

科目：管理文獻評述

編號：321

考生注意：

1. 依次序作答，只要標明題號，不必抄題。
2. 答案必須寫在答案卷上，否則不予計分。
3. 限用藍、黑色筆作答；試題須隨卷繳回。

 本 試 題
 共 9 頁
 第 / 頁

1. The following article is partially adopted from Review of Business Research (2013) 13, p.39-46. Please read it thoroughly and answer the questions either in English or in Chinese.

(1) Please derive a research framework of this article. You may draw a figure to express the causal relationships shown in this article. (15%)

(2) Based on the exploratory ideas proposed by this paper, if you are asked to do a quantitatively confirmatory research, how will you empirically develop the following sections for the research? Please describe the (1) sample, (2) data, (3) control variables, and (4) methodology which you would like to employ. (35%)

TRUST AND INNOVATION: THE IMPACT OF INTERPERSONAL - TRUST ON TEAM INNOVATION

Jhony Choon Yeong Ng, National University of Singapore, Singapore

ABSTRACT

Innovation in a team begins with individual members of a team having novel ideas in their minds. While it might be possible for such ideas to become the team's innovation subsequently, what are the factors that could potentially impede or facilitate the process? In this paper, I first distinguish the concepts of trust, psychological safety, and cohesion from each other, and point out the difference between creativity and innovation, to illustrate the need for research that has a focus on trust and innovation. Next, I propose a multi-level model of trust and team innovation. In general, this paper has three implications. The practical implication of this paper is practitioners need to be wary of the moderating effect that trust can have on the relationship between team social background diversity and team innovation. The theoretical implication of this paper is that there is a need for more focus on the topic of trust and innovation in organization research. And finally, the methodological implication of this paper is that researchers can consider conducting their future research in team-related topics on a multi-level basis.

Keywords: Trust, Innovation, Team

1. INTRODUCTION

Trust forms the basis of almost all human interactions (Das and Teng, 2004), and its presence makes interactions required for organizational operations possible. Given its immense influence, how does it affect team innovation?

Currently, although there is a vast amount of literature on trust and innovation, these two concepts were mainly discussed separately with other concepts. For example, although the literatures on the topic of trust and creativity (for e.g., see Klimoski and Karol, 1976), and psychological safety and innovation (for e.g., see Baer and Frese, 2003), are not lacking, there is currently a dearth of literature on how trust influences team innovation hitherto.

One of the causes of this issue is that some authors presumed research on trust and innovation to be redundant because they assumed research on psychological safety (cohesion) and innovation, and trust and creativity, had already served the purpose of research on trust and innovation. However, though subtle, it must be noted that, on one hand, trust, psychological safety, and cohesion are different from each other, and, on the other hand, innovation and creativity are also not the same. Hence, research on any pair of concepts, one from each of the two mentioned groups, cannot replace the research on the other pairs.

Hence, to fill up the gap in the literature of trust and innovation, and to correct the misperceptions that some readers might have with the prior mentioned five concepts, I shall first distinguish the concepts of trust, psychological safety, and cohesion from each other, and point out the difference between creativity and innovation in this paper. Next, I shall discuss how interpersonal trust within a team can affect the team's innovation. Finally, I will propose a model of trust and team innovation, and will end my paper with a discussion on the implications of my paper.

2. DISTINCTION OF CONCEPTS

2.1 Trust

Despite being a concept that is fundamental to human interactions since antiquity, there is not yet a one definition of the term that is accepted by all researchers (Bigley and Pearce, 1998). Most of

科目：管理文獻評述

編號：321

考生注意：

1. 依次序作答，只要標明題號，不必抄題。
2. 答案必須寫在答案卷上，否則不予計分。
3. 限用藍、黑色筆作答；試題須隨卷繳回。

本 試 題
共 9 頁
第 2 頁

the time, researchers will just choose one definition of trust that suits their intended investigation, and present it without much justification for their choice. For example, two of the most commonly cited definitions of trust are the one proposed by Rousseau, Sitkin, Burt, and Camerer (1998), and the one proposed by Mayer, Davis, and Schoorman (1995). Nonetheless, though not exhaustive, we can group the array of definitions that are currently used by researchers into two broad categories: cognition-based view of trust, and affection-based of trust.

