

This registration is a frozen, non-editable version of [this project \(/kwp6n/\)](#)

This registration is currently embargoed. It will remain private until its embargo end date, Saturday, May 14, 2022.

Register

AsPredicted Preregistration

Have any data been collected for this study already?

Please choose

No, no data have been collected for this study yet

What's the main question being asked or hypothesis being tested in this study?

The present research investigates experiences of trust and distrust in daily-life interactions. For details, please see below.

Describe the key dependent variable(s) specifying how they will be measured.

After completing a screening and intake questionnaire online, participants will complete 5 brief surveys per day on their phone over a period of 5 days: Participants will be asked to report on their social interactions with another person over the past 45 minutes. Our key dependent variables are experiences of trust/distrust and a number of perceptions and psychological states. For measurement specifics, see below.

See below for a list of assessed variables. For the sake of simplicity, hypotheses are only listed

when a variable functions as a predicting (vs. criterion) variable.

How many and which conditions will participants be assigned to?

Specify exactly which analyses you will conduct to examine the main question/hypothesis.

To test our primary hypotheses, we will utilize Multilevel Modeling (MLM) with trust/distrust (during social interactions) as DVs and predicting variables as the IV (note that episodes are clustered within person, necessitating MLM).

Any secondary analyses?

How many observations will be collected or what will determine sample size? No need to justify decision, but be precise about exactly how the number will be determined.

We aim at recruiting a sample of approximately 400 participants. However, the final sample size will depend on recruitment success.
Since the analyses will be based on multilevel modeling, traditional power analyses do not apply.

Anything else you would like to pre-register? (e.g., data exclusions, variables collected for exploratory purposes, unusual analyses planned?)

We will analyze only data from mobile questionnaires with at least five valid responses.

Below, please find the variables assessed in the intake survey and mobile phase of the current study.

Please note that in order to avoid redundancy, hypotheses are only listed once with predictor variables.

(mobile) = as assessed in the mobile phase; (intake) = as assessed in the intake survey.

Hypotheses usually apply symmetrically to trust and distrust--unless otherwise noted.

INTAKE SURVEY

TrustScale

Inclusive General Trust Scale, Yamagishi et al. (2015): Subscale belief, Subscale preference for trust

Hypotheses focus on belief subscale; additional exploratory analyses for preference subscale

- 1) Positively predicts trust with target and general trust (mobile)
- 2) Positively predicts trust and cooperation in trust game (intake),
- 3) Negatively predicts moral disengagement (intake)
- 4) Positively predicts likelihood of reporting a social interaction (vs. no social interaction).
(reversed predictions for distrust DVs)

DistrustScale (Yamagishi, 1988)

- 1) Positively predicts distrust with target and general distrust (mobile)
- 2) Negatively predicts trust and cooperation in trust game (intake), & moral disengagement
(reversed predictions for trust)

Trust Lay Beliefs

- 1) Head vs. Heart
- 2) Binary Beliefs

Trust as Feeling and Trust Binary Beliefs will be negatively correlated.

Trust as Feeling (i.e., Heart) (controlling for Trust Belief Subscale; intake)

Moderation hypothesis: Heart Beliefs amplify the following relations (+/-) between Trust (mobile) and the following variables (mobile):

- 1) Familiarity (+)
- 2) Distance (-)
- 3) (Native) Language (+)
- 4) (Personal) Channel (+)
- 5) Happiness (+)
- 6) Life Satisfaction (+)
- 7) Loneliness (-)

Moderation hypothesis: Heart Beliefs attenuate the following relations (+/-) between Trust (mobile) and:

- 8) SIS Conflict (-)
- 9) SIS Mutual Dependence (+)

Trust Binary Beliefs (controlling for Belief in Trust; intake)

- 1) Positively predicts Victim Sensitivity (intake)
 - 2) Positively predicts Zero-Sum Beliefs (intake)
 - 3) Positively predicts Sugrophobia (intake)
 - 4) Negatively predicts Life Satisfaction (intake)
 - 5) Positively predicts perceived typicality of interaction (mobile)
- Moderation hypothesis: Binary Beliefs amplify the following relations (+/-) between Trust (mobile) and:
- 6) Self-Disclosure (+)
 - 7) Familiarity (+)
 - 8) Sugrophobia (-)
 - 9) Self-Interest (-)
 - 10) Closeness (+)
 - 11) Similarities (+)
 - 12) Warmth (+)
 - 13) Morality (+)

Big Five (Muck, Hell & Gosling, 2007)

Extraversion may moderate how having had vs. not having had an interaction is related to life satisfaction

