Journal of Business and Psychology, Vol. 21, No. 2, Winter 2006 (©2006)
DOI: 10.1007/s10869-006-9029-2

THE EFFECT OF EMPLOYEE TRUST OF THE SUPERVISOR ON ENTERPRISING BEHAVIOR: A CROSS-CULTURAL COMPARISON

Robert D. Costigan
Richard C. Insinga
J. Jason Berman
Selim S. Ilter
St. John Fisher College
Grazyna Kranas
Warsaw University
Vladimir A. Kureshov
The Higher Business School

ABSTRACT: This study examines the effects of an employee's affect-based and cognition-based trust of the supervisor on that employee's enterprising behavior. The extent to which two cultural dimensions, power distance and in-group collectivism, moderate the relationship between the trust measures and enterprising behavior is considered. Trust ratings were provided by 130 U.S. employees, 202 Turkish employees, 101 Polish employees, and 86 Russian employees. Their 519 supervisors then provided ratings of those employees' enterprising behavior. The results show that both affect-based trust and cognition-based trust have a significant, but modest, effect on the employee's enterprising behavior. Our findings indicate that both power distance and in-group collectivism do not moderate the proposed trust-behavior relationship although power distance almost reaches the level of significance. We call for further research on other moderating variables to explain the findings.

Address correspondence to Robert D. Costigan, Associate Professor of Management, St. John Fisher College, 3690 East Avenue Rochester, NY 14618, USA. E-mail: costigan@sjfc.edu

INTRODUCTION

Trust in leadership has drawn a lot of attention over the past decade from both practitioners and researchers. The leadership literature (e.g., Bennis, 1999) claims that a key attribute of an effective leader is trustworthiness. In this study, we want to examine the behavioral effects of the employee's trust in the immediate supervisor. We are also interested in learning whether this relationship between the employee's trust of the supervisor and the employee's workplace behavior is moderated by national culture.

The participants in this study come from Russia, Poland, Turkey, and the United States. The primary motivation for including participants from these countries in the same study is the contrast that these countries provide on power distance and individualism-collectivism. After considering Hofstede's (1980) seminal work, Earley (1986) concluded that two of Hofstede's cultural dimensions (i.e., power distance and individualism-collectivism) apply to the employee's trust of the supervisor. Power distance refers to the extent to which a society tolerates power differences as well as accepts status privileges (Carl, Gupta, & Javidan, 2004). Employee trust in the supervisor may vary depending on the kind of power distance relationship that the culture endorses. Both Russia and Turkey are considered to be high power distance countries while both the U.S. and Poland are considered to be lower in power distance (Carl et al., 2004). Another cultural dimension, in-group collectivism, refers to the extent to which persons have pride and loyalty in their families, close friends, and in the organization in which they work (Gelfand, Bhawuk, Nishii, & Bechtold, 2004). Turkey, Russia, and Poland are considered to be high in-group collectivist countries, while the U.S. is considered to be low in this form of collectivism (Gelfand et al., 2004). Whether power distance or in-group collectivism moderates the proposed linkages between our study's trust measures and workplace behavior will be investigated.

Enterprising Behavior

The workplace behavior that is examined in this study is enterprising behavior. Enterprising behavior, one of Campbell's (2000) five qualities of a proactive employee, reflects initiative, speaking out, independent judgment, and active involvement. Campbell (2000) further added that creativity and risk taking also characterize the enterprising employee. Our focus on investigating trust conditions that promote enterprising behavior seems appropriate, considering the need for more employee creativity and related risk taking behavior, assertiveness,

initiative, and intrinsic motivation to solve work-related problems and to take advantage of promising opportunities.

Cognition-Based Trust and Affect-Based Trust

Cognition-based trust refers to the rational decision to trust or to withhold trust of another employee. In terms of a subordinate employee's trust in the supervisor, a cognition-based trust judgment is based on good reasons, such as the supervisor's history in performing responsibly and competently, which provides evidence of this person's cognition-based trustworthiness (Costigan, Ilter, & Berman, 1998; Lewis & Weigert, 1985; McAllister, 1995). Affect-based trust, on the other hand, is more emotional than rational. It evolves over a period of time into a deep workplace relationship with both parties making an emotional investment to each other (Costigan et al., 1998; Lewis & Weigert, 1985; McAllister, 1995). Care and concern for each party in the relationship typify this form of trust. Establishing relationships based on cognition-based judgments, such as competence and reliability, are thought to be more common in the workplace whereas forming deep, caring relationships based on affect-based trust are probably less common, especially in the typical employee–supervisor relationship.

Relationship between Trust and Enterprising Behavior

It is our belief that an employee who trusts their boss will become more enterprising in the workplace. A trusting relationship with the supervisor should yield less-constrained behavior. Enterprising behaviors, such as speaking one's mind (i.e., assertiveness), taking initiative to solve work-problems as they surface, showing energy and intrinsic motivation to get things done, taking risks and trying out new ideas, and generally being creative, should emerge from a trusting relationship. A subordinate employee who has a socio-emotional close relationship with the boss (i.e., affect-based trust) is likely to exhibit enterprising behavior. Likewise, an employee who respects their boss' competence and trustworthiness (i.e., cognition-based trust) is also likely to respond with positive workplace behaviors, such as enterprising behavior.

