Millennials' Expectation of Trust for Supervisors and Coworkers in the Workplace

By

Miwa Ito

Submitted to the graduate degree program in Communication Studies
and the Graduate Faculty of the University of Kansas in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts.

_____

Chairperson Dr. Tracy Russo

_____

Dr. Suzy D'Enbeau

_____

Dr. Alesia Woszidlo

Date Defended: July 12th, 2011

The Thesis Committee for Miwa Ito

certifies that this is the approved version of the following thesis:

Millennials' Expectation of Trust for Supervisors and Coworkers in the Workplace

_____

Chairperson Dr. Tracy Russo

Date approved: July 26th, 2011

Abstract

Trust has been studied as a significant factor to facilitate organizational communication and outcomes for both individuals and organizations. The purpose of this study was to explore trust in organizational relationships, focusing on Millennials, the most recent generation to enter the workplace. This study investigated 98 Millennial college students at a large Midwestern university, examining their overall propensity to trust, expectations of trust for supervisors and coworkers in their future workplaces, and the degree of formality they expect to encounter in workplace relationships. Findings indicated the participants had higher levels of expectations for trust in workplace relationships than trust in general. Furthermore, they expected to have higher degrees of trust and formality for supervisors than for coworkers. This empirical research contributes to a better understanding of Millennials, who will represent a significant proportion of the workplace population in coming years.

Acknowledgments

A few years ago, I never imagined that I could write an academic thesis, but now, I have completed this one thanks to many people's support. First, I extend my deepest appreciation to my advisor and committee chair Dr. Tracy Russo for all her exceptional support. Dr. Russo always respected my view, maximized my potential, and guided me in directions that have worked best for me. Throughout more than two and a half years, she has helped me grow to an academic level far beyond my expectations. I will never forget her great accommodations and countless words of warm encouragement that allowed me to keep going onwards. She has taught me what it means to be an excellent teacher, scholar, and communicator. An encounter with her is one of the most fortunate things that have happened in my life.

Without help of my committee members, Dr. Suzy D'Enbeau and Dr. Alesia Woszidlo, I would have never finished this thesis project given my extremely tight schedule. I highly appreciate their expertise and advice that complemented my work. Helpful suggestions from Dr. D'Enbeau deepened my discussions with distinctive insights and enhanced the quality of my thesis. I also learned so much from Dr. Woszidlo in such a short period, which greatly helped me successfully complete data collection and analyses on time.

Moreover, I extend my gratitude to my family. My parents, Masayoshi Ito and Mitsue Ito, never hesitated to send me on an unpredictable journey and have always loved me most in the world. Thanks to my brother and sister-in-law, Shigeru and Junko Ito, I have been able to live far away from Japan without worry. I am also grateful to many people in both U.S.A. and Japan who provided useful advice, helped me focus on my study, and warmly encouraged me to pursue my goal. Lastly, my special thanks and love go to my husband Tomotoshi Ito, who chose to support me from a great distance in order to realize my dream, rather than asking me to be with him.

Table of Contexts

Introduction

The significance of trust in organizational contexts has been widely acknowledged and has attracted the attention of many organizational communication scholars. Trust is a key element in effective communication in organizations, influencing both the organization's operation and the experience of its employees (Hosmer, 1995; Rawlins, Indivik & Johnson, 2008; Whitener, Brodt, Korsgaard, & Werner, 1998). Trust has been identified as an important component influencing key organizational outcomes (Dirks & Ferrin, 2002), including job satisfaction, intention to remain with the organization, and organizational identification (Kramer, 2011; Robinson, 1996; Robinson & Rousseau, 1994). Research indicates that trust operates to influence an employee's sense of connectedness to the organization and as a contributor to positive organizational performance (Dirks & Ferrin, 2002; Ellis & Shockley-Zalabak, 2001).

While there is a large variety of definitions of trust in accordance with the long history of studies in the field, a definition given by Mayer, Davis and Schoorman (1995) is one of the most quoted in literature and comprehensively describes characteristics of interpersonal trust: "the willingness of a party to be vulnerable to the actions of another party based on the expectation that the other will perform a particular action important to the trustor, irrespective of the ability to monitor or control that other party" (p. 712). This definition captures the key components of trust: vulnerability, benevolence, and dependency of the trustor on the other individual.

Trust plays a key role for both management and individual employees as they seek to achieve their objectives. The role of trust in establishing a productive working environment also brings trust to the forefront of organizational concern. As management works to respond to the evolving challenges of globalization and the worldwide recession (Reynolds, Bush, & Geist, 2008), trust is increasingly important in terms of various organizational challenges and contexts,

including workforce diversity, organizational change, and self-directed work teams (Mayer et al., 1995). Organizations can be perceived as complex systems in which relationships at the individual level include authority, communication, work roles, and interpersonal relationships (Conrad & Poole, 2005). Information, skills, and resources must be shared among parties involved in the system so that the organization can achieve its objectives (Cheney, Christensen, Zorn, & Ganesh, 2004). For example, in these contexts of organizational change, employees may see if their superiors and their messages are trustworthy or not based on how the superiors communicate about an organizational change. For example, as Miller and Monge (1985) found, employees would rather have negative information about an organizational change than no information. Thus, employees' expectation of and response to downward communication by their immediate superiors is connected with employees' trust toward the superiors. Employees are likely to trust superiors who are willing to share negative information in organizational change, and their trust leads them to give the superiors accurate information (Larkin & Larkin, 1996). Another focused contemporary context in which trust serves an important role is computer-mediated communication, which limits nonverbal cues (Jarvenpaa, & Leidner, 1999) and in which trust must often be assessed without face-to-face interaction. In all these contexts, as in the everyday operation of an organization, the degree to which organizational members trust one another influences their communication, their experiences, and the organization's outcomes.

Learning whom to trust is quite meaningful for individual workers and especially for newcomers to organizations and the professional workplace. The workplace is full of uncertainty especially for new workers because they are not yet fully equipped to deal with their duties without seeking others' cooperation. Further, an increasing proportion of work in contemporary

organizations requires teamwork and collaboration, in which members are dependent upon one another. Vulnerability, one of the key dimensions of trust, demands the trustor take a risk to trust others.

The cohort of new workers currently entering the workplace, labeled Millennials, are the latest to face the challenge of assessing and evaluating trust at work. Although there is relatively little academic research about the Millennials, the popular press has argued that the generation has different work values, attitudes, expectations, and communicative behaviors than other generations (Loughlin & Barling, 2001; Rawlins, et al., 2008; Reynolds et al., 2008). In particular, Trzesniewski and Donnellan (2010) reported that Millennials are less trusting overall than high school seniors were in the 1970s. This same group also is more cynical about the trustworthiness of institutions. It is appropriate to examine specifically the expectations Millennials have about the levels of trust they will encounter in the professional workplaces they are about to enter.

The next section reviews the literature on the dimensions of trust, trust building, and characteristics of Millennials.

Literature Review

This review of literature begins with framing the concept of trust based on four elements: definition of trust, developing trust, dimensions of trust, and interdependency of trust. Then, it presents literature on two specific topics that the current study focused on: trust in superior-subordinate relationships and in peer relationships and Millennials in the workplace.

Definition of Trust

Studies on trust span many fields: psychology, sociology, political science, economics, anthropology, philosophy, computer science, and organizational behavior (Kasper-Fuehrer &

Ashkanasy, 2001; Lewicki, McAllister, & Bies, 1998) and have a long history.

