

PSYCHOLOGICAL REVIEW OF TRUST

Ann Macaskill, Professor of Health Psychology, Sheffield Hallam University
Kyle Brown, Department of Health Psychology, Sheffield Hallam University

Definition

Trust can be conceptualised as...

- A behavioural intention (Meyer, Davis & Schoorman, 1995; McKnight, Cummings & Chervany, 1998)
- An internal action, similar to choosing, judging and preferring (e.g. Lewis & Weigart, 1985; Riker, 1971)
- Some view trust as synonymous with trustworthiness, discussing trust in the context of personal characteristics that inspire positive expectations on the part of other individuals (e.g. Butler & Cantrell, 1984; McKnight *et al*, 1998)
- Others view trust as a facet of personality that develops early in life and remains relatively stable through adulthood (Rotter, 1967; Webb & Worchel, 1986).

Mayer *et al*'s (1995) model defined trust as *"the willingness of the 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"* (p712).

Rosseau *et al* (1998, p395) define trust as *" a psychological state comprising the intention to accept vulnerability based on positive expectations of the intentions or behaviour of another"*.

Khodyakov (2007) notes that *"Trust is a process of constant imaginative anticipation of the reliability of the other party's actions based on (1) the reputation of the partner and the actor, (2) the evaluation of current circumstances of action, (3) assumptions about the partner's actions, and (4) the belief in the honesty and morality of the other side."* (p126)

Although most definitions of trust seem to have a common conceptual core (Rosseau *et al*, 1998), individual researchers have used different operational definitions.

- These potential differences have been recognised by scholars, suggesting that trust comprises multiple dimensions (e.g. Clark & Payne, 1997; Cook & Wall, 1980; McAllister, 1995).

See Burke, Sims, Lazzara & Salas (2007) for a comprehensive summary of 20+ trust definitions.

As stated above, most definitions of trust seem to have certain commonalities (a common conceptual core). I picked the most prominent/comprehensive definitions of trust that I found, each of which acknowledge a vulnerability of the trustor, properties of the trustee and the relationship (see dimensions section below). Definition is of importance to the project because it obviously determines what aspects any intervention needs to focus on to increase trust in science (i.e. finding what it is that makes the trustor able to be vulnerable and what it is about the trustee-trustor relationship that allows this).

Dimensions/Antecedents of Trust

According to (Burke, Sims, Lazzara & Salas, 2007) who examined the trust literature, the **key components of trust** are...

- A willingness to be **vulnerable** (Butler, 1991; Mayer & Davis, 1999)
- Positive **expectations that interests will be protected and promoted** when monitoring is not possible (Dirks, 2000; Mayer, Davis & Schoorman, 1995; Read, 1962).
- Assessment of others' **intentions, sincerity, motivations, character, reliability and integrity** (Butler, 1991; Mayer & Davis, 1999; Rousseau, Sitkin, Burt & Camerer, 1998).
- The literature further dictates that the **willingness to accept vulnerability evolves over the course of a relationship through repeated actions and a history of reciprocity** (Baier, 1985; Govier, 1994).

Ebert (2007) identified a number of (highly cited) papers from a range of disciplines that have helped shape the trust literature...

- Crosby *et al* (1990) examined interchange between salespeople and customers, finding future sales opportunities are mostly dependent on **relationship quality**. (Although quality here is defined in terms of trust and satisfaction...)
- Anderson & Narus (1990) Found **communication and co-operation** as antecedents of trust, which resulted in less conflict and higher satisfaction.
- Larson (1992) examined social control in network organizational forms through an inductive field study in high-growth entrepreneurial firms.
 - Their model highlighted the importance of **reputation, trust reciprocity and mutual interdependence**.
- Moorman *et al* (1993) showed the variables most strongly associated with trust were variables such as **Integrity, willingness to reduce uncertainty,**

confidentiality, expertise, tactfulness, sincerity, congeniality, and timeliness.

