axiom global
DEVELOPMENT PARTNERS

WHITE PAPER

# Measuring What Matters:

# Trust as a Leadership Variable

A Framework for Executive Practice in Business and Nonprofit Organizations

**Javier Perez**
Managing Partner, Axiom Global Development Partners

**AUTHOR NOTE**

*Javier Perez is the Managing Partner of Axiom Global Development Partners, a nonprofit global consulting firm. The Organizational Trust Index™ (OTI™) is a proprietary diagnostic instrument. Correspondence regarding this paper should be directed to the author.*

## Abstract

Trust is one of the most cited and least measured variables in organizational life. Leaders routinely reference it as essential, yet few organizations have systems to interpret, monitor, or manage it. The result is a persistent executive blind spot: a condition that directly shapes organizational performance remains invisible in formal management systems.

This paper advances a single argument: trust is an operating condition that affects speed, alignment, decision quality, and organizational cost. Drawing on more than two decades of empirical research in organizational psychology and leadership studies, this paper establishes the evidence base for that claim. It introduces the Organizational Trust Index™ (OTI™) as a practical response to it.

The Organizational Trust Index (OTI) is introduced as a diagnostic instrument that assesses trust across five theoretically grounded domains: leadership intent, communication transparency, resource stewardship, responsiveness to input, and psychological safety. The framework positions trust as a measurable construct that can be analyzed through observable organizational conditions and interpreted in relation to performance-relevant outcomes.

The paper differentiates the OTI from adjacent constructs such as engagement, culture, and climate, and outlines a future research agenda for empirical validation and longitudinal application. By establishing trust as both a theoretical and measurable organizational variable, this work contributes to bridging the gap between trust research and organizational analysis.

***Keywords:*** *organizational trust, leadership effectiveness, psychological safety, team performance, trust measurement, executive diagnostics*

## Introduction

Every organization runs on trust. Employees decide how much effort to invest based on whether they trust leadership's intentions. Teams decide how much information to share based on whether they trust the environment is safe. Executives make decisions based on whether they trust the data and people

informing them. In each case, trust is an active variable shaping what gets done, how fast, and at what cost.

> *Employees calibrate effort based on perceived leadership intent, teams regulate information sharing based on perceived safety, and executives make decisions based on confidence in the people and systems informing them. In each case, trust operates not as a peripheral cultural attribute, but as a condition that directly influences organizational performance.*

Yet despite this centrality, trust is one of the most systematically unmeasured variables in organizational management. Organizations invest heavily in tracking financial performance, operational efficiency, customer satisfaction, and employee engagement. Trust, by contrast, is most often managed through intuition, anecdote, and retrospective damage control. Leaders typically become aware of a trust problem only after it has already degraded performance.

This represents a significant gap between what research tells us and how organizations operate. The empirical record on organizational trust is robust. Studies spanning more than two decades have documented the links between trust and cooperation, performance, psychological safety, and organizational citizenship behavior (Dirks & Ferrin, 2002; Edmondson, 1999; Kramer, 1999; Legood et al., 2021). The problem is not a lack of theoretical understanding. It is a lack of translation from theory to structured organizational measurement. While the empirical literature has established trust as a central determinant of cooperation, performance, and psychological safety, organizations have not developed corresponding frameworks to measure trust as a distinct and actionable construct within management systems.

This paper addresses that gap. It synthesizes the empirical foundation for treating trust as an operational leadership variable and presents the Organizational Trust Index™ (OTI™) as a practical instrument for measuring and interpreting trust in real organizations. The OTI™ is designed specifically for executive use: it produces actionable insights without requiring a background in organizational psychology, and it frames trust in the operational language that decision-makers use.

The paper proceeds as follows. It first establishes the theoretical and empirical foundations of organizational trust, covering its multidimensional structure, its relational and systemic nature, and the specific mechanisms through which it affects performance. It then introduces the OTI™ framework, explaining how it translates the research into a practical diagnostic instrument. It differentiates the OTI™ from adjacent tools such as engagement surveys and culture assessments. It closes with implications for leadership practice and a discussion of the stakes for organizations that choose to measure trust and those that do not.

