

不同研究视角下的信任及其微观影响因素

陈家行, 吴继霞*

苏州大学教育学院, 江苏 苏州

收稿日期: 2025年11月17日; 录用日期: 2025年12月1日; 发布日期: 2025年12月15日

摘要

在日常生活中, 信任是影响人际关系及行为互动的关键因素, 一直是心理学长盛不衰的热点之一。本文在微观层面上将信任的研究视角分为对受托者的感知视角、关系视角、特质视角, 信任的影响因素据此也可分为情境性因素和特质性因素。未来的研究需要重视生态效度, 考察特质性因素 × 情境性因素、微观情境 × 宏观生态对信任的影响, 满足信任研究应用化、体系化的趋势。

关键词

信任, 研究视角, 影响因素

Trust and Its Micro-Level Influencing Factors from Different Perspectives

Jiaxing Chen, Jixia Wu*

School of Education, Soochow University, Suzhou Jiangsu

Received: November 17, 2025; accepted: December 1, 2025; published: December 15, 2025

Abstract

In daily life, trust is a key factor influencing interpersonal relationships and behavioral interactions, and it has long been one of psychology's enduring hot topics. At the micro level, this article categorizes trust's perspectives into trustee perception perspectives, relational perspectives, and dispositional perspectives. Accordingly, trust's influencing factors can be divided into situational factors and dispositional factors. Future research should emphasize ecological validity by examining the effects of trait factors × situational factors and micro-situations × macro-ecologies on trust, aligning with the trend toward applied and systematic trust research.

*通讯作者。

Keywords

Trust, Perspectives, Micro-Level Influencing Factors

Copyright © 2025 by author(s) and Hans Publishers Inc.

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0).

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>



Open Access

1. 引言

信任(trust)指对他人的意图和行为持有积极的期待,并愿意为此而承担一定风险的意愿(Rousseau et al., 1998: p. 395)。结果取决于他人时,个体对他人意图的预期就会影响其行为,进而影响社会互动和社会关系(Rotter, 1980)。因此,无论是亲密关系,还是陌生人之间的互动,信任都至关重要(Rempel et al., 1985)。在组织环境中,信任也是合作的必要条件(Fehr, 2009; Mayer et al., 1995; McAllister, 1995)。当一段依赖关系中存在利益冲突时,信任特别关键:不同个体偏好的结果存在冲突意味着风险更大、脆弱性更强。此时,相信对方怀有善意尤为重要(Balliet & van Lange, 2013)。

鉴于信任对于人类的社会生活至关重要,心理学与其他学科都将信任作为核心的主题。因此,有必要梳理信任的研究视角以及不同研究视角下影响信任的微观因素。

2. 信任的研究视角

从理论的角度(Mayer et al., 1995: p. 715)出发,信任的研究重点可划分为:

- (a) 受托者特质(一个人是否值得信赖);
- (b) 信任者-受托者关系的影响因素(亲密度、利益一致性、交往频率);
- (c) 信任者特质(如,稳定且普遍的“信任他人的意愿”)。

以上三个研究重点所对应的视角分别为:

- (a) 对受托者的感知视角;
- (b) (信任者-受托者)关系视角;
- (c) (信任者)特质视角。

对受托者的感知视角、关系视角认为,信任水平随着信任者所处情境的变化而变化。特质视角则关注更稳定的个体层面,认为信任水平具有个体差异。三种视角的联系并不紧密,故涉及信任的研究呈现碎片化特征。因此,在概念侧面梳理这些视角有助于未来研究的开展。

对受托者的感知视角认为,信任取决于信任者认为他人可信的程度。该视角假设,信任者根据可获得的情境线索和个体线索(Bacharach & Gambetta, 2001; McAllister, 1995; McKnight et al., 1998)形成对他人可信度的印象(Mayer et al., 1995)。该假设与社会认知感知的三个核心维度——热情、能力和道德有关(Brambilla & Leach, 2014; Fiske et al., 2007; Landy et al., 2016),或者说与组织学中信任的三个前因——仁慈、能力和正直有关(Schoorman et al., 2016; McAllister, 1995)。

关系视角试图确定信任者-受托者关系的主要特征、塑造信任体验的环境。该视角关注人们对特定目标的信任演变、信任对拒绝或承受风险和承诺的调节过程(即回避和趋近)(Murray & Holmes, 2011; Rempel et al., 1985)。关系视角的核心与社会亲密度有关:随着时间的推移,信任逐渐发展(Rempel et al., 1985; Rusbult et al., 1999)。人们对受托者的信任水平、感知到的熟悉度与相似性提高到一定程度时,就会发展为高质量的亲密关系,比如伴侣关系、亲属关系、内群体成员关系(Balliet et al., 2014; DeBruine, 2002;