Rotter (1967), one of the early theorists in the field, defined interpersonal trust as the "expectancy held by an individual or a group that the word, promise, verbal or written statement of another individual or group can be relied upon" (p. 651). Trust relationships are dyadically framed and involve an asymmetry of power exercised by the trustee over the trustor (Brien, 1998, p. 399). Mayer et al. (1995) claimed that the propensity to trust (Rotter, 1967) is a personality trait of the *trustor*, which is also related to his/her general likeliness to take or avoid risks. According to Mayer et al. (1995), the level of trust earned by the *trustee* is influenced by two factors: expertise and trustworthiness, which are based on the motivation (or lack thereof) to lie. Characteristics of trustworthiness included by Rawlins et al. (2008) include benevolence, competence, honesty, integrity, reliability, predictability, good judgment, concerned, and openness.

Dimensions of Trust

Scholars have categorized dimensions of trust in various ways. Ellis and Shockley-Zalabak (2001) mentioned four dimensions of trust: competence, openness and honesty, leaders' concern for organizational members, and reliability. Mayer et al. (1995) proposed three characteristics of a trustee that were related to Ellis and Shockley-Zalabak's dimensions of trust: ability, benevolence, and integrity. Whitener, Brodt, Korsgaard, and Werner (1998) presented five dimensions of trustworthy behavior: behavioral consistency, behavioral integrity, sharing and delegating control, communication, and demonstration of concern. Rawlins (2008) integrated the dimensions of trust found in the literature into three: propensity to trust, vulnerability, and the characteristics of trustworthiness. Consistent among these dimensions are ability or competence, benevolence or concern for organizational members, and integrity or

honesty. The next section discusses these three dimensions.

Competency. Competency, as framed as expertise or ability, indicates the trustee's set of skills that can be perceived and depended upon by the trustor (Ellis & Shockley-Zalabak, 2001). Ability is defined as a "group of skills, competencies, and characteristics that enable a party to have influence within some specific domain" (Mayer et al., 1995, p. 717) and "the belief that a party has the ability to do what it says it will do" (Rawling, 2008, p. 5). According to these scholars, having a high level of competency is a strong factor to earn other's trust, but the effectiveness of competency depends on the type of tasks or situations because competency is domain-specific.

Benevolence. Benevolence represents how much the receiver of trust cares about the provider of trust and takes an interest in the trust provider's well-being and goals (Ellis & Shockley-Zalabak, 2001). Mayer et al. (1995) defined benevolence as "the extent to which a trustee is believed to want to do good to the truster, aside from an egocentric profit motive" (p. 718). Benevolence reflects the trust receiver's attachment to and positive perceptions toward the provider of trust.

Integrity. Integrity is "the belief that a party is fair and just" (Rawlins et al., 2008, p. 5) and that "the trustee adheres to a set of principles that the trustor finds acceptable" (Mayer et al., 1995, p. 719). Whitener et al. (1998) included behavioral integrity as a dimension of trustworthy behavior, and antecedents of integrity included two behaviors: telling the truth and keeping promises. Therefore, consistency between the trustee's words and deeds is required for demonstrating integrity.

Trust Building in Organizations

In organizational contexts, interpersonal relationships are "strategically developed to help individuals accomplish personal or professional goals" (Cheney et al., p. 154). According to Conrad and Poole (2005), interpersonal or organizational barriers may lead to perceptions of distrust in superior-subordinate relationships, possibly resulting in a reduction in the quality (amount and accuracy) of communication. Additionally, when organizational communication is made in written form, messages may be interpreted more differently than in face-to-face contexts due to the lack of nonverbal cues or the ability to ask questions. Individual perspectives may influence trust as well. As employees discuss information received from their superiors, their different interpretations may lead them to perceive their supervisors as untrustworthy (Albrecht & Bach, 1996). At its worst, these processes, especially taken together, continue to reduce trust in a downward spiral, heightening interpersonal barriers that cause individuals to select and filter both upward and downward communication.

Such barriers to the flow of information may reciprocally influence communicative behaviors of both parties. Robinson (1996) noted that the trustee's violation of the implicit psychological contract invites the trustor's negative response and results in a reciprocal decrease in trust. For example, subordinates may defend or protect themselves from untrustworthy superiors, while superiors may justify withholding information from subordinates. Supervisors can reverse the vicious cycle by "de-emphasizing status differences, training their subordinates in communication skills, rewarding their subordinates for keeping them informed, and encouraging them to seek clarification of ambiguous messages" (Conrad & Poole, 2005, p. 74). However, superiors often do the opposite and make negative responses that discourage subordinates' motivation to trust them. Subordinates may withhold negative information from

the superiors whom they do not trust, and they expect the superiors will also do the same. Further, failure in trust building can create conflict, and stress and burnout caused by conflict can affect individuals' performance (Cheney et al., 2004).

Superior-subordinate relationships are representative examples in which negative consequences of violation of trust may be seen (Gabarro & Kotter, 2005). For example, a superior may reduce his or her trust in a subordinate if the subordinate does not meet committed deadlines. As a result of the reduced trust, the subordinate gets fewer chances to be assigned to important tasks than others who are trusted, which means that he or she may lose opportunities including promotion and a raise in pay based on evaluation of performance. Lack of trust may further cause the supervisor to increase his or her control over the subordinate and disables the supervisor's delegation to the subordinate. The supervisor's work efficiency is impaired because he or she has to frequently monitor the untrusted subordinate and cannot entrust important tasks to the subordinate.

Whitener et al. (1998) identified three levels of variables as antecedents that encourage managerial trustworthy behavior: (1) organizational factors, (2) relational factors, and (3) individual factors. They argue that the three variables influence a manager's trustworthy behavior, being expressed through behavioral consistency, behavioral integrity, sharing and delegating control, facilitating communication, and demonstrating concern, all of which may lead employees to perceive trust for managers. Organizational factors include organizational structure, human resource policies and procedures, and organizational culture, and the organizational factors control the degree of managers' trustworthy behavior. Relational factors include the initial interaction between supervisor and subordinate, which then establishes further expectations, and cost of exchanges that influence managers' trustworthy behavior derived from

their cost-benefit analysis. Individual factors such as propensity to trust, self-efficacy, and values also influence managers' engagement in trustworthy behavior, because their individual characteristics influence their expectations toward social exchange.

Trust building is especially salient in initial relationships. A shared understanding of business objectives and relationships established early in an individual's tenure in an organization tends to facilitate the development of trust (Kasper-Fuehrer & Ashkanasy, 2001) and since experiences in the early stages of organizational relationships are most memorable (Conrad & Poole, 2005), trust built in an early stage may make a lasting influence on the relationships. Their argument supports the meaningfulness of this study since college students' reports of their expectation of trust are likely to focus on the initial stages of trust building.

Kasper-Fuehrer and Ashkanasy (2001) argued that face-to-face communication is "the most effective means to facilitate trust" (p. 242). Communicating trustworthiness requires both verbal and nonverbal cues, including emotional messages. Immediate feedback given by face-to-face communication can effectively convey emotional and nonverbal messages, which are often limited in computer-mediated communication that the researchers studied. Confirming nonverbal cues tend to maximize the communication of trustworthiness, and emotional cues also may increase the level of trustworthiness. Conrad and Poole (2005) also argued for relationships between trustworthiness and face-to-face interactions. Employees' interpretations of written messages can vary more than in face-to-face interactions; increased reliance on written communication may lead to a vicious cycle that keeps reducing trust.

Informal Communication

Informal communication, that is, non-work interaction that strengthens personal connections such as friendship (Ring & Van de Ven, 1994), may be another factor that enhances

development of trust. Sharing personal information demonstrates willingness to be vulnerable to the other, which is closely connected with vulnerability mentioned in the definition of trust by Mayer et al. (1995), and "non-work connections made other people seem 'real' and therefore approachable and safe" (Abrams, Cross, Lesser, & Levin, 2003, p. 71).

