

# Trust Creation in Cross Cultural Environment of Indian Companies in Manufacturing Sector in Thailand

**Vinod Kumar Singh**, Burapha University, Thailand  
**Chalong Tubsree**, Retired professor, Chonburi, Thailand  
**Saratid Sakulkoo**, Independent researcher, Thailand

**Abstract:** *Trust among employees and the management is one of the factors that leads to the success of a company, specifically the trust between the management and the employees who are from different cultures. The purposes of this study were to: find the factors which affect trust in cross cultural environment of Indian companies in a manufacturing sector in Thailand among employees of different nationalities (Thai, Indian, Myanmar and others), find the potential avenues which create mistrust, and the measures which can help build the existing level of trust for an effective utilization of existing human capital for economic, social and business advantage. A mixed method strategy was used to discover various dimensions relevant for the organization and potential redressed the issue of strengthening trust building in cross cultural environment of Indian companies operating in Thailand. The study results revealed the factors leading to the mistrust as follows: 1 communication process within Organizations involving Thai, Indian and other nationals, 2 employees experience while working in the organization, 3 language barrier at the workplace, 4 cultural factors and varying beliefs due to own social upbringing, and 5 discriminating factors those can lead to mistrust in the company. The study brought a realistic assessment of trust deficit based on inputs from employees across various levels and possible ways of nurturing the trust and eliminating the avenues for creating mistrust.*

**Keywords:** Trust, Culture, Cross Culture, Indian Company, Experience, Perception

## Introduction

The interaction between two or more cultures in an organization involves the level of trust which leads to a level of engagement, motivation and passion within the organization. The importance of trust in businesses was not clearly acknowledged in the early years in businesses environment as it relied more on a formal and informal business structure with focused on bringing the desired performance mostly in a hierarchical structure, focusing on short term business goals. However, with the evolution of organization and changes in society due to technological advancements, the element of psychology and employee morale came into the limelight, business resorted to the fact that in order to increase efficiency in the workplace and to get better outcome from their human capital, trust is a key pivotal. A conducive work environment based on trust is a prerequisite and it allows the workplace to enforce a bond with the employees, leading to a greater understanding which ultimately leads to higher productivity and prepares the organization to face the emerging challenges in the complex social, economic and political environment in the world today.

In life and business relationships are important but they are empty unless they are established and based upon trust (Covey, 2006). Trust is powerful glue in any human relationship. Setting up businesses in a different environment can be difficult if the foundation of a human relation is not built on trust. In a cross cultural environment, one is bringing his own cultural beliefs and value systems to a new environment. Trust is one of the most essential qualities of human relationship. Without it all human interaction, all commerce, all society would disappear

(Asherman et al.,2000). Zand (1972) reported that “apparently in low trust groups, interpersonal relationships interfered with and distorted perceptions of the problem. Energy and creativity are diverted from finding comprehensive, realistic solutions and members use the problem as an instrument to minimize their vulnerability. This is the case for many organizations and multi-national companies all around the world. The role of trust is to create a bond which allows for effective communication in a cross-cultural environment. Whilst dealing with individuals from different backgrounds, the common ground both individuals share is the empathy and the potential of trust building on to it. Trust allows for a connection in the workplace which allows for a stronger drive, determination, and belief in the cooperation even without the individuals sharing the same value systems.

This study brought the dimension of trust and mistrust in Indian company’s operating in cross cultural environment in Thailand and will continue to influence the journey of economic growth in Thailand, ASEAN region including government agencies like Thailand’s Board of Investment which deals with foreign investors, HR Managers and employees working in these organizations.

### **Problem statement**

The issue of trust existing in employees of any organization has immense potential to define the fate and possesses the opportunity to create wonders in terms of success and results. The various leakages to human productivity due to mistrust, which at times, is not visible on the surface but over a period of time, can cause severe impact on the end objective. This study aimed to bring all real issues in the environment of Indian companies in Thailand to surface, using mix method of research strategy, which enabled interaction with employees of different nationalities, across various levels in the organization so that their experiences, perceptions and beliefs were analyzed and core issues emerging out of study can be addressed by relevant actions within organization. The application of qualitative and quantitative research not only helped in reaching deep into the study topic but also discovered multiple dimensions emerging in day to day life within Indian companies in Thailand where in normal course; the opportunity to penetrate was not feasible for the management or HR department of these companies.