Fleeson & Leicht, 2006; Reis & Shaver, 1988; Rempel et al., 1985; Yamagishi et al., 1998a)。关系视角认为信任是一种动态的人际现象(Rusbult & van Lange, 2008), 重视性格线索(如依恋类型)和情境线索(Mikulincer & Shaver, 2003; van Lange & Rusbult, 2012), 并顺着这条脉络研究情境中相联系的各个方面。

相互依赖理论(interdependence theory)总结了人际关系的基本维度, 研究者可据此简洁地描述大多数人际互动。根据 Gerpott 等人(2018)的研究成果, 人们至少根据五个维度来区分不同情境:

- (a) 冲突: 使个体获得最好结果的行为, 导致另一个体获得最坏结果的程度;
- (b) 信息确定性: 人们对彼此偏好结果的了解程度, 以及个体行为如何影响这些结果;
- (c) 相互依赖: 个体的结果在多大程度上取决于对方在该情境下的行为;
- (d) 未来的相互依赖: 个体和他人在当前情境下的行为对个体和(或)他人未来结果的影响程度;
- (e) 权力: 个体(不对称地)决定自己和他人结果的程度。

了解这些维度(以及它们之间的相互作用)如何塑造信任, 有助于从理论层面理解信任。

特质视角关注稳定的、跨情境的、跨目标的影响因素, 将信任倾向视为一种人格特征(Deutsch, 1958; Yamagishi, 1988)。特质视角涵盖了与信任相关的稳定世界观(涉及人类互动的本质)的研究(Deutsch, 1958; Yamagishi, 1988)、信任者稳定的利己主义与亲社会动机(如, 社会价值取向、道德认同)的研究(Aquino & Reed, 2002; Murphy et al., 2011)。

大量研究关注一般信任或“普遍”(特质)信任, 将信任定义为“不区分对象地相信人性本善”(Yamagishi & Yamagishi, 1994: p. 139), 亦或是关注一般不信任(Yamagishi, 1988)。一般信任可以预测实际的信任体验和行为(Balliet & van Lange, 2013; Fleeson & Leicht, 2006), 其水平在个人、人际关系、社会层面上具有适应性(Jones et al., 1997; van Lange, 2015), 与身体健康、生活满意度、爱情、降低交易成本、合作、降低犯罪率正相关(Barefoot et al., 1998; Elgar & Aitken, 2011; Kramer, 1999; Larzelere & Huston, 1980; Rempel et al., 1985; Stavrova & Ehlebracht, 2016)。相比之下, 一般不信任、愤世嫉俗的世界观与低收入水平、低水平的身心健康等有关(Chen et al., 2016; Stavrova & Ehlebracht, 2016)。然而, 前人通常关注一般信任与其他特质变量或单一行为的关系。目前, 学术界对测量信任特质的问卷的生态效度抱有疑问。因此, 本文的第二个主要目的是总结人们影响信任体验的因素, 为未来探索日常信任打好基础。

3. 信任的影响因素

3.1. 信任的情境性影响因素

在对受托者的感知方面, 本文主要关注热情和能力(Fiske et al., 2007)、道德(Goodwin, 2015)。印象形成的社会认知视角与信任的组织视角(能力、仁慈、正直)密切相关(Mayer et al., 1995)。研究发现, 个体对他人能力的感知促进了对他人可靠性的感知, 进而提高对他人的信任水平(Mayer et al., 1995)。同样, 信任者对受托者称职且可靠的表现的感知被定义为“认知信任”, 其中包括个人正直(如公平)方面的因素(McAllister, 1995)。

早期, 社会心理学将“道德”纳入“热情”的范畴(Fiske et al., 2007), 最近的研究开始区分个体对道德品质的感知与社交热情, 系统地考察了二者的独特影响(Goodwin et al., 2014)。就其相对权重而言, 可信度在概念上与道德品质密切相关, 道德与信任体验密切相关(Goodwin et al., 2014)。

另一方面, 个体对社交热情的感知似乎对元认知发挥了重要作用(Goodwin et al., 2014)。因此, 信任状态某种程度上反映: 个体对他人善意的依赖、目标宜人性的特殊体验可能与对普遍的道德原则、真诚的感知一样重要(Goodwin et al., 2014; Mayer et al., 1995)。