NARQ (Narcissism) (Back et al., 2013)

NARQ Rivalry (controlling for NARQ Admiration):
(Intake)

- 1) Positively predicts Distrust
 - 2) Negatively predicts Trust
 - 3) Positively predicts Moral Disengagement
 - 4) Positively predicts Victim Sensitivity
 - 5) Negatively predicts Perpetrator Sensitivity
 - 6) Negatively predicts Empathic Concern
 - 7) Positively predicts Zero-Sum Beliefs
 - 8) Positively predicts Sugrophobia
 - 9) Positively predicts Counterproductive Work Behavior
 - 10) Negatively predicts Trust and Cooperation in Trust Game
 - 11) Negatively predicts Social-Value Orientation
- (Mobile)
- 12) Positively predicts Distrust
 - 13) Negatively predicts perceptions of self as a target of trust
 - 14) Positively predicts SIS Conflict
 - 15) Negatively predicts Self-Disclosure
 - 16) Negatively predicts Conformity Mind
 - 17) Positively predicts Sugrophobia
 - 18) Positively predicts Self-Interest
 - 19) Negatively predicts Target-Interest
 - 20) Negatively predicts Closeness
 - 21) Negatively predicts Similarities
 - 22) Negatively predicts Competence

- 23) Negatively predicts Warmth
- 24) Negatively predicts Morality
- 25) Positively predicts Entitlement (both facets)
- 26) Positively predicts anti-social inclinations
- 27) Negatively predicts pro-social inclinations
- 28) Positively predicts Zero-Sum Beliefs
- 29) Negatively predicts General Trust

In addition, distrust (mobile) should moderate, i.e. amplify, the above relationships.

Moral Disengagement (Shu, Gino, & Bazerman, 2011)

- 1) Positively predicts distrust with target (mobile)
- 2) Positively predicts general distrust (mobile)
- (reversed predictions for trust)
- 3) Positively (negatively) predicts distrust (trust) (intake)
- 4) Positively predicts self-interest (mobile)
- 5) Negatively predicts target-interest (mobile)
- 6) Positively predicts moral entitlement (mobile)
- 7) Negatively predicts trust and cooperation in trust game (intake)

Justice Sensitivity:

Victim sensitivity, Observer sensitivity, Beneficiary sensitivity, Perpetrator sensitivity
(Beierlein, Baumert, Schmitt, Kemper & Rammstedt, 2013)

Victim Sensitivity:

- 1) Positively predicts moral disengagement (intake) and binary beliefs (intake)
- 2) Negatively associated with trust (intake: both subscales; and mobile) (reversed predictions for distrust)
- 3) Negatively predicts trust in trust game (intake)
- 4) Moderates, i.e. amplifies, the relationship between distrust (trust) (mobile) and antisocial intentions, prosocial intentions, sugrophobia, self-interest, (negatively) target-interest, entitlement, zero-sum beliefs
- 5) Moderates, i.e. amplifies, the relationships between both competition (mobile) & conflict (mobile) and sugrophobia, self-interest, target-interest, antisocial intentions, prosocial intentions, entitlement, zero-sum beliefs

Reversed predictions for Perpetrator Sensitivity (e.g., moderation in the sense of attenuation instead of amplification)

Attachment Styles (Anxious-ambivalent & avoidant attachment subscales; ECR-RD12; Brenk-Franz, Ehrental, Freund, Schneider, Strauß, Tiesler, Schauenburg & Gensichen, 2018)

- 1) High anxious-ambivalent and high avoidant attachment (positively) predict distrust (distrust) with romantic partner (mobile) (reversed for trust). Explore interactive effect (i.e., secure attachment = low values on both scales).
- 2) Avoidant attachment predicts lower self-disclosure to romantic partner.

Empathy (Interpersonal Reactivity Index; Paulus, 2009)

Subscale Empathic Concern:

- 1) Positively predicts trust with target (mobile)
- 2) Positively predicts trust (intake)
- 3) Negatively predicts distrust (intake)

- 4) Positively predicts general trust (mobile)
(reversed predictions for distrust)
- 5) Positively predicts Trust as Feelings (controlling for Trust intake)

Moral Identity (Merz & Tanner, 2009)

Subscale symbolization: May negatively predict self-disclosure when distrusting target (mobile)

Subscale internalization:

- 1) Positively predicts trust with target (mobile)
- 2) Positively predicts general trust (mobile)
(reversed predictions for distrust)
- 3) Positively predicts trust (intake)
- 4) Negatively predicts distrust (intake)
- 5) Attenuates the positive relation between distrust and antisocial intentions (mobile)
- 6) Attenuates the positive relation between distrust and a) counterproductive work behavior, and b) moral disengagement (all intake)
- 7) Positively predicts trust and cooperation in trust game (intake)