### **Research objectives**

1. To explore the factors those impact trust in Indian companies in Thailand in a manufacturing sector.
2. To investigate the potential avenues of mistrust in Indian companies operating in a manufacturing sector in Thailand where two or more nationalities are working together.
3. To propose a model for strengthening the trust factor in cross cultural environment in the Indian company operating in Thailand.

### **The Significance of the Study**

The study helped the Indian organizations operating in the manufacturing sector within Thailand, unions, employees, and government to sensitize the factors and make proactive and corrective actions to harness the true potential of their human capital. It supports creating & maintaining a harmonious work environment leading to an engaged and committed workforce. It also improves the employee engagement, corporate image of the organization and enable the management to attract and retain the right talent for future business growth.

## Literature Review

### Trust in Human Relations

In a cross cultural environment, the experiences from each other build the trust. The more is the sensitivity to each other's personal value system, characteristics and beliefs, the wider gap of trust emerged. The most connecting factor in building ties is in an environment which does not have fear or oppression, having mutual respect, emotional space to each individual who is working in the organization. Once this basic characteristic is there, the human relations evolve faster.

### Trust

Trust has been conceptualized as a belief or confidence in another's reliability, integrity, credibility, honesty, truthful benevolence (Doney & Cannon, 1997; Ganesam, 1994; Geyskens, Steenkamp, Scheer, & Kumar, 1996; Kumar, Scheer, & Steenkamp, 1995; Morgan & Hunt, 1994), faith that another will meet obligations (Gundlach & Murphy, 1993) and the expectation that another will act in accordance with an individual's beliefs (Sirdeshmukh, Singh, & Sabol, 2002). Essentially, trust is confidence in another's goodwill and integrity as well as the belief in another's ability and credibility, and is associated with such qualities as being honest, faithful and truthful. Drawing on these established motions, we define trust as a belief in the benevolence and credibility of a trading partner (Ganesan, 1994; Kumar et al., 1995). According to Baier (1986), trust is much easier to maintain than to get it started and it is never hard to destroy. Trust plays a fundamental role in developing and maintaining successful buyer-seller relationship (Kingshott, 2006; Narayandas & Rangan, 2004). Trust has been shown to reduce conflict, enhance coordination and foster loyalty among trading partners (Krishman, Martin, & Noorderhaven, 2006). Essentially, trust is critical because it facilitates the cooperation necessary for both buyers and sellers (Lohita et al., 2009) to achieve their performance outcome from exchange (Palmatier, Dant, Grewal, & Evans, 2006). However, it is difficult to establish trust in relationships when there are significant differences in the cultures of trading partners (Mehta, Larsen, Rosebloom, & Ganitsky, 2006).

Trust is a current conviction that another party is willing to take individual and organizational interests into account within the context and under possible events. Trust is intuitively, sometimes part-cognitively, assessed concerning the other party from recent past performance and longer term reputation through the lens of personal history hence experiential disposition to trust, coupled with organizational capability (Cultural, systemic and procedural path dependency) to accommodate trusting relations. The presence of a trusted party: (i) reduces perceived (interpreted or 'subjective') risk reduction; (ii) creates organizational and project opportunities to improve the service and content quality (Syyth et al., 2010). Employees can build up trust in specific individuals, for instance superiors, and generalized representatives, such as the organization (More & Tzafrir, 2009).

Global comparisons of trust attitudes around the world today suggest very large time-persistent cross-country heterogeneity. In one extreme, in countries such as Norway, Sweden and Finland, more than 60% of respondents in the World Value Survey think that people can be trusted. And in the other extreme, in countries such as Colombia, Brazil, Ecuador and Peru, less than 10% think that this is the case. Esteban Ortiz-Ospina and Max Roser (2016) – "Trust". Published online at "OurWorldInData.org" shows that average trust in the police tends to be higher than trust in the political and the legal systems. And trust in the political system is particularly low – in fact much lower than interpersonal trust for all countries except

Switzerland. On the other hand, trust in the police is notably high, and in the majority of European countries people trust the police more than they trust each other.