Kasper-Fuehrer and Ashkanasy (2001) noted the importance of informal communication to convey nonverbal and emotional messages. Members of organizations may develop personal friendships with co-workers or supervisors, drawing on the frequency of communication and accumulation of past interactions required for trust building, while at the same time developing formal relationships in the organizational structure. Personal relationships between organizational members may develop psychological affiliations that are not necessarily reflected in their formal organizational relationships (Ring & Van de Ven, 1994). Friendships are informal and personal relationships beyond task-based ones, and they can be established in both superior-subordinate relationships and peer relationships. Friendships can foster high levels of trust because "contact, similarity, and emotional commitment are the basis of strong interpersonal relationships" (Conrad & Poole, 2005, p. 270). However, acknowledging the role of informal communication for trust building, organizational structures such as evaluation in supervisor-subordinate relationships and limitation of information shared between coworkers may impede the trust-building process (Bridge & Baxter, 1992). In addition, friendships in organizations are blended relationships that may invite both positive and negative effects: people may not be willing to build close friendships in order to avoid the impartiality-favoritism dialectic. Therefore, friendships may influence trust building in workplace both in positive and negative ways. Examining what kinds of relationships college students expect to have with their supervisors and

coworkers in the future career may indicate an association between trust and informal communication in the trust building process.

Trust in Superior-subordinate Relationships and Peer Relationships

The current study's focus on superior-subordinate relationships and peer relationships is appropriate because trust building in the two interpersonal relationships is a central process for individuals in organizations. Superior-subordinate relationships are "the most studied relationships by organizational communication researchers" (Cheney et al., 2004, p. 151). The relationships involve upward and downward communication flows.

Supervisors are seen as trustworthy if they are communication minded, empathic listeners, persuasive, sensitive, and open (Redding, 1972); these characteristics overlap with dimensions of trustworthiness: involvement, benevolence, emotional sensitivity, and openness. Supervisors can fail to win their subordinates' trust because they often do the opposite to what Conrad and Poole (2005) suggested: "de-emphasizing status differences, training their subordinates in communication skills, rewarding their subordinates for keeping them informed, and encouraging them to seek clarification of ambiguous messages" (p. 74).

There are many occasions when employees need to work with coworkers and help each other to accomplish organizational goals. Peer relationships with coworkers are influential interpersonal relationships in organizations. Coworkers are valuable sources of information, guidance, and emotional support (Cheney et al., 2004). Relationships with coworkers can be particularly valuable because of their frequency and informality of interaction. Previously, superior-subordinate relationships have been the most studied interpersonal relationships in organizational contexts, but Cheney et al. (2004) argued that interaction with coworkers is also powerful because frequency of communication with coworkers is often higher than with

supervisors. Informal channels used to communicate with coworkers can also convey important information that is difficult to access through formal channels.

Relationships with coworkers are dyadic and changeable like the superior-subordinate relationships but can be more diverse: hostile relationships, informal workplace relationships, friendships, and romantic relationships (Zorn, 1995), because communication among peers involves formal-organizational functions and psychological-individual functions. In the coworker dyad, high trust increases intimacy and reduces caution, so the trustor's vulnerability may be intensified.

Interdependency of Parties in Trust

Trust can be 'a double-edged sword'; the intrinsic interdependency of trustor and trustee can also make trust backfire. Trust is repeatedly rebuilt through interactions in a self-reinforcing cycle (Conrad & Poole, 2005): the more one party trusts another, the more trust can be impaired when it is violated. Thus, when parties in the relationship are interdependent, trust plays a significant role as people need to contribute to the relationship with sincerity in order to avoid negative consequences.

It is useful to think of organizations as network systems, in which every unit is interdependent (Thompson, 1967). Malfunction of any part of the network affects other units and may result in other units' failure or even in the failure of the entire network. Conrad and Poole (2005) included trust as a key element in motivating and controlling individual units in network organizations.

At the same time, interdependency can lead to conflicts because relationships can be both cooperative and competitive, and less trustful relationships tend to create conflicts (Conrad & Poole, 2005). Lack of trust may also lead to conflicts in relationships among coworkers, because

their relatively equal hierarchical levels enable them to easily confront the other party. Some scholars discussed another risk: openness based on disclosure of information, accounting, and resources (Cheney et al., 2004; Conrad & Poole, 2005). The trustor risks that the trustee may unilaterally take advantage of a disclosure or share information with third parties.

Brien (1998) argued that an asymmetry of power exists by the trustee over the trustor in trust relationships, but the asymmetry may be shifted by effectively taking advantage of the interdependency. The trustee may also trust back to the trustor while the trustor takes a risk to trust the trustee, so the trustor can simultaneously become the trustee in the trust building process, and vice versa. For example, if the trustor strategically demonstrates willingness to be vulnerable to win other's trust, the trustee may feel compelled to repay the trust, leading to an increase the trustee's vulnerability, and eventually reducing the asymmetry of power. If a young employee successfully accesses trustworthy people and gains their support, it may improve his or her work performance. Furthermore, consequences of trust in others may even determine continuation of his or her employment. The next section examines the most recent cohort to enter the workplace and face its trust challenges: Millennials.

Millennials in the Workplace

The current study focuses on the demographic cohort called the Millennials in their role as a new generation of company employees. Individuals born between 1979 and 1994 (Myers & Sagadhiani, 2010) comprise the *Millennials*, who are also called *nexters* or *Generation Y*. The population of this cohort is expected to become as large as the 'baby boomers,' as main players in the business world in the near future. Many of them have already started entering the business world, and the scale of their influence on workplaces arguably will become enormous in the near future (Loughlin & Barling, 2001).

Stereotypes about Millennials are both positive and negative. They have been described in the popular press and in popular literature as self-centered, unmotivated, disrespectful, and disloyal (Howe & Strauss, 2007; Marston, 2009; Pew Research Center, 2007). At the same time, they have been described positively, as working well in teams, valuing diversity, being technologically savvy, and favoring open communication (Gorman, Nelson & Glassman, 2004; Tapscott, 1998; Zemke; Raines, & Filipczak, 2000). Although there is relatively little academic research about the Millennials, the popular press has argued that the generation has substantially different (and frequently less positive) work values, attitudes, expectations, and communicative behaviors than other generations (Loughlin & Barling, 2001; Rawlins, et al., 2008; Reynolds et al., 2008). In particular, Trzesniewski and Donnellan (2010) reported that Millennials, specifically, their sample of high school seniors, are less trusting overall than high school seniors were in the 1970s. This same group also is more cynical about the trustworthiness of institutions. It is appropriate to examine specifically the expectations Millennials have about the levels of trust they will encounter in the professional workplaces they are about to enter.

Whether their characterizations are positive or negative, the popular press has argued that the generation has different work values, attitudes, expectations, and communicative behaviors than other generations (Loughlin & Barling, 2001; Rawlins, et al., 2008; Reynolds et al., 2008). Representative of many authors and consultants, Reynolds et al., (2008) argued that corporations need new managerial approaches in response to diverse workforces, including the new generation.

