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The authors investigate the role of trust between knowledge users and knowledge providers. The kind of knowledge of special concern is formal market research. Users include marketing and nonmarketing managers; providers include marketing researchers within a user's own firm and those external to the firm. A theory of the relationships centering on personal trust is developed to examine (1) how users' trust in researchers influences various relationship processes and the use of market research and (2) how the relationships vary when examined across dyads. The relationships were tested in a sample of 779 users and providers of market research information. Results indicate that trust and perceived quality of interaction contribute most significantly to research utilization, with trust having indirect effects through other relationship processes, as opposed to important direct effects on research utilization. Deeper levels of exchange, including researcher involvement in the research process and user commitment to the research relationship, however, have little effect on research use. Finally, the relationships in the model show few differences depending on whether the producer and user share marketing or research orientations. Interorganizational dyads, however, generally exhibit stronger model relationships than intraorganizational dyads.

Relationships Between Providers and Users of Market Research: The Dynamics of Trust Within and Between Organizations

As information collection, processing, transmission, and storage technologies improve, essentially the same information is becoming available at about the same time to any firm desiring it. Indeed, such is already the case across a broad spectrum of important marketing decisions. Currently, few technological reasons (and still fewer in the near future) prevent a company from obtaining timely, valid, and reliable information relevant to most important problems. Hence, sustainable competitive advantage will depend less on who has information and increasingly on who is able to make the best use of that information (Porter and Millar 1985). Consistent with that observation, the Marketing Science Institute has designated research concerned with the utilization of market information as a capital topic for 1990–1992 (Marketing Science Institute 1990).

The use of information in decision making, especially formal market research, is often a complex

---

*Christine Moorman is Assistant Professor of Marketing, Graduate School of Business, University of Wisconsin–Madison. Gerald Zaltman is the Joseph C. Wilson Professor of Marketing, Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University. Rohit Deshpande is Professor of Marketing, Amos Tuck School of Business Administration, Dartmouth College.

The first author thanks the Graduate School, University of Wisconsin–Madison for support of the project. All three authors also thank the Marketing Science Institute for supporting the project, as well as Gil Churchill, Bernie Jaworski, and Dan Smith for their comments on a previous version of the manuscript, the participants of an MSI miniconference for their feedback on a preliminary report, and Jill Orum for her assistance in data collection and manuscript preparation. Finally, the comments provided by Mike Houston and Bart Weitz, as well as three anonymous JMR reviewers, are greatly appreciated.

---

1We use the term "market research" rather than "marketing research" throughout to refer to the information that is collected rather than the functional area or department. Hence, we focus on market research information while considering relationships between various users and marketing researchers.
process involving many people and organizational units. Not surprisingly, a variety of factors affect the process, many of which are behavioral rather than technical (Barbetta and Zaltman 1991). Zaltman and Moorman (1988) concluded from 170 interviews with research users and providers that one phenomenon, personal trust, is potentially the most important behavioral factor affecting research use outcomes. The importance of trust to research utilization is also being echoed in contemporary trade publications that have noted the effects of current low levels of trust exhibited by marketing managers toward their research colleagues. These effects include laying off researchers and minimizing the role of research in decision making (Business Week 1991).

User trust in research providers is important to utilization because trust reduces the perceived uncertainty and hence the perceived vulnerability associated with using marketing information. Uncertainty arises for several reasons. First, managers often feel they have more information available than is necessary for decision making. Indeed, Naisbitt’s (1984) notion that “we are drowning in information and starved for knowledge” may be reality for many managers today. Second, advanced information technologies and increasingly sophisticated research techniques make it difficult for managers to use research (McCann 1986). Third, problems of volume and sophistication are exacerbated by a growing variety of functional area customers of market research who are unfamiliar with research or its use in decision making. Finally, more and more firms are relying on external research organizations rather than internal staff to trim operating expenses. The result is often shorter term relationships with researchers who lack experience with the firm and perhaps are not privy to information that could assist in creating and using research in more effective ways. These conditions make trust in user-researcher relationships of fundamental importance to research utilization outcomes.

Despite its importance, trust has not received significant theoretical or empirical attention as a relevant variable in the use of market research. We therefore propose and test a theory of how trust in user-researcher relationships affects the use of market research. The theory includes consideration of various individual and organizational factors that moderate the effects of trust on research utilization outcomes.

**TRUST**

**The Concept of Trust**

Trust is defined as a willingness to rely on an exchange partner in whom one has confidence. This definition spans the two general approaches to trust in the literature (see also Dwyer and LaGace 1986). First, trust has been viewed as a belief, sentiment, or expectation about an exchange partner’s trustworthiness that results from the partner’s expertise, reliability, or intentionality (Blau 1964; Pruitt 1981; Rotter 1967). Considerable research in marketing views trust in this way (Anderson and Weitz 1990; Dwyer and Oh 1987; Schurr and Ozanne 1985). Second, trust has been viewed as a behavioral intention or behavior that reflects a reliance on a partner and involves vulnerability and uncertainty on the part of the trustor (Coleman 1990; Deutsch 1962; Giffin 1967; Schlenker, Helm, and Tedeschi 1973; Zand 1972). This view suggests that without vulnerability, trust is unnecessary because outcomes are inconsequential for the trustor. This is consistent with Deutsch’s (1962) definition of trust as “actions that increase one’s vulnerability to another” which Coleman (1990, p. 100) suggests might include “[v]oluntarily placing resources at the disposal of another or transferring control over resources to another.” This view also suggests that uncertainty is critical to trust, because trust is unnecessary if the trustor can control an exchange partner’s actions or has complete knowledge about those actions (Coleman 1990; Deutsch 1958).

We argue that both belief and behavioral intention components must be present for trust to exist. Therefore, if one believes that a partner is trustworthy without being willing to rely on that partner, trust is limited. However, if one is willing to rely on a partner without holding a belief about that partner’s trustworthiness, reliance may be more a function of power and control than trust.

