

https://dspace.org/

Employee perceptions of trust in managers of different gender

Gunpath, Dheshni

2008-03-17T11:37:56Z
http://hdl.handle.net/10539/4672

Downloaded from a DSpace repository. https://dspace.org/

EMPLOYEE PERCEPTIONS OF TRUST IN MANAGERS OF DIFFERENT GENDER

Dheshni Gunpath

A research report submitted to the Faculty of Humanities, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in Psychology by Coursework and Research Report.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS:

Whilst labouring over this piece of work, it became necessary to acknowledge the valuable contributions of many toward ensuring my completion. To this end, I would like to thank:

Anushia Reddy, my mentor, for her help in getting me started and smoothing my path towards a dataset.

Charles Potter, my supervisor, for his advice and comments as well as for his guidance and willingness to assist throughout my studies.

Peter Fridjhon, my supervisor and stats guru, who showed *extreme* patience and support. Thank you for your understanding and guidance in terms of theory as well as statistics and for your sense of humour throughout this process.

My parents, for their firm belief in the value of higher education and for constantly encouraging me to try my best.

Emil Gunpath, my husband, for providing me with the space to complete this endeavour. You gave me unwavering support, laughter and encouragement. With you everything is worthwhile and anything is possible.

DECLARATION:

I declare that this research is my own unaided work submitted for the degree of Master of Arts by Coursework in the School of Human and Community Development in the faculty of Humanities at the University of Witwatersrand, Johannesburg.

It has not been submitted before for any degree or examination in any other university.

Signed on _____day of _____2006.

Name:_____

Signature:_____

Student Number:_____

CONTENTS

PAGE

LIST OF TABLES **1**

CHAPTER ONE **2**

1. INTRODUCTION **2**

CHAPTER TWO **7**

2. LITERATURE REVIEW **7**

2.1 TRUST: 7
2.1.1 Definitions of Trust *7*
2.1.2. The Importance of Trust *14*
2.1.3. The Construct of Trust *23*
2.1.4. Building and Maintaining Trust *27*
2.2 GENDER 35
2.2.1 Historical Background of Women in the Organisation *35*
2.2.2 Gender and Managerial Stereotypes *35*
2.2.3 Feminine Leadership *40*
2.2.4. Why Women Have Not Advanced *43*
2.2.5. The Current State of Women in Management *44*
2.2.6. Gender and Trust *46*
2.3 MEASURES OF TRUST 50
2.4. RESEARCH QUESTIONS 53

CHAPTER THREE **55**

3. METHODOLOGY **55**

3.1 RESEARCH DESIGN 55
3.2 PROCEDURE 55
3.2.1 Distribution of Questionnaires *55*
3.3 INSTRUMENT 57
3.3.1 Cognitive and Affect Based Measure of Trust *57*
3.3.2 Questionnaire *58*
3.4 DATA VERIFICATION 60
3.5 ANALYSIS 61
3.5.1 Cronbach Alpha Coefficients *61*
3.5.2 Descriptive Statistics *61*
3.5.3 Exploratory Factor Analyses *62*
3.5.4 T-Tests *62*
3.5.5 Analysis of Covariance *62*
3.5.6 Pearson Correlations *63*
3.6 SAMPLE 63
3.6.1 Sample Access *63*
3.6.2 Target Population Group Demographics *65*

CHAPTER FOUR **67**

4. RESULTS **67**

4.1 SAMPLE DEMOGRAPHICS 67
4.1.1 Gender by Ethnicity by Job Grade Level *67*
4.1.2 Employee Age *69*
4.1.3 Length of Service *69*
4.2 MANAGER DEMOGRAPHICS 69
4.2.1 Manager Age *69*

4.2.2 Manager Gender by Ethnicity by Job Grade Level 70
4.2.3 Length of Time Knowing Manager 71
4.2.4 Length of Time Spent Reporting to Current Line Manager 71
4.3 CRONBACH ALPHA COEFFICIENTS 72
4.4 EXPLORATORY FACTOR ANALYSIS 72
4.5 T-TESTS 74
4.6 ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE 75
4.7 OVERALL LEVEL OF TRUST 76
4.8 PEARSON CORRELATION 77

CHAPTER FIVE 78

5. DISCUSSION 78

5.1 INTRODUCTION 78
5.2 PERCEPTIONS OF TRUST BY MALE AND FEMALE EMPLOYEES: "ARE WOMEN MORE TRUSTING THAN MEN?" 78
5.3. PERCEPTIONS OF TRUST IN MALE AND FEMALE MANAGERS: "ARE MALE MANAGERS TRUSTED MORE THAN FEMALE MANAGERS?" 80
5.4. INTERACTION BETWEEN EMPLOYEE AND MANAGER GENDER: DO FEMALE TRUST FEMALE MANAGERS MORE THAN MALE MANAGERS AND DO MALES TRUST MALE MANAGERS MORE THAN FEMALE MANAGERS? 82
5.5. THE INFLUENCE OF CONFOUNDING VARIABLES 84
5.6. OVERALL LEVELS OF TRUST 86
5.7. STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS OF THE CURRENT RESEARCH 89
5.8. CONCLUSION 91

REFERENCES: 93

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE NUMBER	TABLE TITLE	PAGE
2.1	Changes in Top Management Level	45
3.1	Population Distribution of Gender, Ethnicity and Job Grade Level	66
4.1	Sample Distribution of Gender, Ethnicity and Job Grade Level	69
4.2	Distribution of Manager Gender, Ethnicity and Job Grade Level.	71
4.3	Results of Exploratory Factor Analysis for Affect-Based Trust Scale	73
4.4	Results of Exploratory Factor Analysis for Cognition-Based Trust Scale	73
4.5	Results of T-tests of Employee and Manager Gender	75
4.6	ANCOVA for Affect-based Trust	75
4.7	ANCOVA for Cognition-based Trust	76
4.8	Mean Scores for Trust Scales	77
4.9	Pearson Correlation Coefficients for Manager Age and Trust	77

CHAPTER ONE

1. INTRODUCTION

"Trust men and they will be true to you; treat them greatly, and they will show themselves great".

Ralph Waldo Emerson,

Essays, First Series: Prudence, 1841

Trust is a commonly accepted word that is bandied about in society in general and affects the way we feel about people and act towards people. It thus affects our behaviour and actions and refers to the "willingness of a party to be vulnerable to the actions of another party based on the expectation that the other will perform a particular action important to the trustor, irrespective of the ability to monitor or control that other party" (Mayer, Davis and Schoorman (1995, p. 712).

Trust in an organisational setting is similar but can take on a number of forms. Trust exists between colleagues and as an emotion felt towards the company or the company's leadership and management. In addition, organisational trust exists across business units and between companies. There is a growing recognition that in today's fast paced world filled with changing technologies, an increasingly global business environment, fast organizational growth and expansion through strategic alliances, the ability to effectively develop and maintain strategic alliances and partnerships has become a critical competence. In all of these arenas, the trusting qualities of the relations between parties are critical for successful collaboration (Lewicki, McAllister & Bies, 1998). Trust has been found to be important for a large number of

reasons, as it impacts on many variables, including employee commitment, organisational commitment, morale, employee turnover, absenteeism, group dynamics and interpersonal relationships, cross group collaboration, the effectiveness of the employee-manager relationship, decision making and communication (Atwater, 1988; Caudron, 2002; Jeanquart-Barone, 1993; Martins and von der Ohe, 2002; Mishra and Morrissey, 1990; Scott, 1983; Smith, 2002).

Recent studies have found that 43% of employees believe their managers cheat and lie to them, and 68% of employees do not trust their managers (Davis & Landa, 1999, cited in Willemyns, Gallois & Callan, 2003). A Watson Wyatt (2002) study of nearly 13 000 workers in all job levels and industries in the USA, revealed that fewer than two out of five employees today have trust or confidence in their senior leaders. In addition, the three-year total return to shareholders is almost three times lower at companies with lower levels of trust than at companies with higher trust levels (Caudron, 2002; Smith, 2002). The study shows that trust levels have declined from 2000 to 2002 and this is viewed in a serious light given the link between trust, return to shareholders, company performance and employee commitment. Trust has thus been widely acknowledged as an important construct within relationships in general as well as within the organisation and the manager-subordinate relationship.

As research has indicated, gender and race are the most powerful attributions in person perception and as increases in workforce diversity necessitate that people with very different backgrounds come into contact and deal closely

with one another, a diverse workforce is less able to rely on interpersonal and cultural similarity to contribute to mutual attraction and enhance the willingness to work together (Grady, 1977; Linville and Jones, 1980; Tsui and O'Reilly, 1989; all cited in Jeanquart-Barone,1993; Mayer, et al., 1995). Thus the development of mutual trust between employees from diverse backgrounds is important as trust has been shown to have an impact on a wide range of organisational and individual performance factors.

Given the racially divisive nature of South Africa's history, as well as the increasing diversity of the economic workforce of today and the prevalence of employment equity programmes aimed at growing this diversity from both a gender and ethnic perspective, the issue of trust becomes one of the important factors influencing the success of today's organisation. The current study aims at investigating the trust displayed by employees in relation to their immediate managers and explores this relationship from a gender perspective. As women are still not well represented at management level and as perceptions of male and female managers tend to differ (Billing & Alvesson, 2000; Giscombe & Mattis, 2003; Powell, Butterfield, Alves & Bartol, 2004), the purpose of this study is to determine whether trust perceptions of male and female managers differ and whether this is influenced by employee gender.

In Chapter 2, the definition of trust will be examined from a general, interpersonal and organisational perspective. The different types of trust will be examined, followed by a discussion of the importance of trust within an

organisational context and within the manager-subordinate relationship. The consequences of high and low trust rounds off the discussion on the importance of trust. The construct of trust is then broken down in order to gain a better understanding of its nature and underlying dimensions and a number of factors that are important in building and maintaining trust are then discussed. As the study focuses on trust as well as gender, the position of women as managers and within the organisation is then explored and several studies relating findings of previous research into gender and trust as well as trust and other factors such as time are noted. Finally, several measures of trust, including the one used in this study are discussed.

Chapter 3 covers the study's methodology. The design that was used, a description of the sample of participants, the instrument used to evaluate trust within the organisation under study, the procedure used and the analysis conducted, will be discussed in relevant detail.

In Chapter 4, the results of the study will be shown, beginning with overall employee and manager sample statistics and demographics. This will be followed by results for the different analyses conducted, commencing with reliability estimates and followed by results of the confirmatory factor analysis, t-tests, Ancova, correlations and mean scores for overall levels of trust.

Chapter 5 comprises a detailed discussion of the results, incorporating relevant information from the literature that is used to either support or

differentiate the results of the current study. Limitations to the current study's methodology will also be highlighted.

CHAPTER TWO

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Trust:

2.1.1 Definitions of Trust:

2.1.1.1 General

Trust is a concept that is used rather frequently and loosely within the context of everyday life. How often is it said, “I trust that person”, or “Be careful, don’t trust that man”? A commonly accepted meaning of the term is assumed and what is meant when “trust” is referred to is never actually questioned. Within the scientific literature, however, there have been numerous attempts to define trust. According to Cook and Wall (1980), trust as a word in ordinary language retains much of its commonly accepted meaning when employed as a concept in social science. It refers in the main to the extent to which one is willing to ascribe good intentions to, and have confidence in, the words and actions of other people.

The economic definition of trust is that it is a public good, “a social lubricant which makes possible production and exchange” (Dasgupta, 1988, p.64). A more philosophical or political definition is that provided by Dunn (1988, p.74), who states that “trust as a human passion may rest on close familiarity or massive social distance”, e.g. trust in your mother versus trust in your queen. Dunn gives the essence of trust as the confident expectation of benign intentions in another free agent.

The concept of unconscious trust has also been highlighted (Baird & St-Amand, 1995). For example, we trust that the sun will rise each morning. We also display unconscious trust in certain other elements of our lives, e.g. that the car we get into each morning will work or that the shop we frequent will have bread available for purchase. A deeper version of unconscious trust is that found within most religions. We have complete trust and faith in a supreme being or entity that is beyond our understanding or control – the notion of blind trust, which exists on faith alone.

Johnson-George and Swap (1982), state that interpersonal trust is a basic feature of all social situations that demand cooperation and interdependence. In addition, the notion of trust implies risk and it is this aspect that gives trust its basic character. Even though you may carefully analyse another's intentions, capabilities, and motives, in reality you can never be certain of a satisfactory outcome (Johnson-George & Swap, 1982). This is further emphasised in Robbins (2001, p.336) where trust has been defined as a "positive expectation that another will not – through words, action or decisions – act opportunistically". Rempel, Holmes and Zanna (1985, p.95) cite Rotter's definition of trust as "a generalized expectancy held by an individual that the word, promise, or statement of another individual can be relied on."

Good (1988) states that most definitions of trust are based on an individual set of beliefs as to how another person will perform on some future occasion, as a function of that target person's current and previous claims, either implicit or explicit, as to how they will behave. The implicit claims arise from an

individual's cooperative behaviour, which is a major source of information in our construction of our views of other persons. Good (1988) stresses, however, that while cooperation and trust are intimately related in that the former is a central manifestation of the latter, the former cannot provide, for either the actor or the analyst, a simple redefinition of trust. Mishra (1996, p. 265) provides a definition based on four distinct dimensions of trust, that "trust is one party's willingness to be vulnerable to another party based on the belief that the latter party is (a) competent, (b) open, (c) concerned, and (d) reliable".

A comprehensive definition of trust that encompasses most of the definitions reflected in the literature is that of Golembiewksi and McConkie (1975, cited in Baird and St-Amand, 1995), which states that trust:

- Implies reliance on, or confidence in some event, process or person
- Reflects an expectation of positive outcomes
- Implies that something is being risked in expectation of gain
- Implies some degree of uncertainty as to outcome

In terms of research conducted into trust, Cook and Wall (1980) have distinguished three main approaches in empirical investigations into trust. There is the indirect method of inferring trust from other forms of behaviour; a second approach in which a situation is created wherein the development of trust between or within groups is essential to the performance of a prescribed task, and thus the level of performance is taken as an index of the degree to which trust has developed; the third approach is the measurement of trust as

a directly experienced evaluative or affective reaction by means of a self-report scale. It is the last approach that is most applicable to this research.

In addition, research into the concept of trust falls into three main perspectives, namely research into the individual personality differences in the readiness to trust, research into trust as an institutional phenomenon; and research into trust as an interpersonal transaction between individuals (Lewicki and Bunker, 1996). The current research examines the importance of interpersonal trust within an organisational setting and as such a discussion of the importance of trust within the organisation cannot be ignored.