In the US, the General Social Survey (GSS) has been gathering information about trust attitudes since 1972, and it suggests that people trust each other less today than 40 years ago. This decline in interpersonal trust in the US has been coupled with a long-run reduction in public trust in government – according to estimates The Pew Research Center, an US based organization, recently constructed a series of long-run estimates of trust in the government for the US, starting 1958. This reveals that today, trust in the government in the US is at historically low levels. The Pew Research Center has a dedicated website, with many interesting visualizations – including dis-aggregated trends by ethnicity and political affiliation. Further details and analysis available in the report compiled by the Pew Research Center since 1958, today trust in the government in the US is at historically low levels.

In countries such as Norway, Sweden and Finland, more than 60% of respondents think that people can be trusted. And in the other extreme, in countries such as Colombia, Brazil, Ecuador and Peru, less than 10% think that this is the case. Notice that even in some relatively homogeneous regions, such as Western Europe, there are some marked differences: there is a twofold difference between France and neighboring Germany.

There are very large, time-persistent cross-country differences in the share of people who report trusting others, even within European countries.

The police is trusted more than other public institutions in most European countries. But do people in these countries trust the police more than they trust each other? This question is relevant, because trust in the police can become, in certain situations, an important substitute for interpersonal trust. In majority of countries people report the same or higher trust in the police than trust in others. The clear exceptions are Greece, Czech Republic, Slovakia, Poland, and Slovenia – these are the countries that lie significantly. Denmark and the Netherlands, both with higher levels of trust than the mentioned countries. In the US, people trust each other less now than 40 years ago.

Trust is a key element of social capital – but it is not the only one. Data from the UK suggests that different aspects of social capital change in time at different rates. The study from the Centre for Social Investigation at Nuffield College, Oxford, shows that in the UK trust in other people fluctuates year by year, but there is no trend over the last couple of decades. This is consistent with the figures from the World Value Survey, where the UK shows little variation between the 1998 and 2009 surveys.

The data from Eurostat and the World Value Survey shows that Sweden is one of the countries with the highest levels of trust globally. The study from the SOM institute – an independent survey research organization at the University of Gothenburg in Sweden, shows that interpersonal trust in Sweden is not only high, but also very stable across time.

### **Trust Building in Multi-Cultural Environments**

Recently, one of the management challenges is to win the trust of its stakeholders. Many have often spoken about having trust, when they should have spoken about building trust. Trust is something that must be earned over time by listening, talking and making sure that you “walk the talk” because stakeholders are becoming increasingly cynical, even though many leaders tend to take trust for granted. Trust is a powerful asset and can create loyalty to give the organization the benefit of the doubt in situations where they want to be understood and believed (Beslin and Reddin, 2004).

Defining the role of manager in creating a conducive environment for build trust , Lynne, Alan & Treger have said that “ Defining the role “It is up to the manager to clearly state the purpose of the organization as a whole and the role of each worker in company’s vision. A manager who openly discuss the challenges of the organization, who manages consistently and fairly, and who is available to alleviate rumors and fears will do much to limit employee conflicts.”(Milgram, Spector & Treger, 2000).

Trust development needs mental preparation and mutual acceptance by the interacting parties. Madhok (2006) considers trust-building a costly and time-consuming process because it is a long-term investment. Hakansson and Snehota (2000) state that trust is built up over time in a social exchange process whereby the parties learn, step by step, to trust each other. The reciprocal and self-enforcing nature of trust is generally noted: trust tends to evoke trust and distrust to evoke distrust (Blomqvist,1997). Perlmutter (1969) found building trust between persons of different nationality difficult. This means there is no shortcut to developing trust-service providers must invest time, money and a great deal of tolerance in coming closer to customers of other nationalities.