**The Role of Trust in Relationships**

Trust has been treated in one of two distinct ways in the literature. First, trust has been conceptualized as a feature or an aspect of relationship quality. Dwyer and Oh (1987) and Crosby, Evans, and Cowles (1990), for example, describe trust as a feature of relationship quality, along with satisfaction and opportunism; Anderson, Lodish, and Weitz (1987) view trust as a feature of relationships, in addition to power, communications, and goal compatibility.

Second, consistent with the view adopted in our research, trust has been conceptualized as a determinant of relationship quality. For example, Anderson and Narus (1984, 1990) view trust as a determinant of the amount of cooperation and the functionality of conflict between parties. Parasuraman, Zeithaml, and Berry (1985) view trustworthiness, in addition to believability and honesty, as part of credibility, which determines perceptions of service quality. Finally, Anderson and Weitz (1990) and Mohr and Nevin (1990) model trust as a determinant of communications between parties.

**THEORETICAL RELATIONSHIPS**

Figure 1 is a general model of market research relationships. The model suggests that a user’s trust in a researcher affects the user’s relationship processes with the researcher, including the quality of interactions, the extent to which the researcher is involved in the research process, and the user’s commitment to the specific research relationship. These relationship processes, in turn,
influence the extent to which market research is used in decision making.

Given that we view trust as a central determinant of relationships, our first set of hypotheses pertain to the relationships between trust and relationship processes and between trust and research utilization outcomes. Second, we hypothesize about the indirect effects of the various relationship processes on one another and follow with hypotheses about the direct connections between the relationship processes and research utilization outcomes. Our final set of hypotheses describe the effects of various individual and organizational moderators on the relationships among trust, the relationship processes, and research utilization outcomes.

Effects of Trust on Relationships Processes and Research Utilization

Researcher involvement refers to the extent to which users feel it is important to involve researchers in the design, production, and use of market research information. At a minimum, researchers typically are involved in research design, data collection, and data analysis activities. There is considerably more variation, however, in the extent to which they are involved in other aspects of the research process, such as defining problems and translating data into meaningful recommendations and actions (see Peterson and Kerin 1980). Researchers who are trusted will achieve deeper levels of involvement in all these activities, reflecting what Pruitt (1981) termed “high-risk coordinative behaviors.” Such participation can occur only after trust has been established, because it requires users to become more vulnerable to researchers.

Perceived quality of interactions is the degree to which users view user-researcher interactions as productive. Trust is expected to heighten the quality of interactions as users share more comprehensive, accurate, and timely information about their research needs and provide more background information to researchers (Bialaszewski and Giallourakis 1985; Dwyer, Schurr, and Oh 1987; Schurr and Ozanne 1985; Zand 1972). Such enhanced communication affords researchers a sounder understanding of users’ contexts, particularly about their business and customers (Peterson and Kerin 1980). In addition, trust enables both parties to find productive resolutions to disagreements that might occur. Indeed, the freedom to disagree (which, we argue, comes after trust has been established) often produces novel insights from shared ideas.

Commitment to the relationship is defined as an enduring desire to maintain a valued relationship, consistent with Dwyer, Schurr, and Oh’s (1987) description of a relational continuity between exchange partners and with Leik and Leik’s (1977) definition of an unwillingness to consider partners other than those in the current relationship. However, our definition also suggests that commitment is enduring, and it reflects a positive valuation of a relationship. In other words, commitment generally does not change often. Moreover, people are unlikely to be committed to something they do not value. Because trust increases the extent to which partners engage in risky exchanges, trust is expected to increase the likelihood that users will become committed to relationships with researchers.

Research utilization is defined as the extent to which the research influences the user’s decision making. Trust increases research utilization because of the relationship processes it creates, namely higher quality interactions between users and researchers, higher levels of researcher participation, and greater levels of user commitment to the relationship. These processes reflect greater informational and interpersonal investments by users. These deepened investments increase research quality or the degree to which it is actionable, timely, and comprehensive, factors that other studies have shown to affect utilization (Bailey and Pearson 1983; Deshpande and Zaltman 1982).

In addition to increasing utilization rates by improving the actual quality of the research, trust may improve utilization by increasing users’ perceptions of research quality. The perceptions may be elevated because the relationship processes trust engenders serve as truth tests that increase the believability of market research (Holzner and Marx 1979).

The preceding theorizing is summarized in our first hypothesis.

H1: The greater the trust users have in researchers, (a) the greater the researcher involvement in the research process, (b) the higher users perceive the quality of
their interactions with researchers to be, (c) the more committed users are to their relationships with researchers, and (d) the greater users' utilization of market research information.

**Interrelationships Among the Relationship Processes and Effects of the Relationship Processes on Research Utilization**

Beyond the criticality of trust, the increased involvement of researchers in the research process should improve the quality of their interactions with users. The reason is that as researchers become more involved in strategic aspects of the research process (e.g., the development of marketing strategy recommendations or assisting in the implementation of those recommendations), they gain knowledge and experience relevant to users that make their interactions with users more productive. Consequently, a researcher may become more customer oriented and less technically oriented, or the researcher's ideas may reflect a sounder strategic understanding of the firm. In both cases, users should perceive their interactions with researchers as being of higher quality. Hence,

**H:** The greater the involvement of researchers in the research process, the higher users perceive the quality of their interactions with researchers to be.

Higher quality interactions and greater levels of researcher involvement are theorized to promote a higher level of users' commitment to their relationships with researchers (Scanzoni 1979). Such exchanges reflect the type of economic, communication, and/or emotional investments that Dwyer, Schurr, and Oh (1987) suggest are necessary for commitment to occur. As they note, commitment is "... fueled by the ongoing benefits accruing to each partner. These benefits include the certainty from mutually anticipated roles and goals, the efficiency stemming from the amelioration of bargaining, and the confidence in exchange effectiveness that comes from trust" (p. 19).

As users often spend considerable time familiarizing researchers, especially those outside the firm, with their business or the particular problem at hand, it is not surprising that they would be reluctant to change researchers once an effective relationship has been established. Users, in effect, become committed to relationships in which they have invested substantially. Hence,

**H:** The (a) higher the perceived quality of user-researcher interactions or (b) greater the researcher involvement in the research process, the greater the commitment users have to their relationships with researchers.

