



Munich Personal RePEc Archive

**Trust and collaboration in the aftermath  
of conflict: the effects of contract  
structure**

Malhotra, Deepak and Lumineau, Fabrice

2011

Online at <https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/38358/>  
MPRA Paper No. 38358, posted 25 Apr 2012 12:24 UTC

**TRUST AND COLLABORATION IN THE AFTERMATH OF CONFLICT:  
THE EFFECTS OF CONTRACT STRUCTURE**

**Deepak Malhotra**

Harvard Business School

Baker Library, Room 471

Boston, MA 02163

Email: [dmalhotra@hbs.edu](mailto:dmalhotra@hbs.edu)

**Fabrice Lumineau**

University of Technology Sydney

P.O. Box 123

Broadway NSW 2007

Australia

Email: [fabrice.lumineau@uts.edu.au](mailto:fabrice.lumineau@uts.edu.au)

*Forthcoming Academy of Management Journal*

**TRUST AND COLLABORATION IN THE AFTERMATH OF CONFLICT:  
THE EFFECTS OF CONTRACT STRUCTURE**

*Abstract.* Leveraging a longitudinal dataset concerning 102 inter-firm disputes, we evaluate the effects of contract structure on trust and on the likelihood of continued collaboration. We theoretically refine and empirically extend prior research by (a) distinguishing between control and coordination functions of contracts, (b) separating goodwill-based and competence-based trust, and (c) evaluating the effects of contract structure on relational outcomes in the context of disputes. We find that control provisions increase competence-based trust, but reduce goodwill-based trust, resulting in a net decrease in the likelihood of continued collaboration. Coordination provisions increase competence-based trust, leading to an increased likelihood of continued collaboration.

## **TRUST AND COLLABORATION IN THE AFTERMATH OF CONFLICT: THE EFFECTS OF CONTRACT STRUCTURE**

Inter-firm relationships allow firms to create value and build competitive advantage (Agarwal, Croson, & Mahoney, 2010), but cooperation in such relationships is neither automatic nor easily fostered. Two key impediments to cooperation are the threat of exploitation by an opportunistic exchange partner (Williamson, 1985) and the possibility of coordination failures that can derail the efforts of even well-intentioned parties (Gulati, Lawrence, & Puranam, 2005; Knez & Camerer, 2000). In recognition of the mixed-motive nature of most exchange relationships (e.g., Kogut, 1988), and of the inherent difficulty in coordinating expectations and action (Camerer, 2003), firms rely on contracts to mitigate their risks, facilitate coordination, and promote cooperation (Lusch & Brown, 1996; Ring & Van de Ven, 1992).

Despite the use of contracts to facilitate coordination and control, however, inter-firm disputes can emerge. This raises questions regarding the kind of relationship that will emerge, and the viability of continued collaboration, after parties have been unsuccessful in preventing conflict. In this paper, we examine these dynamics by evaluating how contract structure affects trust, and subsequently, the intent to continue collaboration, in the context of inter-firm disputes. We extend prior research on the effects of contracts on trust by (a) distinguishing the control vs. coordination function of contracts, (b) distinguishing the goodwill vs. competence dimensions of trust judgments, and (c) evaluating these relationships in the context of inter-firm conflict.

We argue that a more nuanced approach that considers the different functions of contracts—coordination vs. control—and the different dimensions of trust judgments—goodwill vs. competence—may provide a more complete assessment of the effects of contracts on trust and collaboration. Prior research has often focused narrowly on a subset of these distinctions,

and in some cases overlooked these distinctions altogether (Puranam & Vanneste, 2009).

Furthermore, our analysis of firms' willingness to continue a relationship after having suffered a costly dispute allows us to evaluate the mechanisms underlying an important, but rarely studied aspect of inter-firm exchange: relationship repair (Zaheer, Lofstrom, & George, 2002).

To test our hypotheses, we leverage a rich dataset comprising more than 150,000 pages of details regarding 102 business disputes arising in vertical exchange relationships in the years 1991-2005. The data include a wide range of contractual and exchange characteristics for each relationship, along with thousands of pages of communication between the disputants. The contracts enable us to codify the degree to which control and coordination provisions were incorporated into the agreement, and the communications allow us to code for statements that reveal goodwill-based and competence-based trust in the relationship. This is notable because, to our knowledge, the current dataset is the first to provide this level of detail on inter-firm conflict, and the first to allow such a fine-grained analysis of trust in inter-organizational relationships.

## **THEORETICAL BACKGROUND AND HYPOTHESES**

### **Contracts as Instruments of Control and Coordination**

Seminal works in organization studies (Barnard, 1938; Burns & Stalker, 1961), as well as work by legal scholars (e.g., Baird, Gertner, & Picker, 1994; McAdams, 2009), decision theorists (e.g., Luce & Raiffa, 1957; Schelling, 1963), and economists (e.g., Camerer, 2003; Knez & Camerer, 2000), have previously contemplated the distinction between control problems (stemming from *misaligned incentives*) and coordination problems (stemming from *misaligned expectations and behavior*) in exchange relationships (Gulati et al., 2005). While these two issues have often been tackled separately in the literature (Kretschmer & Puranam, 2008), some recent studies have suggested that organizational structures—and, in particular, inter-firm

contracts—serve the functions of both control and coordination (e.g., Argyres, Bercovitz, & Mayer, 2007; Mellewigt, Madhok, & Weibel, 2007; Reuer & Ariño, 2007; Salbu, 1997).

Organizational scholars have long considered the use of contracts as instruments of control (Macneil, 1978; Williamson, 1985; 1991). Inter-firm collaborations, have the potential of creating value, but parties to such relationships must contend with the risk of exploitation by their partners (Walker & Weber, 1984; Williamson, 1985). The legal underpinnings of contracts give firms the option of sanctioning an exchange partner who is unable or unwilling to abide by agreed upon terms (Joskow, 1987). The coordination function of contracts has received less attention (Argyres et al., 2007; Mayer & Argyres, 2004). A contract—and the contracting process—helps parties make explicit their assumptions and expectations regarding the transaction and each side’s role (Beatty & Samuelson, 2001; Smitka, 1994). Coordination-oriented provisions in a contract are aimed at mitigating the risk that misunderstandings will disrupt collaboration among (presumably) well-intentioned parties (Macaulay, 1963).

In this paper, we build on the work of those who have called for a broader perspective on contractual complexity, and a more nuanced approach to studying the effects of contracts on relational attitudes and exchange outcomes (Mellewigt et al., 2007; Puranam & Vanneste, 2009). We evaluate contracts at the level of individual provisions, and distinguish between provisions aimed primarily at exerting control and those aimed primarily at facilitating coordination.

### **Two Dimensions of Trust Judgments: Goodwill and Competence**

Following Rousseau, Sitkin, Burt, & Camerer (1998), and consistent with other influential conceptualizations of trust (Lewicki, McAllister, & Bies, 1998; Mayer, Davis, & Schoorman, 1995), we define trust as the willingness of a party to be vulnerable to the actions of another party based on positive expectations regarding the other party’s motivation and/or

behavior. Trust, so defined, can be distinguished from underlying dimensions of trust judgments, which entail attributions of the other party's trustworthiness along relevant characteristics (e.g., integrity). Consistent with prior work on the attributional basis of trust (Ferrin & Dirks, 2003; Mayer et al., 1995; Weber, Malhotra, & Murnighan, 2005) we posit that attributions along relevant dimensions are what create in the trustor a willingness to accept vulnerability.

We follow the lead of Nooteboom (1996) and Das & Teng (2001), who focus on two dimensions of trust judgments: "goodwill" and "competence." Perceptions of goodwill entail attributions regarding the *intention* of the other party to behave in a trustworthy manner; perceptions of competence entail attributions regarding the other party's *ability* to behave or perform as expected (Nooteboom, 1996).<sup>1</sup>

### **The Effect of Contracts on Trust**

Contracts and trust represent alternative means by which parties can manage risk in exchange relationships, but inter-firm relationships typically seek to use contracts while simultaneously attempting to build trust (Poppo & Zenger, 2002; Sitkin, 1995; Wicks, Berman, & Jones, 1999). The seemingly modal preference regarding inter-firm governance—to use contracts and build trust—has sparked a debate regarding the viability of this strategy. Some have argued that contracts and trust are often incompatible (Malhotra & Murnighan, 2002; Molm, Takahashi, & Peterson, 2000; Sitkin & Roth, 1993). Others suggest that contracts and trust are not only compatible, but mutually reinforcing (Gulati & Nickerson, 2008; Poppo & Zenger, 2002). This divergence makes it difficult to predict whether an emphasis on contracts will enhance or inhibit the prospects for continued collaboration after a dispute. Our goal is not

---

<sup>1</sup> This distinction captures all three dimensions in Mayer et al.'s (1995) trust framework: ability, benevolence, and integrity. Competence captures attributions of ability; goodwill captures benevolence and integrity. Combining benevolence and integrity as "goodwill" is useful because many of the statements in our data are hard to categorize as *either* benevolence *or* integrity attributions; many are ambiguous, or are suggestive of a dual attribution.

to reconcile the vast amount of prior research on this topic, nor do we align ourselves completely with either side. Rather, we borrow from both literatures in order to expound a more comprehensive (and nuanced) perspective on the effect of contracts on trust and collaboration in the aftermath of conflict. Our review of prior research suggests that both positive and negative effects of contracts can be better understood when we separately consider the effects of control vs. coordination provisions on goodwill- vs. competence-based trust.