> *The central argument advanced in this paper is that organizational trust functions as a measurable operating condition that shapes performance through its effects on coordination, information flow, and discretionary effort. Organizations that do not measure this condition lack visibility into a variable that directly affects execution and outcomes. The framework introduced here is designed to make that condition analytically visible and conceptually tractable within organizational research and practice.*

Trust either accelerates organizational performance or constrains it. It functions, in measurable terms, as a dividend or a tax. Executives who cannot measure that variable are managing blind.

## Theoretical Foundations of Organizational Trust

### Trust as a Multidimensional Construct

The most influential conceptual model in organizational trust research was proposed by Mayer, Davis, and Schoorman (1995). Their integrative model defines trust as the willingness of a party to be vulnerable to the actions of another based on the expectation that the other will perform a particular action important to the trustor, irrespective of the ability to monitor or control the other party.

Three antecedents drive that willingness: ability, benevolence, and integrity. Ability refers to the perception that a leader or institution has the competence to perform in the relevant domain. Benevolence is the perception that the trustee cares about the trustor's interests beyond their own. Integrity is the perception that the trustee adheres to principles the trustor considers acceptable.

This model carries practical significance that executive discourse often misses. Trust is not primarily about whether someone is likeable or whether a culture feels positive. It is a rational judgment based on observable signals. People assess whether their leaders know what they are doing, whether leadership decisions reflect genuine concern for the people affected, and whether the organization behaves consistently with its stated values. All three of those assessments are observable and, critically, influenceable through deliberate leadership behavior.

Schoorman, Mayer, and Davis (2007) revisited the model and confirmed its continued relevance, noting that trust unfolds dynamically over time and is affected by context, experience, and the control systems organizations put in place. This dynamic quality matters for executives: trust is not a fixed attribute of an organization. It shifts in response to decisions, communications, and behaviors. That means it can be built, and it can be destroyed.

### Trust as a Relational and Systemic Condition

A critical insight from the broader trust literature is that trust operates at multiple levels simultaneously. It is experienced interpersonally between individuals, but it is produced and shaped by organizational structures, processes, and patterns of leadership behavior.

Burke, Sims, Lazzara, and Salas (2007) conducted a multilevel review of trust in leadership and found that trust is shaped not only by leader attributes but by organizational climate, justice perceptions, participation in decision-making, and perceived organizational support. Their review integrated findings across individual, team, and organizational levels, demonstrating that trust is not reducible to individual relationships. It is a property of organizational systems.

This systemic quality has a direct implication for executives. Addressing trust only through interpersonal relationship-building will not close a systemic trust gap. If the budget process signals that leadership does not trust employees to use resources responsibly, no amount of town halls will compensate. If performance feedback is inconsistent or opaque, trust in the fairness of organizational systems erodes regardless of individual leader qualities. Trust must be managed at the system level, not only the relationship level.

Dirks and Ferrin (2002) reinforced this point in their meta-analytic review of 106 studies. They found that trust in leadership is best understood as a core mechanism through which leadership exerts organizational influence and that it is shaped by both relational and structural factors. Their review confirmed meaningful associations between trust and key outcomes, including job performance, organizational citizenship behavior, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and intent to leave.

## Trust as an Operating Condition: The Empirical Case

The theoretical framework established above provides the structure. The empirical record provides the evidence. Together, they support a claim that has significant implications for executive practice: trust is not a cultural nice-to-have. It is a measurable operating condition that directly affects organizational performance.

### Trust and Individual Performance

Legood, van der Werff, Lee, and Den Hartog (2021) examined the relationship between trust in leadership and employee performance, with particular attention to the mechanisms involved. Their findings showed that trust in the leader is significantly related to both task performance and organizational citizenship behavior. Critically, they also found that trust explained unique variance in performance beyond other relational constructs, meaning it is not simply a proxy for leader-member exchange or satisfaction. Trust carries its own predictive power.

This matters for executives because it reframes the conversation. The question is not whether trust is nice to have. The question is what performance capacity is being left unrealized in a low-trust environment. An employee who distrusts organizational leadership may comply with minimum requirements while withdrawing discretionary effort. In service-oriented organizations, where quality depends heavily on engagement and judgment, that withdrawal is a performance cost.

### Trust and Team Performance

The team-level evidence is equally compelling. Dirks (2000) studied trust in leadership at the team level and found that trust predicted both team performance and mediated performance effects over time. Teams operating in higher-trust conditions outperformed their lower-trust counterparts, and the gap widened rather than narrowed as time progressed.

