

Trust Building Mechanisms  
SMS Analysis

R.L. Lewicki, B.B. Bunker, in R.M. Kramer, T.R. Tyler (Eds.), *Developing and Maintaining Trust in Work Relations*, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA, 1996, pp. 114-137

Primary studies

53. Barnett, M., Anderson, J., Hoak, M., Higginbotham, T., & Gilling, A. (2010). The process of trust building between university researchers and school personnel. *Urban Education*, 45(5), 630-660.

54. Blomqvist, K., & Sahlén, P. (2000, September). Building organizational trust. In 16th Annual IMP Conference, Bath, UK (pp. 7-9).

55. TRUST-BUILDING MECHANISMS AND KNOWLEDGE SHARING IN VIRTUAL COMMUNITIES

58. Das, T. K., & Teng, B. S. (1998). Between trust and control: Developing confidence in partner cooperation in alliances. *Academy of management review*, 23(3), 491-512.

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

513. Meier, M., Litschewski, M., Mollwag, T., & Dierker, C. (2016). How managers can build trust in strategic alliances: A meta-analysis on the central trust-building mechanisms. *Journal of Business Economics*, 86(2), 229-247.

515. Sahlén, O., & Crnk, K. S. (2013). A cross-level process theory of trust development in interorganizational relationships. *Strategic organization*, 11(3), 281-303.

516. Tsang, S., Sibal, R., & Surt, B. (2022). Enriching a distributed framework for building trust in distributed agile teams. *Information and Software Technology*, 136(22).

517. Wilman, J.L., Shuffler, M.L., Lazarus, E.H., Floss, S.M., Burke, C.J., Sikes, E., Green, S., Trust development in web starting action teams: A multilevel framework. *Group & Organization Management* 37(2), 123-174 (2017)



## Trust-Building Mechanism SMS Analysis

1. R.L. Lewicki, B.B. Bunker, in R.M. Kramer, T.R. Tyler(Eds.), *Developing and Maintaining Trust in Work Relation ships*, *Frontiers of Research and Theory*, Sage, ThousandOaks, CA, 1996, pp. 114–139

These three levels of trust are believed to be linked in sequential iteration such that one level enables the development of trust at the next higher level, as the relationship evolves and matures[15].

Although no specifics are given as to when such an episodic shift will occur, the movement from one stage to another stage may require a fundamental shift in the dominant perceptual paradigm

### 1.1. Calculus-based trust

The lowest form of trust, termed deterrence-based trust, exists when both parties can be trusted to keep their word. The primary motivation in keeping one's word at this level is that deterrents exist (for example, discontinuing the relationship or likelihood of retribution) that outweighs the benefits of acting in a manner that abuses trust.

#### 1.1.1. Initial interaction

Establishing trust among project participants is crucial for project success, and it can be achieved through effective and rapid initial interactions. Positive interactions between team members can enhance trust, and increasing the frequency and richness of these interactions can lead to higher levels of initial trust.

##### 1.1.1.1. Strong reputation

Consideration of reputation as competent and previous achievements

###### 1.1.1.1.1. S4- Reputation as competent actor

1. Blomqvist, K., & Ståhle, P. (2000, September). Building organizational trust. In 16th Annual IMP Conference, Bath, UK (pp. 7-9).

###### 1.1.1.1.2. S15- General reputation provides a basis for individual–organization trust

2. Schilke, O., & Cook, K. S. (2013). A cross-level process theory of trust development in interorganizational relationships. *Strategic organization*, 11(3), 281-303.

###### 1.1.1.1.2.1. S15- Institutional categories

2. Schilke, O., & Cook, K. S. (2013). A cross-level process theory of trust development in interorganizational relationships. *Strategic organization*, 11(3), 281-303.

1.1.1.1.3. S17. preconceptions about the team member Imported information will also have an impact in determining initial trust in STATs. Imported information can be defined as the preexisting knowledge, stereotypes, and preconceptions stored in the team members' memories.

1.1.1.1.4. S13. A partner company's reputation is positively related to trust in strategic alliances.

#### 1.1.1.2. Getting acquainted

Getting to know and developing familiarity amongst stakeholders well prior to project initiation

1.1.1.2.1. S4- Self-definition of themselves and their competencies as actors of the system

1. Blomqvist, K., & Ståhle, P. (2000, September). Building organizational trust. In 16th Annual IMP Conference, Bath, UK (pp. 7-9).