### ***The Effect of Control Provisions on Trust***

Those who have posited a negative relationship between contracts and trust have largely focused on the control function of contracts and on the goodwill dimension of trust (Bernheim & Whinston, 1998; Malhotra & Murnighan, 2002; Sitkin & Roth, 1993; Tenbrunsel & Messick, 1999). Macaulay (1963) and Ghoshal & Moran (1996) suggest that the mere suggestion or introduction of contracts may signal distrust of the other party's intentions, thereby disrupting the process of trust development (Pillutla, Malhotra, & Murnighan, 2003). Tenbrunsel & Messick (1999) argue that an over-reliance on control mechanisms changes the decision frame of exchange partners; including too many control provisions may, ironically, promote opportunistic behavior by inducing a "business" rather than "ethical" framing of the interaction. Finally, Malhotra & Murnighan (2002) argue that overly controlling contracts, which leave little room for discretion, crowd out trust development because they lead to situational rather than personal attributions for the cooperativeness of partners. This may be especially likely during conflict, because parties are less likely to make generous attributions of each other's behavior when the relationship has turned antagonistic (Ross & Stillingner, 1991). These mechanisms suggest:

*Hypothesis 1. The higher the number of control provisions in a contract, the lower the subsequent level of goodwill-based trust.*



Prior research has not directly examined the effect of control provisions on competence-based trust. However, there are two reasons to expect that control provisions will enhance perceptions of competence in the context of disputes. First, by eliminating incentives for cheating and renegeing, control provisions may force parties to focus more time and effort on their roles and responsibilities. This “substitution effect” away from nefarious conduct may promote exactly the types of behavior (e.g., attention to detail, timeliness, etc.) that enhance competence attributions. Another possibility is that the time spent on drafting contractual language, even for control provisions, leads to a clarification of expectations and assumptions, which in turn facilitates competence attributions (Argyres et al., 2007; Mayer & Argyres, 2004). We therefore hypothesize the following:

*Hypothesis 2. The higher the number of control provisions in a contract, the higher the subsequent level of competence-based trust.*

### ***The Effect of Coordination Provisions on Trust***

In addition to serving a control function, contracts provide a means by which parties can coordinate their expectations and efforts (Gulati et al., 2005; Mayer & Argyres, 2004; Reuer & Ariño, 2007). As a result, common knowledge structures such as shared language and routinized interactions emerge that make it easier for parties to communicate their ability to meet each other’s needs (Morgan & Hunt, 1994; Puranam, Singh, & Zollo, 2006). The process of coordination can thus facilitate competence-based trust development. In their analysis of 11 contracts signed between two firms, Mayer & Argyres (2004: 400) provide a relevant example: “HW Inc. had expressed frustration in the first two projects over the length of time it took Softstar to complete what HW Inc. perceived to be minor changes...Softstar added a system architecture section to the third [contract]. This section allowed both firms to better understand

how the entire product fit together and the impact to Softstar if HW Inc. made a late hardware change.” In this incident, the revised contract was aimed at aligning expectation regarding the link between change requests and delays, lest HW Inc. attribute delays to Softstar’s incompetence. Coordination structures may be especially important for competence perceptions after a conflict has arisen, because disputing parties are unlikely to otherwise engage in the kinds of spontaneous communication that mitigate conflict and promote positive attributions (Hinds & Mortensen, 2005). This suggests:

*Hypothesis 3. The higher the number of coordination provisions in a contract, the higher the subsequent level of competence-based trust.*

Coordination provisions are also expected to increase goodwill-based trust in the context of disputes. By creating channels through which differences in perspective will be resolved, coordination provisions help mitigate misunderstandings of the kind that raise questions about the intent of the other party; this promotes—or at least minimizes damage to—attributions of goodwill during a conflict (Vlaar, Van den Bosch, & Volberda, 2007). Moreover, parties that establish norms and procedures that allow them to coordinate on when and how to expend effort in the relationship will be less likely to face situations where one party feels over-worked or exploited, or is concerned that the other side is not meeting its reciprocal obligations (Malhotra, 2004). Evidence from the laboratory supports this. Ahn, Ostrom, Schmidt, Shupp, & Walker (2001) find that prior experience in a pure coordination game (with no incentives for non-cooperation) helps parties to coordinate towards a mutually cooperative outcome even in subsequent interactions that provide incentives for non-cooperation. This suggests:

*Hypothesis 4. The higher the number of coordination provisions in a contract, the higher the subsequent level of goodwill-based trust.*

## Trust and Consequences

The considerable research attention devoted to the effect of contracts on trust reveals the extent to which trust is seen as crucial for inter-firm collaboration and value creation (Arrow, 1974; Uzzi, 1997), and as a source of competitive advantage for organizations (Barney & Hansen, 1994; Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998). In this paper, we consider a consequence of trust that has received little direct attention, but which is critical to the value-creating potential of inter-firm relationships: the willingness to continue the relationship after a dispute has arisen. We expect that contractual provisions aimed at coordination and control will influence competence- and goodwill-based trust, which will in turn influence the decision of whether to stay together or end a relationship that has experienced conflict. Thus, our data allows us to begin the process of linking contract choices with relational outcomes, with trust serving as a mediator.

Zand (1972) suggests that goodwill-based trust will increase the likelihood of continued collaboration because it leads parties to share accurate and timely information and to be more willing to accept dependence on each other even when formal control mechanisms cannot be applied. Zand (1972) also finds that a high degree of goodwill-based trust increases motivation to implement agreements and makes parties less likely to switch partners. Research on the role of psychological contracts also shows the positive effect of goodwill-based trust on relationship continuance (Morrison & Robinson, 1997; Robinson, 1996). In inter-firm contexts, Uzzi (1997) argues that (goodwill-based) trust is a crucial predictor of future exchange. This suggests:

*Hypothesis 5. The higher the level of goodwill-based trust in a relationship, the higher the willingness to continue a relationship after a dispute has arisen.*

Competence-based trust should also increase the likelihood of continuing a relationship. It is perhaps axiomatic that parties will prefer to do business with those they consider to be

competent. In the aftermath of conflict, the importance of competence-based trust should be even greater. Das & Teng (2001: 266) argue that “the lower the level of acceptable performance risk level, the higher the needed competence trust level.” Parties exiting a dispute will be especially sensitive to the degree of performance risk involved in continuing the relationship. This suggests:

*Hypothesis 6. The higher the level of competence-based trust in a relationship, the higher the willingness to continue a relationship after a dispute has arisen.*

### **Contracts and the Continuation of Relationships after a Dispute**

We expect that control provisions, by reducing goodwill-based trust, should lessen the likelihood that disputing parties will agree to continue working together. If a dispute arises despite reliance on provisions designed to protect against opportunism, parties are likely to seriously question the viability of future exchange. The prospects for continued collaboration are even dimmer if control provisions do not simply substitute for goodwill-based trust, but actually undermine it (Malhotra & Murnighan, 2002). On the other hand, control provisions may increase the desire for continued exchange due to an increase in competence-based trust. If control provisions crowd out self-serving behavior in favor of task-oriented activity, this should increase competence perceptions and make future collaboration more attractive.

The net effect of enhanced control on future collaboration depends on whether the effect of goodwill-based trust or competence-based trust dominates. We expect that the negative effect will dominate. Prior research suggests that strained relationships are more difficult to repair when there has been a breach of goodwill-based trust rather than of competence-based trust (Kim, Dirks, Cooper, & Ferrin, 2006). Moreover, after the dispute, goodwill-based trust is likely to be more important than competence-based trust for resurrecting the scarred relationship: even if there remain concerns about the partner’s ability to meet all of its obligations, the scope of the

relationship can be redefined to focus on areas where competence is not in question; in contrast, concerns about the other's goodwill are unlikely to be limited to a single domain, making it difficult to rekindle the relationship (Kim, Ferrin, Cooper, & Dirks, 2004). We therefore suggest:

*Hypothesis 7a. The higher the number of control provisions in a contract the lower the willingness to continue the relationship after a dispute has arisen.*

*Hypothesis 7b. The effect of control provisions on relationship continuance is mediated by the level of goodwill-based trust.*

*Hypothesis 7c. The effect of control provisions on relationship continuance is mediated by the level of competence-based trust.*

Meanwhile, coordination provisions, by increasing goodwill-based trust, will facilitate continued exchange. Recent case studies point to a mutually reinforcing relationship between coordination, goodwill-based trust, and relationship development (Faems, Janssens, Madhok, & Van Looy, 2008; Mayer & Argyres, 2004; Ness, 2009): relationship development facilitates more efficient contracting aimed at better coordination; better coordination facilitates cooperation; and increased cooperation facilitates goodwill-based trust and relationship development. Coordination provisions should be especially important in the context of disputes: parties may question the usefulness of coordination provisions that failed to prevent a dispute, but if coordination provisions have facilitated goodwill-based trust in the interim, this will provide a basis on which to rebuild the relationship. Coordination provisions should also facilitate relationship continuance due to an increase in competence-based trust. As the relationship continues, parties learn more about the types of contingencies that can arise, which leads to the development of additional coordination provisions aimed at improving the working arrangement (cf., Zaheer & Venkatraman, 1994). Thus, as time goes on, coordination provisions

not only allow parties to make fewer mistakes and appear more competent (as in Hypothesis 3), but also to increase the domain of tasks in which they can demonstrate competency (Argyres et al., 2007). Both of these effects should facilitate continued collaboration. This suggests:

