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Research on trust has increased in recent years as has research on implicit leadership theory (ILT). However, there is a paucity of research on the relationship between ILT and trust in leadership. The purpose of this research was to investigate three antecedents of trust in leadership: ability, benevolence, and integrity. In addition, I explored how a) leader-follower ILT congruence and b) congruence between follower ILT and their perceptions of leaders’ ILT relevant behaviors relate to ability, benevolence, and integrity. Results are based on a sample of 308 temporary summer camp employees who completed the study questionnaires at two time points. Results indicated that ability, benevolence, and integrity were all related to trust in leadership. Leader-follower ILT congruence was related to ability and benevolence, but not integrity. Congruence between follower ILT and leaders’ ILT relevant behaviors was related to ability and integrity, but not benevolence. This study extended the previous work on trust and ILTs. Implications of the results and future research directions are discussed.
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Relationships cannot be effective without trust. The literature from psychology, sociology, management, economics, and political science agree on the importance of trust (e.g., Bachmann & Zaheer, 2006; Berscheid, 1994; Gambetta, 1988; Kramer & Tyler, 1996; Williamson, 1993). And researchers increasingly focus on trust within organizations—specifically, trust in leadership (e.g., Ayoko & Pekerti, 2008; Branzei, Vertinsky, & Camp, 2007; Burke, Sims, Lazzara, & Salas, 2007; Lapidot, Kark, & Shamir, 2007; Schoorman, Mayer, & Davis, 2007; Webber, 2008). Trust is 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” (Mayer, Davis, & Schoorman, 1995, p. 721).

When employees trust their leaders, organizations profit from a range of benefits, including improved organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behavior, employee turnover rates (e.g., Connell, Ferres, & Travaglione, 2003; Dirks & Ferrin, 2002), team performance (Dirks, 2000), and organizational performance (Davis, Schoorman, Mayer, & Tan, 2000). Trust in leaders helps improve team and organization functioning when tasks are complex, unstructured, and require high levels of interdependence, cooperation, and information sharing (Creed & Miles, 1996; Gillespie & Mann, 2004; Zand, 1972). Researchers attempting to understand how trust develops and how it is fostered in the workplace have accumulated evidence regarding the positive consequences of trust in leadership (e.g., Kim, Ferrin, Cooper, & Dirks, 2004; Kim, Dirks, Cooper, & Ferrin, 2006).
Recent theoretical developments in the literature on trust in leadership and organizations allows us to examine the complex relationships between supervisors and subordinates (e.g., Burke, Sims, Lazzara, & Salas, 2007; Schoorman, Mayer, & Davis, 2007). Despite the increasing research on trust, its relationship with implicit leadership theories (ILT) has not garnered as much attention and remains poorly understood.

Under leadership categorization theory, individuals categorize people as either leaders or non-leaders by creating implicit prototypes, or schemas, about the qualities and abilities that characterize the ideal leader (Lord, Foti, & De Vader, 1984; Lord, Foti, & Phillips, 1982). They then evaluate a supervisor against their cognitive models of leadership (Lord, De Vader, & Allinger, 1986; Lord et al., 1984). Although a sound conceptual basis for leadership categorization theory has developed, it has not yet revealed the role of ILTs and followers’ leadership prototypes in making sense of leadership behavior in organizational settings. The majority of studies on ILTs take place in laboratory settings (e.g., Cronshaw & Lord, 1987; Lord et al., 1984; Ritter & Lord, 2007) and concentrate on content and measurement issues (e.g., Epitropaki & Martin, 2004; Lord et al., 1984; Offermann, Kennedy, & Wirtz, 1994). This paper extends prior studies by investigating how ILTs influence follower trust in leadership in a field setting; a relationship that the literature has not explored.

This study tests part of a model proposed by Burke, Sims, Lazzara, & Salas (2007) by investigating benevolence, ability, and integrity as the antecedents of trust in leadership. In addition, it explores how two factors -- (a) leader-follower ILT congruence and (b)
congruence between follower ILT and their perceptions of leaders’ ILT relevant behaviors -- relate to benevolence, ability, integrity, and trust in leadership.

**Trust in Leadership**

Leaders play a key role in determining work effectiveness across all levels (e.g., individual, team, and unit) of an organization. The degree to which subordinates, coworkers, and customers trust the leader is vital to the leader's ability to be effective in the workplace (Bennis, 1999). Research on trust originally focused on two areas: antecedents of trust; and trust between organizational members. Later models focused more specifically on trust between subordinates and supervisors, or followers and leaders. As this literature grew, researchers incorporated the outcomes of trust into more integrative models. A brief review of these models follows. A more detailed review of the literature is contained in Appendix A.

**Components of trustworthiness.** Mayer et al. (1995) proposed one of the most influential and well-known models of organizational trust. This model focused on trust in an organizational setting involving two specific parties: a trusting party (the trustor) and the party to be trusted (the trustee). This model built upon previous work, which considered only characteristics of the trustee, by also incorporating characteristics of the trustor: the propensity to trust, a stable trait that affects the likelihood that an individual will trust another party. Propensity to trust is an individual difference that determines the base level of trust at the beginning of a relationship.

Nevertheless, even when a trustor has a high propensity to trust, in Mayer et al.’s (1995) model, trust within a relationship depends on the trustee’s “trustworthiness.” Mayer
et al. proposed three factors that compose trustworthiness: ability, benevolence, and integrity. First, they define ability as the "group of skills, competencies, and characteristics that enable a party to have influence within some specific domain" (Mayer et al. 1995, p. 717). Next, benevolence is the degree to which the trustee is believed to care about the best interests of the trustor, based on the trustee’s friendliness, engagement with the community, and personal rapport with the trustor. And the third component of trustworthiness, integrity, is the extent to which the trustor believes the trustee adheres to those values the trustor finds acceptable, such as consistency, honesty, and predictability. According to this model, the trustor assesses the ability, benevolence, and integrity of the trustee when deciding whether to trust.

This model is limited, however, because it does not explore how trust develops or whether a trustor’s individual differences influence trust in the relationship. Further, this model yields only one outcome of trust, risk-taking in the relationship, and it does not specify the more distal outcomes of trust. Still, this model has consistently underpinned later models of organizational trust and trust in leadership. Mayer et al.’s (1995) model contributes to the literature by separating trust from trustworthiness, with three characteristics of the trustee (ability, benevolence, and integrity) appearing as antecedents of trust.

**Building trust in the leader.** While Mayer et al. (1995) discussed the foundations of trust between any two individuals in a workplace, Whitener, Brodt, Korsgaard, and Werner (1998) proposed a model of trust between a manager and follower. This model expanded upon the Mayer et al. model by delineating those manager behaviors that build trust, labeled *managerial trustworthy behavior*, and presenting a framework for understanding the antecedents of this behavior.
Managerial trustworthy behavior includes “volitional actions and interactions performed by managers that are necessary though not sufficient to engender employees' trust in them” (Whitener et al., 1998, p. 516). In this model, five categories of managerial behavior influence employees' perceptions of trustworthiness: behavioral consistency; behavioral integrity; sharing and delegating control; communication; and demonstration of concern. Further, Whitener et al. (1998) also proposed antecedents to trustworthy behavior, including organizational, relational, and individual factors. Organizational factors include organizational structure, culture, and human resource policies. Relational factors include initial manager-subordinate interactions, expectations of the relationship, and the costs of exchanges (which Mayer et al. (1995) defined as perceived risk). Moreover, individual factors include propensity to trust, self-efficacy, and personal values. Thus, although this model narrows the focus of Mayer et al. by concentrating on the manager-subordinate relationship, it is less parsimonious than the model proposed by Mayer et al.

A quantitative review. Trust has emerged as a research theme in its own right since Mayer et al. (1995) and Whitener et al. (1998). Trust has become a more prominent topic in both edited books (e.g., Bachmann & Zaheer, 2006; Kramer & Tyler, 1996), and individual articles (e.g., Doney, Cannon, & Mullen, 1998; Gomez & Rosen, 2001; Mayer & Davis, 1999; Pillai, Schriesheim, & Williams, 1999). As Kramer (1999) noted, trust is moving from “bit player to center stage in contemporary organizational theory and research” (p. 594).

Dirks and Ferrin (2002) attempted to integrate the growing research by conducting a meta-analysis of trust in leadership. Trust in leadership was found to have significant relationships with several antecedents and outcomes, including transformational and
transactional leadership, perceived organizational support, performance, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, turnover intentions, satisfaction with leader, leader-member exchange, and interactional, procedural and distributive justice. Dirks and Ferrin did not investigate implicit leadership theories.

Although their review provided a useful and timely quantitative summary of the literature, Dirks and Ferrin (2002) conceptualized trust very differently than Mayer et al. (1995), and what Dirks and Ferrin coded as trust often represented an amalgam of Mayer et al.’s trust, ability, benevolence, and integrity. Unfortunately, this makes it difficult to estimate the relationships between ability, benevolence, integrity, and trust and to explore their unique relationships with outcomes.

An integrative framework. Burke, Sims, Lazzara, and Salas (2007) developed an integrative multi-level framework describing antecedents to trust in leadership, moderators at the individual, team, organizational levels, and both proximal and distal outcomes of trust in leadership. While their framework is not exhaustive, the constructs they used are the most representative of the trust literature.

Burke et al. (2007) specified several antecedents of trust in leadership: follower judgments of leader ability; benevolence; and integrity. Along with these antecedents, they identified eight moderators that may affect the relationships between the antecedents and the decision to trust the leader: propensity to trust; attributions; leadership prototypes; perceived risk; prior history; leader reputation; psychological safety; and organizational climate.

Of these eight, this study focuses on leadership prototypes. Leadership prototypes, or ILTs, are mental models that individuals use to conceptualize effective leadership (Lord,
Foti, & De Vader, 1984). Burke et al. (2007) proposed that ILTs moderate the relationship between ability and trust. But Burke et al. did not explain why leadership prototypes should moderate. Burke et al. did indicate that LMX may help explain how previous leader-member interactions can influence future perceptions. Conversely, this paper treats leadership prototype as an antecedent to trust in leadership, and not as moderator.

Although Burke et al. (2007) did not directly address leader-member exchange theory (LMX) in their model, they did note that LMX might be useful for explaining how previous leader-member interactions influence future perceptions. LMX posits that leaders often have differential relationships with subordinates (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). The differential relationships result in either high or low quality LMX relationships. Research characterizes high quality LMX relationships as mutually respectful, loyal, and trusting; the converse is true of low quality LMX relationships (Gomez & Rosen, 2001; Brower, Schoorman, & Tan, 2000). Burke et al. suggested that individuals with a history of high quality LMX relationships are likely to view leaders as more benevolent and as having more integrity than individuals who have experienced predominantly low quality LMX relationships. Although the Burke et al. did not base their model on a LMX framework, they hold that the quality of the relationship between the leader and follower has an important moderating influence over the trust one holds for the leader. The quality of the relationship also has implications for prototype fulfillment, in which a close match between follower ILT and leader behavior affects the attributions the subordinate makes about the leader's actions and intentions.

In delineating the antecedents, moderators, and outcomes of trust in leadership, Burke et al. (2007) presented the first integrative model of trust in leadership. This study
focuses primarily on the role of ability, benevolence, and integrity in building trust between a leader and follower, and the role ILTs have in determining the perceptions and behavior of leaders. Using the foundation of Mayer et al.’s model of trust between two individuals in an organization, Burke et al. proposed a comprehensive model of trust in leadership. Both models suggest that trust in the leader is a function of the follower’s perception of the leader’s ability, benevolence, and integrity. The leader’s behavior primarily determines the extent to which subordinates trust the leader. Based on this, I propose that

Hypothesis 1: Leaders judged to be high in (a) ability, (b) benevolence, and (c) integrity will be seen by subordinates as trusted.