1.1.1.2.2. S17. The ratio of STAT members who are known and liked (disliked) by trusted colleagues of the STAT team member will have a positive (negative) impact

#### 1.1.2. Attitude

Beginning during the initial stages of newly formed relationships, individuals attitude to determine the trustworthiness of other individuals in that relationship

##### 1.1.2.1. Honesty

Being honest and truthful in interactions with others

1.1.2.1.1. S4.- Honesty, Keeping promises, Morally sound behavior

1. Blomqvist, K., & Ståhle, P. (2000, September). Building organizational trust. In 16th Annual IMP Conference, Bath, UK (pp. 7-9).

1.1.2.1.2. S7. Strong positive (negative) emotional reactions to surface-level cues will have a positive (negative) impact on individual team members' initial trust toward the team

##### 1.1.2.2. Willingness

Transmit growth mindset and willingness to contribute useful knowledge

1.1.2.2.1. S4. Willingness to learn

1. Blomqvist, K., & Ståhle, P. (2000, September). Building organizational trust. In 16th Annual IMP Conference, Bath, UK (pp. 7-9).

1.1.2.2.2. S16- - Growth mindset

8. Tyagi, S., Sibal, R., & Suri, B. (2022). Empirically developed framework for building trust in distributed agile teams. *Information and Software Technology*, 106828.

#### 1.1.2.2.3. S5- willingness to contribute useful knowledge

17. TRUST-BUILDING MECHANISMS AND KNOWLEDGE SHARING IN VIRTUAL COMMUNITIES

#### 1.1.2.3. Risk taking

Ability to accept risk at the beginning of the relationship

##### 1.1.2.3.1. S4. Ability to accept risk

1. Blomqvist, K., & Ståhle, P. (2000, September). Building organizational trust. In 16th Annual IMP Conference, Bath, UK (pp. 7-9).

1.1.2.3.1.1. S4. At individual level the propensity to trust involves the ability to accept risk

##### 1.1.2.3.2. S15- The complexity of negotiating interorganizational relationships usually requires risk-taking

2. Schilke, O., & Cook, K. S. (2013). A cross-level process theory of trust development in interorganizational relationships. *Strategic organization*, 11(3), 281-303.

##### 1.1.2.3.3. S9- unable to develop a system of coping with technical uncertainty and the unstructured task

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

##### 1.1.2.3.4. S8. Risk taking

14. Das, T. K., & Teng, B. S. (1998). Between trust and control: Developing confidence in partner cooperation in alliances. *Academy of management review*, 23(3), 491-512.

#### 1.1.2.4. Teamworking

Team play attitude

##### 1.1.2.4.1. S4- Proactive behavior in helping and adjusting

1. Blomqvist, K., & Ståhle, P. (2000, September). Building organizational trust. In 16th Annual IMP Conference, Bath, UK (pp. 7-9).

1.1.2.4.1.1. S4.- Professionalism

1. Blomqvist, K., & Ståhle, P. (2000, September). Building organizational trust. In 16th Annual IMP Conference, Bath, UK (pp. 7-9).

#### 1.1.2.4.2. S16- Team play attitude

8. Tyagi, S., Sibal, R., & Suri, B. (2022). Empirically developed framework for building trust in distributed agile teams. *Information and Software Technology*, 106828.

##### 1.1.2.4.2.1. S16 - Share new ideas

8. Tyagi, S., Sibal, R., & Suri, B. (2022). Empirically developed framework for building trust in distributed agile teams. *Information and Software Technology*, 106828.

1.1.2.4.3. S9 Our data supports the view of Meyerson et al. (1996) that initiatives (e.g., volunteering to complete tasks) appear to strengthen and unify the team

### 1.1.3. Predictability

#### 1.1.3.1. Consistency

Individual consistency of word and deed. The quality of always behaving or performing in a similar way,

##### 1.1.3.1.1. S4- Consistency of organizational behavior

1. Blomqvist, K., & Ståhle, P. (2000, September). Building organizational trust. In 16th Annual IMP Conference, Bath, UK (pp. 7-9).