2.1.1.2 Organisational Trust

Trust within an organisation is similar to trust within interpersonal relationships, however, different elements are emphasised as being of greater importance. Within the context of the organisation, trust is “generally earned slowly as a result of consistent behaviour based on personal respect and a genuine concern for the well-being of organisational members” (Taylor, 1989, in Baird & St-Amand, 1995, p.5). It is not akin to blind trust as defined earlier, and as a result, leaders within an organisation cannot expect trust from their sub-ordinates solely because of their status or position. Trust between an employer and employee is built on a mutual understanding of expectations and responsibilities, and is built over time as a result of consistent behaviour between parties within an organisation.

Trust within organisations is affected by both interpersonal as well as organisational factors. Interpersonal factors in this instance refers to factors that managers possess and display, e.g. communication style, the perceptual power gap between managers and employees (Willemyns, et al., 2003), as well as managers' overall attitudes and behaviours which determine the initial levels of trust within the organisation (Creed & Miles, 1996). The organisational factors that affect trust in the workplace are elements such as an ingrained culture of mistrust, scarcity of resources, job security, political alliances and rivalries, etc. Such factors may force even the most trustworthy manager to behave in ways that undermine employees' trust in them (Willemyns, et al., 2003).

Theories of the role of trust within the organisation range from viewing trust as the most general of three classes of control mechanism – price, authority, and trust (Bradach & Eccles, 1989, cited in Creed & Miles, 1996) to viewing trust as the essential factor that permits all forms of risk taking in any social system (Luhman, 1988, cited in Creed & Miles, 1996). Creed & Miles (1996) cite Bromiley & Cummings (1992) who argue that the level of trust and trustworthiness in organisations affects the structure and process of those organisations.

McAllister (1995) defines trust as having two principal forms, that is, cognition-based trust and affect-based trust. Cognition-based trust is grounded in individual beliefs about peer reliability and dependability. Affect-based trust is grounded in reciprocated interpersonal care and concern. Trust is cognition-

based in that we trust based on what we consider to be good reasons. These good reasons are seen as evidence of trustworthy behaviour. McAllister (1995) also supports the argument that trust in organisational settings has competence and responsibility as central elements as well as reliability and dependability. The affective base of trust consists of the emotional bonds between individuals.

Cook and Wall (1980) define trust as being placed along two different dimensions, namely, faith in the trustworthy intentions of others, and confidence in the ability of others, yielding ascriptions of capability and reliability. These dimensions of faith and confidence are similar, respectively, to McAllister's (1995) affective based and cognitive based trust. Mishra (1996, p.265) adds his support by advocating that the definitions of trust as "a willingness and a belief subsumes the cognitive, emotional and behavioural components of trust".

The current research uses the definitions provided by McAllister (1995), which is supported by Cook and Wall (1980) and examines the construct of trust from this perspective.

2.1.1.2. Types of Trust

Schindler and Thomas (1993), state that interpersonal trust in organisations can be directed in any or all of three directions from the individual:

(a) Upward (from subordinate to manager/ supervisor)

(b) Downward (from manager/ supervisor to a subordinate)

(c) Laterally (from co-worker to co-worker)

Baird and St-Amand (1995) add external trust to this list, which refers to trust relations between an organisation and its clients or suppliers. They add that a successful organisation is built on all four of these forms of trust.

In addition, research has indicated some difference in terms of importance of the different dimensions of trust within upward, downward and lateral trust relationships (Gabarro, 1978; Butler & Cantrell, 1984; Schindler & Thomas, 1993). Differences in the sample of these three studies reflected possible reasons for differences in results, with Gabarro using a sample of corporate executives, Butler and Cantrell using a sample of students and Schindler and Thomas using a sample of managers and executives within the healthcare industry. Gabarro's (1978) results indicated that integrity, competence and consistency were most important for trust in one's subordinates while integrity, loyalty and openness were most important for trust in one's superior. Butler and Cantrell's (1984) results indicated the same relative importance of the five identified trust components (integrity, competence, loyalty, consistency and openness) irrespective of whether referring to trust in a supervisor or trust in a subordinate. Schindler and Thomas' (1993) results indicated a difference for consistency and openness, which were more important for formation of trust with peers than with subordinates or supervisors.

These results appear to indicate differing importance of the components of trust within the different types of trust relationships based on the sample used.

The salience of the different dimensions of trust appears to depend on the sample of employees surveyed as well as the industry from which the sample was drawn. The current research focuses on the upward trust relationship as employees are surveyed and asked to rate the trust that they feel towards their managers/ supervisors.

2.1.2. The Importance of Trust

2.1.2.1. Within the Organisation

Luhmann (1988) states that a system – economic, legal or political – requires trust as an input condition. Without trust it cannot stimulate supportive activities in situations of uncertainty or risk. A lack of trust simply withdraws activities, and reduces the range of possibilities for rational action. Through lack of trust, a system may reduce size and may even shrink below a critical threshold necessary for its own reproduction at a certain level of development.

Good (1988) cites the findings of Rotter and his colleagues (1980) who examined the characteristics of individuals who are willing to trust others over a wide range of issues, and in a number of different spheres. In general, these studies have found that those who are more willing to trust other people are likely to be equally trustworthy in that they are less likely to lie, cheat, or steal. They are also less likely to be unhappy or maladjusted, and are typically more liked by their friends and colleagues.

Research has linked trust to organisational performance. Bohnet (2004), Jeanquart-Barone (1993), Scott (1983) and Simons (2002) cite research that

highlights this link. The presence of trust in employees has been shown to significantly influence the following:

a) Employee perceptions of accurate performance appraisals (Fulk, Brief, & Bair, 1985, cited in Jeanquart-Barone, 1993);

b) Employee performance (Moore, Shaffer, Pollack & Taylor-Lemcke, 1987, cited in Jeanquart-Barone, 1993; Simons, 2002);

c) Organisational commitment, morale, turnover, absenteeism and unquantified cost in untapped potential (Diffee-Couch, 1984, cited in Jeanquart-Barone, 1993; Mishra and Morrissey, 1990; Simons, 2002);

d) Influences interpersonal relationships in the organisation and the effectiveness of group problem-solving and decision-making (Gamson, 1968; Mellinger, 1956; Zand, 1972, all cited in Jeanquart-Barone, 1993; Mills & Ungson, 2003);

e) Trust is a necessary element for open, accurate communication (Mellinger, 1956, cited in Scott, 1983; Mishra and Morrissey, 1990; Willemyns, et al., 2003);

f) Trust affects people's attitudes and feelings about the organisation and their jobs (Driscoll, 1978, cited in Scott, 1983) and reduces friction among employees (Mishra and Morrissey, 1990);

g) Trust leads to greater predictability, dependability and confidence (Mishra and Morrissey, 1990);

h) Trust leads to openness and a willingness to listen and accept criticism non-defensively (Mishra and Morrissey, 1990);

i) Trust also impacts on repeat business (Mishra and Morrissey, 1990);

j) Trust influences the effectiveness of negotiation within the workplace, helping employees to negotiate in good faith, exchanging information and trading on differences to reach integrative deals that make everyone better off (Bohnet, 2004).

Scott's (1983) study showed through a validation exercise, that the trust in superior and trust in management scales had a positive significant relationship to participation in decision-making, to the success of a management by objectives programme and to job satisfaction.

Martins and von der Ohe (2002), cite Shaw (1997) who argues that trust plays a crucial role in the following domains:

a) empowering individuals and teams

b) horizontal business processes

c) business-unit autonomy and power

d) cross-group collaboration

e) alliances and joint ventures

f) real-time organisational learning

Martins and von der Ohe (2002) used a South African "Best Company to Work For" survey conducted by a consulting company across a number of companies and industries, in their research. They conducted a validation exercise of the survey instrument which measured a number of dimensions

ranging from trust to leadership, change, communication, etc. The results of their research indicate that the impact of trust appears to be most relevant in the dimensions of leadership, relationships, conflict, change, communication and diversity management. Trust was found to correlate the highest with the dimensions of job satisfaction and leadership, as well as with the "relationships" dimension of the survey questionnaire.

Further support for the link between trust and organisational performance comes from Dirks (2000). According to this, research has implied that a higher level of trust in a leader results in higher organisational performance. This proposition has served as the basis for the claim that trust is an important variable in applied settings and therefore deserves further research. Dirks conducted a study on trust in leadership and the link to team performance by using a sample of men's college basketball teams. His research has shown that trust in the leader has an effect on team performance in some situations. In a Watson Wyatt (2002) report the issue of trust within corporate USA was highlighted and it was found that three-year total return to shareholders rates are significantly higher at companies with higher trust levels, clear linkages between jobs and objectives, and employees who believe the company manages change well.

As further support for the importance of trust, Simons (2002) conducted research at 76 US and Canadian Holiday Inn hotels using survey responses from more than 6 500 employees and analysing the hotels' customer satisfaction surveys, personnel records and financial records. His results

show that hotels where employees believed their managers followed through on promises and demonstrated the values they preached were substantially more profitable than those whose managers were rated average or lower.

Cook and Wall (1980) and Brockner, Siegel, Daly, Tyler and Martin (1997) emphasise the link between trust and organisational commitment. Brockner, et al. (1997) state that trust in organisational authorities leads to employees supporting and being committed to organisational authority to a greater degree. The earlier study by Cook and Wall (1980) was undertaken with the aim of developing instruments to measure interpersonal trust at work, organisational commitment and personal need non-fulfilment. Of interest is the finding that all the trust subscales correlated substantially with all the organisational commitment subscales. In addition, the trust in management subscales correlated negatively and reliably with the personal need non-fulfilment scale which was interpreted as indicating that need satisfaction fosters positive regard for management. Job satisfaction also correlated substantially with the trust subscales. Cook and Wall (1980) also found that the single scale with the highest correlation with most of the other scales was the faith in management subscale of trust. This was therefore seen to be an important variable and could be considered as both an outcome of work experience and a variable contributing to the formation of organisational commitment. The faith in management as well as the confidence in management subscales was also found to correlate with anxiety in a negative relationship such that anxiety decreases with increases in trust.

Given these findings, which provide sufficient argument for the importance of trust, Gambetta (1988) cautions that greater trust and co-operation is not always desirable. Sometimes, competition is equally important for the success of an organisation. He gives as the rationale for this view the idea that not only those who succeed in competition benefit, but that the positive influence of competition is likely to be more generally felt. Gambetta concludes that the problem appears to be one of finding the optimal mixture of cooperation and competition rather than deciding at which extreme to converge. Of interest is his view that in order for healthy competition to develop, trust must be evident – at some level, one must trust one's competitors to comply with certain rules, for example, abstention from mutual injury. The growth of trust among political parties is important for building viable societies, even though these parties are traditionally competing against one another.

2.1.2.2 Within the Manager-Subordinate Relationship

Robbins (2001, p.338) emphasises the importance of trust in leaders by saying that "when followers trust a leader, they are willing to be vulnerable to the leader's actions because they are confident that the leader will not abuse their rights or interests". He goes on to say that now, more than ever, managerial and leadership effectiveness depends on the ability to gain the trust of followers. During times of re-engineering and downsizing and in times of change and instability, people's trust in management is undermined. As a result people turn to personal relationships for guidance. The quality of these relationships is largely determined by degree of trust. For this reason trust

needs to have been the basis of the relationship between employee and manager.

With regard to the leader/ follower relationship, Kouzes and Posner (1994) conducted research over a five-year period in which they investigated the perceptions that followers have of leaders. According to their research, the majority of us admire leaders who are honest, competent, forward-looking, inspiring, and ultimately credible. Kouzes and Posner (1994) also state that in every survey conducted, honesty was selected more often than any other leadership characteristic. After all, if we are "to willingly follow someone, whether into battle or into the boardroom, we first want to assure ourselves that the person is worthy of our trust" (Kouzes and Posner, 1994, p.107). They go on to explain that the leaders' behaviour provided the evidence as to honesty, integrity and therefore, trustworthiness. Their research places trust in an important position.

Butler (1991) highlighted that trust is an essential component of the dyadic leader-member exchange (LMX). According to LMX theory the relationship between leader and member is a reciprocal one. This type of interactive behaviour builds and maintains the relationship. The mutual reinforcement in the high quality LMX promotes stability and predictability over time. Many of the organisationally relevant hypotheses concerning the relations of LMX with job satisfaction, productivity, decision influence, and employee turnover have also been supported for trust (Gabarro, 1978 and Zand, 1972; cited in Butler, 1991, p. 657). Trust has also been found to influence the relationship between

transformational leadership and performance (Jung & Avolio, 2000). Jung and Avolio cite research by Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Moorman and Fetter (1990) and Yukl (1998) who consider follower's trust in the leader as one of the most important variables that can influence the effectiveness of transformational leadership. Yukl (1998, cited in Jung & Avolio, 2000), argues that a follower's commitment to the leader's vision depended on the leader's capability to build trust with followers.

The importance of trust within supervisory behaviour is further emphasised by Atwater (1988), who indicates that levels of trust and loyalty among subordinates were found to be factors most predictive of supportive supervisory behaviour (e.g. resolving conflicts, supporting opportunities for improvements for workers and inspiring loyalty). The more trust and loyalty expressed by subordinates towards their supervisors, the more positively the supervisor was perceived to behave.

2.1.2.3. Consequences of High and Low Trust

Low levels of trust have been found to have a negative impact on the effective functioning of any organisation (Sonnenburg, 1994; Shea, 1984; both cited in Baird & St-Amand, 1995). Sonnenburg (1994) found that employees in organisations marked by low levels of trust usually operate under high levels of stress and spend a great deal of effort covering their backs, justifying past decisions or looking for scapegoats when something doesn't work out. This prevents employees from focusing on the work they should be doing and productivity ultimately declines. Innovation is stifled and employees are afraid

of being reprimanded or ridiculed. People in organisations with low level trust operate with incomplete information and treat others' suggestions with suspicion. Barriers to communication are erected and in the end, the decision-making process is weakened.

Schindler and Thomas (1993) add to this by citing Schmidt and Posner (1982), who state that the costs to an organisation in which its employees mistrust one another can be directly and indirectly felt. They add that large amounts of time, energy and resources are spent by employees protecting themselves or avoiding or undermining the efforts of others when they do not trust one another.