As noted, some authors have described Millennials as having a tendency to not trust others (Loughlin & Barling, 2001; Trzesniewski & Donnellan (2010). They argue that Millennials' work values and attitudes may be influenced by their family members' experiences

of work, such as downsizing, which may lead them to a sense of betrayal, alienation, and cynicism, and a tendency not to trust others. Factors motivating the Millennials to work are also different from other generations. Rawlins, Indivik, and Johnson (2008) found that Millennials tend to be interested in benefits, high starting salary, opportunities for learning, ethical standards, and corporate culture, for their career choices. An increasing number of Millennials obtain non-standard employment as temporary, part-time and contract employees who are often marginalized compared to permanent ones, and this circumstance, along with the current economic environment, has led many to heightened concern about job security.

Technology, especially continuously accessible contact and social networking is an important factor that has influenced Millennials. Millennials are products of the Internet age, which is highly globalized and rich in diversity, and the environment in which they have grown up greatly influenced their communicative behaviors (Rawlins et al., 2008). According to Reynolds et al. (2008), Internet-based communication has allowed them to be connected with others immediately and seamlessly whenever they want, and their familiarity with this communication style leads them to higher expectation of connection with others and involvement in communication processes. This may well influence their readiness to trust others in the workplace. Related to the argument that they have a sense of betrayal and nature not to trust others, the Millennials also tend to value authenticity and transparency of communication, and for them openness and honesty is essential to win their trust.

The work values and attitudes, expectations, and communicative behaviors that are characteristic of the Millennial cohort suggest possibilities for them to become the most tolerant and open-minded workforce of all generations, while presenting difficulties in both for themselves and top management to build trust relationships through intraorganizational

communication (Loughlin & Barling, 2001). Although the importance of the Millennials in the workplace and pressure on organizations to respond to the generation is widely recognized (Reynolds et al., 2008), studies in the field are quite limited. Therefore, studying the Millennials' expectation of trust in the workplace will contribute to understanding contributors to differences in work values, attitudes, expectations, and communicative behaviors between the Millennials and other generations.

Based on the literature, the following research questions were posed:

RQ1: How trusting are participants who are preparing to enter the workforce, based on Rotter's Propensity to Trust Scale?

RQ 2: Are participants more likely to expect trust for their coworkers than for their supervisors?

RQ3: What is the relationship between participant's trust and their demographic characteristics?

RQ4: How do participants describe the relationship they expect to have with their supervisors and coworkers in their future professional jobs?

The next section describes the research methods, procedures, and analysis methods employed in the current study.

Method

This study examined college students' reported expectations about the levels of trust they would encounter in their professional workplaces. Participants responded to an online questionnaire. Rotter's (1967) Interpersonal Trust Scale was employed to measure participants' propensity to trust as a baseline for participants' general approach to trust. Participants also responded to a series of items addressing trust expectations about supervisors and coworkers;

these items were developed specifically for this study. Demographic information was collected to examine how length and type of participants' work experience are related to expectations of trust in the workplace. Finally, participants characterized what kind of relationship they expected to have with their supervisors and their coworkers.

Participants

Participants were recruited on a voluntary basis from college undergraduate students aged 18 and older taking communication courses in a large Midwestern university. The study involved 98 subjects (mean age = 21.68 years; range = 18-31 years), consisting of 46 females (46.9%) and 52 males (53.1%); 67.3% were Caucasian, 8.2% were African-American, 3.1% were Hispanic, 15.3% were Asian or Pacific-Islander, and 6.1% were mixed. Of the participants, 8.2% were freshmen, 21.4% were sophomores, 41.8% were juniors, 41.8% were seniors, and 8.2% were extended plan seniors. Variables also included a current job for pay (14.3% had full-time jobs; 56.1% had part-time jobs; 29.6% neither), job category (20.4% retail; 10.2% food service; 8.2% clerical; 5.1% manual labor; 26.5% other), the length of paid work for a supervisor ($M = 2.46$ years; range = 0-12 years), internship experience (13.3% paid internship; 10.2% unpaid internship; 76.5% neither), and the length of internship ($M = 6.30$ months; range = 2-27 months).

Measures

The online questionnaire included Rotter's 25-item Propensity to Trust scale (1967), a set of 38 Likert-style items addressing expected trust that were developed for this study, demographic questions for sex, race, age, academic status, work experience, and work levels, and two items addressing expected relationship with supervisors and coworkers in future professional jobs.

Rotter's Propensity to Trust scale. Rotter's Propensity to Trust scale (1967) was used

to establish a baseline of participants' general level of trust. Rotter's (1967) Interpersonal Trust

Scale measures interpersonal trust, defined as "an expectancy held by an individual or a group

that the word, promise, verbal or written statement of another individual or group can be relied

upon" (p. 651). The Interpersonal Trust Scale was constructed as "an additive scale in which a

high score would show trust for a great variety of social objects" (p. 653). The scale has been

widely used in studies that demonstrated its usefulness and reliabilities. Huff and Kelley (2003)

adopted Rotter's scale to examine 1,282 mid-level managers in China, Hong Kong, Japan, Korea,

Malaysia, Taiwan, and United States to observe differences in levels of trust between

individualist and collectivist cultures. The researchers found higher levels of individual

propensity to trust in the Unites States than Asian nations. Bernerth and Walker (2009) studied

the influence of propensity to trust on leader-member social exchange and used other items by

Rotter (1980) measuring propensity to trust in order to examine levels of trust between two

individuals or between an individual and an organization. The studies indicated high levels of

reliabilities, with Cronbach's alphas for propensity to trust: .78 (Huff & Kelley, 2003), and .83

for employees and .88 for managers (Bernerth & Walker, 2009), respectively.

For the first section on the questionnaire, the subject is asked to respond to the 25 items

of Rotter's (1967) Interpersonal Trust Scale. With this instrument, participants' propensity to

trust is assessed on a scale of five Likert-type options: (1) strongly disagree, (2) disagree, (3)

agree and disagree equally, (4) agree, and (5) strongly agree. The reliability analysis of this scale

displayed satisfactory internal consistency in the current study; Cronbach's alpha was .82.

Expectations of trust. In addition to Rotter's general approach, the questionnaire

included 38 items asking participants to estimate the likelihood that they will be able to trust in

the workplaces they enter after graduation. The items were developed for this study, drawing on items from subscales for trust and distrust that Tutzauer and Hsieh (2004) developed, as well as concepts drawn from trust-related questionnaires by Ellis and Shockley-Zalabak (2001), Clerk and Payne (1997) and Simon and Eby (2003).

Tutzauer and Hsieh (2004) developed a measurement instrument for trust and distrust in order to examine the distinction between the two constructs in coworker relations in the organizational context. The researchers argued for the usefulness of the instruments in the measurement of pure trust among coworkers. Thus the application of the instruments is appropriate for the current study. The researchers initially constructed 40 trust items based on dependability, capability, competence, group cohesion, monitoring, and potential for punishment of trust violators. Each item was scaled from (1) strongly disagree to (7) strongly agree. The original pool of trust items were divided into two subscales: trust and distrust. In their study, a web-based questionnaire was conducted on several public Internet newsgroup categories. A total of 99 responses were completed out of 107 responses, covering a wide range of age groups and industries with some diversity in ethnicity, gender, and age.

The expectations of trust scale developed for this study asked for participant to report their degree of agreement with statements about actions reflecting both trust and distrust. Eighteen items addressed supervisors' behavior and 20 items addressed coworkers' behavior. Half of each set were trustworthy behavior while the other half were untrustworthy behavior. The degree of agreement with the statements showed the degree of trust participants expect to have for their future supervisor and coworkers respectively. Responses to the Likert-type scales were: (1) strongly disagree, (2) disagree, (3) agree and disagree equally, (4) agree, and (5) strongly agree.