Each of the relationship processes is also expected to have a direct effect on users' utilization of market research information. For example, high quality interactions between users and researchers (which, we argue, follow from trust) indicate greater information sharing from the user. Such sharing improves researchers' abilities to design and disseminate research that is relevant to users, who will be more likely to apply it in their decision making. Researcher involvement, which also follows from trust, is another risky behavior that improves the quality of the research and increases users' utilization of it. Finally, users who are committed to research relationships may have a greater propensity to use research products because of their need to remain consistent with that commitment (see Cialdini 1985; Festinger 1957; Heider 1946). Therefore,

**H:** The greater the (a) perceived quality of user-researcher interactions, (b) researcher involvement in the research process, or (c) commitment users have to relationships with their researchers, the greater users' utilization of market research information.

**Effects of Individual and Organizational Moderators on H-H**

Differences between users and researchers can facilitate or inhibit the role of trust in research relationships. At the individual level, we examine two differences that occur between users and researchers depending upon their research and marketing orientations. At the organizational level, we examine relationships within a single organization and relationships between two distinct organizations.

**Individual differences: members of the same and different communities.** Previous work has described differences between users and producers of knowledge and how those differences affect knowledge use. For example, Caplan, Morrison, and Stambaugh (1975) use the metaphor of two communities to describe differences found in users' and producers' norms, values, methods of socialization, and reality tests for what constitutes usable research (see also Crosby, Evans, and Cowles 1990 for a discussion of similarity).

We examine two types of community differences. The first type occurs either when a user and provider are both researchers (i.e., researcher-researcher relationships) or when one is a manager and the other is a researcher (i.e., manager-researcher relationships). The second type occurs either when the user and the provider are both in marketing (i.e., marketing manager-marketing researcher relationships) or when one is a nonmarketer (e.g., engineer-marketing researcher relationships).

Deshpande and Zaltman (1984) highlight differences between marketing managers and marketing researchers, noting that managers perceive the technical quality of the research report as most important to research utilization, whereas researchers perceive manager-researcher interactions as most important. They also cite work by Bogart (1967), who notes that managers view themselves as "businesspeople" and researchers see themselves primarily as "scientists," and Newman (1962), who suggests that one source of conflict between managers and researchers occurs because managers feel their judgments will be undervalued when market research is available.
Research has also documented the distinctiveness of managers based on their functional area. For example, Gupta, Raj, and Wilemon (1986) describe sociocultural differences between product development managers and marketing managers. They note that R&D managers tend to be more professionally oriented, have a longer term orientation, and have a lower tolerance for ambiguity; marketing managers are more bureaucratic or organizationally oriented, have a shorter-term orientation, and have a higher tolerance for ambiguity in decision making. Research by Moeneart and Soeder (1990) and Ruekert and Walker (1987) also suggests that managers in various functional areas perceive transactions differently because of their unique location, training, and expectations.

Trust's effects are expected to be weaker in dyads involving dissimilar parties. For example, trust may not mitigate the parties' differences about what constitutes useful knowledge (e.g., managers value experience, but researchers value research findings; marketers value customer information, but nonmarketers value engineering or cost information). Hence, trust's effects on research use are expected to be weaker in such dyads, as are the direct effects of the other relationship processes on research use.

Trust's effect on quality of interaction may also be weakened because communities process information and use metaphors differently. Managers tend to process information more intuitively, employ heuristics that focus on specific performance indicators, use informal and interactive processing methods, and rely on professional jargon to communicate their understanding. Researchers, in contrast, prefer impersonal analytical models, process data more exhaustively to develop a consistent theoretical structure, and use technical jargon (see Moorman and Zaltman 1984; Shrivastava and Mitroff 1984). Similar distinctions could be made for marketers and nonmarketers. Finally, the effects of trust on involvement and commitment should be weaker in dissimilar dyads because both risky behaviors involve deeper levels of exchange with the researcher, which may be undermined by community differences.

The preceding predictions raise an interesting paradox, suggesting that risk may affect trust (and its resulting processes) in two different and seemingly contradictory ways. First, risk is necessary for trust to occur, suggesting that trust may be more likely in dissimilar dyads, where, we have argued, risk is more prevalent. Second, risk makes trust difficult to establish because as risk increases, so does the trustor's probability of loss, suggesting that trust would be more likely in similar dyads. The two views are not, however, incommensurate. In fact, by factoring in the gains and losses from trust (see Coleman 1990), we expect that high levels of risk will increase the likelihood of trust in circumstances where gains outweigh losses. If gains do not outweigh losses, however, high levels of risk will reduce trust.

Given the substantial epistemic and functional differences described, we expect a low perception of gains from market research to be prevalent among users as well as a high sense of costs associated with performing and using research in decision making. Hence, we expect stronger trust-related relationships when dyads involve similar parties and weaker relationships when they involve dissimilar parties. Therefore,

H₃: The hypothesized relationships among trust, relationship processes, and research utilization are weaker for manager-researcher dyads than for researcher-researcher dyads.

H₄: The hypothesized relationships among trust, relationship processes, and research utilization are weaker for nonmarketer-marketer dyads than for marketer-marketer dyads.

Organizational differences: intraorganizational and interorganizational relationships. The effects of trust are also expected to be different in inter- and intraorganizational dyads. Users and providers within the same firm, for example, are more likely than those in different organizations to have a common basis for communicating and resolving conflicts because of their shared assumptions, expectations, and decision rules. Thus, trust's effects may be more tenuous in interorganizational relationships than in intraorganizational relationships.