### **Research design**

The researcher employed a mixed methods research for the study. The exploratory sequential mixed methods strategy was used, starting with the qualitative method to explore the life experiences of 20 informants who were Thai, Indian and Myanmar workers, staff and managers working in Indian companies in manufacturing sector operating in different province of Thailand which includes, Angthong, Saraburi, Rayong, Samuthprakhan, Ayutthaya and Bangkok. The instrument for the qualitative data collection was an in-depth interview. The researcher interviewed 20 participants from those 6 locations. The data from the qualitative data collection were analyzed qualitatively.

The quantitative research method was later conducted with 318 the employees in Angthong, Saraburi, Rayong, Samuthprakhan, Ayutthaya and Bangkok. They were purposively selected from the population of the employees who are at the management level and the worker level. A questionnaire was used as the research instrument for the data collection on trust creation in the cross-cultural environment which consisted of 70 items for 7 aspects that may lead to the mistrust in the companies, they were: 1. Communication, 2. Employees experience, 3. Language barrier, 4. Cultural aspects, 5. Discrimination, 6. Working condition, and 7. Management behavior. The researcher has developed the questionnaire items from the results of the prior qualitative data collection and analysis. The researcher administered the questionnaires by himself in each of the 6 provinces.

### **Ethical consideration**

The researcher has observed and followed the research ethic strictly in all phases of the research starting from the data collection. At the data collection, the researcher kept the identity of the research participant in secret. The participant were told to feel free to withdraw from the data collection if they feel wanting to.

### **Trustworthiness and validity**

The researcher had confirmed the trustworthiness of the qualitative data collection by strictly adhered to the interview guide, conducted audio-recording during the interview. The researcher has also employed the triangulation methods of data collection and analysis by

interviewing different sources of data. The validity of the questionnaire was obtained through the confirmation of the experts' pinion through the index of item-objective congruence, the IOC approach.

### Research results

1. The qualitative data collection and analysis were conducted to answer the research question concerning factors which impact trust in Indian Manufacturing Sector Companies in Thailand.

The qualitative data analysis revealed that the factors responsible for creation of trust or mistrust in Indian companies in manufacturing sector operating in Thailand are:

1. Communication process within Organizations involving Thai, Indian and other nationals
2. Employees experience while working in the organization
3. Language barrier at the workplace
4. Cultural factors and varying beliefs due to own social upbringing
5. Discriminating factors those can lead to mistrust in the company.
6. Working condition factors those can lead to mistrust in the company.
7. Management Behavior / Leadership Style demonstrated and perceived

### Responding to the Research Question Two – Quantitative Research

The quantitative research aimed to confirm the potential areas which lead to mistrust in an Indian company in manufacturing sector operating in Thailand where two or more nationalities are working together. The data from the questionnaires were analyzed using descriptive statistics and factor analysis.

#### Part 1: Participants Demographic

Data analysis showed the frequency and percentage of the participants demographic.

Gender	Frequency	Percent
Male	139	44.30
Female	175	55.70
<b>Total</b>	<b>314</b>	<b>100.00</b>
Nationality	Frequency	Percent
Thai	277	88.20
Indian	31	9.90
Burmese	6	1.90
<b>Total</b>	<b>314</b>	<b>100.00</b>
Position	Frequency	Percent
Administrator	102	32.50
Staff	212	67.50
<b>Total</b>	<b>314</b>	<b>100.00</b>



The table indicates that discriminating was the highest rated cause of mistrust followed by management behavior, work condition, communication, cultural, language barrier and employees experience, respectively.