High levels of trust within the organisation reduce friction among employees and bond people together. It is associated with increased productivity and stimulates growth. Employee morale is improved and employee absenteeism and turnover are reduced. In addition, an environment is created where innovation flourishes. Trust allows an organisation to switch its focus to the long term. Trust is also an essential component of effective change management as a transition occurs much more easily within a trusting environment (Baird & St-Amand, 1995). Schindler and Thomas (1993) cite research by Kegan and Rubenstein (1973) who showed that employee effectiveness increases when employees trust one another, which is supported by Driscoll (1978, cited in Schindler and Thomas, 1993) who showed that job satisfaction is enhanced when employees trust one another.

The literature surveyed has examined the construct of trust from an interpersonal level as well as from an organisational perspective. Trust has also been examined within the employee/employer relationship. However, there has been very little research conducted into whether trust differs from a gender perspective or whether trust is defined differently for males and females. The present research therefore adopts the stance of the preceding research and assumes a cross-gender definition of trust with the aim of then discovering whether there are any gender-based differences in terms of the degree of trust displayed within the employer/employee relationship from the employee perspective.

2.1.3. The Construct of Trust

Rempel, et al. (1985) list four critical elements that were derived from previous definitions of trust:

a) Trust is seen to evolve out of past experience and prior interaction

b) Dispositional attributions are made to the partner such that s/he is regarded as reliable, dependable and concerned with providing expected rewards

c) Trust involves a willingness to put oneself at risk, be it through intimate disclosure, reliance on another's promises, sacrificing present rewards for future gains, etc.

d) Trust is defined by feelings of confidence and security in the caring responses of the partner and the strength of the relationship.

Rempel, et al. (1985) developed a model of trust based on three components, that is, predictability, dependability and faith. The results of their research indicate that trust is related in important ways to the success of a close relationship. Rempel, et al. (1985) found that the most important element of trust in close relationships appears to be faith, i.e. the belief that one's partner will act in loving and caring ways whatever the future holds.

Butler (1991) reviewed a number of studies of trust in organisations, which have emphasised two characteristics of trust. The first of these relates to the salience of a specific other to be trusted or mistrusted. Research (Johnson-George & Swap, 1982; Butler & Cantrell, 1984; Scott, 1983) has advocated the relevance of situational trust in specific others as opposed to global trust in generalised others. The second characteristic of trust relates to its multidimensional nature (Mishra, 1996, Butler, 1991). According to Butler (1991), trust has been found to be multidimensional as a construct as well as being activated and sustained by a multidimensional set of conditions.

Butler and Cantrell (1984) cite research by Jennings (1971), and Gabarro (1978) who specified the dimensions of trust as follows:

a) integrity, honesty and truthfulness
b) competence, technical and interpersonal knowledge and skills required to do one's job
c) consistency, reliability, predictability, and good judgement in handling situations

d) loyalty or benevolent motives, willingness to protect and save face for a person

e) openness or mental accessibility, willingness to share ideas and information freely.

This multidimensional nature of trust has been supported by others examining this complex issue who have, in addition to the five dimensions listed above, proposed trust to be composed of openness or congruity, shared values, and autonomy-feedback (Hart, Capps, Cangemi and Caillouet, 1986; McClelland, 1987; both cited in Schindler & Thomas, 1993). Schindler and Thomas (1993) conducted research into the dimensions identified previously by Gabarro (1978) and Jennings (1971), and researched by Butler and Cantrell (1984). Their findings suggest that integrity (honesty and truthfulness) and competence (technical or interpersonal skill and knowledge) are the most critical characteristics that an individual looks for in determining trustworthiness. Of the remaining dimensions, more emphasis was placed on loyalty (commitment to one another), followed by consistency (whether or not workers can rely on one another to be relatively uniform in attitudes and behaviour), and least of all openness (how receptive others are to sharing ideas and information).

Butler (1991) further researched the conditions of trust, or the factors leading to the development of trust. This research gives insight into the construct of trust as well as the conditions leading to trust. The rationale for his research endeavours was that the conditionality of trust also suggests measuring the

conditions leading to trust in addition to the trust construct itself. Although a measure of trust dimensions could focus on a specific other and could reflect the complexity of the construct, it would be unable to pinpoint specific causes of trust or mistrust that needed attention in a given organisation or relationship. Via interviews conducted with 84 managers at diverse firms, mostly in the Eastern USA, Butler highlighted ten conditions of trust, which were then used to develop his Conditions of Trust Inventory (CTI):

a) availability
b) competence
c) consistency
d) discreetness
e) fairness
f) integrity
g) loyalty
h) openness
i) promise fulfilment
j) receptivity

Luhmann (1988), goes on to differentiate further between confidence and trust. Confidence is important for the everyday act of living and refers to the expectation that something will happen, without acknowledging the possibility of disappointment.

The distinction between confidence and trust depends on perception and attribution. If you do not consider alternatives, you are in a situation of

confidence. If you choose one action in preference to others in spite of being disappointed by the action of others, you define the situation as one of trust. Luhmann (1988, p.98) stresses further that “trust is only possible in a situation where the possible damage may be greater than the advantage you seek”. Otherwise, it would simply be a question of rational calculation and you would choose your action anyway, because the risks remain within acceptable limits. Trust is only required if a bad outcome would make you regret your decision.

This discussion highlights a number of common elements across the research conducted to demystify the construct of trust. The most frequent dimensions highlighted for organisational trust include competence, integrity, reliability or dependence and faith.

2.1.4. Building and Maintaining Trust

“Trust building is a dynamic process, an investment in the future…Trust is the miracle ingredient in organizational life – a lubricant that reduces friction, a bonding agent that glues together disparate parts, a catalyst that facilitates action” (Shea, 1984, cited in Mishra & Morrissey, 1990, p. 449).

Dasgupta (1988, p.51) presents the view that the mere statement of an intention is not sufficient for feelings of trust to develop. Rather you trust a person because, “knowing what you know of the person’s disposition, the available options and their consequences, the person’s ability and so forth, you expect that the person will *choose* to do it”. Dasgupta concludes that trust is based on reputation and that reputation has ultimately to be acquired

through behaviour over time in well-understood circumstances. This highlights the role of reputation which is acquired over a period of time, and hence the importance of longer term interaction for the development of trust. A reputation for honesty or trustworthiness is acquired gradually, but can generally be destroyed very quickly (Dasgupta, 1988). This holds true for the individual as well as for the institution, e.g. trust in a colleague and the trust and reputation that has developed over time in an institution.

Hirschman (1984, cited in Dasgupta, 1988, p.66), has observed that trust "grows with use and that bonds develop among people who encounter one another repeatedly". The implications for the current research are that those employees, who know their managers for a longer period of time, should trust their managers more. Logic then dictates that those employees who know their managers for a longer period, and who also reported to their managers for a longer period should typically display higher levels of trust as more intense, repeated encounters would arise from this relationship. This does not, however, imply that trust is a guaranteed outcome of familiarity, as familiarity does sometimes breed contempt. Luhmann (1988) cautions against confusing trust with familiarity. Support for this is derived from citing Barber (1983), who proposes to distinguish between three different dimensions in which trusting expectations may fail: the continuity of the natural and moral order, the technical competence of actors in roles, and the fiduciary obligations of actors, that is, their duty and their motives to place the interests of others before their own.

One of the methods of conducting research into trust is via game theory. Gambetta (1988) extracts an important learning from the research done in this area, regarding the importance of communication. Even if people have perfectly adequate motives for cooperation they still need to know about each other's motives and to trust each other, or at least the effectiveness of their motives. It is necessary not only to trust others before acting cooperatively, but also to believe that one is trusted by others. If you are unclear as to others' intentions, you may lack the belief that everyone else is going to cooperate. These circumstances, whether or not you intended to cooperate, may lead to 'fear of being the only "sucker" around to sweat on the pedals' (Gambetta, 1988, p.217), and a corresponding unwillingness to cooperate oneself.

Gambetta (1988) further points out that trust appears to be one of those states that cannot be induced at will, with respect either to oneself or to others. In the former case this is because rational individuals cannot simply decide to believe that they trust someone if they do not; in the latter case because they cannot easily set out intentionally to impress someone of their trustworthiness. Trust is a state that appears to come about as the by-product of actions undertaken for other ends. Trust may be a by-product, typically of familiarity and friendship, both of which imply that those involved have some knowledge of each other, and some respect for each other's welfare. Similarly trust may emerge as a by-product of moral and religious values which prescribe honesty and mutual love. Trust, although a potential spin-off of

familiarity, friendship, and moral values, must not be confused with them, for it has quite different properties.

Gambetta (1988) goes on to highlight a peculiarity of trust, namely that it is a belief predicated not on evidence but on the lack of contrary evidence – a feature that makes it vulnerable to deliberate destruction. In other words, we trust based on a lack of evidence of distrust. Gambetta also points out that trust begins with keeping oneself open to evidence, acting as if one trusted, at least until more stable beliefs can be established on the basis of further information. This would imply that trust in an individual who you do not know very well may initially be high, but this situation may change as further evidence of the individual's trustworthiness becomes available.

This has implications for the current research in that trust could vary with the length of the relationship. Employees, who have not worked with their managers for very long, may trust them irrespective of this. This could change as the relationship lengthens and trust could either increase or decrease. Employees who know their managers well and who have more frequent and regular contact with them could also possibly be disposed to displaying higher levels of trust in their managers. The question of trust formation and time is an interesting one. Initial trust between parties will not be based on experience or firsthand knowledge of the other party. Rather it will be based on an individual's disposition to trust or on institutional cues that enable one person to trust another without firsthand knowledge (McKnight, Cummings & Chervany, 1998).

Good (1988) uses a number of experimental, laboratory based studies, e.g. the Prisoner's Dilemma and the Trucking Game (Deutsch & Krauss, 1960, cited in Good, 1988) to reveal some interesting findings on cooperation and trust: Firstly, if subjects believed that they would need to interact with each other after the study was concluded, and therefore the usual social and temporal isolation of such interactions was removed, their behaviour became considerably more cooperative. Secondly, the reduction of the threat which individuals can pose to one another increases cooperation. Thirdly, gradual change or increase in profits that can be accrued increases the possibility of cooperation, as opposed to situations where the benefit is initially set at a high value. The fourth finding is that the greater the amount of communication between players in a wide variety of games, the greater the likelihood of there being a mutually beneficial outcome.

Good's (1988) review of the experiments in this area provides an understanding of the antecedents of trust, or the conditions in which trust is likely to develop. He proposes that in conditions where the long-term interests of the participants are stressed, where only small initial or additional rewards are at stake, where there is no potential for threat and great potential for successful communication in that the ambiguity of a situation is reduced, and where the participants are in free and easy contact, then cooperation and a certain level of trust can develop.

With regard to the types of behaviours that can build trust, Sinetar (1988) proposes five guidelines that can promote trust:

a) a way of being, i.e. being trustworthy as a person
b) a cooperative voice, i.e. using an informal tone and displaying a lack of superiority
c) a quiet manner
d) congruence, i.e. not sending out mixed messages
e) regard for self and others

Sinetar's five points appear to be based on a version of common sense rather than any scientific premise, however, support for some of her points is evident in the literature. Mishra and Morrissey (1990), state that four factors breed trust:

a) open communication
b) greater share in decision making
c) sharing of critical information
d) true sharing of perceptions and feelings

Atwater (1988) lists a number of suggested behaviours for managers and supervisors in building mutual trust and loyalty with subordinates:

a) Trust subordinates and subordinates will be more likely to trust supervisors in return
b) Be consistent
c) Be fair, which does not mean treating everyone the same
d) Be honest
e) Set an example with your own behaviour
f) Be dependable and carry out promises

g) Be sincere; care about subordinates as people as well as workers

h) Assume group responsibility for mistakes rather than looking to place blame

i) Give competent advice or admit not knowing the answer

j) Back up subordinates to higher levels of management, especially when they have made a mistake

k) Answer questions and concerns from subordinates in a timely manner

l) Reward a good job

m) Admit mistakes

n) Be a good listener

o) Let people know the sources of rules, regulations and constraints. Subordinates tend to believe that supervisors are responsible unless they are told otherwise

p) Be available to subordinates to answer questions and solve problems

q) Take time to talk with subordinates either about work or nonjob-related topics

r) Those who supervise repetitive routine jobs need to make an extra effort to show concern and build trust among subordinates

The three models share some similarity, for example, all three models make reference to consistency and the true sharing of perceptions and feelings. However there is greater overlap between Atwater (1988) and the other two models (Sinetar, 1988; Mishra & Morrisey, 1990) than between Sinetar (1988)

and Mishra and Morrisey (1990). This is possibly due to the greater comprehensiveness of Atwater's (1988) model, whereas the Sinetar (1988) as well as the Mishra and Morrisey (1990) models can be considered higher level models.

Butler (1991) conducted research into the conditions of trust. He highlighted the ten conditions of trust as availability, competence, consistency, discreetness, fairness, integrity, loyalty, openness, promise fulfilment and receptivity. Butler's research indicates that these conditions need to be present in order to effectively build trust. Lewicki and Bunker (1996) list certain activities that strengthen the development of trust within an organisation, such as developing a collective identity (for example, a joint name, title, logo), sharing the same building, creating joint products or goals, and committing to commonly shared values.

Butler (1991) also cites Larzelere and Huston (1980) as well as his earlier research (Butler, 1983, 1986), where it was found that trust was reciprocal, as predicted by Zand's (1972, cited in Butler, 1991) dynamic model of trust. This model proposes that trust between two individuals develops through a circular process. If one expects that the other is trustworthy, then one will disclose information and relax controls. The other will then perceive this trustworthy behaviour and will tend to treat one with similar trustworthy behaviour. This in turn, reinforces one's initial trusting expectations and interpersonal trust continues to grow. The opposite circular process can produce mistrust, when expectations that the other is untrustworthy lead one to withhold information

and tighten controls. The other perceives this mistrust and reacts similarly, which in turn reinforces one's behaviour and so on.

2.2 Gender

2.2.1 Historical Background of Women in the Organisation

Historically, the corporate world has been a male-dominated environment which was characterised by the division of labour, a state from which we are only now moving away. Kanter (1993), in her seminal work on men and women within the corporation, informs us that from 1900 – 1970, most female workers concentrated in occupations that were seen as the domain of females, notably clerical work. Women have had more opportunity in areas such as education, the arts, social science, the retail trade, personnel work, advertising, public relations and staff support positions. White collar occupations were segregated into managerial roles for men and clerical roles for women. This situation has perpetuated a number of gender stereotypes in the workplace. One of the major gender stereotypes relates to gender and management.

