

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/24233117>

Initial reliability of a Turkish version of the Dyadic Trust Scale.

Article in *Psychological Reports* · January 2009

DOI: 10.2466/PRO.103.7.917-920 · Source: PubMed

CITATIONS

0

READS

29

3 authors, including:



Murat Hancer

University of Central Florida

46 PUBLICATIONS **504** CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)



Robert E Larzelere

Oklahoma State University - Stillwater

93 PUBLICATIONS **3,531** CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)

Some of the authors of this publication are also working on these related projects:



Outcomes of Appropriate Spanking and Alternatives That Could Replace It [View project](#)



Causes and Correlates of Adolescent Substance Use in Venezuela [View project](#)

INITIAL RELIABILITY OF A TURKISH VERSION OF THE DYADIC TRUST SCALE¹

MURAT HANCER

ROBERT E. LARZELERE

DAVID NJITE

*School of Hotel and Restaurant
Administration*

*Department of Human
Development and Family Science*

*School of Hotel and Restaurant
Administration*

Oklahoma State University

Summary.—The Dyadic Trust Scale, previously adapted for a range of applications in organizational research, was translated into Turkish in this study and evaluated with a sample of 117 service employees (69 men and 48 women), whose mean age was 21.5 yr. ($SD=1.8$). The internal consistency of the Turkish version was estimated with a Cronbach alpha of .90. Test-retest reliability was .88. Both principal component analysis and confirmatory factor analysis supported the prior unidimensional structure of the eight items. These findings indicate that the Turkish version provides a reliable assessment of interpersonal trust in a service environment.

Trust is defined as a person's belief in the integrity of another individual (Larzelere & Huston, 1980). It is also considered a phenomenon contributing to the strength of interpersonal, intraorganizational, and interorganizational relationships in general (Svensson, 2006). The Dyadic Trust Scale was originally designed by Larzelere and Huston (1980) to examine interpersonal trust between partners in close relationships, but the items are generic to relationships with a specific other partner in a wide range of relationships, including relationships in organizations.

The Dyadic Trust Scale has been cited in over 50 journal articles in the areas of business or management. Trust has been reported to be a crucial factor in successful management (e.g., Cunningham & MacGregor, 2000) and relationships among cooperating organizations (Morgan & Hunt, 1994). Although originally conceptualized as a 2-dimensional scale, most factor analyses of the Dyadic Trust Scale have yielded a single factor (e.g., Larzelere & Huston, 1980; Fynes, De Burca & Mangan, 2008).

The Dyadic Trust Scale has been used to measure trust in a sample of customers (Fynes, *et al.*, 2008), companies (Morgan & Hunt, 1994), and supervisors (Ringer & Boss, 2000). It has consistently shown good reliability and validity in these organizational applications, e.g., a mean coefficient alpha of .95 for 7- and 8-item versions and .82 for a 4-item version in the above three studies. As examples of validity, scores on the scale provided one of two key mediators of the Commitment–Trust Model of relationships

¹Address correspondence to Murat Hancer, School of Hotel and Restaurant Administration, 210 HESW, Stillwater, OK 74078-6173 or e-mail (murat.hancer@okstate.edu).

in marketing (Morgan & Hunt, 1994). A previous study of trust in hospital supervisors indicated trust was associated with less assertiveness and less upward appeal, although scores were not correlated as hypothesized with three other variables (Ringer & Boss, 2000). Given the wide use of the Dyadic Trust Scale in organizational research, the present purposes were to translate the Dyadic Trust Scale into Turkish and to examine the factor structure, test-retest reliability, and internal consistency.

METHOD

Participants

The sample included 117 service employees, 69 men and 48 women from several large hotels in Kusadasi, Turkey. An initial meeting with the participating employees was conducted to explain the purpose of the study. After the meeting, surveys were distributed to participants. The mean age of respondents was 21.5 yr. ($SD = 1.8$), ranging from 18 to 28 years. To estimate temporal stability, the same group of respondents were administered the survey 2 wk. after the initial survey date.

Procedure

The Dyadic Trust Scale (Larzelere & Huston, 1980) is an 8-item scale which measures trust in a close relationship. Each item is rated on a 7-point Likert-type scale using anchors of 1: Strongly disagree and 7: Strongly agree. The Dyadic Trust Scale items were modified to tailor the items to employees' relationships with hotel managers. For example, the item "My partner is primarily interested in his (her) own welfare" (Larzelere & Huston, 1980, p. 599) was modified for employees, to read "My manager is primarily interested in his (her) own welfare."

