

Building and Management of Trust in Information Systems

István Mezgár

*Budapest University of Technology and Economics, Hungary &
Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Budapest, Hungary*

INTRODUCTION

Thanks to the rapidly developing information and communication technologies, the complexity of networked organizations becomes very high, so the representation of their structure, the description of their operation, and their control needs new technologies and approaches. The availability of individuals independent from location and time means mobility, and that is an important attribute of today's society. This mobility can be achieved by using different types of wireless networks such as wireless wide area networks (WWANs—GSM, GPRS, and UMTS), wireless local area networks (WLANs, such as WiFi 802.11b, 802.11a), and wireless personal area (or Pico) networks (WPAN—Bluetooth, IrDA2).

In spite of the application of high-tech approaches, tools, and methodologies, there is a common point in all of the organizations; human beings make the most of important decisions, and they operate and use systems. According to experience, improper application of this human factor can make operation very inefficient, even in the case of technically advanced systems. The lowest level of connection among systems is made through protocols; the highest contact level is among decision makers and users, namely, human beings. A very important element of this human contact is trust. In a networked organization, trust is the atmosphere, the medium in which actors are moving (Castelfranchi & Yao-Hua Tan, 2001). Only trust can bridge the cultural, geographical, and organizational distances of team members (and even of firms) and keep them from turning into unmanageable psychological distances. Trust is the base of cooperation, the normal behavior of the human being in society. The ability of enterprises to form networked systems depends on the existing level of trust in the society and on the capital of society (Fukuyama, 1995). As the rate of cooperation is increasing in all fields of life, the importance of trust is evolving even faster.

Lack of trustworthy security services is a major obstacle in the use of information systems in private, in business (B2B [business to business]), as well as in public services. Trust is intimately linked to consumers' rights, like security, identification, authentication, privacy, and

confidentiality. Secure identification, authentication of the users, and communication security are main problems in networked systems.

Information management (IM) is a fuzzy term covering the various stages of information processing from production to storage and retrieval to dissemination toward the better working of an organization, where information can be from internal and external sources and in any format. The role of trust in these processes is definitive as human-to-human and human-to-system communications form the base of information management.

BACKGROUND

Definitions of Trust

The word trust is used by different disciplines, so there are many definitions of the term fulfilling the demands of the actual theory or application. In everyday life, without trust, one would be confronted with the extreme complexity of the world in every minute. No human being could stand this, so people have to have fixed points around them. One has to trust in family members, partners, trust in the institutions of a society and its members, and trust within and between organization partners. The diversity of approaches is one reason that trust has been called an "elusive concept to define" (Gambetta, 1988, p. 213).

Trust can be defined as a psychological condition comprising the truster's intention to accept vulnerability based upon positive expectations of the trustee's intentions or behavior (Rousseau, Sitkin, Burt, & Camerer, 1998). Those positive expectations are based upon the truster's cognitive and affective evaluations of the trustee and the system and world as well as of the disposition of the truster to trust. Trust is a psychological condition (interpreted in terms of expectation, attitude, willingness, perceived probability). Trust can cause or result from trusting behavior (e.g., cooperation, taking a risk) but is not behavior itself.

According to Luhman (1979), trust can be viewed as a cognitive and social device able to reduce complexity, enabling people to cope with the different levels of uncer-

tainty and sometimes the risks that, at different degrees, permeate our life. Without trust, an individual would freeze in uncertainty and indecision when faced with the impossibility to calculate all possible outcomes of a situation. Engaging trust automatically can reduce the number of decision nodes that are being analyzed and facilitate the decision-making processes. From a social perspective, trust permits the necessary knowledge sharing of delegation and cooperative actions.

The following components are included in most definitions of trust (Harrison, McKnight, & Chervany, 1996):

- the willingness to be vulnerable and to rely,
- confidence and having positive expectations and attitudes toward others, and
- interdependence and taking risks as necessary conditions.

Trust has different forms such as the following.