Prior research tends to support these linkages of employee trust to positive workplace behavior. Dirks and Ferrin's meta-analysis (2002) findings, for example, indicated that the employee's trust in leadership (i.e., an overall trust measure which included affect-based trust and cognition-based trust) correlated with employee job performance and citizenship behavior (i.e., altruism and civic virtue). Dirks and Ferrin (2002) called for more research in the area of affect-based trust, and the present study extends on their work by separately examining the

influence of affect-based trust and cognition-based trust on enterprising behavior. Considering this research, the following hypothesis is put forth:

> *Hypothesis 1*: An employee's affect-based trust of their supervisor will be positively associated with that employee's enterprising behavior.

Employees make inferences about their leader's ability and dependability which then has consequences for the employees' work behavior (Dirks & Ferrin, 2002). Dirks and Ferrin's (2002) findings did not support the hypothesized relationships between cognition-based trust of the leader and organizational citizenship behaviors, such as civic virtue and altruism, as well as improved job performance. We investigate the cognition-based trust proposition for a different behavioral effect (i.e., enterprising behavior). We propose that:

> *Hypothesis 2*: An employee's cognition-based trust of their supervisor will be positively associated with that employee's enterprising behavior.

Power Distance

A central question in this study is whether the positive behavioral effects emanating from a more trusting hierarchic relationship are moderated by the power distance or the in-group collectivism cultural dimension. As stated, power distance indicates the extent to which organizational members and society as a whole believe that power is to be unequally shared (Carl et al., 2004). Because persons from a high power distance culture tend to be constrained by defined role expectations that will not let them deviate (Tyler, Lind, & Huo, 1995), we expect that these employees' extra-role, enterprising behaviors will be less influenced by their level of affect-based trust of the supervisor. On the contrary, persons from a low power distance culture tend to be less constrained by role expectations allowing them more freedom to deviate behaviorally across situations, depending on trust levels.

In a slightly different vein, Williams, Whyte, and Green (1966) reported that Peruvians, who in a high power distance culture were less trusting of others, tended to base their satisfaction with their supervisor less on the socio-emotional qualities of the leader and more on the leader's technical competency. These findings suggest that affect-based trust, which is akin to socio-emotional trust, may have a less powerful influence in high power distance societies than in low power distance societies. We therefore expect that the extra-role, enterprising behaviors of employees in lower power distance countries will be influenced more

strongly by an affectively trusting or distrusting hierarchical relationship. The hypothesis originating from this line of thinking is:

> *Hypothesis 3(a)*: An employee's affect-based trust of the supervisor will be more strongly associated with this employee's enterprising behavior in lower power distance cultures (U.S. and Poland) than in high power distance cultures (Turkey and Russia).

Doney, Cannon, and Mullen (1998) proposed that both trustee predictability (i.e., dependability and consistency) and trustee capability, which are akin to cognition-based trust, will have a stronger influence on the trustor's trust judgments in high power distance cultures relative to low power distance cultures. In other words, variability in trustee behavior and trustee incompetence is thought to be less acceptable in the high power distance society. Williams et al.'s (1966) study appears to provide some justification for Doney et al.'s (1998) proposition. As previously stated, high power distance Peruvians, who were less trusting, tended to base their satisfaction with the supervisor more on the supervisor's technical competence than on socio-emotional qualities. Apparently, cognition-based trust judgments played a stronger role in these high power distance relationships than did affect-based trust judgments. With Williams et al.'s (1966) findings and Doney et al.'s (1998) proposition as a basis, we put forth the following hypothesis:

> *Hypothesis 3(b)*: An employee's cognition-based trust of the supervisor will be more strongly associated with this employee's enterprising behavior in high power distance cultures (Turkey and Russia) than in lower power distance cultures (U.S. and Poland).

In-group collectivism

As stated, in-group collectivism indicates the extent in which societal members have pride, loyalty, and attachment to their family, close friends, and the organization (Gelfand et al., 2004). Collectivist societies distinguish between in-group members (e.g., family, close friends) and out-group members (e.g., strangers) whereas individualist societies tend to be less discriminating between the two. Self-interests tend to be central in individualist cultures while in-group interests are dominant in collectivist cultures. Whitener, Brodt, Korsgaard, and Werner (1998) said that supervisors in individualist cultures tend to manage employees by continually keeping transaction costs and benefits in mind. That is, leaders are more calculating in deciding whether to maximize their own self-interests in these boss-subordinate relationships or promote a more trusting relationship with subordinates.

Conversely, bosses in collectivist societies tend to disregard their own self-interests in favor of promoting trusting relationships with subordinates.

Perhaps, employees in individualist and collectivist cultures operate in ways similar to their bosses. Employees from individualist societies may be just as calculating as their supervisors, deciding to maximize their own self-interests in the relationship with their supervisor, by promoting a more trusting relationship or ignoring it, whichever furthers the employee's self-interests. Collectivist employees, on the other hand, may be guided by the principle of developing a trusting relationship with their superior, which then involves some form of reciprocation.