The cognition-based view of trust focuses on the cognitive processes of a trustor in his/her interactions with a trustee. It focuses on how a trustor perceives a trustee's actions, and the trustee's intentions behind those actions, and the trustor's expectation about that trustee's future actions based on the trustee's past behaviors (Kramer, 1996; Kramer, 2001; Rempel, Holmes, and Zanna, 1985). It is also target- and context-specific (Johnson-George and Swap, 1982; Kadefors, 2004; Zaheer, McEvily, and Perrone, 1998), although there are evidences that a trustor's level of trust in a trustee can be influenced by his/her trust in a third party who is connected to the trustee in some ways (Lander, Purvis, McCray, and Leigh, 2004; Lau and Liden, 2008).

In general, under this perspective, trust refers to the willingness of a trustor to risk becoming vulnerable to a trustee's actions (Dirks and Ferrin, 2001; Dunn and Schweitzer, 2005; Bigley and Pearce, 1998), based on the expected consistency and reliability in the trustee's words and deeds that the trustor had derived from his/her past experiences with the trustee (Bhattacharya, Devinney, and Pillutla, 1998), by believing that the trustee would conduct beneficial acts to the trustor, or to act as the trustor had expected the trustee would act (Ammeter, Douglas, Ferris, and Goka, 2004; Das and Teng, 2004; Kasper-Fuehrer and Ashkanasy, 2001; Lewicki, McAllister, and Bies, 1998; Mayer et al., 1995; Panteli and Sockalingam, 2005; Renzl, 2008; Rotter, 1971; Zaheer et al., 1998). Under this view of trust, a trustor's level of trust in a trustee was proposed to be influenced by one's cognitive evaluation of the trustee's personal characteristics (Kramer, 1996, 2001), such as the trustee's educational qualifications, or the trustee's actions.

The affection-based view of trust, on the other hand, focuses on the effect that a trustor's affective ties with the trustee could have on the trustor's level of trust in the trustee (McAllister, 1995). In contrary to the cognition-based view of trust, the affection-based view of trust proposes that the affective ties between two parties make possible for a certain level of trust to persist between them even in the presence of evidences that would be judged as trust-depleting factors under the cognition-based view of trust (McAllister, 1995).

As an illustration of the difference between these two views of trust, consider this hypothetical scenario. Upon promised by party A that s/he will complete all his/her tasks by a stipulated deadline, party B expects that A will deliver his/her promise by the deadline. In the case where A failed to deliver his/her promise, according to the cognition-based view of trust, B's trust in A will decrease.

However, according to the affection-based view of trust, if B has been working with A for a long time, and the two parties have a very close relationship, B's trust in A may not decrease, or at least not as significantly as the expectation of the other view of trust. According to proponents of the affection-based view of trust, the emotional ties that A and B had built up in their past interactions would have cushioned the expected decrease in trust.

Nevertheless, although emotional ties between two individuals can influence the trust between them given the occurrence of an event, it can essentially be viewed as a moderator of the relationship between the level of trust of a trustor and the action undertaken, or failed to be undertaken, by a trustee. Thus, although some trust researchers might argue for an independent definition of trust that takes into account the emotional ties between a trustor and trustee in an interaction, I would not make this distinction here in this paper as the trust that is in focus in both views of trust is essentially the same, just that one of the two interactions is moderated by the concept of emotional ties.

科目：管理文獻評述

編號：321

考生注意：

1. 依次序作答，只要標明題號，不必抄題。
2. 答案必須寫在答案卷上，否則不予計分。
3. 限用藍、黑色筆作答；試題須隨卷繳回。

本試題
共 9 頁
第 3 頁

Hence, taking into account the various definitions of trust that were either proposed or used, or both, by researchers, for the purpose of discussion in the remaining portion of this paper, the cognition-based view of trust shall be adopted.