1. **Intrapersonal trust:** trust in one's own abilities (self-confidence) and a basic trust in others
2. **Interpersonal trust:** expectation based on cognitive and affective evaluation of partners in primary relationships (e.g., family) and nonprimary relationships (e.g., business partners)
3. **System trust:** trust in depersonalised systems and a world that function independently (e.g., economic system, regulations, legal system, technology); requires voluntary abandonment of control and knowledge
4. **Object trust:** trust in nonsocial objects; trust in correct functioning (e.g., in an electronic device)

Trust is a Multifaceted Construct

There is compelling evidence originating from the organizational research community to support the idea that trust is a many sided, complex construct. McAllister (1995) has proposed two critical dimensions: emotional trust and cognitive trust. Emotional trust is the development of noncalculating and spontaneous emotional bonds, and affects two or more people. Emotional trust is demonstrated through confidence and openness in sharing ideas, feelings, and concerns. Cognitive trust refers both to judgments of competence (predictably professional behavior) and reliability (the congruence between words and actions) about the other members of a team.

Represented Forms of Trust

There are two basic modeling approaches in describing trust: the cognitive approach (Castelfranchi & Falcone, 1999) and the mathematical approach (Marsh, 1994). In the

case of applying cognitive models, trust is made up of underlying beliefs, and trust is a function of the value of these beliefs. The mathematical modeling approach ignores the role of underlying beliefs and uses a trust metric based on variables like perceived competence, perceived risk, utility of a situation for the agent involved, importance of a situation, and so forth. These models incorporate some aspects of game theory and the evolution of cooperation models. Both modeling approaches see trust as a variable with a threshold for action. When the value of the variable crosses the threshold, the agent executes an action. In the Marsh model, the action is cooperation; in the Castelfranchi and Falcone model, the action is delegation. The action is Boolean in nature; the agent either delegates or not, or the agent either cooperates or not.

Classifying the Meanings of Trust

Harrison et al. (1996) made a very deep and thorough analysis of the word trust from many aspects in their working paper. The goal of the paper was to develop a classification system for the types of trust, and to develop trust definitions and types that can be accepted by most disciplines.

In the following, the main groups of the classification system for trust constructs are given to better understand the definitional problem. Impersonal and structural trust refers to those definitions of trust that differentiate it from being a property or state of a person or persons. Dispositional trust means that trust is based on the personality attributes of the trusting party. Personal and interpersonal trust means that one person trusts another person, persons, or thing(s) in the situation.

Guided by the classification system, six related types of trust have been defined in the working paper. The six constructs are as follows: trusting intention, trusting behavior, trusting beliefs, system trust, dispositional trust, and situational decision to trust. Both cognitive and affective components are included in trusting beliefs, trusting intention, and trusting behavior. The six constructs cover the more common of the dictionary definitions of trust. This multidimensional view of trust provides a parsimonious way to organize measurable trust types while clearly distinguishing one type from another.

BUILDING TRUST

Connection of Trust and Information Management

Information technology management deals with the management of the different steps of information processing,

7 more pages are available in the full version of this document, which may be purchased using the "Add to Cart" button on the publisher's webpage:

www.igi-global.com/chapter/building-management-trust-information-systems/14253

Related Content

LIBNET: A Case Study in Information Ownership & Tariff Incentives in a Collaborative Library Database

A.S.C. Hooper (2005). *Journal of Cases on Information Technology* (pp. 77-97).

www.irma-international.org/article/libnet-case-study-information-ownership/3156

Citizenship and New Technologies

Peter J. Smith and Elizabeth Smythe (2005). *Encyclopedia of Information Science and Technology, First Edition* (pp. 414-419).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/citizenship-new-technologies/14272

Virtual Work, Trust and Rationality

Peter Murphy (2009). *Encyclopedia of Information Science and Technology, Second Edition* (pp. 4024-4027).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/virtual-work-trust-rationality/14179

A Software Design Model for Integrating LMS and MOOCs

Talent T. Rugube, Colin Chibaya and Desmond Wesley Govender (2022). *Journal of Information Technology Research* (pp. 1-14).

www.irma-international.org/article/a-software-design-model-for-integrating-lms-and-moocs/299375

The Adoption of Information Security Management Standards: A Literature Review

Yves Barlette and Vladislav V. Fomin (2010). *Information Resources Management: Concepts, Methodologies, Tools and Applications* (pp. 69-90).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/adoption-information-security-management-standards/54471