**Conclusion from the Quantitative Analysis**

The quantitative factor analysis results confirmed the findings of the qualitative analysis that factors like management behavior in day-to-day transactions created experiences of discrimination and decisions based on bias (actual as well as perceived). This was as simple as a manager speaking on a plant breakdown issue in the presence of Thai employees within a group of Indian employees leaving no clue with Thai employees, workers or managers as to what is being discussed and the direction of the next action to be taken. Similarly, in case of a marketing or Finance related matter, when the decision was taken by an Indian manager holding the authority and Thai employees were not aware or convinced of the background or rationale of the decision, they tend to get frustrated, not fully aware of the whole context and then found themselves not convinced with the decision, shifted towards “sulk” and got disengaged. This led to creation of mistrust at the workplace. The differential treatment in terms of benefits, varying norms of annual increments and perks while working in the same company, coupled with “Partial involvement approach” on communication between two or more nationals in Indian companies, whether it was due to a language barrier where employees of two nationalities were unable to express their mutual viewpoints or decisions were taken or conveyed through someone who merely translated the decision to their native language, non-involvement in emails or meetings, experience of not being heard on viewpoints added to the situation of mistrust. The experience of bias in career, recruitment of Indian’s for roles which could be filled by local nationals, placement of employees from one specific national in almost all functions like marketing, finance, HR, Technical at senior roles, generation of perception that something is “confidentially maintained” with intent to maintain confidentiality. The behavior of senior leadership, which is dominated by Indian nationals only, with easy access available for any Indian employee, irrespective of his position in organization hierarchy, with top management and the same accessibility not being there for employees of other nationalities, created a sense of “Not Being Important” or “Remaining Relevant” and led to mistrust. The career growth being accelerated for Indian employees in an Indian company, besides benefits being different, there

was a sense of disbelief on management's intent of being trustworthy management. The researcher believed that this is a strong possibility for Thai employees, including managers, joining an employee's union and extending their silent support to the union. Though, many of the managers were not officially members of the union, but internally supported the acts and opted to be driven by union management agreement for their benefits like an annual bonus. This reinforced the findings reflected in the quantitative survey where male and female participants in Indian companies in Thailand choose to not trust the management. The experiences of different guest houses for Indians within the company where employees of other nationalities do not have free access, taking of back seats in a meeting room during official meetings where Indian employees were supposed to sit at the front, depicted the organization culture of one nationality having supremacy in company affairs. The deep rooted beliefs in the organization had developed due to practices and experiences like not empowering the Thai managers in union negotiation and keeping the string with senior management, which are of Indian nationality. The researcher found that stated discrimination occurred in a variety of areas like career matters, differentiation in nominations in various training programs, authority at the workplace, involvement in decision making and various other aspects have led to high scores by respondents on Manager's / Management behavior, discrimination, work environment, communication & employee experiences.

Research Objective 3: Recommendations for building trust in cross cultural environment of Indian Organization Operating in Thailand

To synthesize the recommendations, the researcher has consulted the 7 categories of the causes of mistrust emerging from the Qualitative analysis, and then merged the qualitative results with the Quantitative results. The merged results indicated that the most influence towards the mistrust consist of:

1. Discriminating factors those can lead to mistrust in the company.
2. Management Behavior / Leadership Style demonstrated and perceived
3. Working condition factors those can lead to mistrust in the company
4. Communication process within the organization involving Thai, Indian and other nationals
5. Cultural factors and varying beliefs due to social upbringing
6. Language barrier at the workplace
7. Employees experience while working in the organization

The researcher while going through the findings from the Qualitative and Quantitative Research, got input about the context of India companies operating in Thailand, the prime movers for creation of trust and / or mistrust originated from the experiences, perceptions in day-to-day working within the company environment. The norms and way of life in any organization for that matter, creates a culture and environment of Trust or Mistrust. The researcher, with deep reflections on the findings and narration received by respondents during the qualitative research, covered live interviews with 20 employees from different levels, locations, factories, and businesses in the manufacturing sector arrived at various insights and revelations. Based upon his understanding, some of his core experiences during the process of research encountered during his professional stint within Thailand, and findings arriving from the Quantitative & Qualitative research along with synthesis of experiences gathered, the researcher found that the following are the reasons which led to creation of Trust & Mistrust and would like to make following recommendations for nurturing trust and avoid creating Mistrust in Indian companies operating in manufacturing sector in Thailand.



With the combination of the findings from the Quantitative results concerning the perspective of administrators and staff. The researcher has synthesized the following recommendations:

### **1. Building effective, transparent & consistent channels of communication**

Researcher noticed that there were too many initiatives about communication within organization, various platforms are created and management processes reinforce the importance of communication, feedback and sharing of business information. This was a very positive practice being followed in all the units covered under research. The fact was that “All the times, Indian Managers speak and Thai Employees Listen”.