De Jong and Elfring (2010) identified specific mechanisms. They found that trust improves team performance through stronger monitoring, increased effort, and greater reflexivity, meaning teams operating in high-trust environments are more likely to examine and improve their own processes. This suggests that trust does not merely improve immediate output; it improves the team's capacity to learn and adapt.

De Jong, Dirks, and Gillespie (2016) extended this work through meta-analysis, confirming that intrateam trust is positively related to team performance across organizational contexts. Their findings indicated that the relationship is robust across industries, team types, and measurement approaches. Trust functions consistently as a performance driver.

## Psychological Safety and the Trust Environment

A closely related construct strengthens the case further. Edmondson (1999) defined psychological safety as a shared belief that the team is safe for interpersonal risk-taking. Her original research demonstrated that psychologically safe teams show stronger learning behavior, even when controlling for factors such as team design and organizational context. The mechanism is straightforward: when people do not fear punishment for speaking up, raising concerns, or acknowledging mistakes, information flows more freely, and problems are identified earlier.

Frazier, Fainshmidt, Klinger, Pezeshkan, and Vracheva (2017) conducted a meta-analysis of 136 independent samples and found that psychological safety is positively associated with engagement, information sharing, learning behavior, task performance, and citizenship behavior. Their findings confirmed that psychological safety is a driver of outcomes that organizations typically measure in entirely different ways.

The connection to trust is direct. Psychological safety is, in operational terms, the experienced expression of organizational trust. When employees believe the organization is trustworthy, they act in psychologically safe ways. When trust is absent, they act protectively, withholding information, avoiding accountability, and disengaging from the behaviors that drive organizational performance.

## The Economics of Trust

The cumulative evidence points to a conclusion with economic as well as operational implications. Low-trust organizations do not simply perform worse on satisfaction surveys. They incur real costs: slower decision cycles, higher coordination friction, increased monitoring requirements, elevated turnover, and degraded information quality. These costs are rarely explicitly attributed to trust, but they are trust-driven.

Conversely, high-trust organizations capture a performance dividend. Decisions move faster because people believe they are based on sound reasoning and good intentions. Information flows more freely because people believe sharing it will not be used against them. Coordination requires less overhead because people extend the benefit of the doubt rather than requiring explicit verification at every step.

This framing, trust as either dividend or tax, is a direct translation of what the empirical literature shows. Trust either reduces friction and accelerates performance, or it introduces friction and slows it. The difference between those two conditions is measurable, and it is consequential.

### The Levers of Trust

The theoretical and empirical evidence reviewed above supports several propositions that guide the framework introduced in this paper:

| | |
|---|---|
| 1 | **Lever 1:** Organizational trust functions as an operating condition that influences performance through its effects on coordination, information flow, and discretionary effort. |
| 2 | **Lever 2:** Organizational trust is produced not only through interpersonal relationships, but through organizational systems, structures, and leadership behaviors that signal competence, integrity, and alignment. |
| 3 | **Lever 3:** Variations in organizational trust are measurable through employee perceptions of key organizational conditions, including leadership intent, communication transparency, resource stewardship, responsiveness to input, and psychological safety. |

These levers provide the conceptual bridge between the existing literature on trust and the measurement framework operationalized in the OTI™.

## The Organizational Trust Index: A Practical Framework

The empirical foundation described above establishes that trust matters. The question for executive practice is what to do with that knowledge. How does an organization translate research findings into an actionable diagnostic? How does leadership move from understanding trust theoretically to managing it operationally?

The Organizational Trust Index™ is designed to answer those questions. It is an executive-facing diagnostic instrument that measures organizational trust across five empirically grounded domains, produces a composite trust score, and translates findings into performance-relevant insights. The following sections explain the framework, the domain structure, and the interpretive logic of the instrument.

## Framework Design Principles

Three design principles shaped the OTI™. First, the instrument must be grounded in the research. Every domain it measures must correspond to a construct with an established empirical base in organizational psychology or leadership studies. Measurement without theoretical grounding produces data without meaning.

Second, the instrument must be usable by executives without specialized training. The research literature on trust is sophisticated and technically demanding. The OTI™ does not ask executives to engage that literature directly. It translates it into observable organizational conditions and presents findings in operational language.