2.2 Psychological Safety

Psychological safety refers to the perception of a safe environment for individuals to be involved in interpersonal risk taking, without the fear of any potential negative consequences that may arise out of their actions (Carmeli, 2007; Carmeli, Brueller, and Dutton, 2009; Edmondson, 1999; Nembhard and Edmondson, 2006; Tynan, 2005). When it exists in a particular work context, it can take the form of a taken-for-granted positive belief of an individual about his/her co-workers that facilitates open and trustful interactions between them (Baer and Frese, 2003; Roussin, 2008).

When psychological safety exists, there exists a certain level of trust between interacting parties that allows them to interact without substantial fear of future adverse backfires (Edmondson, 1999). However, while trust is the underlying factor for psychological safety to exist, the two concepts are not the same.

For the ease of clarification, consider the following hypothetical scenario: in a team which members are always afraid to speak up their mind against the team leader (i.e., a team culture which is low in psychological safety), members may still act in accordance to the leader's orders with due diligence when future rewards are promised by the leader (i.e., they have trust in the leader to keep his/her promise).

If psychological safety and trust is referring to the same concept, either theoretically or empirically, the two of them should not co-exist in the same scenario in opposite extremities as illustrated. Analogous to the distinction between trust and distrust – two concepts that are recognized as distinct from each other, despite the previous stand that they are two ends of a single continuum (Lewicki et al., 1998) – psychological safety is different from trust.

2.3 Cohesion

Cohesion refers to the tendency of members of a team to stay together and remain united in the pursuit of the team's objectives and goals (Wang, Ying, Jiang, and Klein, 2006). It is the force that keeps members of a team close together without breaking apart by feelings of solidarity, harmony, and commitment (Fine and Holyfield, 1996; Odom, Boxx, and Dunn, 1990; Wang et al., 2006). When a team of people with complementary skills are able to work together with ease towards the team's common goals and objectives, team cohesion is said to be present (Montes, Moreno, and Morales, 2005). In general, trust and cohesion cannot be the same concept because they can be used as the antecedent or outcome to each other depending on the nature of investigation in focus.

Humans have limited resources. May the resource in focus be time, money, or individuals' efforts, people tend to expend them in accordance to what they perceive as likely to generate them the desired outcome. In face of adversaries, when an individual has a high level of trust in his/her team, s/he would perceive dangers and threats faced by the team as more manageable than a person who has a low level of trust in the team (Fine and Holyfield, 1996). Under such conditions, the person with a higher level of trust would be more likely to stay committed with the team, and continues to devote his/her resources to the team's course of actions (Bigley and Pearce, 1998), and contributes to the cohesion of the team more. Hence, in such instances, trust can be taken a contributor to a team's cohesion (Fine and Holyfield, 1996).

On the other hand, trust can also be influenced by a team's cohesion. A trustor's level of trust in a trustee was reported to be influenced by the trustee's identification with the team (Kasper-Fuehrer and Ashkanasy, 2001). When the trustee is perceived to have a low commitment to the team, or to have a higher identification with another team, other people in the team will have a lower level of trust in him/her. That is, a team's weak cohesion can result in a lower level of interpersonal

科目：管理文獻評述

編號：321

考生注意：

1. 依次序作答，只要標明題號，不必抄題。
2. 答案必須寫在答案卷上，否則不予計分。
3. 限用藍、黑色筆作答；試題須隨卷繳回。

本 試 題
共 9 頁
第 4 頁

trust between different parties in a team. In such situations, team cohesion acts as the antecedent to interpersonal trust.

As illustrated, trust and cohesion can thus be conceptualized as either the antecedent or outcome to each other depending on the focus of research in perspective. Hence, as a concept is not logically possible to be an antecedent and outcome to itself, trust and cohesion are distinct concepts.

Having distinguished the concepts of trust, psychological safety, and cohesion, I would like to emphasize here again that these three concepts are different concepts, although they may be correlated. Thus, research with a primary focus on the relationship between trust and innovation is needed despite the literatures of psychological safety (cohesion) and innovation, and trust and creativity, may not be lacking.