在关系方面, 本文主要关注亲密度、熟悉度和相似性, 这能代表亲密关系研究、进化心理学、群际心理学、行为经济学中涉及信任与社会亲密度关系的工作(DeBruine, 2002; Fleeson & Leicht, 2006; Romano

et al., 2017; Yamagishi et al., 1998a)。亲密关系的研究发现, 人们的信任水平通常很高, 人们感知到彼此的可预测性和可靠性时就会出现信任(Rempel et al., 1985)。此外, 信任也是衡量同伴对关系承诺的机制: 当遇到与信任相关的情境时, 承诺型同伴更可能做出牺牲、主动承担、提高信任等行为(Rusbult & van Lange, 2003; Simpson, 2007)。除此之外, 共同的社会关系、群体内成员的身份通常与合作、忠诚的期望有关(Rai & Fiske, 2011; Yuki et al., 2005)。亲密关系也会增加经济博弈中的信任行为(Binzel & Fehr, 2013)。

上述发现可视为测量社会距离的典型例子。社会距离(如, 共同的群体成员身份、亲属关系、态度和信仰的相似性)是人们信任他人的基础, 因此可以认为信任与亲密度、熟悉度和相似性正相关。

此外, 信任与相互依赖理论所描述的社会互动深层次的结构特征相关(Kelley et al., 2003; Kelley & Thibaut, 1978)。结构维度描述了互动同伴的结果相互影响。随着维度的变化, 情境也随之改变(Rusbult & van Lange, 2003)。因此, 相互依赖结构随着关系和伙伴不同而不同, 也随着个体情境的变化而变化(Rusbult et al., 1999)。本文参考了相互依赖理论以全面地了解情境性的相互依赖塑造信任的过程。

经济学、心理学对亲密关系的研究(Murray & Holmes, 2009)为候选维度提供了理论基础。鉴于信任与受托人的意图有关(Rousseau et al., 1998), 信任者与受托人的利益冲突就变得十分重要(Evans & Krueger, 2011; Murray & Holmes, 2009)。感知到的利益分歧越大, 信任者就越有理由怀疑自己被利用, 就会越不信任受托人。利益冲突往往使个体产生消极的认知和情绪(如, 贪婪、恐惧), 促使个体更积极地寻求信息和自我呈现(Rusbult & van Lange, 2008: p. 2054)。鉴于信任的许多理论认为冲突具有核心作用(Balliet & van Lange, 2013), 因此对利益冲突的感知应该与信任水平的降低有关。此外, 利益冲突会导致不信任的倾向和表达(Rusbult & van Lange, 2003; Simpson, 2007)。鉴于冲突在构建社会互动中的基础作用, 冲突可能因此加剧相互依赖其他方面的影响。

至于信息确定性, 鉴于不同理论有分歧, 其效应尚不确定。从特质视角、关系视角出发, 信任的特征包括自信感、可预测性(Deutsch, 1958; Rempel et al., 1985; McAllister, 1995; Rusbult et al., 1999)。研究者通常认为, 信任需要“信念的飞跃”(Möllering, 2001; Murray & Holmes, 2011): 除了根植于先前的经验或情境线索, 信任还通过接受脆弱性、获得与未来结果相关的安慰感以减少不确定性(Murray & Holmes, 2011)。从相互依赖的角度来讲, 他人的动机、情境信息的不确定性会使个体误解, 对信任关系造成挑战(Rusbult & van Lange, 2003; van Lange et al., 2002)。然而, 一些理论认为, 信任和不信任都是信任者管理受托者意图不确定性的方式, 因此也涉及确定性的感觉(Lewicki et al., 1998)。在概念上, 一般关系和特定关系的信任、不信任的两种取向是对称的(van Lange & Balliet, 2015)。因此, 仍未确定信息确定性和信任的关系。

信任可能涉及高度的相互依赖(Lewicki et al., 1998)。在日常生活中, 相互依赖和信任更可能正相关。高度相互依赖的情境称为“信任情境”(Kelley et al., 2003; Simpson, 2007)。相互依赖可以增加组织环境、亲密关系中的合作和承诺(Gerpott et al., 2018; Martin et al., 2014)。相互依赖程度越高, 个体间的目标就越一致, 信任水平就越高(Lewicki & Tomlinson, 2014)。人们会寻找与可信他人相互依赖的情境(Lewicki et al., 1998), 这种元认知会增加信任, 有助于作出积极的关系承诺、维护行为。另外, 人们还会考虑到相互依赖情境的未来影响(van Lange & Balliet, 2015)。在长期维持关系的情况下, 个人更可能表现出互惠行为(Rusbult et al., 1999), 这又增进互动同伴的相互信任。

最后, 权力和信任的关系是争论不断的话题。在经济交易中, 有权力、独立的个体更难以信任他人(Mooijman et al., 2015; Schilke et al., 2015)。最近的研究也发现, 如果权力不稳定, 个体会因为担心失去权力而不信任他人(Mooijman et al., 2019)。但其他研究发现, 掌权者更信任他人, 甚至对他人的忠诚和支持过于自信而危及自己的地位(Brion & Anderson, 2013; Hommelhoff & Richter, 2017)。

