

A Trust Matrix - cultural dimensions and hypotheses on their impact on trust criteria

	DEFINITION	HIG/LOW CONTEXT	POWER DISTANCE	UNCERTAINTY AVOIDANCE	MASCULINITY/ FEMININITY	INDIVIDUALISM/ COLLECTIVISM	UNIVERSALISM/ PARTICULARISM
1. Competence	Trust based on the assumption that team members are competent, and so will not let me down	More in LC cultures. Stronger task emphasis over relationship means functional rather than social competence more valued. Hard skills more valued than soft skills.	More in high PD. There is an expectation of inequalities in expertise and intellectual abilities. Therefore competence is valued. Team members will expect regular feedback from the boss to understand if they are working 'correctly'. Bosses are expected to be competent in the field of activity (not just a coordinator/facilitator). Low PD will tend to take fuller responsibility for ownership of tasks and so no need to check up.	More in high UA. In the attempt to mitigate risk and uncertainty trust can be established on evidence of a trustor's capability, theoretical background, experience and expertise. In low UA, competence linked to creativity and problem-solving skills as well as flexibility. No special trust in titles – will look at concrete experience and results in terms of 'what have you done?'	More in MAS. Respect for 'super achievers'. Individual brilliance is admired and successful achievers are idealised.	More in INDIV. Performance evaluation based on individual achievement and rewards tied closely to performance. Track record important so competence defined as what you have done (one person holding the rope) However COLL may define competence differently, linked to who you are and in getting things done through networking (more people holding the rope)	More in UNIV. The rule-based behaviour and the adherence to standards acknowledge and reward competence.
2. Commonality	Trust based on background, values, approaches, interests and objectives held in common	More in HC. The focus is more on relationship, therefore similarities in background, in-group membership and shared codes of communication are the basis for effective communication. In LC less important as long as there is openness about values and explicit objectives.	More on low PD. More participative approach means more focus on negotiation towards common goals (rather than through directives of the leader). Shared way of thinking. However, high compatibility in rank within the team may link those with higher PD orientation.	More in high UA. What is different is seen as dangerous. People are looking for conformity rather than marginal behaviour. It is safer to share the same values.	More in FEM. Focus on similarity and shared values. Cooperation to reach common goals.	More in COLL. Tighter integration and higher level of conformity. Collective sharing of values and common interests. In INDIV sharing professional culture is more important than sharing personal background	More in PART. Placing emphasis on logic of the heart and human friendship helps sharing of deeper values and common interests.
3. Benevolence	Trust based on the belief that other team members are concerned about my overall welfare	More in HC. The more personal the type of relationship, the more people value genuine concern for each other.	More in low PD. Low PD cultures value relationships based on mutual and comparable dependences in the team. Cooperation is based on solidarity. Such norms and values are positive and benevolent. High PD would look for benevolence of the manager.	More in high UA. People are motivated to maintain existing relationships because they value stability and diffident about unknown 'outsiders'. Lower level of conflict and higher value on compromise. Team should help me avoid risks and generally protect me. Benevolence creates more security in an unknown future.	More in FEM. FEM cultures have been associated with higher levels of benevolence and more 'tender' values. Benevolence correlated with doing things for others, sharing with others, helping the unfortunate, being generous.	More in COLL. Subordination of personal interests to goals of the in-group. Within the in-group expectation of benevolence is high. Outside in-group this may be reversed. In INDIV 'too much concern' is an invasion of privacy and indicates I am weak. At times benevolence could be considered more generous because it is so unexpected.	More in PART. PART emphasise high levels of trust between their close network of friends on which they depend. High expectation that trust is linked to mutual benevolence in established relationships, but that some people may need more attention than others.

A Trust Matrix - cultural dimensions and hypotheses on their impact on trust criteria