**Implicit Leadership Theories**

In addition to investigating the role of ability, benevolence, and integrity in judgments of trustworthiness, this study examines the influence of ILT congruence on trust. Research on ILTs stems from implicit organization theory, developed by Eden and Leviatan (1975), which posits that individuals’ preconceptions of leaders could affect their ratings of leader behavior. Similarly, cognitive categorization theory proposes that individuals’ limited ability to process information quickly leads people to create prototypes or schemas to ease the mental load (Rosch, 1978). These theories formed the basis of leadership categorization theory, advanced by Lord and his colleagues (e.g., Engle & Lord, 1997; Lord, Foti, & Phillips, 1982). Leadership categorization theory is the foundation for the idea that ILTs are prototypes, or mental models, of leadership that people use to classify others as leaders (Lord, Foti, & De Vader, 1984).
ILTs are beliefs held by an individual about the traits and abilities that characterize an ideal leader (Epitropaki & Martin, 2004; Lord et al., 1984). Employees or team members develop ILTs through socialization and past experiences with leaders (Lord, Foti, & De Vader, 1984; Phillips & Lord, 1981, 1982). This proposition – that leadership quality is in the eye of the followers – instigated a line of research that has had an unprecedented effect on the study of leadership for over the past 30 years (Lord & Emrich, 2000).

The most influential work on ILTs was undertaken by Lord and his associates (e.g., Lord, 1985; Lord & Alliger, 1985; Lord & Maher, 1993; Phillips & Lord, 1981). Lord, Foti, and Phillips (1982) argued that ILTs reflect the structure and content of cognitive categories used to distinguish leaders from non-leaders. A series of experimental studies tested their model of leadership perceptions. Lord et al. (1984) found two categories of ILT traits: prototypical traits such as intelligence and honesty, which are positively associated with leaders; and anti-prototypical traits such as authoritarianism and dishonesty, which are negatively associated or unassociated with leaders.

Offermann, Kennedy, and Wirtz (1994) built upon this work by developing a measure of ILTs. They assessed the content and factor structure of ILTs across three stimuli: leaders; effective leaders; and supervisors. Results from Offermann et al. indicate that ILTs follow eight broad dimensions: sensitivity, dedication, tyranny, charisma, attractiveness, masculinity, intelligence, and strength.

Despite the significant progress made since the advent of leader categorization theory in 1975, far more empirical work is required (Avolio, Sosik, Jung, & Berson, 2003; Epitropaki & Martin, 2004, 2005). For example, research needs to direct more attention to
understanding the relationship between ILTs and trust. Although Burke, Sims, Lazzara, and Salas (2007) include implicit leadership theory in their model of trust in leadership, there has yet to be an empirical investigation of this relationship in the literature on trust or on ILTs. Most research on the antecedents of trust focuses on follower perceptions that appear to be critical conditions for trust (Butler, 1991; Mayer et al., 1995). Given that follower perceptions of leadership produce ILTs, this study suggests that integration of the trust and ILT literatures will provide a more complete picture of trust formation. Further, to arrive at a decision to trust, individuals must compare the trust target (i.e., leader) against some referent (i.e., effective leadership). This comparison is theoretically similar to the comparison between an ILT and the referent leader’s behavior (Whitener, Brodt, Korsgaard, & Werner, 1998).

**ILT Congruence, Leader-Member Exchange and Trust**

Burke et al. (2007) propose that ILTs may moderate the relationship between ability and trust, but there is an absence of research on ILTs and trust in leadership. Leader-member exchange theory (LMX) can help bridge this gap. LMX assumes that leaders differentiate among followers in the establishment of these relationships, and is concerned with the outcomes of these relationships for individuals and the organization (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995; House & Aditya, 1997). LMX, derived from vertical dyad linkage theory, states that leaders differentiate between subordinates in the way they supervise them (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995) such that the leader develops a closer relationship with some followers (Cashman Dansereau, Graen, & Haga, 1976; Dansereau, Graen, & Haga, 1975). Mutual trust, loyalty, and OCB characterize a high LMX relationship. Burke et al. suggest that LMX
could be used to examine how previous interactions influence later perceptions of leader behavior. Although they did not examine LMX in their study, the literature indicates that trust is a component of LMX.

**Leader-member exchange and trust.** Theories of LMX and trust share a few similarities. First, that leader and follower assessments of the quality of the relationship (either LMX or trust) are not necessarily equal (Brower et al., 2000). Moreover, trust need not be mutual: only one party may trust the other (Mayer et al., 1995). In theory, as two parties interact over time, the history of their exchanges builds the LMX relationship, and the parties reach a balance (Emerson, 1962; Smircich & Morgan, 1982). Yet empirical evidence has not supported the assertion that LMX has equal reciprocity (Gerstner & Day, 1997).

Second, the source of measuring either trust or LMX is a perception rather than a reality; trust is a judgment held by the trustor rather than an objective reality (Mayer et al., 1995). Thus, the measure of trust is exists within an individual perceiver. There is no objective measure of trust; one can measure behavior that indicates trust through risk taking, but that is a merely consequence of trust, not trust’s proxy. Thus, only followers can assess how much they trust particular leaders. Leaders may estimate how much they believe that they enjoy a follower’s trust, but the leader’s expectations may be inaccurate because they are based on perception. Although leaders may not be able to know how much followers trust them, their perceptions of followers’ trust, based upon the followers’ behavior, will still affect leaders’ attitudes and behavior.
The same logic follows for LMX; the leader and the follower have individual conceptions of the LMX relationship. Because LMX is a relational construct, the relationship has no absolute actuality, only the individuals’ perceptions (Brower et al., 2000).

While LMX and trust have some parallels, and the trust existing between followers and leaders is a facet of the LMX relationship, the literatures are distinct (Brower et al., 2000; Burke et al., 2007). However, we can look to the theory and methodology of LMX research to aid in the exploration of trust in leadership. Although only a few published studies have examined leader-follower ILT congruence or similarity (Engle & Lord, 1997; Epitropaki & Martin, 2005), this appears to be a fruitful avenue for exploring ILT’s relationship with trust as proposed in Burke et al. (2007).

**ILT congruence and leader-member exchange.** As there are no existing studies of ILT congruence and trust, I look to the literature on LMX and ILT for methodology and previous findings. In the first study to examine ILT congruence, Engle and Lord (1997) investigated the relationship between liking, LMX, ILTs, implicit performance theories (IPT), and perceived attitudinal similarity to the leader. IPTs are similar to ILTs but refer to the performance of the follower. In a cross-sectional design, they assessed 23 traits formerly rated as prototypical in Offermann et al. (1994). Engle and Lord (1997) found that the relationship between ILT congruence (here defined as the square root of the mean of squared differences between follower ILT and leader ILT) and follower-rated LMX quality was not significant. Similarly, ILT congruence was not significantly related to follower-rated liking. However, congruence on implicit performance theories significantly predicted LMX quality and liking, as did perceived attitudinal similarity.
Even though this study did not find a significant relationship between ILT congruence and LMX, the relationship between ILT congruence and trust still warrants exploration. Improvements to the methodology could yield different results. The small sample size may have limited their ability to find main effects (McClelland & Judd, 1993). Further, the variables Engle and Lord (1997) studied (i.e., perceived attitudinal similarity and implicit leadership theories) are likely to be influential if measured from the initial stages of the relationships. Research using a longitudinal design should examine the impact of these variables throughout the course of exchange relationships. Also, while their results indicated no significant relationship between ILT and LMX, they did not investigate the relationship between ILT congruence and trust. As further discussed below, my study attempts to address these concerns.

The second study on ILT congruence explored the role of ILTs in organizational leadership processes (Epitropaki & Martin, 2005). These researchers examined the role of follower ILTs on the quality of LMX and, subsequently, on their perceptions of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and well-being. They also used longitudinal data to clarify the issue of causality between ILTs and LMX. Without the aid of researcher-defined leadership traits, participants rated whether business leaders had certain traits. They were also asked to rate how the same characteristics applied to their own managers (ILT recognition). Epitropaki and Martin (2005) used the absolute difference of follower ILTs minus follower ILT recognition to determine congruence.

Like Engle and Lord (1997), Epitropaki and Martin (2005) tested their models within an LMX framework. They found evidence that ILT incongruence has a significant negative
impact on LMX. They also observed that the more distant the leader’s profile was from a subordinate’s implicit one, the worse was the quality of LMX. Their longitudinal investigation explored the possibility of reciprocal effects of LMX and the difference between ILT and recognized ILT. Using a cross-lagged modeling analysis, they found evidence that the difference between ILT and ILT-recognition affects LMX – and not the other way around.

These two studies suggest that ILT-ILT recognition congruence can help explain the leadership relationship from the subordinate’s perspective. However, as Engle and Lord (1997) is the only study to investigate follower – leader ILT congruence, more research on both ILT congruence and ILT-ILT related behavior is warranted. While these two studies focused on LMX, trust is a component of high quality exchange relationships (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995), and it is reasonable to expect that ILT congruence should positively influence follower trust in leadership as well.

**ILT congruence and trust.** Congruent ILTs should influence the follower’s trust in three ways. First, congruent ILTs may increase a follower’s perceived similarity with the leader, facilitating identification and increasing trust. Second, congruence can become a shared frame of reference as ILTs guide both behavior and interpretations of behavior (Lord & Maher, 1993). In relationships with follower-leader ILT congruence, both parties are likely to interpret behavior similarly. Third, congruence should allow for more intuitive interpersonal interactions, which could influence the attributions followers make about their leaders’ ability, benevolence, and integrity.

Thus, I propose the following:
Hypothesis 2: Similarity between follower-leader ILTs will be positively related to the follower’s perceptions of the (a) ability, (b) benevolence, and (c) integrity of the leader.

In addition, congruence between follower ILT and leader ILT-related behavior (ILT/ILT-B) should lead to increased trust in the leader. Unless explicitly shared by the leaders, followers are unlikely to know the ILT of their leader. Without knowledge of leader ILT, followers may be unable to know the degree of congruence in their relationships with leaders. Consequently, followers may be basing their perceptions of congruence upon how congruent behaviors of their leaders are with their expectations.

To investigate the impact of congruence between follower ILT and leader ILT-related behavior on trust, I propose the following:

Hypothesis 3: Similarity between follower ILT and leader ILT-related behavior will be positively related with the follower’s perceptions of leader (a) ability, (b) benevolence, and (c) integrity.

This study examines how ILT congruence and ILT/ILT-B congruence influence trust and its antecedents - ability, benevolence, and integrity (see Figure 1). It develops previous research by investigating how ILTs influence follower trust in leadership in a field setting, a relationship that researcher has not previously explored.

Method

Participants

Participants came from five residential summer camps located in the United States. Participants were temporary summer employees, including counselors, specialists (e.g., ropes
course, arts and crafts), unit heads (managers), clerical staff, maintenance staff, and kitchen staff. Seventy-five percent of the participants were between the ages of 18 and 21, 14% were between the ages of 22 and 25 years old, 4% were between the ages of 26 and 29 years old, and 4% were 30 years old or older. Seventy-three percent of participants identified as American, 13% as Israeli, 5% as British, and the remaining 9% as other. Fifty-eight percent of participants were female. The participants worked in small teams (4-8 people) with an official leader (for instance, the head of a unit or specialty area). Approximately 600 staff members were asked to participate and 308 returned usable questionnaires for a response rate of 51%. Eighty-one leaders who participated the survey also had at least one follower complete the survey.