For example, despite trust, the quality of interactions in interorganizational relationships may be poor because parties are less willing to share proprietary information. This lack of sharing, in turn, hampers the researcher's ability to develop relevant and meaningful research. Parties in interorganizational relationships may also meet less often and, when they do meet, discussion may be more formal and allow less opportunity for productive disagreements and the type of informal give-and-take that often generates new ideas. In the case of researcher involvement, users contracting outside the firm may not feel that (for proprietary reasons) even a trusted researcher should be allowed to make recommendations to the firm about the research findings and certainly should not be responsible for their implementation. Finally, the fact that interorganizational relationships reside outside the organizational boundary also weakens the relationships between trust, involvement, and quality of interaction on commitment. The reason is that the loss of control in interorganizational relationships makes commitment to an external organization much riskier than commitment to the user's own organization. Such risk does not facilitate trust, however, because the gains associated with trusting, interacting with, involving, and becoming committed to an external research organization remain unclear to many users, whereas the threat of loss due to the involvement of outsiders is clear and could further dilute the perception of gains associated with external relationships. Hence,

H₅: The hypothesized relationships among trust, relationship processes, and research utilization are weaker in interorganizational dyads than intraorganizational dyads.
METHOD

Sample

The sample consisted of three distinct types of users of market research information, each of which was asked to evaluate a unique relationship with various providers of market research. One group of users consisted of marketing managers, usually vice presidents of marketing, marketing directors, or product and brand managers. They were asked to evaluate research relationships occurring with either (1) internal marketing researchers or (2) external marketing researchers. The second user group consisted of marketing researchers within a firm, who were asked to evaluate their relationships with external marketing researchers. Finally, a group of nonmarketing managers, typically engineers, product development managers, and research and development managers, were asked to evaluate their relationships with internal researchers. This approach resulted in three distinct types of respondents evaluating four distinct dyads: (1) internal marketing manager–internal marketing researcher (IMM-IMR), (2) internal marketing manager–external marketing researcher (IMM-EMR), (3) internal marketing researcher–external marketing researcher (IMR-EMR), and (4) internal nonmarketing manager–internal marketing researcher (INM-IMR).

Procedure

Three months before the start of the study, each firm (and division) in Advertising Age’s 1990 list of the top 200 advertisers was requested by telephone to provide the names of six to eight users of marketing research. A sample of 1680 users was generated from the calls.

Each sample member was mailed a cover letter, a questionnaire, and a brief author profile. The cover letter explained the purpose of the research and promised a summary of the results to all who returned their business card with the completed questionnaire. The questionnaires, though identical in structure, directed respondents to evaluate the different types of relationships. A single new dollar bill was affixed to the cover letter as an advance token of appreciation. Finally, marketing managers and marketing researchers completing the survey were asked to give the name and address of one nonmarketing manager who used marketing research. These recommendations resulted in 188 additional eligible users, increasing the sample size to 1868.

Three weeks after the first mailing, randomly selected nonrespondents were phoned, reminded of the survey, and encouraged to complete and return it. Two weeks after the phoning, a second mailing was sent to all nonrespondents. A similar procedure was used for the recommended nonmarketers, with the exception that the phone calls were omitted because the response rate was above average after the first mailing.

Table 1 summarizes the samples and response rates for each of the four dyads examined. Elimination of persons who indicated that the questionnaire was inappropriate for their organization or experience reduced the original sample to 1719. Of those eligible research users, 779 or 45.3% responded. The response rates varied across dyads from 35.8% for the internal manager–external researcher dyad to 58.0% for the internal researcher–external researcher dyad. Such variance across types of respondents also has been found in past research on similar samples (Deshpande and Zaltman 1984; Peterson and Kerin 1980). Overall, the response rate is above average for such research and suggests that the results are robust and generalizable. That conclusion is reinforced by examining key relationship variables (e.g., trust, quality of interaction), individual variables (e.g., job position, years with firm), and organizational variables (e.g., company type) with chi square difference tests on early responses (i.e., received prior to the second mailing) versus later responses (i.e., received after the second mailing). No significant differences are found.

Measure Development

Following from construct definitions, measures were either developed or borrowed from past research (see Appendix) and two pretests performed. The first pretest involved mailing a list of defined constructs and list of items for those constructs to 10 academicians and 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship type</th>
<th>Original sample</th>
<th>Eligible sample</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Response rates (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All dyads</td>
<td>1868</td>
<td>1719</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>45.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyad 1 (IMM-IMR)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal marketing manager–internal marketing researcher</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>39.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyad 2 (IMM-EMR)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal marketing manager–external marketing researcher</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyad 3 (IMR-EMR)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal marketing researcher–external marketing researcher</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>570*</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>58.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyad 4 (INM-IMR)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal nonmarketing manager–internal marketing researcher</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>46.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The eligible sample increased over the original sample because of reallocation of dyad 1 and dyad 2 members to dyad 3.
practitioners and asking them to assign each item to the construct they thought represented it best, as well as to note when they thought the item could be represented by more than one construct. That test assisted in measure refinement by indicating initial discriminant and convergent validity among the items (Churchill 1979).

The second pretest sought to determine whether trust could be discriminated adequately from related interpersonal variables and relationship processes in the model. A sample of 50 potential respondents was selected randomly from the study population and mailed a short survey asking them to evaluate their most recent relationship with either an internal or external researcher. Twenty-seven, or 54%, responded. Responses were analyzed for discriminant validity with related constructs by an exploratory factor analysis (principal components analysis with oblique rotation). Results indicated that trust could be differentiated from related constructs such as researcher sincerity, dependability, and congeniality and similar relationship processes such as quality of interaction and commitment to the relationship. The measure of trust was also found to be reliable.

**Measure Purification**

After the data collection, the proposed measures were purified by assessing the item-to-total correlations for items in each proposed scale and deleting items with low correlations when they were determined not to tap an additional theoretical domain of interest. The remaining items were then factor analyzed by using a principal components analysis with varimax rotation. All items load strongly on only a single factor. Table 2 shows that the constructs are, in general, internally reliable and have acceptable intercorrelations. Research utilization was the only variable not to exceed conventional reliability levels. However, the noted reliability was accepted, given that the measures had been validated in previous research (see Deshpande and Zaltman 1982, 1984) and the current study includes both research users and providers, as well as marketers and nonmarketers, which may have diluted alpha. Finally, the alpha is not inconsistent with published results of other research in this area.