	DEFINITION	HIG/LOW CONTEXT	POWER DISTANCE	UNCERTAINTY AVOIDANCE	MASCULINITY/ FEMININITY	INDIVIDUALISM/ COLLECTIVISM	UNIVERSALISM/ PARTICULARISM
4. Integrity	Trust based on the fact that other team members maintain promises, are team oriented and behave towards me in accordance with a moral code	More in LC. The high value place in LC cultures on the correlation between promises and actions as well as coherence with values expressed. May want promises written down which would disturb HCs. May want an explicit 'moral code' for the team (HCs would see it as developing as the relationships develop) IN HCs the moral code is fully internalised.	No hypothesis.	More in high UA. People need to feel supported when under pressure to reduce anxiety. Consistent behaviour also reduces fear of being betrayed. Need to trust in smaller steps before giving 'deeper trust'. Need agendas schedules and plans. Proximity is important as it is hard to trust people you can't see – creates anxiety. In low UA people tend to believe statements that members have integrity – trust is open and up front... and people take leaps of faith more.	No hypothesis.	More in INDIV. INDIV cultures rely more on 'contractual' obligations through promises which are not subject to modification as circumstances and priorities change. This is the only way to ensure interdependences in the team.	More in UNIV. Close correlations between shared 'textual' rules and behaviour should be applied. A kind of anonymous trust becomes important – in systems and standards. In PART promises are more negotiable and shifting. Personal and not objective – so open to change.
5. Predictability	Trust based on the observation that the behaviour of team members is consistent over time and in different contexts	More in LC. Written, unambiguous obligations are valued in LC cultures. Disciplined approach and behaviours according to norms and rules are therefore valued. Sanctions imposed when violations occur regardless of rank, role or circumstances. Constancy of information dissemination through formal channels for everyone. In HC there would be more need for direct experience of team members to verify and prove behaviours in informal communication.	More in Low PD. Self discipline and individual responsibility (not bosses directives to enforce discipline and compliance) . Behaviours expected to be more constant whereas in HPD can be more contextual and so less predictable (bosses can change direction quickly to respond to changing circumstances)	More in high UA. Variability in a partner is less acceptable and relationships expected to be predictable. Clear rules for behaving expected and so within a defined range easier to predict trustors' behavioural reliability	More in Feminine cultures. Support for the common good is strong, so focus on solidarity – values on social norms which honour moral obligations – cost of behavioural anomalies. MASC and FEM may have differing focus on important 'consistencies', eg FEM focus on quality, way of doing, harmony, win-win; MASC effectiveness, productivity, goal/task focus and success is winning.	More in Collective cultures. In-groups establish guidelines for acceptable behaviour, joint goals reached in unison. Conformity is high. Deviant behaviours low as cost is very high. In INDIV behaviour is competency based. Behaviour can be unpredictable in essence – individual goals. No face-losing issues in doing this.	More in Universalism. Once the rules are clear, predictability is expected with "strict" adherence to rules. Role model behaviour valued.

A Trust Matrix - cultural dimensions and hypotheses on their impact on trust criteria

	DEFINITION	HIG/LOW CONTEXT	POWER DISTANCE	UNCERTAINTY AVOIDANCE	MASCULINITY/ FEMININITY	INDIVIDUALISM/ COLLECTIVISM	UNIVERSALISM/ PARTICULARISM
6. Security	Trust arising from the feeling that I have nothing to fear from the other members of the group	More in HC. The level of loyalty and trust in people's use of delicate information need to be high in HC cultures for people to speak their mind. Greater fear of speaking inappropriately in HC cultures until people feel secure together.	More in high PD. High PD value loyalty and people are tolerant and protective when genuine mistakes occur, but strong directive decision-making, caretaking, protective leadership, with clear task and role assignments, and clear rewards and punishments can create team security – but also fear of the boss. Low PD encourages sincere, informal, open discussion and people are tolerant with divergent views.	More easily given in low UA. Divergent or unpopular views are more tolerated, since disagreement is not a cause of anxiety. There is no need for tight control or dominating behaviour to keep situation under control. Learning culture with 'post-mortems' and best practice drawn up from mistakes. However high UA is motivated by security and belongingness. Higher number of checks and controls to increase security. Higher fear of making mistakes in a group.	More in FEM cultures. More tolerant towards divergent views (less aggressive behaviour). More prone to forgive genuine mistakes. Higher need for safety and positive emotions/feelings, whereas MASC focus on handling any unsafe situation through 'conflict management'. Rational thought and behaviour more important for them	More in COLL culture. Emphasis on harmony and concern about in-group members reduce risk of betrayal. Tolerance is higher towards in-group. In INDIV security has to be demonstrated through clear role definition and specific – lower context – behaviours-	More in PART cultures. The importance of the personal relationships and the unique mutuality can reduce the fear from other members of the group to be untrustworthy
7. Inclusion	Trust based on the observation that other group members actively include me in their social and work activities	More in HC. The fluid interchange between social and business fosters inclusion in social activities. People in HC cultures are more available to share success.	More in low PD. The consultative management style in low PD values democratic decision-making, openness to listen and share ideas and treat members as equals. More probability to feel 'included' between different hierarchical levels	More in high UA. Need to share decision and consensus with a wider range of people. More time needed to establish trust of inclusion and see clear evidence for it. Low UA has less need to be included as more comfortable with anxiety of potential exclusion	More in FEM. Preference for a participative and inclusive approach. Accustomed to seeking consensus. Focus on equality and levelling. MASC have a generally lower requirement for inclusive relationships, enough to be consulted and watch an occasional game competitive sport together	More in COLL. Inclusion in out of work activities seen as a prerequisite for building trusting long-term relationships	More in PART. Including me in their social and work activity is a prerequisite for 'club membership' in PART cultures.