Third, the instrument must be actionable. Assessment without a path to intervention produces awareness without improvement. The OTI™ is designed to generate not only a score but a frame for leadership action.

## Measurement Logic and Construct Representation

The OTI™ is designed to measure organizational trust through observable organizational conditions rather than attempting to measure trust as a purely internal psychological state. This approach builds on a central insight from the literature: trust is experienced subjectively, but it is produced by objective signals embedded in leadership behavior, organizational systems, and decision-making processes.

The five domains measured by the OTI™ represent distinct but interrelated dimensions of organizational trustworthiness. Each domain captures a set of signals through which employees assess whether the organization and its leadership are competent, principled, and aligned with their stated intentions. In this sense, the instrument does not measure trust as an abstract attitude, but as a structured response to organizational conditions.

The inclusion of psychological safety as a distinct domain reflects the experiential expression of trust within the organization. While the other four domains capture antecedent conditions, psychological safety captures the behavioral consequence of those conditions as they are experienced in day-to-day organizational life.

This structure allows the OTI™ to represent organizational trust as a multidimensional construct, while preserving analytical clarity regarding the specific mechanisms through which trust is built, maintained, or eroded.

## The Five Measurement Domains

The OTI™ measures trust across five domains. Each domain is grounded in the research literature reviewed above and reflects a distinct dimension of organizational trust as experienced by the people inside an organization.

***Leadership Intent.*** This domain assesses the degree to which employees perceive leadership decisions as purposeful, principled, and oriented toward the organization's mission and their interests. It corresponds directly to the ability and benevolence dimensions of Mayer et al.'s (1995) model and is the most fundamental driver of trust in leadership. When employees cannot identify a coherent rationale behind leadership decisions, or when decisions appear to serve narrow interests rather than the broader organization, trust at the foundational level erodes.

***Communication Transparency.*** This domain assesses whether information flows accurately and completely through the organization, whether leadership communicates the reasoning behind decisions, and whether people feel they have the information needed to do their work effectively. Dirks and Ferrin (2002) identified communication quality as a significant predictor of trust in leadership. A key nuance here is that transparency is not simply about frequency of communication. It is about whether people believe they are receiving the truth.

***Resource Stewardship.*** This domain examines whether employees perceive that organizational resources, including budget, time, personnel, and attention, are allocated fairly and in alignment with stated priorities. Resource decisions are among the most visible signals of organizational integrity. When stated values and resource allocations are inconsistent, the dissonance registers directly as a trust signal. This domain connects to the integrity dimension of Mayer et al.'s (1995) model and to the organizational justice literature underlying Burke et al.'s (2007) multilevel framework.

***Responsiveness to Input.*** This domain assesses whether leadership listens to employees, whether concerns are acknowledged, and whether input meaningfully shapes decisions. It corresponds to the participation mechanisms identified in Burke et al.'s (2007) review as significant drivers of organizational trust. Responsiveness does not require that every suggestion is adopted. It requires that people believe their input reaches decision-makers and is taken seriously. Organizations where that belief is absent deprive themselves of the distributed intelligence that makes organizations adaptable.

***Psychological Safety Conditions.*** This domain assesses whether employees feel safe enough to speak up, raise concerns, acknowledge mistakes, and offer candid perspectives without fear of punishment or exclusion. It is grounded in Edmondson's (1999) foundational work and the meta-analytic confirmation by Frazier et al. (2017). This domain is the experiential output of the other four. Organizations that score well on leadership intent, transparency, stewardship, and responsiveness typically produce conditions of psychological safety.

### Composite Scoring and Interpretive Logic

The OTI™ produces a composite trust score that aggregates performance across the five domains and translates the result into a single executive metric. The composite score is supported by domain-level breakdowns that allow leaders to identify where trust is functioning well and where it is not.

The instrument also incorporates a Net Promoter Score (NPS) adapted for organizational use. The NPS, originally developed in customer loyalty research, asks employees to assess whether they would recommend the organization as a place to work. In the context of trust measurement, this indicator functions as a proxy for organizational loyalty and internal reputation. It captures the integrated experience of working in the organization and is a leading indicator of retention, recruitment, and cultural momentum.