Extending Whitener et al.'s (1998) ideas to the linkage between trust and enterprising behavior, we expect that the employee's trust of the supervisor will more strongly correlate with the employee's enterprising behavior in collectivist cultures relative to individualist cultures. Subordinate employees in collectivist societies who experience a trusting relationship with their boss may be more willing to reciprocate with enterprising behavior when the boss has earned their trust. Conversely, a less trusting relationship between the subordinate and the supervisor should yield less enterprising behavior on the part of the subordinate employee in the reciprocating collectivist societies. Subordinate employees in the less reciprocating individualist society may feel less compelled to display enterprising behavior, even though their bosses may have earned their trust, because it is not in the employee's best interests. The opposite may be true as well. A less trusting relationship between the employee and supervisor may have little connection to the individualist employee who wants to maximize their enterprising behavior because it is in their best interest to do so. Thus, the relationship between the employee's trust of the boss and enterprising behavior should be weaker in such cultures. Applying this reasoning to the association of affect-based trust and cognition-based trust to enterprising behavior, we propose that:

Hypothesis 4(a): An employee's affect-based trust of the supervisor will be more strongly associated with this employee's enterprising behavior in high in-group collectivist cultures (Turkey, Russia, and Poland) than in low in-group collectivist cultures (U.S.).

Hypothesis 4(b): An employee's cognition-based trust of the supervisor will be more strongly associated with this employee's enterprising behavior in high in-group collectivist cultures (Turkey, Russia, and Poland) than in low in-group collectivist cultures (U.S.).

METHOD

Samples

There are 1,074 participants in this study, organized into 537 employee-supervisor dyads. Of the 1,074 participants, 36 were dropped from the study because of missing data on the key variables (i.e., affect-based trust, cognition-based trust, or enterprising behavior), leaving us with 1038 participants organized into 519 dyads. Specifically, we have 86 Russian, 130 U.S., 101 Polish, and 202 Turkish intact employee–supervisor dyads in this study. The Russian sample is made up of employees from different firms located in and around city of Krasnoyarsk in central Russia. These participants were recruited from among current and former students of a local university, who were employed in various Russian firms. The Polish sample is made up of dyads from different firms located in Warsaw. These employees were enrolled in a non-traditional program for adult learners in a major Polish university while working in their respective organizations. The U.S. sample is made up of dyads from mostly different firms located in Western New York State. Ninety-five U.S. participants were employed in their respective organizations while enrolled as adult learners at a local university. Another thirty-five employees worked full-time in a small U.S. technology firm. The Turkish participants were employed at four manufacturing firms including one technology firm located in Istanbul and its vicinity. The estimated response rate for the U.S. sample is 30% and 50% for the Polish, Russian, and Turkish samples.

Demographic statistics describing each country's sample are provided in Table 1. As shown in Table 1, the average tenure of the Russian, Polish, Turkish, and U.S. participants in their firms is, 9.29, 3.91, 6.44, and 8.31 years, respectively, suggesting that relatively experienced employees took part in this study. The gender makeup of our Turkish sample of focal employees may appear to be overrepresented with males (82%), but it is representative of many Turkish firms. The Europa World Handbook (1999) indicates that the 1997 Turkish workforce was 74% male. Hence, the participation rate of Turkish males in our study does not dramatically differ from the participation rate of males in the entire Turkish workforce.

The four countries included in this study have been identified as being either high or low power distance countries. According to Project GLOBE findings (Carl et al., 2004), Russia and Turkey's power distance scores are 5.52 and 5.57, respectively. The U.S. and Poland's power distance scores are 4.88 and 5.10, respectively. Both sets of scores reflect current power distance *practices* in these countries rather than an ideal state. Russia and Turkey's power distance scores place these countries in

Table 1
Descriptive Statistics for the Sample in Each Country

Demographic Variables	U.S.[a]	Russia[b]	Poland[c]	Turkey[d]
Subordinate Employees				
Female	54%	62%	70%	18%
Management Position	31%	34%	19%	28%
Number of years in firm	8.31 yrs. (SD = 6.11)	9.29 yrs. (SD = 9.07)	3.91 (SD = 4.70)	6.44 yrs. (SD = 4.54)
Number of years in position	4.53 yrs. (SD = 4.39)	5.38 yrs. (SD = 5.66)	2.53 yrs. (SD = 3.26)	4.24 yrs. (SD = 4.12)
Supervisor				
Female	32%	48%	55%	4%
Number of years has supervised subordinate employee	3.76 yrs. (SD = 3.32)	6.86 yrs. (SD = 6.94)	2.30 yrs. (SD = 2.89)	3.76 yrs. (SD = 3.90)
Number of employees in firm	8305 (SD = 20,822)	895 (SD = 1859)	1984 (SD = 12783)	1476 (SD = 992)

[a] $n = 130$.
[b] $n = 86$.
[c] $n = 101$.
[d] $n = 202$.

Band A while the U.S. and Poland's scores place them in Band B (Carl et al., 2004). According to GLOBE methodology, different bands (i.e., Band A versus Band B) indicate that societal members in both Russia and Turkey are significantly more willing to accept power and status differences than are societal members in the U.S. and Poland. According to Project GLOBE findings (Gelfand et al., 2004), Turkey, Russia, and Poland's in-group collectivism scores are 5.88, 5.63, and 5.52, respectively. The U.S.'s in-group collectivism score is 4.25. These scores reflect current in-group collectivism *practices* in these countries. Turkey, Russia, and Poland's scores place them in Band A while the U.S.'s score places it in Band C (Gelfand et al., 2004). Again, the different bands suggest that the in-group collectivism practices in the U.S. are significantly low than the practices in Turkey, Russia, and Poland. In sum, our study includes participants from two nations (i.e., Russia and Turkey) that are considered high power distance countries and two nations (i.e., U.S. and Poland) that are considered lower in power distance as well as three nations (i.e., Turkey, Russia, and Poland) that are considered high in-group collectivist countries and one nation (i.e., U.S.) that is considered a lower in-group collectivist country.