A Trust Matrix - cultural dimensions and hypotheses on their impact on trust criteria

	DEFINITION	HIG/LOW CONTEXT	POWER DISTANCE	UNCERTAINTY AVOIDANCE	MASCULINITY/ FEMININITY	INDIVIDUALISM/ COLLECTIVISM	UNIVERSALISM/ PARTICULARISM
8. Open with information	Trust based on the fact that other team members share information important to the team proactively and clearly	More in LC. Explicit code of communication and focus on literal meaning of words are prerogative of LC cultures. Things are spelled out clearly and follow a concrete logic. Reframing from openness means sneaky, sly power-plays. However, in HC cultures, communications can be fluid even if nonverbal, but can be clear to the in-group members which are able to decode the cryptic message. If 'too clear' can be perceived as childish or too obvious. Communication flows through relationships between the people rather than through prescribed system.	More in Low PD because information flows more easily up and down the organisation. In HPD information is power and can be concealed from subordinates with a lower level of pressure to share knowledge belonging to the top status 'club'. Information tends to flow down not across.	In high UA emotional need of clear and unambiguous information as way to prevent uncertainties. This aspect of trust may start slower and progress with small steps as the other parties are tested. Open info is a means of reducing ambiguity as well as sharing of clear rules, roles and structures. In low UA this trust criteria will start higher but will require measurement of results (competence and personal reliability)	More in FEM cultures. Openness in sharing needs and motives. Concerned with relationships and communication. Higher availability and responsiveness. MASC cultures 'protect' information as power. However, in MASC cultures if shared it is the basis for trust	Equal in INDIV and COLL. Individualists need clear and transparent communication between loose groups. Collectivists share information in a more indirect and implicit way due to the tighter social network. Collectivists tend to be higher context while individualists are more low context. Collectivists share with in-group members but less with those they consider outsiders – it depends how well integrated the team is.	Equal in PART and UNIV. PART reserve info for special, consolidated relationships. If high they would share more. UINV share information in order to work towards common standards, so everyone should be expected to have equal access
9. Accessibility	Trust based on the fact that other team members share their true feelings and I can relate to them at a personal level	More in HC. More attention to the deeper needs of the person in the LC cultures. Sincerity and openness with own feelings and reactions can be a sign of trust if additionally the culture has a strong affective orientation. LC cultures use relationships more instrumentally.	Equal in low and high PD. The paternalistic management style in high PD fosters more personal and human behaviour. Feelings can be expressed more openly. But although high PD bosses are more present with subordinates' day to day work, they may be considered less accessible – 'let's not disturb the boss'. Low PDs look to accessibility as a prerequisite for trusting behaviour. High PD don't have such an expectation	More in high UA. Not hiding feelings and showing sincerity is a way of reducing uncertainties.	More in FEM cultures. More prone to show feelings and warmth in relationships. Ready to open to personal information and social contact. MASC are more 'poker players' in business as emotional accessibility can be seen as weakness	More in COLL cultures. Closer relationships foster availability of revealing personal information and openness in the showing feelings.	More in PART. The involvement at personal level other than only working relationships ease the development of trust

A Trust Matrix - cultural dimensions and hypotheses on their impact on trust criteria

	DEFINITION	HIG/LOW CONTEXT	POWER DISTANCE	UNCERTAINTY AVOIDANCE	MASCULINITY/ FEMININITY	INDIVIDUALISM/ COLLECTIVISM	UNIVERSALISM/ PARTICULARISM
10. Reciprocal	Trust based on the observation that other group members are trusting and co-operative towards me	More in LC. Tendency to have a default to be more trusting towards others as long as competence and information flow was high	More in low PD. Mutual dependence and cooperation are facilitated in low PD. People in low PD feel less threatened by power status issues.	No hypothesis	More in FEM. More opportunity for mutual help. Caring for others and tender relationships. In masculine societies, people wait the other to make the first step.	More in COLL. Interest of group prevails over personal interest. Interdependences are natural and the atmosphere in the group is critical. There is a higher awareness of others. Trust is the group as a whole with no dissent, so total reciprocity. IND pay back debts as soon as they can to no have long term dues, COLL have a longer term debt/IOU network.	No hypothesis.