

G.4 Decision-making style and trusting stance at the workplace: a socio-cultural approach

Research

Frithiof Svenson¹, Himadri Roy Chaudhuri², Arindam Das³,
Markus Launer¹

¹Ostfalia University of Applied Sciences, Faculty of Trade and Social Work,
Suderburg, Germany

²Xavier School of Management-XLRI, Jamshedpur, India

³Alliance School of Business, Alliance University, Bangalore, India

1 Problem

The transformation of economic and societal contexts often labeled sharing economy involves changes in business processes, interactions between people and use of information and communication technologies (ICTs) (Eckhardt et al., 2019). Now, platform brands and digital cues court for consumer attention in stylized customer experience journeys. Due to the flexibility and internationalization of actors, processes and organizational structures, research has ‘largely centered on marketplace design, yield management, choosing an appropriate organizational scope, and creating effective labor policy’ (Sundararajan, 2019, p. 32).

Scholarship pays less attention to the facilitation of trust across different marketplace contexts. Industry specifics (logistics, security, healthcare, IT, etc.) are essential, but hardly feature in combination with country-level specifics. Platforms are becoming important societal institutions (Van Dijk, Poell & De Waal, 2018). When these platforms rise to build brand communities establishing participants’ confidence in other community members and the technology becomes salient (Svenson, 2018). However, workplaces within firms still shape confidence towards digital life (Myers & Sadaghiani, 2010). Workplaces determine digital conduct and they are opening up towards platforms.

The goal of this submission is to outline a conceptual framework for the empirical measurement of trust in digital business transactions within organizations. This research seeks to understand the evolving interplay between digital cues distributed across ICTs and organizational conduct as shaping preferences for decision-making styles to generate a liquid digital trust. The framework yields a scaffold for a comparative analysis of individual behavior in different markets to find out the degree of trust towards digital processes, people and technology.

Trust forms a base of digital strategies across industries (Urban, 2000; Pavlou, 2002). Saying that there is a lack of trust, would be simple, yet fails to take into account, how users’ decision-making style and trust cues relate to one another. People learn different decision-making styles within organizations.

Strategy making for different markets should take these into account, when creating cues for digital trust (Carbonell et al., 2019). People possess the ability to use different thinking styles. Often however, people prefer one style of thinking to the other, depending on the domain to which they apply cognition. Organizational micro-contexts are further factors that may affect thinking styles.

2 Approach

Most of the available literature on trust (i.e., confidence towards the reliability and intentions of a business partner) depicts scenarios prior to the rise of the platform economy. The aim of subsequent empirical research is to assess digital trust among employees and their perspective about own experience at the workplace, their attitude towards the employing organization, as well as confidence towards regulatory efforts in the society as a whole. Specifically, the research is primarily aimed at measuring digital trust in the workplace with an emphasis on people (interactions at the workplace), technology (integration with ICTs), and process (the way ICTs are handled within organizations). We regard these domains as fundamental areas in which digitization transforms business transactions. The study does not include the measurement of digital trust among consumers of sharing platforms and users of digital products and services of specific brands. However, it collects demographics and industry specifics about the workforce in different sectors of countries all around the world. Through a link to respondent's decision-making preference for analytical or intuitive thinking, it will be possible to highlight trajectories of decision-making at the workplace. Therewith describing the landscape of intuition and digital trust at the workplace.

3 Trust as liquid or solid

Inspired by work in cultural studies and sociology (Bauman) this contribution assumes a new dimension of trust as liquid or solid. Given the rise of platforms, which are likely future successors of hierarchical organizations, trust is likely to be more short-lived. Hence, our ambition is to open up social theory in search of more suitable concepts. For Bauman, the contemporary world of liquid modernity suffers from a triple trust crisis—trust in self, other, and the jointly built durable institution. The decline of trust in institutions causes other types of trusts to dwindle (Harrington, 2017). Taking a bird's eye perspective on market interaction benefits from social theory about the onset of modernity.

The modern liquid man has marked an aporetic doubt in the rational and eternal structures in comparison to their short lives. Like Kafka's hero, for the man of the modern liquid world, the institutions of reason and logic become irrational and ephemeral Castle(s) (Rakušanová & Sedláčková, 2002, p. 843–44). Here one must

be reminded, when solid modernity gives way to liquid modernity it happens not to choose ephemerality by default. For Bauman, ‘Solids may be melted, but they are melted in order to mould new solids better shaped and better fitted for human happiness than the old ones – but also more solid and so more “certain” than the old solids managed to be. Melting the solids was to be but the preliminary, site-clearing stage of the modern undertaking to make the world more suitable for human habitation’ (Bauman, 2007, p. 3). The former site is melted and dismantled in search of a more suitable, tough, durable, logical, and trustworthy human institution. Yet, any search for a new reason-based democratic institution (viz. ICT based institutions that are thought to further a democratic system) brings in its wake the rein of totalitarianism. This unpredictability of the new scenario breeds anxiety, fear and trustlessness, and thus makes it liquid.