Finally, we examined the variables believed to moderate the main-effect relationships, community similarities and intra- versus interorganizational relationships. To classify the dyads into similar or different communities, we coded a respondent's title as either marketing manager, marketing researcher, or nonmarketing manager. In addition, the directions at the beginning of the questionnaire asked the respondent to focus on his or her most recently completed research project with an external or internal researcher.

**RESULTS**

We tested the hypotheses by using four regression models in which all main and interaction effects were entered simultaneously as predictors of the four dependent variables (research utilization, commitment, involvement, and interaction). To test these models, main effects of the individual and organization moderators were constructed. Given the categorical nature of these characteristics, unweighted effects coding (−1, +1) was utilized. Using this approach allows the coefficients associated with the main effects of trust, involvement, interaction, and commitment to be interpreted as the average of the slope for the entire sample (as opposed to the slope of the 0 condition in a dummy coding approach) (Cohen and Cohen 1983). Following H3, RES-DYAD consists of researcher-manager relationships (i.e., IMM-IMR, IMM-EMR, and INM-IMR dyads, coded −1)
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**Table 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. User trust in researcher (TRUST)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Perceived quality of interaction (INTERACT)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Researcher involvement (INVOLVE)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Commitment to relationship (COMMIT)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Market research utilization (MRUSE)*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

--All correlations are significant at the p < .001 level. 
--These measures were assessed on 5-point scales, whereas the others were assessed on 7-point scales.
and researcher-researcher relationships (i.e., IMR-EMR dyads, coded +1). The moderator, MKTDYAD, consists of nonmarketer–marketer relationships (i.e., INM-IMR dyads, coded −1) and marketer-marketer relationships (i.e., IMM-IMR, IMM-EMR, and IMR-EMR dyads, coded +1) in H₆. Following H₆, the variable ORGDYAD consists of interorganizational relationships (i.e., IMM-EMR and IMR-EMR dyads, coded −1) and intraorganizational relationships (i.e., IMM-IMR and INM-IMR dyads, coded +1). Based on our hypotheses, this coding scheme suggests that the coefficients for all of the moderators should be positive.

Prior to testing the regression models, we tested for the possible presence of multicollinearity, which inflates the standard errors of the parameter estimates. We followed Mason and Perreault (1991), who recommend assessing multicollinearity by regressing each predictor variable on the other predictor variables to detect linear relationships among the variables. Because none of the R²’s for the relationships among the predictor variables exceeded the R² of the overall model, we did not consider collinearity a problem.

The results of the regression analyses were used as an input to a path analysis—an analytic method that involves the decomposition of linear relationships among a set of variables hypothesized to be causally related and involving direct and indirect relationships.

Main Effect Relationships Among Trust, Relationship Processes, and Research Use

Table 3 gives the standardized regression coefficients for the four regression equations. As suggested there, a user’s trust in his or her researcher significantly affects the quality of interactions (β = .64, p < .05), researcher involvement in the research process (β = .21, p < .05), and user commitment to the research relationship (β = .16, p < .05). Trust in the researcher does not, however, have a significant direct effect on the utilization of market research (see Table 3). These findings support H₄a−c, but fail to support H₄c.

H₅ holds that the greater the researcher involvement in the research process, the greater the perceived quality of a user’s interactions with the researcher. Results support this hypothesis (β = .18, p < .05). Furthermore, H₆ suggests that perceived quality of interaction and researcher involvement increase a user’s level of commitment to the researcher. That prediction is only partially supported as perceived quality of interaction (β = .40, p < .05) significantly increases commitment, but researcher involvement fails to do so.

The direct effects of each relationship process on research utilization are only partially supported, as perceived quality of interactions (β = .33, p < .05) increases research utilization, but researcher involvement and user commitment have no direct effects on research utilization. These results support H₄a, but not H₄b,c.

Table 4 summarizes the direct, indirect, and total effects of trust and the relationship processes on research utilization. The indirect effects are calculated as a simple multiplicative sum of the magnitude of sequential beta weights, a procedure commonly used in causal modeling and path analysis (Asher 1976; Blalock 1964; Duncan 1966; Simon 1957). For example, to determine the indirect effect of quality of interaction (via commitment)

---

**Table 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>Utilization of market research</th>
<th>Commitment to relationship</th>
<th>Quality of interaction</th>
<th>Involvement in research activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RESDYAD</td>
<td>.69*</td>
<td>−.13</td>
<td>.60*</td>
<td>−.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MKTDYAD</td>
<td>−.14</td>
<td>−.34</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>−.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORGDYAD</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.48*</td>
<td>.49*</td>
<td>.44**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRUST</td>
<td>−.02</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.64*</td>
<td>.21*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRUST × RESDYAD</td>
<td>−.26</td>
<td>.54*</td>
<td>−.11</td>
<td>−.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRUST × MKTDYAD</td>
<td>−.09</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.34*</td>
<td>−.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRUST × ORGDYAD</td>
<td>−.14</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>−.21</td>
<td>−.40**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INVOLVE</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INVOLVE × RESDYAD</td>
<td>−.13</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>−.43*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INVOLVE × MKTDYAD</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>−.04</td>
<td>−.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INVOLVE × ORGDYAD</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>−.06</td>
<td>−.32**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTER</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>.40*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTER × RESDYAD</td>
<td>−.39</td>
<td>−.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTER × MKTDYAD</td>
<td>−.57</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTER × ORGDYAD</td>
<td>−.76**</td>
<td>−.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMIT</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMIT × RESDYAD</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMIT × MKTDYAD</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMIT × ORGDYAD</td>
<td>.54*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total R²</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*RESDYAD = +1 for researcher-researcher dyads, −1 for researcher-manager dyads. MKTDYAD = +1 for marketer-marketer dyads, −1 for marketer-nonmarketer dyads. ORGDYAD = +1 for interorganizational dyads, −1 for intraorganizational dyads.

*p < .05.