2.2.2 Gender and Managerial Stereotypes

Stereotypes of men and women have always existed and gender stereotypes have been defined as common culture wide beliefs about how men and women differ in personal qualities and characteristics (Dennis & Kunkel, 2004). These stereotypes of typical male and female behaviours and qualities further translate into managerial and leadership stereotypes. The world of work may be changing, but the world of management has been and continues

to be dominated by men (Billing & Alvesson, 2000; Nazarko, 2004). Historically and even today, the view of manager and leader has been constructed in masculine terms (Billing & Alvesson, 2000; Coleman, 2003), and gender stereotypes prevail.

A good manager has been described as possessing predominantly masculine characteristics that are traditionally associated with males such as assertiveness, independence, willingness to take risks (Powell, Butterfield & Parent, 2002); task oriented or agentic, competitive, authoritative, focused on hierarchy and prone to using power in their management practices (Paris, 2004; Robinson & Lipman-Blumen, 2003). Males were viewed as possessing the traits of a tough minded approach to problems; analytic abilities to abstract and plan; a capacity to set aside personal, emotional considerations in the interests of task accomplishment; and a cognitive superiority in problem solving and decision making (Kanter, 1993).

Stereotypes of women often include characteristics such as being gentle, emotional, intuitive, dependent, sensitive, passive, illogical, nurturant, warm and accommodating. Feminine traits tend to be expressive or communal, the disposition to be sensitive and nurturing to others (Dennis & Kunkel, 2004). In general, research on gender stereotypes reveals that people consider women to have more communal qualities and men more agentic qualities (Powell, et al., 2002; Powell, Butterfield, Alves and Bartol, 2004). Female leaders are seen as using a relationship-oriented management style encompassing

collaborative, inclusive, contributory and vicarious behaviours, to accomplish their tasks (Paris, 2004; Robinson & Lipman-Blumen, 2003).

The expectation arose that leaders in most professional and managerial positions are driven, objective, assertive, and authoritative and hence possess and display characteristics associated with the “masculine” stereotype rather than the “feminine” (Dennis & Kunkel, 2004). This image of managers reflected a masculine ethic and elevated the traits assumed to be associated with some men to the status of being necessary for effective management. When women tried to enter management jobs, the “masculine ethic” was invoked as an exclusionary principle (Kanter, 1993).

In the 1930’s and 1940’s the human relations model grew. This model posited that people were motivated by social as well as economic rewards and their behaviours and attitudes were a function of group memberships. It emphasised the roles of participation, communication patterns and leadership style in affecting organisational outcomes and therefore introduced social and emotional considerations. (Kanter, 1993). This model added what was referred to as a “feminised” element to the old “masculine” ethic. Despite this, the masculine ethic dominates the managerial field. This image also provided a rationale for where women belonged in management. If they belonged at all, it was in people handling functions, such as personnel, where their emotional fine tuning was more appropriate than in decision-making functions. Women were thus directed into the emotional end of management, and excluded from the centres of power in management. Women were stereotypically perceived

as too emotional whereas men were rational. Women who could get in were those who demonstrated the ability to think like a man (Kanter, 1993).

The prevailing stereotypes disadvantage women at all levels of management. When decision makers believe that masculine characteristics are best suited for managerial roles and that men possess these characteristics in greater abundance than women, they are more likely to select men for available management positions than equally qualified women (Dennis & Kunkel, 2004; Powell, et al., 2002). They are also likely to evaluate male managers more favourably than female managers who have exhibited equivalent performance (Lee & James, 2003; Powell, et al., 2002). This might in turn influence promotion decisions (Dennis & Kunkel, 2004). Further, women who hold these beliefs may hold back from seeking management positions (Powell, et al., 2002), thereby perpetuating this cycle of beliefs.

The perception of males as better skilled in business creates an unfair barrier to newly recruited and hired women. The stereotypical view of instrumental or agentic traits as advantageous creates a masculine corporate standard that also defines feminine attributes such as expressiveness and communality as being outside the successful leader stereotype (Dennis & Kunkel, 2004). One of the ways in which women cope with this is by adopting the masculine ethic and becoming “one of the boys”, a situation that further perpetuates the notion of “think leader, think masculine” (Dennis & Kunkel, 2004, p.159). Of course, these stereotypes may also have an impact on men in that male managers

may suppress any desire to display those leadership characteristics that are typically associated with women.

Research on how these perceptions of women leaders manifest themselves in the marketplace was conducted by Lee and James (2003) who analysed shareholder reactions to the announcement of the appointment of females to the position of Chief Executive Officer (CEO). Their findings indicate that shareholder reactions are more negative to these announcements than they are to the announcement of male CEOs, that their reactions are more negative to the appointment of female CEOs than to the female appointments in top management appointments other than CEO, and that women promoted to the CEO position from within are viewed more positively than women who are appointed from externally.

Wren (2004) highlights an article in The London Times published in 2003 in which women were criticised for failing their companies after landing boardroom jobs. They were blamed for plummeting share prices and profits after firms they directed were reportedly performing poorly compared to those directed by men. Wren cites research by Ryan and Haslam (2004) who found that women rather than being incapable were landed with the dirty jobs, a practice they refer to as the “second wave” of discrimination against women. They refer to the “glass cliff” which refers to women at the top of the ladder being promoted into risky and precarious leadership positions, where the chance of failure is very high. Women are being appointed into these leadership positions in companies that have been doing badly for a while.

However, the positive news is that for women who have weathered this initial storm, the companies that they lead have shown marked improvement in performance.

2.2.3 Feminine Leadership

The growth of feminine leadership seems to have been stimulated by the move to bring more women into the workforce and into senior managerial roles. The idea of stereotypically “feminine” characteristics as the new wave of management practices has led to a belief in the value of feminine leadership as an effective way to manage and indeed, lead. This has culminated in a call for organisations to place greater emphasis on feminine characteristics associated with women managers (Powell, et al., 2002).

Feminine leadership emphasises female values or principles which are characterised by interdependence, cooperation, receptivity, merging, acceptance, awareness of patterns, wholes and contexts, emotional tone, personalistic perception, being, intuition, and synthesising (Marshall, 1993; cited in Billing & Alvesson, 2000). It has been suggested that women may contribute in the following important aspects: communication and cooperation, affiliation and attachment, power and intimacy and nurturing (Grant, 1988; cited in Billing & Alvesson, 2000).

Fagenson (1993; cited in Billing & Alvesson, 2000) suggests that women managers have a transformational, democratic, and/or web style rather than an hierarchical style of leadership and more satisfied subordinates than men

managers. Helgesen (1990, cited in Billing & Alvesson, 2000) emphasises women's difference from men in that they are more caring, involved and listening than men. In addition, it was found that women more often talk about themselves as interactive, they actively work to make their interactions with others positive for everyone involved (Rosener, 1990; cited in Billing & Alvesson, 2000). Powell, et al. (2004) cite a meta-analysis of 61 experimental studies conducted between 1973 and 1990 by Eagly, Makhijani and Klonsky (1992), which shows an overall tendency for male leaders to be evaluated more favourably than female leaders. Feminine leadership appears linked to transformational leadership, which is more consistent with the female stereotype of nurturing, mentoring of subordinates and a high concern for relationships. Transactional leadership, on the other hand is associated with the masculine stereotype in its focus on task accomplishment, contingent reward and management by exception (Coleman, 2003; Powell, et al., 2004).

Of interest though, is the presence of a body of comparative research that points towards minimal or no differences between male and female managers. Robinson and Lipman-Blumen (2003), conducted research comparing the achieving styles of men and women and found no significant differences for 6 of the 9 scales measured (namely, power direct, personal instrumental, social instrumental, entrusting instrumental, collaborative relational and contributory relational). They did find a significant difference for the competitive achieving style with men scoring higher on competitiveness than women. Of further interest are the small counter stereotypical but significant differences that they found in two other styles. Women scored

higher on intrinsic achievement which relates to executing a task and measuring performance against an internal standard of excellence. This differs from the argument that women are more people than task oriented. They also found that men score higher on use of the vicarious style, which is deriving a sense of achievement through the accomplishments of others with whom one identifies. The stereotype is that women are higher on this style.

Paris (2004) found a significant difference between the importance that male and female managers placed on participative leadership with females viewing this as a more important contributor to outstanding leadership than did males managers. She also found that this differed across societies, specifically linked to the level of gender egalitarianism within that society. Societies higher in gender egalitarianism displayed less of a difference in terms of the importance with which participative management was viewed. However, she found no main effects due to gender for team oriented leadership, autonomous leadership, self-protective leadership, humane-oriented leadership or charisma/ value-based leadership. Power distance (the extent to which men and women are seen as having differential power status) or gender egalitarianism (the extent to which men and women are viewed as different or unequal) were found to be moderating variables for all except humane-oriented leadership.

Dennis and Kunkel (2004) examined this issue from the perspective of participant sex, target (leader) sex and target label (CEO or successful CEO). They found that while male managers continue to be perceived generally to

have innately different characteristics from females, there is one population segment (individuals of either sex whose gender identity is associated with predominantly female characteristics) whose members believe that males and females do not differ with respect to qualities traditionally identified as crucial to leadership and success.

This research seems to indicate that gender alone cannot be used to predict managerial success nor can it be used to predict the typical behaviours in which male and female managers will engage. However, this is by no means a clear-cut topic of research and no firm conclusions can easily be reached.

2.2.4. Why Women Have Not Advanced

There are numerous challenges that female leaders face on a global level. There have been mainly two ways of explaining the small numbers of women in management: the explanation that emphasises differences between men and women that have mainly pointed at psychological traits and socialisation background, different work orientations or educational/ career choices, and the explanations that favour the view that men and women are alike which points at sociological, structural explanations, such as effects of positions in organisations, organisational policy, interests, bias in evaluations, etc. (Billing & Alvesson, 2000).

A third explanation is to consider the cultural contexts and perceptions and how identity/ subjectivity is being formed by cultural forces operating on the individual (Billing & Alvesson, 2000; Paris, 2004). Unique personal and social

experiences that arise from being a member of a particular culture determines the way in which one formulates one's perceptions of others and the way in which one places individuals into gender role categories (Paris, 2004).

All of these explanations give credence to the existence of the glass ceiling, and the view that due to these perceived stereotypes, women are overlooked for managerial positions irrespective of the leadership qualities that they may exhibit. Even when women are placed into leadership positions, there may sometimes be an element of tokenism and the question arises as to whether women leaders do possess the actual power to make decisions that affect the future of departments, business units and companies (Billing & Alvesson, 2000; Giscombe & Mattis, 2003).

2.2.5. The Current State of Women in Management

This situation is changing in recent years, and women have gained entry to business careers in significant numbers, however, the reality is that while women have achieved parity with men in the entry- and mid-level ranks of the management pipeline, there is still a paucity of women at the upper levels of corporate leadership (Chisholm, 2001; Giscombe & Mattis, 2003).

According to the 2002-2003 Commission for Employment Equity report, women hold 37% representation in the total workforce. Females account for only 21% of all senior management positions and 13.7% of all top management positions. A comparative analysis of the 2000 and 2002 race and gender figures is illustrated in Table 2.1. The figures for females of all race groups has increased marginally by 1% overall, whereas the figures for

males of colour have increased by 4.8% overall (Department of Labour, 2003).

Therefore, South Africa with its largely male dominated corporate management provides an ideal opportunity for a study examining the different levels of trust in leaders of differing gender.

Table 2.1: Changes in Top Management Level

	African 2000	African 2002	Coloured 2000	Coloured 2002	Indian 2000	Indian 2002	White 2000	White 2002	Total 2002
Females	1.2%	2.0%	0.7%	0.7%	0.5%	0.6%	10.2%	10.4%	13.7%
Male	5.0%	8.0%	2.0%	2.7%	3.3%	4.4%	77.3%	71.1%	86.2%
Total	6.2%	10.0%	2.7%	3.4%	3.8%	5.0%	87.5%	81.5%	100.0 %

The situation in South Africa is by no means unique to this country. The International Labour Organisation (cited in van Engen, van der Leeden and Willemsen, 2001) states that the labour market has been, and still is, highly segregated by sex. Women are concentrated in professions that have traditionally been held by women and are underrepresented in “masculine-typed” jobs and in higher positions.

A report by the Corporate Leadership Council (2004) illustrates the situation in the United Kingdom where the 2003 figures show that 84% of men were economically active versus 73% of women. The report cites Cranfield University’s 2002 “Female FTSE Report” which shows that 88% of the UK’s

top 100 companies have no female executive directors and 39 have no female directors at all. The report also shows that the number of female executive directors has increased from 10% in 2001 to 15% in 2002 (Corporate Leadership Council, 2004).

Statistics in the United States of America indicate that women make up close to 47% of the labour force and hold 50% of managerial and professional specialty positions. However, women are noticeably underrepresented at upper levels of corporate leadership. In 2002, women represented 15.7% of corporate officers among Fortune 500 companies, up from 12.5% in 2000 and 8.7% in 1995. Women held 12.4% of board seats in the Fortune 500 in 2001, up from 11.2% in 1999 and 9.5% in 1995 (Giscombe & Mattis, 2003).

Many studies have been done on the different styles of leadership displayed by men and women. It will be of interest to conduct a study on the perceptions of differences in level of trust between managers of both genders as trust is an important component of leadership and all managers need to be effective leaders. The manner in which employees view the trustworthiness of managers will therefore influence the perceived effectiveness of these managers.

2.2.6. Gender and Trust

A number of studies into trust have highlighted gender differences or influences in terms of the level of trust displayed. Johnson-George and Swap (1982) cite research by Chun and Campbell (1974), Rosenberg (1957) and

Wrightsman (1964) who found evidence that females score higher on measures of generalised trust of others. Johnson-George and Swap's (1982) research found that overall women were more trusting than males on the scale measuring trust in a specific other on reliableness and emotional trust. The reason they put forward for this finding is that women may be more hesitant to label another as untrustworthy on limited information, instead moving slowly and collecting additional data before solidifying such an opinion.

Scott (1983) cites research by Wrightsman (1974) that found that women consistently indicated more trust in authority figures than men. Wrightsman's study was conducted over eight years, however, his results were only significant for four of those eight studies. Scott (1983) also cites research by Rotter (1971) and Sawyer, Davis, Pasework and Fitzgerald (1973) who found no differences in gender using the Interpersonal Trust Scale developed by Rotter (1971).