The interpretive framework translates composite scores into four operational zones, each corresponding to a distinct performance condition. A high-trust organization is operating in what might be called a trust dividend zone: trust is functioning as an accelerant, reducing coordination costs and enabling the kinds of discretionary effort and candid communication that drive performance. A low-trust organization is operating in what might be called a trust tax zone: trust is functioning as a constraint, introducing friction, elevating monitoring costs, and suppressing the behaviors that produce organizational effectiveness.

The intermediate zones between those extremes represent different stages of trust erosion or trust development. They are not neutral conditions. Organizations that remain in a functional but declining trust state often do not experience a dramatic performance break. They experience a slow drain: decisions take longer, alignment requires more effort, and the gap between what is possible and what is achieved quietly widens.

## Differentiation: What the OTI™ Is and Is Not

A legitimate challenge to any new organizational assessment tool is positioning. Organizations already use employee engagement surveys, culture assessments, and climate instruments. Before adopting another diagnostic, executives reasonably ask what distinguishes it from the tools they already have. This is a fair question, and it deserves a direct answer.

### Employee Engagement Surveys

Employee engagement surveys measure the degree to which employees are motivated, committed, and emotionally invested in their work and their organization. Widely used instruments such as the Gallup Q12 focus on factors including role clarity, recognition, development opportunities, and belonging.

Engagement and trust are related but distinct constructs. An employee can be highly engaged with their work, their team, and their professional growth while simultaneously harboring significant distrust of organizational leadership or institutional systems. Conversely, an employee can trust the organization while being disengaged due to factors unrelated to trust, such as insufficient challenge, lack of autonomy, or personal circumstances.

The OTI™ measures a specific condition, organizational trust, rather than an aggregate of motivational factors. Its five domains target the mechanisms through which trust operates, providing diagnostic specificity that engagement surveys are not designed to offer. When an engagement score declines, an engagement survey can confirm the decline but not necessarily explain whether it is driven by a trust failure, a management quality issue, a compensation issue, or something else entirely. The OTI™ provides that specificity.

### Culture Assessments

Culture assessments measure organizational values, behavioral norms, and the shared assumptions that shape how work gets done. They are useful for understanding organizational identity and for diagnosing misalignments between stated and lived culture.

Culture and trust are also related but distinct. Trust is a specific dimension of organizational culture, but it is one that can be measured and managed with more precision than culture assessments typically allow. A culture assessment might identify that an organization's culture values transparency while also finding that people do not feel safe raising concerns. That apparent contradiction is, in trust terms, exactly what a gap between the transparency domain and the psychological safety domain would look like. The OTI™ surfaces that kind of specific structural tension; a culture assessment describes it as a values misalignment without necessarily identifying its operational consequences.

### Climate Surveys

Organizational climate surveys measure employees' shared perceptions of organizational policies, practices, and procedures. They are broader than trust assessments and less specific in their actionability.

The OTI™ differs from climate surveys in its explicit theoretical grounding and its direct connection to performance outcomes. Climate surveys describe organizational conditions. The OTI™ measures a specific mechanism, trust, whose effects on performance outcomes are documented in the empirical literature. That theoretical specificity is the basis for the OTI's™ interpretive framework. It allows leaders to connect their scores not merely to descriptive benchmarks but to an established body of evidence about what those scores mean for organizational performance.

### The OTI's™ Distinct Contribution

The OTI™ occupies a specific space that existing tools do not. It is not a satisfaction instrument. It is not a cultural audit. It is a measurement of a specific, research-documented operating condition, organizational trust, with an interpretive framework that translates that measurement into executive-level performance intelligence.

> *The OTI™ is designed for leaders who need to make decisions, not for researchers who need to understand phenomena. That distinction shapes everything from its domain structure to its scoring framework to the language in which results are reported.*

## Implications for Leadership Practice

The argument advanced in this paper has three specific implications for leadership practice in both business and nonprofit organizations. These are not recommendations offered at the level of general leadership advice. They are conclusions that follow directly from the empirical evidence reviewed above.

### Trust Must Be Managed Deliberately

The first implication is the most fundamental: trust requires intentional management. It does not maintain itself. Organizations that do not actively measure and respond to trust signals do not simply hold steady. They drift, typically downward, as the gap between leadership intentions and employee experience widens without detection.