This scale reflected ten themes derived from those studies: competency, delegation/monitoring, willingness to make effort, motivation to compete, blaming, disappointment, interdependency, integrity, backstabbing, and informal communication. The questionnaire is found in Appendix. For example, items "my supervisor will be competent" and "my coworkers will have the ability to accomplish what they say they will do" reflected competency, one of dimensions of trust. There were also items reflecting distrust: "my supervisor will lack the job-related expertise to provide guidance to me" and "my coworkers won't be successful at the things he/she tries to do" for the same competency dimension. All items were randomly presented to participants.

Analysis of this scale displayed satisfactory internal consistency; Cronbach's alphas were .89 (supervisor subscale) and .81 (coworker subscale).

Expected workplace relationships. The questionnaire included two items asking participants to characterize the relationship they expect to have with their supervisors and the relationships they expect to have with their coworkers as they enter professional environments. Five choices were presented to measure participants' response to the prompts, one for supervisors and one for coworkers "Please choose the answer that best describes the kind of relationships you expect to have in your future professional job." (1) drinking buddy, (2) friendship, (3) friendly colleagues, (4) workplace relationship only, and (5) hostile relationship. Specific definitions of the choices were not provided for participants.

Procedures and Analysis

The questionnaire was created on research software Qualtrics, and participants accessed a website link via their course websites to answer the questionnaire online. Short instructions on how to answer questions were given for each set of questions. All participants were treated in

accordance with conditions provided by the university's human subject committee, which approved the study, and collected data was secured. Collected data was quantitatively analyzed for each research question: RQ1) Frequency analysis of the propensity to trust scale; RQ2) A paired-samples *t* test on the expectations of trust scale; RQ3) Correlation analysis among the propensity of trust scale, the expectations of trust scale for supervisors and coworkers, and demographic characteristics; and RQ4) frequency analysis of two relational expectation questions.

Results

The current study investigated Millennials' expectations of trust generally and of trust specifically for supervisors and coworkers in their organizational lives, along with their expectations about the kinds of relationships they will have with supervisors and coworkers. Responses collected through the online survey were statistically analyzed for the participants' propensity to trust, expectations of trust for supervisors and coworkers, relationships between trust and demographic characteristics, and expected relationships with supervisors and coworkers. Results are discussed in order of research questions.

RQ1: How trusting are participants who are preparing to enter the workforce, based on Rotter's Propensity to Trust Scale?

The mean score for the Propensity to Trust scale of 2.71 (*SD* = .38: range = 1.64-3.92) is below the midpoint, and the distribution is centralized around the mean. This may reflect a relatively low level of trust for others in general or, because the midpoint option was "agree and disagree equally," uncertainty or ambivalence about the items.

RQ2: Are participants more likely to expect trust for their coworkers than for their supervisors?

A paired-samples *t* test was conducted to evaluate whether participants were likely to expect trust for their coworkers more or less than for their supervisors. The results indicated that the mean expectations of trust for supervisors ($M = 3.59$: $SD = .49$) was significantly greater than the mean expectations of trust for coworkers ($M = 3.27$: $SD = .38$), $t(97) = 10.62$, $p < .01$. The standardized effect size index ($d = .73$) indicated a large effect size. The 95% confidence interval for the mean difference between the two ratings was .27 to .39. The results revealed that participants expected higher levels of trust for supervisors than for coworkers.

RQ3: What is the relationship between participant's trust and their demographic characteristics?

Correlation was examined among the 12 variables: participants' propensity to trust, expectations of trust for supervisors, expectations of trust for coworkers, and eight demographic characteristics (sex, age, race, school year, current job for pay, the length of paid work for a supervisor, internship experience, and the length of internship), excluding job category as a categorical variable. In order to compute Pearson's correlation coefficient, responses to an item of race were divided into Caucasian ($N = 66$) and non-Caucasian ($N = 32$) and were dummy-coded: 1 for Caucasian respondents and 0 for non-Caucasian respondents. Likewise, other two categorical variables (current job and internship experience) were also dummy-coded for analysis, but no significant correlation was found. The results of the correlational analyses presented in Table 1 show that five correlations were statistically significant. Expectations of trust for coworkers had a strong, positive relationship to both expectations of trust for supervisors ($r = .78$, $p < .001$) and propensity to trust ($r = .54$, $p < .001$). Further, moderate and positive relationships were found between expectations of trust for coworkers and the length of internship ($r = .43$, $p = .043$), as well as between propensity to trust and expectations of trust for

supervisors ($r = .33$, $p = .001$). Finally, propensity to trust had a small, positive relationship to race/ethnicity ($r = .25$, $p = .013$). All three trust scales were significantly and positively intercorrelated. Also, the longer participants had internship experience, the more they tended to trust their coworkers. Caucasian participants tended to have higher levels of propensity to trust than non-Caucasian participants.

Table 1

Bivariate Correlations among Trust Scales and Demographics

	Propensity to trust	Expectations of trust for supervisors	Expectations of trust for coworkers
Propensity to trust	--		
Expectations of trust for supervisors	.33**	--	
Expectations of trust for coworkers	.54**	.78**	--
Sex	-.08	.10	.08
Age	-.01	-.07	-.03
Race/ethnicity	.25*	-.05	-.07
School year	.17	-.02	.06
Current job	.05	.01	-.05
Length of paid work	.14	-.02	.05
Internship experience	-.08	-.07	-.03
Length of internship	.07	.24	.43*

Note. N = 98. **p* <.05; ***p* <.01.

RQ4: How do participants describe the relationship they expect to have with their supervisors and coworkers in their future professional jobs?

Frequencies and percentages were examined for the relationship that participants expected to have with their supervisors and coworkers in their future workplaces. The frequency participants indicated their relationship with supervisors would be as friendly colleagues (51.0%) and as a workplace relationship only (32.7%) were high, while the frequency for expectations of relationships with coworkers as friendship (45.9%) and as friendly colleagues (33.7%) were the

dominant two. In general, the results suggest that participants expect more formal relationships with supervisors than coworkers. Table 2 reports the frequencies and percentages of the expected relationships in future workplaces, and clearly shows different patterns between the relationships with supervisors and the relationships with coworkers.

Table 2

Frequencies and Percentages of the Expected Relationships in Future Workplaces

Relationship type	Supervisor		Coworker	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Drinking buddy	2	2.0	15	15.3
Friendship	13	13.3	45	45.9
Friendly colleagues	50	51.0	33	33.7
Workplace relationship only	32	32.7	5	5.1
Hostile relationship	1	1.0	0	0

Discussion

The purpose of this research was to explore the expectations of trust Millennial college students expect in their future workplace relationships. Given the number of individuals in the Millennial generation and the importance of trust in organizational life, this examination is timely and appropriate. Findings from this study indicated a moderate mean propensity to trust overall and expectations of trust in workplace relationships somewhat higher than the overall trust propensity. Participants showed a higher level of expectations of trust and formality of communication for supervisors than coworkers. Statistically significant correlations were found among propensity to trust, expectations of trust for supervisors, and expectations of trust for

coworkers. Expectations of trust for coworkers were also statistically significantly related to the length of internship experience where that was present. These results reflect the inconsistent claims made in the literature, especially the popular literature, about Millennials.