Scott (1983) examined trust differences between managerial or professional men and women. He used previous studies of women in work, which highlighted the negative attitudes toward women in management. Based on these findings, Scott (1983) hypothesised that subordinates would indicate higher levels of trust for male superiors than for female superiors. He also hypothesised that women would display higher overall levels of trust, and that an interaction would occur where a subordinate would indicate higher levels of trust in a superior of the same sex than a superior of the opposite sex. Scott

found no support for the assumption that women would display higher levels of trust. In fact, men appeared to have higher levels of trust in one of the relationships. In addition, trust displayed was not higher for male than for female managers. Scott did, however, find that trust levels were higher where respondents reported to someone of the same sex rather than someone of the opposite sex.

Scott (1983) gives several reasons for this interaction effect, including a study by Terborg, Petters, Ilgen and Smith (1977) who found that women have more favourable attitudes towards women than did men. The higher the education level of the group of women, the more they appear to trust female managers. Another reason could be due to the large number of women in management programmes and articles that have been published since the mid-1960's. These interventions have usually been directed towards women and as such, the findings that women have developed a more positive attitude towards women managers than have men is understandable. In addition, Scott also uses as a rationale for these findings the belief that one has a higher understanding of a person of the same sex than a person of the opposite sex.

Jeanquart-Barone (1993) cites research by Tsui and O'Reilly (1989) who found that the more dissimilar the supervisor and the subordinate are in terms of race and gender, the less effective the supervisor perceives the subordinate to be, and the less the personal attraction of the supervisor to the subordinate. Jeanquart-Barone (1993) also cites Grady (1977) and Linville and Jones (1980) who suggest that gender and race attributions are the most

powerful characteristics in person perception, and that parallels between gender and race can be readily drawn.

Jeanquart-Barone (1993) structured her research to replicate Scott's (1983) research. She hypothesised that similar gender dyads experience higher levels of trust than cross-gender dyads. In addition, she examined race from the same perspective, and hypothesised that similar race dyads experience higher levels of trust than cross-race dyads. The research findings indicated that women reporting to men experience significantly more trust than women reporting to women and men reporting to men. A possible reason given for this finding is that the majority composition of the sample was secretarial and that these female secretaries may not be used to working for women. Another explanation is the possibility of survey bias, where male respondents used the survey as a vehicle to vent their dissatisfaction. The research findings support the race hypothesis, where blacks reporting to whites experienced less trust than blacks reporting to blacks and whites reporting to whites.

In addition to these findings on gender, Jeanquart-Barone (1993) quotes research by Scott and Cook (1983) which examined trust between supervisors and subordinates when differences in age existed, and found that older employees trusted management more than younger employees. Age is thus a variable to be considered in the trust relationship. In addition, Cook and Wall (1980) found that age appears to be positively associated with trust in management and a wish to remain with the employer.

Even though some research has been conducted into the area of gender and its influence on trust, there is still insufficient evidence to be able to conclude reliably that gender has a particular effect on trust. To this end, research designed to investigate the relationship between gender and trust is necessary when the proven importance of trust in organisations and within the manager-employee relationship is considered.

2.3 Measures of Trust

There are a number of instruments that have been developed for measuring trust (Rotter, 1967, cited in Mayer, et al., 1995; Johnson-George & Swap, 1982) which were designed to measure trust in close relationships. There are other instruments that have been developed to measure trust in an organisational setting. Cook and Wall (1980) examined organisational trust at the broad interpersonal level in terms of peers and management. However management did not reflect a specific other but rather the broader "management at my firm" context. Cummings and Bromiley (1996) developed an organisational trust inventory aimed at measuring trust between units of an organisation or between organisations.

McAllister (1995) developed a measure of trust which focuses on interpersonal trust within the organisational context and examines trust with a specific other. Butler (1991) developed an inventory which measures the conditions of trust. This examined the preceding conditions needed for trust to develop in a specific target person. Butler (1991, p.659) emphasised the distinction between conditions leading to trust and dimensions of the construct

of trust. As such Butler's CTI (Conditions of Trust Inventory) examined what causes trust rather than developing an instrument based on an already present understanding of the construct of trust. All of these instruments were developed outside the South African context.

The current research utilises McAllister's (1995) measures of trust as it focuses on trust in a specific other within the organisational context and is still in keeping with research into the construct of trust, which, by and large, defines trust as having a capability or cognitive aspect as well as a faith or affective aspect. To the question of how one should measure or quantify trust, Dasgupta's response (1988, p.51) - that "even though there are no obvious units in which trust can be measured, this does not matter, because, in any given context you can measure its value, its worthwhileness" - is a useful one.

McAllister developed and tested a theoretical model based on the sociological literature on trust and on the social-psychological work on trust in close relationships. He used affect- and cognition-based trust as the principal forms of interpersonal trust citing Lewis and Wiegert (1985) as support for this model.

The cognition-based elements of trust refer to elements of knowledge and good reasons for trusting. This incorporates competence and responsibility as well as reliability and dependability. Support for the centrality of elements such as competence and responsibility are provided in past measures of trust (Butler, 1991; Cook & Wall, 1980). McAllister (1995) used research by

Johnson-George and Swap (1982) and Rempel, et al. (1985) who have included elements of reliability and dependability in measure of interpersonal trust in close relationships. Rempel et al. (1985) state that trust is present when the partner is regarded as reliable, dependable and concerned with providing expected rewards. Reliability and dependability expectations must usually be met for trust relationships to exist and develop (Zucker, 1986, cited in McAllister, 1995) and evidence to the contrary provides a rational basis for withholding trust (Luhmann, 1979; Shapiro, 1987, 1990; all cited in McAllister, 1995).

Further support for the cognitive foundation of trust comes from Butler and Cantrell (1984) who list competence as well as consistency and reliability as dimensions of trust. Research by Schindler and Thomas (1993) suggests that integrity (honesty and truthfulness) and competence (technical or interpersonal skill and knowledge) are the most critical characteristics that are looked for in determining trustworthiness.

McAllister (1995) states that affective foundations for trust, which consist of the emotional bonds between individuals, also exist. People make emotional investments in trust relationships, express genuine care and concern for the welfare of partners, believe in the intrinsic virtue of such relationships and believe that these sentiments are reciprocated (Pennings & Woiceshyn, 1987, cited in McAllister, 1995; Rempel, et al., 1985). Butler and Cantrell (1984) list loyalty or benevolent motives and a willingness to protect and save face for a

person as well as openness and a willingness to share ideas and information freely as dimensions of trust.

Empirical evidence from the social-psychological literature on trust in close relationships supports this distinction between the two forms of trust (McAllister, 1995). Johnson-George and Swap (1982) identified, differentiated and measured two forms of trust that they called reliableness and emotional trust. In addition, Rempel, et al. (1985) differentiated between dependability and faith (emotional security) as unique forms of trust. McAllister (1995) used these research findings to distinguish between the cognitive and affective elements of trust and builds his model on these foundations.

In developing this measure, McAllister drew on a review of the literature and on available measures of interpersonal trust (Cook & Wall, 1980; Johnson-George & Swap, 1982; Rempel, et al., 1985; Rotter, 1971). Thus the reasons for choosing McAllister's trust instrument for use in this research study are based on the strong theoretical framework that he used for the development of his scales, and also on the strong reliability estimates (Cronbach's alphas) that were obtained for both the cognition- and affect-based trust measures.

2.4. Research Questions

The research questions for this study are as follows:

a) Do female employees display a greater propensity to trust than male employees? In other words, do females score higher overall on the two trust scales than males?

b) Do employees overall trust one particular management gender more than the other? Specifically, are male managers trusted more than female managers?

c) Do female employees trust female managers more than they trust male managers?

d) Do male employees trust male managers more than they trust female managers?

CHAPTER THREE

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design

The aim of the current research was investigated via a non-experimental cross sectional exploratory research design as the independent variable of gender could not be manipulated, there was no random assignment of subjects to a control or experimental group and finally no control group was actually present in the design of the study.

The study was questionnaire based and targeted naturally occurring groups of males and females within the organisation at a particular point in time, in order to investigate whether there was any significant difference in the measurement of the dependent variables within these groups. The dependent variables were levels of Affect-based and Cognition-based trust. The primary independent variables were employee and manager gender.

3.2 Procedure

3.2.1 Distribution of Questionnaires

An introductory e-mail was sent to all employees within the sample explaining the purpose of the research. Employees were informed that the researcher was a Psychology Masters student at the University of the Witwatersrand, who was conducting research in order to understand the role of trust that employees have in managers within an organisation. It was also made clear that participation in the research was voluntary and that employee responses would be kept confidential.

In addition, employees were informed that a hard copy version of the questionnaire would be delivered to them over the next few days, along with a pre-addressed envelope. The questionnaires were delivered over the next week along with the envelope. Participants were asked to complete the questionnaire, place the completed questionnaire into the envelope, seal it and then return the envelope to the researcher via the internal mail system. It was felt that this method would ensure greater confidentiality and respondents would be more inclined to answer honestly and with no fear of identification. A time period of two weeks was given as the deadline for submission.

Over the next two weeks, a number of completed questionnaires were returned via the internal mail system. Several queries were also received telephonically as well as by e-mail regarding whether permission had been obtained for distribution of the survey and also to confirm the process for returning the completed questionnaires. These queries were handled as they arose and employees were informed that permission had been obtained and the process for completion was reiterated.

Two further follow-up e-mails were sent out to the survey sample. Employees who had completed the survey were thanked for their participation and were asked to ignore the remainder of the e-mail. Employees who had not completed the survey were asked to please do so, and the cut-off date was extended by a week each time. When the final cut-off date arrived, a further week was taken into account to accept any possible late questionnaires.

3.3 Instrument

3.3.1 Cognitive and Affect Based Measure of Trust

Trust in managers was researched via a measure developed and used by Daniel J. McAllister in 1995. The trust measure consists of two scales, namely Affect-based Trust and Cognition-based Trust. The sample that the measure was administered to was 194 managers and professionals, including men and women from various industries. The respondents' average age was 38 years with 57% having some graduate training and 28% having an undergraduate degree. These were individuals with considerable organisational experience (an average professional tenure of 11.7 years). In addition, the average age of the sample was 37 years with 74.8% men (McAllister, 1995).

The process followed by McAllister was to draw on a review of the literature as well as the measures that were available at the time, thereby creating a pool of 48 items. Eleven organisational behaviour scholars who were provided with definitions of cognition- and affect-based trust, then classified these items as tapping into one of these constructs, or both or neither. A subset of 20 unambiguous items was thus created. The results of an exploratory factor analysis of pre-test data from a group of employed Master of Business Administration (M.B.A.) and undergraduate business students were used to reduce the measure to the 11 strongest loading items. The Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficients for the scales were .91 for cognition-based and .89 for the affect-based scales (McAllister, 1995).

The final version of the measure consists of 11 items. Six of these items assess levels of cognition-based trust and five items assess affect-based trust. McAllister's measure utilises a 7-point likert type scale to evaluate the level of trust displayed by the respondents. Respondents indicated on a scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree) their agreement with various statements about their manager. The original scale was used to assess perceptions of a specific peer at work.

3.3.2 Questionnaire

Full copies of the informed consent page as well as the questionnaire appear in Appendices A (page 100) and B (page 102) respectively.

3.3.2.1 Informed Consent Cover Page

The questionnaire commenced with a cover page that provided an explanation of the purpose of the research, assurances of confidentiality, highlighted the voluntary nature of completion, provided an explanation regarding how employees were selected for participation, i.e. based solely on the fact that they were employed by the company, and urged the participants to answer as honestly as possible as no individual other than the researcher would have access to the individual responses. Instructions on how to complete and return the survey as well as a deadline date and contact details in the event of a query, were also provided.

3.3.2.2 Section One: Trust Scale

Section one of the questionnaire comprised the trust scale of 11 questions. The first six questions made up the cognition-based subscale and the following five questions made up the affect-based subscale.

Instructions on how to complete this section were given before the questions were listed, and included an explanation that the statements to follow referred to the employee's relationship with his/ her immediate manager. As such employees were primed to respond to the statements only with their immediate managers in mind.

3.3.2.3 Section Two: Employee Biographical Information

Section two consisted of a number of biographical questions related specifically to the employee completing the questionnaire. Employees were asked to provide information on their age, gender, ethnicity, length of service with the company and their job grade level.

The biographical information on gender was necessary in order to determine whether any gender differences exist in terms of the level of trust as measured by the trust scales. Ethnicity was seen as being of importance as an influencing factor and was thus included for investigation. The remaining variables were viewed as possible confounding variables and were therefore included in order to possibly control for these variables at the analysis stage.

3.3.2.4 Section Three: Manager Biographical Information

Section three consisted of a number of biographical questions related to the employee's manager. The questions asked were similar to those in Section two, (manager's age, gender and equity designation). In addition, employees were asked to indicate how long they have known their managers, irrespective of whether they reported to them or not during that time; how long they have been reporting to their manager; and to indicate their manager's job grade level. These biographical variables have been included for the same reasons as explained in the employee biographical section.

3.4 Data Verification

The completed questionnaires were checked in order to ascertain whether they had been completed fully and were thus valid. A data capturing company was contracted to capture the responses onto a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet which was then imported for analysis into the SAS system. Data verification was conducted in order to check for capturing errors. A frequency count of all the variables was carried out in order to determine whether the captured data had been coded correctly. Problems were highlighted and corrected.

One problem was that 9 Hay Band B employees submitted completed questionnaires, which they had obviously gained access to when the questionnaires were delivered to the sampled employees. These 9 employee responses were deleted so as not to have lower Hay Grade level contaminate the results of the research. Missing values were common where employees were asked for information on their manager's age. These were considered to

be of secondary importance and the employees' responses were included in the research as it still provided useful information. Cross tabulations were also conducted in order to check for cross relationships within the variables.

3.5 Analysis

3.5.1 Cronbach Alpha Coefficients

The next step in the data analysis procedure was to reverse score one of the questions within the Cognition based scale, and to total up the scales into the Affect based and Cognition based scales. Internal reliability or consistency of the scales was evaluated by Cronbach Coefficient Alphas. The demographics of the sample that completed returned questionnaires are reported in the Results (Chapter 4, page 67) of this report.

3.5.2 Descriptive Statistics

A distribution analysis was conducted on the Affect and Cognition based trust scales in order to test normality of the distribution. Descriptive statistics were then carried out on the biographical variables, i.e. employee race, gender, age, length of service with the company and job grade level. Further descriptive statistics were run on the biographical data for the employees' manager, also covering the variables of race, gender, age, length of time that the employee knows the manager, length of time that the employee has been reporting to the manager and the managers' job grade level. Frequency and means analyses were conducted depending on the variable investigated.