Researcher while visiting the units covered during survey noticed that there was usually a monologue and there was no realization that every Thai employee may not be able to understand the particular accent or could not relate to the context of the communication. It was found that an effective, transparent and credible channel of communication was needed to be built consistently.

### **2. The Organization Design and Management Styles**

Researcher found out that these organizations, since its inception, were designed to work on framework of satellite unit of their Indian Head office where right from organizational processes in almost all functions like, Accounts, Production, Marketing, HR and Maintenance practices including the work process were adopted from India. The leadership role like Head of Unit, Function Head, Department Head and Section Head were mostly Indians. There were few exceptions noticed where Thai nationals are at Department Head level. Respondents clearly mentioned that for all practical purposes, the decision making authority in all unit matters, big or small, was vested with Indian managers. This went to the extent of a decision on maintenance on plant breakdown, response to a customer complaint, transaction with a local bank, finalization of a vendor, date of a business review or hospital to be chosen for medical treatment of an employee post-accident.

### **3. Establishing the Intent Right – Perception Matters!**

It is essential for businesses and leadership in organization to maintain the intent right. Any sort of cosmetic efforts, even if it is being perceived so, would not generate any objective gains or benefits. Whether there is an activity of communication meeting, Employee engagement survey, Celebration of a local festival, or employee get-together, there is always an employee perspective and experience as end result of that event. The lens through which employee experiences the whole event, is very critical. The researcher realized that the “Intent” of management and managers as perceived by Thai and Myanmar employees, was a big question in the organizations covered under scope of this research.

### **4. Discrimination at the Workplace**

Even though it may not be intended, there is a uniform and consistent response in Qualitative & Quantitative research from the male, female, management, staff and workmen employees on discrimination at work place . This issue is taken sentimentally and has a damaging impact in management and employee relations. A progressive management and multinational company in today’s context on globalization will focus on consistency in policy and their processes.

## **Conclusions Discussions and Recommendation**

The entire process of research, with a constant focus on identified research questions and the strategy to bring an appropriate response used the qualitative method to specifically answer research question 1. The dimensions explored through the findings out of qualitative research

were helpful in preparing the instrument for research question 2 and the inputs from research questions 1 and 2 were used to get the response to research question 3. The researcher based on his research findings post adaptation of mixed method strategy made certain recommendations which may be of help to the organization in improving their Trust Quotient and manage the existing Trust Deficit.

While looking at the outcome of the qualitative and quantitative research and examining the possible avenues for building trust in cross cultural environment of Indian companies operating in Thailand, the researcher attempted to understand the entire ecosystem in Indian companies operating in manufacturing sector in Thailand, the management processes and styles existing in the environment, the changes within the organization, available data on experiences and perceptions, stories and major incidents which evolved over time for employees of different nationalities (i.e., Thais, Indians and Myanmars). The researcher spent a lot of time in identifying potential employee groups which can bring real issues affecting trust and creating mistrust within organization. For this purpose, the researcher reached out to the employees of different nationalities in different provinces, belonging to different business verticals so that a heterogeneous sampling of data was available for the study.

The simpler, convenient, pragmatic and doable ways of inculcating the trust factor among employees in cross cultural environment of Indian companies in manufacturing sector operating in Thailand are originating in small actions within organization, demonstrating the trust towards each other. The intent of management in empowering local employees, hiring of local managers in all functions, based on competence and gradual withdrawal of Indian expatriates in phased manner would have strengthen the credentials of management in eyes of local nationals. While trust is a mutual phenomenon, the responsibility of building trust lies with the foreign investors, (Indians in this particular context), who came to Thailand to leverage the opportunity of growing business for long term, in Thailand.

An effective, transparent and consistent channel of communication with clear intent for all segments of employees will build management credentials within a short span of time. The need is to begin the same immediately, with no justifications or coatings. The authenticity of communication has intrinsic power to create a shift in human minds. There is no reason why an honest expression by management or employees will not registered within the organization.