- Morgan & Hunt (1994) studied relationship marketing, finding **shared values, communication** and **less opportunistic behavior** to influence trust.
 - They also found **co-operation, functional trust** and **less uncertainty** to be positive consequences of trust.
- Mohr & Spekman (1994) examined the primary characteristics of partnership success. Main characteristics involved: **commitment, coordination, trust, communication quality, participation, and the conflict resolution technique of joint problem solving.**
- Mayer *et al's* (1995) model emphasizes antecedents being characterized in terms of the **trustor, trustee and relationship between the two.**
- Doney & Cannon (1997) Examined trust between industrial buyers and a supplier firm (in addition to their accompanying salesmen).
 - Antecedents of trust included characteristics of the firm (**e.g. reputation, size**), the salesperson (**e.g. expertise, power**) and characteristics of the relationship (**e.g. willingness to customize, confidential information sharing and length of relationship**).

The predominant number of antecedents proposed within the larger literature base are argued to fall within one of the three categories (Burke, Sims, Lazzara & Salas, 2007)

The Meyer *et al* (1995) model (and subsequent models: McKnight *et al*, 1998; Ross & LaCroix, 1996; Williams, 2001) separated trust from trustworthiness, placing particular emphasis on (three) characteristics of the trustee (ability, benevolence and integrity) appearing as antecedents of trust.

- Ability captures the "can-do" component of trustworthiness by describing whether the trustee has the skills and abilities needed to act in the appropriate fashion.
- In contrast, benevolence and integrity capture the "will-do" component of trustworthiness, by describing whether the trustee will choose to use those skills to act in the best interest of the trustor.
- In a meta-analysis (Colquitt, Scott & LePine, 2007), these variables, in addition to trustworthiness and trust propensity were all found to be significantly related to trust.

As part of a review, Dirks & Ferrin (2002) classified potential antecedent variables into three categories: **Leader actions and practices, Attributes of the follower & Attributes of the leader-follower relationship.**

- These categories mirror the idea of trustor, trustee and the trustor-trustee relationship.
- This review found trust to be significantly related to a number of variables, including: altruism, civic virtue, conscientiousness, courtesy, sportsmanship, job satisfaction, organisational commitment and **propensity to trust.**

Costa, Roe & Tailieu (2001) conceptualised trust as a multi-component variable with three distinct but interrelated dimensions.

- These dimensions consist of propensity to trust, perceived trustworthiness and co-operative and monitoring behaviours.
- Notably, propensity to trust may be more accurately described as an antecedent (Gill, Boies, Finegan & McNally, 2005).

Trustor

Rotter (1967) and others have theorised that individuals vary in the extent to which they trust others in general.

- This trait is often referred to as *propensity to trust*.
- This propensity may affect how individuals initially perceive and interact with their leaders, which in turn may influence the level of trust in the relationship.
- Propensity to trust impacts the **information that is salient** (i.e., strengthens ones' belief in the **trustworthiness of others**; Kosugi & Yamagishi, 1998) and **how the information is processed** when deciding to trust (Yamagishi, Kikuchi, & Kosugi, 1999).
- Ferrin & Dirks (2003) suggest that perhaps people with a low propensity to trust are more likely to have a '**suspicion bias**' when processing information about one's trustworthiness.

Perceived risk is one constant in nearly every definition of trust (e.g. Dirks, 2000; Rousseau *et al*, 1998).

Attributions: Much like the propensity to trust influencing the information that is made salient, people often fall victim to fundamental attribution error: Through the tendency to make fundamental attribution errors, the information that most closely supports the attribution will be attended to and serve to fulfill expectations.

Trustee

Mayer *et al* (1995) particularly stressed characteristics of the trustee: ability, benevolence and integrity.