Before carrying on with my discussion on the relationship between trust and innovation, I shall first continue to distinguish between two more concepts that are, though essential to my discussion later, also frequently mixed-up by some readers' creativity and innovation

2.4 Creativity and Innovation

Creativity refers to the generation of novel and useful ideas, bounded by practical restraints (Hirst, Dick, and Knippenberg, 2009; Hulsheger, Anderson, and Salgado, 2009; Thompson, 2003). In work context, such ideas can be product-related, procedure-related, or process-related (Hirst et al., 2009). On the other hand, while innovation can also be used to refer to the property of being new of a product, or a procedure to produce a product (King, 1992), it is not the same as creativity although they are related.

Innovation, in general, refers not only to the generation of novel and useful ideas, but also to the implementation of such ideas with the aim to significantly benefit the performance of the implementor, his/her team, his/her organization, or his/her society at large (Anderson and West, 1998; Hulsheger et al., 2009). Though innovation needs not to be something radically new or successful, it should have an impact on others who are related to the changes brought upon by the process of the innovation (King, 1992). To put it in a simple way, innovation differs from creativity in the aspect that while creativity pertains only to the coming up of new and useful ideas, innovation requires those new ideas to be implemented with an impact on others for it to be considered as an innovation.

In this paper, I shall use the term team innovation to denote the amount of innovation – the number of ideas that are implemented with an impact on others – of a team.

3. LITERATURE REVIEW

An idea can only become an innovation if it is acted upon by individuals, even if the implementation of the idea is not successful (King, 1992). If not, an idea will always remain as an idea. However, in a team where the leader makes the final decision on whether ideas proposed by the team members should be implemented by the team or not, what determines whether an idea proposed by a team member will be acted upon? In addition, what determines the quantity of creative ideas that team members can come up with for the consideration of the leader? For these two questions, interactions between two categories of people in a team are relevant to our present inquiry: the interaction between team members, and the interaction between team members and their leader.

Trust permeates the interactions between individuals and makes the occurrence of certain phenomena possible. It gives a trustor the confidence in a trustee to keep personal information that was communicated to the trustee private, or at least, to not use it in a way that is harmful to the trustor (Fine and Holyfield, 1996; Panteli and Sockalingam, 2005). Such confidence in others

科目：管理文獻評述

編號：321

考生注意：

1. 依次序作答，只要標明題號，不必抄題。
2. 答案必須寫在答案卷上，否則不予計分。
3. 限用藍、黑色筆作答；試題須隨卷繳回。

本 試 題

共 9 頁

第 5 頁

facilitates the flow of information in a team and hence contributes to team innovation (Klimoski and Karol, 1976).

However, before a trustor makes the decision of whether a trustee can be trusted with certain information, a series of evaluations would be first made by the trustor. For example, the trustor might think about his/her past experiences with the trustee. If the trustee had done anything that was contrary to the well-being of the trustor before, with the information that was communicated to the trustee by the trustor, a lower level of trust would be ascribed to the trustee (Bhattacharya, Devinney, and Pillutla, 1998; Weber, Mathotra, and Murnighan, 2005). Under such conditions, a lower amount of information is expected to be communicated to the trustee by the trustor (Klimoski and Karol, 1976). This is because when an individual got hurt because s/he communicated some information to a trustee, his/her trust in the trustee will decrease, and s/he will learn to communicate lesser information to the trustee in his/her future interactions with that trustee as a way to protect him/her-self from further harms (Rotter, 1971).

For innovation to take place, novel ideas, or its elements, must be communicated between team members to facilitate idea generation. It is only when concrete ideas are generated and implemented with an impact that innovations can said to have realized. Hence, as the amount of information communicated between individuals is influenced by the trust between them (Klimoski and Karol, 1976; Renzl, 2008), the trust between team members and team innovation should be positively correlated. Hence,

Proposition 1. In a team, interpersonal trust between team members is positively correlated with team innovation

Nevertheless, in a team, whether an idea will be implemented is ultimately dependent on the decision of the team leader (Ancona and Caldwell, 1992). If the leader does not believe that the idea can be successfully implemented, or will lead to beneficial outcomes, then it is unlikely for it to be accepted and be implemented. This will be especially the case when there is high risk involved in the implementation of the idea

From an evolutionary perspective, humans have been conditioned to act in ways that will either improve their chances of survival, or in ways that are perceived by them to have the potential to boost their chances of survival (Buss, 1991; Nicholson, 1998). In our society, it is more often than not that individuals will have to depend on their incomes to fulfill their basic needs to survive (Doyal and Gough, 1984; Maslow, 1943). The incomes that individuals have to depend on for their livings are in turn dependent on their work performances.