Procedures

Subordinate employees in this study completed their ratings (e.g., trust items, demographic items) and then returned their responses in person or by mail. Similar to McAllister's (1995) procedures, these employees were also asked to deliver a similar questionnaire to their supervisor. In the instructions, the supervisor was told that they could return their completed ratings and demographic responses by mail or have their subordinate employee return their *sealed* responses. All questionnaires were completed anonymously. An identifying number was used to match each subordinate employee's trust ratings with his or her supervisor's ratings of the employee.

Measures

This study's trust and behavior scales come from a broader study of workplace trust. The Russian, Polish, and Turkish questionnaires used in this study were translated into their respective languages. Each questionnaire was then back-translated into English by one interpreter (for each country) in order to insure translation accuracy. A discussion of our method of translation and back-translation appears in Pavett and Morris (1995). The questionnaire administered to subordinate employees included various demographic items (e.g., gender, number employed in firm, managerial status, firm tenure) and items assessing this employee's affect-based trust and cognition-based trust of the supervisor. More specifically, four items from McAllister's (1995) scale measuring affect-based trust (e.g., "If I shared my problems with this person I know (s)he would respond constructively and caringly", "We have a sharing relationship; we can share our ideas, feelings, and hopes", "I can talk freely to this individual about difficulties I am having at work and know that (s)he will want to listen", "We would both feel a sense of loss if one of us was transferred and we could no longer work together") were used to assess the subordinate employee's affect-based trust level of his or her supervisor. Likewise, five items from McAllister's (1995) scale measuring cognition-based trust (i.e., "This person approaches his/her job with professionalism and dedication", "Given this person's track record, I see no reason to doubt his or her competence and preparation for the job", "I can rely on this person not to make my job more difficult by careless work", "Most people, even those who aren't close friends of this individual, trust and respect him or her as a supervisor", "Other work associates of mine who must interact with this individual consider him or her to be trustworthy") were used to assess the subordinate employee's cognition-based trust level of his or her supervisor. A five-point Likert scale format (1 = "strongly agree,"..., 5 = "strongly

disagree") was used as anchors in both of McAllister's (1995) trust scales. To aid in the interpretation of the data, all trust responses were reverse-scored. A composite mean was computed separately for the four affect-based trust items and the five cognition-based trust items. The reliabilities (coefficient alphas) for each country's two sets of trust ratings are reported in Table 2.

The questionnaires administered to the supervisors contained the same kind of demographic items found in the subordinate employee's questionnaire and five items assessing the employee's enterprising behavior. More specifically, supervisors were asked to evaluate the subordinate employee's behavior in five areas: creativity, motivation, risk taking, initiative, and assertiveness. The exact wording of these enterprising behavioral items are: "His/her level of creativity in the job is generally very high," "S/he) displays a high level of motivation and energy in the job," "S/he) is not afraid of taking risks and trying new things in the job," "S/he takes immediate action to resolve work-related problems as they emerge," and "S/he volunteers his/her work-related views without waiting to be asked." The last two behavioral items came from Fandt's (1994) taking-action scale. The same five-point Likert scale and anchors were used for these behavioral items as before. The supervisor's five behavioral ratings were first reverse-scored and then averaged into a composite rating of the subordinate employee's enterprising behavior. The coefficient alphas for these five enterprising

Table 2
Descriptive Statistics and Intercorrelations between Affect-Based and Cognition-Based Trust and Effects By Country

Variables	*M*	SD	Employee's Affect-based Trust of Supervisor	Employee's Cognition-based Trust of Supervisor
Employee's affect-based trust of supervisor	U[a] 3.9 T[c] 3.90 U .81 T .86 U (.88)[e] T (.87) P[b] 3.49 R[d] 3.85 P 1.03 R .66 P (.90) R (.78)			
Employee's cognition-based trust of supervisor	U 4.00 T 3.77 U .76 T .92 U .80** T .87** U (.89) T (.90) P 3.61 R 4.00 P .99 R .55 P .77** R .75** P (.91) R (.79)			
Supervisor's composite enterprising rating	U 4.13 T 3.96 U .64 T .64 U .15 T .26** U .10 T .24** P 3.91 R 3.65 P .63 R .74 P .14 R .21 P −.03 R .26*			

[a]U = 130 U.S. participants. [b]P = 101 Polish participants.
[c]T = 202 Turkish participants. [d]R = 86 Russian participants.
[e]Coefficient alphas are reported in diagonal parentheses.
*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$.

ratings are: .83 for the U.S., .80 for Poland, .82 for Turkey, and .84 for Russia.

Analyses

Demographic differences in the makeup of national samples may account for some portion of the variance in the dependent measure in cross-cultural studies. Consequently, the extraneous influence of these variables is commonly controlled for in these studies (e.g., Spector et al., 2004). In the present study, we control for the influence of five demographic variables (i.e., firm size, number of years supervised by the boss, gender of the subordinate employee and supervisor, and managerial status) on enterprising behavior.