此外, 权力-信任关系的性质仍令人费解。现实中, 人们经常不信任掌权者(van Prooijen & van Lange,

2014)。大量研究证明, 掌权者可能经常滥用自己的地位, 做出自私、不合作、不值得信任的行为(Lammers et al., 2015), 这可能是他们的信任水平降低所致。尽管原因不同, 但权力不平衡使得不同个体对资源的控制不对称, 这可能是对高、低权力者的信任水平降低的根源(即害怕权力滥用和剥削, 害怕失去权力和隐含的责任)。相互依赖理论也认为, 不对称的依赖关系可能加剧依赖方的脆弱性和旨在减少脆弱性的反应(Rusbult & van Lange, 2003)。此外, 对权力的解释可能会引起双方不适(Scholl et al., 2018; van Lange & Balliet, 2015)。

3.2. 信任的特质性影响因素

研究表明, 道德认同(moral identity)——作为一个道德的人对自我的(特质层面)重要性与日常生活的信任水平正相关。人们认为, “他人怀有善意, 愿意接受易受伤性”是合乎道德的、可取的(Dunning et al., 2014)。

零和信念(zero-sum beliefs)反映了人们对“别人的积极结果往往是以自己的利益为代价获得, 反之亦然”的看法(Crocker et al., 2017; Różycka-Tran et al., 2015)。零和信念代表了一种怀疑利益冲突的稳定倾向, 因此, 零和信念与日常互动中的信任负相关。

(不)信任和社会价值取向(social value orientation, SVO)的关系仍未明晰, 这反映了对自己和他人结果的评价和工作的差异(Murphy et al., 2011)。高 SVO (即亲社会)在理论、实际体验上都与个体对他人动机和行为的积极期望有关(Rusbult & van Lange, 2003; Pletzer et al., 2018)。然而, SOV 与现实生活互动中信任状态的关系还需要深入研究(Pletzer et al., 2018)。

此外, 日常信任可能与人口学变量(性别、年龄、政治视角和宗教信仰)有关。例如, 有研究发现, 保守主义与避免不确定性、威胁的观念有关, 因此保守派的信任水平低于自由派(Jost et al., 2003)。

4. 总结与展望

在心理学和其他领域, 信任研究的繁杂一方面深化了人们对信任的见解, 另一方面也让人们对于不同甚至相矛盾的结果和结论感到迷惑, 本文系统梳理了不同视角对信任的观点以及对应的影响因素。据此, 本文认为未来的信任研究有以下三个方向:

第一, 聚焦日常信任, 缩短实验室结论与现实的距离。传统的研究通常聚焦于个体对单一同伴或是对陌生人的信任(即关系视角、特质视角)。在生活中, 信任不仅仅影响“亲密关系”、“人性”等抽象的概念, 但人们对日常生活中(不)信任的表现知之甚少。鉴于人们每天与不同的人进行不同的接触, 因此需要相应的数据来研究个体日常的信任体验(Couch & Jones, 1997)。为了排除干扰因素, 研究者普遍强调实验和研究范式(如信任博弈、囚徒困境、独裁者游戏等经济博弈)的环境, 只关注其中一种视角, 没有综合考虑哪些因素影响日常信任。此外, 目前尚不清楚测量信任特质的方法——如不信任量表(Yamagishi, 1988)和信任博弈(Berg et al., 1995)是普遍的情境还是具体情境的预测因素。最后, 基于实验室开展的信任研究所得的发现是否能在现实复现? 研究者是否忽视了超出实验室环境限制的某些因素? 要回答这些问题, 未来需要更加重视研究成果的推广性, 采用更具生态效度的方法对在不同角度影响信任的因素进行综合的分析, 这将有助于研究与现实的距离。

第二, 探究不同视角下影响信任的因素的交互作用。研究者很早就认为, 同时考虑个体特质和情境才能理解人类的行为与心理状态(Allport, 1937; Lewin, 1936; Murray, 1938)。后来, 人们认为交互作用论(interactionism)是围绕“个人和情境变量的相对重要性”辩论的一种解答(Ekehammar, 1974; Endler & Magnusson, 1976; Fleeson & Nofle, 2008; Kenrick & Funder, 1988)。然而, 考虑到近期研究的焦点为动态的、基于过程的行为(Baumert et al., 2017; Fleeson & Jayawickreme, 2015; Rauthmann, 2021; Kuper et al., 2021),