While innovation may boost the performance of a team, the prospect of it not working out to the increment of the team's performance is sometimes enough to offset the potential inclination that an individual may have towards trying the idea out to gain the potential benefit that might arise out of the act. Hence when a leader perceives that a novel idea is not likely to lead to beneficial outcomes, or when the perceived cost of implementing the idea is greater than the perceived benefit that would arise out of the idea's implementation (Shane and Venkataraman, 2000), it is unlikely for the leader to implement the idea.

Then how do individuals decide whether a novel idea is feasible or not? Other than some objective criteria that might be used by them, it should also be dependent on the amount of trust that the person has in the proposer. For instance, if a team member has records in making inflated claims in the past, or has a long-standing history of perpetually failing to live up to promises, then the credibility of his/her proposal is likely to be discounted (Montes and Zweig, 2009; Weber et al., 2005). Under such conditions, even though a team member might have some ideas that have the potential to create beneficial outcomes for the team, it is highly probable that the leader will reject those ideas proposed by this particular member due to the low level of trust that the leader has in him/her. This will cause that member's contribution to team innovation to be limited although s/he might have novel ideas in mind.

科目：管理文獻評述

編號：321

考生注意：

1. 依次序作答，只要標明題號，不必抄題。
2. 答案必須寫在答案卷上，否則不予計分。
3. 限用藍、黑色筆作答；試題須隨卷繳回。

本 試 題

共 9 頁
第 6 頁

Thus, when a leader does not have enough trust in the team members, it is unlikely for their ideas to become innovations as the leader is unlikely to be receptive of their ideas (Dirks and Ferrin, 2001). As ideas need to be implemented for it to become innovations, the lower amount of ideas, contributed by team members, that is accepted by the leader is likely to affect team innovation adversely.

Other than affecting team innovation, the quantity of ideas generated in a team is also likely to have an impact on the interpersonal trust between team members. Humans like to feel good about themselves. Thus, when individuals are able to generate more ideas and contribute more to team innovation, they will feel more identified with the team as it is likely that the perceived contributions that they made will contribute to their perceived self-efficacies. As the trust that members of a team has towards a particular member is positively correlated with that member's identification with the team (Kasper-Fuehrer and Ashkanasy, 2001), it is highly possible that the quantity of ideas that a team member proposed, and is accepted, during his/her tenure in the team is positively correlated with the trust that the other members have towards him/her too. This trust, in turn, is likely to cause others in the team to generate more ideas and to cause a stronger trusting relationship to be forged within the team subsequently. As a result, a higher level of team innovation is likely to be achieved by the team. Hence,

Proposition 2. In a team, team members' novel ideas are positively correlated with team innovation.

Proposition 3a. In a team, team members' novel ideas are positively correlated with the trust that team members have in each other.

Proposition 3b. In a team, team members' novel ideas are positively correlated with the trust the team leader has in the team members.

Proposition 4. In a team, interpersonal trust between the team leader and the members is positively correlated with team innovation.

Proposition 5. In a team, interpersonal trust between the team leader and the members mediates the relationship between team members' novel ideas and team innovation.

On the other hand, in a team, it is likely that members need to liaise with each other before deciding whether an idea should be submitted to their leader (Ancona and Caldwell, 1992). When a call for novel ideas is sent out by a leader, team members may need to make a joint proposal submission. In such scenarios, the level of interpersonal trust that team members has in each other is likely to have an impact on whether an individual's idea will be accepted by the team, and be submitted for the leader's evaluation subsequently.

