

Linkage of Social Exchange Theory and Hospitality Industry

Siti Aishah Binti Edros*

Postgraduate Student, Universiti Teknologi Mara, ShahAlam, Selangor Malaysia.

ABSTRACT

Hospitality industry are one of the most influential among other industry in Malaysia. Based on the gross output value gained in 2017 RM15.8 billion based on the 2018 references year. (Department of Statistic Malaysia,2019) it's shown the huge amount that contributed to the nation. Therefore, the objective of this paper is to review the linkage of the Social Exchange Theory contribute to the hospitality industry. The novel of this review paper is given a contribute of the SET and how it helps to maintain the social, economics and organization exchange in perspective of both parties (employee and employer) or vice versa.

INTRODUCTION

In order to make the world become changes, its start from our behaviour. Social exchange theory (SET) is among the most influential conceptual models for understanding not only workplace behaviour but also as individually. Even though different views of social exchange have arisen, theorists and researcher agree that social exchange involves a series of interactions that generate obligations [11]. Within SET, these interactions are usually seen as interdependent and dependent on the engagements of another person [3]. SET also highlights that these interdependent transactions have the potential to generate high-quality relationships, even though as we the situation are happens in certain circumstances. SET being discussed for theoretical uncertainties and empirical needs [4], whereas others figure out lamented frequent misunderstandings of the general SET model [6]. For the best author knowledge, nearly a half a century ago, this is clearly presented a concept of social behaviour that was based on exchange [16]. Essentially, researcher introduced the concept or idea that exchanges are not limited to material goods but also include symbolic value (e.g., approval and prestige). This is critically agreed that exchange may happened in goods and services in order to help the industry and world. As mentioned above, the objective or mission of this paper about the linkage of SET and Hospitality industry that have vital or critical significant for all the researcher and industry player.

PROBLEM STATEMENT

This paper as mentioned earlier to review the relationship or linkage of social exchange theory and hospitality industry. This matter happens as mentions in the few articles which wrote by Cropanzano.R et all (2017) in their article "Social Exchange Theory: A Critical Review with Theoretical Remedies". They mentioned that its lack of article that discuss about the SET and importance of the theory toward the work behaviour in the service industry that reflect the hospitality industry as one of the services industries as mentioned by Department of Statistic Malaysia, 2018 in their series article published on April, 2019. Besides that, this issues also been raised by Emily Ma, 2019, in her article regarding to the issues which the importance of service

*Corresponding Author: aisyah.edros@yahoo.com

quality and employee motivation are expanding of the social exchange theory that lack of attention by the researcher. [13]

FOUNDATION OF SOCIAL EXCHANGE THEORY

SET is the theory has been one of the major theoretical perspectives in the field of social psychology, and it's found by the pioneer scholar of exchange theory which is Homans (1961), Blau (1964) and Emerson (1962, 1972).[9]. They reviewed that this orientation of theoretical SET is based on earlier philosophical and psychological orientations developing from utilitarianism on the one hand and behaviourism on the other. The rests of both of these theoretical foundations remain useful in the versions of exchange theory that are current today. Based on the article by Nunkoo.R,2016, the author make summary that the authors that have been studies about the evolution of SET. Nunkoo mentioned that SET has been popular in the sociology and social psychology literature and is considered to be one of the oldest theories of social behaviour (Homans, 1958). Emerson (1981) notes that social exchange involves two persons, each of whom provides some benefits to the other, and contingent upon rewards from the other.[22] It's shown that this theory is remain useful to the workplace currently. SET may well have the huge potential to provide a several frameworks for much of organizational behaviour. Yet, even if this potential exists, it is unlikely to manifest itself given the current conceptual difficulties. Our review will return to the foundational ideas of SET's explanatory power:

- (a) Rules and norms of exchange,
- (b) Resources exchanged,
- (c) Relationships that emerge.

In this paper we will focusing more to rules and norms of exchange because that foundation is the first guide/foundation that must be fulfil by the industry. [7].

Rules and Norms Exchange

One of the fundamentals beliefs of SET is that relationships keep progressing over time into trusting that relate to superior/management, loyal, and mutual commitments. In order to make it clear, parties must tolerate by certain "rules" of exchange. Rules of exchange form a "normative" definition of the situation that forms among or is adopted by the participants in an exchange relation" [11]. The researcher added that, in this way, rules and norms of exchange are "the guidelines" of exchange processes. Thus, the use of SET in models of organizational behaviour is framed on the basis of the exchange rule or principle the researcher relies on.

Most of management research focuses on expectations of reciprocity (repayment); however, a number of other exchange rules have been outlined in SET. Thus, the majority of this section will outline principles of reciprocity, but we also introduce negotiated rules and lesser researched rules of exchange. This study is focusing more to this foundation because this is the first guide or foundation that must follow to fulfil the SET concept.