考察特质 × 情境对信任的影响愈发重要。因此, 应该使用标准化的情境、新的交互框架与方法, 这对于跨视角地理解不同因素对信任的影响具有重大意义。

第三, 考虑宏观因素对信任的影响。前文所提及三个视角均建立在人际交往情境的基础之上, 但宏观的人类生态也可能影响人际信任, 比如文化、社会政治和自然环境。个人主义 - 集体主义的经典理论认为, 集体主义文化更重视群体内联系, 群体间的差异更规范, 人们更信任亲密之人(Triandis, 1995; Yamagishi et al., 1998b)。人类合作的进化理论认为, 相对于基因遗传, 对陌生人的信任反映出更明显的社会文化差异(Van Lange, 2015)。不同理论认为微观 × 宏观的交互作用具有不同模式, 但它们尚未回答: 在不同的生态、文化中, 不同视角下的信任的影响因素的具体表现如何? 而且, 许多研究比较了美国人和东亚人(中国、日本和韩国)对不同亲密度的他人的信任水平。结果发现, 日本人对群体外成员的信任水平低于美国人(Buchan et al., 2002), 但与美国人相比, 中国人却表现出更强的群体外信任(Buchan et al., 2006)——这与许多现有的文化理论相矛盾。因此, 综合考虑微观的情境 × 宏观的生态文化的交互作用有助于扩展研究者对具体情境的信任的理解的广度和深度。

参考文献

- Allport, G. W. (1937). *Personality: A Psychological Interpretation*. Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.
- Aquino, K., & Reed, A. (2002). The Self-Importance of Moral Identity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83, 1423-1440. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.83.6.1423>
- Bacharach, M., & Gambetta, D. G. (2001). Trust in Signs. In K. S. Cook (Ed.), *Trust in Society* (pp. 148-184). Russell Sage Foundation.
- Balliet, D., & Van Lange, P. A. M. (2013). Trust, Conflict, and Cooperation: A Meta-Analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 139, 1090-1112. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0030939>
- Balliet, D., Wu, J., & De Dreu, C. K. W. (2014). Ingroup Favoritism in Cooperation: A Meta-Analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 140, 1556-1581. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0037737>
- Barefoot, J. C., Maynard, K. E., Beckham, J. C., Brummett, B. H., Hooker, K., & Siegler, I. C. (1998). Trust, Health, and Longevity. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, 21, 517-526. <https://doi.org/10.1023/a:1018792528008>
- Baumert, A., Schmitt, M., Perugini, M., Johnson, W., Blum, G., Borkenau, P. et al. (2017). Integrating Personality Structure, Personality Process, and Personality Development. *European Journal of Personality*, 31, 503-528. <https://doi.org/10.1002/per.2115>
- Berg, J., Dickhaut, J., & McCabe, K. (1995). Trust, Reciprocity, and Social History. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 10, 122-142. <https://doi.org/10.1006/game.1995.1027>
- Binzel, C., & Fehr, D. (2013). Social Distance and Trust: Experimental Evidence from a Slum in Cairo. *Journal of Development Economics*, 103, 99-106. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdeveco.2013.01.009>
- Brambilla, M., & Leach, C. W. (2014). On the Importance of Being Moral: The Distinctive Role of Morality in Social Judgment. *Social Cognition*, 32, 397-408. <https://doi.org/10.1521/soco.2014.32.4.397>
- Brion, S., & Anderson, C. (2013). The Loss of Power: How Illusions of Alliance Contribute to Powerholders' Downfall. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 121, 129-139. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2013.01.005>
- Buchan, N. R., Croson, R. T. A., & Dawes, R. M. (2002). Swift Neighbors and Persistent Strangers: A Cross-Cultural Investigation of Trust and Reciprocity in Social Exchange. *American Journal of Sociology*, 108, 168-206. <https://doi.org/10.1086/344546>
- Buchan, N. R., Johnson, E. J., & Croson, R. T. A. (2006). Let's Get Personal: An International Examination of the Influence of Communication, Culture and Social Distance on Other Regarding Preferences. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 60, 373-398. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jebo.2004.03.017>
- Chen, S. X., Lam, B. C. P., Wu, W. C. H., Ng, J. C. K., Buchtel, E. E., Guan, Y. et al. (2016). Do People's World Views Matter? The Why and How. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 110, 743-765. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000061>
- Couch, L. L., & Jones, W. H. (1997). Measuring Levels of Trust. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 31, 319-336. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jrpe.1997.2186>
- Crocker, J., Canevello, A., & Lewis, K. A. (2017). Romantic Relationships in the Ecosystem: Compassionate Goals, Nonzero-Sum Beliefs, and Change in Relationship Quality. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 112, 58-75.