3.5.3 Exploratory Factor Analyses

A principal component factor analysis was conducted on all items of the affect-based and cognition-based trust scales.

3.5.4 T-Tests

A series of two sample t-tests were conducted in order to determine whether the mean scores for male and female employees differed on the Affect and Cognition based trust scales. Additional two sample t-tests were conducted to investigate whether any differences existed in the mean scores based on manager gender for the Affect and Cognition based trust scales.

Four further sets of analyses were conducted with the independent variable of ethnicity nested within gender. Two sample t-tests were conducted to compare the mean responses of male employees for male managers to their mean responses for female managers. The same analysis was conducted for female employee responses.

3.5.5 Analysis of Covariance

Due to the fact that there could be a number of confounding variables that would not be possible to control for, but which would have to be accounted for, the Analysis of Covariance (Ancova) procedure was used as a method to control possible confounding variables. Rosenthal and Rosnow (1991) describe the Ancova procedure as an analysis of variance performed on a dependent variable that has been corrected or adjusted for a subject's score on some other variable(s) (a covariate) that correlates (usually substantially)

with the dependent variable. Galpin (2000) states that Ancova allows one to correct the values of the response variable for the values of the covariate(s), so that this source of variation is removed from the analysis, and one may then see more clearly where the differences among treatments lie.

An Ancova was conducted for both the affect- and cognition-based trust scales using the variables of Length of Service with Company, Length of Time Knowing Manager, Length of Time Spent Reporting to Manager, Employee Age and Manager Age. These five variables were considered to be most likely to act as confounding variables thereby influencing the results of the study.

3.5.6 Pearson Correlations

Pearson correlations were conducted for manager age and the Affect-based and Cognition-based trust scales. This analysis was conducted to investigate the relationship between manager age and the responses to the trust scales.

3.6 Sample

3.6.1 Sample Access

A large Retail company where the researcher was employed, was selected as the site for the distribution of the questionnaires. Access to the company was obtained, as the researcher was an employee of the company. Any bias in this regard was considered minimal as the researcher had joined the company recently and was relatively unknown.

Once permission to conduct the research was obtained, non-probability sampling was the method chosen to select a sample for obtaining the data.

The obvious advantages of this method are convenience and economy. The weakness, however, was that there was no guarantee that the returned questionnaires would consist of the required mix of male and female employees in order to fulfil the main aims of the research. The type of non-probability sampling used was that of purposive sampling, as the sample was selected on the basis of location and grade level within the hierarchy of the organisation.

Permanent full-time employees based at the company head office were selected for participation in the survey. In addition, only employees graded at Hay Band C and above, who were based at the head office, were included in the sample. The company utilises the Hay job grading system, which was recently revised to broadband the different Hay points into a system very similar to that of the Paterson model. By utilising Hay Band C and above, the sample included skilled technical and academically qualified workers, junior management, supervisors, foremen, superintendents (C-Band); professionally qualified and experienced specialists and middle management (D-Band), senior management, executive managers and executive directors (E & F bands), managing directors and deputy CEOs (Band G), and the Chief Executive Officer (Band H). These sample criteria together with company requirements that all employees possess a Grade 12 (or equivalent) certificate was considered sufficient to ensure that the sample comprised a calibre of employee who would understand the questions used within the instrument. The total targeted population was 553 employees. Section 3.6.2 provides an analysis of the demographics of this group of employees.

3.6.2 Target Population Group Demographics

3.6.2.1 Gender by Ethnicity by Job Grade Level

Gender was fairly evenly distributed, with 56.78% of the target population being female and 43.22% being male. An analysis of the ethnicity of the targeted population, showed that the sample at this grade level was mainly white (66%), followed by African (14.83%) and then Indian (13.02%). The coloured component was small (6.15%). In terms of the Hay Band distribution, the largest part of the target population comprised employees at a Band D level (45.03%). This reflected a target population that consisted of a larger percentage of professionally qualified and experienced specialists and middle management. This was followed by C band (28.57%) and then E band (20.98%) employees, with the F band (3.44%) and G band (1.99%) making up the remainder of the sample.

Of further interest is an analysis of Gender by Ethnicity by Job Grade Level (Table 3.1), which provides an interesting picture of ethnicity and gender at the different Hay grade levels. At Band C level, white females predominate and make up 36.08% of the sample. This is followed by African (14.56%) and then Indian (13.92%) females. White males at this level make up 10.13% of the sample.

At Band D level, white females are still the majority of the sample (41.77%) followed this time, however, by white males (26.51%). From Hay Band E, this situation is reversed, and the sample is predominantly white male (50.86%), followed by white female (32.76%). The higher levels follow this trend, with

63.16% of the sample at Hay band F being white male, and no female representation at G band.

Table 3.1: Population Distribution of Gender, Ethnicity and Job Grade Level

Ethnicity	Hay Band C		Hay Band D		Hay Band E		Hay Band F		Hay Band G		Total
	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	
African	23 (4.15%)	13 (2.35%)	23 (4.15%)	12 (2.16%)	2 (0.36%)	8 (1.44%)	-	1 (0.18%)	-	-	82 (14.83%)
Coloured	13 (2.35%)	2 (0.36%)	9 (1.62%)	4 (0.72%)	2 (0.36%)	2 (0.36%)	1 (0.18%)	-	-	1 (0.18%)	34 (6.15%)
Indian	22 (3.97%)	12 (2.16%)	12 (2.16%)	19 (3.44%)	4 (0.72%)	1 (0.18%)	-	1 (0.18%)	-	1 (0.18%)	72 (13.02%)
White	57 (10.30%)	16 (2.89%)	104 (18.80%)	66 (11.93%)	38 (6.87%)	59 (10.66%)	4 (0.72%)	12 (2.16%)	-	9 (1.62%)	365 (66.0%)
Total	115 (20.80%)	43 (7.78%)	148 (26.76%)	101 (18.26%)	46 (8.32%)	70 (12.66%)	5 (0.90%)	14 (2.53%)	0	11 (1.99%)	553

3.6.2.2 Functional Area

The sample at head office consisted of staff from a number of functional areas, including Call Centre; Financial Operations; Finance; Human Resources (based at head office and included a portion of Recruitment & Assessment, Training & Development, Employee Benefits, Organisational Development, HR Generalists); Chain Management; Chain Operations; Credit Department; Merchandisers (this included Buyers, Planners as well as Visual Merchandisers); the Trends Office; Quality Assurance; Marketing; Chain Marketing; Supply Chain; Investment Management; and the Forensic Investigations department.

CHAPTER FOUR

4. RESULTS

4.1 Sample Demographics

Of the 553 employees that made up the population, 117 returned completed questionnaires. The response rate was thus 21.16%. This is a lower response rate than expected and part of the reason for this is that this figure was impacted by a number of variables including sample attrition with an employee turnover rate of 11% during the period of the study. This would have been exacerbated by employees who were on leave and who would not have seen the e-mails, as well as by new employees who entered the company during this period and who would not have completed the questionnaire. Furthermore, those employees who were considering leaving the company may not have been inclined to complete the questionnaire.

4.1.1 Gender by Ethnicity by Job Grade Level

Gender was fairly evenly distributed with females making up 58.88% of the sample and males making up 41.12% (Table 4.1). This closely mirrors the gender split of the population to whom the questionnaire was distributed.

An analysis of the ethnicity of the sample, showed that the sample at this grade level was mainly White (69.16%), followed by Indian (14.02%) and then African (11.21%). In addition, 5.61% of the sample was Coloured. This differed from the population ethnicity composition for Indian and African in that

African representation was 14.83% and Indian was 13.02%. More Indians than African completed the questionnaire.

As was the case with the target population, the largest part of the sample comprised employees at a Band D level (53.27%). This was followed by C band (23.37%) and then E band (18.69%) employees, with the F band employees making up 4.67% of the sample.

The distribution of gender by ethnicity by job grade level (Table 4.1) shows a similar picture as Table 3.1. At Band C level, White females predominate and make up 14.02% of the overall sample, compared to 10.30% of the population. This is followed by African, Indian and Coloured females as well as by White males each comprising 1.87%. This is similar to the population figures which range from 4.15% for African females to 2.35% for Coloured females. At Band D level, White females are still the majority of the sample (19.63%) followed this time, however, by White males (13.08%). This is also similar to the population percentages where White females and White males dominate. At Hay Band E, the sample is still slightly skewed to White female (9.35%), followed by White male (7.48%). Disappointingly, few males and females of the remaining ethnic groups responded. However, it should be noted that the percentages of these groups at population level were also extremely small (Table 3.1.). At Hay band F the sample is fully male with 3.74% White male and 0.93% Indian male.

Table 4.1: Sample Distribution of Gender, Ethnicity and Job Grade Level

Ethnicity	Hay Band C		Hay Band D		Hay Band E		Hay Band F		Total
	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	
African	2 (1.87%)	1 (0.93%)	5 (4.67%)	3 (2.80%)	0	1 (0.93%)	0	0	12 (11.21%)
Coloured	2 (1.87%)	0	1 (0.93%)	2 (1.87%)	1 (0.93%)	0	0	0	6 (5.61%)
Indian	2 (1.87%)	1 (0.93%)	4 (3.74%)	7 (6.54%)	0	0	0	1 (0.93%)	15 (14.02%)
White	15 (14.02%)	2 (1.87%)	21 (19.63%)	14 (13.08%)	10 (9.35%)	8 (7.48%)	0	4 (3.74%)	74 (69.16%)
Total	21 (19.63%)	4 (3.74%)	31 (28.97%)	26 (24.30%)	11 (10.28%)	9 (8.41%)	0	5 (4.67%)	107

Note that only 107 participants completed all the information required

4.1.2 Employee Age

The mean age of the sample was 38 years (n=116, SD=8.37), with a youngest age of 25 and an oldest of 62.

4.1.3 Length of Service

The mean length of service was calculated at 114.94 months, which is equivalent to 9.57 years. The minimum was 0 (newcomers) and the maximum value was 39 years.

4.2 Manager Demographics

4.2.1 Manager Age

The mean age of the managers, as reported on by employees, was 41.59 years (n=94, SD=8.47). The youngest age was 28 and the oldest reported age was 63.

4.2.2 Manager Gender by Ethnicity by Job Grade Level

The reported gender for managers was the reverse of the employee gender, with 53.06% male and 45.91% female (Table 4.2). An analysis of the ethnicity of managers showed that the largest portion of the managers reported on was White (79.60%). This was followed by Indian with 13.27%, Coloured with 5.10% and African with 2.04%. The majority of the managers were reported as being at Band E level (48.98%). This was followed by Band F with 26.53%. Managers at Band D represented 18.36%, followed by Band G with 5.10% and Band H with 1.02%.

White females dominate the managerial component at Band D level, and make up 7.14% of the sample at this level. White and Indian males follow this with 4.08%. White females are again the largest group at Band E level with 21.43% of the sample at this level. White males with 18.37% follow this. At Hay Band F, the situation is reversed with 14.28% of the sample comprising white males, followed by 8.16% white females. Hay Band G & H consist solely of white males.

Table 4.2: Distribution of Manager Gender, Ethnicity and Job Grade Level

Ethnicity	Hay Band D		Hay Band E		Hay Band F		Hay Band G		Hay Band H		Total
	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	
African	1 (1.02%)	0	0	1 (1.02%)	0	0	0	0	0	0	2 (2.04%)
Coloured	0	0	2 (2.04%)	1 (1.02%)	0	2 (2.04%)	0	0	0	0	5 (5.10%)
Indian	2 (2.04%)	4 (4.08%)	3	2	1 (1.02%)	1 (1.02%)	0	0	0	0	13 (13.27%)
White	7 (7.14%)	4 (4.08%)	21 (21.43%)	18 (18.37)	8 (8.16%)	14 (14.28%)	0	5 (5.10%)	0	1 (1.02%)	78 (79.60%)
Total	10 (10.20%)	8 (8.16%)	26 (26.53%)	22 (22.45%)	9 (9.18%)	17 (17.35%)	0	5 (5.10%)	0	1 (1.02%)	98

Note that only 98 participants completed all the information required

4.2.3 Length of Time Knowing Manager

Employees were asked to indicate how long they knew their managers irrespective of how long they actually reported to them. The mean length of time that employees knew their managers was 5.93 years. This ranged from less than one month to 25 years.

4.2.4 Length of Time Spent Reporting to Current Line Manager

Employees were then asked to indicate how long they have been reporting to their current managers. The average length of time was 2.39 years. This ranged from less than one month to 15 years.

4.3 Cronbach Alpha Coefficients

The calculation of the descriptive statistics was followed by the reverse scoring of one of the questions within the Cognition based scale, and totalling up the scales into the Affect based and Cognition based scales. Internal reliability or consistency of the scales was tested via the calculation of Cronbach Coefficient Alphas. The Cronbach alpha estimate for the affect-based trust scale was 0.92. For the cognition-based scale the Cronbach coefficient was 0.90. The results for the affect-based and cognition-based trust scales were similar to that of McAllister's (1995) research that reported alphas of 0.85 and 0.91 respectively.

4.4 Exploratory Factor Analysis

A principal component factor analysis was conducted on both the affect-based and cognition-based trust scales. McAllister (1995) claimed a two-factor model, however the results obtained from this exploratory factor analysis indicate a one-factor model. However, if the scale is broken into two parts as per McAllister, his model is confirmed. The results are reflected in Tables 4.3 and 4.4.

Table 4.3: Results of Exploratory Factor Analysis for Affect-Based Trust Scale

Item	Factor Loading
4	0.92159
2	0.91712
1	0.91565
3	0.84946
5	0.76558

This factor explains 76% of the variance.

Table 4.4: Results of Exploratory Factor Analysis for Cognition-Based Trust Scale

Item	Factor Loading
7	0.91276
9	0.90912
6	0.89917
10	0.88502
8	0.83322
11	0.48777

This factor explains 69.7% of the variance. Item 11 is the only item that does not load as highly as the other items on this factor. Rather it loads higher on a second unknown factor.

4.5 T-Tests

The mean score for female employees on the affect-based trust scale was 24.36, whereas male employees scored a mean of 24.31. The mean score for female employees on the cognition-based scale was 32.41 and the mean score for male employees was 32.54.

The mean scores for manager gender were calculated to reflect a mean score of 24.63 for female managers on the affect-based scale versus 24.10 for male managers. The mean scores for the cognition-based scale were calculated at 32.10 for female managers and 32.73 for male managers.