Procedures

I collected data via paper-based and online questionnaires at the beginning and end of the camp session, but the vast majority of surveys were administered solely on paper because the two camps given the option of completing the first survey online had difficulty with internet access. There were no significant differences in the variables of interest between the paper-based and web-based surveys. The study participants responded to the first survey at the beginning of the session, when the teams were forming and they were meeting their team members and leaders for the first time. Participants (both leaders and followers) provided individual difference data, including ILTs, at Time 1. The study participants responded to the second survey four weeks later at the end of the camp session before their teams disbanded. The second survey contained ILT-related behavior scales for followers to report on leader behavior as well as the antecedents to trust and trust in leadership scales. To
promote a higher response rate, I held three random drawings for monetary incentives at the end of data collection.

Measures

Implicit leadership theories. I used a slightly modified version of the 41-item Implicit Leadership Theory (ILT) scale developed by Offermann, Kennedy, and Wirtz (1994) (see Appendix B). On this scale, participants rated items on a 5-point scale (from not at all characteristic to extremely characteristic) depending on whether they thought each of the 41 traits (e.g., “Domineering,” “Educated”) was characteristic of an ideal leader, with no additional definition of the term “leader” provided (Offermann et al., 1994). The scale included eight dimensions: attractiveness, charisma, dedication, intelligence, masculinity, sensitivity, strength, and tyranny. For the item “classy,” I substituted the more contemporary term, “refined.” Participants provided this information at Time 1. Cronbach alpha reliability coefficients for the subscales ranged from .62 to .80, except for strength, which had a reliability of .52.

Implicit leadership theory-relevant behavior. Participants’ reported their perceptions of ILT-relevant behavior (hereafter referred to as ‘ILT-B’) of the leader on a version the Offermann et al. (1994) scale modified by Koommoo-Welch (2009; see Appendix C). I collected this information from followers at Time 2. On this scale, behavioral representations (e.g., “responds to the feelings of others” replaced “sensitive”) replace the 41 original ILT items. Again, the item “is classy” was changed to “is refined.” Instead of rating an ideal leader, participants rated their current leader. Followers used the same 5-point scale as in the ILT scale (not at all characteristic to extremely characteristic). Cronbach alphas
reliability coefficients for the subscales were between .79 and .92, again except for strength, which had a reliability of .62.

**Ability, benevolence, and integrity.** I used Mayer and Davis’s (1999) 17-item scale on trustworthiness to measure the ability, benevolence, and integrity of the leader (see Appendix D). For consistency, I changed the term “manager” to “leader.” To avoid having reversed-scored items, I rewrote one item. Sample items include “My leader is very capable of performing his/her job” and “My leader would not knowingly do anything to hurt me.” Participants rated each item on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). Followers provided this information at Time 2. Cronbach’s coefficients alpha reliability was .92 for the ability scale, .89 for the benevolence scale, and .90 for the integrity scale.

**Trust in leadership.** I used McAllister’s (1995) measure of supervisory trust to measure trust in leadership. Participants responded to 11 items that describe follower-leader relations, using a 5-point agreement scale (see Appendix E). To maintain consistency with the terminology used in the summer camps, I changed the term “supervisor” to “leader,” and “work associate” to “staff member.” Sample items include “I can talk freely to my leader about difficulties I am having at work and know that (s)he will want to listen” and “Most people, even those who aren’t close friends of my leader, trust and respect him/her as a coworker.” Followers responded to this scale at Time 2. Cronbach’s alpha for this scale was .93.

**Demographic items.** Participants provided demographic data including name, age, gender, job title, nationality, marital status, educational level, direct supervisor, years worked
at the camp, and years worked in that position at Time 1. They provided their names, job
titles and names of their direct supervisors at Time 2. I collected identifiers so that I could
match data from Time 1 and Time 2 and so I could complete the random drawing. I removed
identifiers from the data set after I matched the data.

Analysis and Results

Preliminary Analyses

Prior to analysis, I examined all scales to determine accuracy of data entry, missing
values, and scale reliability. I then checked fit between the scale distributions and the
assumptions of multivariate analysis (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). All analyses were
performed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 16.0 (SPSS
Inc., 2007) or Mplus version 4.0 (Muthén & Muthén, 2006). I conducted purification
analyses using the statistical package Tetrad 3.1 (Drewes, 2009; Spirtes et al., 1999). Means,
standard deviations, reliability coefficients, and intercorrelations among study variables are
presented in Table 1.

Congruence Indices. I calculated congruence between Leader-follower ILTs and
follower ILT – leader ILT-B using squared Euclidean distance (SED). Squared Euclidean
Distance is calculated as follows:

\[ SED = \sum (x_{ik} - x_{jk})^2 \]

where SED is the distance squared between cases i and j; i is follower ILT and j is either
leader ILT or ILT-B. The difference between \(x_{ik}\) and \(x_{jk}\) was determined for each subscale,
or \(k_{th}\) variable (Aldenderfer & Blashfield, 1984). To calculate SED subscale scores for the
ILT, I first standardized measures into z-scores and then calculated the difference between
the two measures for each of the matching subscales. SED was calculated as the sum across all eight of these difference scores, for each individual. I chose to use SED as the similarity index for this study because of its sensitivity to three components of pattern similarity: shape (the pattern of high and low scale scores in a profile); level (the overall elevation of the profile); and scatter (the degree of variability of the subscale scores around the profile average; Cronbach & Gleser, 1953).

Structural Models

**Confirmatory factor analysis.** Before testing any structural models, I performed confirmatory factor analyses to test the measurement models. I examined several criteria to assess the overall fit of the measurement models. The ratio of chi-square to degrees of freedom ($\chi^2/df$) was computed, with ratios of less than 2.0 indicating a good fit. I examined two relative indices, the comparative fit index (CFI) and the Tucker and Lewis index (TLI) to provide a more robust evaluation of model fit (Tucker & Lewis, 1973). For CFI and TLI, coefficients closer to unity indicate a good fit, with acceptable levels of fit being above 0.95 and 0.06 indicating acceptable fit for root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) for (Hu & Bentler, 1999).

I performed confirmatory factor analysis to test the measurement models of the four latent variables: ability, benevolence, integrity, and trust. I did not test confirmatory models for the ILT scales, but instead relied on these scales in their published form.

Table 2 displays the factor loadings and standard errors produced by a test of the initial ability measurement model. This measurement model did not provide adequate fit of the data ($\chi^2 (9, N =210) = 32.931, p < .0001, \chi^2/df = 3.659, CFI = .97, TLI = .96, RMSEA = $
0.11); therefore the Tetrad III software (Spirtes et al., 1999) was run to identify items that could be contributing to poor model fit. Tetrad purification analysis tests that a one-factor CFA model is unidimensional, or scalable. Scalability is defined as a set of items that have identical distributions of scores on a common standardized latent dimension (Drewes, 2009). This analysis showed that I should drop item 5 (“My leader has specialized capabilities that can increase our team’s performance.”) from further analysis. I tested a second measurement model with this item omitted. This measurement model, $\chi^2 (5, N = 210) = 4.785$, $p = 0.44$, showed an improvement in model fit ($\chi^2/df = 0.957$, CFI = 1.00, TLI = 1.00, RMSEA = 0.00). Cronbach’s coefficient alpha reliability for the revised scale was .92. Table 2 also displays the factor loadings and standard errors produced by the test of this revised measurement model.

The factor loadings and standard errors produced by a test of the initial benevolence measurement model is presented in Table 3. This measurement model did not provide adequate fit of the data ($\chi^2 (5, N = 210) = 38.543$, $p < .000$, $\chi^2/df = 7.71$, CFI = .95, TLI = .89, RMSEA = .18). Tetrad III results indicated that I should omit item 5 (“My leader will go out of his/her way to help me.”) from further analysis. I then tested a second measurement model that did not include this item. This measurement model, $\chi^2 (2, N = 210) = 4.659$, $p = 0.09$, showed an improvement in model fit ($\chi^2/df = 2.32$, CFI = 0.99, TLI = 0.98, RMSEA = 0.08). Cronbach’s coefficient alpha reliability for the revised benevolence scale was .87. Table 3 displays the factor loadings and standard errors produced by the test of this revised measurement model.
Table 4 displays the factor loadings and standard errors produced by a test of the initial Integrity measurement model. This measurement model, $\chi^2 (9, N = 210) = 25.81$, $p < .0022$, did not provide adequate fit of the data ($\chi^2/df = 2.86$, CFI = .98, TLI = .96, RMSEA = 0.90). Tetrad III analysis indicated that I should remove item 2 (“I never have to wonder whether my leader will stick to his/her word.”) from further analysis. I tested a second measurement model that did not include this item. This measurement model, $\chi^2 (5, N = 210) = 8.04$, $p = 0.15$, showed an improvement in model fit ($\chi^2/df = 1.87$, CFI = 0.99, TLI = 0.99, RMSEA = 0.05). Cronbach’s alpha reliability for the revised integrity scale was .89. Table 4 displays the factor loadings and standard errors produced by the test of this revised measurement model.

Factor loadings and standard errors produced by a test of the initial Trust measurement model are presented in Table 5. This measurement model, $\chi^2 (44, N = 210) = 304.023$, $p < .000$, did not provide adequate fit ($\chi^2/df = 6.91$, CFI = .85, TLI = .81, RMSEA = 0.14). Tetrad III analysis indicated that I should drop items 1, 3, 7, 8, and 9 from further analysis. The revised model without these items was tested, $\chi^2 (9, N = 210) = 16.87$, $p = 0.50$, and showed an improvement in model fit ($\chi^2/df = 1.87$, CFI = 0.99, TLI = 0.98, RMSEA = 0.07). Cronbach’s coefficient alpha reliability for the revised trust scale was .90. Table 5 displays the factor loadings and standard errors produced by the test of this revised measurement model.

Using the refined and confirmed scales, I tested the overall measurement model. This model, $\chi^2 (146, N = 210) = 621.548$, $p < .000$, indicated that the fit was not satisfactory ($\chi^2/df = 4.25$, CFI = .83, TLI = .81, RMSEA = 0.13).
Because the overall measurement model did not provide an adequate fit, I was not able to test the structural equation model since a poor fitting measurement model precludes an adequate fitting causal model. As I could not test a causal model I used correlation analyses to test the hypotheses I proposed. Correlation analyses are appropriate in this context when each hypothesis is considered individually. I found significant correlations between the three facets of trustworthiness and trust in leadership: ability and trust, \( r = .73, p < .001 \); benevolence and trust, \( r = .66, p < .001 \); and integrity and trust, \( r = .80, p < .001 \). There were significant correlations between ability and ILT congruence, \( r = .22, p = .006 \) and benevolence and ILT congruence, \( r = -0.18, p = .033 \). Integrity and ILT congruence were not significantly correlated, \( r = -0.03, p = .363 \). There were significant correlations between ability and ILT - ILT-B congruence, \( r = 0.26, p = .000 \), and integrity and ILT - ILT-B congruence, \( r = 0.16, p = .011 \). Benevolence and ILT - ILT-B congruence were not significantly correlated: \( r = -0.02, p = .384 \).

**Discussion**

The primary goal of this study was to examine the influence of leader behaviors (specifically ability, integrity, and benevolence) on follower trust in leadership and implicit leadership theory congruence, an issue previously uncharted in the trust literature. The results of this research found that ability, benevolence, and integrity relate to trust in leadership and suggest that implicit leadership theories may play a role in judging trustworthiness in a sample of young adults working in summer camps. While I was unable to assess the fit of an overall causal model, zero-order correlation analyses revealed mixed findings between ILTs and trust in leadership. This is the only study to date that investigates
relationships between ILTs and trustworthiness. The results of this study yield both practical and theoretical implications when considering trust in leadership, especially in light of the turbulent economy.