- <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspi0000076>
- David Schoorman, F., Mayer, R. C., & Davis, J. H. (2016). Empowerment in Veterinary Clinics: The Role of Trust in Delegation. *Journal of Trust Research*, 6, 76-90. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21515581.2016.1153479>
- DeBruine, L. M. (2002). Facial Resemblance Enhances Trust. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences*, 269, 1307-1312. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2002.2034>
- Deutsch, M. (1958). Trust and Suspicion. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 2, 265-279. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002200275800200401>
- Dunning, D., Anderson, J. E., Schlösser, T., Ehlebracht, D., & Fetchenhauer, D. (2014). Trust at Zero Acquaintance: More a Matter of Respect than Expectation of Reward. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 107, 122-141. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0036673>
- Ekehammar, B. (1974). Interactionism in Personality from a Historical Perspective. *Psychological Bulletin*, 81, 1026-1048. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0037457>
- Elgar, F. J., & Aitken, N. (2011). Income Inequality, Trust and Homicide in 33 Countries. *European Journal of Public Health*, 21, 241-246. <https://doi.org/10.1093/eurpub/ckq068>
- Endler, N. S., & Magnusson, D. (1976). Toward an Interactional Psychology of Personality. *Psychological Bulletin*, 83, 956-974. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.83.5.956>
- Evans, A. M., & Krueger, J. I. (2011). Elements of Trust: Risk and Perspective-Taking. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 47, 171-177. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2010.08.007>
- Fehr, E. (2009). On the Economics and Biology of Trust. *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 7, 235-266. <https://doi.org/10.1162/jeea.2009.7.2-3.235>
- Fiske, S. T., Cuddy, A. J. C., & Glick, P. (2007). Universal Dimensions of Social Cognition: Warmth and Competence. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 11, 77-83. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2006.11.005>
- Fleeson, W., & Jayawickreme, E. (2015). Whole Trait Theory. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 56, 82-92. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2014.10.009>
- Fleeson, W., & Leicht, C. (2006). On Delineating and Integrating the Study of Variability and Stability in Personality Psychology: Interpersonal Trust as Illustration. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 40, 5-20. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2005.08.004>
- Fleeson, W., & Noflie, E. (2008). The End of the Person-Situation Debate: An Emerging Synthesis in the Answer to the Consistency Question. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 2, 1667-1684. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9004.2008.00122.x>
- Gerpott, F. H., Balliet, D., Columbus, S., Molho, C., & de Vries, R. E. (2018). How Do People Think about Interdependence? A Multidimensional Model of Subjective Outcome Interdependence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 115, 716-742. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000166>
- Goodwin, G. P. (2015). Moral Character in Person Perception. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 24, 38-44. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721414550709>
- Goodwin, G. P., Piazza, J., & Rozin, P. (2014). Moral Character Predominates in Person Perception and Evaluation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 106, 148-168. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0034726>
- Hommelhoff, S., & Richter, D. (2017). Refuting the Cliché of the Distrustful Manager. *European Management Journal*, 35, 164-173. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2016.06.007>
- Jones, W. H., Couch, L. L., & Scott, S. (1997). Trust and Betrayal: The Psychology of Getting Along and Getting Ahead. In R. Hogan, J. A. Johnson, & S. R. Briggs (Eds.), *Handbook of Personality Psychology* (pp. 465-482). Elsevier. <https://doi.org/10.1016/b978-012134645-4/50020-2>
- Jost, J. T., Glaser, J., Kruglanski, A. W., & Sulloway, F. J. (2003). Political Conservatism as Motivated Social Cognition. *Psychological Bulletin*, 129, 339-375. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.129.3.339>
- Kelley, H. H., & Thibaut, J. W. (1978). *Interpersonal Relations: A Theory of Interdependence*. Wiley.
- Kelley, H. H., Holmes, J. G., Kerr, N. L., Reis, H. T., Rusbult, C. E., & van Lange, P. A. M. (2003). *An Atlas of Interpersonal Situations*. Cambridge University Press.
- Kenrick, D. T., & Funder, D. C. (1988). Profiting from Controversy: Lessons from the Person Situation Debate. *American Psychologist*, 43, 23-34. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066x.43.1.23>
- Kramer, R. M. (1999). Trust and Distrust in Organizations: Emerging Perspectives, Enduring Questions. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 50, 569-598. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.50.1.569>
- Kuper, N., Modersitzki, N., Phan, L. V., & Rauthmann, J. F. (2021). The Dynamics, Processes, Mechanisms, and Functioning of Personality: An Overview of the Field. *British Journal of Psychology*, 112, 1-51. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjop.12486>