Because the power distance and in-group collectivist variables are categorical, they were first formed into dummy variables for this study's regression procedures. The coding for these variables are: low power distance countries U.S. and Poland = 0 and high power distance countries Russia and Turkey = 1; and low in-group collectivist country U.S. = 0 and high in-group collectivist countries Turkey, Russia, and Poland = 1. The power distance dummy variable contrasts U.S. and Poland with Russia and Turkey while the in-group collectivist dummy variable contrasts U.S. with Turkey, Russia, and Poland (Aiken & West, 1991). Dummy variables were also formed for three demographic variables: the managerial-status variable (non-managers = 0 and managers = 1) and the employee's and supervisor's gender (males = 0 and females = 1).

A series of hierarchical moderated regression procedures, in line with Baron and Kenny's (1986) recommendations, were employed to assess the variance accounted for by the predictor variables and the additional, unique effects of the cultural variable X predictor-variable interactions, on the dependent variable (i.e., enterprising composite) in this study. Specifically, all main effects were entered into these hierarchical regression equations first, followed by the two-way interaction involving each cultural dummy variable (Oldham & Cummings, 1996; Peters, O'Connor, & Wise, 1984). As mentioned, to control for the influence of demographic differences between the four countries' samples, five demographic variables (i.e., firm size, number of years supervised by the boss, gender dummy variables for the subordinate employee and supervisor, and managerial-status dummy variable) were entered into each regression equation in Step 1. To test all of this study's hypotheses, the relevant trust measure (i.e., either affect-based trust or cognition-based trust) was entered in Step 2, followed by the relevant cultural dummy variable in Step 3 (i.e., either power distance or in-group collectivism) and the two-way interaction (cultural dummy variable X trust measure) in Step 4.

RESULTS

Besides internal consistency data, Table 2 presents descriptive statistics and intercorrelations between affect-based and cognition-based trust and enterprising behavior for each country. Hypothesis 1 predicted that the subordinate employee's affect-based trust of the supervisor will be positively associated with the supervisor's combined enterprising rating for the employee (i.e., composite rating of creativity, risk taking, motivation, initiative, and assertiveness). The supervisor's composite behavioral rating of the employee served as the dependent variable in this first regression procedure. The subordinate employee's affect-based trust of the supervisor was entered in Step 2, after the five control variables. The results presented in Table 3 show that the employee's affect-based trust of the supervisor in Step 2 is significant ($\Delta R^2 = .04$, $p < .01$), garnering support for Hypothesis 1.

The correlation reported for each country in Table 2 shows that only the Turkish correlation reached statistical significance. We were concerned, however, that the different size of the country samples may, in part, be responsible for the finding. When we reran our first regression without the Turkish data, we still found significance for affect-based trust in Step 2, ($\Delta R^2 = .02$, $p < .01$), indicating that affect-based trust still accounts for significant rating variance when only the U.S., Russian, and Polish respondents are included. Thus, our findings support Hypothesis 1.

Table 3
Summary of Results of a Moderated Hierarchical Regression Analysis of Affect-Based Trust on the Supervisor's Enterprising Behavior Rating Considering Power Distance

	Supervisor's Composite Enterprising Rating			
Variable	Unstandardized Coefficient	Standard Error	*t*-value	ΔR^2
Step 1: Demographic				.01
Firm size	.00	.00	.93	
Yrs. supervising	.01	.01	.74	
Employee's gender	.00	.07	−.06	
Supervisor's gender	−.11	.07	−1.53	
Management status	−.01	.07	−.19	
Step 2: Affect-based trust of supervisor	.15	.03	4.46**	.04**
Step 3: Power distance dummy	−.25	.06	−4.02**	.03**
Step 4: Power distance dummy X affect-based trust	.09	.07	1.37	.00

n = 519. U.S. = 130. Russia = 86. Poland = 101. Turkey = 202.
* $p < .01$. ** $p < .001$.

Hypothesis 2 proposes that an employee's cognition-based trust of their supervisor will be positively associated with this employee's enterprising behavior. The supervisor's composite behavioral rating of the employee served as the dependent variable in this second regression procedure. The subordinate employee's cognition-based trust of the supervisor was entered in Step 2, following the five demographic variables in Step 1. The results presented in Table 4 show that the employee's cognition-based trust of the supervisor in Step 2 is significant ($\Delta R^2 = .02$, $p < .01$), garnering support for Hypothesis 2.

Hypothesis 3(a) predicted that the subordinate employee's affect-based trust of the supervisor will be more strongly associated with the supervisor's composite enterprising rating in the lower power distance context (U.S. and Poland) than in the higher power distance context (Turkey and Russia). As stated, the subordinate employee's affect-based trust of the supervisor was entered into the regression in Step 2. The power distance dummy was entered in Step 3, followed by the two-way interaction (power distance dummy X employee's affect-based trust of the supervisor) in Step 4. A look at the Step 4 results in Table 3 shows that the two-way interaction (power distance X affect-based trust of the supervisor) in this regression procedure is not significant ($\Delta R^2 = .00$, $p = .17$), indicating a lack of support for Hypothesis 3(a).