- Hackman's (2002) functional approach to leadership argues that **the degree to which the leader ensures there is compelling direction and an enabling structure**, the leader will be viewed as effective and are behavioural markers of leader **ability**.
- Benevolent leaders are those that are perceived to genuinely care about their subordinates and convey authentic concern in relationships (Caldwell & Hayes, 2007).
- A number of researchers have linked leader integrity to the trust held by their subordinates for their leaders (Lieberman, 1981; Sitkin & Roth, 1993; Butler & Cantrell, 1984).
 - When leaders are perceived as dishonest and lacking integrity, subordinates will not commit to achieving goals set by the leader due to fears of vulnerability.
 - Leaders who are consistently accountable for their actions may be viewed as having a higher level of integrity.
 - Also related to integrity, perceptions of justice: In general the literature suggests that people want to be treated fairly and consistently and that this leads to trust (Ambrose & Schminke, 2003; Greenberg, 1990; Greenberg, 2003; Schminke, 1990)

A number of people have a **leadership prototype**: A general perception of how a leader should be (e.g. Den Hartog, House, Hanges & Ruiz-Quintanilla, 1999; House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman & Gupta, 2004). Certain characteristics/ prototypes result in increased trust...

- House *et al.* (1999) found that (a) charismatic/value based and team-orientated leadership styles are universally endorsed, (b) humane and participative styles are nearly universally endorsed, and (c) self-protective and autonomous styles are culturally contingent

Leader reputation acts primarily in a moderating role as it has been argued to be a substitute for personal interactions (Hall *et al.*, 2004). In the trust literature, reputation is known as a combination of the salient characteristics of accomplishments (Ferris, Jagannathan, & Pritchard, 2003).

- Reputation reveals information about a leader's ability and morals. Reputation will impact the degree of trust, monitoring, and accountability standards (Hall *et al.*, 2004)

Trustor-Trustee relationship

The relationship between trust and Leader-Member exchange (LMX) is particularly complex.

- Some have conceptually or empirically separated trust from LMX (e.g. Cunningham & MacGregor, 2000; Lagace, 1987), whilst other studies have treated it as a sub-dimension of LMX (see Schriestein *et al*, 1999).
 - Other studies examining LMX include... (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995; Tesluk & Gerstner, 2002).

The key components of trust emphasised at the beginning of this section are similar to points expressed in the definition section: The presence of two parties and their interaction to form a trust relationship. Not only this, there is expression of vulnerability on the part of the trustor. **If one wanted to examine what variables are most influential with regards to trust, these variables would be a safe bet to examine.**

The variables thought to influence trust **from the highly cited papers** also have considerable overlap with the definition of trust and largely reflect variables highlighted in the (varied) trust literature.

What is of importance here is that **each of these variables mentioned fall into a predominant framework**, that is, in line with the Hardin (2002) most models stress three dimensions of trust (Trustor, trustee and context). Most variables fit neatly into one of these categories (i.e. most of the characteristics identified by Moorman *et al* (1993) are of the trustor, whilst those identified by Mohr & Spekman (1994) are in terms of the trustor and trustee relationship). It is clear from looking at these studies however, that many of the variables noted will not be applicable to every type of trust relationship. This underlines the fact that we must first identify what aspect of trust we want to examine and which dimension we wish to focus on. A pertinent example here is the fact that the aspect of trust relevant for persuasive messages from the government is the trust-trustee relationship. This is because it is not a typical trust relationship (see below).

Another noteworthy concern is that **there have been some inconsistencies in the conceptualisation and measurement of trust in previous research** (Bigley & Pearce, 1998; Dirks & Ferrin, 2002). The most serious criticism is the lack of agreement about the structure of trust, and in particular, the inability of researchers to distinguish between the antecedents and the construct of trust itself (Bhattacharya, Devinney & Pillutla, 1998; Mayer, Davis & Schoorman, 1995).

Institutional Trust

Before examining the framework in detail, there is one particular issue... The notion that the trust of an institution is very different to trust between two people...

Trust can be divided into vertical trust in the institutions of society (institutional trust) or horizontal trust (generalised trust in other people: Putnam, Leonardi & Nanetti, 1993).

- It is important to distinguish between the different dimensions of trust, as they are not always related. For example, it is possible to trust people in general, but at the same time, mistrust the formal system (Ahnquist, Lindstrom & Wamala, 2008).

Trust in institutions is very different from trust in people, because the former may pre-suppose no 'encounters at all with the individuals or groups who are in some way "responsible" for them.' (Giddens, 1990, p83).