Self-Control (Trait Self-Control Scale; Bertrams & Dickhäuser, 2009)

- 1) Attenuates the positive relation between distrust towards target on antisocial intentions (mobile)
- 2) The more distrust is experienced in episodes, the more self-control reduces self-disclosure (mobile)

General zero-sum beliefs

- 1) Associated with distrust/trust (intake)
- 2) Predicts zero-sum beliefs (mobile)
- 3) Positively predicts counterproductive work behavior and moral disengagement (intake)
- 4) Negatively predicts trust and particularly cooperation in trust game (intake)

For 3) & 4): explore interaction between distrust/trust (intake) & ZSB to predict outcomes

- 5) Positively predicts perceptions of competition and of conflict (mobile); explore whether relationship holds when controlling for distrust/trust
- 6) Positively (negatively) predicts distrust (trust) (mobile)
- 7) Explore whether ZSB (intake) & distrust/trust (mobile) interact on self-interest & target-interest and self-interest (mobile) such that particularly individuals who see outcomes in zero-sum terms in general react to distrusting others' intentions with a focus on their own interest, and a reduced focus on the targets' interest.

Sugrophobia (in consumer contexts; Madrigal, Wardley & Armstrong-Soule, 2014)

- 1) Positively predicts distrust in episodes involving consumer behavior (mobile)
 - 2) Negatively predicts self-disclosure and conformity in episodes involving consumer behavior (mobile)
- (content analysis of situation descriptions & targets in order to determine consumer context)

Counterproductive work behavior (Bräutigam & Liebig, 2006)

- 1) Positively predicts distrust with the following targets: co-worker, supervisor, and subordinates, controlling for distrust with all other targets (mobile)
(reversed predictions for trust)

2) Moral Identity (subscale internalization) attenuates the positive relation between counterproductive work behavior and distrust in targets mentioned in 1)

Social Power (Generalized Sense of Power Scale; Anderson & Galinsky, 2006)

- 1) Positively predicts distrust with targets (mobile)
- 2) Positively predicts general distrust (mobile)
(reversed predictions for trust)
- 3) Positively predicts distrust (intake)
- 4) Negatively predicts trust (intake)

Life Satisfaction (Satisfaction with Life Scale; Glaesmer, Grande, Braehler & Roth, 2011)

- 1) Positively predicts trust with target (mobile)
- 2) Positively predicts general trust (mobile)
(reversed predictions for distrust)
- 3) Positively predicts trust (intake)
- 4) Negatively predicts distrust (intake)

Circadian Rhythm (Reduced Morningness-Eveningness Questionnaire, rMEQ; Randler, 2012)

Circadian Rhythm Score interacts with signal (sending) time: A mismatch between circadian rhythm and time of day (e.g. evening for a morning person) is associated with higher levels of trust. A match between circadian rhythm and time of day (e.g. morning for a morning person) is associated with higher levels of distrust.

Trust Game

Trust behavior positively predicts trust in episodes (mobile)
(reversed predictions for distrust)
Cooperation positively predicts trust in episodes (mobile)
(reversed predictions for distrust)

Social Value Orientation (Adapted from Murphey, Ackermann, & Handgraaf, 2011)

Positively predicts trust in trust game (intake)

Demographics:

Age
Gender
Language
Family
School
Education
Activity

Political Orientation (Kroh, 2007)

- 1) Conservatism is positively related to distrust (intake & mobile) (reversed predictions for trust)
- 2) Conservatism positively predicts Binary Trust Beliefs (controlling for Trust intake)

Religiosity (Duke Religiosity Index, Koenig & Büssing, 2010)

Subscale intrinsic:

- 1) Negatively predicts self-reported moral disengagement & CWB
- 2) Explore relationship with self-interest, target-interest, and prosocial and antisocial intentions (mobile)
- 3) Positively predicts trust (intake).
Explore interaction between religiosity and survey, such that religiosity predicts reports of general trust (intake; mobile) to a greater degree than trust in specific targets (mobile).
Analogously for moral disengagement (intake) and moral entitlement (mobile)
- 4) Explore whether symbolization moral identity (partly) mediates the relationships in 1-3)
- 5) Positively predicts Trust as Feeling (intake; controlling for Trust intake)

Religious Affiliation

MOBILE SURVEY

Reporting a social interaction (vs. no social interaction) is negatively related to loneliness (mobile).

