

The role of security-effects of cognitive based and emotional trust

Csilla Ilona Mizser

Obuda University Keleti Faculty of Business and Economics, Budapest, Hungary,
mizser.csilla@uni-obuda.hu

Abstract: The basis of all communication is security and trust. This study aims to be a secondary research summarizing scientific articles and research investigating effective organizational communication. Effective organizational communication is important, among other relevant factors, in terms of the quality of life of the employees in the organization, in terms of the organization's partner relationships, and in the issue of adapting to continuous changes. Effective organizational communication enables people to interpret reality together, summarizing individual interpretations.

Keywords: organizational trust, innovation, security, communication

1 Introduction

Is trust a good or a bad phenomenon? Does it always depend on the given situation whether trust is born? Or are there general, always valid criteria and foundations for trust?

The phenomenon of exactly how we trust another person has been the focus of research for a long time. Examining both individual and organizational trust, many authors have concluded that quite a lot of components of trust are known and that trust cannot be measured on a single level.

Grammatical and linguistic interpretations of trust serve as an excellent basis for adequately establishing the complexity of the topic. According to Kovács (2021), trust as an expression is a comprehensive phenomenon that can be interpreted as a speech act. The complexity of the question is caused by the second part of the author's assumption, according to which the speech act has a trust dimension. The proposition can be formulated that communication presupposes trust, and thanks to trust, communication becomes more efficient and complete. Trust extends from the most personal level, from self-confidence, to the most comprehensive network of relationships, from social trust.

Every day we live in a state of fluctuation between trust/distrust. Deep within trust/distrust, in relation to relationships between people, an insoluble aporia can be grasped: there is trust, but not yet; there is no trust, but nevertheless there is. No community can function without the presence of trust, but at the same time, no community can assume the full realization of trust. In other words, there is always a given level of trust or distrust, in which trust is constantly exposed to distrust and vice versa. The full fulfillment of trust can be considered a borderline situation or an extraordinary state, which manifests itself in exceptional moments of peace (finding love, security, harmony with ourselves and the world). Similarly, the radical form of distrust is fulfilled in war (we fear losing our loved ones or our lives, we fear becoming homeless). (Kovács, 2021)

2 Method: review of scientific literature on the topic of organizational trust

There is a general consensus among contemporary social scientists that social trust is important. (Delhey&Newton, 2003)

In the “new normal” after the Covid-19 pandemic, working methods, communication channels, and thus the everyday lives of organizations and leaders have changed permanently, and new global challenges are emerging. Szathmári&Kiss (2024) sought to answer the question of how individual leadership roles develop in this situation from the perspective of leaders and their subordinates, and how these are related to organizational trust and leadership styles.

Organizational theory holds that communication is the lifeblood of all organizational cultures, and even organizations. (Vári, 2016)

According to Fukuyama (1995), due to the social embeddedness of the economy, relationships are regulated not only by the cost-benefit principle, contracts, and sanctions that assume self-interest, which the author calls the “tax of distrust” due to their cost implications, but also by mutual trust between members of society.

Mutual trust as social capital influences the willingness to associate and can serve as a basis for the effective exploitation of economic opportunities of companies, as well as the well-being of the organization's members (Sass, 2011).

The family is the oldest and smallest unit of human coexistence, which has been the basic unit of society and economy for thousands of years, and therefore the family business is one of the oldest forms of business. Families all over the world create naturally occurring communities that are built on trust relationships (Fukuyama, 1995). Businesses with a family dimension therefore tend to use trust as a management mechanism in their operations. The economic importance of family businesses today

is clearly demonstrated by the fact that 90% of companies in Germany are managed by families, which account for more than half of GDP. (Vajda, 2020)

Studies on trust, which concern different levels of phenomena, have to date nuanced the ideas regarding the unilaterally positive effect of trust. The negative effects of excessive trust have also been shown. Consequently, the question may arise as to what is the optimal level of trust and how different levels of trust affect organizational functioning. In a trust relationship, in addition to the cognitive evaluation of experiences, emotional factors also play a role in information processing. The uncertainty due to the risk of trusting causes direct emotional reactions. The background emotions experienced during the decision (favorable/unfavorable) and the emotions resulting from the evaluation of the consequences have an effect. (Sass, 2005)

The study of organizational trust is justified by research results that indicate that the beneficial effects of trust can be identified for both individuals and organizations. At the individual level, this includes the role of trust in reducing workplace stress and increasing performance. At the organizational level, trust contributes to increased organizational efficiency and performance by facilitating cooperation, obedience, and information sharing.