I agree with previous authors that one cannot build trust quickly or easily (e.g., Lewicki, McAllister, & Bies, 1998; Tyler & Degoej, 1995). Nevertheless, my findings suggest that trust might be developed over a relatively short period of time. In this study, followers made judgments regarding their leader’s trustworthiness four weeks after the start of the relationship, more quickly than in previous studies. All three factors of trustworthiness; ability, benevolence, and integrity, related to trust - confirming previous research (Cunningham & MacGregor, 2000; Davis, Schoorman, Mayer, & Tan, 2000; Gill, Boies, Finegan, & McNally, 2005; Mayer & Davis, 1999). This supports the notion that it is possible that congruent ILTs and ILT/ILT-Bs lay a foundation for followers to gauge the leader as trustworthy at the beginning of the relationship.

The ability of the leader positively related with follower-leader ILT congruence, ILT/ILT-B congruence, and trust in leadership. Observation coupled with similar leadership frameworks may have caused followers to believe that the leaders were capable of completing their job successfully. When there was limited time to scrutinize the leader’s ability, followers could have relied on schemas more and in conjunction with observed behavior to assess their leaders’ ability.

Benevolence also positively related with trust in leadership, but was negatively related to ILT congruence and unrelated to ILT/ILT-B congruence. The more similar the leader-follower ILTs were, the less likely followers were to rate leaders as benevolent. This
is not what I hypothesized. One possible explanation for this discrepant finding is that
leaders may have over-compensated for presumed divergent schemas. Leaders may have
shown more concern for followers’ welfare, or gone out of their way to assist, since the work
was in a highly interpersonal setting where teamwork was essential. However, benevolence
and ILT - ILT-B congruence were not significantly correlated. Benevolence is composed of
behaviors such as coaching subordinates and creating and sustaining a supportive
environment. Benevolence, therefore, may need longer than a month’s time to develop fully.
The ramifications of such a short time period might have been even further magnified by the
followers’ and leaders’ awareness that their professional relationship was temporary.

The third antecedent of trust, that is integrity, also showed mixed results. Integrity
positively related to trust, did not correlate with ILT congruence, and positively correlated
with ILT/ILT-B. Integrity is comprised of accountability, perceptions of justice, and value
congruence. It may be that integrity is a difficult construct for followers to deduce from their
leader’s ILT since characteristics like honesty and consistency are easier to assess via
observable behaviors. Integrity items like “My leader tried hard to be fair in dealings with
others.” support the idea that observable behaviors are more likely to guide followers than
similar ILTs when it comes to ILTs.

The relationships between ability, trust, congruent ILTs and congruent ILT/ILT-B are
consistently significant, yet the effect of benevolence or integrity is mixed. Other studies
have found similar results. For instance, Jarvenpaa, Knoll, and Leidner (1998) found that
benevolence had an impact on trust only at the end of the project, while others (e.g., Aubert
& Kelsey, 2003) found no effect at all. Future research should consider how people observe
and how they judge ability, benevolence, and integrity across multiple time points. This would provide a more complete picture of how these relationships change over time.

Researchers should especially assess these components of trust at the beginning of relationships, after critical junctures (i.e., change in teammates, organization-wide change), and towards the end of relationships.

Limitations

As with any study, this one has a number of limitations. First, I used a difference index (squared Euclidean distance, SED) to compute ILT and ILT-B congruence. Many have criticized the use of difference scores because of their purported inability to be reliable and valid (Cronbach & Furby, 1970). However, Rogosa and colleagues (Rogosa & Willett, 1983, 1985; Rogosa, Brandt, & Zimowski, 1982) demonstrated that in many circumstances a difference score can be an intuitive and unbiased measure of change. I chose to use SED in this study because of its sensitivity to the three components of pattern similarity: shape, level, and scatter to address.

There is also concern that difference scores can never explain more variance than their component measures because they are simply composites of their components (Edwards, 1994). Tisak and Smith (1994), however, maintain that a difference score can often represent something conceptually distinct from its components. Perhaps newer methodology like latent variable congruence (Cheung, 2009) may address some of the concerns regarding the use of difference scores. However, Edwards (2009) has already criticized this method and it is not one commonly used by researchers in the field. Future
research of ILT congruence and trust in leadership should seek alternatives to difference scores.

Second, the data collected were, for the most part, single source data. ILT/ILT-B congruence was calculated using data from two difference sources (leaders and followers), but the remainder of the data was reported by the follower. The ability, benevolence, integrity and trust scales were cross-sectional; however, the ILT measures were collected prior to these measures. I believe that this strengthens the evidence in favor of these causal relationships. Nevertheless, I was unable to assess directly a causal model and had to rely on supportive relationships identified by zero-order correlations between variable measured at different points in time.

Conclusion and Implications

This study was one of the first to test some of the theoretical propositions of the leadership categorization approach in relation to trust. It is the first study to consider ILT congruence and ILT/ILT-B congruence and trust. This research shows that ability, benevolence, and integrity all relate to trust in leadership and that congruent ILTs correlate with ability. Although mixed findings on the role of ILTs and trust in leadership exist when looking at integrity, benevolence, and ILT congruence, these results still provide the impetus for future research into the relationship between ILTs and trust.

My findings may have a few practical implications, especially in light of recent economic turbulence. This economic instability has left many wary of trusting governments, corporations, and banks (Sorkin, 2010); job insecurity probably also encourages people to distrust their leaders. Mulki, Jaramillo, and Locander (2006) found that the ethical climate is
an important predictor of trust in leadership. Employees who are unsure of their work climate are more distrustful of their leaders. Reductions in force, reallocations of workloads, outsourcing, and insecurity can all cause employees to lose trust in their leaders. When workers who have had negative experiences with previous leaders begin new jobs, they may enter their new jobs with ILTs negatively colored by their experiences. These employees may be initially more distrustful of their new leaders. Future research should explore how the increased distrust in the workplace caused by the economy influences trust in leadership, particularly via ILTs.

My study suggests that to increase trust, leaders should increase perceptions of ability, integrity, and benevolence. To strengthen perceptions of ability, benevolence, and integrity, we can look at behavioral indicators identified by Burke et al. (2007). Leader behaviors such as setting a compelling direction or creating an enabling structure indicate ability. Setting a compelling direction requires leaders to ensure that employees perceive their tasks and goals as challenging, clear, and consequential (Hackman, 2002). Leaders create an enabling structure when they allocate resources, establish the norms of behavior within the team, and recruit, select, and form the team (Hackman, 2002; Fleishman et al., 1991). The economic turmoil can sometimes hamper these processes.

Leaders show benevolence by coaching subordinates (as by interacting directly with a team to help it appropriately use its collective resources) or by creating a supportive environment (Hackman & Wageman, 2005), During tough economic times or rough organizational transitions, leaders may lack time for behaviors such as coaching and supporting, however, as this research shows, these are essential for developing trust.
Integrity is composed of accountability and perceptions of justice (Burke et al., 2007). Followers who perceive that their leaders hold themselves personally accountable for their actions are more likely see their leaders as having integrity. Accountability is not only important for trust in leadership, but also for receiving government funding or improving public relations. The second component of integrity, perceptions of justice, is also particularly relevant during challenging economic situations. When policies and procedures are administered consistently (procedural justice), rewards and promotions are disseminated consistently (distributive justice), and people are treated with respect (interactional justice, Skarlicki, Barclay, & Pugh; 2008). Under these circumstances, followers are more likely to perceive their leaders as fair and just. This is especially true in times of scarce rewards, growing terminations, and pay reductions (Skarlicki et al., 2008; Williams, 2009; Zoogah, 2010). Leaders should concentrate on increasing perceptions of ability, benevolence, and integrity at the beginning of relationships or when there would be an immediate impact on work quality if trust were absent.

ILT congruence could also yield important information for leaders. These results are important for the leadership and trust literatures because they indicate that leader–follower relationships do not start from blank slates. Like my study, Ballinger, Schoorman, and Lehman (2009) found that the quality of the prior relationships held by group members influence future leader-member exchange relationships. This is important for two reasons. First, certain followers may not evaluate new leaders based solely on the characteristics of the new group leader; affective reactions can carry over from previous relationships and color their perception of the new leader. Second, it implies that exchange relationships are
Driven both by the behavior of the new leader and by the willingness of the follower to engage in such a relationship. Work contexts marred by economic instability may influence ILTs and trust. For instance, an employee who has been rehired after being laid off may harbor mistrust based upon experiences with prior leaders.

Recognition of the importance of trust in organizations has grown considerably in recent years. This study contributes to the growing literature in this area of management. This is the first study to investigate ILT congruence and trust, and it the only study to do so in a field setting. This study has extended the previous work on trust by Burke et al. (2007), Mayer et al. (1995), and Schoorman et al. (2007). Its findings are consistent with research on LMX, a similar relational construct that suggests that leaders often have differential relationships with subordinates (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). The results of this study should stimulate more research on ILTs and their influence on theories related to trust, an area where followers’ perceptions of leaders are particularly relevant to optimal personal and organizational performance and well-being.
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Table 1

Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations among Study Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ability\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Benevolence\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.50**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Integrity\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.68**</td>
<td>0.65**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ILT Congruence\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>17.25</td>
<td>15.89</td>
<td>-0.21*</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.19*</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. ILT ILT-B Congruence\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>11.77</td>
<td>14.76</td>
<td>-0.16*</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.62**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Trust\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.74**</td>
<td>0.69**</td>
<td>0.80**</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.21**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \textsuperscript{a}n=210, \textsuperscript{b}n=185, *p < 0.05, **p < 0.01
Table 2

*Ability Measurement Models*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Initial Factor Loadings</th>
<th>Initial S.E.</th>
<th>Final Factor Loadings</th>
<th>Final S.E.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. My leader is very capable of performing his/her job.</td>
<td>0.91**</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.93**</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. My leader is known to be successful at the things he/she tries to do.</td>
<td>0.75**</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.76**</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My Leader is knowledgeable about the work that needs done.</td>
<td>0.55**</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.55**</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I feel very confident about my leader’s skills.</td>
<td>0.93**</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.92**</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. My leader has specialized capabilities that can increase our team’s performance.</td>
<td>0.70**</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.63**</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. My leader is well qualified.</td>
<td>0.65**</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. n=210, *p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01*
Table 3

*Benevolence Measurement Models*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Initial Factor Loadings</th>
<th>Initial S.E.</th>
<th>Final Factor Loadings</th>
<th>Final S.E.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. My leader is very concerned about my welfare.</td>
<td>0.62**</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.65**</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. My needs and desires are very important to my leader.</td>
<td>0.80**</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.87**</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My leader would not knowingly do anything to hurt me.</td>
<td>0.56**</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.54**</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. My leader really looks out for what is important to me.</td>
<td>0.86**</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.79**</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. My leader will go out of his/her way to help me.</td>
<td>0.76**</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. n=210 *p < 0.05, **p < 0.01*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Initial Factor Loadings</th>
<th>Initial S.E.</th>
<th>Final Factor Loadings</th>
<th>Final S.E.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. My leader has a strong sense of justice.</td>
<td>0.58**</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.60**</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I never have to wonder whether my leader will stick to his/her word.</td>
<td>0.80**</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My leader tries hard to be fair in dealings with others.</td>
<td>0.80**</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.77**</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. My leader’s actions and behaviors are consistent.</td>
<td>0.81**</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.79**</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I like my leader’s values.</td>
<td>0.81**</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.83**</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Sound principles seem to guide my leader’s behavior.</td>
<td>0.68**</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.70**</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* n = 210, *p* < 0.05, **p* < 0.01
### Table 5

