oxytocin on trust (for example Kosfeld et al., 2005; Zak et al., 2004).

METHODOLOGICAL CHALLENGES

The methodological challenges of researching trust are illuminated throughout each chapter in this book, as authors reflect on their own work. Five key themes can be identified that present trust research with its specific challenges: the dynamic process of trust; researching tacit elements of trust; conceptualizing and describing trust in different cultures; the role of researchers in shaping the trust situation they are researching; and research ethics of trust. These challenges also point the way towards future research opportunities in the field.

As outlined earlier, trust is a dynamic process as it is built up, used, maintained, broken and repaired. The temporal element is rarely captured in trust research but longitudinal data collection methods can allow such processes to be captured. Nicole Gillespie (Chapter 17) shows how research on measures of trustworthiness can be related to trust behaviour, Rosalind H. Searle (Chapter 21) shows how diaries can be used to record processes over time (although as research progresses the dropout rate tends to increase) and Robert Münscher and Torsten M. Kühlmann (Chapter 16) show how high-quality interviewing skills used to examine critical incidents in relationships can capture the dynamism of changing trust relationships over time.

Methodologically, the less visible or tacit forms of trust are particularly hard to identify and collect data about as they may not be expressed explicitly by those involved. Research in this volume shows how trust can be captured by recording the non-verbal responses, with innovative approaches examining people's response to particular words (see Calvin Burns and Stacey Conchie, Chapter 22). However, research has to recognize that trust cannot be explained by rational choice alone as there are emotional constraints that can be intuitive or routinized.

The cultural dimension of trust is particularly important and increasingly recognized as central to trust research (Saunders et al., 2010). With cross-cultural research come methodological challenges of language translation and questions of whether the scales of trust commonly used can be transferred across cultures. This issue is discussed in detail by Katinka M. Bijlsma-Frankema and Denise M. Rousseau in their examination of the 'generality' of trust research results (Chapter 24). Friederike Welter and Nadezhda Alex (Chapter 5) show this is particularly difficult in comparative work between countries, and Christine Goodall (Chapter 9) shows the challenges of working on this topic with new arrivals in a UK community. Reinhard Bachmann (Chapter 13) cautions against assuming universality on any concept, although there are approaches which explore these differences. Miriam Muethel (Chapter 12) uses a board game to allow researchers to explore how people from different cultures use language related to trust. Malin Tillmar (Chapter 10) explores how ethnographic methods and a researcher's knowledge of the different languages can help. Replication of studies in different cultures along with careful analysis will allow for more insights into those conceptual elements that are more universal, although as both Nicole Gillespie (Chapter 17) and Roy J. Lewicki and Chad Brinsfield (Chapter 3) show, there has been little consistency in the questions being asked by different surveys.

The fourth methodological challenge identified here is the role of the researcher. Researching trust raises issues of reflexivity, including trust between researcher and the researched. Both Fergus Lyon (Chapter 8) and Malin Tillmar (Chapter 10) show that how the researcher is perceived shapes the information provided. These chapters and others show the significance of building up relationships of trust with interviewees and how important it is to pay careful attention to issues that might create mistrust (such as the use of interview recording in some situations). Research can also change relationships by talking about trust. Rosalind H. Searle (Chapter 21) refers to psychological reactance, Mark N.K. Saunders (Chapter 11) highlights that discussing trust can lead to stress or behaviour change, and Robert Münscher and Torsten M. Kühlman (Chapter 16) are sensitive to the distress that discussing critical incidents can have on respondents.

This leads to the final methodological challenge related to the ethics of research on trust. As mentioned earlier, trust research covers topics that are sensitive in nature, either within an organization or community, or between groups. Where these activities have an element of illegality or secrecy this becomes particularly challenging. Christine Goodall (Chapter 9) shows that there is a tendency for respondents to report trust in neighbours or authority as they wish to appear trusting; Calvin Burns and Stacey Conchie (Chapter 22) refer to the risk of people giving socially desirable answers in interviews. A further ethical dilemma arises when looking at different sides of a trust relationship when there are likely to be different views of the same situation and the potential for research to affect the relationship negatively.