The individual is not considering whether or not they can trust an institution to carry out an act for them over which they have a choice.

- Instead they are considering the extent to which they trust the institution to fulfil its role in a satisfactory manner.
- In considering this, the individual is not weighing up the gains or losses from engaging in an (implicit) contract with the institution, even though their behaviour may change depending upon whether or not the individual trusts the institution.

Trust in institutions depends on their **perceived legitimacy, technical competence and ability to perform assigned duties efficiently** (Khodyakov, 2007).

It is the impersonal nature of institutions that makes institutional trust so difficult, because it is more problematic to trust some abstract principles or anonymous others who do not express any feelings and emotions. Having no trust in institutions does not mean distrusting them...

Mishler & Rose (2001) analysed trust in institutions as a whole, defined as average trust across six institutions.

- The results only showed a weak effect for socio-economic status, with trust increasing with age and for smaller towns and villages.
- Perceptions of factors such as corruption and economic performance are in contrast much more significant.

Parry (1976) claims that institutional trust is more likely to be rooted in the effective performance in institutions rather than in the overall level of societal trust and citizens' participation in civil society.

Warren (1999, p349) reasoned that institutional trust stems from the normative expectations of an institution that is shared by individuals and which are ultimately backed by sanctions that help ensure that institutional behaviour accords with expectations.

Notably, a number of researchers treat trust in people as a necessary factor for the development of trust in institutions (Fukayama, 1995; Almond & Verba, 1965).

- Also, having no trust in institutions does not mean distrusting them (Khodyakov, 2007)...

This section is of particular interest because although the literature on trust is quite comprehensive, it may not apply to the problem at hand too well. As the relationship between trustor and trustee is not reciprocal, we may either need to focus on other relevant variables (such as perceived legitimacy and technical competence mentioned above) or find a way to make it seem like there is a relationship between the institution and person.

More Examples of Predictors/Variables related to trust

Ahnquist, Lindstrom & Wamala (2008) **found lack of institutional trust** (assessed as an average trust rating of ten different institutions) to be related to **related to increased alcohol consumption**.

Cheung & Tse (2008) found a **negative relationship between institutional trust and anxiety** in Hong Kong. This effect was more pronounced (albeit exhibiting a fairly weak correlation) during the SARS epidemic.

Generalised trust (as a measure of social capital) has been associated with good health and longevity in a number of studies (Hyypa & Maki, 2001; Hyypa, Maki, Impivaara & Aromaa, 2007; Kawachi, 1999; Kawachi, Kennedy & Glass, 1999)

Trust in others develops gradually over time (e.g. Lewicki & Wiethoff, 2000), but it has also been suggested that individuals can exhibit surprisingly high levels of trust even without a history of interaction (McKnight *et al*, 1998; Meyerson, Weick & Kramer, 1996; Weber, Malhotra & Murnighan, 2005).

- High initial trust is theorised to arise for a number of reasons, including an individual's disposition to trust; feelings of dependence; a belief that interpersonal structures such as regulations and laws support one's likelihood

of success in a given situation; and **rapid cognitive cues arising from group membership, reputations and stereotypes.**

High levels of trust in society can facilitate faster and wider diffusion of information, which in turn may promote healthier behaviours (Yip, Subramanian, Mitchell, Lee, Wang & Kawachi, 2007), in addition to helping control unhealthy behaviours such as smoking and alcohol abuse (Lindstrom, 2003, 2005; Lindstrom & Janzon, 2007)

Trust Repair?

Scientific studies have only recently begun to give attention to trust repair (e.g. Ferrin, Kim, Cooper & Dirks, 2007; Kim, Dirks, Cooper, & Ferrin, 2006; Kim, Ferrin, Cooper & Dirks, 2004; Nakayachi & Watabe, 2005; Schweitzer, Hershey & Bradlow, 2006).