Both emotional and cognitive processes play a role in these favorable consequences. The beneficial effect of trust can be realized in several ways, and research highlights the influence on the feeling of uncertainty and the development of organizational relationships. Organizational trust, as a means of organizational coordination, makes interactions predictable, reduces perceived uncertainty in the workplace, while trust in colleagues and managers facilitates social exchanges and creates greater commitment to the workplace. (Sass-Bodnár, 2018)

3 Results

The literature on social trust contains different theories of the origins and determinants of social trust. It also contains many conflicting empirical findings, even within the same country, and especially in cross-national research. In Delhey&Newton's (2003) article they identify six main theories of trust, ranging from bottom-up, individual ones to top-down, societal ones. These theories run in parallel with different interpretations of the concept of trust itself. Some see it as a social-psychological property of individuals. People are 'trusters' or 'distrusters' according to how they were brought up, or according to their experience of later life. Others argue that trust is a social property and a contextual variable. Individuals don't 'have' it as a personal attribute, so much as evaluate the society in which they live as generally trustworthy or untrustworthy. The more people believe that others are to be trusted, the more they will act in a trustworthy manner themselves, and the more they will reinforce the virtual

circle of trust. In this sense, trust is a contextual or emergent property of social systems, which means that it is a social good that is fortified by constant use.

Delhey&Newton's (2004) finding results, that cross-national comparative analysis of generalised social trust in 60 countries shows that it is associated with, and is an integral part of, a tight syndrome of cultural, social, economic, and political variables. High trust countries are characterized by ethnic homogeneity, Protestant religious traditions, good government, wealth (GDP per capita), and income equality. This particular combination is most marked in the high trust Nordic countries but when this group of outliers is removed from the analysis, the same general pattern is found in the remaining 55 countries, albeit in a weaker form. There are indications that rural societies tend to have comparatively low levels of generalized trust but no evidence that large-scale urban society tends to undermine trust.

The cause and effect relations between trust and its correlates are impossible to specify but the results suggest that the ethnic homogeneity and Protestant traditions have a direct impact on trust, and an indirect one through their consequences for good government, wealth and income equality. The importance of ethnic homogeneity for generalised trust also suggests that the difference between particularised and generalised trust may be one of degree rather than kind. (Delhey&Newton, 2004)

Generalized trust has become a paramount topic throughout the social sciences, in its own right and as the key civic component of social capital. To date, cross-national research relies on the standard question: "Generally speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted or that you need to be very careful in dealing with people?" Yet the radius problem—that is, how wide a circle of others respondents imagine as "most people"—makes comparisons between individuals and countries problematic. Until now, much about the radius problem has been speculation, but data for 51 countries from the latest World Values Survey make it possible to estimate how wide the trust radius actually is. We do this by relating responses to the standard trust question to a new battery of items that measures in-group and out-group trust. In 41 out of 51 countries, "most people" in the standard question predominantly connotes out-groups. To this extent, it is a valid measure of general trust in others. Nevertheless, the radius of "most people" varies considerably across countries; it is substantially narrower in Confucian countries and wider in wealthy countries. Some country rankings on trust thus change dramatically when the standard question is replaced by a radius-adjusted trust score. In cross-country regressions, the radius of trust matters for civic attitudes and behaviors because the assumed civic nature of trust depends on a wide radius. (Delhey et al., 2011)

Theories	Variables
Individual	Optimism, life control
Personality theory	Income, social status, life satisfaction, job satisfaction, happiness, anxiety
Success and well-being theory	Membership of voluntary associations
Social	Networks of friends
Voluntary organisation theory	City size, satisfaction with the community, community safety
Social network theory	Social conflicts, satisfaction with democratic institutions, political freedom, public safety
Community theory	
Societal theory	

Table 1

Six theories of trust and related variables

Source: Delhey, J., & Newton, K. (2003). Who trusts?: The origins of social trust in seven societies. European societies

Benesik&Juhász (2018) pointed out that at the micro level, trust is related to the following factors: employee satisfaction, performance, behavior, teamwork, leadership effectiveness, human resource management perceptions, successful negotiations, communication, commitment, ethical behavior, corporate partnerships, etc. Based on these, it is considered a fundamental influencing factor in the internal functioning of organizations. At the macro level, trust is the driving force behind organizational change and survival, corporate cooperation, strategic alliances and mergers or acquisitions.