*Hypothesis 8a. The higher the number of coordination provisions in a contract the greater the willingness to continue the relationship after a dispute has arisen.*

*Hypothesis 8b. The effect of coordination provisions on relationship continuance is mediated by the level of goodwill-based trust.*

*Hypothesis 8c. The effect of coordination provisions on relationship continuance is mediated by the level of competence-based trust.*

## **RESEARCH METHODS**

### **Data**

We were granted access to all legal files concerning contract disputes handled by one law firm in Western Europe between 1991 and 2005. This mid-sized law firm is a generalist in the field of corporate law; its clients include small, mid-size and large firms from a variety of industries. We restricted our sample to all two-party disputes involving vertical relationships; these represented 80 percent of all two-party disputes handled by the firm. Our sample consists of 102 cases (i.e., disputes), 99 of which involved only European firms; each of the other three involved at least one non-European firm. Because some companies were repeat clients and involved in more than one dispute, the sample contained 178 different firms.<sup>2</sup> To check for selection bias, differences were examined between included and excluded files (i.e., those

---

<sup>2</sup> The results were unchanged when a “repeat client” control variable was included in the analyses.

involving non-vertical relationship). We found no significant differences on any dimension that we could observe (contractual complexity, firm size, etc.).<sup>3</sup>

Each legal file contained between 800 and 5,000 pages and included (a) the original contract, along with any contract revisions that were made prior to the dispute, and (b) all documents exchanged during the dispute-resolution process. In addition, the lawyers in each case obtained from the clients all potentially relevant information related to the initial context of the relationship, the origins of the conflict, and its progression over time. In total, over 150,000 pages of documents were collected and analyzed for this study. Data collection took place over four months. The law firm did not allow us to contact the disputing firms directly.

The firms in our sample came from a variety of industries: manufacturing (52 percent), services (32 percent), retail (15 percent) and construction (2 percent). There were four types of contracts: distribution (35.3 percent), production supply (29.4 percent), IT (26.5 percent), and a smaller number of contracts for consulting and other services (8.8 percent). 46 percent of the cases involved cross-border relationships. 65.7 percent of the contracts were time-bound in that they stipulated a pre-specified end to the relationship. 32.4 percent of the cases included exchange partners that had interacted with each other previously.

## **Dependent Variable**

### ***Intent to Continue***

We analyze the intent of the parties to continue their relationship after the dispute is resolved. For multiple reasons, this performance variable is especially relevant when considering

---

<sup>3</sup> Because all of our relationships involve legal disputes, we evaluated the representativeness of our sample—at the contract level and relationship level—relative to the broader universe of inter-firm relationships. On Parkhe's (1993: 829) unweighted index of contractual complexity—which tabulates the presence of up to eight key contractual clause categories—our sample's score (4.36) is situated comfortably between the score (3.69) for Reuer & Ariño's (2002) sample and the score (5.05) of Reuer, Ariño, & Mellewig's (2006) sample. At the relationship level, the percentage of prior ties among firms in our sample (32.4 percent) is within the range observed in prior research: 12 percent in Gulati (1995b); 20 percent in Reuer & Ariño (2002); 53 percent in Hagedoorn & Hesen (2009).

the effects of contract structure on trust in the context of conflict. First, the strategic alliance literature has traditionally sought to investigate factors that contribute to alliance survival (Dhanaraj & Beamish, 2004; Park & Russo, 1996) and stability (Blodgett, 1992; Inkpen & Beamish, 1997). Second, an analysis of the parties' intent to continue collaborating after a dispute has arisen responds to the call by trust researchers to examine when and how damaged relationships can be repaired (Bottom, Gibson, Daniels, & Murnighan, 2002; Dirks, Lewicki, & Zaheer, 2009). Finally, this measure provides a more direct measure of the consequences of trust than would be provided by some (eventual) financial measure of performance.

We examined the messages that were exchanged between the parties, as well as the terms of the settlement/judgment recorded in the legal files, to look for indications of a willingness to continue with the relationship. Such intent was sometimes manifested in a direct communication between the firms (e.g., "I hope we have clarified and overcome this 'misunderstanding' and we can now continue our fruitful collaboration on a sound basis.") In other cases, it was made evident through the crafting of a new agreement by the parties. For example, in one case, the following clause was added to the contract: "Addendum to Clause 14: The Parties thereby agree that [Firm A] and [Firm B] shall now each conduct by the end of each month review of the progress made [...] The Agreement is thereby extended for a 2 (two)-year period." We coded as "no intent to continue" those cases in which either or both parties explicitly stated no willingness to continue the relationship (e.g., "You should perfectly understand that we have put an end to our collaboration."), or when there was an absence of an indication to continue the relationship. Intent to continue the relationship was indicated in 29 cases out of 102.

## **Independent Variables**

### *Control vs. Coordination Provisions*



Our codification of contract provisions as control- vs. coordination-oriented was based on existing research (e.g., Parkhe, 1993; Reuer & Ariño, 2007), and supplemented with extensive interviews of legal experts specializing in contract law. We conducted a total of seventeen interviews with three practicing lawyers and seven professors in contract law. Interviews lasted between 1.5 and 3 hours. The experts examined both the codification scheme we had prepared based on the literature, and a sample of contracts from our dataset. The experts then offered an evaluation of the coding scheme and proposed some changes, which we implemented. Here, more precisely, is the method we followed in coding our contract provisions:

***Step 1: Codification based on prior research.*** We relied upon a set of indicators developed by Parkhe (1993) that are designed to evaluate various provisions in formal contracts. Parkhe (1993: 829) identified the following eight key provisions that might be included in a contract: (1) the exchange of periodic written reports of all relevant transactions; (2) prompt written notice of any departures from the agreement; (3) the right to examine and audit all relevant records through a firm of CPAs; (4) designation of certain information as proprietary and subject to confidentiality provisions of the contract; (5) non-use of proprietary information even after termination of agreement; (6) termination of agreement clauses; (7) arbitration clauses; and (8) lawsuit provisions. Reuer & Ariño (2007) factor analyzed the inclusion of Parkhe's eight provisions in an analysis of 88 strategic alliances and found that the first three provisions of Parkhe's 8-item index relate primarily to coordination, whereas the remaining five relate primarily to enforcement (what we call control). They therefore measured *Coordination Provisions* as the number of coordination-related clauses included in the contract (i.e., clauses 1, 2, and/or 3 from Parkhe (1993)), yielding an integer variable ranging from 0 to 3; *Control*

*Provisions* was measured as the number of control-related clauses in the contract (i.e., clauses 4, 5, 6, 7 and/or 8 from Parkhe (1993)) to obtain a score ranging from 0 to 5.

The coding of our contracts for control vs. coordination provisions was done by (i) one of the authors and (ii) a faculty member with a degree in law who was unaware of the hypotheses or the purpose of the study. To further eliminate the possibility of bias, all coding of contracts was done prior to any analysis of dispute-related data (e.g., trust messages, intent to continue, etc.). Pairwise correlation among raters for the coding of control-related provisions ( $r = 0.911$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ) and for coordination-related provisions ( $r = 0.923$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ), along with high Cronbach's alphas (0.953 and 0.959, respectively), confirm the reliability of the coding. Any disagreements on coding were resolved by discussion.

***Step 2: Revisions based on expert advice.*** In order to evaluate and refine our coding scheme, we presented the scheme, as well as a sample of real contracts, to a set of legal experts. These interviews yielded two primary results. First, the legal experts supported our general approach to codification, stating that contract provisions could be meaningfully distinguished as being focused primarily on control versus coordination. Second, the legal experts expressed concerns with two clause categories from Reuer & Ariño's (2007) coding framework. Specifically, the experts argued that clause category 3 (regarding the right to examine and audit all relevant records through a firm of CPAs) did not clearly represent a coordination function. In addition, the legal experts suggested that clause category 7 (regarding arbitration clauses) was ambiguous because such provisions may not serve a clear control function. Based on this advice, we revised our categorization scheme such that our measure of *Coordination Provisions* would

be based on clauses 1 and 2 from Parkhe (1993) and our measure of *Control Provisions* would be based on clauses 4, 5, 6, and 8 from Parkhe (1993).<sup>4,5</sup>

***Robustness checks.*** The results below are based on the measures of coordination and control provisions derived by the two-step process described above. In addition, we conducted two robustness checks of our results. In the first set of analyses, we used the initial (Step 1) Reuer & Ariño (2007) coding framework for our measures of coordination and control provisions. The findings based on this eight-clause analysis strongly converge with the results reported below (results available on request). In the second set of analyses, we added an interpretive (coding) step to the Step 1 categorization, in which a rater evaluated each provision in every contract of the dataset for seeming ambiguity of intent (Hagedoorn & Hesen, 2009). All clauses that seemed ambiguous as to (coordination vs. control) function were then eliminated. To test the reliability of this elimination procedure, a second rater evaluated 10 randomly selected clauses for each of the 8 types of provisions; the level of agreement was 91.25%. This process yielded more conservative measures in which we deleted 5.96% of the coordination provisions and 12.42% of the control provisions. The results based on these measures were also consistent with our primary (reported) analyses, with no differences in the tests of our hypotheses. Together, these two robustness checks provide confidence in our reported analyses.

## **Mediator Variables**

### ***Competence-Based Trust and Goodwill-Based Trust***

In order to assess the level of trust between the parties during the conflict, every communication (paper or electronic) exchanged between the disputing firms during the entire resolution process was analyzed. The choice *not* to reply to a communication by the other party

---

<sup>4</sup> A confirmatory factor analysis confirms that the revised scheme improves on Parkhe's (1993) eight-clause coding.

