

# GENERAL TRUST SCALE

## Reference:

Yamagishi, T. & Yamagishi, M. (1994). Trust and commitment in the United States and Japan. *Motivation and Emotion, 18*, 129-166.

## Description of Measure:

A 6-item questionnaire that uses general statements to measure participants' beliefs about honesty and trustworthiness of others, in general. Some of these items come from Yamagishi's (1986) Trust Scale.

## Abstracts of Selected Related Articles:

Yamagishi, T. (1986). The provisioning of a sanctioning system as a public good. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51*, 110-116.

Both the rational-structural approach and the goal/expectation approach to the problem of public goods have theoretical difficulties. The structural approach requires the provision of a sanctioning system to solve the free rider problem. However, a sanctioning system is also a public good because its benefits can be enjoyed by all members regardless of their contribution to its provision. A new problem of the same kind is thereby created in the process of solving the original public good problem. The goal/expectation approach assumes the inducement of other members to mutual cooperation through individuals' cooperative actions, a situation which will be almost impossible in larger groups. To overcome these theoretical difficulties in the existing approaches, a new approach called the structural goal/expectation approach is proposed. According to this new approach, members who have realized the undesirable consequence of free riding and the importance of mutual cooperation will cooperate to establish a sanctioning system which assures other members' cooperation instead of trying to induce other members into mutual cooperation directly through cooperative actions. One important condition for their voluntary cooperation in the establishment of a sanctioning system is their realization that voluntarily based cooperation is impossible. Predictions derived from the new approach are supported in an experiment using 48 four-person groups.

Levi, M. & Stoker, L. (2000). Political trust and trustworthiness. *Annual Review of Political Science, 3*, 475-507.

After addressing the meaning of "trust" and "trustworthiness," we review survey-based research on citizens' judgments of trust in governments and politicians, and historical and comparative case study research on political trust and government trustworthiness. We first provide an overview of research in these two traditions, and then take up four topics in more detail: (a) political trust and political participation; (b) political trust, public opinion, and the vote; (c) political trust, trustworthy government, and citizen compliance; and (d) political trust, social trust, and cooperation. We conclude with a discussion of fruitful directions for future research.

Kramer, R. M. (1999). Trust and distrust in organizations: Emerging perspectives, enduring questions. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 50, 569-598.

Scholarly interest in the study of trust and distrust in organizations has grown dramatically over the past five years. This interest has been fueled, at least in part, by accumulating evidence that trust has a number of important benefits for organizations and their members. A primary aim of this review is to assess the state of this rapidly growing literature. The review examines recent progress in conceptualizing trust and distrust in organizational theory, and also summarizes evidence regarding the myriad benefits of trust within organizational systems. The review also describes different forms of trust found in organizations, and the antecedent conditions that produce them. Although the benefits of trust are well-documented, creating and sustaining trust is often difficult. Accordingly, the chapter concludes by examining some of the psychological, social, and institutional barriers to the production of trust.

**Scale:**

Using the following scale, please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements:

1 <i>Strongly Disagree</i>	2 <i>Disagree</i>	3 <i>Neutral</i>	4 <i>Agree</i>	5 <i>Strongly Agree</i>
-------------------------------	----------------------	---------------------	-------------------	----------------------------

- 1.) Most people are basically honest.
- 2.) Most people are trustworthy.
- 3.) Most people are basically good and kind.
- 4.) Most people are trustful of others.
- 5.) I am trustful.
- 6.) Most people will respond in kind when they are trusted by others.

**Scoring:**

The score for each item is averaged together to form a continuous measure of generalized trust.

# TRUST SCALE

## Reference:

Yamagishi, T. (1986). The provisioning of a sanctioning system as a public good. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51, 110-116.

## Description of Measure

A 5-item questionnaire designed to measure an individual's general level of trust toward other people. It is specifically designed to measure two of the main factors that form general trust: (1) belief that other people are basically honest and (2) belief that trusting others is risky. The items from this scale come partially from Yamagishi and Sato's (1986) Fear scale and partially from Yamagishi and Sato's (1986) trust scale.

## Abstracts of Selected Related Articles:

Yamagishi, T. & Sato, K. (1986). Motivational bases of the public goods problem. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 50, 67-73.