Studies have investigated an assortment of tactics that can be used following a violation, including **apologies** (e.g., Kim *et al*, 2006; Tomlinson *et al*, 2004), **denials** (e.g. Kim *et al*, 2006; Sigal *et al*, 1988), **promises** (Schweitzer *et al*, 2006), **excuses** (Shapiro, 1991; Tomlinson *et al*, 2004), **reparations** (Bottom *et al*, 2002), **legalistic remedies** (Sitkin & Roth, 1993), **hostage posting** (Nakayachi & Watabe, 2005), and even **no response at all** (Ferrin *et al*, 2007).

Since trustworthiness is in the eye of the beholder, **there may be times when trust has been violated but the trustee does not know a violation has occurred.**

- In such cases, the violation need not necessarily be followed by a trust repair attempt, the trustee may simply just need to be informed of the violation.

Trust repair requires more than simply compensating for negative expectations (e.g. responding to damaged beliefs about the trustee's integrity by bolstering beliefs about the trustee's competence; Baumeister & Jones, 1978).

- Such an approach encourages trust building as oppose to actually addressing the negative violation (trust repair).
- Similarly, although parties may initiate a number of legalistic remedies (e.g. policies, procedures, contracts, monitoring) to promote trustworthy behaviour (e.g. Nakayachi & Watabe, 2005; Sitkin, 1995; Sitkin & Roth, 1993), such constraint oriented remedies may not necessarily repair trust itself.

Since we are trying to get people to trust institutions again, the literature on trust repair may be a good place to examine. It is not a simple concept, but bringing together these findings may be beneficial...

Maximising the legitimacy of messages

The more prominent (dual process) models of persuasion (Petty & Cacioppo, 1981, 1986; Chaiken, Liberman & Eagly, 1989) propose that there are two ways in which people process a message.

- People can process a message in a systematic (unbiased) way, in which they examine all aspects of an argument objectively, or...
- People can process a message in a heuristic manner, relying on simple cues and rules of thumb that are not necessarily related to the argument.
- Although both modes of processing can result in persuasion, it is generally held that the systematic manner results in deeper assimilation of information, and a stronger resulting attitude.
 - Mode of processing is dependent on the ability and motivation of the message recipient to process the message.

Variables that increase the amount of systematic processing include...

- Personal relevance (e.g. Petty & Cacioppo, 1979b; Petty, Cacioppo & Heesacker, 1981; Petty & Cacioppo, 1984; Harkness, DeBono & Borgida, 1985)
- Need for cognition (e.g. Cacioppo et al, 1983)
- Argument Quality (e.g. Petty, Cacioppo & Goldman, 1981)
- Attitude accessibility (e.g. Petty, Haugtvedt & Smith, 1995; Fabrigar, Priester, Petty, and Wegener (1998).
 - Although (see Clark, Wegener & Fabrigar, 2008).
- Diagnosticity (Chang, 2007)
 - Diagnosticity is “the extent to which a given piece of information discriminates between alternative hypotheses, interpretations, or categorization” (Herr, Kardes, and Kim 1991, p. 457)
- Credibility (e.g. Newell & Goldsmith, 2001; Friestad & Wright, 1994; MacKenzie & Lutz, 1989)

Variables that increase the amount of heuristic processing include...

- Bodily movements such as head nodding (e.g. Tom, Pettersen, Lau, Burton & Cook, 1991), which increases persuasion.
- Expertise of the source (Chaiken, 1980; Petty, Cacioppo & Goldman, 1981).
- The number of arguments in a message (Petty & Cacioppo, 1984)
- The overall length of the argument (Wood, Kallgren & Preistler, 1985).
- Emotional states/Moods (Petty, Schumann, Richman & Strathman, 1993; See Petty, Cacioppo, Sedikides & Strathman, 1988; Bohner, Chaiken, & Hunyadi 1994; Petty, Schuman, Richman, & Strathman, 1993).
- Attitude accessibility (Fazio & Williams, 1986)
- Extreme attitudes (e.g. Lord, Ross & Lepper, 1979)

- Vague/Ambiguous messages (e.g. Pallak et al, 1983)
- Brand name (e.g. Maheswaran, Mackie & Chaiken, 1992)
- Message Framing (e.g. Smith, 1996; Lewis, Watson & White, 2008; see Keller, Lipkus & Rimer, 2003)
 - However, this is more complex...