Silence is not trust. Compliance is not trust. Positive annual survey results are not trust. These are common substitutes that organizations use in the absence of genuine trust diagnostics, and they are unreliable proxies. Edmondson (1999) and Frazier et al. (2017) showed that psychological safety, a direct expression of organizational trust, must be actively cultivated. It does not emerge automatically from low-conflict environments. It is produced by specific leadership behaviors and organizational conditions that can be measured and deliberately strengthened.

### Trust Is a Leading Indicator

The second implication is that trust should be treated as a leading indicator of organizational performance, not a lagging descriptor of organizational culture. By the time a trust breakdown is visible in performance data, attrition rates, or customer outcomes, it has typically been underway for months or years. The performance data captures the effect. Trust data captures the cause.

Dirks and Ferrin (2002) and de Jong and Elfring (2010) both found that trust predicts performance over time, meaning current trust conditions are predictive of future performance outcomes. Legood et al. (2021) showed that trust explains unique variance in performance beyond other relational factors. Taken together, these findings support treating trust not as a commentary on organizational culture but as an early warning system for organizational effectiveness.

> *A declining trust score is not a morale problem. It is a forecast. Organizations that catch and respond to trust signals early preserve the performance they would otherwise lose to compounding friction and disengagement.*

### Trust Is a Leadership Responsibility

The third implication is the most direct. Trust is produced, and destroyed, by the decisions, behaviors, and systems that leadership controls. It is not a property of employees, a function of the labor market, or a residue of organizational history. It is an output of leadership choices.

This means that when a trust diagnostic reveals significant gaps, the response is a leadership question. What decisions have produced this condition? What systems are generating these perceptions? What behaviors need to change? The OTI™ is designed to support precisely that conversation, giving leadership teams a common vocabulary and a common data set from which to diagnose conditions and develop targeted responses.

For nonprofit organizations, this implication carries additional weight. Nonprofits typically operate with greater reliance on intrinsic motivation, mission alignment, and organizational loyalty than their for-profit counterparts. When trust erodes in a nonprofit context, the performance consequences are amplified because the motivational buffers that exist in better-compensated environments are thinner. Trust is not peripheral to nonprofit effectiveness. In many cases, it is the primary operating mechanism.

## Limitations

Any framework designed for executive practice involves tradeoffs, and intellectual honesty requires naming them directly.

First, the OTI™, like all survey-based instruments, relies on self-report data. Self-reports are susceptible to social desirability bias, particularly in organizational settings where employees may be uncertain about the confidentiality of their responses. Interpretation of OTI™ findings should account for the possibility that scores in lower-trust organizations may overstate actual trust levels, because the very conditions the instrument is designed to detect, fear of candor, can suppress accurate reporting.

Second, trust is context-dependent. Burke et al. (2007) noted that trust varies across team types, organizational levels, roles, and industries. Composite scores must be interpreted in an organizational context, not against universal benchmarks. A score that indicates healthy trust in one organizational setting may reflect a different condition in another.

Third, the OTI™ provides a snapshot of organizational trust at a point in time. Trust is dynamic; Schoorman et al. (2007) noted that it shifts in response to events, decisions, and changing organizational conditions. A single administration of the instrument captures a moment. Longitudinal use, tracking trust

across multiple administrations, provides the trend data that is most useful for executive decision-making.

Fourth, this paper presents a conceptual framework and theoretical justification for the OTI's™ domain structure. Formal psychometric validation, including confirmatory factor analysis, reliability testing, and criterion validity studies, represents the next stage of instrument development. The empirical literature reviewed here provides strong theoretical grounding for the five-domain structure, but direct validation of the OTI™ as a measurement instrument is required to establish its technical properties.

Fifth, the OTI™ is a diagnostic instrument, not a prescriptive protocol. It identifies where trust is functioning and where it is not. It does not prescribe specific interventions, because effective responses to trust gaps depend on organizational context, leadership capacity, and the specific mechanisms driving each gap. The instrument is designed to inform leadership judgment, not replace it.

### Applied Research Opportunities

The development of the OTI™ presents several opportunities for future applied organizational research. Formal psychometric validation is a necessary next step, including confirmatory factor analysis to test the proposed five-domain structure and reliability testing to establish internal consistency across items.