#### 1.1.3.2. Appreciation of complementarity

Clear appreciation that the firms involved depend on each other for their individual gains to increase

##### 1.1.3.2.1. S4. Appreciation of complementarity

1. Blomqvist, K., & Ståhle, P. (2000, September). Building organizational trust. In 16th Annual IMP Conference, Bath, UK (pp. 7-9).

1.1.3.2.2. S3. Goals. I guess I am a sucker or something because I decided to go along with it because it sounded like a good project. You also seemed like you genuinely cared for the students which was the main reason I did it.

10. Barnett, M., Anderson, J., Houle, M., Higginbotham, T., & Gatling, A. (2010). The process of trust building between university researchers and urban school personnel. *Urban Education*, 45(5), 630-660.

1.1.3.2.3. S17. Interpreting surface-level cues into perceptions of similarity (dissimilarity) between the team member and the team will have a positive (negative) impact

1.1.3.2.4. S5. transmit knowledge growth

17. TRUST-BUILDING MECHANISMS AND KNOWLEDGE SHARING IN VIRTUAL COMMUNITIES

1.1.3.3. Norms

Provide some norms to make their members believe that are in proper order and safe

1.1.3.3.1. S4. Norms and sanctions

1. Blomqvist, K., & Ståhle, P. (2000, September). Building organizational trust. In 16th Annual IMP Conference, Bath, UK (pp. 7-9).

1.1.3.3.2. S5. provide some regulation procedures or policies to make their members believe that VCs are in proper order and safe. Researchers suggest that when a situation feels safe, one may believe that this situation possesses some kind of trustworthy attributes

17. TRUST-BUILDING MECHANISMS AND KNOWLEDGE SHARING IN VIRTUAL COMMUNITIES

1.1.3.3.3. S8. use desirable behavior in strategic alliances

1.1.3.4. Confidence

Demonstrating and encouraging confidence in the project's success can help build trust among team members and stakeholders.

1.1.3.4.1. S13. Performance implication

15. Meier, M., Lütkevitte, M., Mellewigt, T., & Decker, C. (2016). How managers can build trust in strategic alliances: a meta-analysis on the central trust-building mechanisms. *Journal of Business Economics*, 86(3), 229-257.

1.1.3.4.2. S9- Communication Conveying Enthusiasm<sup>o</sup>

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

1.1.3.4.2.1. In teams with low initial trust, the messages revealed markedly little enthusiasm or optimism.

## 1.2. Knowledge-based trust

knowledge-based trust, is based on the predictability of the other party developed through knowing the other sufficiently well that their behavior is predictable. Knowledge-based trust relies on information rather than fear of punishment or rewards of being trustworthy

### 1.2.1. Communication

The trust literature is replete with studies focusing on the role of communication in the development of trust between parties. The importance of communication is expected to be magnified by organizational boundaries, cultures, and policies.

#### 1.2.1.1. Encouraging communication

frequent interactions allow individuals to know one another and create a common opinion,

##### 1.2.1.1.1. S9- Social Communication

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

##### 1.2.1.1.1.1. S9- Predictable communication

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

##### 1.2.1.1.2. S13- Communication between partners is positively related to trust in strategic alliances

15. Meier, M., Lütkevitte, M., Mellewig, T., & Decker, C. (2016). How managers can build trust in strategic alliances: a meta-analysis on the central trust-building mechanisms. *Journal of Business Economics*, 86(3), 229-257.

##### 1.2.1.1.3. S5- frequent interactions allow individuals to know one another and create a common opinion,

17. TRUST-BUILDING MECHANISMS AND KNOWLEDGE SHARING IN VIRTUAL COMMUNITIES

##### 1.2.1.1.4. S15- Trust is disembedded from face-to-face interactions

2. Schilke, O., & Cook, K. S. (2013). A cross-level process theory of trust development in interorganizational relationships. *Strategic organization*, 11(3), 281-303.

##### 1.2.1.1.5. S16- - Regular sozialization

8. Tyagi, S., Sibal, R., & Suri, B. (2022). Empirically developed framework for building trust in distributed agile teams. *Information and Software Technology*, 106828.

#### 1.2.1.1.5.1. S16- - Engaging working environment

8. Tyagi, S., Sibal, R., & Suri, B. (2022). Empirically developed framework for building trust in distributed agile teams. *Information and Software Technology*, 106828.