**p < .10.
Table 4
DIRECT, INDIRECT, AND TOTAL EFFECTS OF INDEPENDENT VARIABLES ON THE UTILIZATION OF MARKET RESEARCH INFORMATION (MRUSE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>Direct effects</th>
<th>Indirect effects</th>
<th>Total effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TRUST</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTER</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INVOLVE</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMIT</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

on research utilization, .40 and −.005 are multiplied to equal −.002. The total effect then is assessed by multiplying the magnitude of the indirect effects to the direct effects. Examining the total effects, we see that perceived quality of interaction is the most important predictor of research utilization, followed by user trust in the researcher, researcher involvement, and the user’s commitment to the research relationship.

Effects of Individual and Organizational Moderators on H1–H4

Beginning with differences between relationships in which both parties are researchers and relationships in which one party is a researcher and another a manager, we find a main effect for RESDYAD on research utilization (β = .69, p < .05) and quality of interaction (β = .60, p < .05), suggesting that researcher-researcher dyads increase those processes over researcher-manager dyads. In addition, we find two significant interactions on research use involving RESDYAD: trust × RESDYAD on commitment (β = .54, p < .05) and involvement × RESDYAD on quality of interaction (β = −.43, p < .05). The mixed signs associated with these interactions together with the lack of support for other differences due to a common research orientation suggest a lack of support for H3. Therefore, despite the significant main effects a common research orientation has on key relationship processes, it appears to have little or no effect on the strength with which trust and the relationship processes influence one another and research utilization outcomes.

Regarding the differences between relationships in which both parties are marketers and relationships in which one party is a marketer and the other a nonmarketer, we find that MKTDYAD has a significant main effect on quality of interaction (β = .39, p < .10), suggesting that interaction has a higher quality in marketer-marketer relationships than in marketer-nonmarketer relationships. There are also two interactions involving the effect of commitment × MKTDYAD (β = .47, p < .10) on research use and the effect of trust × MKTDYAD (β = .34, p < .05) on quality of interaction. These results also indicate that the relationship between commitment and research use is stronger in marketer-marketer dyads than in marketer-nonmarketer dyads, providing some support for H6.

Turning to the differences between intra- and interorganizational dyads, we find that the main effect ORG DyAD is a significant predictor of commitment (β = .48, p < .05), interaction (β = .49, p < .05), and involvement (β = .44, p < .10), suggesting that these processes are facilitated in intraorganizational dyads as opposed to interorganizational dyads. Turning to the interactions, commitment × ORG DyAD is a significant predictor of research utilization (β = .54, p < .05), indicating that the relationship between commitment and research use is stronger in intraorganizational dyads. On the other hand, quality of interaction × ORG DyAD is a significant predictor of research use (β = −.76, p < .10), involvement × ORG DyAD is a significant predictor of quality of interaction (β = −.32, p < .10), and trust × ORG DyAD is a significant predictor of involvement (β = −.40, p < .10), indicating that these relationships are stronger in interorganizational dyads. Together, the two results suggest that interorganizational relationships encourage certain types of relationship exchanges (i.e., trust, interaction, and involvement), but that other exchanges (involving more risk perhaps, like commitment), are fostered in intraorganizational settings. These results provide some support for H3.

DISCUSSION

Let us recall briefly the basic question driving our study: What effect, if any, does a user’s trust in researchers have on his or her utilization of market research? We believe our results show that trust and a host of relationship processes do affect the use of market research. As anticipated, trust was a critical variable in our proposed model. Our findings provide empirical support for what previous research had suggested more anecdotally and offer one view of the way in which trust influences such activities as relationship processes and research utilization.

What is interesting, however, is that trust did not have the strongest direct effect on research utilization. Instead, trust’s effects were achieved primarily through critical indirect effects on quality of interaction and researcher involvement levels, suggesting that trust facilitates these relationship processes, which in turn encourage research utilization. Hence, trust’s indirect effects support the view of it acting as a determinant of relationship processes (see also Anderson and Weitz 1990; Anderson and Narus 1990).

Among the relationship processes, the key variable in the model is the quality of user-researcher interactions (as perceived by the user). Quality of interaction was strongly and significantly affected by user trust and research involvement. The importance of quality interaction may be due to the fact that user trust and deeper levels of researcher involvement make it more likely that users will share strategic insights and discuss more fully various aspects of the problem being researched. Those exchanges could lead to researchers’ gaining more information and better direction, resulting in the produc-
tion of research perceived to be more relevant and hence more useful to decision making. The importance of this finding lies in the fact that users often do not share with researchers important background information that could affect how the research is conducted and therefore its consequent value (Barabba and Zaltman 1991). Such a practice, our study indicates, affects research utilization in negative ways. Perceived quality of interactions is also important because it accounts for higher levels of variation in research use than does trust itself, suggesting that quality of interaction mediates trust’s effects on research use.

Despite the risk and vulnerability associated with involving the researcher more deeply in the research process, deeper levels of involvement have few measurable effects on the processes and outcomes of research relationships. Deeper levels of involvement do appear to contribute to the productivity of user-researcher interaction which, in turn, contributes to research utilization. However, involvement does not directly contribute to users’ commitment or their utilization of research information. These findings run counter to our theory that involvement would enhance commitment and research use by upgrading the quality of information products and by placing users in a position of using information so as to remain consistent with their investment in the researcher. Commitment was expected to affect research use for similar reasons, but did not. Both results were unexpected and warrant further attention.

As a way of exploring the limited effect of involvement and commitment on research use, we suggest that one way to view involvement and commitment is as involving deeper levels of exchange between parties and higher levels of risk than do trust and interaction. Therefore, perhaps higher levels of involvement and commitment occur only after the parties have been in the relationship for a while and have acquired experience in dealing with one another. This high level of experience, in turn, may cause users to feel that researchers have lost their ability to be objective, which detracts from their effectiveness as researchers (Peterson and Kerin 1980). Relatedly, if deeper user commitment and more researcher involvement do signify greater experience between the parties, these relationship processes may inhibit or have no effect on research utilization because they increase users’ perceptions that researchers have become stale or too similar to them in their thinking and therefore have less value to add. Other research has also suggested that the rate of information diffusion is greatest when the adopter (in this case, the user) and the change agent (the provider) are somewhat different from one another (Rogers 1983). Hence, commitment and involvement bring about a familiarity that may breed boredom and a desire for new ideas.