**Trust Measurement Models**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Initial Factor Loadings</th>
<th>Initial S.E.</th>
<th>Final Factor Loadings</th>
<th>Final S.E.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. We have a sharing relationship. We can both freely share our ideas, feelings, and hopes.</td>
<td>0.76**</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I can talk freely to this individual about difficulties I am having and know that (s)he will want to listen.</td>
<td>0.91**</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.92**</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. We would both feel a sense of loss if we could no longer work together.</td>
<td>0.79**</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. If I shared my problems with this person, I know (s)he would respond constructively and caringly.</td>
<td>0.79**</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.81**</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I would have to say that we have both made considerable emotional investments in our working relationship.</td>
<td>0.63**</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.60**</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. This person approaches his/her job with professionalism and dedication.</td>
<td>0.57**</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.56**</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Given this person's track record, I see no reason to doubt his/her competence and preparation for the job.</td>
<td>0.67**</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I can rely on this person not to make my job more difficult by careless work.</td>
<td>0.74**</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Most people, even those who aren't close friends of this individual, trust and respect him/her as a coworker.</td>
<td>0.81**</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Other staff members who must interact with this individual consider him/her to be trustworthy.</td>
<td>0.79**</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.77**</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I trust my leader.</td>
<td>0.83**</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.82**</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. n = 210, *p < 0.05, **p < 0.01*
Figure 1. Proposed Model of Hypothesized Relationships
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Trust in Leadership: The Role of Implicit Leadership Theory Congruence

Trust is often cited as a hallmark of effective relationships, be they personal, professional, or political, between individuals, groups or nations. The literature from psychology, sociology, management, economics, and political science agree on the importance of trust (e.g., Bachmann & Zaheer, 2006; Berscheid, 1994; Gambetta, 1988; Kramer & Tyler, 1996; Williamson, 1993) and recent years have seen a renewed interest in research on trust in organizational contexts and specifically on trust in leadership (e.g., Ayoko & Pekerti, 2008; Branzei, Vertinsky, & Camp, 2007; Burke, Sims, Lazarra, & Salas, 2007; Lapidot, Kark, & Shamir, 2007; Schoorman, Mayer, & Davis, 2007; Webber, 2008). Trust, as defined by Mayer, Davis, and Schoorman (1995) is 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.721).

Employees’ trust in their leaders has been related to a range of organizational outcomes such as improving organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behavior, the rate of employee turnover (e.g., Connell, Ferres, & Travaglione, 2003; Dirks & Ferrin, 2002), team performance (Dirks, 2000), and organizational performance (Davis, Schoorman, Mayer, & Tan, 2000). Trust in leaders has been found to be particularly important for effective functioning in teams and organizations where tasks are complex, unstructured, and require high levels of interdependence, cooperation, and information sharing (Creed & Miles, 1996; Gillespie & Mann, 2004; Zand, 1972). Researchers attempting to understand how trust develops and how it can be fostered in the workplace have been accumulating evidence regarding the positive consequences
of trust in leadership (e.g., Kim, Cooper, Ferrin, & Dirks, 2004; Kim, Dirks, Cooper, & Ferrin, 2006).

Recent theoretical developments in the literature on trust in leadership and organizations have given researchers a unique opportunity to examine these questions in the context of organizations and to advance our understanding of the complex relationships between supervisors and subordinates (e.g., Burke, Sims, Lazarra, & Salas, 2007; Schoorman, Mayer, & Davis, 2007). While research on trust has increased in recent years, its relationship with implicit leadership theories (ILT) has not garnered as much attention and remains under-researched. ILT holds that individuals form prototypes, or schemas, about the qualities and abilities that characterize an ideal leader. These implicit theories help individuals categorize people as leaders and non-leaders and specify traits and behaviors that followers expect from leaders (Lord, Foti, & De Vader, 1984). When people are asked to evaluate someone on her leadership abilities, they decide how good she is based on how well she fits their cognitive model of leadership (Lord, DeVader, & Allinger, 1986; Lord et al., 1984). Although there has been much conceptual development, the role of ILTs and followers’ leadership prototypes in making sense of leadership behavior in organizational settings remains relatively understudied. The majority of studies on ILTs have been conducted in laboratory settings (e.g., Cronshaw & Lord, 1987; Lord et al., 1984; Ritter & Lord, 2007) and have concentrated on content and measurement issues (e.g., Epitropaki & Martin, 2004; Lord et al., 1984; Offerman, Kennedy, & Wirtz, 1994). The current study improves on previous studies by investigating how ILTs influence follower trust in leadership in a field setting; a relationship that has not previously been explored in the literature.
The goals of this study are threefold. The present study will test part of a model proposed by Burke, Sims, Lazarra, & Salas (2007). Specifically, I will investigate benevolence, ability, and integrity as the antecedents of trust in leadership (see Mayer, Davis, & Schoorman, 1995; Schoorman, Mayer, & Davis, 2007). Second, I will investigate how a) leader-follower ILT congruence and b) congruence between follower ILT and their perceptions of leaders’ ILT relevant behaviors relate to benevolence, ability, integrity, and trust in leadership. Third, I will examine whether these relationships are stable over multiple leaders.

In this section, I will review the literature on trust in leadership, implicit leadership theory, and on how ILT congruence helps to create the perception among followers that their leaders are trustworthy.

Models of Trust in Leadership

Leaders play a key role in determining organizational effectiveness across all levels (e.g., individual, team, and unit) within organizations. The degree to which subordinates, coworkers, and customers trust the leader is vital to the leader’s ability to be effective in the workplace (Bennis, 1999). Both practitioners and researchers have become increasingly interested in trust in leadership. Research on trust originally focused on two areas, trust between organizational members and antecedents of trust. Later models began to focus on trust between subordinates and supervisors, or followers and leaders. As the literature grew, the outcomes of trust were incorporated and into more integrative models and literature reviews. A review of these models, as well as relevant empirical studies, follows.

The antecedents of trust. Mayer et al. (1995) proposed one of the most influential and well-known models of organizational trust (see Figure 1). This model was designed to focus on
trust in an organizational setting involving two specific parties: a trusting party, the trustor and the party to be trusted, the trustee. Unlike previous models Mayer et al.’s model considered characteristics of both the trustor and the trustee. The characteristic of the trustor included in this model is referred to as the propensity to trust. Propensity to trust, as defined by Mayer et al., is a stable trait that affects the likelihood that the individual will trust another party. Propensity to trust can be thought of as an individual difference that determines the base level of trust at the beginning of a relationship.

Even when a trustor has high levels of propensity to trust, the level of trust between the trustor and trustee is dependent upon characteristics of the trustee in Mayer et al.’s (1995) model. This concept, called trustworthiness, helps explain why some individuals are more trusted than others. Mayer et al. proposed three factors that compose trustworthiness: ability, benevolence, and integrity. Ability is defined as the "group of skills, competencies, and characteristics that enable a party to have influence within some specific domain" (p. 717). Benevolence is the degree to which the trustee is believed to have the best interests of the trustor in mind. The perception that a trustee is benevolent comes from friendliness, citizenship behaviors, social interaction, finding commonalities, and a general feeling of liking towards the person. The third component of trustworthiness is integrity. Integrity is the extent to which the trustor believes the trustee adheres to a set of values, such as consistency, honesty, and predictability, which the trustor finds acceptable. According to this model the trustor assesses the ability, benevolence, and integrity of the trustee and uses this assessment in deciding whether to trust the trustee.

In the Mayer, et al. (1995) model, trust leads to an outcome called risk taking in the relationship. The level of trust between the leader and follower will affect the amount of risk the
trustor is willing to take in the relationship. For example, leaders may take a risk when delegating an important task to a follower who has never completed the task before. Likewise, followers may take a risk when divulging sensitive information to their leaders. Risk taking in the relationship is distinct from the tendency to take risks and risk-taking behavior in that it can occur only in the context of a specific, identifiable relationship with another party.

One of the limitations of this model is that it does not explore the process by which trust develops or if trustor individual differences influence trust in the relationship. In addition, this model yields only one outcome of trust, risk taking in the relationship, and it does not specify more distal outcomes of trust. Still, this model has consistently been the basis of later models of organizational trust and trust in leadership. Mayer et al.’s (1995) model contributed to the literature by separating trust from trustworthiness, with three characteristics of the trustee (ability, benevolence, and integrity) appearing as antecedents of trust.

Building trust in the leader. Whitener, Brodt, Korsgaard, and Werner (1998) took a slightly different perspective on trust (see Figure 2). While Mayer et al. (1995) specified trust between two individuals in a workplace, Whitener et al. proposed a model of trust between a manager and follower. This model expanded upon the Mayer et al. model by delineating the types of manager behaviors that build trust, which they label managerial trustworthy behavior, and presenting a framework for understanding the antecedents of this behavior in organizations.

Whitener et al. (1998) define managerial trustworthy behavior, as “volitional actions and interactions performed by managers that are necessary though not sufficient to engender employees' trust in them.” (p. 516). Five categories of managerial behavior influence employees' perceptions of managerial trustworthiness in this model: behavioral consistency, behavioral
integrity, sharing and delegation of control, communication, and demonstration of concern. Behavioral consistency develops as followers observe manager behavior over time and across situations, and are better able to predict managers' future behavior. When followers observe consistency between their managers' words and actions they are able to make attributions about their honesty and character leading to judgments of behavioral integrity. Sharing and delegating control can range from soliciting opinions from subordinates to relinquishing decision making to subordinates. Communication in this model specifies three factors that influence trustworthiness: accuracy of information, explanations of decisions, and openness. The emphasis in communication is on sharing and exchanging ideas. The final dimension, demonstration of concern, is composed of showing consideration and sensitivity for subordinates’ needs, protecting subordinates' interests, and avoiding the exploitation of others for their own benefit.

These five categories fit more parsimoniously into Mayer et al.’s (1995) model. Behavioral consistency and behavioral integrity are included in Mayer et al.’s integrity factor. Demonstration of concern is subsumed in Mayer et al.’s benevolence construct, while communication is one facet of the manager’s ability to work and lead. Delegation of control in Mayer et al.’s model is an example of risk in the relationship –the leader trusts in the follower to such an extent that he or she would delegate an important task to the follower. In the Mayer et al. model delegation of control is an outcome of trust, while in the Whitener et al. (1998) model delegation is an antecedent to trust.

The Whitener et al. (1998) model extends the Mayer et al. model by the addition of antecedents to trustworthy behavior. The proposed antecedents include organizational factors, relational factors, and individual factors. Organizational factors include the organizational
structure, human resource policies, and organizational culture. The relational factors include the initial interactions between the manager and subordinate, the expectations of the relationship, and the costs of exchanges, or as Mayer et al.’s model defines it, the perceived risk. The individual factors that influence perceptions of trustworthy behaviors are the propensity to trust, self-efficacy, and personal values. While this model focuses on trust in the manager/subordinate relationship, it is less parsimonious than the model proposed by Mayer et al. (1995).

A quantitative review. Since Mayer et al. (1995) and Whitener et al. (1998), trust has emerged as a research theme in its own right. The rise in interest is evidenced by a growing number of edited books (Bachmann & Zaheer, 2006; Kramer & Tyler, 1996), and a growing number of individual articles (e.g., Doney, Cannon, & Mullen, 1998; Gomez & Rosen, 2001; Mayer & Davis, 1999; Pillai, Schrieshaim, & Williams, 1999). As Kramer (1999) noted, trust is moving from “bit player to center stage in contemporary organizational theory and research” (p. 594). Frustrated by a lack of integration in the growing literature, Dirks and Ferrin (2002) conducted a meta-analysis of trust in leadership. Dirks and Ferrin meta-analyzed the results of 93 articles examining the antecedents (e.g., length of relationship, leadership style, procedural justice) and consequences (e.g., job satisfaction, intention to quit, job performance) of trust. Antecedents found to have a significant relationship with trust include transformational leadership ($r = .72$), perceived organizational support ($r = .69$), interactional justice ($r = .65$), procedural justice ($r = .61$), transactional leadership ($r = .59$) and distributive justice ($r = .50$). Propensity to trust had a small significant relationship ($r = .16$) while length of relationship had no appreciable relationship ($r = .01$). Trust in leadership was found to have significant relationships with the following outcomes: job performance ($r = .16$), job satisfaction ($r = .51$),
organizational commitment ($r = .49$), turnover intentions ($r = .40$), satisfaction with leader ($r = .73$), leader-member exchange ($r = .69$), and the organizational citizenship components of altruism ($r = .19$), civic virtue ($r = .11$), conscientiousness ($r = .22$), courtesy ($r = .22$), and sportsmanship ($r = .20$). Implicit leadership theories were not investigated by Dirks and Ferrin.