<sup>5</sup> Following Lui & Ngo (2004) and Barthélemy & Quélin (2006), we use unweighted composite indices.

was also coded as a (“no reply”) message. In total, 2,293 messages were studied (of which only 132 were coded as “no reply”). A scheme for categorizing statements as relating to competence- and/or goodwill-based trust (or neither) was constructed to evaluate each message (see below for more details). We allowed each message to be coded as signaling neither, one, or both types of trust. After an evaluation of all documents in a given dispute, the ratio of competence-based trust messages to total messages was calculated, and served as a measure of the degree of competence-based trust. Likewise, the ratio of goodwill-based trust messages to total messages served as a measure of the degree of goodwill-based trust. Thus, the score on each variable can vary between 0 (i.e., a complete absence of this type of trust) and 1 (i.e., all the messages exchanged between the partners conveyed this type of trust).

Coding of messages was done by a team of two researchers: one is a co-author of this paper and the other is a colleague (with a law degree) who was unaware of the hypotheses or the topic of research. We followed the coding procedure developed by Weber (1990: 21-24), which includes the following steps: defining the message as our unit of analysis; developing a list of relevant preliminary response categories; applying the coding scheme to a subsample (four cases); assessing and revising the coding rules as a result; having both raters independently read and code each message in the dataset.<sup>6</sup> The percent of agreement between raters (97 percent for competence-based trust and 95 percent for goodwill-based trust) and the pairwise correlation between raters ( $r = 0.948$ ,  $p < 0.01$  for competence-based and  $r = 0.939$ ,  $p < 0.01$  for goodwill-based trust) were high. Any disagreements were resolved through discussion. (See Appendix A for examples of statements that were coded as competence-based trust and goodwill-based trust.)

### **Control Variables**

---

<sup>6</sup> We did this based on the item selection and classification process outlined by Jauch, Osborn, & Martin (1980).

***Asymmetry of Revenue.*** We controlled for power asymmetry between the parties using firm revenues as a proxy for firm strength. Asymmetry is necessary to control because it may affect the likelihood that the parties include coordination and/or control provision in the contract. Asymmetry was measured as:  $\log [ABS [(Revenue\ of\ Firm\ A)-(Revenue\ of\ Firm\ B)]]$ . Revenue was measured in thousands of inflation-adjusted Euros for the year when the contract was signed. These data were obtained from the Bureau van Dijk's ORBIS database.

***Type of Dispute.*** We evaluated the nature of the dispute as described by the disputants (Weaver & Dickson, 1998) at the outset. Disputes could be meaningfully distinguished as disagreements regarding the nature of the transaction (30.4 percent) or as a perceived failure on the part of one party to meet payment, delivery, or other clear objectives (69.6 percent). Type of Dispute takes the value of 1 in disputes regarding the nature of the transaction; 0 otherwise.<sup>7</sup>

***Type of Settlement.*** We controlled for the type of resolution that was eventually pursued (litigation vs. private settlement) because the anticipation of this eventuality may have influenced the parties' willingness to make statements that admit to the other party's trustworthiness (or lack thereof). Type of Settlement takes the value of 0 if the dispute was eventually settled through litigation and the value of 1 if the dispute was eventually settled via private negotiation.

***Prior Ties.*** To mitigate endogeneity concerns regarding the relationship between contract provisions and trust, we controlled for pre-existing trust. Following Gulati (1995a), we used the existence of prior ties as a proxy. We then improved on this measure by coding whether the previous transactions (if any) were viewed positively or negatively by the parties. Based on prior research on satisfaction with trading partners (Heide & John, 1992; Jap & Ganesan, 2000), files

---

<sup>7</sup> It is arguable that disagreements regarding the nature of the transaction seem like coordination problems, and that failure to meet objectives is a control problem. We pursued this intriguing possibility with supplemental analyses to test whether (a) Type of Dispute was predicted by our Control or Coordination IVs, and (b) Type of Dispute interacted with Control or Coordination IVs to predict Intent to Continue. Neither test produced significant results.

with messages that explicitly referenced norms of flexibility, participation, and/or solidarity were coded as positive prior ties; files referencing inflexibility, non-participation, and/or individualism in prior interactions were coded as negative prior ties. Two dummy variables were created: 16.67 percent of relationships were coded as having *Positive Prior Ties*; 12.74 percent had *Negative Prior Ties*. When there was no prior tie (67.65 percent), or if there was no reference to positive or negative perceptions (2.94 percent), both variables took on a value of 0.

***Prior Relationship Length.*** We controlled for the length of the prior relationship because a lengthy interaction history may help parties build trust (Kramer, 1999). As such, controlling for prior relationship length helps to further mitigate endogeneity concerns. Also, organizations interacting repeatedly may learn from prior experiences, allowing contracts to be specified in greater detail (Mayer & Argyres, 2004; Vanneste & Puranam, 2010). We measured the amount of time for which the firms transacted prior to engaging in the transaction that led to the current conflict (Argyres et al., 2007; Dekker, 2008) as  $\ln(\text{number of days} + 1)$ . The mean prior relationship length was 942 days for the 33 cases where firms had prior ties.

***Revisions to the Initial Contract.*** In 10.8 percent of cases, the contract in place at the outset of the dispute was not identical to the original contract that was signed by the parties. Amendments over time might indicate recurrent conflict—or, to the contrary, the ability of parties to cooperatively reengage to improve the relationship (Mayer & Teece, 2008; Reuer & Ariño, 2002). As such, we controlled for whether the contract had been revised previously, prior to the current conflict.<sup>8</sup> (We did not observe any revisions during the dispute period itself.)

***Asymmetry of Alternatives.*** Even parties that have low levels of trust may decide to continue collaborating if they have few viable alternatives. Given our dyad-level outcome

---

<sup>8</sup> We conducted an additional analysis at the provision level and found that 96.1 percent of the control provisions and 94.4 percent of the coordination provisions were in the contracts from the beginning of the transaction. Including controls for changes made at the provision level did not change any of the results.

variables, we controlled for outside alternatives by evaluating the degree of asymmetry between the parties' alternatives, as well as the sum of their alternatives. To approximate the number of alternatives each party may have to dealing with the other, we content analyzed the communications to look for mentions of alternative options and/or partners (e.g., "You know that if you continue to deny the facts, we will turn to [Firm X] to supply this part;" "If we aren't able to put this relationship on the right track, we will produce the [part] ourselves."). Because the text did not allow us to calculate the precise number of each party's alternatives, we estimated the strength of one's alternatives based on the frequency with which the party mentioned alternatives. *Asymmetry of alternatives* was measured as:  $[\text{ABS} [(\# \text{ of references to alternatives by Firm A}) - (\# \text{ of references to alternatives by Firm B})]]$ .

***Sum of Alternatives.*** We evaluated "mutual dependence" by calculating the sum of each party's alternatives. A higher value indicates that the parties have strong alternatives to dealing with each other, (i.e., a lower degree of mutual dependence).

***Other Factors.*** The following variables were tested in a supplemental set of tests for our hypotheses, but dropped from the analyses reported below because they did not have any significant effects in any of the analyses: industry (e.g., manufacturing), type of transaction (e.g., distribution contract), international (i.e., whether the transaction entailed a cross-border relationship), time bound (i.e., a dichotomous variable capturing whether the initial contract had a specified end time), technical detail (i.e., the level of complexity of the transaction), stakes (i.e., the amount of money involved in the contract), and geographic distance between the firms.

## ANALYSES

Regressions were used to test the impact of contractual provisions on the level of each type of trust (Hypotheses 1 to 4). As some companies were repeat clients in our sample, which

may result in correlated residuals across observations, we report results with robust standard errors clustered on firms (76 clusters). When intent to continue the relationship, a binary variable, served as the dependent measure (Hypotheses 5 to 8), we used probit models. As a robustness check, we also used logit models for these analyses; results were identical.

Hypotheses 7b, 7c, 8b, and 8c predicted mediated relationships. To test for mediation, we followed the procedure outlined by Baron & Kenny (1986). Mediation is supported if: (1) the IV significantly predicts the DV, (2) the IV significantly predicts the MV (mediator), (3) the MV significantly predicts the DV, and (4) when the IV and MV are simultaneously included in the analysis, the MV is a significant predictor, but the IV is less (or no longer) significant.

Any such study will raise the issue of potential endogeneity. It is worth noting, however, that although regression analysis cannot evaluate temporal causality, our data suggest that a temporal sequence is in play. The data on contract provisions and transaction attributes is based on information that predates the onset of the dispute (T=1). The data on goodwill- and competence-based trust is based on messages exchanged at a later time (T=2), after the onset of the conflict. Finally, the intent to continue the relationship is manifested at the end of the dispute resolution process (T=3). In addition, we try to address this issue of alternative relationships by including a host of control variables (described above) that may influence initial contract structure, most notably the existence and influence of pre-existing trust (measured *both* by the length of prior ties as well as with measures of the quality of prior ties). Finally, as an additional robustness check, we conducted a supplemental analysis aimed at mitigating, to the degree possible, concerns regarding whether prior relationships (and prior trust, specifically) influenced the types of contractual clauses. In this analysis, we eliminated all 32.35 percent of relationships that contained *any* prior ties. The results are consistent with those of our core analyses, again



suggesting that endogeneity concerns are perhaps not problematic for our results.