Hypothesis 3(b) proposed that the subordinate employee's cognition-based trust of the supervisor will be more strongly associated with the

Table 4
Summary of Results of a Moderated Hierarchical Regression Analysis of Cognition-Based Trust on the Supervisor's Enterprising Behavior Rating Considering Power Distance

	Supervisor's Composite Enterprising Rating			
Variable	Unstandardized Coefficient	Standard Error	*t*-value	ΔR^2
Step 1: Demographic				.01
Firm size	.00	.00	.93	
Yrs. supervising	.01	.01	.74	
Employee's gender	.00	.07	−.06	
Supervisor's gender	−.11	.07	−1.53	
Management status	−.01	.07	−.19	
Step 2: Cognition-based trust of supervisor	.11	.03	3.25*	.02*
Step 3: Power distance dummy	−.23	.06	−3.65**	.03**
Step 4: Power distance dummy X cognition based trust	.13	.07	1.87	.01

n = 519. U.S. = 130. Russia = 86. Poland = 101. Turkey = 202.
* $p < .01$. ** $p < .001$.

supervisor's composite enterprising rating of this employee in higher power distance cultures (Turkey and Russia) than in lower power distance cultures (U.S. and Poland). As shown in Table 2, the correlations between the employee's cognition-based trust ratings and the supervisor's combined behavioral rating for the two higher power distance countries are significant ($r = .24$, $p < .01$ for the Turkish sample and $r = .26$, $p < .05$ for the Russian sample), whereas the correlations for the two lower power distance countries are not significant ($r = .10$, $p = .26$ for the U.S. sample and $r = -.03$, $p = .77$ for the Polish sample). To more formally test Hypothesis 3(b), a hierarchical moderated regression was conducted. The ordering of the variables entered into this regression equation was the same as the previous regression. Instead of affect-based trust, the employee's cognition-based trust was entered in Steps 2 and 4. A look at the regression results presented in Table 4 indicates that the hypothesized two-way interaction (power distance X cognition-based trust) in Step 4 just missed reaching the conventional level of significance ($\Delta R^2 = .01$, $p = .06$), failing to support this hypothesis.

Hypothesis 4(a) predicted that the subordinate employee's affect-based trust of the supervisor will be more strongly associated with the supervisor's composite enterprising rating in the high in-group collectivism context (Turkey, Russia, and Poland) than in the low in-group collectivism context (U.S.). To test this hypothesis, another regression procedure was conducted to assess the moderating effects of in-group collectivism on the relationship between affect-based trust and the supervisor's composite enterprising rating. Except for the cultural variables, the same predictor variables appearing in a previous regression were included in this regression. Namely, affect-based trust and the in-group collectivism dummy variable were entered in Steps 2 and 3 respectively, followed by the two-way interaction (in-group collectivism dummy X affect-based trust) in Step 4. As shown in Table 5, the results indicate that the two-way interaction in Step 4 (in-group collectivism variable X affect-based trust) is not significant ($\Delta R^2 = .00$, $p = .67$), resulting in a lack of support for this hypothesis.

Hypothesis 4(b) predicted that the subordinate employee's cognition-based trust of the supervisor will be more strongly associated with the supervisor's composite enterprising rating in the high in-group collectivism context (Turkey, Russia, and Poland) than in the low in-group collectivism context (U.S.). To test this hypothesis, another regression procedure was conducted to assess the moderating effects of in-group collectivism on the relationship between cognition-based trust and the supervisor's composite enterprising rating. Except for the trust variables, the same predictor variables appearing in the previous regression were included in this regression. That is, cognition-based trust was entered in Step 2, followed by the in-group collectivism dummy in Step 3

Table 5
Summary of Results of a Moderated Hierarchical Regression Analysis of Affect-Based Trust on the Supervisor's Enterprising Behavior Rating Considering In-Group Collectivism

	Supervisor's Composite Enterprising Rating			
Variable	Unstandardized Coefficient	Standard Error	*t*-value	ΔR^2
Step 1: Demographic				.01
Firm size	.00	.00	.93	
Yrs. supervising	.01	.01	.74	
Employee's gender	.00	.07	−.06	
Supervisor's gender	−.11	.07	−1.53	
Management status	−.01	.07	−.19	
Step 2: Affect-based trust of supervisor	.15	.03	4.46**	.04**
Step 3: In-group collectivism dummy	−.25	.07	−3.63**	.02**
Step 4: In-group collectivism dummy X affect-based trust	.03	.08	.42	.00

n = 519. U.S. = 130. Russia = 86. Poland = 101. Turkey = 202.
* $p < .01$. ** $p < .001$.

and the two-way interaction (in-group collectivism dummy X cognition-based trust) in Step 4. As shown in Table 6, the results indicate that the two-way interaction in Step 4 (in-group collectivism variable X cognition-based trust) is not significant ($\Delta R^2 = .00$, $p = .84$), resulting in the rejection of Hypothesis 4(b).