The issue of organizational totalitarianism is a fall out of what Bauman calls *adiaphorization* or absence of moral concern. Within an organizational structure this according to Bauman ‘is achieved by excluding some categories of people from the realm of moral subjects, or through covering up the link between partial action and the ultimate effect of coordinated moves, or through enthroning procedural discipline and personal loyalty in the role of the all-overriding criterion of moral performance’ (Bauman, 1995, p. 149). The hegemonic ICT imperatives within an organization add to this moral insensitivity and exclusion of a subject’s moral ontology. Rightly, Bauman expresses about such *adiaphorized* organizational culture, ‘Reduction and simplification of moral obligations and ethically inspired emotions, in general, are viewed as indispensable conditions for a focused, determined, efficient and therefore rational conduct’ (Bauman, 2014, p. xvi). Commenting on the non-violable authority/power of the logic-based ICT (such as the use of CCTV) within an organization, Clegg (2018) dubs them to be of the panoptic magnitude of a Baumanian *adiaphorized* structure (Clegg, 2018, p. 355). The ICT surveillance, with its disciplinary potentialities, within an organization, is to Bauman a matter of degenerative power structure, ‘Today’s Big Brother is not about keeping people in and making them stick to the line, but about kicking people out and making sure that when they are kicked out that they will duly go and won’t come back...’ (Bauman, 2006, p. 25). These power-infested digitized in/visible surveillance agencies/mechanisms in an organization render subject bodies to mere data and create “data-doubles” which are more significant than real-life stories of organizational subjects (Lyon, 2010, p. 325). Further, the concerns of personal data accumulation of the organization and its (especially about the non-mandatory disclosure data type) unsolicited breach heighten the sense of a subject’s vulnerability and consequent lack of trust for the organization. With this collapse and liquefaction of trust and non-faith in the organization, the subject’s organizational commitment becomes one of access-based.

Much contrary to the concept of possession or sense of belongingness for an organization, a subject's position is that of ephemeral, impermanent transaction with the organization and is context-specific and access-based (Bardhi & Eckhardt, 2017). Away from any solid sense of attachment, due to the lack of trust thereby generated, an organizational subject enters into an until-further-notice arrangement, with no strings attached commitment, and seeking fast-paced satisfaction and profit with the place of work. Liquid trust is defined as ephemeral, access based, and dematerialized, while solid trust is defined as enduring, and material.

In this article, we conceptualize a range of trust cues tentatively as digital trust. We extend work on sources of trust in the wake of the platform economy by Sundararajan (2019), adjusting it to our purpose to allow the mapping of digital trust at the workplace. We propose the following trust cues (see table 1): Nondigital word of mouth, as confidence based on positive credentials from trusted people in the workplace or business partners. Confidence gained due to availability of digital platforms (used/moderated/operated) for official transactions in the workplace, e.g. Facebook, Twitter. Confidence coming from technology integration at the workplace, such as own use of digital information to display the person's authenticity, intent and capabilities. Confidence stemming from organizational legitimization through idiosyncratic handling of processes, such as people at work talking about use of specific ICTs, tempting people to assume that contact through these media assures trustworthiness of distant colleagues and business partners.

In order to move beyond description of digital trust, we combine it with individual decision-making style from cognitive psychology. Organizations are institutions that introduce and re-enforce doings and sayings of computer-mediated communication. The combination of a socio-cultural approach to trust with perspectives from psychology provides the opportunity to grasp how trust and decision-making interact with regard to different kinds of phenomena. Workplace conduct shapes industry- and country-specific handling of issues around digital life.

4 Thinking Styles and Decision-making

In work that looks into platforms (e.g., Bardhi & Eckhardt, 2017), the individual level calculus on decisions about whether privacy is valued higher than the release of personal data is studied for the consumer-market level. Less work has focused on organizational conduct that shapes digital conduct at the workplace. After all, the majority of the workforce spend more time at work than at home. The CoVid-19 pandemic that struck the globe in early 2020 dramatically changed this. The majority of computer-mediated workplace communication migrated from office buildings to homes at an unprecedented pace.

For illustration of the economic and societal challenges involved, we can shine a light on individual confidence towards data protection and digital policy within organizations. On the one side, there is the risk of data breaches and on the other side, there is an at times overcautious interpretation of data protection principles at the workplace.

Different management-related fields are looking into the question of analytical versus intuitive thinking styles. The management literature still lacks studies that empirically test different kinds of decision-making styles simultaneously, to verify how they interact, for example, with trust in data protection, protection of privacy and digital literacy issues. Overall, most scholars from different disciplines have endorsed intuition from a dual process perspective. The analytical decision-making style (Orlandi & Pierce, 2020) considers the rational aspects of decisions, which have a long-standing tradition in management studies (Cabantous & Gond, 2011). Intuitions are also based on what people hear inside their organization informally and officially, therewith leading people ‘to judge their trusting conceptions as more familiar and to have been encountered more often’ (Bensley, 2020, p. 78).