## RESULTS

Inter-firm relationships varied in the degree to which they included coordination vs. control provisions in the contract. The mean number of coordination provisions was 0.99 (out of 2) and the mean number of control provisions was 2.30 (out of 4). Table 1 provides summary statistics and Pearson correlations for the variables in our analysis. Because some variables were significantly correlated, we checked for multicollinearity problems. The variance inflation factors (VIF) range from 2.47 to 4.70, diminishing this concern (Chatterjee & Price, 1991).

-----  
Insert Table 1 about here  
-----

Table 2 displays the first set of results in which goodwill-based trust and competence-based trust are regressed on contractual provisions (control vs. coordination). As predicted by Hypothesis 1 (Table 2, Model 1d), controlling for attributes of the transaction, of the dispute, and of the relationship, the higher the level of control provisions, the lower the level of goodwill-based trust ( $\beta = -.05$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ). We also find (Table 2, Model 2d) that control provisions positively influence competence-based trust ( $\beta = .06$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ), supporting Hypothesis 2. As predicted by Hypothesis 3, increasing the coordination provisions of a contract results in an increase in competence-based trust ( $\beta = .16$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ; Table 2, Model 2d). However, Hypothesis 4, which predicted that an increase in coordination provisions would result in an increase in goodwill-based trust was not supported (Table 2, Model 1d).

-----  
Insert Table 2 about here  
-----

Table 3 shows the results of binomial probit regressions in which the dichotomous dependent variable is *Intent to Continue*. A positive coefficient indicates an increased likelihood of continuing the relationship. Consistent with our predictions, we find (Table 3, Model 3d) that both goodwill-based trust ( $\beta = 17.07$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ) and competence-based trust ( $\beta = 9.45$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ) positively impact the intent to continue, supporting Hypothesis 5 and Hypothesis 6, respectively.

We also predicted that the greater the level of control provisions, the less likely it would be that the parties would intend to continue the relationship (Hypothesis 7a), and that this effect would be mediated by goodwill-based (Hypothesis 7b) and competence-based trust (Hypothesis 7c). Consistent with Hypothesis 7a (Table 3, Model 4c), the higher the number of control provisions, the lower the likelihood of continuing the relationship ( $\beta = -.62$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ).

The mediation predictions of Hypotheses 7b and 7c require multiple tests (Baron & Kenny, 1986). We have already shown that control provisions predict goodwill-based trust and competence-based trust. We have also shown that goodwill-based trust and competence-based trust are positively related to the intent to continue. Finally, consistent with Hypothesis 7b, when we simultaneously include control provisions (the IV) and goodwill-based trust (the MV) as predictors of intent to continue (Table 3, Model 5a), goodwill-based trust is still a significant predictor ( $\beta = 12.93$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ), but control provision is no longer significant ( $\beta = -.15$ ; *ns*), suggesting full mediation. To evaluate the mediation effect, we conducted a Sobel test (Sobel, 1982), which computes a Z-value to assess whether the indirect effect of the IV on the DV through the mediator is significantly different from zero. The Sobel test confirmed the mediating effect of goodwill-based trust between control provisions and the intent to continue ( $z = -2.718$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ). In contrast, when we simultaneously include control provisions (the IV) and competence-based trust (as the MV) as predictors of intent to continue (Table 3, Model 5b), both

variables—competence-based trust ( $\beta = 11.90$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ) and control provisions ( $\beta = -2.11$ ;  $p < 0.001$ )—remain highly significant, suggesting no support for the mediation predicted in Hypothesis 7c. Thus, the (negative) effect of control provisions on intent to continue the relationship is mediated by goodwill-based (but not competence-based) trust.

Hypothesis 8a predicted that coordination provisions would positively influence intent to continue. Hypotheses 8b and 8c predicted that goodwill-based trust (8b) and competence-based trust (8c) would mediate this effect. Consistent with Hypothesis 8a, we find (Table 3, Model 4c) that the higher the level of coordination provisions, the higher the likelihood of continuing the relationship after a dispute ( $\beta = .77$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ). Since we have already established, in failing to support Hypothesis 4, that coordination provisions do not affect goodwill-based trust, we need not assess the role of goodwill-based trust as a mediator; Hypothesis 8b is not supported. The mediation prediction regarding competence-based trust (Hypothesis 8c), however, is supported: we have already shown that competence-based trust positively influences intent to continue the relationship. When we simultaneously include coordination provisions and competence-based trust as predictors of intent to continue (Table 3, Model 5b), competence-based trust remains a significant predictor ( $\beta = 11.90$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ), but coordination provisions does not ( $\beta = -.61$ ; *ns*). This suggests full mediation, which a follow-up Sobel test confirms ( $z = 3.325$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ). Thus, the (positive) effect of coordination provisions on the intent to continue collaboration is mediated by competence-based (but not goodwill-based) trust.

For completeness, as a final analysis (Table 3, Model 5c), we simultaneously included both IVs (coordination and control provisions) and both MVs (competence- and goodwill-based trust) as predictors of intent to continue. Both mediators remain marginally significant predictors of intent to continue ( $\beta = 19.38$ ;  $p < 0.01$  and  $\beta = 14.96$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ). Also consistent with

predictions, coordination provisions is no longer significant ( $\beta = .46, ns$ ). Meanwhile, control provisions continues to have a marginally significant direct negative effect on intent to continue ( $\beta = -1.45; p < 0.10$ ), which suggests that control provisions may negatively influence the intent to continue in ways that are not fully accounted for by the effects of control provisions on trust.

-----  
Insert Table 3 about here  
-----

## **DISCUSSION**

We sought to extend theorizing and empiricism by distinguishing between the control and coordination functions of contracts, and between goodwill-based and competence-based dimensions of trust judgments. Prior research on the effects of contracts on trust has focused primarily on the control function of contracts and the goodwill dimension of trust judgments. Less attention has been paid to the coordination function of contracts; the competence dimension of trust has been largely ignored. We find, consistent with those who have argued that contracts “crowd out” trust (e.g., Malhotra & Murnighan, 2002) that the greater the number of control-oriented provisions, the lower the subsequent level of goodwill-based trust. In addition, consistent with those who perceive a more complementary relationship between contracts and trust (e.g., Lazzarini, Miller, & Zenger, 2004; Poppo & Zenger, 2002), we find that increases in control provisions as well as increases in coordination provisions lead to higher levels of competence-based trust. Thus, our more nuanced approach to analyzing contracts and trust reveals that seemingly divergent conclusions in prior research are not necessarily incompatible.

The current investigation also addresses the scarcity of research on the effects of contractual governance on performance and relational outcomes (e.g., Argyres et al., 2007; Poppo & Zenger, 2002). Our findings indicate that contract design affects the degree of trust that exists after a conflict has arisen, and, through this, the likelihood of relationship continuance. In

particular, control provisions have a negative effect on the willingness to continue a damaged relationship, and this effect is mediated by goodwill-based trust. Although control provisions enhance perceptions of competence, and, high levels of competence-based trust increase the likelihood of continued collaboration, competence-based trust does not act as a mediator in the relationship between control provisions and the intent to continue collaboration. Whereas prior research has argued that control mechanisms can diminish goodwill-based trust (e.g., Malhotra & Murnighan, 2002), ours is the first to document (a) the effects of control mechanisms on the willingness to continue a relationship and (b) the mediating role of goodwill-based trust in this relationship. Furthermore, although perceptions of competence do not mediate the effects of control on collaboration, ours is the first study to empirically document a positive relationship between (control provisions in) contracts and competence-based trust.

We also find that coordination provisions increase the likelihood of continued collaboration after a dispute, and that this effect is mediated by perceptions of competence. While prior research has predicted a relationship between coordination and continued collaboration (Argyres et al., 2007; Mayer & Argyres, 2004), ours is the first empirical study to identify a mechanism—enhanced perceptions of competence—that underlies this relationship. Contrary to predictions, we did not find an effect of coordination provisions on goodwill-based trust.

### **Theoretical Implications**

The results yield a number of theoretical implications that build upon and clarify prior research. Our study extends TCE-based research (e.g., Barthélemy & Quélin, 2006; Reuer & Ariño, 2002) by showing that firm decisions regarding contractual governance structures should consider not only (a) transaction attributes (as proposed by the TCE perspective; Sampson, 2004;

Williamson, 1985), and (b) existing levels of trust (e.g., Gulati, 1995a), but also (c) the effect of contract choices on subsequent trust and commitment (cf., Puranam & Vanneste, 2009).

Another important implication of our results concerns the simultaneity with which contracts can produce positive and negative effects. Previously, Vlaar (2008: 18) has argued:

“The relationship between contracting and interorganizational performance is likely to follow a curve-linear path, where too little contracting gives rise to chaos and destructive or opportunistic behaviour and where too much contracting causes rigidity and curbs creativeness and entrepreneurial activities (Foss et al. 2007; Luo, 2002; Mintzberg, 1994; Sampson, 2004a). In this respect, Mintzberg (1994: 386) notes that ‘formalization is a double-edged sword, easily reaching the point where help becomes hindrance.’”

While this logic suggests that there may be an optimal level of contracting, our results suggest otherwise, at least as far as control provisions are concerned. We find that an increase in control provisions will decrease goodwill-based trust and increase competence-based trust, suggesting that an optimal contract will not be found by discovering the “point where help becomes hindrance,” but by appreciating inherent trade-offs and evaluating the priorities of the current relationship. Future research that studies whether it is possible to avoid such trade-offs—e.g., by mitigating the effects of control on goodwill-based trust—would be of significant value.