Although their review provided a useful and timely quantitative summary of the literature, Dirks and Ferrin’s (2002) decisions about conceptualizing trust were not synonymous with the terms of Mayer et al.’s (1995) model. As a result, what they coded as trust often represented an amalgam of Mayer et al.’s trust, ability, benevolence, and integrity. This approach makes it difficult to estimate the relationships between ability, benevolence, integrity, and trust and to explore their unique relationships with outcomes.

**An integrative framework.** Mayer et al. (1995) first defined trust as separate from its antecedents, Whitener et al. (1998) focused their model on managerial trust, and Dirks and Ferrin (2002) examined the relationships between antecedents to and outcome of trust. Burke, Sims, Lazarra, and Salas (2007) developed a model based on the reviews and meta-analyses of Mayer et al., Whitener et al., and Dirks and Ferrin (see Figure 3). Burke et al.’s integrative multi-level framework depicts antecedents to trust in leadership, moderators at the individual, team, and organizational levels, both proximal and distal outcomes of trust in leadership. While their framework is not exhaustive, the constructs included in their model are the most representative of the trust literature.

Burke et al. (2007) found that the categorization of antecedents into the broad facets of Mayer et al. (1995) ability, benevolence, and integrity is prevalent in the literature. Burke et al. more explicitly defined these broad antecedents by examining the literature with regard to the
specific behaviors that followers judge when determining the trustworthiness of their leaders. These behavioral indicators are further explained below.

The ability of the leader is composed of the observable behaviors that serve as indicators to the follower. The indicators of ability, drawn from Hackman's (2002) functional approach to leadership, are setting a compelling direction and creating an enabling structure. Setting a compelling direction requires that leaders ensure that employees perceive their tasks and goals as challenging, clear, and consequential (Hackman, 2002). Creating an enabling structure includes allocating work and resources, establishing the norms of behavior within the team, and recruiting, selecting, and forming the composition of the team (Hackman, 2002; Fleishman et al., 1991).

The second antecedent, benevolence, is composed of coaching subordinates and creating and sustaining a supportive environment. Coaching has been defined as, “direct interaction with a team intended to help members make coordinated and task appropriate use of their collective resources in accomplishing the team's work” (Hackman & Wageman, 2005, p. 269). Coaching indicates authentic concern and genuine concern for subordinates, two indicators of benevolence. The supportive role that leaders occupy in coaching extends to building a supportive context for followers. Burke et al. (2007) propose that leadership behaviors used to build a supportive context fall into one of three leadership styles (i.e., transformational, consultative, transactional). In a transformational leadership approach, leaders facilitate followers' efforts to solve complex problems (Bass, Avolio, Jung, & Berson, 2003). Transformational leaders focus on moving followers motivational states to higher level needs, such as self-actualization (Burns, 1978) and typical behaviors that fall within this style of leadership (e.g., charisma, intellectual stimulation,
inspiration, individualized consideration, Bass, 1999) may be viewed by followers as indicators of leader's benevolence.

Consultative leadership has also shown a positive relationship to trust in leadership (Korsgaard, Schweiger, & Sapienza, 1995). Leaders gain trust from their followers by consulting with them on decisions and valuing their opinions (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, & Fetter, 1990). Consultative leadership cultivates trust because it allows followers to have autonomy and provides opportunities to voice opinions and concerns. Because consultative leadership looks to followers for input, they feel valued, influencing the trust between them and their leaders.

The third leadership style proposed to influence benevolence is transactional leadership. While some argue that transactional leadership behaviors do not inspire levels of trust in the leader (Bass, 1985; Jung & Avolio, 2000), Burke et al. argue that because there is a focus on consistent fulfillment of reward contingencies and exchange relationships, the dyadic exchanges under transactional leadership are perceived by the follower as just. When followers perceive justice, this leadership style may be viewed as an indicator of leader benevolence.

The third antecedent is integrity, which Burke et al. proposed is comprised of accountability, perceptions of justice, and value congruence. Accountability refers to an obligation that people will be held responsible for their actions. Leaders that hold themselves personally accountable for their actions and decision-making are perceived by followers as having integrity. The second component of integrity is perceptions of justice. When policies and procedures are administered consistently (procedural justice), rewards and promotions are given in a consistent manner (distributive justice), and people are treated with respect (interactional justice), followers perceive that their leaders are fair and just. Perceptions of justice reduce
ambiguity in the relationship and increase the level of trust. Value congruence is the third component of integrity. Values are beliefs about what matters to an individual (Rokeach, 1973). Burke et al. suggest that the degree to which there is congruence between leader and follower values the more likely follower will view the leader as having integrity.

This model specifies follower judgments of leader ability, benevolence, and integrity as antecedents of trust in leadership. Along with these antecedents, a number of moderators may affect the relationships between the antecedents and the decision to trust the leader. Eight constructs have been identified as possible moderators: propensity to trust, attributions, leadership prototypes, perceived risk, prior history, leader reputation, psychological safety, and organizational climate. A discussion of these moderators follows.

Moderators on the individual level include both characteristics of the trustor and the trustee. Trustor characteristics that moderate trust in leader include the propensity to trust, perceived risk, attributions, prior history with the leader, and leadership prototypes. Propensity to trust, as discussed above, is the general willingness to place faith in others. Perceived risk, like in the Mayer et al. (1995) model involves the trustor's belief about the likelihood of gains or losses outside of the relationship with the particular trustee. This may be manifested, for example, as risk to ones' reputation or opportunity for promotion. Attribution in this model is a function of how one assigns cause to others’ behavior. Because followers base their attributions on perceptions they may not always be accurate. Fundamental attribution error is the idea that individuals tend to assign internal responsibility for others' behaviors instead of considering external causes for behavior. A follower could think that the leader mistakenly assigned credit to a coworker because he or she is thoughtless and uncaring (internal attribution), or could assume
that the leader was busy and glanced at the last name in the email chain under a tight deadline (external attribution).

An individual level moderator noted in this model that is of particular interest is leadership prototypes. Leadership prototypes, or ILTs, are mental models individuals hold with regard to the characteristics of effective leaders (Lord, Foti, & De Vader, 1984). ILTs, discussed in more detail below, are proposed to have a moderating influence on the relationship between ability and trust in the Burke et al. (2007) model. However, Burke et al. did not provide rationale for why leadership prototypes should moderate, other than that prototypes often vary across individuals and cultures. The current research, explained more fully below, suggests that leadership prototype should be categorized as antecedents to trust in leadership rather than as moderators.

The final trustor characteristic proposed by Burke et al. (2007) as a moderator is the follower’s prior history with the leader. Burke et al. suggest that the degree to which one has previous experience with the leader will influence an individual's mental model pertaining to that leader. Prior history with the leader can serve as a substitute for many of the behavioral indicators identified within the leader strengthening or decreasing the relationship between leader characteristics and trust in leadership depending on the nature of the prior interactions.

Although Burke et al. (2007) did not include leader-member exchange theory (LMX) in their model they did note that LMX could be used to examine how previous interactions influence future perceptions. LMX posits that leaders often have differential relationships with subordinates (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). The differential relationships result in either high or low quality LMX relationships. High quality LMX relationships are characterized by mutual respect,
loyalty, and trust, the converse is true of low quality LMX relationships (Gomez & Rosen, 2001; Brower, Schoorman, & Tan, 2000). Burke et al. (2007) suggest that individuals with a history of high quality LMX relationships are likely to view leaders as more benevolent and as having more integrity than individuals who have had low quality LMX relationships. While the Burke et al. model is not based on a LMX framework, they hold that the quality of the relationship between the leader and follower has an important moderating influence over the trust one holds for the leader. The quality of the relationship also has implications for prototype fulfillment, in which a close match between follower ILT and leader behavior affects the attributions the subordinate makes about the leader's actions and intentions. The role of implicit leadership theories on trust in leadership will be discussed in more detail below.

A second set of moderating variables include leader, team, and organizational characteristics. In the Burke et al. (2007) model the majority of leader characteristics are antecedents, however they suggest that leader reputation acts as a moderator since it is a substitute for personal interactions (Hall, Blass, Ferrin, & Massengale, 2004). Psychological safety is a team level moderator. Psychological safety is the shared belief held by team members that the team culture is safe for interpersonal risk taking (Edmondson, 1999), and is distinct from team cohesiveness (Edmondson, 1999). It reflects a sense of mutual respect and interpersonal trust that the team will not punish or reject someone for well meaning actions. Organizational climate is an organization level moderator. As leader-follower relationships exist within a larger context, it would be remiss to discount the effect of contextual variables on trust between organizational members. Organizational climate is relatively stable and influences employees' behavior through the perceived values of the organization (Tagiuri & Litwin, 1968).
The Burke et al. (2007) model is unique in that it is the first model of trust to include proximal and distal outcomes in addition to antecedents and moderators. The proximal outcomes of trust include communication, organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), learning, and a willingness to follow. When trust exists between followers and leaders, upward communication from the follower to the leader increases. Communication from subordinates is important for a number of reasons. Upward communication assists leaders in understanding team functioning to allow them to take actions for improvement. Input from subordinates also provides insight on their key motivators or performance hurdles. Likewise, trust can stimulate OCB. OCB is any behavior that is not prescribed by an employee’s job description (Organ, 1990; Katz & Kahn, 1978). In order to learn from others one must be willing to accept feedback, which puts individuals at interpersonal risk (Edmondson, Bohmer, & Pisano, 2001). It would follow that trust would support learning because research has shown that trust in leadership increases knowledge sharing which is a key component of learning. The third proximal outcome is the willingness to follow. Researchers often study leadership from the point of view of the leader even though leadership is about influencing at least one follower. Rarely do they frame questions of leader effectiveness in terms of followership, yet the willingness to follow is an important determinant of leader effectiveness. Burke et al. (2007) argue that this is a significant oversight within much of the literature because they believe that followers who trust their leaders will be more likely to follow them. Communication, organizational citizenship behavior, learning, and willingness to follow are the proximal outcomes of trust in leadership; distal outcomes include performance and turnover.
Although performance and turnover are not the only distal outcomes of trust, Burke et al. (2007) chose to focus on these particular outcomes because they have received the most theoretical and empirical support and are most likely to be meaningful to organizations. Performance, either at the individual or team level, affects both the quality and quantity of output produced by the organization. There is significant support in the literature for stating that trust in leadership leads to higher team and organizational performance (Argyris, 1964; Davis, Schoorman, Mayer, & Tan, 2000; Kouzes & Posner, 1995; Likert, 1967; McGregor, 1967; Zand, 1972). Undesired turnover occurs when a productive and valuable employee voluntarily leaves the organization. Turnover has significant consequences for the organization due to the cost incurred from recruiting and training replacements, loss in productivity, and loss of unique knowledge and skills held by the employee leaving the organization. Davis, Schoorman, Mayer, and Tan (2000) argue that when supervisors create a trusting environment employees feel safer and are more loyal to the organization. In concluding this discussion of the potential outcomes of trust between a follower and leader, it is important to acknowledge that trust alone will not suffice. However, the literature provides evidence that trust has an important and unique impact on outcomes that are important to the organization.