- Lammers, J., Galinsky, A. D., Dubois, D., & Rucker, D. D. (2015). Power and Morality. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 6, 15-19. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2015.03.018>
- Landy, J. F., Piazza, J., & Goodwin, G. P. (2016). When It's Bad to Be Friendly and Smart: The Desirability of Sociability and Competence Depends on Morality. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 42, 1272-1290. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167216655984>
- Larzelere, R. E., & Huston, T. L. (1980). The Dyadic Trust Scale: Toward Understanding Interpersonal Trust in Close Relationships. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 42, 595-601. <https://doi.org/10.2307/351903>
- Lewicki, R. J., & Tomlinson, E. C. (2014). Trust, Trust Development, and Trust Repair. In P. T. Coleman, M. Deutsch, & E. C. Marcus (Eds.), *The Handbook of Conflict Resolution: Theory and Practice* (pp. 104-136). Jossey-Bass. <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2013-42744-005>
- Lewicki, R. J., McAllister, D. J., & Bies, R. J. (1998). Trust and Distrust: New Relationships and Realities. *The Academy of Management Review*, 23, 438-458. <https://doi.org/10.2307/259288>
- Lewin, K. (1936). *Principles of Topological Psychology*. McGraw-Hill.
- Martin, J. M., Gonzalez, C., Juvina, I., & Lebiere, C. (2014). A Description-Experience Gap in Social Interactions: Information about Interdependence and Its Effects on Cooperation. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, 27, 349-362. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bdm.1810>
- Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H., & Schoorman, F. D. (1995). An Integrative Model of Organizational Trust. *The Academy of Management Review*, 20, 709-734. <https://doi.org/10.2307/258792>
- McAllister, D. J. (1995). Affect- and Cognition-Based Trust as Foundations for Interpersonal Cooperation in Organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38, 24-59. <https://doi.org/10.2307/256727>
- McKnight, D. H., Cummings, L. L., & Chervany, N. L. (1998). Initial Trust Formation in New Organizational Relationships. *The Academy of Management Review*, 23, 473-490. <https://doi.org/10.2307/259290>
- Mikulincer, M., & Shaver, P. R. (2003). The Attachment Behavioral System in Adulthood: Activation, Psychodynamics, and Interpersonal Processes. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (pp. 53-152). Elsevier. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0065-2601\(03\)01002-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0065-2601(03)01002-5)
- Möllerling, G. (2001). The Nature of Trust: From Georg Simmel to a Theory of Expectation, Interpretation and Suspension. *Sociology*, 35, 403-420. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0038038501000190>
- Mooijman, M., van Dijk, W. W., Ellemers, N., & van Dijk, E. (2015). Why Leaders Punish: A Power Perspective. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 109, 75-89. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspi0000021>
- Mooijman, M., van Dijk, W. W., van Dijk, E., & Ellemers, N. (2019). Leader Power, Power Stability, and Interpersonal Trust. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 152, 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2019.03.009>
- Murphy, R. O., Ackermann, K. A., & Handgraaf, M. J. J. (2011). Measuring Social Value Orientation (SVO). *Judgment and Decision Making*, 6, 771-781. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s1930297500004204>
- Murray, H. A. (1938). *Explorations in Personality*. Oxford University Press.
- Murray, S. L., & Holmes, J. G. (2009). The Architecture of Interdependent Minds: A Motivation-Management Theory of Mutual Responsiveness. *Psychological Review*, 116, 908-928. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0017015>
- Murray, S. L., & Holmes, J. G. (2011). Trust as Motivational Gatekeeper in Adult Romantic Relationships. In L. M. Horowitz, & S. Strack (Eds.), *Handbook of Interpersonal Psychology: Theory, Research, and Therapeutic Interventions* (pp. 193-208). Wiley.
- Pletzer, J. L., Balliet, D., Joireman, J., Kuhlman, D. M., Voelpel, S. C., & Van Lange, P. A. M. (2018). Social Value Orientation, Expectations, and Cooperation in Social Dilemmas: A Meta-Analysis. *European Journal of Personality*, 32, 62-83. <https://doi.org/10.1002/per.2139>
- Rai, T. S., & Fiske, A. P. (2011). Moral Psychology Is Relationship Regulation: Moral Motives for Unity, Hierarchy, Equality, and Proportionality. *Psychological Review*, 118, 57-75. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0021867>
- Rauthmann, J. F. (2021). *The Handbook of Personality Dynamics and Processes*. Elsevier Academic Press.
- Reis, H. T., & Shaver, P. R. (1988). Intimacy as an Interpersonal Process. In S. W. Duck, F. D. Hay, S. E. Hobfoll, W. Ickes, & B. M. Montgomery (Eds.), *Handbook of Personal Relationships: Theory, Research and Interventions* (pp. 369-389). Wiley.
- Rempel, J. K., Holmes, J. G., & Zanna, M. P. (1985). Trust in Close Relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 49, 95-112. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.49.1.95>
- Romano, A., Balliet, D., Yamagishi, T., & Liu, J. H. (2017). Parochial Trust and Cooperation across 17 Societies. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 114, 12702-12707. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1712921114>
- Rotter, J. B. (1980). Interpersonal Trust, Trustworthiness, and Gullibility. *American Psychologist*, 35, 1-7.