Finally, the current research suggests that future work on the effects of contractual governance should seek to include outcome measures as well as mediator variables. In our complete model, for example, we find that our mediator, goodwill-based trust, accounts for some, but not all of the effects of control provisions on the intent to continue collaboration, thus raising additional questions regarding the mechanisms underlying these relationships.

### **Managerial Implications**

The current investigation also has implications for managers who are tasked with the responsibility of mitigating relationship risks. By distinguishing between control and coordination provisions (rather than relying on standard measures of contractual complexity,

such as length or detail; Joskow, 1987; Pirrong, 1993), we are able to to advocate for an increase in coordination provisions as a means of building competence-based trust in anticipation of conflict. Consistent with this, a South Asian executive recently explained to one of the authors that he refuses to do business with any U.S. firm unless the firm contractually agrees to sending each new project manager to his city and on a car ride from the airport to his manufacturing facility; the facility is 18 kilometers from the airport, but requires 3 hours of travel. “Because if the managers have not done that, they do not understand how things work here—and the next time something goes wrong, they think it is because we are incompetent.”

The results regarding control give pause and suggest that optimal decisions regarding contract structure require an assessment of the key sources of vulnerability in the relationship. If the relationship is likely to evolve, and it is difficult to predict the kinds of vulnerabilities that will emerge over time—as is often the case when negotiating contracts at the outset of a long-term JV, or among partners in a start-up environment—goodwill-based trust is likely to be critical and managers might choose to reduce the emphasis on control and increase the emphasis on coordination. If competence-based trust is critical, as in relationships where one or both of the parties are providing technically or operationally complex services, managers might increase reliance not only on coordination provisions (which is obvious), but also on control provisions.

Managers might also take note that while 29 percent of disputes in our sample—all of which had escalated to the point where law firms were involved—were resolved with the parties intending to continue collaborating, contract structure influenced whether the relationship could be revived. Relationships were more likely to survive when they contained fewer control provisions and more coordination provisions. This suggests that if parties anticipate future conflict—e.g., in cross-cultural relationships—they might choose contracting structures that,

while sub-optimal in some ways (e.g., for minimizing risk via control), are better able to encourage trust development in the relationship (through an increase in coordination provisions). This highlights another insight for managers to appreciate: the types of contracts that are best at avoiding conflict may not be the most helpful in situations where conflict was not avoided.

### **Limitations and Directions for Future Research**

A number of limitations of the current research can be identified. First, we focus on only one type of outcome variable (relationship continuance). Research on other performance variables (e.g., profits) and relational variables (e.g., partner satisfaction) would be of clear benefit. Second, as with any such analysis, it is impossible to fully ensure that the results of our analyses support precisely the causal relationships we have predicted. The longitudinal nature of our data, our control variables, and our numerous robustness checks help mitigate these concerns, but future research using experimental designs would nicely complement the current investigation. Third, while our empirical approach suggests a clear distinction between control and coordination provisions, we acknowledge that some provisions may simultaneously accomplish both objectives. To address this concern, we (a) revised the coding scheme that was derived from existing research with the help of legal experts, and (b) conducted two separate robustness checks. Future research could extend our approach by seeking other methods of evaluating the coordination vs. control functions of contracts.

This study sought to conceptually refine and empirically extend previous work on the effect of contracts on trust and trust-related outcomes in inter-organizational relationships. The findings provide a more nuanced understanding of these issues, as well as unique and actionable theoretical and managerial insights. We hope future research that builds on the strengths of our approach, and overcomes the weaknesses herein admitted, will be aided by this investigation.



## REFERENCES

- Agarwal, R., Croson, R., & Mahoney, J. T. 2010. The role of incentives and communication in strategic alliances: An experimental investigation. *Strategic Management Journal*, 31(4): 413–437.
- Ahn, T. K., Ostrom, E., Schmidt, D., Shupp, R., & Walker, J. 2001. Cooperation in PD games: Fear, greed, and history of play. *Public Choice*, 106: 137–155.
- Argyres, N. S., Bercovitz, J., & Mayer, K. J. 2007. Complementarity and evolution of contractual provisions: An empirical study of IT service contracts. *Organization Science*, 18: 3–19.
- Arrow, K. J. 1974. *The limits of organization*. New York: Norton.
- Baird, D., Gertner, R., & Picker, R. 1994. *Game theory and the law*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Barnard, C. 1938. *The functions of the executive*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Barney, J. B., & Hansen, M. H. 1994. Trustworthiness as a source of competitive advantage. *Strategic Management Journal*, 15: 175–190.
- Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. 1986. The mediating-moderator variables distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51: 1173–1182.
- Barthélemy, J., & Quélin, B. V. 2006. Complexity of outsourcing contracts and ex post transaction costs: An empirical investigation. *Journal of Management Studies*, 43(8): 1775–1797.
- Beatty, J., & Samuelson, S. 2001. *Business law for a new century*. Cincinnati, OH: West Legal Studies in Business.
- Bernheim, B. D., & Whinston, M. D. 1998. Incomplete contracts and strategic ambiguity. *American Economic Review*, 88(4): 902–932.
- Blodgett, L. L. 1992. Factors in instability of international joint venture: An event history analysis. *Strategic Management Journal*, 13(3): 475–481.
- Bottom, W. P., Gibson, K., Daniels, S. E., & Murnighan, J. K. 2002. When talk is not cheap: Substantive penance and expressions of intent in rebuilding cooperation. *Organization Science*, 13(5): 497–513.
- Burns, T., & Stalker, G. M. 1961. *The management of innovation*. London: Tavistock Publications.
- Camerer, C. F. 2003. *Behavioral game theory: Experiments in strategic interaction*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Chatterjee, S., & Price, B. 1991. *Regression analysis by example* (2nd ed.). New York: Wiley.
- Das, T. K., & Teng, B. S. 2001. Trust, control, and risk in strategic alliances: An integrated framework. *Organization Studies*, 22: 251–283.
- Davis, J. H., Schoorman, F. D., Mayer, R. C., & Tan, H. H. 2000. The trusted general manager and business unit performance: Empirical evidence of a competitive advantage. *Strategic Management Journal*, 21: 563–576.
- Dekker, H. C. 2008. Partner selection and governance design. *Accounting, Organizations, and Society*, 33: 915–941.
- Dhanaraj, C., & Beamish, P. W. 2004. Effect of equity ownership on the survival of international joint ventures. *Strategic Management Journal*, 25(3): 295–305.

- Dirks, K. T., Lewicki, R. J., & Zaheer, A. 2009. Repairing relationships within and between organizations: Building a conceptual foundation. *Academy of Management Review*, 34: 401–422.
- Faems, D., Janssens, M., Madhok, A., & Van Looy, B. 2008. Towards an integrative perspective on alliance governance: Connecting contract design, contract application, and trust dynamics. *Academy of Management Journal*, 51(6): 1053–1078.
- Ferrin, D. L., & Dirks, K. T. 2003. The use of rewards to increase and decrease trust: Mediating processes and differential effects. *Organization Science*, 14(1): 18–31.
- Foss, K., Foss, N. J., & Klein, P. G. 2007. Peripheral vision. *Organization Studies*, 28(2): 1893–1912.
- Ghoshal, S., & Moran, P. 1996. Bad for practice: A critic of the transaction cost theory. *Academy of Management Review*, 21(1): 13–47.
- Gulati, R. 1995a. Does familiarity breed trust? The implications of repeated ties for contractual choice in alliances. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38: 85–112.
- Gulati, R. 1995b. Social structure and alliance formation patterns: A longitudinal analysis. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 40(4): 619–652.
- Gulati, R., Lawrence, P. R., & Puranam, P. 2005. Adaptation in vertical relationships: Beyond incentive conflict. *Strategic Management Journal*, 26(5): 415–440.
- Gulati, R., & Nickerson, J. 2008. Interorganizational trust, governance choice, and exchange performance. *Organization Science*, 19: 688–708.
- Hagedoorn, J., & Hesen, G. 2009. Contractual complexity and the cognitive load of R&D alliance contracts. *Journal of Empirical Legal Studies*, 6: 867–903.
- Heide, J. B., & John, G. 1992. Do norms matter in marketing relationships? *Journal of Marketing*, 56(2): 32–44.
- Hinds, P. J., & Mortensen, M. 2005. Understanding conflict in geographically distributed teams: The moderating effects of shared identity, shared context, and spontaneous communication. *Organization Science*, 16(3): 290–307.
- Inkpen, A. C., & Beamish, W. P. 1997. Knowledge, bargaining power and the instability of international joint venture. *Academy Management Review*, 22: 177–202.
- Jap, S. D., & Ganesan, S. 2000. Control mechanisms and the relationship life cycle: Implication for safeguarding specific investments and developing commitment. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 37: 227–245.
- Jauch, L. R., Osborn, R. N., & Martin, T. N. 1980. Structured content analysis of cases: A complimentary method for organizational research. *Academy of Management Journal*, 5: 517–526.
- Joskow, P. L. 1987. Contract duration and relationship-specific investments: Empirical evidence from coal markets. *American Economic Review*, 77(1): 168–185.
- Kim, P. H., Dirks, K. T., Cooper, C. D., & Ferrin, D. L. 2006. When more blame is better than less: The implications of internal vs. external attributions for the repair of trust after a competence- vs. integrity-based trust violation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 99(1): 49–65.
- Kim, P. H., Ferrin, D. L., Cooper, C. D., & Dirks, K. T. 2004. Removing the shadow of suspicion: The effects of apology versus denial for repairing competence-versus integrity-based trust violations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(1): 104–118.