Target

- 1) Perceived trust will vary between the different target categories (more intimate targets will be perceived as more trustworthy)
- 2) General trust positively predicts likelihood of having interacted with strangers (reversed predictions for distrust)
- 3) Greater competitiveness of interactions with colleagues compared to superordinates or subordinates
- 4) For work-related targets (professional contacts, superordinates, subordinates, colleagues), competence will be more strongly related to trust compared to private targets (target options 1-7)

Target Initials

Trust (intake) predicts greater number of unique initials (as a proxy for number of different targets interacted with)(reversed for distrust)

Observers

Familiarity

Is positively related to perceived trust (mobile)
(reversed prediction for distrust)

Trust (intake) predicts overall lower familiarity with targets (reversed for distrust)

Duration

Distrust (intake) predicts overall shorter interactions.

Duration is negatively associated with distrust (mobile) (controlling for familiarity)
(reversed predictions for trust)

Medium

Predicted rank order on perceived trust (mobile; reversed for distrust) controlling for familiarity:

Personal

Video call

Phone

Chat

E-mail

Importance

Content

Place

Distance

Physical distance negatively predicts perceived trust
(reversed predictions for distrust)

Language

Perceived trust will be higher when interacting in native language
(reversed predictions for distrust)

Trust

(NOTE: We will analyze the correlation between trust & distrust. If it exceeds .60, we will combine trust & distrust measures to form a trust index. Otherwise, we will conduct separate analyses.)

Positively predicts (mobile):

TargetSelf

Self-Disclosure

ConformityMind

Target-Interest

Prosocial intentions

Authenticity

Happiness

Satisfaction

General trust

Closeness

Similarity

Warmth

Morality

Competence

Negatively predicts (mobile):

Sugrophobia
 Deservingness Entitlement
 Moral entitlement
 Zero-sum beliefs
 Antisocial intentions
 Mental (depletion)
 Loneliness
 Sense of control

Could moderate whether having had an interaction (vs. not) is associated with lower or higher loneliness
 Could moderate how (low) information certainty predicts self-disclosure and conformity

Distrust
 Positively predicts (mobile):
 Mentalizing
 Sugrophobia
 Self-Interest
 Deservingness Entitlement
 Moral Entitlement
 Zero-sum beliefs
 Antisocial intentions
 Mental (depletion)
 Loneliness
 Sense of control

Negatively predicts (mobile):
 TargetSelf
 Self-Disclosure
 ConformityMind
 Target-Interest
 Prosocial intentions
 Authenticity
 Happiness
 Satisfaction
 General Trust
 Closeness
 Similarity
 Warmth
 Morality
 Competence
 Explore whether distrust (mobile) moderates the association between reporting an interaction (vs. not) and loneliness (mobile)

Typicality
 Explore whether typicality of trust/distrust for a particular target moderates the relationship between trust/distrust (mobile) and social perception (morality & warmth)

Self as Target of Trust/Distrust

Is positively associated with trust (reversed for distrust; mobile)

Explore relationship to social perception (closeness, similarity, warmth)

Explore relationship to states (anti- & prosocial intentions, moral self-perception, authenticity, arousal, happiness, mental fatigue, sense of control)

Competition

Positively associated with distrust (mobile)

(reversed prediction for trust)

Predicts focus on self-interest & target-interest; explore moderation by trust/distrust (mobile)

Cooperation

Positively associated with trust (mobile)

(reversed prediction for distrust)

Positively associated with target-interest (mobile)

Predicts ZSB (mobile)

Situational interdependence (Gerpott, Balliet, Columbus, Molho & de Vries; 2017)

SIS_F5

Future interdependence positively predicts trust

SIS_MD6

Mutual dependence predicts trust

Mutual dependence predicts closeness

Mutual dependence predicts cooperation

SIS_IC16 (information certainty)

SIS_C19

Conflict predicts distrust; Trust (mobile) stronger predictor of cooperation and target-interest for high levels of conflict (Balliet et al., 2013)

Conflict may predict enhanced zero-sum beliefs (mobile)

SIS_P27

Increasing differences in power predict distrust

Power over one's own outcomes may affect sense of control, happiness, satisfaction (mobile)

Social Power (power over other's outcomes)

Increasing power over target's outcome predicts distrust

Self-disclosure

NOTE: Hypotheses as preregistered refer to the reversed coded item (as the item assesses how much participants are concerned with how much they disclosed to the target, not how much they engaged in self-disclosure)

Conformity Mind (adopting others' views)

Mentalizing

Sugrophobia

Self-Interest

Target-Interest

Closeness

Similarity

Competence

Competition & cooperation & conflict (mobile) each moderate the degree to which competence predicts trust/distrust (mobile), with competence being positively associated with trust in cooperative, but less strongly so, or even negatively, in competitive situations.