The benefits of organizational trust	cost reducer	driving force for organizational change
	conflict reducer	driving force
	the organization's performance increases	ethical behavior
	competitive advantage	corporate collaborations
	employee dissatisfaction	teamwork
	successful negotiations	commitment

Table 2
Organizational trust objects

Source: SASS, J. (2005). Trust patterns and trust decisions in the organization. Own editing based on the Doctoral School of Psychology, University of Pécs

Based on the questions posed by Sass (2005), it conducted an investigation of two phenomena. One is to explore and measure the components of organizational trust - according to its object and basis -, to examine the relationship between these components, and to identify and typify the trust patterns of the organizations examined, which differ according to their components. The other goal is to examine individual decisions dependent on the level of organizational trust or lack of trust in organizational trust dilemmas. The investigation supports the hypothesis that in a given social system, organizational trust, according to its object, applies to three areas: organizational operation, the immediate manager, and the group of colleagues. Organizational trust is a complex phenomenon that is composed of components that can be separated according to the trust object (predictability, reliability, benevolence), which can be measured separately. Sass (2005) found that cognitive and emotional trust bases appear in relation to all three trust objects. Since trust is formed on a different experiential basis in relation to trust objects, and this trust experience in the organization is influenced by institutional, task and personal and intergroup relationship experience, cognitive and emotional trust bases can be distinguished. Regarding the relationship between the individual trust objects, the correlations support our assumption that employee, management and system trust jointly determine trust in the organization. (Sass, 2005)

Swift&Hwang's (2013) paper examines the influence of one conceptualization of trust, one that has two sub-constructs – affective (emotional) trust and cognitive (rational)

trust – on knowledge sharing among 157 marketing and sales executives. Their results indicate that affective trust is more important than cognitive trust in sharing interpersonal knowledge, but cognitive trust is more important in creating an organizational learning environment. (Swift&Hwang, 2013)

	<i>Most people can be trusted (%)</i>	<i>Valid n</i>
South Korea	60	
Switzerland	43	1,000
East Germany	35	984
West Germany	32	473
Spain	28	1,888
Hungary	18	2,381
Slovenia	14	1,422
		972

Table 3
Trust in seven countries
Source: Delhey, J., & Newton, K. (2003). Who trusts?: The origins of social trust in seven societies.
European societies

Conclusions

Many studies in the field of risk perception and acceptance of hazards include trust as an explanatory variable. Despite this, the importance of trust has often been questioned. The relevant issue is not only whether trust is crucial but also the form of trust that people rely on in a given situation. In this review, I discuss various trust models and the relationship between trust and affect heuristics. I conclude that the importance of trust varies by hazard and respondent group. Most of the studies use surveys that provide limited information about causality. Future research should focus more on experiments that test whether trust is a consequence of people's attitudes or influences their attitudes toward a technology. Furthermore, there is a need for a better understanding about the factors that determine which heuristics people rely on when evaluating hazards. (Siegrist, 2021)

Trust is an essential ingredient in our daily activities. The fact that these activities are increasingly carried out using the large number of available services on the Internet makes it necessary to understand how users perceive trust in the online environment. A wide body of literature concerning trust perception and ways to model it already exists. A trust perception model generally lists a set of factors influencing a person trusting another person, a computer, or a website. Different models define different set of factors, but a single unifying model, applicable to multiple scenarios in different settings, is still missing. Moreover, there are no conclusions on the importance each factor has on trust perception. In this paper, we review the existing literature and

provide a general trust perception model, which is able to measure the trustworthiness of a website. Such a model takes into account a comprehensive set of trust factors, ranking them based on their importance, and can be easily adapted to different application domains. A user study has been used to determine the importance, or weight, of each factor. The results of the study show evidence that such weight differs from one application domain (e.g. e-banking or e-health) to another. We also demonstrate that the weight of certain factors is related to the users knowledge in the IT Security field. (Costante et al., 2011)

In the “new normal” after the Covid-19 pandemic, working methods, communication channels, and thus the everyday lives of organizations and leaders have changed permanently, and new global challenges are emerging. Szathmári&Kiss (2024) sought to answer the question of how individual leadership roles develop in this situation from the perspective of leaders and their subordinates, and how these are related to organizational trust and leadership styles.