- <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066x.35.1.1>
- Rousseau, D. M., Sitkin, S. B., Burt, R. S., & Camerer, C. (1998). Not So Different after All: A Cross-Discipline View of Trust. *Academy of Management Review*, 23, 393-404. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1998.926617>
- Różycka-Tran, J., Boski, P., & Wojciszke, B. (2015). Belief in a Zero-Sum Game as a Social Axiom. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 46, 525-548. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022115572226>
- Rusbult, C. E., & Van Lange, P. A. M. (2003). Interdependence, Interaction, and Relationships. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 54, 351-375. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.54.101601.145059>
- Rusbult, C. E., & Van Lange, P. A. M. (2008). Why We Need Interdependence Theory. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 2, 2049-2070. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9004.2008.00147.x>
- Rusbult, C. E., Wieselquist, J., Foster, C. A., & Witcher, B. S. (1999). Commitment and Trust in Close Relationships: An Inter-Dependence Analysis. In J. M. Adams, & W. H. Jones (Eds.), *Handbook of Interpersonal Commitment and Relationship Stability* (pp. 427-449). Springer US. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4615-4773-0_25
- Schilke, O., Reimann, M., & Cook, K. S. (2015). Power Decreases Trust in Social Exchange. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 112, 12950-12955. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1517057112>
- Scholl, A., de Wit, F., Ellemers, N., Fetterman, A. K., Sassenberg, K., & Scheepers, D. (2018). The Burden of Power: Construing Power as Responsibility (Rather than as Opportunity) Alters Threat-Challenge Responses. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 44, 1024-1038. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167218757452>
- Simpson, J. A. (2007). Psychological Foundations of Trust. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 16, 264-268. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8721.2007.00517.x>
- Stavrova, O., & Ehlebracht, D. (2016). Cynical Beliefs about Human Nature and Income: Longitudinal and Cross-Cultural Analyses. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 110, 116-132. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000050>
- Triandis, H. C. (1995). *Individualism and Collectivism*. Westview.
- Van Lange, P. A. M. (2015). Generalized Trust: Four Lessons from Genetics and Culture. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 24, 71-76. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721414552473>
- Van Lange, P. A. M., & Balliet, D. (2015). Interdependence Theory. In M. Mikulincer, P. R. Shaver, J. A. Simpson, & J. F. Dovidio (Eds.), *APA Handbook of Personality and Social Psychology, Volume 3: Interpersonal Relations* (pp. 65-92). American Psychological Association. <https://doi.org/10.1037/14344-003>
- Van Lange, P. A. M., & Rusbult, C. E. (2012). Interdependence Theory. In P. A. M. van Lange, A. W. Kruglanski, & E. T. Higgins (Eds.), *Handbook of Theories of Social Psychology* (pp. 251-272). Sage Publications Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446249222.n39>
- Van Lange, P. A. M., Ouwerkerk, J. W., & Tazelaar, M. J. A. (2002). How to Overcome the Detrimental Effects of Noise in Social Interaction: The Benefits of Generosity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82, 768-780. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.82.5.768>
- Van Prooijen, J. W., & van Lange, P. A. M. (2014). Power, Politics, and Paranoia: An Introduction. In J. W. van Prooijen, & P. A. M. van Lange (Eds.), *Power, Politics, and Paranoia: Why People Are Suspicious of Their Leaders* (pp. 1-14). Cambridge University Press.
- Yamagishi, T. (1988). The Provision of a Sanctioning System in the United States and Japan. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 51, 265-271. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2786924>
- Yamagishi, T., & Yamagishi, M. (1994). Trust and Commitment in the United States and Japan. *Motivation and Emotion*, 18, 129-166. <https://doi.org/10.1007/bf02249397>
- Yamagishi, T., Cook, K. S., & Watabe, M. (1998a). Uncertainty, Trust, and Commitment Formation in the United States and Japan. *American Journal of Sociology*, 104, 165-194. <https://doi.org/10.1086/210005>
- Yamagishi, T., Jin, N., & Miller, A. S. (1998b). In-Group Bias and Culture of Collectivism. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 1, 315-328. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-839x.00020>
- Yuki, M., Maddux, W. W., Brewer, M. B., & Takemura, K. (2005). Cross-Cultural Differences in Relationship- and Group-Based Trust. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 31, 48-62. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167204271305>