DISCUSSION

Trust in leadership has drawn a good deal of attention over the past decade from both practitioners and researchers. The leadership literature (e.g., Bennis, 1999) claims that a key attribute of an effective leader is trustworthiness. Although trust appears to be an important variable in this regard, the debate continues as to whether it actually produces consequences that matter for the organization. Dirks and Ferrin's (2002) meta-analysis has provided some answers to this lingering debate, showing that cognition-based trust effects are largest for self-reported outcome measures, such as job satisfaction and organizational commitment. They also reported that an overall, hybrid measure of leadership trust is modestly correlated with job performance and various citizenship behaviors in organizations, whereas a separate cognition-based trust variable is uncorrelated with these measures. With this as a context, the

Table 6
Summary of Results of a Moderated Hierarchical Regression Analysis of Cognition-Based Trust on the Supervisor's Enterprising Behavior Rating Considering In-Group Collectivism

	Supervisor's Composite Enterprising Rating			
Variable	Unstandardized Coefficient	Standard Error	t-value	ΔR^2
Step 1: Demographic				.01
Firm size	.00	.00	.93	
Yrs. supervising	.01	.01	.74	
Employee's gender	.00	.07	−.06	
Supervisor's gender	−.11	.07	−1.53	
Management status	−.01	.07	−.19	
Step 2: Cognition-based trust of supervisor	.11	.03	3.25*	.02*
Step 3: In-group collectivism dummy	−.25	.07	−3.53**	.02**
Step 4: In-group collectivism dummy X cognition-based trust	.02	.09	.20	.00

n = 519. U.S. = 130. Russia = 86. Poland = 101. Turkey = 202.
* $p < .01$. ** $p < .001$.

present study attempted to extend the trust literature in a couple of substantive ways. Besides cognition-based trust, we separately investigated the behavioral effects of affect-based trust because of Dirks and Ferrin's (2002) call for more research in this area. We investigated these trust effects on a different workplace outcome (i.e., enterprising behavior). We also utilized a research design that avoided common method variance which has plagued some studies in the trust literature (e.g., Pearce, Branyiczki, & Bigley, 2000). Our study included samples from four countries (i.e., Turkey, Russia, Poland, and the U.S.), allowing us to test whether the hypothesized trust-enterprising behavior relationships are moderated by two cultural variables: power distance and in-group collectivism.

Our results indicated that, across all of the studied cultures, both affect-based trust and cognition-based trust have significant effects on enterprising behavior, although the magnitude of those effects is modest. Taking into account these fairly small R^2 values as well as the small correlations reported in Dirks and Ferrin's (2002) meta-analysis, one may wonder whether an employee's trust or distrust of the supervisor has important consequences for the organization. We find it difficult to believe that the effects of trust of the supervisor on the behavior of subordinates are minor, and further research in this direction is suggested. We investigated cultural variables, but perhaps organizational

variables and individual difference variables should be considered as possible moderators of the trust-enterprising behavior relationship in future studies. For instance, the association between trust and behavior in the workplace may be greater in what Sheppard and Sherman (1998) call deep relationships instead of shallow relationships. In addition, the relationship between trust and enterprising behavior may be moderated by the trustor employee's need for achievement. Future trust research could consider these moderators, as well as other untried moderators, to identify conditions in which the effects of employee trust either flourish or wane.

In Table 2, note that each country's correlation between the two trust measures is high, indicating that the participants are viewing these measures as similar facets of the same overall construct, which is trust. Turkey's correlation is particularly high. Kozan (1997) stated that respondents from an associative culture, such as Turkey, tend not to be able to distinguish between dimensions of an overall construct, which may account for the high Turkish correlation.

Considering the lack of support for the hypothesized two-way interactions with national cultural variables, it appears that the role of in-group collectivism as a moderator variable is essentially non-existent. There may be some promise in power distance as a moderator because the two-way interaction involving cognition-based trust reached a marginal significance level. Could these results, which provide little-to-no support for our cultural moderators, be due to the kind of samples drawn in Poland, Russia, and the U.S.? Recall that most of the U.S. and Russian samples and all of the Polish samples were found through their direct or indirect connection with local universities. It is possible that the cross-cultural moderator effects on the trust-enterprising behavior linkages were muted by the strong educational background of our respondents. Future research might consider whether cultural effects, especially in the trust-behavior domain, are significantly different for university-derived samples versus broadly represented samples.

Another possibility for the relatively weak cultural effects in this study may lie with the temporal circumstances of the Polish and Russian economies. Perhaps, the effects of a transitioning economy with few alternative long-term employment opportunities have trumped national cultural effects, especially for studies investigating bottom-up hierarchic trust. Measures of this form of trust may be corrupted when the individual's economic survival is at stake. Whether there is a more relevant cultural moderator variable in international trust research could also be explored. Den Hartog (2004) posited that interpersonal trust may develop on the basis of capability (i.e., cognition-based trust) in high assertiveness societies, whereas it may be built on predictability in low assertiveness cultures. Assertiveness could be explored as a possible

moderator of trust-behavior relationships in future international research.

Though not formally proposed, the significant main effects detected for the two cultural dummy variables (i.e., power distance in Step 3 of Table 3 and in-group collectivism in Step 3 of Table 5) on the employee's enterprising behavior deserve comment. A look at each country's enterprising behavior mean in Table 2 indicates that the U.S. and Russian ratings may be accounting for the cultural differences detected in this study. The results of a one-way analysis of variance (U.S. vs. Turkey vs. Russia vs. Poland) followed by Duncan's post hoc test (see Howell, 1982) indicate that the U.S. mean is significantly greater than both the Polish and Turkish means ($p < .05$) and the U.S., Polish, and Turkish means are greater than the Russian mean ($p < .05$). This pattern of the means indicates that both power distance and in-group collectivism are not accounting for these differences. If power distance were causing the effect, then the Russian mean would be comparable to the Turkish mean, which it is not. If in-group collectivism were causing the effect, then the Russian mean would be comparable to the Turkish and Polish means, which it is not. Hence, an investigation of some other factor contributing to the mean differences of the enterprising composite may be a direction for future research.