#### 1.2.1.1.5.2. S16-regular socialization with distributed team members, builds trust among team members

#### 1.2.1.2. Providing timely feedback

The provision of timely feedback

#### 1.2.1.2.1. S9- Substantive and Timely Response

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

1.2.1.2.1.1. A key difference between HiLo and HiHi teams was that HiHi team, members received explicit and prompt responses verifying that their messages, and their contributions to the assignments, were thoroughly read and evaluated.

#### 1.2.1.2.2. S8- Open and prompt communication

14. Das, T. K., & Teng, B. S. (1998). Between trust and control: Developing confidence in partner cooperation in alliances. *Academy of management review*, 23(3), 491-512.

#### 1.2.1.3. Sharing knowledge and appropriate information

The sharing of relevant information and knowledge

#### 1.2.1.3.1. S3. Share ideas and research findings

10. Barnett, M., Anderson, J., Houle, M., Higginbotham, T., & Gatling, A. (2010). The process of trust building between university researchers and urban school personnel. *Urban Education*, 45(5), 630-660.

#### 1.2.1.3.1.1. S3. Resource sharing

10. Barnett, M., Anderson, J., Houle, M., Higginbotham, T., & Gatling, A. (2010). The process of trust building between university researchers and urban school personnel. *Urban Education*, 45(5), 630-660.

#### 1.2.1.3.2. S8. Communication. The significance of sharing information with partners



14. Das, T. K., & Teng, B. S. (1998). Between trust and control: Developing confidence in partner cooperation in alliances. *Academy of management review*, 23(3), 491-512.

1.2.1.3.2.1. Through information exchange, partners should identify and develop more commonalities, so a sense of trust would be reinforced

1.2.1.3.3. S16- Transparent working environment

8. Tyagi, S., Sibal, R., & Suri, B. (2022). Empirically developed framework for building trust in distributed agile teams. *Information and Software Technology*, 106828.

1.2.1.3.3.1. S16. Majority of interviewed participants mentioned transparent working environment as one of the key enablers for building trust amongst agile team members. Sharing information amongst distributed team members through mediums like online scrum and discussion boards brings in transparency about the progress of the project

1.2.1.4. Creating shared vision

The creation of a shared vision setting action plan and goal setting

1.2.1.4.1. S4. Soundness of strategy and vision

1. Blomqvist, K., & Ståhle, P. (2000, September). Building organizational trust. In 16th Annual IMP Conference, Bath, UK (pp. 7-9).

1.2.1.4.2. S3. Shared vision

10. Barnett, M., Anderson, J., Houle, M., Higginbotham, T., & Gatling, A. (2010). The process of trust building between university researchers and urban school personnel. *Urban Education*, 45(5), 630-660.

1.2.1.4.3. 12-Creating shared vision

12-Lander, M. C., Purvis, R. L., McCray, G. E., & Leigh, W. (2004). Trust-building mechanisms utilized in outsourced IS development projects: a case study. *Information & Management*, 41(4), 509-528.

1.2.1.4.4. S5- Trust will arise among individuals who think they share a common objective and value

17. TRUST-BUILDING MECHANISMS AND KNOWLEDGE SHARING IN VIRTUAL COMMUNITIES

1.2.1.5. Handling expectation

Raise fulfillable expectation to clients help to maintain trusts

1.2.1.5.1. S4. Role clarity and stretching

1. Blomqvist, K., & Ståhle, P. (2000, September). Building organizational trust. In 16th Annual IMP Conference, Bath, UK (pp. 7-9).

#### 1.2.1.5.1.1. S4-Communication of feelings and expectations

1. Blomqvist, K., & Ståhle, P. (2000, September). Building organizational trust. In 16th Annual IMP Conference, Bath, UK (pp. 7-9).

#### 1.2.1.5.2. S8. Goal setting

14. Das, T. K., & Teng, B. S. (1998). Between trust and control: Developing confidence in partner cooperation in alliances. *Academy of management review*, 23(3), 491-512.

1.2.1.5.2.1. the process of goal setting may become even more important as a useful social control mechanism in strategic alliances

#### 1.2.1.6. Open and clear

Open and transparent communication

#### 1.2.1.6.1. S4. Openness of organizational communications

1. Blomqvist, K., & Ståhle, P. (2000, September). Building organizational trust. In 16th Annual IMP Conference, Bath, UK (pp. 7-9).