Two motivational bases for not contributing to a public good, desire to free ride (or greed) and fear of being a "sucker," were experimentally compared; 110 Japanese undergraduates served as subjects. It was hypothesized that these two types of motivation would be activated under different situations. When a public good was provided conjunctively, fear would have a strong effect but greed would not; when a public good was disjunctively provided, greed would have a strong effect but fear would not. In addition, this prediction was expected to hold when subjects are total strangers, and that the greater mutual trust existing among friends would make them contribute more than strangers would in the conjunctive condition but would make no difference in the disjunctive condition. Three types of "production rules," in which a public good is conjunctively, disjunctively, or additively produced on the basis of members' contributions, were experimentally created. Half of the groups in each condition consisted of total strangers, and the other half consisted of friends. The hypotheses were supported when the size of the public good (bonus points) was relatively large. Also, subjects responded similarly in the conjunctive condition and in the additive condition.

Yamagishi, T. & Yamagishi, M. (1994). Trust and commitment in the United States and Japan. *Motivation and Emotion*, 18, 129-166.

A distinction is proposed between trust as a cognitive bias in the evaluation of incomplete information about the (potential) interaction partner and assurance as a perception of the incentive structure that leads the interaction partner to act cooperatively. It is hypothesized that trust in this sense helps people to move out of mutually committed relations where the partner's cooperation is assured. Although commitment formation is a rather standard solution to the problems caused by social uncertainty, commitment becomes a liability rather than an asset as opportunity costs increase. Facing increasing opportunity costs, trust

provides a springboard in the attempt to break psychological inertia that has been mobilized to maintain committed relations. In conjunction with an assumption that networks of mutually committed relations play a more prominent role in Japanese society than in American society, this hypothesis has been applied to predict a set of cross-national differences between the United States and Japan in the levels of trust and related factors. The results of a cross-national questionnaire survey (with 1,136 Japanese and 501 American respondents) support most of the predictions, and indicate that, in comparison to Japanese respondents, American respondents are more trusting of other people in general, consider reputation more important, and consider themselves more honest and fair. In contrast, Japanese respondents see more utility in dealing with others through personal relations.

Kollock, P. (1998). Social dilemmas: The anatomy of cooperation. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 24, 183-214.

The study of social dilemmas is the study of the tension between individual and collective rationality. In a social dilemma, individually reasonable behavior leads to a situation in which everyone is worse off. The first part of this review is a discussion of categories of social dilemmas and how they are modeled. The key two-person social dilemmas (Prisoner's Dilemma, Assurance, Chicken) and multiple-person social dilemmas (public goods dilemmas and commons dilemmas) are examined. The second part is an extended treatment of possible solutions for social dilemmas. These solutions are organized into three broad categories based on whether the solutions assume egoistic actors and whether the structure of the situation can be changed: Motivational solutions assume actors are not completely egoistic and so give some weight to the outcomes of their partners. Strategic solutions assume egoistic actors, and neither of these categories of solutions involve changing the fundamental structure of the situation. Solutions that do involve changing the rules of the game are considered in the section on structural solutions. I conclude the review with a discussion of current research and directions for future work.

**Scale:**

Using the following scale, please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements:

1 <i>Strongly Disagree</i>	2 <i>Disagree</i>	3 <i>Neutral</i>	4 <i>Agree</i>	5 <i>Strongly Agree</i>
-------------------------------	----------------------	---------------------	-------------------	----------------------------

- 1.) Most people tell a lie when they can benefit by doing so.
- 2.) Those devoted to unselfish causes are often exploited by others.
- 3.) Some people do not cooperate because they pursue only their own short-term self-interest. Thus, things that can be done well if people cooperate often fail because of these people.
- 4.) Most people are basically honest (R).
- 5.) There will be more people who will not work if the social security system is developed further.

**Scoring:**

Item 4 is reverse scored. Items 1 and 4 make up the “belief that other people are basically honest” factor. Items 2, 3, and 5 make up the “belief that trusting others is risky” factor. Scoring is kept continuous.

# TRUST IN CLOSE RELATIONSHIPS SCALE

## Reference:

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

## Description of Measure:

A 17-item measure designed to gauge levels of trust in one's relationship partner. Each item is answered based on a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

The scale can be divided up into the following subscales:

- 1.) Predictability
- 2.) Dependability
- 3.) Faith

## Abstracts of Selected Related Articles:

Bradbury, T. N. & Fincham, F. D. (1990). Attributions in marriage: Review and critique.  
*Psychological Bulletin, 107*, 3-33.