LOOKING AHEAD

The more recent growth in trust research is evidenced by the large proliferation in publications on the subject. In this book we reflect on the different strategies for researching trust, the range of innovative methods that have been developed by trust researchers, and the methodological challenges that are particular to trust. As Roy J. Lewicki and Chad Brinsfield suggest (Chapter 3), trust research appears to be undergoing a process of divergence not convergence of paradigms. Parallel debates are taking place in the literature of different disciplines, whether they are management and organization studies, sociology, geography, anthropology, psychology, institutional economics, political science or emerging schools such as neuro-economics. There is a risk that each school of thought will develop a self-referential discourse and language, although we note that many trust researchers are trying to break across these boundaries.

Trust research is frequently going beyond disciplines and being carried out by interdisciplinary researchers or interdisciplinary teams. The methodological challenge of bringing different schools and different disciplinary methods together is touched on in a number of chapters. Friederike Welter and Nadezhda Alex (Chapter 5) show how the interaction in international interdisciplinary groups of scholars also requires an element of trust. However, such combinations of disciplines and professions provide their own challenges in terms of comparing findings or interpreting studies that test the same hypotheses using very different methods.

The future directions of trust research are therefore diverse, but a number of trends can be identified. There is an emerging focus on culture and a move beyond a focus on assuming universality of trust constructs developed in North America and Western Europe. The chapters in this volume illuminate methods and associated issues when researching how trust operates in different contexts and cultures. Such methods need to recognize cultural differences between countries, within countries, between professions and between sectors. Specific methods such as card sorts (Chapter 12 by Miriam Müthel) and ethnography (Chapter 10 by Malin Tillmar) offer alternative ways to explore the different underlying cultural interpretations.

Trust appears to be of growing interest following the breakdown of many institutions that were previously relied on, whether they were related to international financial systems or community-level engagement and relationships. These challenges to the status quo also throw up new forms of trust-building that are worthy of academic investigation. Examples include new forms of relationships arising from e-commerce and virtual networking, or new forms of organizing that rely on cooperation and collaboration. These may be at the bilateral level, at the community scale or at the macro scale in wider societal levels of trust in others and formal institutions. There are demands from different disciplines to explain changes in trust and new opportunities arising to challenge disciplinary conventions such as rational choice models in economics. These require clear thought regarding method.

As mentioned at the start of this chapter, this volume is an exercise of a community of researchers sharing their ideas and experiences of researching trust. It is not a definitive textbook, although it identifies a diversity of research methods that new researchers can explore in more detail elsewhere. It is part of the process of reflecting on methodology and demonstrating a stage in the maturity of trust research. As editors, we believe this handbook will contribute to the next stage of trust research as it cuts across boundaries, whether they are disciplinary, professional, sectoral or geographical.

REFERENCES

Bachmann, R. and A. Zaheer (2006), *Handbook of Trust Research*, Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar.
Baier, A. (1986), 'Trust and antitrust', *Ethics*, **69** (2), 231–60.
Brownlie, J., A. Greene and A. Howson (2008), *Researching Trust and Health*, London: Routledge.
Castaldo, S. (2007), *Trust in Market Relationships*, Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar.
Deutsch, M. (1973), *The Resolution of Conflict*, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
Dietz, G. and D.N. Den Hartog (2006), 'Measuring trust inside organisations', *Personnel Review*, **35** (5), 557–88.
Dietz, G., N. Gillespie and G.T. Chao (2010), 'Unravelling the complexities of trust and culture', in M.N.K. Saunders, D. Skinner, G. Dietz, N. Gillespie and R.J. Lewicki (eds), *Organizational Trust: A Cultural Perspective*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 3–41.
Dirks, K.T., R.J. Lewicki and A. Zaheer (2009), 'Repairing relationships within and between organizations: building a conceptual foundation', *Academy of Management Review*, **34** (1), 68–84.
Garfinkel, H. (1967), *Studies in Ethnomethodology*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
Goel, S. and R. Karri (2006), 'Entrepreneurs, effectual logic, and over-trust', *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, **30** (5), 477–93.
Granovetter, M.S. (1985), 'Economic action and social structure: the problem of embeddedness', *American Journal of Sociology*, **91** (3), 481–510.
Hardin, R. (2002), *Trust and Trustworthiness*, New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
Kosfeld, M., M. Heinrichs, P.J. Zak, U. Fischbacher and E. Fehr (2005), 'Oxytocin increases trust in humans', *Nature*, **435** (7042), 673–6.
Kramer, R.M. (1996), 'Divergent realities and convergent disappointments in the hierarchic relation: trust and the intuitive auditor at work', in R.M. Kramer and T.R. Tyler (eds), *Trust in Organizations: Frontiers of Theory and Research*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, pp. 216–45.
Lewicki, R.J. and B.B. Bunker (1996), 'Developing and maintaining trust in work relationships', in R. Kramer and T.R. Tyler (eds), *Trust in Organizations: Frontiers of Theory and Research*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, pp. 114–39.
Lewicki, R.J., D.J. McAllister and R.J. Bies (1998), 'Trust and distrust: new relationships and realities', *Academy of Management Review*, **23** (3), 438–58.
Luhmann, N. (1979), *Trust and Power: Two Works by Niklas Luhmann*, Chichester: Wiley.