When the interpersonal trust between members is low, it will be less likely that ideas proposed by individual members would receive significant support in the team because of the prospect of lower team performance, and any potential form of punishment that may be imposed upon them, if the proposed ideas do not generate any form of benefits subsequently. Hence, the level of interpersonal trust between team members is also likely to have an effect on whether a novel idea will become an innovation subsequently even if members of the team have a lot of novel ideas in their minds.

Proposition 6. In a team, interpersonal trust between team members mediates the relationship between team members' novel ideas and team innovation

Nevertheless, while most leaders might prefer team works among the members, it is more often than not that individual team members will be allowed to submit individual proposals to the leader. This mechanism is implemented in some teams to minimize the potential loss of good ideas due to team decision processes. However, whether such alternative route to idea proposition would be taken up by individual members subsequently should be influenced by their individualistic-collectivistic tendency – the tendency of individuals to give priority to their own wills over their team's will, or vice versa (Ilies, Wagner, and Morgeson, 2007).

科目：管理文獻評述

編號：321

考生注意：

1. 依次序作答，只要標明題號，不必抄題。
2. 答案必須寫在答案卷上，否則不予計分。
3. 限用藍、黑色筆作答；試題須隨卷繳回。

本 試 題

共 9 頁

第 7 頁

When individuals have high individualistic tendency, they are more likely to act according to their own wills, in their own ways, towards their self-interests (Hofstede, 2001). In contrast, individuals who have high collectivistic tendency would be more likely to engage other members of their team when they are doing something (Hofstede, 2001). If this is the case, then, for the same level of interpersonal trust between members of two teams, the team with more individualistic members should have a higher level of team innovation in comparison to another team that has more collectivistic members.

Disputes do occur in teams. Depending on the nature of conflicts occurred within a team, the quality of decisions made by different teams will differ (Amason, 1996). In a scenario where an individual's idea is rejected by other team members after some debates, it is likely for a collectivistic person to accept the decision and keep his idea away. As a collectivistic person has a general tendency to maintain team cohesion (Hofstede, 2001), even if that person is persistent in nature, it will be more probable for him/her to continue to persuade other members into accepting his/her ideas than for him/her to disregard the opinions of them, and make an individual submission to the leader instead. For people with such collectivistic characteristics, their tendency to maintain team cohesion is likely to affect their contribution to team innovation adversely when support is not given by the other team members.

On the other hand, this might not hold true for an individualistic person. As an individualistic person will tend not to have as much emphases on things such as team cohesion, and what others would think about his/her actions (Hofstede, 2001), it is likely for him/her to submit an individual proposal upon rejection from other team members when s/he truly believes that his/her idea is good and creative.

Moreover, for team members who are overly individualistic, they might not even go through other team members prior to their individual idea submission to the leader. Hence, the individualistic-collectivistic tendency of team members should also influence team innovation.

In view that conflicts do occur in teams, it is likely that ideas will be disputed upon proposal and some of them might be rejected subsequently. If this is the case, in a team where members tend to push forward their ideas by submitting individual proposals whenever ideas are rejected, the quantity of ideas that are proposed to the team leader should be greater, and higher level of team innovation should be achievable. Hence,

Proposition 7. In a team, the individualistic-collectivistic tendency of team members moderates the relationship between team members' novel ideas and team innovation.

Next, it had been proposed that diversity and dissimilarity in team members' social background will facilitate the generation of creative ideas. When people from different social background are brought together to form a team, such as people with different work experiences or academic qualifications (Bantel and Jackson, 1989), the different insights that they can contribute to a team's discussions (Wiersema and Bantel, 1992), based on their personal experiences, will allow them to think outside of their usual boundaries of thinking, and thus handle issues with different approaches (Aldrich and Martinez, 2001; Ancona and Caldwell 1992). It was proposed that such contributions should have a synergetic effect on the generation of novel ideas, and hence a positive effect on team innovation. For example, based on a population of 460 state chartered and national banks in the United States, Bantel and Jackson (1989) found that heterogeneity in team composition had a positive effect on organization innovation.