The prevailing behavioral account of marriage must be expanded to include covert processes. This article therefore examines the attributions or explanations that spouses make for marital events. A review indicates that dissatisfied spouses, compared with satisfied spouses, make attributions for the partner's behavior that cast it in a negative light. Experimental, clinical outcome, and longitudinal data suggest further that attributions may influence marital satisfaction. Rival hypotheses for these findings are examined. Because continued empirical development in this domain depends on conceptual progress, a framework is presented that integrates attributions, behavior, and marital satisfaction. This framework points to several topics that require systematic study, and specific hypotheses are offered for research on these topics. It is concluded that the promising start made toward understanding marital attributions holds considerable potential for enriching behavioral conceptions of marriage.

Ryan, R. M. (1995). Psychological needs and the facilitation of integrative processes.  
*Journal of Personality, 63*, 397-427.

The assumption that there are innate integrative or actualizing tendencies underlying personality and social development is reexamined. Rather than viewing such processes as either nonexistent or as automatic, I argue that they are dynamic and dependent upon social-contextual supports pertaining to basic human psychological needs. To develop this viewpoint, I conceptually link the notion of integrative tendencies to specific developmental processes, namely intrinsic motivation; internalization; and emotional integration. These processes are then shown to be facilitated by conditions that fulfill psychological needs for autonomy, competence, and relatedness, and forestalled within contexts that

frustrate these needs. Interactions between psychological needs and contextual supports account, in part, for the domain and situational specificity of motivation, experience, and relative integration. The meaning of psychological needs (vs. wants) is directly considered, as are the relations between concepts of integration and autonomy and those of independence, individualism, efficacy, and cognitive models of "multiple selves."

Yamagishi, T. (1986). The provisioning of a sanctioning system as a public good. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51, 110-116.

Both the rational-structural approach and the goal/expectation approach to the problem of public goods have theoretical difficulties. The structural approach requires the provision of a sanctioning system to solve the free rider problem. However, a sanctioning system is also a public good because its benefits can be enjoyed by all members regardless of their contribution to its provision. A new problem of the same kind is thereby created in the process of solving the original public good problem. The goal/expectation approach assumes the inducement of other members to mutual cooperation through individuals' cooperative actions, a situation which will be almost impossible in larger groups. To overcome these theoretical difficulties in the existing approaches, a new approach called the structural goal/expectation approach is proposed. According to this new approach, members who have realized the undesirable consequence of free riding and the importance of mutual cooperation will cooperate to establish a sanctioning system which assures other members' cooperation instead of trying to induce other members into mutual cooperation directly through cooperative actions. One important condition for their voluntary cooperation in the establishment of a sanctioning system is their realization that voluntarily based cooperation is impossible. Predictions derived from the new approach are supported in an experiment using 48 four-person groups.

**Scale:**

(taken from <http://www.yorku.ca/rokada/psyctest/trust.doc>)

**Instructions:**

Using the 7 point scale shown below, indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements as they relate to someone with whom you have a close interpersonal relationship. Place your rating in the box to the right of the statement.

Strongly Disagree			Neutral			Strongly Agree
-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3



1. My partner has proven to be trustworthy and I am willing to let him/her engage in activities which other partners find too threatening.  D
2. Even when I don't know how my partner will react, I feel comfortable telling him/her anything about myself, even those things of which I am ashamed.  F
3. Though times may change and the future is uncertain, I know my partner will always be ready and willing to offer me strength and support.  F
4. I am never certain that my partner won't do something that I dislike or will embarrass me.  P
5. My partner is very unpredictable. I never know how he/she is going to act from one day to the next.  P
6. I feel very uncomfortable when my partner has to make decisions which will affect me personally.  P
7. I have found that my partner is unusually dependable, especially when it comes to things which are important to me.  D
8. My partner behaves in a very consistent manner.  P
9. Whenever we have to make an important decision in a situation we have never encountered before, I know my partner will be concerned about my welfare.  F
10. Even if I have no reason to expect my partner to share things with me, I still feel certain that he/she will.  F
11. I can rely on my partner to react in a positive way when I expose my weaknesses to him/her.  F
12. When I share my problems with my partner, I know he/she will respond in a loving way even before I say anything.  F
13. I am certain that my partner would not cheat on me, even if the opportunity arose and there was no chance that he/she would get caught.  D
14. I sometimes avoid my partner because he/she is unpredictable and I fear saying or doing something which might create conflict.  P
15. I can rely on my partner to keep the promises he/she makes to me.  D
16. When I am with my partner, I feel secure in facing unknown new situations.  F
17. Even when my partner makes excuses which sound rather unlikely, I am confident that he/she is telling the truth.  D

### Scoring

The items marked with a D are the Dependency items. Items marked with an F are the Faith items, and Items marked with a P are the Predictability items.