T-tests were conducted to compare the mean responses of male employees for male managers to their mean responses for female managers. The same analysis was conducted for female employee responses. The results are reported in Table 4.5. The results of the t-tests were not found to be significant, indicating that none of the differences in mean scores reported for employee and manager gender highlight significant relationships for either affect-based or cognition-based trust.

Table 4.5: Results of T-tests of Employee and Manager Gender

	Affect-based Trust			Cognition-based Trust		
	Female Employees	Male Employees	't' (p)	Female Employees	Male Employees	't'(p)
Female Managers	25.23	22.69	0.93	32.81	29.84	1.10
Male Managers	22.96	24.91	-1.14	31.60	33.54	-0.93

4.6 Analysis of Covariance

An Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) was conducted for both the affect- and cognition-based trust scales using the variables of Length of Service with Company, Length of Time Knowing Manager, and Length of Time Spent Reporting to Manager, Employee Age, Manager Age. These five variables were considered to be most likely to act as confounding variables thereby influencing the results of the study.

Table 4.6: ANCOVA for Affect-based Trust

Variable	**Mean (years)**	**F Value**
Length of Service with Company	9.57	1.31
Length of Time Knowing Manager	5.93	5.79*
Length of Time Spent Reporting to Manager	2.39	0.23
Employee Age	38.00	0.04
Manager Age	41.59	9.42**

*significance at p<0.05; **significance at p<0.01

Two of the covariates are significant, namely length of time knowing the manager and manager age. However, as the relationship between affect-

based trust and gender is not significant, these two covariates are therefore confounding variables which influence the employee/ manager trust relationship.

Table 4.7: ANCOVA for Cognition-based Trust

Variable	**Mean (years)**	**F Value**
Length of Service with Company	9.57	0.0.2
Length of Time Knowing Manager	5.93	5.79*
Length of Time Spent Reporting to Manager	2.39	1.15
Employee Age	38.00	1.31
Manager Age	41.59	5.24*

*significance at $p<0.05$

When analysing the dependant variable of cognition-based trust, the same two covariates are significant, namely length of time knowing the manager and manager age. Once again, as the relationship between cognition-based trust and gender is not significant, these two covariates are considered to be confounding variables that influence the employee/ manager trust relationship.

4.7 Overall Level of Trust

The mean scores for the trust scales were calculated as reflected in Table 4.8. The overall score for affect-based trust is 24.32 and for cognition-based trust is 32.43.

Table 4.8: Mean Scores for Trust Scales

Scale	Mean	SD
Affect-based	24.32	6.96
Cognition-based	32.43	7.79

4.8 Pearson Correlation

The relationships between manager age and the two trust scales were investigated further by means of a Pearson correlation. Table 4.9 shows the results of these analyses.

Table 4.9: Pearson Correlation Coefficients for Manager Age and Trust

	Cognition-based Trust (r)	Affect-based Trust (r)
Manager Age	-0.16015	-0.17542

n = 101; *significance at $p<0.05$

Table 4.9. shows weak non-significant negative correlations between manager age and both scales of the trust measure.

CHAPTER FIVE

5. DISCUSSION

5.1 Introduction

In this section, the results for each of the content areas, which were reported in Chapter 4, will be discussed in relation to the literature. The ensuing discussion has been structured such that each of the research questions is dealt with separately. This is then followed by a discussion of the overall level of trust as displayed by respondents of this study. Thereafter, the limitations of the study will be outlined, followed by a discussion of suggestions for future research.

5.2 Perceptions of Trust by Male and Female Employees: "Are women more trusting than men?"

The results of the t-tests conducted for male and female employees indicate very small differences, which show that the sample used in this research cannot be differentiated in terms of gender on trust.

Previous research cited by Johnson-George & Swap (1982), for example, Chun & Campbell (1974), Rosenburg (1957) and Wrightsman (1964) as well as Johnson-George & Swap's own research highlighted gender differences in trust. These studies found that overall, women displayed higher levels of trust than men. However, research by Rotter (1971) and Sawyer, et al. (1973), both cited in Scott (1983) as well as Scott's (1983) own research found no support for the hypothesis that women display higher overall levels of trust. Rotter

(1971) measured trust in terms of the individual's feelings of trust toward significant but unspecified others and was designed to measure one's expectations that the behaviour, promises or statements of other individuals can be relied on (Scott, 1983). Scott (1983) chose to use the situational trust approach and measured respondents' perception of trust toward his or her on-site supervisor, program area superior and top management. The items chosen appear to tap into the affective (e.g. "My supervisor is friendly and approachable", Scott, 1983, p.328) as well as cognitive dimensions of trust (e.g. "I can count on my immediate supervisor to help me if I have difficulties getting my job done", Scott, 1983, p.328), as defined by McAllister (1995). The current research results are consistent with these findings in that women do not display statistically significant higher levels of trust than men do. A possible reason for this could be similarities in terms of the dimensions of trust that both Scott (1983) and McAllister (1995) measure.

The implications of this finding are that men and women are both equally likely to label another as trustworthy or untrustworthy. Both genders are likely to equally assess another's trustworthiness irrespective of whether the trust questions probe the affective or emotional element of trust or whether they probe the cognitive or competence element of trust as defined by McAllister's (1995) instrument.

Dennis and Kunkel (2004) found that gender identity of the participants may be crucial to their perceptions of similarities and differences between the genders. The research showed that individuals who identified with feminine

characteristics or a feminine orientation perceive little difference between the sexes. This is an element that the current research does not examine and as such, the influence of gender identity could not be established.

5.3. Perceptions of Trust in Male and Female Managers: "Are male managers trusted more than female managers?"

The results for male versus female managers also indicate no statistical differences in overall levels of trust displayed on either of the trust scales according to manager gender. The literature by and large highlights previous studies of women in work (e.g. Kanter, 1993; Scott, 1983) that found negative attitudes toward women in management. The prevailing image of the rational, objective manager was aligned to the image of men in general, whereas women were viewed as emotional, unobjective and irrational. In the field of research on organisational trust, this was taken to give support to the view that male managers would be considered more trustworthy. Scott's (1983) findings found that trust displayed was not higher for male than for female managers. However, Jeanquart-Barone found that women reporting to men experience significantly more trust than women reporting to women and men reporting to men. The current research provides support for Scott's (1983) findings.

This finding is important as it highlights the increasing perception that men and women do not differ in terms of trustworthiness as managers. Women have obviously made massive strides into the traditionally male dominated

corporate world and their image is not viewed as all that different to that of men. Whether this is due to a greater recognition of the worth of “female” characteristics in a manager or whether this is due to a tendency by female managers to adopt “male” characteristics in order to fit-in, is a matter for further debate and research that is beyond the scope of the current paper.

The findings also highlight that there are no statistical differences for men and women whether they were assessed on the affect- or cognition-based trust scales. Even though the stereotype might be that women are more caring than men, women managers in this sample were not viewed differently in comparison to male managers when asked about the relationship and emotional aspects of the trust relationship. Similarly, male managers were not rated significantly higher on the cognitive or competence elements of the trust scale, despite literature indicating that men possess more agentic traits (Dennis & Kunkel, 2004; Kanter, 1993).

Possible reasons for this finding could link to the view that societies high in gender egalitarianism and low in power distance (Paris, 2004) display less of a differential in the view of male and female managers, with gender egalitarianism and power distance viewed as variables that moderate gender stereotypes. The company surveyed in this research is one that has advocated gender equality and in fact has promoted gender equality as evidenced by the fact that more than half of managers are female. The organisational culture is thus one of equality and women are in a number of positions of perceived “power”. Employees have been socialised into

accepting and promoting gender equality via a series of diversity training initiatives as well as other mechanisms such as the company corporate social investment programme which supports a number of women's initiatives and the company employment equity programme.

In addition, the culture is one where employees are encouraged to interact openly with all levels of management and access to senior management is easily obtained, indicating a culture of lower power distance. Power distance and gender egalitarianism are areas that have not been actively researched in this study. However, these are factors that could have had mediating effects on the outcome of this research.

5.4. Interaction between Employee and Manager Gender: Do females trust female managers more than male managers and do males trust male managers more than female managers?

Based on the literature reviewed (e.g. Scott, 1983; Jeanquart-Barone, 1993), it was hypothesised that there would be significant differences when same gender relationships were compared to cross gender relationships between managers and employees. Thus it was expected that female employees would display significantly higher levels of trust in female managers than in male managers, and that male employees would likewise display higher levels of trust in male managers than in female managers.

The results obtained from this study were not significant and thus could not offer support for these hypotheses. A possible reason for these results could relate to the high percentage of female managers within the organisation. The sample was fairly evenly split in terms of male and female managers. As a result of this, female managers are not uncommon and greater acceptance and trust could have developed. The broader society within which we live is also one that legally and actively promotes Employment Equity and diversity. This applies not just to race but to gender as well. Given the history of South Africa and the numerous articles and research commissioned on the topic of diversity, a possible result of this could be greater understanding and acceptance of female managers as a group.

Two of the possible reasons given by Scott (1983) for his findings that same sex dyads display more trust that do cross sex dyads are that one has a higher understanding of a person of the same sex than a person of the opposite sex and that there has been a proliferation of women in management articles and programmes that have been aimed at women. He takes this as an explanation for women developing a more positive attitude toward women managers. Within the South African context, however, diversity initiatives and programmes have been aimed at entire organisations, and not just at one segment. As a result, women and men have become more tolerant and accepting of each other and a greater understanding of men and women in the workplace has developed.

5.5. The Influence of Confounding Variables

The results from the ANCOVA indicate findings that are in line with the literature (Dasgupta, 1988; Lewicki and Bunker, 1996; Powell, et al., 2002; Rempel, et al., 1985; Scott, 1983; Smith & Rutigliano, 2002; Taylor, 1989, in Baird and St-Amand, 1995) in that time is an important element in the manager-subordinate relationship as well as in the development of a trust relationship. The length of time that the employee knows a manager is shown to be significant as a covariate on the affect-based trust scale but was not significant on the cognition-based trust scale.

The length of time that the employee reported to the manager was not significant and this highlights the distinction between knowing a manager and simply reporting to a manager. Interaction or knowledge of a person is thus more important as a possible confounding variable than a direct manager-subordinate relationship. As Smith & Rutigliano (2002) state, “it’s human nature to trust those we know more than those we don’t know”, and that knowledge grows with time. Trust is a dynamic phenomenon that takes on different characteristics in the early, developing, and mature stages of a relationship (Lewicki and Bunker, 1996). Trust in the manager-employee relationship is built over time as a result of consistent behaviour and interaction between parties within an organisation, which allows the development of an expectation that the other will act in a trustworthy and predictable manner (Baird and St-Amand, 1995; Rotter, 1971).

McKnight, et al. (1998) posit a model that shows that cognition-based trust relies on rapid, cognitive cues or first impressions as opposed to personal interactions. This may explain why length of time knowing a manager was a significant covariate for affect-based trust but not for cognition-based trust. Cognition-based trust in a manager does not vary as a function of time, whereas affect-based trust which is more emotional and considers factors such as caring and warmth as elements that vary and change over time, is influenced by length of the relationship. These findings are thus supported by the model of McKnight, et al. (1998).

In addition, age of the employee and age of the manager were tested as possible confounding variables through the ANCOVA procedure. Previous research (e.g. Cook & Wall, 1980; Scott, 1983) found that older employees trusted management more than younger employees and that age was positively correlated with trust in management. The results from this study, however, indicated that employee age was not a significant variable affecting the trust relationship.

The age of the manager was, however, found to be a significant variable in relationship to affect-based trust, but was not significant for cognition-based trust. This implies that the age of the manager impacts trust more than the age of the employee. A Pearson correlation analysis showed a weak negative relationship between manager age and affect- and cognition-based trust. A possible reason for this relates to the history of the organisation concerned. The sample organisation has gone through a number of upheavals and

restructuring within the past 5 years. A new CEO as well as a new Executive team has led to the growth and development of a new and different set of company values. The company culture has changed substantially and this has also resulted in the appointment of new blood into the company. A number of older middle and senior managers still exist and the results might be indicative of lesser trust in these individuals who no longer “fit” into the new corporate culture. These are the “dinosaurs” that the newer members of the organisation do not fully trust as they operate from a mindset that the company is no longer actively cultivating.

5.6. Overall Levels of Trust

The overall level of trust displayed by the participants in this study is in line with the overall level of trust displayed by the sample used in McAllister’s (1995) research. The affect-based trust scale has a maximum value of 35. The overall score of 24.32 when reduced to a score out of 7 (an average of an average) is 4.86. The cognition-based trust scale has a maximum value of 42. The overall mean score of 32.43 when reduced to a score out of 7 is 5.41. The guideline for a 7 point scale is that a low score is from 1 to 3, and a good score from 5 to 7. This shows that the score obtained on the affect-based trust scale is high average to good and on the cognition-based trust scale, the score is good. This is positive news as it indicates a fairly high level of trust within the organisation surveyed.

An examination of the company’s practices and history show that this state of trust was probably not always there. The company has always been

considered a retail giant, but has gone through a period of poor performance and plummeting share price. This impacted on the workforce and resulted in streamlining and widespread retrenchment of staff, all of which impacted on employee morale. The appointment of a new CEO and HR Director as well as the subsequent restructuring of the Executive team led to a new era in the organisation. A number of strategic initiatives were put into place, store trading space was reduced, the target market of the various chains were researched and defined, and people practices were evaluated and revised.

The company has launched a strong initiative to be an employer of choice organisation and a number of company policies and practices have been re-evaluated to align with this aim. In addition, the new values that the company and employees should subscribe to were launched amidst much fanfare in 2003. The values encourage a corporate and individual culture of promoting people, integrity, performance and professionalism. The aim is for employees and organisation to operate within the framework of these values in everyday business and in all endeavours. The importance of creating joint goals and committing to commonly shared values has been highlighted by Lewicki and Bunker (1996), as being activities that strengthen and build trust within an organisation. Thus it can be seen that the organisation has actively embarked on a number of initiatives that may have had a significant impact on the levels of trust within the manager/ employee relationship. Further support for the importance of other organisational initiatives in trust formation is given by McKnight, et al. (1998) who refer to institution-based trust which refers to trust that reflects the security one feels about a situation because of guarantees,

safety nets, or other structures. This implies that the structure of the organisation as well as organisational processes and practices have contributed to the high levels of trust shown by employees.

The literature shows the importance of trust within the organisation as it impacts on decision-making, employee morale and performance, organisational commitment, improved communication, a reduction in employee turnover amongst others (Brockner, et al., 1997; Cook & Wall, 1980; Dirks, 2000; Jeanquart-Barone, 1993; Martins & von der Ohe, 2002; Mishra & Morrissey, 1990; Scott, 1983). Luhmann (1988) has concluded that without trust a system may lose size and be unable to grow or develop.