- Knez, M., & Camerer, C. F. 2000. Increasing cooperation in prisoner's dilemmas by establishing a precedent of efficiency in coordination games. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 82: 194–216.
- Kogut, B. 1988. Joint ventures: Theoretical and empirical perspectives. *Strategic Management Journal*, 9(4): 319–332.
- Kramer, R. M. 1999. Trust and distrust in organizations: Emerging perspectives, enduring questions. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 50: 569–598.
- Kretschmer, T., & Puranam, P. 2008. Integration through incentives in differentiated organizations. *Organization Science*, 19: 860–875.
- Lazzarini, S. G., Miller, G. J., & Zenger, T. R. 2004. Order with some law: Complementarity versus substitution of formal and informal arrangements. *Journal of Law, Economics, and Organization*, 20(2): 261–298.
- Lewicki, R. J., McAllister, D. J., & Bies, R. J. 1998. Trust and distrust: New relationships and realities. *Academy of Management Review*, 23: 438–458.
- Luce, R. D., & Raiffa, H. 1957. *Games and decisions*. New York: Wiley.
- Lui, S. S., & Ngo, H. Y. 2004. The role of trust and contractual safeguards on cooperation in non-equity alliances. *Journal of Management*, 30(4): 471–485.
- Luo, Y. 2002. Contract, cooperation, and performance in international joint ventures. *Strategic Management Journal*, 23(10): 903–919.
- Lusch, R. F., & Brown, J. R. 1996. Interdependency, contracting and relational behavior in marketing channels. *Journal of Marketing*, 60: 193–238.
- Macaulay, S. 1963. Non-contractual relations in business. *American Sociological Review*, 28: 55–70.
- Macneil, I. 1978. Contracts: Adjustment of long-term economic relations under classical, neoclassical, and relational contract law. *Northwestern University Law Review*, 72: 854–902.
- Malhotra, D. 2004. Trust and reciprocity decisions: The differing perspectives of trustors and trusted parties. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 94(2): 61–73.
- Malhotra, D., & Murnighan, J. K. 2002. The effects of contracts on interpersonal trust. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 47(3): 534–559.
- Mayer, K. J., & Argyres, N. S. 2004. Learning to contract: Evidence from the personal computer industry. *Organization Science*, 15(4): 394–410.
- Mayer, K. J., & Teece, D. J. 2008. Unpacking strategic alliances: The structure and purpose of alliance versus supplier relationships. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 66: 106–127.
- Mayer, R. C., & Davis, J. H. 1999. The effect of the performance appraisal system on trust for management: A field quasi-experiment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84: 123–136.
- Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H., & Schoorman, F. D. 1995. An integrative model of organizational trust. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(3): 709–734.
- McAdams, R. H. 2009. Beyond the prisoners' dilemma: Coordination, game theory, and the law. *Southern California Law Review*, 82(2): 209–258.
- Mellewigt, T., Madhok, A., & Weibel, A. 2007. Trust and formal contracts in interorganizational relationships: substitutes and complements. *Managerial & Decision Economics*, 28: 833–847.
- Mintzberg, H. 1994. *The rise and fall of strategic planning*. Hemel Hempstead, UK: Prentice Hall.

- Molm, L. D., Takahashi, N., & Peterson, G. 2000. Risk and trust in social exchange: An experimental test of a classical proposition. *American Journal of Sociology*, 105(5): 1396–1427.
- Morgan, R. M., & Hunt, S. D. 1994. The commitment-trust theory of relationship marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, 58: 20–38.
- Morrison, E. W., & Robinson, S. L. 1997. When employees feel betrayed: A model of how psychological contract violation develops. *Academy of Management Review*, 22(1): 226–256.
- Nahapiet J., & Ghoshal, S. 1998. Social capital, intellectual capital, and the organizational advantage. *Academy of Management Review*, 23(2): 242–266.
- Ness, H. 2009. Governance, negotiations, and alliance dynamics: Explaining the evolution of relational practice. *Journal of Management Studies*, 46(3): 451–480.
- Nooteboom, B. 1996. Trust, opportunism and governance: A process and control model. *Organization Studies*, 17(6): 985–1010.
- Park, S. H., & Russo, M. 1996. When competition eclipses cooperation: An event history analysis of alliance failure. *Management Science*, 42: 875–890.
- Parkhe, A. 1993. Strategic alliance structuring: A game theoretic and transaction cost examination of interfirm cooperation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36(4): 794–829.
- Pillutla, M. M., Malhotra, D., & Murnighan, J. K. 2003. Attributions of trust and the calculus of reciprocity. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 39(5): 448–455.
- Pirrong, S. C. 1993. Contracting practices in bulk shipping markets: A transactions cost explanation. *Journal of Law and Economics*, 36(2): 937–976.
- Poppo, L., & Zenger, T. 2002. Do formal contracts and relational governance function as substitutes or complements? *Strategic Management Journal*, 23(8): 707–726.
- Puranam P., Singh, H., & Zollo, M. 2006. Organizing for innovation: Managing the coordination-autonomy dilemma in technology acquisitions. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(2): 263–280.
- Puranam, P., & Vanneste, B. S. 2009. Trust and governance: Untangling a tangled web. *Academy of Management Review*, 34(1): 11–31.
- Reuer, J., & Ariño, A. 2002. Contractual renegotiations in strategic alliances. *Journal of Management*, 28(1): 47–68.
- Reuer, J., & Ariño, A. 2007. Strategic alliance contracts: Dimensions and determinants of contractual complexity. *Strategic Management Journal*, 28(3): 313–330.
- Reuer, J., Ariño, A., & Mellewigt, T. 2006. Entrepreneurial alliances as contractual forms. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 21(3): 306–325.
- Ring, P. S., & Van de Ven, A. H. 1992. Structuring cooperative relationships between organizations. *Strategic Management Journal*, 13(7): 483–498.
- Robinson, S. L. 1996. Trust and breach of the psychological contract. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41: 574–599.
- Ross, L., & Stillinger, C. 1991. Barriers to conflict resolution. *Negotiation Journal*, 7(4): 389–404.
- Rousseau, D. M., Sitkin, S. B., Burt, R. S., & Camerer, C. 1998. Not so different after all: A cross-discipline view of trust. *Academy of Management Review*, 23: 393–404.
- Salbu, S. R. 1997. Evolving contract as a device for flexible coordination and control. *American Business Law Journal*, 34(3): 329–384.

- Sampson, R. C. 2004. The cost of misaligned governance in R&D alliances. *Journal of Law, Economics, and Organization*, 20(2): 484–526.
- Schelling, T. 1963. *The strategy of conflict*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- 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.
- Sitkin, S. B. 1995. On the positive effect of legalization on trust. *Research on Negotiation in Organizations*, 5: 185–217.
- Sitkin, S. B., & Roth, N. L. 1993. Explaining the limited effectiveness of legalistic ‘remedies’ for trust/distrust. *Organization Science*, 4: 367–392.
- Smitka, M. J. 1994. Contracting without contracts: How the Japanese manage organizational transactions. In S. B. Sitkin & R. J. Flies (Eds.), *The legalistic organization*: 91–109. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Sobel, M. E. 1982. Asymptotic confidence intervals for indirect effects in structural models. In S. Leinhardt (Ed.), *Sociological methodology*: 290–312. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Tenbrunsel, A. E., & Messick, D. M. 1999. Sanctioning systems, decision frames, and cooperation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44(4): 684–707.
- Uzzi, B. 1997. Social structure and competition in interfirm networks: The paradox of embeddedness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 42(1): 35–67.
- Vanneste, B. S., & Puranam, P. 2010. Repeated interactions and contractual detail: Identifying the learning effect. *Organization Science*, 21: 186–201.
- Vlaar, P. W. L. 2008. *Contracts and trust in alliances. Discovering, creating, and appropriating value*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Vlaar, P. W. L., Van den Bosch, F. A. J., & Volberda, H. W. 2007. On the evolution of trust, distrust, and formal coordination and control in interorganizational relationships. *Group & Organization Management*, 32(4): 407–429.
- Walker, G., & Weber, D. 1984. A transaction cost approach to make-or-buy decisions. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 29(3): 373–391.
- Weaver, K. M., & Dickson, P. H. 1998. Outcome quality of small- to medium-sized enterprise-based alliances: The role of perceived partner behaviors. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 13: 505–522.
- Weber, J. M., Malhotra, D., & Murnighan, J. K. 2005. Normal acts of irrational trust: Motivated attributions and the trust development process. In R. M. Kramer (Ed.), *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 27: 75–101. New York: Elsevier/JAI.
- Weber, R. P. 1990. *Basic content analysis*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Wicks, A. C., Berman, S. L. & Jones, T. M. 1999. The structure of optimal trust: Moral and strategic implications. *Academy of Management Review*, 24: 99–116.
- Williamson, O. E. 1985. *The economic institutions of capitalism*. New York: Free Press.
- Williamson, O. E. 1991. Comparative economic organization: The analysis of discrete structural alternatives. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 36(2): 269–296.
- Zaheer, A., Lofstrom, S., & George, V. 2002. Interpersonal and organizational trust in alliances. In F. Contractor & P. Lorange (Eds.), *Cooperative strategies and alliances: What we know 15 years later*: 347–377. London: Elsevier Science.
- Zaheer, A., & Venkatraman, N. 1994. Determinants of electronic integration in the insurance industry: An empirical test. *Management Science*, 40(5): 549–566.
- Zand, D. E. 1972. Trust and managerial problem solving. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 17(2): 229–239.