In delineating the antecedents, moderators, and outcomes of trust in leadership Burke et al. (2007) present the first integrative model of trust in leadership. Of the most interest to this study is the role of ability, benevolence, and integrity in building trust between a leader and follower, and the role implicit leadership theories have in determining the perceptions and behavior of leaders. The proposed research is based upon the models developed by Burke et al. (2007) and Mayer et al. (1995). Using the foundation of Mayer et al.’s model of trust between
two individuals in an organization, Burke et al. has proposed a comprehensive model of trust in leadership. Both models suggest that trust in the leader will be a function of the follower’s perception of the leader’s ability, benevolence, and integrity. In other words, the extent to which subordinates trust the leader is determined primarily by the leader’s behavior. Based on this, I hypothesize that

Hypothesis 1: Leaders judged to be high in (a) ability, (b) benevolence, and (c) integrity will be seen by subordinates as trusted.

*Implicit Leadership Theories*

Burke et al. (2007) indicate that implicit leadership theories moderate the relationship between leader behavior and trust in leadership. This section provides a review of implicit leadership theory and explores how similar implicit leadership theories between subordinates and leaders may influence leader-follower trust relationships.

Research suggests that employees or team members develop implicit leadership theories (ILTs) through socialization and past experiences with leaders (Lord, Foti, & De Vader, 1984; Phillips & Lord, 1981, 1982). ILTs are beliefs held by an individual about the traits and abilities that characterize an ideal leader (Epitropaki & Martin, 2004; Lord et al., 1984). Research on ILTs stems from implicit organization theory, developed by Eden and Leviatan (1975), which posits that individuals’ preconceptions of leaders could impact their ratings of leader behavior. Similarly, cognitive categorization theory proposes that individuals’ limited ability to process information quickly leads people to create prototypes or schemas to ease the mental load (Rosch, 1978). These theories formed the basis of leadership categorization theory, advanced by Lord and his colleagues (e.g., Engle & Lord, 1997; Lord, Foti, & Phillips, 1982). Leadership
categorization theory is the foundation for the idea that ILTs are prototypes, or mental models, of leadership that people use to classify others as leaders (Lord, Foti, & De Vader, 1984). The proposition that leadership is in the eye of the followers began a line of research that has had an unprecedented effect on the study of leadership over the past 30 years (Lord & Emrich, 2001). While research on ILTs has recently had a resurgence, there is still need for further exploration and development of implicit leadership theory (Avolio, Sosik, Jung, & Berson, 2003; Epitropaki & Martin, 2004).

The most influential work regarding ILTs was undertaken by Lord and his associates (e.g., Lord, 1985; Lord & Alliger, 1985; Lord & Maher, 1993; Phillips & Lord, 1981). Lord, Foti, and Phillips (1982) argued that ILTs reflect the structure and content of cognitive categories used to distinguish leaders from non-leaders. A series of experimental studies tested their model of leadership perceptions. Lord et al. (1984) found that certain traits, such as intelligence and honesty, were highly rated as being related to leadership, whereas another category of traits, such as authoritarianism and dishonesty, were rated atypical of a leader. Based on this work, Lord et al. proposed two categories of ILT traits, prototypical traits, which are positively associated with leaders, and anti-prototypical traits, which are negatively associated or unassociated with leaders. Offerman, Kennedy, and Wirtz (1994) built upon this work by developing a measure of implicit leadership theories. Offerman et al. assessed the content and factor structure of ILTs across three stimuli: leaders, effective leaders, and supervisors. They carried out the research in five stages with a sample of 999 undergraduates and 260 full-time employees. Results from Offerman et al. indicate that ILTs follow eight broad dimensions: sensitivity, dedication, tyranny, charisma, attractiveness, masculinity, intelligence, and strength. These factors did not differ across gender
groups, or between working adults and university students, but stimulus conditions that described a “leader,” an “effective leader,” or a “supervisor” yielded some differences. Implicit theories for leaders and effective leaders were typically more favorable than for supervisors.

More recently, Epitropaki and Martin (2004) cross-validated the Offerman, Kennedy, and Wirtz (1994) measure on two independent samples ($N_1 = 500$ and $N_2 = 439$) and which yielded a reduced scale containing 6 factors (Sensitivity, Intelligence, Dedication, Dynamism, Tyrannity, and Masculinity). They found that ILTs generalized across different employee groups by age, organizational position, and tenure. These findings suggest that employees in different stages of their working lives hold similar perceptions of ideal leadership, providing support for ILTs being context-free constructs of leadership. The finding of total invariance between different groups of organizational tenure is of note as it provides preliminary evidence for ILTs’ stability over time.

In study two, Epitropaki and Martin (2004) conducted a one year longitudinal investigation to assess the stability of ILTs over time and across multiple leaders. An evaluation of gamma, beta, and alpha change (Golembiewski, Billingsley, and Yeager, 1976) provided support for ILTs’ stability over time. In addition, this study investigated whether ILTs remain stable when employees work under the leadership of different managers. Repeated measures analysis of variance (ANOVA) for each ILT dimension, as well as for a composite of the dimensions, indicated no significant manager change and time interaction effects on ILTs or the six individual factors. Epitropaki and Martin observed that ILTs remained constant across the groups of employees who had the same manager at both times and for those who changed manager at Time 2. Participants’ ILTs remained unaffected by their recent experiences with a
new manager. This finding provides initial support that change in leadership is not a sufficient enough condition for ILTs to change.

Although there has been significant progress made since the advent of leader categorization theory in 1975, there is still far more empirical work required (Avolio, Sosik, Jung, & Berson, 2003; Epitropaki & Martin, 2004, 2005). Most importantly for the current study, researchers should direct more attention to understanding the relationship between ILTs and trust. While Burke, Sims, Lazarra, and Salas (2007) include implicit leadership theory in their model of trust in leadership, I have been unable to find an empirical investigation of this relationship in the literature on trust or on ILTs. Given that most research on the antecedents of trust has focused on follower perceptions that appear to be critical conditions for trust (Butler, 1991; Mayer et al., 1995), and that ILTs are based on follower perceptions of leadership, I contend that an integration of the two will provide a more complete picture of the role of ILTs in trust formation. Further, to arrive at a decision to trust, individuals must compare the trust target (i.e., leader) against some referent (i.e., effective leadership). This comparison is theoretically similar to the comparison between an ILT and the referent leader’s behavior (Whitener, Brodt, Korsgaard, & Werner, 1998).

**ILT Congruence, Leader-Member Exchange and Trust**

Burke et al. (2007) suggest that ILTs may moderate the relationship between ability and trust, but there is a dearth of research on ILTs and trust in leadership. To help bridge the gap, I looked to the literature on leader-member exchange theory (LMX) since there have been investigations of ILT congruence in this field. Moreover, Burke et al. (2007) suggested that LMX could be used to examine how previous interactions influence later perceptions of leader
behavior. Although LMX will not be explicitly examined in this study, the literature indicates that trust is a component of LMX. I will briefly review the theoretical relationship between LMX and trust before examining how ILT congruence influences perceptions of leader behavior.

*Leader-member exchange and trust.* Leader-member exchange differs from other leadership theories because it is primarily concerned with dyadic relationships. By focusing on dyadic relationships many of the issues associated with interpersonal trust are addressed. For example, LMX assumes that leaders differentiate among followers in the establishment of these relationships, and is concerned with the outcomes of these relationships for individuals and the organization (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995; House & Aditya, 1997). LMX was derived from vertical dyad linkage theory, which stated that leaders differentiate between subordinates in the way they supervise them (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995) such that the leader develops a closer relationship with some followers (Cashman Dansereau, Graen, & Haga, 1976; Dansereau, Graen, & Haga, 1975). Mutual trust, loyalty, and OCB characterize a high LMX relationship.

Theories of LMX and trust share a few similarities. The first is that that leader and follower assessments of the quality of the relationship (either LMX or trust) are not reciprocal (Brower et al., 2000). It is possible for a leader to trust a follower, and at the same time, the follower may not trust the leader; trust need not be mutual (Mayer et al., 1995). In theory, as two parties interact over time and the history of those exchanges builds the LMX relationship, the two parties will reach a balance (Emerson, 1962; Smircich & Morgan, 1982). However, the available empirical evidence in the LMX literature has not supported the assertion that LMX has balanced reciprocity (Gerstner & Day, 1997).
A second commonality is that the source of measuring either trust or LMX is, at its core, a perception rather than an actuality. Trust is a perception held by the trustor rather than an objective reality (Mayer et al., 1995). Thus, the measure of trust is a measure of a construct that exists within an individual perceiver. There is no objective measure of trust; one can measure behavior that indicates trust through risk taking, but it is a consequence of trust, not a proxy. Likewise, only the leader can assess the extent to which he or she trusts a particular follower. The follower may assess how much he or she believes the leader trusts in him/her, but his/her perception may not agree with the leader's report of his or her trust in the follower because it is based on perception, not actuality. Although followers may not be able to know the degree of trust the leader has in them, their perception of leaders’ trust in them, based upon attributes of the leaders’ behavior, will affect their attitudes and behavior.

The same logic follows for LMX; the leader and the follower each have their own conception of the LMX relationship. Because LMX is a relational construct, there is no absolute actuality, only the individuals’ perceptions of the relationship (Brower et al., 2000). While LMX and trust have some parallels and trust between follower and leader is a facet of the LMX relationship, the literatures are distinct (Brower et al., 2000; Burke et al., 2007). However, we can look to the theory and methodology of LMX research to aid in the exploration of trust in leadership. While only a few published studies have examined leader-follower ILT congruence or similarity (Engle & Lord, 1997; Epitropaki & Martin, 2005), this may be a fruitful avenue for exploring ILTs relationship with trust as proposed in Burke et al. (2007).

**ILT congruence and leader-member exchange.** In the first study to examine ILT congruence, Engle and Lord (1997) investigated the relationship between liking, LMX, ILTs,
implicit performance theories (IPT), and perceived attitudinal similarity to the leader. IPTs are similar to ILTs but refer to the performance of the follower. The sample consisted of 18 supervisors and 76 subordinates who were employed in the marketing division of a Midwestern electric company. Seventy-five percent of the subordinates were male. In a cross-sectional design, they assessed 23 traits that were rated as prototypical in both Lord et al. (1984) and Offerman et al. (1994).

A few major findings from Engle and Lord (1997) are of interest. The relationship between ILT congruence (here defined as the square root of the mean of squared differences between follower ILT and leader ILT) and follower-rated LMX quality was not significant ($r = - .12, p > .25$). Similarly, ILT congruence was not significantly related to follower-rated liking ($r = -.13, p > .25$). However, congruence on implicit performance theories significantly predicted LMX quality and liking, as did perceived attitudinal similarity.

Even though this study did not find a significant relationship between ILT congruence and LMX, the relationship between ILT congruence and trust still warrants explorations. For one, improvements to the methodology could yield different results. The small sample size may have limited their ability to find main effects (McClelland & Judd, 1993). Further, the variables Engle and Lord (1997) studied (i.e., perceived attitudinal similarity and implicit leadership theories) are likely to be influential if measured from the initial stages of the relationships. Future research using a longitudinal design should examine the impact of these variables throughout the course of exchange relationships. Secondly, while their results indicated no significant relationship between ILT and LMX, the relationship between ILT congruence and trust, which is
the focus of this study, has not been investigated to date. As further discussed below, the current study attempts to address these concerns.