This appears to have been the situation with the organisation in this study. Anecdotal evidence gathered informally indicates that the organisation was characterised by internal competition and suspicion. The previous CEO encouraged this state of affairs and the various chains within the group did not work in synergy but rather in competition with one another. The consequences highlighted within the literature of an organisation operating within an environment characterised by low levels of trust (Schmidt & Posner, 1982, cited in Schindler & Thomas, 1993; Sonnenburg, 1994; Shea, 1984, both cited in Baird & St-Amand, 1995) was evident in that organisational performance suffered and the share price plummeted. This was compounded by weak decision-making, internal competition and lack of effective communication. By all accounts, this was an organisation under immense stress and it showed.

In clear contrast, three years later, this appears to be an organisation functioning optimally. Labour issues and strike activity has been reduced, if not eradicated completely, productivity and profitability has increased, employee turnover has reduced slightly and there appears to be greater knowledge of who the company's customers and competitors really are. An outside survey by an independent institution pitted the company against a number of other organisations in South Africa in terms of employee well-being and commitment. The results of this exercise were extremely positive and highlighted overall satisfaction with job, management and organisation. An additional financial survey which measures organisations according to financial statistics and ratios also ranked the organisation highly in terms of financial performance and shareholder value.

Whilst it is not possible to conclude that the high trust displayed in managers has a direct causal relationship to these results, it seems evident that there is a relationship between trust and individual and organisational performance.

5.7. Strengths and Limitations of the Current Research

The current research endeavour was undertaken to determine whether differences exist within cross gender employee-manager relationships.

The instrument used for this purpose was developed by McAllister (1995). The strengths of the instrument are as follows:

i) It was developed taking into account the theoretical research that had been carried out on the construct of trust,

ii) The research sample it was developed on was fairly large,

iii) The questions were designed to address trust in a specific person within the working or organisational context.

The weaknesses are as follows:

i) It is an instrument developed outside of the South African context and was tested on a homogeneous sample group, which would account for the high internal reliability estimates. As such the instrument itself may not be appropriate for a heterogeneous South African sample.

ii) It is also a short questionnaire and the overall score for Cognition and Affect based trust is derived from 6 & 5 questions respectively.

Given the relative strengths and weaknesses, it was the view of the researcher that the measure would be appropriate as the sample it was to be administered on mirrored McAllister's sample and consisted of professional and management level employees within an organisation. The high Cronbach reliability estimates indicate that the questionnaire was not problematic for this sample. This result is in fact, one of the strengths of the current research.

The limitations of the research are that the sample used was fairly homogenous and largely white. As a result the applicability of the research to other sample groups is limited. The study was conducted within the retail industry and as such may not translate across to other industries. Further

research should be done with employees at lower levels within the organisation and across the board with employees in other industries.

Further suggestions for future research are that race (Grady, 1977; Linville & Jones, 1980; Tsui & O'Reilly, 1989, all cited in Jeanquart-Barone, 1993) and education level (Terborg, 1977, cited in Scott, 1983) have been highlighted as factors in the trust relationship between managers and employees. Neither of these variables has been examined in the current study. Race in particular has been highlighted as a powerful characteristic in person perception and support has been found for the hypothesis that same race dyads display greater trust than cross race dyads. The present research could not examine the race hypothesis and indeed, it would be hard pressed to do so at this point in time from a manager-employee perspective as South Africa is still recovering from the racial imbalances of the past, and being able to conduct such research with a sample that is comprised of a sufficient number of black managers will prove to be a challenge. This is however, an important area of research as it has implications for company performance if trust is found to be lower in cross race manager-employee relationships. The findings from this type of research could then inform interventions to counterbalance this possible threat.

5.8. Conclusion

As stated, the aim of this research was to investigate the possibility of gender differences in trust with the view to informing interventions to deal with this difference. The results of the research show that within the organisation

surveyed, gender differences were non-significant. Neither male nor female employees show a greater tendency to trust managers, and neither male nor female managers are trusted to a larger extent. In addition, no significant cross-gender dyad interactions were found for this sample. The overall levels of trust for affect-based and cognition-based trust were also found to be fairly high within the organisation used for the purposes of the research. The importance of these findings within the South African context bears testament to the road that we have travelled and the interventions that organisations and government have put in place to encourage an environment that values the diversity of gender and the results give support to the perception that “times, they are a-changing” for women in the workplace.

REFERENCES:

Atwater, L.E. (1988). The relative importance of situational and individual variables in predicting leader behaviour: The surprising impact of subordinate trust. *Group and Organizational Studies, 13 (3), 290-310.*

Baird, A & St-Amand, R. (1995). Trust within the organisation. *Public Service Commission of Canada, 1.* Retrieved July 1, 2004, from http://www.psc-cfp.gc.ca/publications/monogra/mono1_e.htm

Billing, Y.D. & Alvesson, M. (2000). Questioning the notion of feminine leadership: A critical perspective on the gender labelling of leadership. *Gender, Work and Organization, 7(3), 144-157.*

Bohnet, I. (2004). The payoff of trust. *Negotiation, July, 3-5.*

Brockner, J., Siegel, P.A, Daly, J.P, Tyler, T & Martin, C. (1997). When trust matters: The moderating effect of outcome favorability. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 42, 558-583.*

Butler, J.K. (1991). Toward understanding & measuring conditions of trust: Evolution of a conditions of trust inventory. *Journal of Management, 17(3), 643-663.*

Butler, J.K. & Cantrell, R.S. (1984). A behavioural decision theory approach to modelling dyadic trust in superiors and subordinates. *Psychological Reports, 55, 19-28.*

Caudron, S. (2002). Rebuilding employee trust. *Quick Update, 28-34.* Retrieved September 7, 2003, from http://www.gpworldwide.com/quick/oct2002/art5.asp

Chisholm, L. (2001). Gender and leadership in South African educational administration. *Gender and Education, 13(4), 387-399.*

Coleman, M. (2003). Gender and the orthodoxies of leadership. *School Leadership & Management, 23(3), 325-339.*

Commission for employment equity annual report 2002-2003. (2003). Retrieved June 8, 2004 from Department of Labour Web site: http://www.labour.gov.za/reports/report.jsp?report_id=8524&parCat_id=8522

Cook, J. & Wall, T. (1980). New work attitude measures of trust, organizational commitment & personal need non-fulfilment. *Journal of Occupational Psychology, 53, 39-52.*

Corporate Leadership Council (2004). State of the workforce 2004: United Kingdom. Corporate Leadership Council, Catalogue No. CLC-0040Z. Retrieved October 4, 2004, from http://www.corporateleadershipcouncil.com

Creed, W.E.D. & Miles, R.E. (1996). Trust in organizations: A conceptual framework linking organizational forms, managerial philosophies, and the opportunity costs of controls. In D.M. Kramer & T.R. Taylor (Eds.), *Trust in organizations: Frontiers of theory and research,* (pp. 16-38). California: Sage Publications.

Cummings, L.L. & Bromiley, P. (1996). The organizational trust inventory (OTI): Development & validation. In D.M. Kramer & T.R. Taylor (Eds.), *Trust in organizations: Frontiers of theory and research,* (pp. 302-330). California: Sage Publications.

Dasgupta, P. (1988). Trust as a commodity. In D. Gambetta (Ed.), *Making & breaking cooperative relationships,* (pp.47-72). New York: Basil Blackwell.

Dennis, M.R. & Kunkel, A.D. (2004). Perceptions of men, women and CEOs: The effects of gender identity. *Social Behavior and Personality, 32(2), 155-172.*

Dirks, K.T. (2000). Trust in leadership and team performance: evidence from NCAA basketball. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85(6), 1004-1012.*

Dunn, J. (1988). Trust and political agency. In D. Gambetta (Ed.), *Making & breaking cooperative relationships,* (pp. 73-93). New York: Basil Blackwell.

Emerson, R.W. (1841). Essays, First Series, Prudence. Retrieved August 10, 2004 from: http://www.quotationspage.com/subjects/trust/11.html

Gabarro, J.J. (1978). The development of trust, influence and expectations. In A.G. Athos & J.J. Gabarro (Eds.), *Interpersonal behaviour: Communication and understanding in relationships,* (pp. 290-303). New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Galpin, J.S. (2000). Course Notes for Statistics. University of the Witwatersrand.

Gambetta, D. (1988). Can we trust trust? In D. Gambetta (Ed.), *Making & breaking cooperative relationships,* (pp. 94-107). New York: Basil Blackwell.

Giscombe, K & Mattis, M. (2003). Women in corporate management at the new millennium: Taking stock of where we are. *The Diversity Factor, 11(1), 5-10.*

Good, D. (1988). Individuals, interpersonal relations and trust. In D. Gambetta (Ed.), *Making & breaking cooperative relationships,* (pp. 31-48). New York: Basil Blackwell.

Jeanquart-Barone, S. (1993). Trust differences between supervisors and subordinates: Examining the role of race and gender. *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research, 29(11/12), 1-11.*

Johnson-George, C. & Swap, W.C. (1982). Measurement of specific interpersonal trust: Construction and validation of a scale to assess trust in a specific other. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 43(6), 1306-1317.*

Jung, D.L. & Avolio, B.J. (2000). Opening the black box: An experimental investigation of the mediating effects of trust and value congruence on transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour, 21, 949-964*.

Kanter, R.M. (1993). *Men and women of the corporation*. New York: BasicBooks.

Kouzes, J.M. & Posner, B.Z. (1994). Leadership is in the eye of the follower. *Leadership, 107-113*.

Lee, P.M. & James, E.H. (2003). She'-e-os: Gender effects and stock price reactions to the announcements of top executive appointments. *Academy of Management Best Conference Paper.*

Lewicki, R.J. & Bunker, B.B. (1996). Developing and maintaining trust in work relationships. In R.M. Kramer & T.R. Tyler (Eds.), *Trust in organizations: frontiers of theory and research (pp. 115-139).* California: Sage Publications.

Lewicki, R.J., McAllister, D.J. & Bies, R.J. (1998). Trust and distrust: New relationships and realities. *Academy of Management Review, 23(3), 438-458.*

Luhmann, N. (1988). Familiarity, confidence, trust: problems and alternatives. In D. Gambetta (Ed.), *Making & breaking cooperative relationships,* (pp. 94-107). New York: Basil Blackwell.

Martins, N. & von der Ohe, H. (2002). Trust as a factor in determining how to attract, motivate and retain talent. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology, 28(4), 49-57.*

Mayer, R.C., Davis, J.H. & Schoorman, F.D. (1995). An integrative model of organizational trust. *Academy of Management Review, 20(3), 709-734.*

McAllister, D,J. (1995). Affect- and cognition-based trust as foundations for interpersonal cooperation in organizations. *Academy of Management Journal, 38(1), 24-59.*

McKnight, D.H., Cummings, L.L. & Chervany, N.L. (1998). Initial trust formation in new organisational relationships. *Academy of Management Review, 23(3), 473-490.*

Mills, P.K. & Ungson, G.R. (2003). Reassessing the limits of structural empowerment: Organizational constitution and trust as controls. *Academy of Management Review, 28(1), 143-153.*

Mishra, A.K. (1996). Organizational responses to crisis: The centrality of trust. In R.M. Kramer & T.R. Tyler (Eds.), *Trust in organizations: frontiers of theory and research,* (pp. 261-287). California: Sage Publications.

Mishra, J. & Morrissey, M. (1990). Trust in employees/employer relationships: A survey of West Michigan managers. *Public Personnel Management, 19(4), 443-463.*

Nazarko, L. (2004). All work and low pay. Part 2: The challenge of diversity. *Nursing Management, 11(3), 25-28.*

Paris, L.D. (2004). The effects of gender and culture on implicit leadership theories: a cross-cultural study. *Academy of Management Best Conference Paper.*

Powell, G.N., Butterfield, D.A. & Parent, J.D. (2002). Gender and managerial stereotypes: Have the times changed? *Journal of Management, 28(2), 177-193.*

Powell, G.N., Butterfield, D.A, Alves, J.C. & Bartol, K.M. (2004). Sex effects in evaluations of transformational and transactional leaders. *Academy of Management Best Conference Paper.*

Rempel, J.K., Holmes, J.G. & Zanna, M.P. (1985). Trust in close relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 49(1), 95-112.*

Robbins, S.P. (2001). *Organizational Behaviour.* San Diego: Prentice Hall International Inc.

Robinson, J.L. & Lipman-Blumen, J. (2003). Leadership behaviour of male and female managers, 1984-2002. *Journal of Education for Business, 79(1), 28-33.*

Rotter, J.B. (1971). Generalized expectancies for interpersonal trust. *American Psychologist, 26, 443-452.*

Rosenthal, R. & Rosnow, R.L. (1991). *Essentials of Behavioral Research: Methods and Data Analysis*. New York: McGraw Hill.

Schindler, P.L & Thomas, C.C. (1993). The structure of interpersonal trust in the workplace. *Psychological Reports, 73, 563-573.*

Scott, D. (1983). Trust differences between men and women in superior-subordinate relationships. *Group and Organizational Studies, 8, 319-336.*

Simons, T. (2002). The high cost of lost trust. *Harvard Business Review, 80 (9), 18-19.*

Sinetar, M. (1988). Building trust into corporate relationships. *Organizational Dynamics, 16(3), 73-79.*

Smith, B. & Rutigliano, T. (2002). Trust is not the issue. *Gallup Management Journal Online. Retrieved on August 8, 2003, from* http://www.gallupjournal.com/CA/sm/20020808.asp

Smith, S. (2002). Declining levels of employee trust are a major threat to competitiveness. *Occupational Hazards.* Retrieved May 10, 2004, from http://www.occupationalhazards.com/articles/4473

Van Engen, M.L., van der Leeden, R. & Willemsen, T.M. (2001). Gender, context & leadership styles: A field study. *Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology, 74, 581 – 598.*

Watson Wyatt (2002). WorkUSA 2002 – Weathering the storm: A study of employee attitudes and opinions. Retrieved on May 4, 2003 from Watson Wyatt Web site: http://www.watsonwyatt.com/research

Willemyns, M., Gallois, C. & Callan, V.J. (2003). Trust me, I'm your boss: trust and power in supervisor-supervisee communication. *International Journal of Human Resource Management, 14(1), 117-127.*

Wren, A. (2004). Beware the glass precipice. *Mail&Guardian, September 17 to 22, 26.*