However, on the other hand, it had been proposed that while similarity in team members' social background would increase the level of trust that team members have in each other, dissimilarity in their background tends to have a negative effect on the level of interpersonal trust that team members have in each other (Alaszewski and Coxon, 2009; Lau and Liden, 2008; Tsui, Egan, and O'Reilly, 1992). For example, based on a sample of 108 dyads, Zolin, Hinds, Fruchter, and

科目：管理文獻評述

編號：321

考生注意：

1. 依次序作答，只要標明題號，不必抄題。
2. 答案必須寫在答案卷上，否則不予計分。
3. 限用藍、黑色筆作答；試題須隨卷繳回。

本 試 題
共 9 頁
第 8 頁

Levitt (2004) found that a trustor perceives a trustee from a different culture to be less trustworthy than a trustee who was from similar cultural background.

Though subtle, these two findings are contradictory on prima facie. As discussed earlier, trust affects team innovation because it affects intra-team interactions such as the willingness of members to take risk in acting on another member's proposal. If this is the case, then diversity in team members' social background should lead to a lower level of team innovation but not higher. Then, why positive effects of social background diversity on team innovation were observed?

From early psychological research, it was found that a person's mere repeated exposure to a stimulus will cause the person to have a more positive attitude towards that stimulus (Zajonc, 1968). From a more recent study, Nahrgang, Morgeson and Ilies (2009) had found that regardless of the quality of the initial relationship between two parties, the quality of the relationship between the leader and members of a team improves over time. As the quality of a relationship between a leader and the members is related to the level of trust that they have in each other (Nahrgang et al., 2009), it is highly probable that while social background diversity might lead to a relatively lower level of interpersonal trust between parties in a team, in comparison to a more homogenous team, the level of trust between them might increase over time as they spend more time working with each other.

Indeed, it was proposed that an individual's judgment of another party's trustworthiness is dependent on how that party's action fits that individual's expectation (Costa, Bijlsma-Frankema, and de Jong, 2009; Kramer, 1996). When the observed action fits the expectation, trust increases; and when it does not, trust will be depleted (Kramer, 1996; Montes and Zweig, 2009). Hence, while social diversity can lead to a lower level of trust between members of a team, the level of trust in a diversified team can be higher than that of another diversified team depending on the interactions within each team.

In a diversified team that has low interpersonal trust, the team's diversity would not be used in the right way as parties would be utilizing their resources to guard against each other (Dirks, 1999; Kadeors, 2004). This would lead to a lower level of team innovation as the team's resources were not put into good use. On the contrary, in a diversified team that has high interpersonal trust, the team's diversity would be capitalized in functional ways such as the sharing of different individual experiences or insights (Bantel and Jackson, 1989; Wiersema and Bantel, 1992). As proposed earlier, such sharing of information should have a positive synergetic effect on team innovation.

If this is the case, while the team innovation of a diversified team that has low interpersonal trust between different parties in the team may be low, the team innovation of a diversified team that has high interpersonal trust between different parties in the team should be higher. Hence,

Proposition 8a. In a team, interpersonal trust between team members and the leader moderates the relationship between social background diversity and team innovation.

Proposition 8b. In a team, interpersonal trust between team members moderates the relationship between social background diversity and team innovation.

科目：管理文獻評述

編號：321

考生注意：

1. 依次序作答，只要標明題號，不必抄題。
2. 答案必須寫在答案卷上，否則不予計分。
3. 限用藍、黑色筆作答；試題須隨卷繳回。

本 試 題

共 9 頁

第 9 頁

2. 下列文章，出自於『丁學勤，「零售商承諾量表的發展與驗證」，管理學報，25 卷 2 期，民 97 年，頁 195-220』的研究動機與目的部分，文中對於承諾一詞做了初步的探討，請您在讀畢後，做出一些推想，並回答下列問題：(50%)

(1) 根據丁文，您認為承諾應該包含那些意義與成分？(10%)

(2) 您認為承諾的實務運用，除了丁文所提的組織承諾外，在行銷或其他的領域，承諾可以有哪些運用實例？請將這些實例做較詳細的描述，不能只是簡單的例子。(20%)