The researcher feels that while some interventions and approaches are required to build the macro level changes for creating trust but on micro level, some of the small yet powerful means, mentioned as low hanging fruits will act as catalytic factors in fostering changes like non-usage of native language by Thai, Indian or Myanmar employees in meeting or work place where employees of different nationalities are together and to use a common language of conversation, reviewing the need and effectiveness of business meetings, equal and consistent sharing of company related information whether it is related to visit of a guest or change of product or reason of increase in stock of the finished goods . The employees being sent to Thailand from India to work with employees of local nationalities to be essentially sensitized on the cultural nuisances in Thailand and to be made aware on minor behavioral issues like need to control the style of speaking loudly at workplace, showing aggressiveness, demanding the work output by creating pressure or the awareness of body language which is seen as offending by local nationals. This can be avoided by organizing a mandatory session on cultural understanding before a new Indian employee is placed on the shop floor.

The creation of trust is not a binary process where an action will lead to trust. The whole process has to travel through an experience which inculcates the trust and integrates the heart

with mind. The researcher re-affirmed his findings that the experiences and perceptions prevailing in Indian companies in manufacturing sector within Thailand, the possibilities of building trust, further exists and it has immense potential to leverage improved business results, and the opportunity to build a vibrant, successful and world class organization which can sustain every turbulent tide of the volatile business environment of today.

### **Additional findings**

While researcher attempted to capture the findings based upon the outcome received from qualitative & quantitative research, and support from literature review, the some of the dimensions, which emerged during the research activity, on the basis of employee responses , study of existing environment and various past experiences shared by respondents are mentioned below as “Additional findings”:

#### **1. Acknowledgement of Trust Creation in Indian Companies in Cross Cultural environment of Indian Company’s in manufacturing sector in Thailand**

There were certain reports by respondents of each nationality, which indicates existence of “Different Mental Islands on Positioning of Trust” within the organization under purview of study. The knowledge on Trust creation factors and potential areas which can lead to mistrust, help management to identify ways which are indicative of Trust & Mistrust prevailing in the company, the consequences of low trust and advantages of improving the trust in Indian company’s in manufacturing sector operating in Thailand.

#### **2. Management Complacency**

The researcher also experienced “Management Complacency” on trust between the employees and management in Cross Cultural environment of Indian companies operating in manufacturing sector within Thailand. The managers expressed with confidence that there is immense transparency in their working and Thai employee are fully empowered to make decisions in their functional areas. When researcher attempted to find out number of Thai managers in management, there were hardly any local managers in first and second layer of management in each of the organization, irrespective of the fact that many of the organizations have been in Thailand for more than 25 years. The Thai respondents did not provide the same level of response when it comes to empowerment or awareness on background of business decisions.

#### **3. Empowerment will strength the Trust Creation in Indian Companies in Cross Cultural environment of Indian Company’s in manufacturing sector in Thailand**

The empowerment of employees will strengthen the trust and help organization to make speedy decision while bringing higher accountability. This will further boost employee morale and enhance quality of commitment, pride, employer Brand and services of employees which will eventually impact the overall energy level and ultimate experience of each of the stake holder. The higher trust level will have certain and direct benefit on employee engagement, work environment, reduction of breakdown. The higher the level of Trust is within the Organization, the higher the Speed of Transaction will be and the Lower the Cost to the business will be. Trust factor will work as a catalyst in the process of achieving business goals in the company.

### **Research Application**

The application of research findings can be used by Indian companies operating in Thailand in manufacturing sector to improve its Employee Engagement, Employer Brand within country of operation, attracting talent and enhancing the business profitability by leveraging its available human capital, to fullest potential, for a sustainable business model. The Management of Indian companies can review its hiring policy, employee engagement initiatives and

administrative processes to build positive experiences and perceptions. Also, some of the people processes like approach on organizing review meetings, communication channel, avenues of discrimination, actual or perceived, can be re-looked.

The research findings are equally relevant for other MNCs existing in Thailand who have employees of different nationalities. These findings can be used as reference for any industry, other than manufacturing sector; where the cross cultural environment exists due to employees of different nationalities working together for a common business goal.