The second study that addressed ILT congruence, Epitropaki and Martin (2005), explored the role of ILTs on organizational leadership processes. They specifically examined the role of follower ILTs on the quality of LMX and, subsequently, on their perceptions of job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and well-being. They also used longitudinal data to clarify the issue of causality between ILTs and LMX. At time 1, their sample included 439 employees of seven British organizations (six manufacturing and one services). Male respondents accounted for 67.4% of the sample. The average age was 39 years ($SD = 10.69$ years), and the mean organizational tenure was 14.69 years ($SD = 10.5$ years). Two hundred and seventy one of the 439 employees who participated at Time 1 participated at Time 2, one year later (a 61.6% response rate). Epitropaki and Martin used the 21-item scale (Epitropaki & Martin, 2004) to measure ILTs. Participants rated how characteristic each of the 21 traits presented was of a business leader, with no explicit definition of the trait provided. Participants were also asked to rate how the same characteristics applied to their manager (ILT recognition). Congruence, or rather dissimilarity, in this study was determined by the absolute difference of follower ILTs minus follower ILT recognition.

Like Engle and Lord (1997), Epitropaki and Martin (2005) tested their models in an LMX framework. They found evidence for a significant negative impact of ILT incongruence, or dissimilarity, on LMX. They also found that the more distant the leader’s profile was perceived to be from an implicit one, the worse the quality of LMX that was developed. Their longitudinal investigation explored the possibility of reciprocal effects of LMX and the difference between
ILT and recognized ILT. Using a cross-lagged modeling analysis, they found evidence to suggest that it is the difference between ILT and ILT-recognition that affects LMX and not the other way around.

The findings from these two studies suggest that ILT-ILT recognition congruence may be a more important explanatory mechanism for understanding the leadership relationship from a subordinate’s perspective. However, as Engle and Lord (1997) is the lone study to investigate follower – leader ILT congruence, more research on both follower – leader ILT congruence and ILT-ILT recognition is warranted. While these two studies focused on LMX, trust is a component of high quality exchange relationships (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995), and it is reasonable to expect that ILT congruence should positively influence follower trust in leadership as well.

Implicit leadership theories and trust. There are several reasons why congruence in ILTs may influence the follower’s trust in the leader. First, congruent ILTs may increase a follower’s perceived similarity with the leader to facilitate identification and increase trust in the leader. Second, congruence may provide a basis for a shared frame of reference as ILTs guide both behavior and interpretations of behavior. When follower-leader ILT congruence exists, the behavior of both members is likely to align with their expectations and both parties are likely to interpret behavior similarly. Lastly, congruence would allow for more automatic or intuitive interpersonal interactions between a leader and follower, which might implicitly influence the attributions the follower makes about the leader’s ability, benevolence, and integrity.

With the aforementioned in mind, I propose the following:
Hypothesis 2: Similarity between follower-leader ILTs will have a positive relationship with the follower’s perceptions of the (a) ability, (b) benevolence, and (c) integrity of the leader.

There are also reasons why congruence between follower ILT and leader ILT-related behavior would lead to increased trust in the leader. Unless explicitly shared by the leaders, followers are unlikely to know the ILT of their leader. Without knowledge of leader ILT, followers would not be able to know the degree of congruence between themselves and their leaders. Thus their own perceptions of congruence will be based on the observed behavior of their leader.

To investigate the impact of congruence between follower ILT and leader ILT-related behavior on trust, I propose the following:

Hypothesis 3: Similarity between follower ILT and leader ILT-related behavior will have a positive relationship with the follower’s perceptions of leader (a) ability, (b) benevolence, and (c) integrity.

Epitropaki and Martin (2004) examined the interaction of naturally occurring changes in leadership in a subset of their sample. Some of the employees experienced a change in leadership over time while others did not. The researchers found that ILTs remained consistent in employees who had the same manager at both times and in those who had a change in managers by the second time point. Similarly, this study will examine the relationships between ILT and trust over multiple leaders. As a majority of the participants will experience a change in leaders over the duration of the study, I will be able to observe whether ILTs and associated relationships of interest in this study will remain consistent over multiple leaders. To examine this I put forward the following research questions:
Research Question 1: Do the relationships between follower ILT – leader ILT congruence, trustworthiness characteristics (ability, benevolence, and integrity) and trust remain the same when there is a change in leader?

Research Question 2: Do the relationships between follower ILT – leader ILT-related behavior congruence, trustworthiness characteristics (ability, benevolence, and integrity) and trust remain the same when there is a change in leader?

Summary of Current Research

The current research will uniquely contribute to the literature on trust and leadership in several ways. First, this study examines the influence of ILT congruence and ILT-ILT-related behavior congruence on trust and its antecedents of ability, benevolence, and integrity. Second, the stability of the ILT congruence-trust relationship over multiple leaders will be examined using a quasi-experimental design. This is possible because the groups being studied will be restructuring their teams after the first session of a two-session camping season. A majority of the followers, therefore, will be assigned new leaders half way through their employment contact. The current study improves upon previous studies by investigating how ILTs influence follower trust in leadership in a field setting; a relationship that has not previously been explored in the literature.
Figure 1. Mayer, Davis, and Schoorman (1995) Model
Figure 2. Whitener, Brodt, Korsgaard, Werner (1998) Model
Figure 3. Burke, Sims, Lazzara, and Salas (2007) Model
Figure 4. Proposed Model
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Time 1: Beginning of Session 1</th>
<th>Time 2: End of Session 1</th>
<th>Time 3: Beginning of Session 2</th>
<th>Time 4: End of Session 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Context</strong></td>
<td>Before/ start of F-L relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td>At start of some F-L relationships, continuation of some F-L relationships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Follower Measures</strong></td>
<td>• ILT • demographics</td>
<td>• ILT-Relevant Behaviors • Ability, benevolence, integrity • Trust in leader</td>
<td>• ILT • demographics</td>
<td>• ILT-Relevant Behaviors • Ability, benevolence, integrity • Trust in leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leader Measures</strong></td>
<td>• ILT • demographics</td>
<td>• ILT • demographics</td>
<td>• ILT • demographics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 5. Proposed Methodology*
Appendix B

Implicit Leadership Theories Questionnaire (ILT)

For each trait below, please use the following scale to indicate the extent to which it should describe **an ideal leader:**
1 = Not at all characteristic
2 = Slightly characteristic
3 = Moderately characteristic
4 = Characteristic
5 = Extremely characteristic

An ideal leader is…

Se 1. Sympathetic
C 2. Energetic
D 3. Dedicated
A 4. Well-groomed
T 5. Domineering
M 6. Masculine
I 7. Intellectual
St 8. Strong
Se 9. Sensitive
C 10. Charismatic
D 11. Motivated
A 12. Attractive
T 13. Pushy
I 14. Educated
St 15. Bold
Se 16. Compassionate
C 17. Inspiring
D 18. Hard-working
A 19. Well-dressed
T 20. Dominant
I 21. Intelligent
T 22. Obnoxious
C 23. Enthusiastic
D 24. Goal-oriented
A 25. Refined
T 26. Manipulative
I 27. Wise
Se 28. Sincere
C 29. Dynamic
T 30. Power-hungry
I 31. Knowledgeable
Se 32. Warm
T 33. Conceited
I 34. Clever
Se 35. Forgiving
T 36. Loud
T 37. Selfish
M 38. Male
S 39. Understanding
Se 40. Helpful
T 41. Demanding
* Leftmost columns contain scale identifier for item, and were not shown to participants:
Se = Sensitivity (8 items) A = Attractiveness ( items) C = Charisma ( items)
D = Dedication ( items) M = Masculinity ( items) St = Strength ( items)
T = Tyranny (0 items) I = Intelligence (6 items)
Appendix C
Implicit Leadership Theories - Behaviors Questionnaire (ILT-B)
For each trait below, please use the following scale to indicate the extent to which it describes your current leader:

1 = Not at all characteristic
2 = Slightly characteristic
3 = Moderately characteristic
4 = Characteristic
5 = Extremely characteristic

My current leader …
Se 1. shows sympathy toward others.
C 2. is energetic.
D 3. shows dedication
A 4. keeps himself/herself well-groomed.
T 5. domineers situations.
M 6. behaves in a masculine way.
I 7. is an intellectual.
St 8. displays strength.
Se 9. responds to the feelings of others.
C 10. displays charisma.
D 11. is motivated.
A 12. is attractive.
T 13. forces his/her ideas onto others.
I 14. is educated.
St 15. demonstrates boldness.
Se 16. shows compassion towards others.
C 17. inspires others.
D 18. works hard.
A 19. dresses well.
T 20. dominates others.
I 21. is intelligent.
T 22. behaves obnoxiously.
C 23. shows enthusiasm.
D 24. sets and works toward goals.
A 25. is refined.
T 26. manipulates people and situations.
I 27. demonstrates wisdom.
Se 28. displays sincerity in his/her interactions with others.
C 29. is dynamic.
T 30. seeks power.
I 31. is knowledgeable.
Se 32. shows warmth.
T 33. thinks too highly of himself/herself.
I 34. is clever.
Se 35. forgives others.
T 36. is loud.
T 37. exhibits selfishness.
M 38. is masculine.
S 39. shows understanding towards others.
Se 40. helps others.
T 41. puts people under pressure to get things done.

* Leftmost columns contain scale identifier for item, and were not shown to participants:
Se = Sensitivity (8 items) A = Attractiveness (4 items) C = Charisma (5 items)
D = Dedication (4 items) M = Masculinity (2 items) St = Strength (2 items)
T = Tyranny (0 items) I = Intelligence (6 items)
Appendix D

Mayer and Davis (1999)
Measures of Ability, Integrity and Benevolence

Indicate the degree to which you agree with each statement by using the following scale:

1 = Disagree strongly
2 = Disagree
3 = Neither agree nor disagree
4 = Agree
5 = Agree strongly

Think about your leader. For each statement, write the number that best describes how much you agree or disagree with each statement.

Ability
1. My leader is very capable of performing his/her job.
2. My leader is known to be successful at the things he/she tries to do.
3. My leader is knowledgeable about the work that needs done.
4. I feel very confident about my leader’s skills.
5. My leader has specialized capabilities that can increase our team’s performance.
6. My leader is well qualified.

Benevolence
1. My leader is very concerned about my welfare.
2. My needs and desires are very important to my leader.
3. My leader would not knowingly do anything to hurt me.
4. My leader really looks out for what is important to me.
5. My leader will go out of his/her way to help me.

Integrity
1. My leader has a strong sense of justice.
2. I never have to wonder whether my leader will stick to his/her word.
3. My leader tries hard to be fair in dealings with others.
4. My leader’s actions and behaviors are consistent.
5. I like my leader’s values.
6. Sound principles seem to guide my leader’s behavior.
Appendix E

Trust in Leader

McAllister (1995)

Please respond to the statements below with your leader in mind. Minor word changes were made to this scale so that it would better fit the context.

Indicate the degree to which you agree with each statement by using the following scale:

1 = Disagree strongly
2 = Disagree
3 = Neither agree nor disagree
4 = Agree
5 = Agree strongly

Affect-based trust
1. We have a sharing relationship. We can both freely share our ideas, feelings, and hopes.
2. I can talk freely to this individual about difficulties I am having and know that (s)he will want to listen.
3. We would both feel a sense of loss if we could no longer work together.
4. If I shared my problems with this person, I know (s)he would respond constructively and caringly.
5. I would have to say that we have both made considerable emotional investments in our working relationship.

Cognition-based trust
1. This person approaches his/her job with professionalism and dedication.
2. Given this person's track record, I see no reason to doubt his/her competence and preparation for the job.
3. I can rely on this person not to make my job more difficult by careless work.
4. Most people, even those who aren't close friends of this individual, trust and respect him/her as a coworker.
5. Other staff members who must interact with this individual consider him/her to be trustworthy.
6. I trust my leader.