(3) 除了承諾，請您推想，行銷上其他概念有沒有可能的意義與成分？例如：品牌忠誠的意義與成分？顧客滿意的意義與成分？請您列舉一個概念對其意義與成分做詳細的描述。(20%)

組織承諾自 Whyte 在 1956 年發表組織人 (The Organization Man) 一書後，就一直被廣泛地討論。承諾 (commitment) 依字典的解釋，承諾有許諾 (promise)，誓約 (pledge)，及承擔 (undertaking) 的意思。承諾表達的是一種保證，也是一種意圖，進一步而言，是對於持續雙方關係的保證，亦是一種犧牲短期利益來達成長期利益的一種意圖 (Dwyer et al., 1987)，而且承諾也是社交規範中相當重要的基礎 (MacNeil, 1980)。所以，在合作關係中，獲得對方的承諾是雙方樂於見到的結果。同時，分析合作關係的承諾強度，亦可得知合作的關係品質。

有關承諾的研究，在組織的研究中較多，這種情境下的承諾常稱為組織承諾。組織承諾可視為個人與組織間的連結橋樑，Mowday et al. (1982) 指出個人與組織間若有好的連結，即個人對組織具有高度的承諾，如此對個人、組織及社會均會產生好的結果。個人若能繼續投身組織中，則對組織能提供生產力；相對而言，組織則提供個人經濟來源、滿足期望及各種層次的需求。

組織承諾感強的成員有下列三種傾向：(一) 強烈地相信及接受組織的目標與價值；(二) 願意為組織付出更多的努力；(三) 渴望繼續成為組織的一份子 (Porter et al., 1974)。

由於組織承諾具有上述的優點，所以組織承諾的研究除了獲得學者的重視，亦為企業界所關注，企業經理人期望能夠培養出員工的組織承諾，使得員工對組織有認同感與願意投入心力於組織中，最後提升企業經營績效。換個情境而言，站在供應商的立場，應該希望其零售商能對合作的關係產生強烈的承諾意識，如此零售商才可能願意做短期犧牲以共謀長期利益，願意投入

資源於夥伴關係上，願意維持與供應商繼續合作的關係。由以上的探討，可知承諾對合作關係的重要。不過，過去有關承諾的研究，出現在組織的文獻較多，相對而言，在行銷方面的研究較少，直到近幾年才普遍受到重視 (Sanchez and Iniesta, 2004)。

承諾除了在實務上重要，在理論上也存在著缺口，這個缺口是承諾是整體的概念還是多面向的概念，若是多面向，又應包括那些面向，所以承諾的分類問題需要釐清。Morgan and Hunt (1994) 與 Moorman et al. (1992) 都將承諾操作為單一構念，Morgan and Hunt (1994) 採用七個題目衡量，而 Moorman et al. (1992) 採用三個題目衡量。類似的衡量方式亦使用在近年來的研究中，例如 Tellefsen (2002) 採用六個題目用在企業對企業的環境中，Yilmaz and Hunt (2001) 採用九個題目來檢查組織內的承諾關係。雖然有研究視承諾為單一構念，但是以整體量表 (global scale) 衡量承諾會造成資訊遺失與不正確的發現，一部份的原因是因為公司對於繼續合作關係所持的原因並不完全相同，即使原因相同，在程度上或許也有所差異 (Kim and Frazier, 1997a; Gilliland and Bello, 2002)。承諾的單一構念整體量表有其缺點，有研究者已建議，行銷文獻應朝向多成份的承諾模式發展 (Kim and Frazier, 1997a; Kelly, 2004)。

雖然已有一些研究探討承諾的成份，但是不同的研究對承諾所持的觀點並不完全相同，有人以態度視之；有人以行為視之；有人把重點放在價值上；有人將重點放在目標上；有人採交換的觀點；有人採道德的觀點，隱含著承諾不是由單一構面所組成 (Allen and Meyer, 1990; Gundlach et al., 1995; Kim and Frazier, 1997b)，但是承諾應包括那些成份，至今並無結論，因此，有必要對承諾的構面做個統整研究，使得承諾的意義更加清楚。