In our contribution, we take a broader view of intuition. The development of hypotheses related to intuition is rooted in the review of literature that presents both the theoretical and empirical studies supporting the likely (positive or negative) effects of deploying intuitive information processing.

4.1 Heuristics: Gerd Gigerenzer

Decision heuristics are simplifying ‘rules of thumb’ actors use under conditions of uncertainty. In the field of heuristics, Gigerenzer and colleagues (Gigerenzer et al., 1999) assume that the decision maker selects heuristics while adapting to the environment and the context. This domain specific selection stresses that people use pattern recognition to make decisions.

4.2 Intuitive expertise: Gary Klein

The psychologist Gary Klein is a pioneer in the field of naturalistic decision-making. His works are mainly concerned with intuition in the world of professions (Klein, 2008). He mainly deals with professional groups that have to make important and quick decisions in their job. Klein’s work has been applied to groups of police officers, firefighters, doctors, nurses, exchange traders, lawyers and managers; also, the intersection of this work with organization studies has been explored (Lipshitz, Klein & Carroll, 2006).

4.3 Unconscious thinking: Ap Dijksterhuis

Based on the studies of social psychologist Ap Dijksterhuis (et al., 2006) there is evidence that with increasing complexity of a choice, the intuitive decision is superior to the rational alternative. Recent literature examines controversial claims about the merit of ‘unconscious thought’ made by Ap Dijksterhuis for making complex decisions. Unconscious information processing is associated with taking time for decisions, e.g. to sleep on it or to distract oneself, before a decision is taken.

4.4 Anticipation: Dean Radin

The concepts presented so far cannot yet handle all phenomena of intuitive decision-making we know from everyday practice. In various experiments, Radin (2004) was able to demonstrate that humans anticipate the future. Research subjects displayed anticipation measured through skin resistance (lie detector principle) and the enlargement of pupils (Radin & Borges, 2009). Recent meta-studies totaling up to 90 experiments around anticipation confirm the effects measured by Radin (Bem et al., 2016). Although many of us might have heard about anticipation as part of intuition, wide ranging acknowledgement of this research strand has been missing. This research stream investigates, if people have feelings for things or events that are about to happen, therewith anticipating the future. People tend to resort to intuitive responses during times of great workloads, time compression, little information and other characteristics of uncertainty. The tasks in our future empirical research will address among other things the sensitive domain/ethical issue of digital trust.

5 Framework for Digital Trust and Intuitive Decision-making

The platform economy uses a range of digital systems to facilitate trust. Often, these systems are framed on typical users, usually men in the global north. Users from the global south or even females and non-binary users are often marginalized when designing systems to facilitate digital trust. There have been increased calls to conceptualize the state of trust so that trust building is not limited to consumer reviews or government regulation (Eckhardt et al., 2019). For digital strategists, to find out which of the different trust cues matters most to impact confidence towards market offerings appears significant. Several trust cues have to be taken into account and their relative importance should be determined (Sundararajan, 2019). What is the nature of trust in the current global condition, and to what degree can preferences for intuitive or analytic thinking inform digital strategy, therewith shaping business transactions? Sundararajan cautions that any misunderstanding regarding the ‘importance of individual digital confidence could result in overinvestments [...]’ by making ‘digital trust systems more sophisticated (Sundararajan, 2019, p. 35).

It seems as though the modern (liquid) trust generates its other--the digital non-trustworthy or the ethicless design of a digital world (we do not generally trust anybody). While exploring trust through empirical study, indicators are collected to find out, whether decision-makers, prefer rational-analytic thinking (slow) or intuitive and automatic (rapid) thinking. We would expect high individual confidence towards digital processes and preference for rapid decision-making to indicate more liquid trust. A preference for rational-analytic (slow) thinking would indicate more solid trust. Returning to the example of confidence towards data protection within the organization can help to illustrate the kinds of phenomena that digital trust research may address. The managers with a higher confidence towards the processes of data protection, preferring rapid intuitive thinking, may have a better endorsement of liquid trust, given their tenure inside the organization. There are also perils of rapid thinking, such as the endorsement of unsubstantiated claims or constant delegation of decision tasks to superiors. Even though anybody within an organization bears some discretion to act, subordinates, 'are excluded from the authorship of their acts' (Bauman, 2014, p. xvi). We recommend managers to observe their organizations' trust cues as well as organizational members' discretion to reflect upon different cognitive styles, before taking action. Results from different marketplace contexts will show the need for adjustments to digital strategies.