#### 1.2.1.6.2. S8- Open and prompt communication

14. Das, T. K., & Teng, B. S. (1998). Between trust and control: Developing confidence in partner cooperation in alliances. *Academy of management review*, 23(3), 491-512.

#### 1.2.1.6.3. S16- Transparent working environment

1.2.1.6.3.1. Make work visible to team members, visibility of work status, information radiators, online task sharing

#### 1.2.1.6.3.1.1. S16- Open working environment

8. Tyagi, S., Sibal, R., & Suri, B. (2022). Empirically developed framework for building trust in distributed agile teams. *Information and Software Technology*, 106828.

#### 1.2.1.7. Receptivity

the presence of receptive actors in communications

#### 1.2.1.7.1. S5- build their trust toward VCs when they receive responsiveness from others.

17. TRUST-BUILDING MECHANISMS AND KNOWLEDGE SHARING IN VIRTUAL COMMUNITIES

#### 1.2.1.7.2. S9- Communication Conveying Enthusiasm°

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

1.2.1.7.3. S17-Strong positive (negative) emotional reactions to surface-level cues will have a positive (negative) impact on individual team members' initial trust toward the team.

#### 1.2.2. Adaptation

formation of the relationship adjusting one to each other.

##### 1.2.2.1. Cultural blending

Cultural "sense of cohesion"

1.2.2.1.1. S15- The development of a common understanding (among members of the focal organization) triggers the progression from individual–organization trust to organization organization trust

2. Schilke, O., & Cook, K. S. (2013). A cross-level process theory of trust development in interorganizational relationships. *Strategic organization*, 11(3), 281-303.

##### 1.2.2.1.2. S16- - Cultivating hybrid team culture

8. Tyagi, S., Sibal, R., & Suri, B. (2022). Empirically developed framework for building trust in distributed agile teams. *Information and Software Technology*, 106828.

##### 1.2.2.1.2.1. S16 - Respecting others cultures

8. Tyagi, S., Sibal, R., & Suri, B. (2022). Empirically developed framework for building trust in distributed agile teams. *Information and Software Technology*, 106828.

##### 1.2.2.1.3. S13- Culture similarity

15. Meier, M., Lütkevitte, M., Mellewigt, T., & Decker, C. (2016). How managers can build trust in strategic alliances: a meta-analysis on the central trust-building mechanisms. *Journal of Business Economics*, 86(3), 229-257.

##### 1.2.2.1.4. S8 Cultural blending

14. Das, T. K., & Teng, B. S. (1998). Between trust and control: Developing confidence in partner cooperation in alliances. *Academy of management review*, 23(3), 491-512.

##### 1.2.2.2. Organization blending

Making adaptations according to the needs of the partnership and willingness to accommodate deviations

#### 1.2.2.2.1. S4. Proactive behavior in adaptation

1. Blomqvist, K., & Ståhle, P. (2000, September). Building organizational trust. In 16th Annual IMP Conference, Bath, UK (pp. 7-9).

1.2.2.2.2. S15. employees of the focal organization strive for coordinated interaction with the partner organization by adjusting their activities so that they are consistent with the focal organization's common understanding regarding the trustworthiness of the partner organization

2. Schilke, O., & Cook, K. S. (2013). A cross-level process theory of trust development in interorganizational relationships. *Strategic organization*, 11(3), 281-303.

#### 1.2.2.2.3. S16 - Bridging time zone gaps

8. Tyagi, S., Sibal, R., & Suri, B. (2022). Empirically developed framework for building trust in distributed agile teams. *Information and Software Technology*, 106828.

#### 1.2.2.2.4. S8- Interfirm adaptation

14. Das, T. K., & Teng, B. S. (1998). Between trust and control: Developing confidence in partner cooperation in alliances. *Academy of management review*, 23(3), 491-512.

### 1.3. Identification based trust

The final and highest order of trust is identification-based trust. This level of trust is developed when one party has "fully internalized the other's preferences ([28], p. 371)." Trust exists because the parties effectively understand and appreciate the other's wants, and this mutual understanding is developed to the point that each can effectively act for the other

#### 1.3.1. Equity preservation

Equity is an important source of trust in alliances. Individual perceptions of control or influence of decisions are associated with perceptions of the ability to protect one's own interests.