To conclude, most of the trust studies published to date include samples from Western countries (see Dirks and Ferrin, 2002). In contrast, our study drew samples from Russia, Poland, and Turkey, providing a modest beginning for trust research in these countries. More cross-cultural trust research using different scales and fresh research designs is to be encouraged.

REFERENCES

Aiken, L. S., & West, S. G. (1991). *Multiple regression: Testing and interpreting interactions*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The Moderator–Mediator Variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51*, 1173–1182.

Bennis, W. (1999). The end of leadership: Exemplary leadership is impossible without full inclusion, initiatives, and cooperation of followers. *Organizational Dynamics, Summer*, 71–79.

Campbell, D. J. (2000). The proactive employee: Managing workplace initiative. *Academy of Management Executive, 14*, 52–66.

Carl, D., Gupta, V., & Javidan, M. (2004). Power distance. In R. J. House, P. J. Hanges, M. Javidan, P. W. Dorfman & V. Gupta (Eds.), *Culture, leadership, and organizations* (pp. 513–563). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Costigan, R. D., Ilter, S. S., & Berman, J. J. (1998). A multi-dimensional study of trust in organizations. *Journal of Managerial Issues, X*, 303–317.

Den Hartog, D. N. (2004). Assertiveness. In R. J. House, P. J. Hanges, M. Javidan, P. W. Dorfman & V. Gupta (Eds.), *Culture, leadership, and organizations* (pp. 395–436). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dirks, K. T., & Ferrin, D. L. (2002). Trust in leadership: Meta-analytic findings and implications for research and practice. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*, 611–628.

Doney, P. M., Canon, J. P., & Mullen, M. R. (1998). Understanding the influence of national culture on the development of trust. *Academy of Management Review, 23*, 601–620.

Earley, P. C. (1986). Trust, perceived importance of praise and criticism, and work performance: An examination of feedback in the United States and England. *Journal of Management, 12*, 457–473.

Fandt, P. M. (1994). *Management skills: Practice and experience*. St. Paul, MN: West Publishing Company.

Gelfand, M. J., Bhawuk, D. P. S., Nishii, L. H., & Bechtold, D. J. (2004). Individualism and collectivism. In R. J. House, P. J. Hanges, M. Javidan, P. W. Dorfman & V. Gupta (Eds.*Culture, leadership, and organizations* (pp. 437–512). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hofstede, G. (1980). *Understanding cultural differences*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Howell, D. C. (1982). *Statistical methods for psychology*. Boston, MA: Duxbury Press.

Kozan, M. K. (1997). Culture and conflict management: A theoretical framework. *TheInternational Journal of Conflict Management, 8*, 338–360.

Lewis, J. D., & Weigert, A (1985). Trust as a social reality. *Social Forces, 63*, 967–985.

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

Oldham, G. R., & Cummings, A. (1996). Employee creativity: Personal and contextual factors at work. *Academy of Management Journal, 39*, 607–634.

Pavett, C., & Morris, T. (1995). Management styles within a multinational corporation: A five-country comparative study. *Human Relations, 48*, 1171–1191.

Pearce, J. L., Branyiczki, I., & Bigley, G. A. (2000). Insufficient bureaucracy: Trust and commitment in particularistic organizations. *Organization Science, 11*, 148–162.

Peters, L. H., O'Connor, E., & Wise, S. L. (1984). The specification and testing of useful moderator variable hypotheses. In T. S. Bateman & G. R. Ferris (Eds.*Method and analysis in organizational research* (pp. 128–139). Reston, VA: Reston.

Sheppard, B. H., & Sherman, D. M. (1998). The grammars of trust: A model and general implications. *Academy of Management Review, 23*, 422–437.

Spector, P. E., Cooper, C. L., Poelmans, S., Allen, T. D., O'Driscoll, M., Sanchez, J. I., Siu, O. L., Dewe, P., Hart, P., & Lu, L. (2004). A Cross-National Comparative Study of Work-Family Stressors, Working Hours, and Well-Being: China and Latin America Versus the Anglo World. *Personal Psychology, 57*, 119–142.

The Europa World Handbook (Vol. II). (1999). London: Europa Publications Ltd.

Tyler, T. R., Lind, E. A., & Huo, Y. (1995). Culture, ethnicity, and authority: Social categorization and social orientation effects on the psychology of legitimacy. University of California working paper.

Whitener, E. M., Brodt, S. E., Korsgaard, M. A., & Werner, J. M. (1998). Managers as initiators oftrust: An exchange relationship framework for understanding managerial trustworthy behavior. *Academy of Management Review, 23*, 513–530.

Williams, L. K., Whyte, W. F., & Green, C. S. (1966). Do cultural differences affect workers' attitudes? *Industrial Relations, 5*, 105–117.