Table 1: Sources of Trust Cues and Intuition types around digital phenomena

Individual digital confidence is a kind of Trust Cue	Preference for a kind of Decision-making	Application to different digital phenomena
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Nondigital word of mouth/ People - Digital Trust Systems/Technology integration - Societal legitimization/Process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Intuitive or Analytical Thinking - Heuristics - Unconscious Thought - Anticipation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Data Protection - Personal Data Protection - Digital Society - Industry-specifics - Country-specifics

Literature

- Bardhi, F., & Eckhardt, G. M. (2017). Liquid consumption. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 44(3), 582–597.
- Bauman, Z. (1995). *Life in Fragments: Essays in Postmodern Morality*. Blackwell: Oxford.
- Bauman, Z. (2006). *Liquid Fear*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bauman, Z. (2014). Preface. In J. Kociatkiewicz & Kostera, M. (eds.) *Liquid Organization: Zygmunt Bauman and Organization Theory*. London: Routledge, xiv–xix.
- Bem, D., Tressoldi, P., Rabeyron, T. & Duggan, M. (2010): Feeling the future: A meta-analysis of 90 experiments on the anomalous anticipation of random future events. doi:10.12688/fl1000research.7177.2
- Bensley, D. A. (2020). Critical thinking and the rejection of unsubstantiated claims. In R. J. Sternberg & Halpern, D. F. (eds.) *Critical thinking in psychology*. Cambridge: Oxford, 68–94.
- Bullini Orlandi, L. & Pierce, P. (2020). Analysis or intuition? Reframing the decision-making styles debate in technological settings. *Management Decision*, 58(1), 129–145. doi:10.1108/MD-10-2017-1030
- Cabantous, L., & Gond, J. P. (2011). Rational decision making as performative praxis: Explaining rationality's Éternel Retour. *Organization Science*, 22(3), 573–586.
- Carbonell, G., Barbu, C. M., Vorgerd, L., & Brand, M. (2019). The impact of emotionality and trust cues on the perceived trustworthiness of online reviews. *Cogent Business & Management*, 6(1). doi:10.1080/23311975.2019.1586062
- Clegg, S. R. (2018). Reading Bauman and Retrotopia. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 34(4), 354–363.
- Dijksterhuis, A., Bos, M. W., Nordgren, L. F., & Van Baaren, R. B. (2006). On making the right choice: The deliberation-without-attention effect. *Science*, 311(5763), 1005–1007.
- Eckhardt, G. M., Houston, M. B., Jiang, B., Lambertson, C., Rindfleisch, A., & Zervas, G. (2019). Marketing in the sharing economy. *Journal of Marketing*, 83(5), 5–27.
- Harrington, M. (2017). Survey: People's trust has declined in business, media, government, and NGOs. *Harvard Business Review*, 16.
- Klein, G. (2008). Naturalistic decision making. *Human factors*, 50(3), 456–460.
- Lipshitz, R., Klein, G., & Carroll, J. S. (2006). Introduction to the special issue. Naturalistic decision making and organizational decision making: Exploring the intersections. *Organization Studies*, 27(7), 917–923.

- Lyon, D. (2010). Liquid Surveillance: The Contribution of Zygmunt Bauman to Surveillance Studies. *International Political Sociology*, 4, 325–338.
- Myers, K. K., & Sadaghiani, K. (2010). Millennials in the workplace: A communication perspective on millennials' organizational relationships and performance. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 25(2), 225–238.
- Pavlou, P. A. (2002). Institution-based trust in interorganizational exchange relationships: the role of online B2B marketplaces on trust formation. *The Journal of Strategic Information Systems*, 11(3–4), 215–243.
- Radin, D. (2004). Electrodermal Presentiments of Future Emotions. *Journal of Scientific Exploration*, 18(2), 253–273.
- Radin, D. & Borges, A. (2009). Intuition Through Time: What Does the Seer See? *Explore: The Journal of Science and Healing*, 5, 200–211.
- Rakušanová, P. & Sedláčková, M. (2002) Zygmunt Bauman in Prague – a new impulse for Czech sociology, *Czech Sociological Review*. 38(6), 843–845.
- Sundararajan, A. (2019). Commentary: The twilight of brand and consumerism? Digital trust, cultural meaning, and the quest for connection in the sharing economy. *Journal of Marketing*, 83(5), 32–35.
- Svenson, F. (2018). Smartphone crises and adjustments in a virtual P3 community – doing sustainability oriented smartphone consumption. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 34(7–8), 664–693. doi:10.1080/0267257X.2018.1464495
- Urban, G. L., Sultan, F., & Qualls, W. J. (2000). Placing trust at the center of your Internet strategy. *Sloan Management Review*, 42(1), 39–48.
- Van Dijck, J., Poell, T., & De Waal, M. (2018). *The platform society: Public values in a connective world*. Oxford University Press.