**TABLE 1**  
**Descriptive Statistics and Correlations**

Variables	Mean	Min.	Max.	S.D.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	10	11	12	13	
1. Intent to continue	.284	0	1	.45													
2. Control provisions	2.30	0	4	.90	-.139												
3. Coordination provisions	.99	0	2	.89	.397*	-.117											
4. Goodwill-based trust	.22	0	.666	.16	.788*	-.166	.214*										
5. Competence-based trust	.261	0	.8	.22	.600*	.240*	.686*	.476*									
6. Asymmetry	7.66	5.17	10.28	.96	.007	.047	-.023	.037	-.083								
7. Type of conflict	.32	0	1	.47	.028	-.023	.148	.012	.163	.008							
8. Settlement type	.40	0	1	.49	.458*	.122	.098	.576*	.366*	.141	-.054						
9. Negative prior ties	.127	0	1	.33	-.110	-.193	.070	-.125	-.200*	.227*	-.075	-.253*					
10. Positive prior ties	.166	0	1	.37	.009	-.004	.004	.022	.034	.034	-.084	.169	-.170				
11. Prior relationship length	1.80	0	8.63	2.94	-.087	-.146	.018	-.076	-.168	.152	-.130	-.076	.641*	.593*			
12. Revisions	.22	0	4	.72	.133	.328*	.154	.134	.209	.127	-.099	.213*	-.037	.114	.075		
13. Asymmetry of alternatives	1.18	0	5	1.27	-.075	.104	-.102	-.068	.000	.093	-.084	-.135	.059	-.106	-.042	-.024	
14. Sum of alternatives	1.51	0	8	1.65	.025	.091	-.049	-.055	.337	.030	-.001	-.149	.040	-.013	-.009	-.048	.826*

\*  $p < 0.05$

**TABLE 2**  
**The Effect of Control vs. Coordination Provisions on Goodwill- and Competence-Based Trust**

	Type of trust							
	Goodwill-based				Competence-based			
	Model 1a	Model 1b	Model 1c	Model 1d	Model 2a	Model 2b	Model 2c	Model 2d
<i>Independent variables</i>								
Control provisions		-.053*** (.013)		-.050*** (.013)		.036† (.020)		.064*** (.014)
Coordination provisions			.030† (.015)	.022 (.014)			.158*** (.015)	.168*** (.014)
<i>Control variables</i>								
Asymmetry	-.008 (.014)	-.006 (.015)	-.005 (.014)	-.003 (.015)	-.037 (.023)	-.039† (.023)	-.021 (.016)	-.022 (.014)
Type of conflict	.014 (.028)	.013 (.027)	.004 (.029)	.006 (.027)	.083† (.042)	.0830† (.042)	.032 (.035)	.030 (.032)
Settlement type	.207*** (.036)	.209*** (.034)	.201*** (.035)	.205*** (.033)	.165** (.047)	.163** (.048)	.133*** (.028)	.128*** (.028)
Negative prior ties	-.018 (.106)	-.052 (.106)	-.065 (.100)	-.084 (.101)	.220 (.284)	.243 (.276)	-.025 (.184)	-.000 (.164)
Positive prior ties	-.063 (.082)	-.077 (.088)	-.093 (.074)	-.098 (.081)	.189 (.239)	.198 (.231)	.034 (.157)	.041 (.137)
Prior relationship length	.004 (.013)	.005 (.013)	.010 (.012)	.009 (.012)	-.038 (.038)	-.039 (.037)	-.011 (.025)	-.010 (.022)
Revisions	.006 (.020)	.027 (.019)	-.000 (.019)	.021 (.018)	.058* (.026)	.044† (.026)	.023 (.019)	-.004 (.018)
Asymmetry of alternatives	-.007 (.019)	-.005 (.019)	-.005 (.019)	-.004 (.019)	-.025 (.022)	-.027 (.022)	-.012 (.016)	-.014 (.015)
Sum of alternatives	.008 (.015)	.011 (.014)	.008 (.015)	.010 (.014)	.036† (.018)	.035† (.018)	.032** (.012)	.029* (.012)
Constant	.199† (.115)	.298* (.117)	.151 (.115)	.257* (.116)	.429* (.174)	.362† (.167)	.181 (.121)	.045 (.120)
R <sup>2</sup>	.345	.416	.368	.428	.276	.294	.644	.701

$N = 102$ ; †  $p < 0.10$ ; \*  $p < 0.05$ ; \*\*  $p < 0.01$ ; \*\*\*  $p < 0.001$ . Standard errors in parentheses; clustering on firms (# of clusters = 76).

**TABLE 3**  
**The Effect of Control and Coordination Provisions on the Intent to Continue in the Relationships**

	Intent to continue									
	Model 3a	Model 3b	Model 3c	Model 3d	Model 4a	Model 4b	Model 4c	Model 5a	Model 5b	Model 5c
<i>Independent variables</i>										
Control provisions					-.624*		-.628**	-.159	-2.119***	-1.455†
					(.249)		(.224)	(.282)	(.519)	(.758)
Coordination provisions						.789**	.774**	1.135*	-.614	.466
						(.230)	(.244)	(.455)	(.374)	(.606)
Goodwill-based trust		10.597***		17.079***				12.936***		19.384**
		(1.474)		(4.444)				(1.908)		(6.033)
Competence-based trust			4.645***	9.458**					11.907***	14.969**
			(.899)	(2.733)					(3.019)	(5.542)
<i>Control variables</i>										
Asymmetry	-.131	-.111	-.022	-.002	-.140	-.092	-.118	-.111	-.147	-.020
	(.144)	(.246)	(.168)	(.255)	(.162)	(.149)	(.164)	(.209)	(.204)	(.235)
Type of conflict	.097	-.089	-.363	-.849	.167	-.121	-.040	-.236	-.414	-1.273
	(.307)	(.431)	(.356)	(.519)	(.306)	(.334)	(.338)	(.459)	(.456)	(.949)
Settlement type	1.530***	.307	1.217**	-.221	1.791***	1.685***	1.938***	.215	2.081**	.344
	(.329)	(.533)	(.385)	(.732)	(.375)	(.446)	(.494)	(.688)	(.613)	(1.162)
Negative prior ties	.273	1.022	-.121	1.079	-.002	-.679	-.825	.105	1.529	1.741
	(1.435)	(1.499)	(1.163)	(1.545)	(1.655)	(1.280)	(1.434)	(1.487)	(1.475)	(1.730)
Positive prior ties	-.315	.420	-.925	.163	-.451	-1.058	-1.120	-.112	-.601	.137
	(1.156)	(1.199)	(1.010)	(1.256)	(1.353)	(1.076)	(1.206)	(1.194)	(1.068)	(1.478)
Prior relationship length	-.020	-.123	.102	.010	-.041	.096	.054	-.051	-.184	-.152
	(.184)	(.207)	(.160)	(.222)	(.221)	(.170)	(.195)	(.202)	(.219)	(.254)
Revisions	.119	.056	-.168	-1.354*	.441	.043	.311	-.216	.670*	-1.140†
	(.195)	(.208)	(.186)	(.557)	(.222)	(.173)	(.206)	(.272)	(.269)	(.668)
Asymmetry of alternatives	-.398†	-.748**	-.368	-.457	-.350	-.390	-.325	-.621†	-.192	-.252
	(.227)	(.266)	(.264)	(.343)	(.225)	(.277)	(.272)	(.318)	(.310)	(.370)
Sum of alternatives	.344*	.553**	.242	.254	.370*	.386†	.392†	.510†	.111	.208
	(.167)	(.180)	(.212)	(.204)	(.159)	(.216)	(.207)	(.248)	(.246)	(.289)
Constant	-.404	-2.619	-2.182	-6.529**	.776	-1.602	-.226	-3.881*	1.339	-6.544*
	(1.147)	(1.831)	(1.474)	(2.489)	(1.397)	(1.286)	(1.511)	(1.898)	(1.813)	(2.782)
Pseudo R <sup>2</sup>	.235	.657	.438	.766	.312	.366	.425	.758	.652	.833
Wald $\chi^2$	26.90	81.73	43.64	39.82	33.11	23.60	31.37	96.73	28.85	58.73

$N = 102$ ; †  $p < 0.10$ ; \*  $p < 0.05$ ; \*\*  $p < 0.01$ ; \*\*\*  $p < 0.001$ . Standard errors in parentheses; clustering on firms (# of clusters = 76).



## APPENDIX A

### Examples of Statements Coded as Competence- vs. Goodwill-Based Trust

Response categories were derived from definitions of trust dimensions in Davis, Schoorman, Mayer, & Tan (2000), Mayer & Davis (1999), Mayer et al. (1995), and Schoorman, Mayer, & Davis (2007).

**Competence-Based Trust:** Messages were coded for references to skills, competencies, aptitude, training, and/or experience.

Examples:

“We know that you are able to do it properly.”

“Usually you deliver it on time.”

“My engineers told me that they are confident about your experience in the [...] field.”

“You manifested your high level of competence during Phase 1 of the Project.”

**Goodwill-Based Trust:** Messages were coded for references to benevolence and/or integrity.

Benevolence Examples:

“We know you want the success of this Project.”

“We really appreciated your technicians’ efforts to repair the damage during the night.”

“Your employees have been kind and friendly to help [Firm A] to face this issue.”

Integrity Examples:

“So far, you have been fair and honest.”

“[Firm B] is well known for respecting its employees. It is what gives you a great reputation!”

“You have moral principles and I like that.”