Another explanation is that higher levels of commitment and involvement reduce or have little effect on research utilization because such exchanges cause users to have higher expectations for performance, which in turn increase the likelihood of their dissatisfaction with researchers’ services. Finally, increased involvement and commitment may decrease research utilization because such high levels of risk and vulnerability create opportunities for distrust or opportunistic behavior to occur. For example, commitment to the research relationship may reduce researchers’ incentive to perform and encourage what Austin (1991) refers to as a lack of consistency in researcher behavior over the life of the relationship. As he notes, “[u]sers do not want suppliers to allow studies conducted in the past to reduce the level of thought put into designing a later study or to unduly influence the nature and level of analysis performed in a current study” (p. 6). Likewise, allowing researchers to make strategy recommendations (the deepest form of involvement) may encourage researchers to draw on their experience in working with other firms or to compromise objectivity in data collection for confirmation of a preferred strategy choice. In each of these cases, opportunistic behavior follows from deeper exchanges, a situation Granovetter (1985) describes as an “enhanced opportunity for malfeasance.” As he observes, “... a person’s trust in you results in a position far more vulnerable than that of a stranger” (p. 491). Therefore, a researcher’s ability to manage deepening involvement and commitment levels to ensure research utilization may entail remaining objective, keeping the relationship vital, managing users’ expectations, and ensuring that researcher opportunism does not follow from users’ high risk behaviors.

Another perspective on these findings is that users do not value, and in fact devalue, high levels of involvement and commitment to researchers. Perhaps, for example, commitment and involvement are not as important in knowledge-based exchanges (wherein researchers perform a service function) as is a sense of trust and high-quality interactions. This may, in part, be due to the fact that users typically undervalue research and sometimes hold researchers in low regard (see Zaltman and Moorman 1988, 1989). Lack of commitment and involvement may also arise from dealing with internal researchers who act primarily as intermediaries between users and external researchers, a “broker” role often perceived as being easily filled by other actors.

Examining the relationships in the model across different kinds of dyads was less productive than we had hoped. However, several insights did emerge that warrant further attention. We expected that the relationships would be stronger for researcher-researcher dyads than for manager-researcher dyads. In general, the relationships exhibit very few differences across the two types of dyads. However, RESDYAD is a significant predictor of research utilization and commitment, indicating that the extent to which a research orientation is shared may influence research relationships more as a main effect as opposed to a moderating effect.

---

1 We are indebted to one of our reviewers for this explanation.
Like research orientation, the extent to which a marketing orientation is shared between members of a dyad affects research relationships very little. However, in some of the relationships where we find significant interactions, several interesting insights can be gleaned from plotting the regression lines under the two conditions of the moderating variable. For example, plotting the effect of commitment on research utilization shows that the intercept is equal under marketer-marketer and marketer-nonmarketer dyads at low levels of commitment. However, as commitment increases, its effect on research use is positive and significant for marketer-marketer dyads, but negative and insignificant for marketer-nonmarketer dyads. These findings indicate that a shared marketing orientation facilitates the effect of commitment on research use only at high commitment levels. Users in dissimilar dyads, however, appear to use more research when they are uncommitted to providers, which suggests that less information will be used as the relationship develops and deepens. These results begin to provide insight into how complex behavioral phenomena influence research utilization.

Two possible explanations for the lack of other differences due to shared research and marketing orientations include the potential success of interdepartmental and intradepartmental mechanisms that structure interactions among managers from different functional areas. Moreover, perhaps marketing researchers and nonmarketers (in this case, engineers and product development managers) share certain technical skills and values that facilitate the effects of trust and various relationship processes on research use. Furthermore, lack of other differences may be the result of a wider appreciation of research and marketing principles in organizations. In other words, communities may not be as distinct as in the past. Finally, lack of other differences may be due to the fact that research and marketing orientations were inferred from respondents’ job titles. Clearly, research and marketing orientations go beyond title to the set of values and beliefs that represent community membership. To the extent that distinct communities are represented here, future research exploring differences should measure these values and beliefs directly.

Finally, we suggested that the hypothesized relationships would be stronger in an interorganizational context than in an interorganizational context, but our findings generally indicate otherwise. One explanation arises when we consider the very nature of trust. Recall that for trust to be established, one party must be vulnerable to another party. However, in some internal research relationships, users exert such a high level of control over their researchers that vulnerability is not likely to occur; hence, trust may not be necessary. If, for example, research budgeting practices make internal researchers dependent on only a few users, the issue of trust may be less salient for users. External researchers, however, are typically less dependent than internal researchers on any one client’s support. That independence increases a user’s vulnerability, a condition that appears to facilitate trust in the relationship.

A second explanation might evolve from the fact that external market research firms generally are used when their skills and expertise are unavailable within the organization. Such deficiency may cause trust to become more important in interorganizational settings because users generally do not have the expertise to evaluate researchers’ services, nor do they have an internal researcher available within the firm on whom to rely to do so. In fact, dissonance theory predicts that trust should have stronger effects when users are unable to evaluate research on some important dimensions. This dissonance, in certain respects, is compensated for by trusting the researcher.

Examining the interaction involving the effect of ORGDYAD on the commitment-research use relationship by plotting the regression lines under the two conditions of the moderating variable reveals an interesting effect. When commitment is low, its effect on research use is stronger in interorganizational dyads than in intraorganizational dyads. However, as commitment increases, its effect on research use is stronger in interorganizational dyads, as it was for the similar marketer-marketer dyad. However, at moderate levels of commitment, there is no difference in the effect of commitment on research use across dyad types. This type of interaction is the likely cause of the weak main effect of commitment on research use as described previously.