##### 1.3.1.1. Equity in responsibilities

Fairness of decision-making processes. The sharing of control also is associated positively with the perceived fairness of decisions. Shared leadership, Rotary leadership, and Letting each other freely take their own courses to fulfill their obligations.

##### 1.3.1.1.1. S16- Shared leadership

8. Tyagi, S., Sibal, R., & Suri, B. (2022). Empirically developed framework for building trust in distributed agile teams. *Information and Software Technology*, 106828.

1.3.1.1.1.1. S16-To create high performing distributed agile team that sail high on trust, sharing the leadership amongst team members is very crucial.

#### 1.3.1.1.2. S9- Rotary leadership

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

#### 1.3.1.2. Equity in rewards

A “win-win” relationship. Fairness in benefits, the firm contributing the most resources to the alliance should get the most from it. Profit distribution needs to be kept on an equitable basis.

##### 1.3.1.2.1. S3. win-win

10. Barnett, M., Anderson, J., Houle, M., Higginbotham, T., & Gatling, A. (2010). The process of trust building between university researchers and urban school personnel. *Urban Education*, 45(5), 630-660.

1.3.1.2.1.1. S3-the language of col- laboration and that we wanted a “win-win” relationship

##### 1.3.1.2.2. S8. Equity preservation

14. Das, T. K., & Teng, B. S. (1998). Between trust and control: Developing confidence in partner cooperation in alliances. *Academy of management review*, 23(3), 491-512.

##### 1.3.1.2.2.1. S8. - shared equity ownership

14. Das, T. K., & Teng, B. S. (1998). Between trust and control: Developing confidence in partner cooperation in alliances. *Academy of management review*, 23(3), 491-512.

1.3.1.2.2.2. S8-the relationship between trust and equity appears to go both ways—that is, a high level of trust tends to encourage partners to tolerate short-term inequity or mutual forbearance.

#### 1.3.2. Commitment

Commitment generally is viewed as a strong indicator of the intent of an individual to continue participation in an organization or team. To the extent trust amongst participants is strengthened by a sense of shared commitment, the development or preservation of individual commitment is important to success. Extant research indicates that commitment is instrumental in ensuring that team members accept decisions and work cooperatively in carrying out those decisions. individual confidentiality, individual job satisfaction, and a focus on the long-term interests of individual participants.

##### 1.3.2.1. Long-term interests

demonstrated interest in the long-term interests of relevant stakeholders has been shown to contribute positively to trust

#### 1.3.2.1.1. S3. Long term commitment

10. Barnett, M., Anderson, J., Houle, M., Higginbotham, T., & Gatling, A. (2010). The process of trust building between university researchers and urban school personnel. *Urban Education*, 45(5), 630-660.

#### 1.3.2.1.2. S13. Expected continuity is positively related to trust in strategic alliances.

#### 1.3.2.2. Familiarity with processes

The habitualization of alliance routines. By being familiar with the processes (development processes), the actors can, for instance, present their progression in a way that is understandable to another supplier.

#### 1.3.2.2.1. S15. The habitualization of alliance routines (within the focal organization) triggers the progression from individual–organization trust to organization–organization trust

2. Schilke, O., & Cook, K. S. (2013). A cross-level process theory of trust development in interorganizational relationships. *Strategic organization*, 11(3), 281-303.

#### 1.3.2.2.2. S9. Transition from Procedural to Task Focus.

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

#### 1.3.2.3. Performance

Implication and ability to perform, individual competence is an importance determinant of trust—particularly when contact between participants is in any way limited

#### 1.3.2.3.1. S4. Ability to perform, Partnership competencies, Capability to carry through, Interpersonal skills

1. Blomqvist, K., & Ståhle, P. (2000, September). Building organizational trust. In 16th Annual IMP Conference, Bath, UK (pp. 7-9).