Differences in General Propensity to Trust and Expectations of Trust in the Workplace

One of the most compelling findings of this study is the difference in scores on Rotter's (1967) overall propensity to trust scale and on the expectation of trust in the workplace scales. While the results also revealed that propensity to trust, expectations of trust for both supervisors and coworkers were significantly correlated, participant scores on propensity to trust in general were lower than expectations of trust in workplace relationships. Post hoc analysis with two paired-samples t tests was conducted to examine the mean differences among expectations of trust for supervisors, expectations of trust for coworkers, and propensity to trust. The results indicated that the mean expectations of trust for supervisors and for coworkers were significantly greater than the mean propensity to trust, $t(97) = 16.99$, $p < .01$ for expectations of trust for supervisors, and $t(97) = 14.94$, $p < .01$ for coworkers. The standardized effect size indices for expectations of trust for supervisors ($d = 2.01$) and for coworkers ($d = 1.47$) indicated large effect sizes. The 95% confidence interval for the mean difference between the two ratings was .78 to .98 for expectations of trust for supervisors, and .48 to .63 for coworkers. The results revealed that participants expected higher levels of trust for both supervisors and coworkers than general propensity to trust. The findings for propensity to trust are consistent with Loughlin and Barling's (2001) and Trzesniewski and Donnellan's (2010) claims that Millennials have a tendency not to trust others. If Howe and Strauss's (2007) claim that Millennials tend to conform to conventional norms, which was not examined here, is true, participants might also select an ambiguous option "agree and disagree equally" rather than risking other answers that might not

be clearly right ones. The middle "agree and disagree equally" option also may represent a response of "I don't know," reflecting inexperience or even disinterest in the question. On the other hand, despite the claims that Millennials do not tend to be trusting, the result unexpectedly displayed expectations for greater trust in the specific context of the workplace than generalized propensity to trust.

Furthermore, the findings of correlation analyses revealed different levels of propensity to trust among races. In the current study, Caucasian participants indicated higher level of propensity to trust than other races, though the limited number of non-Caucasian participants should be taken into account in evaluating this finding. According to Howe and Strauss (2007), many Millennials have a sense of being protected. Caucasians are a majority in the university where this research was conducted; if Caucasian students have a greater sense of security than other races, this may influence their expectations of trust.

Work experience is assumed to be one of the major factors that influenced participants' perceptions of trust in workplaces. While most of demographic characteristics didn't show a significant correlation with trust, participants who had a longer internship expect higher levels of trust for coworkers. The length of internship may give more opportunity for socialization. As argued in the literature (Abrams, Cross, Lesser, & Levin, 2003; Ring & Van de Ven, 1994), this opportunity establishes personal ties and helps people expect a higher level of trust. However, the question arises why the higher expectation for trust was seen only for coworkers, not for supervisors. College students may have a more anxious or negative image of supervisors by hearing others' experience or being exposed to the media than those who experienced an internship that can be very close to the actual workplace.

Trust and Formality for Millennials

Focusing on the relationship between trust and formality is a unique approach that this study adopted. The findings revealed that Millennials expected more formality in relationships with supervisors than coworkers, though no statistically significant correlation was found between relationship type and the expectations subscale. It might be expected, based on the literature (Abrams, Cross, Lesser, & Levin, 2003; Ring & Van de Ven, 1994) that there would be a clear relationship between participants' description of the kind of relationship they expect with their supervisors and their scores on the expectations for trust in supervisors scale. That is, in contrast to the findings, expectations of a relatively informal relationship might be consistent with general expectations of trust in supervisors.

One possibility is that the participants do not see a connection between type of communication and trust. They have had relatively little professional work experience overall, and it is likely they have had experience in only one (or perhaps two) types of organizations. Therefore, contrary to the literature (e.g., Abrams, Cross, Lesser, & Levin, 2003; Ring & Van de Ven, 1994), no statistically significant relationship was revealed in these results.

Another possible reason may be based on Millennials' perception of supervisors. According to Howe and Strauss (2007), they tend to be conventional and try to follow the rules with respecting authority and hierarchy. Their norms respecting authority and hierarchy may lead to their beliefs that supervisors are likely to be trustworthy, while they may also regard supervisors as superior parties to whom they are not allowed to be personally close, and perceive informal interaction with supervisors as inappropriate. In addition, due to limited work experience, many Millennials who have not had professional work experience, such as the participants in this study, may not have had an opportunity to establish trust relationships with

supervisors through informal interactions and benefit from the personal ties with superiors. Further examination specifically of Millennials' attitudes about norms, authority and hierarchy are in order.

Furthermore, Millennials' expectation to be connected with others, derived from capability their experience being connected through communication technologies (Reynolds, et al., 2008), may lead to participants' expectation of close relationships with coworkers. Compared with supervisors, Millennials may not differentiate coworkers from their personal friends, so they try to be closely connected with them as they do with their friends through instant and frequent communication through technologies that they are familiar with. Millennials may take advantage of their communicative capability to further expand their personal closeness with coworkers to increase the level of trust that support them effectively work together as business partners.

Implications for Practice

The findings of the current study suggest several useful approaches that both Millennials and managers working in organizations may apply to their workplaces.

In terms of informal communication, which may include sharing of personal information, supervisors can help Millennials by coaching appropriate degrees of informality in organizational communication: when, what, and how much informality can be demonstrated in a way acceptable to the workplace. Cultivating friendly ties with supervisors is not necessarily inappropriate, as long as employees adopt a level of informality that is suitable for workplace settings. If Howe and Strauss's (2007) claim that Millennials tend to conform to conventional norms, which was not examined here, is true, they may seek to behave properly, that is, to get the "right answer," so they might welcome coaching about the appropriate degree of formality and informality with different groups. For example, Millennials are said to be more comfortable with

disclosing their personal information than other generations, given the norms associated with social networking media. Their communicative behavior may lead to different expectations of privacy from what is expected by organizations. Therefore, Millennials can learn to what extent they can expect self-disclosure from others and how much of their own is appropriate. At the same time, managers can creatively consider how to communicate with Millennials effectively. In addition to face-to-face interactions, managers can take advantage of other communication channels, such as electronic media that Millennials are comfortable with, to facilitate informal communication with Millennials.

Another implication of this research focuses on the negative consequences that may result from trust building. As Zorn (1995) claimed, vulnerability may rise in peer relationships because trust can increase intimacy while reducing caution. When one of the parties in the peer relationship violates the other's trust, the outcome may negatively influence his/her performance. Also, trust may make parties in peer relationships feel as if they are "in the same boat," which, in a negative situation, may double the potential effect on organizations.

Furthermore, Millennials can learn to be sensitive to potential cultural differences in workplace trust building. Nowadays, globalization is affecting most organizations, and workforce diversity is one of the major challenges in workplaces. Although Millennials are said to be more welcoming of diversity than other generations (Howe & Strauss, 2007), it doesn't necessarily mean that they have better understanding of it. As the findings showed, different levels of propensity to trust were observed among races/ethnicities, and this may be based on individuals' cultural background. For example, power distance in interpersonal relationships varies among cultures (Hofstede, 2001), so a certain level of informality in the hierarchical structure, which is influenced by power distance, is not necessarily acceptable to all cultures.

Therefore, it may be useful for organizations to help Millennials learn that everyone does not expect informal communication or workplace trust building in the same way.

Limitations and Future Studies

One of the major contributions of this research is to establish a reliable scale to measure expectations of trust in a specific organizational context. The reliability of the expectations of trust scale was demonstrated in several analyses in this research. The current study may also contribute to enhanced understanding of Millennials based on empirical data. While there are studies that have explored Millennials' overall characteristics, none has focused specifically on trust. The specific focus on trust in workplace settings may trigger further application in studies on Millennials. In addition, this study is unique in exploring the relationship between trust and informal communication. Past studies (Abrams, Cross, Lesser, & Levin, 2003; Ring & Van de Ven, 1994) argued for a positive relationship between the two factors, though empirical studies to demonstrate it are limited. Future studies may further examine the relationship and identify factors that make the significant effect.