To summarize our findings about the moderating influences, we offer three general conclusions. First, despite the generally weak nature of the individual or organizational moderators, our findings indicate that they appear to influence certain types of exchanges more than others. For example, the moderators appear to have stronger effects on relationships involving quality of interaction and research utilization as dependent variables rather than commitment and level of involvement as independent variables. Future research should develop theory to account for these differential effects. Second, our results about interaction effects indicate the importance of plotting the main-effect relationships under different conditions of the moderating variables. This exercise led us to very different conclusions about our results, especially the results involving the effect of commitment on research use. In particular, our results indicate that subtle differences in the level of the predictor can have important implications for the moderator’s effects on the relationship. These interactions also offered additional guidance in explaining the lack of certain main-effect relationships. Finally, though we theorized that the risk in various moderating conditions would weaken the model relationships, risk appears to weaken certain relationships (marketer-nonmarketer) while strengthening others (interorganizational). Given this, empirically assessing users’ perceptions of risk, and the costs and benefits associated with research relationships (see Coleman 1990), may provide additional insight into how risk influences relationships.
Our findings suggest several other important directions for future research. One recommendation is to assess the generalizability of our results by testing similar relationships in other marketing contexts and in other instances involving the use of organizational intelligence (e.g., competitive intelligence, engineering information, management consultants’ reports, and legal briefs). Much of what we have learned about the role of trust between users and researchers may apply to situations involving other forms of organizational knowledge or intelligence as well. There may, however, be important differences in how relationship processes affect information utilization, depending on the riskiness or importance of information exchange (e.g., competitive intelligence). Future research should examine similarities and differences in this model across various types of organizational intelligence.

Some limitations of our study also serve as sources of future research directions. For example, similar to many other operationalizations, our measures of trust may be construed as assessing individual personality characteristics, such as a willingness to trust, in general rather than a respondent’s willingness to trust a particular researcher. Likewise, to ensure that we were capturing an uncertain context, our measures were very specific (e.g., asking respondents to rate their willingness to trust when they or their department cannot be reached or cannot perform the activity). Pretesting and exploratory interviews suggested the importance of using concrete situations to tap an uncertain context in which vulnerability may be present. These situations, though permitting a more exact linkage with our conceptualization, may also have been affected by circumstances within the organization, such as the level of centralization or formalization. Future research in this area will involve similar tradeoffs. However, one way to obviate the problem may be to collect individual-difference measures of “willingness to trust” or to ensure a degree of comparability or randomness in the organizations in which trust is assessed.

Further, despite the demonstrated importance of trust, some research has suggested that other factors—namely, economic factors, social norms, and power—explain more effectively how relationships operate. Granovetter (1985), for example, argues that trust can be distinguished from opportunistic behaviors that maximize individual economic gains (an undersocialized view) and behaviors that maximize coherence to social norms (an oversocialized view) (see also Etzioni 1988 for that distinction). Future research should examine how trust works in a more complicated nexus of variables such as those mentioned. For example, the cost of the external researcher is one omitted economic variable that may influence the relationships in our model.

At a more micro level, we did not collect information about the specific nature of the research relationship and the research products. For example, was the relationship one between an advertising agency and a marketing manager? A marketing research firm and a brand manager? Was the research product evaluative? Developmental? Given that relationships function differently depending on these factors (Zaltman and Moorman 1989), more systematic information on these variables should be collected in future studies.

Future research could also expand upon perceived quality of interactions. We have gone beyond previous work by showing that it is the quality, not merely the level, of interaction that is critical to research utilization. Moreover, quality was operationalized in terms of the user’s perspective, namely productive disagreements, novel insights, a customer orientation, and interaction grounded in a sound understanding of the user’s business. However, it is not clear even from those measures how user-researcher interactions actually operate. Future research would benefit from observing actual interactions to develop a more concrete and realistic sense of the construct. Relatedly, another outcome, the degree to which users feel a need to or actually do monitor the researchers’ activities, may warrant further consideration. Perhaps less monitoring would be an important outcome of trust in relationships.

Finally, our study is concerned with users’ trust in their researchers, but researchers’ trust in users may also be important to the productivity and longevity of the relationship. If trust does not ultimately flow in two directions, it is likely to disappear. Future research, then, could examine whether and to what extent researchers’ trust in users affects research utilization.

---

### APPENDIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>User trust in researcher</strong></td>
<td>New scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) strongly disagree (4) neither agree nor disagree (7) strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. If I or someone from my department could not be reached by our researcher, I would be willing to let my researcher make important research decisions without my involvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. If I or someone from my department were unable to monitor my researcher’s activities, I would be willing to trust my researcher to get the job done right</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. I trust my researcher to do things I can’t do myself</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. I trust my researcher to do things my department can’t do itself</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. I generally do not trust my researcher*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX—(Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived quality of interaction</td>
<td>New scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) strongly disagree (4) neither agree nor disagree (7) strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Disagreements between my researcher and me tend to be handled productively</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. My meetings with my researcher produce novel insights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. My researcher displays a sound strategic understanding of my business in his/her interactions with me</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. My researcher is very customer-oriented in his/her interactions with us</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. My interactions with my researcher are productive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher involvement</td>
<td>New scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) very unimportant (4) neither important nor unimportant (7) very important</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For this project, how important was the involvement of your internal researcher in each of the following five activities?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Problem definition</td>
<td>d. Development of recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Research design</td>
<td>e. Implementation of recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Data analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to relationship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) strongly disagree (4) neither agree nor disagree (7) strongly agree</td>
<td>New scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. I am committed to my relationship with my researcher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. I consider my researcher to be a part of my department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. I really care about the fate of my working relationship with my researcher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research utilization</td>
<td>Adapted from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) strongly disagree (3) neither agree nor disagree (5) strongly agree</td>
<td>Deshpande and Zaltman (1982)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Without this research information, the decisions made would have been very different</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. No decision would have been made without this research information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. The majority of the research information from this project was not used</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. In your opinion, what proportion of this particular study need not have been done (for whatever reasons): ____%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) less than average (3) average (5) greater than average</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Compared to past research projects, the number of people who will use or have used this research is:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Reverse coded.
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