The research findings can also be used by Manpower / Labor department in Thailand to improve the productivity and derive maximum economic benefit and promote Thailand as a friendly country for Indian investors in future. There are immense opportunity's to further enhance the productivity, profitability and intrinsic energy of Indian organization's in manufacturing sector operating in Thailand by acknowledging, actioning and achieving possible milestone's in journey towards building trust within its work force.

The research aims to bring long term success to Indian company's operating in manufacturing sector in Thailand by creating a trust based organization where the leveraging of the full potential of available human capital is possible by deeper connect with its employees belonging to different nationality's and cultural backgrounds.

## References

- Algan, Y., & Cahuc, P. (2010). Inherited Trust and Growth. *American Economic Review*, 100(5), 2060-2092.
- Arrow, K. J. (1972). What has economics to say about racial discrimination?. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 12(2), 91-100.
- Asherman, A. (2000). Conceptualizing trust with cultural perspective in International business operations. *Benchmarking an International Journal*, 24(4), 1099-1118.
- Baier, T. (1986). Trust and Antitrust-Jstor. *Ethics*, 96(2), 231-260.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (3<sup>rd</sup> ed)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Creswell, J.W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (4<sup>th</sup> ed)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Doney, T., & Cannon, N. (1997). Toward A Trustful B to B Relationship. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 4(10), 64-77.
- Doney, T. (1998). *The oxford handbook of economic and institutional transparency*. Oxford: Oxford University.
- Ganesan, G. (1994). The Measurement of Trust in Marketing Studies. *Journal of Marketing*, 58, 1-19.
- Ganesan, S. & Hess, R. L. (1997). Dimension and Levels of Trust. Implications for Commitment to a Relationship. *Marketing Letters*, 8(4), 439-448.
- Glesne, C., & Peshkin, A. (1992). *Becoming qualitative researchers, an introduction white plains*. NY: Longman.
- Greenberg, D. F. (2001). State Prison Populations and Their Growth. *Criminology*, 39(3), 615-564.
- Guba, E. G. & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). Competing paradigm in Qualitative research. In. N.K. Dezine & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.). *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp. 105-117). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Guba, E. G. & Lincoln, Y. S. (2005). Paradigmatic: Controversies, contradictions, and emerging confluences. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds). *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed) (pp. 191-215). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hakansson, T., & Sheheta, D. (2000). *Organization Culture, Business to Business Relationship*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's Consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organization across nations* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 30(3), 607-610.
- Kroeber, A. L., & Kluckhohn, C. (1952). *Culture: A critical review of concepts and definitions*. New York, NY: Random House.
- Kingshott, B. F. (2006). Operational and communication effectiveness, and leadership structures. *Criminal Justice Studies*, 19(2), 121-137.
- Krishnan, R., Martin, X., & Noorderhaven, N. (2006). Contracts and trust in alliances: Discovering, creating and appropriate value. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 49(5), 894-917.
- Lewicki, R. J., & Bunker, B. B. (1996). *Developing and maintaining trust in work relationship*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Mooij, W. T. M. (1999). Cross cultural consumer behavior. *A review of research findings*, 23(3), 181-192.
- Morgan, R. M., & Hunt, S. (1994). The commitment-Trust theory of relationship marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, 58(3), 20-38.
- Nunn, N., & Wantchekon, L. (2011). The slave trade and the origins of mistrust in africa. *American Economic Review*, 101, 3221-3252.
- Palmatier, R., Dant, P. R., Grewall, D. & Evans, R. K. (2006). Factors influencing the effectiveness of relationship marketing: A meta. *Analysis. SSRN Electronic Journal*, 70(4), 136-153.
- Perlmutter, T. (1969). The tortuous evaluation of the multinational corporation Columbia. *Journal of World Business*, 4, 9-18.
- Rokeach, M. (1973). *The nature of human values*. New York: The Free.
- Stephan, P. R., & Timothy, A. J. (2007). On location. In P.R. Stephan, & A.J. Timothy (Eds.), *Situating: Essays on the philosophy of John Perry*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 251-393.
- Toyeb, A. (1988) *Organization and national culture: A comparative analysis*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.