From this, it would seem that to increase the persuasiveness of a message, one could use either method, but systematic processing would lead to a stronger, more resilient attitude.

- However, one of the major postulates of dual process persuasion theories is that any variable can influence persuasion through multiple processes, that is, as an argument or cue depending on the person's motivation and ability to think carefully about the merits of an appeal.
- For example, simple cues can serve in other roles when motivation is high: these variables can be analysed as evidence and thus can aid *or* hinder persuasion (e.g. Petty, 1997; Pierro, Mannetti, Kruglanski & Sleeth-Keppler, 2004; Erb *et al*, 2007 see Petty & Brinol, 2008)...
 - An attractive person selling a beauty product may be construed as additional evidence for the product, whereas if the same source was a spokesperson for a new mortgage company, the relevance of attractiveness would be low.
- So, using emotion as an example as a message variable (Petty & Brinol, 2008)...
 - When thinking is constrained, **emotions tend to serve as simple associative cues** and produce evaluations consistent with their valence (e.g. Petty *et al*, 1993)
 - **Emotions can affect the extent of thinking:** People may think about messages more in a sad state than a happy one because sadness signals a problem to be solved (Schwarz, Bless & Bohner, 1991).
 - **When thinking is high, emotions can be examined as arguments:** One may rate a scary movie more positively if frightened because fear is the desirable feature of this type of entertainment (Martin, Ward, Achee & Wyer, 1993).
 - **Emotion can bias the ongoing thoughts** people have about an object (Petty *et al*, 1993): Positive consequences seem more likely when people are in a happy state than when they are in a sad one (DeSteno, Petty, Wegener & Rucker, 2000)

One particular issue with the dual process models is the relative lack of examination of metacognitive processes: There is little exploration into the assumption that

message recipients are aware of both their thoughts and persuasive content of a message.

- Notably, dual process model research is beginning to look at this, with focus on both need for cognition and self validation (i.e. confidence their in message related thoughts/conclusions: See Petty & Brinol, 2008).
- Additionally, the models do little to examine the fact that many message recipients are actually aware of the persuasive intent of messages and not just passive in the process.
- The persuasion knowledge model (PKM) explicitly focuses on audience members' knowledge of a persuasive agent's goals and tactics (Friestad & Wright, 1994; Campbell & Kirmani, 2000; Kirmani & Campbell 2004).
- A key element of the PKM is that audiences are conceptualised as actively coping with the persuasive attempt by pursuing their own desired goals.
 - Many different goals may drive responses to persuasion attempts (Friestad & Wright, 1994).
- One way to gain credibility for a campaign is to implement seemingly independent third party organisations, or "front groups", rather than a particular company (Cutlip, 1994; Pfau *et al*, 2007).
- As the literature on persuasion knowledge is quite vast (and not completely relevant), it shall not be discussed further. However, it certainly must be acknowledged as a factor because persuasion knowledge is very likely to be linked to trust: Those who are fully aware of the persuasion attempt may be much less likely to trust the source...

Another important area that may warrant further examination is that which examines the effects of persuasive warnings specifically.

- These stage models of warning effectiveness (Argo & Main, 2004; Wogalter, DeJoy & Laughery, 1999) stress a number of stages a warning recipient must pass through for effective communication of the content.
- Generally, these models firstly implicate an **attentional stage** (i.e. a message must gain the attention of the recipient before any further processing), followed by a **cognitive-like stage** (the models examine aspects such as comprehension and memory). A **belief/attitudinal stage** then precedes a **motivational** and finally **behaviour change stage**.

- Notably, the models differ (this is a general overview), but this is an effective way to conceptualise any persuasive message.
- Even before the different modes of processing delineated by the dual process models, one must first attend to a persuasive communication. Then the message must be sufficient to affect cognitive and affective thought processing before one is motivated to comply with the persuasive communication.