One of the major limitations of this research is its highly homogenized sample of Midwestern college students. Millennials who are actually working in corporations are prospective samples that may indicate more realistic attributions of the cohort. The military forces are another organizational context that may show very different results from other organizational contexts. Comparison with a different generation group may also highlight the Millennials' characteristics. Even in the same generation, the current study suggested difference in propensity to trust among races/ethinicities, though the details were not identified due to limited sample diversity. Further study on diverse participants is in order.

Another limitation is the age of Rotter's propensity to trust scale; since this scale contains many questions related to social and political issues, the non-contemporary framing of the items might influence participants' responses. This may be another reason for the differences in results between Rotter's scale and the expectation of trust scales. It may be appropriate to modify Rotter's items or adapt his approach to apply to organizational contexts for future studies.

Furthermore, because definitions for the five relationship types (drinking buddy, friendship, friendly colleagues, workplace relationship only, and hostile relationship) were not specified in the survey, participants may have interpreted the terms differently. The results revealed visibly different patterns of expected workplace relationships with supervisors and with coworkers, but the current research is limited because of the lack of definitions. Future study should clearly present definitions.

Another topic for future studies is how Millennials define "coworkers"; do they consider people as their coworkers based on age or the organizational level? How do Millennials perceive their generation identity as ingroups in organizations, within or beyond a functional boundary? An intergroup communication approach may be especially appropriate, because empirical studies in the realm in organizational contexts are still very limited (Paulsen, Graham, Jones, Callan, & Gallois, 2008).

Conclusion

The current study investigated the degree of trust that college students of Millennials generation expect in their future workplace relationships. Specifically, this research examined their propensity to trust, expectations of trust they expect to have in their future workplaces with supervisors and coworkers. Overall, this study revealed that Millennials have moderate and greater expectations to trust their supervisors and coworkers in their future workplaces than

general propensity to trust. Moreover, the findings indicated that they expect more formal relationships and higher levels of trust for their supervisors than for coworkers. In light of influence that the huge generation of Millennials will have on workplaces and the significance of trust in workplace relationships, this research may contribute to all parties in organizations seeking improvement of organizational communication.

This study suggests that Millennials' relatively high expectations of trust towards superiors should be welcomed in organizations, but this also suggests an opportunity for organizations to help Millennials develop sound trust relationships. The fact of positive expectations for trust is good news for organizations, but as Rawlins, et al. (2008) and Reynolds, et al. (2008) argued, organizations should be ready to respond to Millennials' high expectations for workplace environments in order to secure the valuable human resources represented by this generation.

References

Abrams, L.C., Cross, R., Lesser, E., & Levin, D.Z. (2003). Nurturing interpersonal trust in knowledge-sharing networks. *Academy of Management Executive, 17*, 64-78.

Albrecht, T., & Bach, B. (1996). Organizational Communication. Ft. Worth, TX: Harcourt.

Bernerth, J. B., & Walker, H. J. (2009). Propensity to trust and the impact on social exchange: An empirical investigation. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 15*, 217-226.

Bridge, K., & Baxter, L., A. (1992). Blended relationships: Friends as work associates. *Western Journal of Communication, 56*, 200-225.

Brien, A. (1998). Professional ethics and the culture of trust. *Journal of Business Ethics, 17*, 391-409.

Cheney, G., Christensen, L. T., Zorn, T. E., & Ganesh, S. (2004). *Organizational communication: In an age of globalization.* Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press.

Clerk, M. C. & Payne R. L. (1997). The nature and structure of workers' trust in management. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 18*, 205-224.

Conrad, C. & Poole, M. S. (2005). *Strategic Organizational Communication*, (6th ed.). Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.

Dirks, K. T., & Ferrin, D. L. (2002). Trust in leadership: Meta-analytic findings and implications for research and practice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *87*, 611-628.

Ellis, K., & Shockley-Zalabak, P. (2001). Trust in top management and immediate supervisor: The relationship to satisfaction, perceived organizational effectiveness, and information receiving. *Communication Quarterly, 49*, 382-397.

Gabarro, J. J., & Kotter, J. P. (2005). Managing your boss. *Harvard Business Review, 83*, 92-99.

Gorman, P., Nelson, T., & Glassman, A. (2004). The Millennial generation: A strategic opportunity. *Organizational Analysis*, *12*, 255–270.

Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hosmer, L. T. (1995). Trust: The connecting link between organizational theory and philosophical ethics. *Academy of Management Review, 20,* 379-402.

Howe, N., & Strauss, W. (2007) *Millennials go to college*, (2nd ed.). Great Falls, VA: Lifecourse Associates.

Huff, L., & Kelley, L. (2003). Levels of organizational trust in individualist versus collectivist societies: A seven-nation study. *Organization Science, 14*, 81-90.

Jarvenpaa, S.L., & Leidner, D.E. (1999). Communication and trust in global virtual teams. *Organization Science,* 10(6), 791-815.

Kasper-Fuehrer, E. C. & Ashkanasy, N. M. (2001). Communicating trustworthiness and building trust in interorganizational virtual organizations. *Journal of Management, 27,* 235-254.

Kramer, R. M. (2011). Trust and distrust in organizations: Emerging perspectives, enduring questions. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *50*, 569-598.

Larkin, T. J., & Larkin, S. (1996). Reaching and changing frontline employees. *Harvard Business Review, 74*, 95-104.

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

Loughlin, C., & Barling, J. (2001). Young workers' work values, attitudes, and behaviors. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 74, 543-558.

Marston, C. (2009). Myths about Millennials: Understand the myths to retain Millennials.

Retrieved June 23, 2009, from

http://umanresources.about.com/od/managementtips/a/millennial_myth.Htm

Mayer, R.C., Davis, J.H., & Schoorman, F.D. (1995). An integrative model of organizational

Trust. *Academy of Management Review, 30*(3), 709-734.

Miller, K. I., & Monge, P. R. (1985). <u>Social information and employee anxiety about

organizational change</u>. *Human Communication Research, 11*, 365–386.

Myers, K., & Sadaghiani, K. (2010). Millennials in the workplace: A communication perspective

on Millennials' organizational relationships and performance. *Journal of Business &

Psychology, 25*, 225-238.

Paulsen, N., Graham, P., Jones, E., Callan, V. J., & Gallois,C. (2008). Organizations as

intergroup contexts: Communication, discourse, and identification. In J. Harwood & H.

Giles (Eds.), *Intergroup Communication: Multiple Perspectives*. New York: Peter Lang.

Pew Research Center. (2007). How young people view their lives, futures, and politics: A

portrait of ''Generation Next.''

http://people-press.org/report/300/a-portrait-of-generation-next

Rawlins, C., Indivik, J., & Johnson, P. R. (2008). Understanding the new generation: What the

Millennial cohort absolutely, positively must have at work. *Journal of Organizational

Culture, Communications, and Conflict, 12*(2), 1-8.

Redding, W. C. (1972). *Communication within the Organization.* New York, NY: Inducstrial

Communication Council.

Reynolds, L., Bush, E. C., & Geist, R. (2008). The gen Y imperative. *Communication World, 25*,

19-22.

Ring, P. S., & Van de Ven, A. H. (1994). Developmental processes of cooperative interorganizational relationships. *Academy of Management Review, 19*, 90-118.

Robinson, S. L. (1996). Trust and breach of the psychological contract. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *41*, 574-599.

Robinson, S. L., & Rousseau, D. M. (1994). Violating the psychological contract: Not the exception but the norm. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *15*, 245-259.

Rotter, J. B. (1967). A new scale for the measurement of interpersonal trust. *Journal of Personality, 35*, 651–665.