Warmth

Morality

Power

NOTES: Variables 1-5 will be assessed only in approx. 50% of reported interactions. We will explore the connection of all of these psychological states with trust/distrust (particularly as assessed in the mobile phase) using network analysis.

Deservingness/Entitlement

Moral entitlement

Antisocial intentions

Prosocial intentions

Authenticity

Zero-sum beliefs

Moral self-perception

Happiness

Arousal

Life satisfaction

Mental fatigue

Loneliness

Sense of control

General trust

References

Anderson, C., & Galinsky, A. D. (2006). Power, optimism, and risk-taking. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 36, 511-536. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.324>

Armstrong-Soule, C., Wardley, M., & Madrigal, R. (2014). Duped, scammed and suckered: the development of the sugrophobia scale. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 42, 592. Retrieved from http://www.acrwebsite.org/volumes/v42/acr_v42_17257.pdf

Beierlein, C., Baumert, A., Schmitt, M., Kemper, C., & Rammstedt, B. (2013). Vier Kurzskalen zur Messung des Persönlichkeitsmerkmals „Sensibilität für Ungerechtigkeit“. *Methoden, Daten, Analysen*, 7, 279-310. <https://doi.org/10.12758/mda.2013.015>

Bertrams, A., & Dickhäuser, O. (2009). Messung dispositioneller Selbstkontroll-Kapazität: Eine deutsche Adaptation der Kurzform der Self-Control Scale (SCS-K-D). *Diagnostica*, 55, 2-10. <https://doi.org/10.1026/0012-1924.55.1.2>

Bräutigam, J., & Liebig, C. (2006). Über den Zusammenhang von psychologischem Vertragsbruch und kontraproduktivem Verhalten am Arbeitsplatz unter Berücksichtigung von Sensibilität für widerfahrene Ungerechtigkeit. Retrieved from

http://psydok.psycharchives.de/jspui/bitstream/20.500.11780/367/1/2006-01_Mannheimer_Beitraege_web_2-_braeutigam_und_liebig.pdf

Brenk-Franz, K., Ehrenthal, J., Freund, T., Schneider, N., Strauß, B., Tiesler, F., Schauenburg, H. & Gensichen, J. (2018). Evaluation of the short form of "Experience in Close Relationships" (Revised, German Version "ECR-RD12") - A tool to measure adult attachment in primary care. *PloS ONE*, 13, e0191254. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0191254>

Gerpott, F. H., Balliet, D., Columbus, S., Molho, C., & de Vries, R. E. (2017). How do people think about interdependence? A multidimensional model of subjective outcome interdependence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. Advance online publication. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000166>

Glaesmer, H., Grande, G., Braehler, E., & Roth, M. (2011). The German version of the satisfaction with life scale (SWLS). *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 27, 127-132. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1015-5759/a000058>

Kroh, M. (2007). Measuring left-right political orientation: The choice of response format. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 71, 204-220. <https://doi.org/10.1093/poq/nfm009>

Merz, C., & Tanner, C. (2009). Weitere Befunde zur Validierung der Geschützte Werte Skala (GWS). Retrieved from http://www.bf.uzh.ch/cms/files/content/pdf/Centers/CenterForResponsibilityInFinance/Merz_Tanner_2009_GWS.pdf

Muck, P. M., Hell, B., & Gosling, S. D. (2007). Construct validation of a short five-factor model instrument. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 23, 166-175. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1015-5759.23.3.166>

Murphy, R. O., Ackermann, K. A., & Handgraaf, M. J. (2011). Measuring social value orientation. *Judgment and Decision Making*, 6, 771-781. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1804189>

Copyright © 2011-2018 Center for Open Science (<https://cos.io>) | Terms of Use (https://github.com/CenterForOpenScience/centerforopenscience.org/blob/master/TERMS_OF_USE.md) | Privacy Policy (https://github.com/CenterForOpenScience/centerforopenscience.org/blob/master/PRIVACY_POLICY.md) | Status (<https://status.cos.io/>) | API (<https://developer.osf.io/>) TOP Guidelines (<http://cos.io/top/>) | Reproducibility Project: Psychology (<https://osf.io/ezcuji/wiki/home/>) | Reproducibility Project: Cancer Biology (<https://osf.io/e81xl/wiki/home/>)



(<http://twitter.com/OSFramework>)



(<https://www.facebook.com/CenterForOpenScience/>)



(<https://groups.google.com/forum/#!forum/openscienceframework>)



(<https://www.github.com/centerforopenscience>)