Further research will also examine convergent and discriminant validity by comparing OTI™ results with established measures of engagement, organizational climate, and culture. This would clarify the distinct contribution of trust as a construct and ensure that the instrument captures a unique dimension of organizational life.

In addition, longitudinal studies would allow for examination of how changes in OTI™ scores relate to subsequent changes in organizational outcomes such as performance, retention, and employee engagement. Establishing predictive validity would strengthen the case for trust as a leading indicator of organizational effectiveness.

Finally, cross-sector and cross-cultural applications of the OTI™ would provide insight into how trust operates in different organizational contexts, further refining both the theoretical model and its practical application.

## Conclusion

The body of research reviewed in this paper supports a consistent conclusion: organizational trust is not merely a relational or cultural attribute, but a measurable condition that shapes core dimensions of organizational performance, including coordination, learning, information flow, and discretionary effort. Its presence reduces friction and enables execution; its absence introduces constraints that accumulate across systems and over time.

Despite this, trust has remained underdeveloped as an object of formal organizational measurement. While leadership literature has established its importance, and empirical studies have demonstrated its effects, the translation of trust into structured, multidimensional measurement frameworks has been

limited. This gap has left organizations with an incomplete view of the conditions that influence their performance.

This paper contributes to addressing that gap by reframing trust as an organizational-level operating condition and proposing a domain-based framework for its measurement. By integrating established theoretical constructs with observable organizational signals, the Organizational Trust Index provides a structured approach to interpreting how trust functions within organizations and how it varies across key dimensions.

The implications of this shift are both analytical and practical. Analytically, it positions trust as a construct that can be examined with greater precision within organizational research. Practically, it creates the conditions for organizations to treat trust not as an abstract value, but as a measurable variable that can be monitored over time.

The framework presented here represents an initial step in that direction. Further empirical validation, longitudinal analysis, and cross-context application will be necessary to refine the model and establish its robustness.

However, the underlying premise remains clear: organizational trust is a condition that can be measured, and its measurement provides insight into a set of dynamics that are otherwise difficult to observe directly. Organizations routinely measure what they consider critical to performance. Extending that logic to trust represents not a conceptual shift, but an analytical one—bringing into focus a variable that has long shaped organizational outcomes without being systematically captured within them.

## References

Burke, C. S., Sims, D. E., Lazzara, E. H., & Salas, E. (2007). Trust in leadership: A multi-level review and integration. The Leadership Quarterly, 18(6), 606–632. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2007.09.006

De Jong, B. A., Dirks, K. T., & Gillespie, N. (2016). Trust and team performance: A meta-analysis of main effects, moderators, and covariates. Journal of Applied Psychology, 101(8), 1134–1150. https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000110

De Jong, B. A., & Elfring, T. (2010). How does trust affect the performance of ongoing teams? The mediating role of reflexivity, monitoring, and effort. Academy of Management Journal, 53(3), 535–549. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2010.51468649

Dirks, K. T. (2000). Trust in leadership and team performance: Evidence from NCAA basketball. Journal of Applied Psychology, 85(6), 1004–1012. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.85.6.1004

Dirks, K. T., & Ferrin, D. L. (2002). Trust in leadership: Meta-analytic findings and implications for research and practice. Journal of Applied Psychology, 87(4), 611–628. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.4.611

Edmondson, A. C. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. Administrative Science Quarterly, 44(2), 350–383. https://doi.org/10.2307/2666999

Frazier, M. L., Fainshmidt, S., Klinger, R. L., Pezeshkan, A., & Vracheva, V. (2017). Psychological safety: A meta-analytic review and extension. Personnel Psychology, 70(1), 113–165. https://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12183

Kramer, R. M. (1999). Trust and distrust in organizations: Emerging perspectives, enduring questions. Annual Review of Psychology, 50, 569–598. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.50.1.569

Legood, A., van der Werff, L., Lee, A., & Den Hartog, D. (2021). A meta-analysis of the role of trust in the leadership-performance relationship. European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 30(1), 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2020.1800108

Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H., & Schoorman, F. D. (1995). An integrative model of organizational trust. Academy of Management Review, 20(3), 709–734. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1995.9508080335

Schoorman, F. D., Mayer, R. C., & Davis, J. H. (2007). An integrative model of organizational trust: Past, present, and future. Academy of Management Review, 32(2), 344–354. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2007.24348410