The translation procedures were based on recommendations by Bradley (1994), which included forward and back translations and subsequent improvements. In addition, a second forward translation was done. The two forward translators discussed the differences in their translations and reconciled those differences. A back translation was then done by a third person. Final modifications were made in the translation after comparing the back translation with the original English version. All three translators were native Turkish speakers who were fluent in English and had lived in an English-speaking country. They were knowledgeable about cultural differences in interpersonal trust, which they considered conceptually equivalent in Turkey and the USA (Chang, Chau, & Holroyd, 1999).

RESULTS

To examine internal consistency, Cronbach alpha was calculated using SPSS Version 15. For this Turkish version of the Dyadic Trust Scale, the overall internal consistency was high ($\alpha = .90$) and similar for men (.92)

and women (.88). Temporal stability of the scale was measured by giving the survey to 85 of the 117 employees 2 wk. later. Test-retest reliability was .88. A principal component analysis was applied to examine the factor structure of the Turkish version of the Dyadic Trust Scale. The criterion of eigenvalues greater than 1.0 and visual inspection of the scree plot were used to estimate the number of factors. A unidimensional factor emerged with an eigenvalue of 4.82, which accounted for 60.3% of the total variance (Table 1). The second largest eigenvalue of .79 did not support a second factor. A confirmatory factor analysis using maximum likelihood in Mplus also fit the data adequately with a one-factor model [$\chi^2_{20}(N=117)=28.02, p=.11, CFI=.98, RMSEA=.059$].

TABLE 1
FACTOR LOADINGS OF TURKISH DYADIC TRUST SCALE FROM PRINCIPAL COMPONENTS ANALYSIS

Item	Factor Loading
1. I feel that I can trust my manager completely. Müdürüme tam anlamıyla güvenebileceğimi hissedebiliyorum.	.85
2. My manager is perfectly honest and truthful with me. Müdürüm benimle tamamen dürüst ve samimidir.	.84
3. There are times when my manager cannot be trusted.* Müdürümüm güvenilmez olduğu anlar vardır.	.83
4. My manager treats me fairly and justly. Müdürüm bana eşit ve adil davranır.	.82
5. My manager is truly sincere in his (her) promises. Müdürüm vaatlerinde gerçekten samimidir.	.80
6. I feel that my manager can be counted on to help me. Yardıma ihtiyacım olduğunda müdürüme güvenebileceğimi hissediyorum.	.77
7. My manager is primarily interested in his (her) own welfare.* Müdürüm her şeyden önce kendi iyiliğini düşünür.	.66
8. I feel that my manager does not show me enough consideration.* Müdürümün bana yeterli ilgiyi göstermediğini hissediyorum.	.57
Eigenvalue	4.82
% Variance explained	60.3

Note.—Translations to Turkish follow English items. *Reverse coded.

DISCUSSION

These initial psychometric results suggest adequate reliabilities for this new Turkish version of the Dyadic Trust Scale for measuring interpersonal trust of supervisors by employees in the hotel industry. A larger representation from different occupational segments in Turkey is required to develop Turkish norms for the scale. In addition, researchers should explore the possibility of distinctive aspects of trust in different types of interpersonal relationships in distinct cultures (Hofstede, Neuijen, Ohavy, & Sanders, 1990). Finally, further psychometric assessment of reliabilities in other occupations and of validities with independent samples is required.

REFERENCES

- BRADLEY, C. (1994) Translation of questionnaires for use in different languages and cultures. In C. Bradley (Ed.), *Handbook of psychology: a guide to psychological measurement in diabetes research and management*. Singapore: Harwood Academic. Pp. 43-56.
- CHANG, A., CHAU, J. P. C., & HOLROYD, E. (1999) Translation of questionnaires and issues of equivalence. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 29, 316-322.
- CUNNINGHAM, J. B., & MACGREGOR, J. (2000) Trust and the design of work: complementary constructs in satisfaction and performance. *Human Relations*, 53, 1575-1591.
- FYNES, B., DE BURCA, S., & MANGAN, J. (2008) The effect of relationship characteristics on relationship quality and performance. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 111, 56-69.
- HOFSTEDE, G., NEUIJEN, B., OHAYV, D. D., & SANDERS, G. (1999) Measuring organizational cultures: a qualitative and quantitative study across twenty countries. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 35, 286-316.
- LARZELERE, R. E., & HUSTON, T. L. (1980) The Dyadic Trust Scale: toward understanding interpersonal trust in close relationships. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 42, 595-604.
- MORGAN, R. M., & HUNT, S. D. (1994) The commitment-trust theory of relationship marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, 58, 20-38.
- RINGER, R. C., & BOSS, R. W. (2000) Hospital professionals' use of upward influence tactics. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 12, 92-108.
- SVENSSON, G. (2006) Multiple informants and asymmetric interactions of mutual trust in dyadic business relationships. *European Business Review*, 18, 132-152.

Accepted December 23, 2008.