Rotter, J. B. (1980). Interpersonal trust, trustworthiness, and gullibility. *American Psychologist, 35*, 1-7.

Simon, S. A., & Eby, L. T. (2003). A typology of negative mentoring experiences: A multidimensional scaling study. *Human Relations, 56*(9), 1083-1106.

Thompson, J. (1967). *Organizations in action*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Tapscott, D. (1998). *Growing up digital: The rise of the Net generation.* New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Trzesniewski, K. H., & Donnellan, M. B. (2010). Rethinking "Generation Me": A study of cohort effects from 1976-2006. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 5*, 58-75.

Tutzauer, C., & Hsieh, R. (2004). Distinguishing between trust and distrust in organizational contexts. *Conference Papers -- International Communication Association*, 1.

Whitener, E. M., Brodt, S. E., Korsgaard, M. A., & Werner, J. M. (1998). Managers as initiators of trust: An exchange relationship framework for understanding managerial trustworthy behavior. *Academy of Management Review, 23*, 513-530.

Zemke, R., Raines, C., & Filipczak, B. (2000). *Generations at work: Managing the clash of veterans, Boomers, Xers, and Nexters in your workplace*. New York: AMACOM American Management Association.

Zorn, T. E. (1995). Bosses and buddies: A constructive/dramaturgical analysis of simultaneously close and hierarchical relationships in organizations. *Under-studied relationships: Off the beaten track*, ed. Julia T. Wood & Steven Duck, Newbury Park, CA: Sage, pp. 122-147.

Appendix

Survey Questionnaire

Section 1: Propensity to Trust
Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each statement.
Scale: Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Agree and Disagree Equally, Agree, Strongly Agree

1. Hypocrisy is on the increase in our society.
2. This country has a dark future unless we can attract better people into politics.
3. Using the honor system of not having a teacher present during exams would probably result in increased cheating.
4. The United Nations will never be an effective force in keeping world peace.
5. Most people would be horrified if they knew how much news the public hears and sees is distorted.
6. Even though we have reports in newspapers, radio, and T.V., it hard to get objective accounts of public events.
7. If we really know what was going on in international politics, the public would have reason to be more frightened than they now seem to be.
8. Many major national sports contests are fixed in one way or another.
9. Most people can be counted on to do what they say they will do.
10. In dealing with strangers one is better off to be cautious until they have provided evidence that they are trustworthy.
11. Fear of social disgrace or punishment rather than conscience prevents most people from breaking the law.
12. Parents usually can be relied upon to keep their promises.
13. The judiciary is a place where we can all get unbiased treatment.
14. It is safe to believe that in spite of what people say most people are primarily interested in their own welfare.
15. The future seems very promising.
16. Most elected public officials are really sincere in their campaign promises.
17. Most experts can be relied upon to tell the truth about the limits of their knowledge.
18. Most parents can be relied upon to carry out their threats of punishment.
19. In these competitive times one has to be alert or someone is likely to take advantage of you.
20. Most idealists are sincere and usually practice what they preach.
21. Most salespeople are honest in describing their products.
22. Most students in school would not cheat even if they were sure of getting away with it.
23. Most repairmen will not overcharge even if they think you are ignorant of their specialty.
24. A large share of accident claims filed against insurance companies are phony.
25. Most people answer public opinion polls honestly.

Section 2: Expectation of Trust
Please choose the answer that best describes the kind of relationships you expect to have in your future professional job.

Relationship with your supervisor
- o Drinking buddy
- o Friendship
- o Friendly colleagues
- o Workplace relationship only
- o Hostile relationship

Relationship with your coworkers
- o Drinking buddy
- o Friendship
- o Friendly colleagues
- o Workplace relationship only
- o Hostile relationship

The following statements are expectations people entering a professional workplace might have about their supervisors or coworkers. Indicate for each the degree to which you agree or disagree (strongly disagree, disagree, agree and disagree equally, agree, strongly agree). For each item, start with "I expect that in my professional workplace:"

1. My coworkers will have the ability to accomplish what they say they will do.
2. My supervisor will be competent.
3. My coworkers won't be successful at the things he/she tries to do.
4. My supervisor will lack the job-related expertise to provide guidance to me.
5. I will feel comfortable delegating work to my coworkers.
6. I will be able to depend on my supervisor because I know he/she won't want to let me down.
7. I will try to keep close tabs on my coworkers when I am counting on them to accomplish certain things.
8. Whether I can count on my supervisor depends on the nature of the task.
9. My coworkers will go out of their way to be helpful.
10. My supervisor will make a consistently high effort.
11. There will be consequences if my coworkers don't do what is expected of them.
12. My supervisor will tend to do as little as possible just to get by.
13. My coworkers won't make others look bad (so they will look better).
14. My coworkers will tend to compete with the other people in my workplace.
15. My coworkers will take the blame when a mistake or problem is their fault.
16. My supervisor will take responsibility for his/her mistakes.
17. My coworkers will cover up their performance problems by blaming me.
18. My supervisor will blame me for his/her mistakes or problems.
19. My coworkers won't let me down.
20. My supervisor won't leave me hanging.
21. If coworkers let me down, I am not likely to depend on them again.
22. My supervisor will violate my expectations.
23. Working with my coworkers will be necessary for me to accomplish my work.
24. My supervisor and I will have the same goals.
25. I usually will be much better off if I do my work alone than working with my coworkers.

26. Working with my supervisor will make my job more difficult.
27. My coworkers will be very responsible in their work.
28. My supervisor will be generally forthright and honest.
29. My coworkers will lie about my performance.
30. My supervisor will deceive me.
31. My coworkers will keep secrets I tell them.
32. My supervisor won't repeat secrets I tell him/her.
33. My coworkers will gossip about me.
34. My supervisor will backstab me.
35. My coworkers will want to know more about me as a person.
36. My supervisor will wish he/she and I could be friends.
37. My coworkers won't want to get involved with me personally.
38. My supervisor won't be interested in my personal life that is not related to my job.

Section 3: Demographics
Tell us about yourself.

What is your sex?
Male   Female

How old are you?
_____ Age in years

What is your race/ethnicity?
Caucasian, African-American, Hispanic, Native American, Asian or Pacific-Islander, Mixed

What year are you in college?
Freshman   Sophomore   Junior Senior Extended plan senior

Do you have a current job for pay?
- o   Full-time job
- o   Part-time job
- o   Neither

Which category best describes your current work for pay?
- o   Retail
- o   Food service
- o   Clerical
- o   Manual labor
- o   Other

How long have you worked for pay for a supervisor, boss, or manager?
_____ Years
_____ Months

I have had

- o A paid internship
- o An unpaid internship
- o Neither

How long did your internship last?
_____ Months

Section 4: Participation Credits
In order for you (or the student that you are completing this survey for) to receive credit for this research opportunity, please fill in the information below. You (or the student) will receive no credit if this information is missing.

Your last name (or the last name of the student that you are completing this survey for)

Your first name (or the first name of the student that you are completing this study for)

What is the last name of your instructor? (If you are completing this survey for your friend, enter the last name of your friend's instructor. If you don't know, enter NA.)

What class are you completing this survey for? (If you are completing this survey for your friend, choose a class of your friend. If you don't know, choose NA.)
   * COMS 104 Intro to Communication Studies
   * COMS 130 Speaker Audience Communication
   * COMS 244 Interpersonal Communication Theory
   * COMS 246 Intro to Intercultural Communication
   * COMS 310 Intro Organizational Communication
   * COMS 320 Communication on the Internet
   * COMS 330 Effective Business Communication
   * COMS 356 Intro to Research Methods
   * NA