This section is the most varied, as it attempts to shed some light on what makes a message persuasive (i.e. what message characteristics make one trust the message?) The first section expresses that the answer to this depends on which form of processing: Inducing systematic processing should result in a more persuasive message. However, that is not to say that heuristic characteristics of messages are ineffective, they can be just as persuasive. It is also shown that the same cues can be construed as systematic or heuristic under certain circumstances. Therefore, the important part of designing a trustworthy communication is to examine the **motivation and ability** of the intended recipients and tailor the message accordingly (i.e. use an expert source if recipients are motivated and able to process the message, but only if the source is relevant to the persuasive message: If the participant is not motivated or able to process the message, they could use a cue such as expertise in a manner opposite to that intended by the researcher.). If there is no motivation and ability to process the message (and one can be sure that recipients will not gain either), then a heuristic cue will be more effective. Theoretically, any of the variables mentioned could increase the trust in a persuasive message if used in the right context (i.e. the variable interacts in the correct manner with motivation and ability).

However, it is not that simple. As the vast majority of society is subjected to persuasive messages on a daily basis, one must account for their knowledge of this. One must account for this knowledge by either making it seem **less like a persuasive message** (i.e. by using a "front group"), **increasing motivation and ability** to process the message despite their knowledge of persuasion or **increasing trust in the message** (i.e. increasing the trustworthiness dimension, possibly through increasing perceptions of benevolence). Notably, this is a likely cause of why many people do not pay attention to mass media messages, so further research into this area (and media scepticism) would be a good avenue.

Finally, examining persuasion as a process of stage (i.e. similarly to the stage models of effective warnings) is also relevant. This is also linked to much of the most recent research into dimensions of trust, which specifies trust as a process (e.g. Khodyakov, 2007). Finding inventive ways to increase attention, comprehension and similar processes may be an effective way to enhance message effectiveness.

Key References

Argo, J. & Main, K. (2004) Meta-Analysis of the effectiveness of warning labels. *Journal of public policy and marketing*. 23 (2), p193-208.

Burke, C.S. Sims, D.E. Lazzara, E.H. & Salas, E. (2007) Trust in leadership: A multi-level review and integration. *The leadership quarterly*. p606-632.

Colquitt, J.A. Scott, B.A. & LePine, J.A. (2007) Trust, trustworthiness, and trust propensity: A meta-analytic test of their unique relationships with risk taking and job performance. *Journal of applied psychology*. 92 (4), 909-927.

Dirks, K.T. & Ferrin, D.T. (2002) Trust in leadership: Meta-analytic findings and implications for research and practice. *Journal of applied psychology*. 87 (4), p611-628.

Dirks, K.T. & Ferrin, D.T. (2001) The role of trust in organizational settings. *Organization science*. 12 (4), p450-467.

Friestad, M. & Wright, P. (1994) The persuasion knowledge model: How people cope with persuasion attempts. *Journal of consumer research*. 21, p1-31.

Gill, H. Boies, K. Finegan, J.F. & McNally, J. (2005) Antecedents of trust: Establishing a boundary condition for the relation between the propensity to trust and intention to trust. *Journal of business and psychology*. 19 (3), p287-302.

Khodyakov, D. (2007) Trust as a process: A three-Dimensional approach. *Sociology*. 41, p115-132.

Kim, P.H. Dirks, K.T & Cooper, C.D. (2009) The repair of trust: A dynamic bilateral perspective and multilevel conceptualisation. *Academy of management review*. 34 (3), p401-422

Lewicki, R.J. Tomlinson, E.C. & Gillespie, N. (2006) Models of interpersonal trust development: Theoretical approaches, empirical evidence and future directions. *Journal of management*. 32, p991.

Mayer, R.C. Davis, J.H. & Schoorman, F.D. (1995) An integrative model of organizational trust. *Academy of management review*. 20 (3), p709-734.

Mishler, W. & Rose, R. (2001) What are the origins of political trust? Testing institutional and cultural theories in communist societies. *Comparative political studies*. 34, p30.

Petty, R.E. & Brinol, P. (2008) Persuasion: From single to multiple to metacognitive processes. *Perspectives on psychological science*. 3 (2), p137-147.

Professor Ann Macaskill & Kyle Brown.

October 2009