Lyon, F. (2005), 'Managing co-operation: trust and power in Ghanaian associations', *Organization Studies*, **27** (1), 31–52.
Mayer, R., J. Davis and F. Schoorman (1995), 'An integrative model of organisational trust', *Academy of Management Review*, **20** (3), 709–34.
McAllister, D.J. (1995), 'Affect- and cognition-based trust as foundations for interpersonal cooperation in organizations', *Academy of Management Journal*, **38** (1), 24–59.
McEvily, B. and M. Tortoriello (2011), 'Measuring trust in organisational research: review and recommendations', *Journal of Trust Research*, **1** (1), 23–63.
McEvily, B., V. Perrone and A. Zaheer (2003), 'Trust as an organizing principle', *Organization Science*, **14** (1), 91–103.
Misztal, B.A. (1996), *Trust in Modern Societies*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
Möllering, G. (2006), *Trust: Reason, Routine, Reflexivity*, Oxford: Elsevier.
Nooteboom, B. (1999), *Inter-firm Alliances: Analysis and Design*, London: Routledge.
Nooteboom, B. (2002), *Trust: Forms, Foundations Functions, Failures and Figures*, Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA, USA: Edgar Elgar.
Rotter, J.B. (1967), 'A new scale for the measurement of interpersonal trust', *Journal of Personality*, **35** (4), 651–65.
Rousseau, D.M., S.B. Sitkin, R.S. Burt and C. Camerer (1998), 'Not so different after all: a cross-discipline view of trust', *Academy of Management Review*, **23** (3), 393–404.
Saunders, M., P. Lewis and A. Thornhill, (2009), *Research Methods for Business Students*, 5th edition, Harlow: FT Prentice Hall.
Saunders M.N.K., D. Skinner, N. Gillespie, G. Dietz and R. Lewicki (eds) (2010), *Organisational Trust: A Cultural Perspective*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Seppanen, R., K. Blomqvist and S. Sundqvist (2007), 'Measuring inter-organisational trust: a critical review of the empirical research in 1990–2003', *Industrial Marketing Management*, **36** (2), 249–65.
Sitkin, S. and D. Stickel (1996) 'The road to hell: the dynamics of distrust in an era of quality', in R. Kramer and T. Tyler (eds), *Trust in Organizations: Frontiers of Theory and Research*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, pp. 196–215.
Teddlie, C. and A. Tashakkori, (2010), 'Overview of contemporary issues in mixed methods research', in A. Tashakkori and C. Teddlie (eds), *Sage Handbook of Mixed Methods in Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 2nd edition, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, pp. 1–41.
Williamson, O.E. (1993), 'Calculativeness, trust, and economic organization', *Journal of Law and Economics*, **36** (2), 453–86.
Zaheer, A. and J. Harris (2005), 'Interorganizational trust', in O. Shenkar and J.J. Reuer (eds), *Handbook of Strategic Alliances*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, pp. 169–97.
Zaheer, A., B. McEvily and V. Perrone (1998), 'Does trust matter? Exploring the effects of inter-organizational and interpersonal trust on performance', *Organization Science*, **9** (2), 141–59.
Zak, P.J., R. Kurzban and W.T. Matzner (2004), 'The neurobiology of trust', *Annals of the New York Academy of Science*, **1032**, 224–7.
Zand, D.E. (1972), 'Trust and managerial problem solving', *Administrative Science Quarterly*, **17** (2), 229–39.