#### 1.3.2.3.2. S17. Team Performance as a Trust Input

1.3.2.3.2.1. the final outcome of the team's work (team performance) becomes an input into the trust development process

#### 1.3.2.3.3. S5- members in VCs have the skill, expertise

17. TRUST-BUILDING MECHANISMS AND KNOWLEDGE SHARING IN VIRTUAL COMMUNITIES

#### 1.3.2.3.4. S13. Performance implication

15. Meier, M., Lütkevitte, M., Mellewig, T., & Decker, C. (2016). How managers can build trust in strategic alliances: a meta-analysis on the central trust-building mechanisms. *Journal of Business Economics*, 86(3), 229-257.

#### 1.3.2.4. Good-follower

##### 1.3.2.4.1. S9- Individual Initiative

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

1.3.2.4.1.1. The teams with low initial trust, and those that remained at low trust, had members who did not take initiative: several members on each LoLo team revealed a desire to be told what to do and simply waited for others to make the important decisions.

##### 1.3.2.4.2. S16 - Share new ideas

8. Tyagi, S., Sibal, R., & Suri, B. (2022). Empirically developed framework for building trust in distributed agile teams. *Information and Software Technology*, 106828.

##### 1.3.2.4.2.1. 8- - Open working environment

8. Tyagi, S., Sibal, R., & Suri, B. (2022). Empirically developed framework for building trust in distributed agile teams. *Information and Software Technology*, 106828.

#### 1.3.3. Management

In addition to the trust-building mechanisms discussed thus far, managers of projects have before them some potentially unique opportunities to foster trust amongst participants. Such opportunities include the provision of training and personal growth opportunities, no strict contracts, the management style, and the support of information systems.

##### 1.3.3.1. Management style

participants consider the organizational structure and management style as one of the key enablers in building trust in the team

1.3.3.1.1. S16 - Teal management approach- Majority of participants consider organizational structure and management style as one of the key enablers in building trust amongst agile teams

8. Tyagi, S., Sibal, R., & Suri, B. (2022). Empirically developed framework for building trust in distributed agile teams. *Information and Software Technology*, 106828.

##### 1.3.3.2. Information systems support

Tool support is required, characteristics of information systems influence trust significantly

1.3.3.2.1. S.16- Requisite tool support- is very important to have communication facilities through which team members can connect with each other

8. Tyagi, S., Sibal, R., & Suri, B. (2022). Empirically developed framework for building trust in distributed agile teams. *Information and Software Technology*, 106828.

1.3.3.2.2. S5. characteristics of information systems influence trust significantly

17. TRUST-BUILDING MECHANISMS AND KNOWLEDGE SHARING IN VIRTUAL COMMUNITIES

## 2. Primary studies

- 2.1. S3. Barnett, M., Anderson, J., Houle, M., Higginbotham, T., & Gatling, A. (2010). The process of trust building between university researchers and urban school personnel. *Urban Education*, 45(5), 630-660.
- 2.2. S4. Blomqvist, K., & Ståhle, P. (2000, September). Building organizational trust. In 16th Annual IMP Conference, Bath, UK (pp. 7-9).
- 2.3. S5. TRUST-BUILDING MECHANISMS AND KNOWLEDGE SHARING IN VIRTUAL COMMUNITIES
- 2.4. S8. Das, T. K., & Teng, B. S. (1998). Between trust and control: Developing confidence in partner cooperation in alliances. *Academy of management review*, 23(3), 491-512.
- 2.5. S9. Jarvenpaa, S. L., & Leidner, D. E. (1999). Communication and trust in global virtual teams. *Organization science*, 10(6), 791-815.
- 2.6. S13. Meier, M., Lützkewitte, M., Mellewigt, T., & Decker, C. (2016). How managers can build trust in strategic alliances: a meta-analysis on the central trust-building mechanisms. *Journal of Business Economics*, 86(3), 229-257.
- 2.7. S15. Schilke, O., & Cook, K. S. (2013). A cross-level process theory of trust development in interorganizational relationships. *Strategic organization*, 11(3), 281-303.
- 2.8. S16. Tyagi, S., Sibal, R., & Suri, B. (2022). Empirically developed framework for building trust in distributed agile teams. *Information and Software Technology*, 106828.
- 2.9. S17. Wildman, J.L., Shuffler, M.L., Lazzara, E.H., Fiore, S.M., Burke, C.S., Salas, E., Garven, S.: Trust development in swift starting action teams: A multilevel frame- work. *Group & Organization Management* 37(2), 137–170 (2012)