References

- [1] Bencsik, A.&Juhász, T. (2018). Knowledge-oriented organizations' value judgments on the economic effects of trust. *Management Science*, 49 (1), 30-39.
- [2] Costante, E., Den Hartog, J., & Petkovic, M. (2011, September). On-line trust perception: What really matters. In 2011 1st Workshop on Socio-Technical Aspects in Security and Trust (STAST) (pp. 52-59). IEEE.
- [3] Delhey, J., & Newton, K. (2003). Who trusts?: The origins of social trust in seven societies. *European societies*, 5(2), 93-137.
- [4] Delhey, J., & Newton, K. (2004). Social trust: global pattern or Nordic exceptionalism? (No. SP I 2004-202). WZB Discussion Paper.
- [5] Delhey, J., Newton, K., & Welzel, C. (2011). How general is trust in “most people”? Solving the radius of trust problem. *American sociological review*, 76(5), 786-807.
- [6] Filmer, C. A. – Gelfand, M. J. (2012): At What Level (and in Whom) We Trust – Trust Across Multiple Organizational Levels. *Journal of Management*, 38, p. 1167– 1230.
- [7] Fukuyama, F. (1995): “Trust – Social Virtues and the Creation of Well-being”, Európa Kiadó
- [8] Gabriella, K., Miklós, H., Edit, G. B. (2022) Leadership And Trust: Approaches To The Topicand Its Significance In Leadership Development. In 3rd Ferenc Farkas International Scientific Conference: „Management Revolutions”: Conference Proceedings 3rd Ferenc Farkas International Scientific Conference: „Management Revolutions”: Conference Proceedings (p. 226).

- [9] Kovács, B. (2021): Trust–speech–act. *Transylvanian Museum* 83.4 (2021): 137-146.
- [10] Sass, J. (2005). Trust patterns and trust decisions in the organization. University of Pécs Psychology Doctoral School
- [11] Sass, J. (2005). Trust in organizations. *Hungarian Psychological Review*, 60 (1-2), 7-27.
- [12] Sass, J. (2011): “The concept, effects and foundations of trust” in Sass, J.: *Organizational emotions and organizational trust*, Corvinus University of Budapest
- [13] Sass & Bodnár (2018): Examination of the trust climate in schools. In.: Péter Tóth – István Simonics – Heléna Manojlovic – Jenő Duchon (eds.): *New challenges and pedagogical innovations in vocational training and higher education. Proceedings of the 8th Ágoston Trefort Vocational Training and Higher Education Pedagogical Conference*. Óbuda University Trefort Ágoston Engineering Pedagogical Center. pp. 104-123. ISBN 978-963-449-148-4
- [14] Siegrist, M. (2021). Trust and risk perception: A critical review of the literature. *Risk analysis*, 41(3), 480-490.
- [15] Szathmári, E., & Kiss, O. E. (2024). Vezetői szerepek és szervezeti bizalom az „új normális”-ban. *Magyar Pszichológiai Szemle*, 79(3), 453-467.
- [16] TÖRÖK, L. (2019): *Trust in Leadership*, Budapest ISBN 978-615-00-6669-1
- [17] Uricska, E. (2022). Is Trust in the (Linguistic) Details? Language Use on the Instagram Profile of police_hu. *APPLIED LINGUISTICS*, (SI), 37-51.
- [18] Vajda, É. (2020). The Role of Trust in Family Firms. *Köz-gazdaság-Review of Economic Theory and Policy*, 15(3), 106-118.
- [19] Swift, P.E. & Hwang, A. (2013), The impact of affective and cognitive trust on knowledge sharing and organizational learning", *The Learning Organization*, Vol. 20 no. 1, pp. 20-37. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09696471311288500>