One can score the questionnaire based on the 3 subscales separately, or combine the subscales to create an overall trust in close relationships score.

# TRUST IN PEOPLE SCALE

## Reference:

*1964 Election Study*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Inter-University Consortium for Political Research, University of Michigan.

## Description of Measure:

A 3-item questionnaire designed to measure individuals' general level of trust toward other people. The three items were first used in the 1964 post-election study conducted by the Survey Research Center and have continued to be used in national surveys since. Each of the three items provides a dichotomous choice. One of the two choices is the high trust response, the other is considered the low trust response.

## Abstracts of Selected Related Articles:

Hetherington, M. J. (1998). The political relevance of political trust. *The American Political Science Review*, *92*, 791-808.

Scholars have debated the importance of declining political trust to the American political system. By primarily treating trust as a dependent variable, however, scholars have systematically underestimated its relevance. This study establishes the importance of trust by demonstrating that it is simultaneously related to measures of both specific and diffuse support. In fact, trust's effect on feelings about the incumbent president, a measure of specific support, is even stronger than the reverse. This provides a fundamentally different understanding of the importance of declining political trust in recent years. Rather than simply a reflection of dissatisfaction with political leaders, declining trust is a powerful cause of this dissatisfaction. Low trust helps create a political environment in which it is more difficult for leaders to succeed.

Yamagishi, T. (1986). The provisioning of a sanctioning system as a public good. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *51*, 110-116.

Both the rational-structural approach and the goal/expectation approach to the problem of public goods have theoretical difficulties. The structural approach requires the provision of a sanctioning system to solve the free rider problem. However, a sanctioning system is also a public good because its benefits can be enjoyed by all members regardless of their contribution to its provision. A new problem of the same kind is thereby created in the process of solving the original public good problem. The goal/expectation approach assumes the inducement of other members to mutual cooperation through individuals' cooperative actions, a situation which will be almost impossible in larger groups. To overcome these theoretical difficulties in the existing approaches, a new approach called the structural goal/expectation approach is proposed. According to this new approach, members who have realized the undesirable consequence of free riding and the importance of mutual cooperation will cooperate to establish a sanctioning system which assures other members' cooperation instead of trying to induce other members

into mutual cooperation directly through cooperative actions, One important condition for their voluntary cooperation in the establishment of a sanctioning system is their realization that voluntarily based cooperation is impossible. Predictions derived from the new approach are supported in an experiment using 48 four-person groups.

Levi, M. & Stoker, L. (2000). Political trust and trustworthiness. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 3, 475-507.

After addressing the meaning of “trust” and “trustworthiness,” we review survey-based research on citizens' judgments of trust in governments and politicians, and historical and comparative case study research on political trust and government trustworthiness. We first provide an overview of research in these two traditions, and then take up four topics in more detail: (a) political trust and political participation; (b) political trust, public opinion, and the vote; (c) political trust, trustworthy government, and citizen compliance; and (d) political trust, social trust, and cooperation. We conclude with a discussion of fruitful directions for future research.

### Scale:

- 1.) Generally speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted or that you can't be too careful in dealing with people?  
  
(a) Most people can be trusted (b) can't be too careful
- 2.) Would you say that most of the time, people try to be helpful, or that they are mostly just looking out for themselves?  
  
(a) Try to be helpful (b) Look out for themselves.
- 3.) Do you think that most people would try to take advantage of you if they got the chance or would they try to be fair?  
  
(a) Take advantage (b) Try to be fair

### Scoring:

The high trust choices are 1a, 2a, and 3b. For each one of these give respondent 1 point. Thus, all respondents will have a score ranging from 0 to 3, with 0 signifying a very low level of trust and 3 signifying a very high level of trust.