Definition of reciprocity or repayment is probably the best-known exchange rule. Repayment provided a multi-disciplinary review of what was then known of SET [15]. It's being review to makes clear that there is some ambiguity in the way in which reciprocity can be defined. The primary contribution of review by Gouldner was outlining the nature of reciprocity within exchange and distinguishing three different types of reciprocity: (a) reciprocity as a transactional pattern of interdependent exchanges, (b) reciprocity as a folk belief, and (c) reciprocity as a moral norm [15].

Even though there are type of reciprocity, if a person supplies a benefit, the receiving party should respond in kind [14]. That is the real concept of reciprocity. That is the roots of this theory that must be applicable in all industry. If the manager treats the employee wisely in return, the employee will repay all the kindness to the organization.

STUDIES EXAMINING INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES IN RECIPROCITY

| Author(s) | Exchange Orientation | Independent Variable(s) Examined ^a | Dependent Variable(s) Examined |
|---|---|---|--|
| Andrews, Witt, and Kacmar (2003) | Exchange ideology (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, & Sowa, 1986) | Organizational politics Exchange ideology (M) | Manager-rated retention |
| Cotterell, Eisenberger, and Speicher (1992) | Reciprocation wariness (Eisenberger, Cotterell, & Marvel, 1987) Creditor ideology (Eisenberger et al., 1987) | Helpfulness Approachability Social goal orientation Machiavellianism Reciprocation wariness (M) Creditor ideology (M) | Cooperativeness Expectations of future interaction |
| Coyle-Shapiro (2002) | Reciprocity norm acceptance (Eisenberger et al., 1987) | Perceptions of employer inducements Perceptions of employer obligations Acceptance of norm of reciprocity (M) Procedural justice (M) Interactional justice (M) Trust in the employer (M) | Organizational citizenship behavior |
| Coyle-Shapiro and Neuman (2004) | Exchange ideology (Eisenberger et al., 1986) Creditor ideology (Eisenberger et al., 1987) | Perceptions of employer obligations Perceptions of employer fulfillment of obligations Exchange ideology (M) Creditor ideology (M) | Employee obligations to employer Employee fulfillment of obligations to employer |
| de Ruyter and Wetzels (2000) | Relational exchange orientation | Resource dependence Procedural justice Communication difficulties Interfunctional rivalry Interfunctional distance | Relational exchange orientation |
| Eisenberger, Armeli, Rexwinkel, Lynch, and Rhoades (2001) | Exchange ideology (adapted version from Eisenberger et al., 1986) | Perceived organizational support Felt obligation (I) Exchange ideology (M) Positive mood (I) | Affective commitment Organizational spontaneity In-role performance Withdrawal behavior |

| | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| Eisenberger et al. (1986) | Exchange ideology | Perceived organizational support Exchange ideology (M) | Absenteeism |
| Eisenberger et al. (1987) | Reciprocation ideology – Reciprocity norm acceptance – Creditor ideology – Reciprocation wariness | Bargaining resources Reciprocation ideology (M) | Resources exchanged |
| Eisenberger, Lynch, Aselage, and Rohdeck (2004) | Positive norm of reciprocity Negative norm of reciprocity | Need for dominance Impulsivity Dispositional anger Expectational trust Favorable/unfavorable treatment Positive norm of reciprocity Negative norm of reciprocity (M) | Experienced anger Ridicule Experienced anxiety Encouragement Positive emotional engagement |
| Gallucci and Perugini (2003) | Personal norm of reciprocity – Positive reciprocity – Negative reciprocity – Beliefs in reciprocity | Personal norm of reciprocity – Positive reciprocity – Negative reciprocity – Beliefs in reciprocity (M) | Information regarding future interaction Selfish behavior |
| Ladd and Henry (2000) | Exchange ideology (Eisenberger et al., 1986) | Perceived coworker support Perceived organizational support Exchange ideology (M) Conscientiousness Empathy | Coworker-directed citizenship Organizational citizenship |
| Lynch, Eisenberger, and Armeli (1999) Orpen (1994) | Reciprocation wariness (Eisenberger et al., 1987) Exchange ideology | Reciprocation wariness Perceived organizational support (M) Perceived organizational support Exchange ideology (M) | In-role performance Extra-role performance Employee effort Job performance |
| Perugini and Gallucci (2001) | Personal norm of reciprocity – Positive reciprocity – Negative reciprocity – Beliefs in reciprocity | Personal norm of reciprocity Cooperation Hostility Social value orientation | Prosociality of behavior (negative, neutral, positive) Payoffs |

| Author(s) | Exchange Orientation | Independent Variable(s) Examined ^a | Dependent Variable(s) Examined |
|---|--|---|---|
| Perugini, Gallucci, Presaghi, and Ercolani (2003) | Personal norm of reciprocity – Positive reciprocity – Negative reciprocity – Beliefs in reciprocity | Personal norm of reciprocity Creditor ideology Reciprocation wariness Reciprocity-norm acceptance Empathy/attachment Forgiveness/nonretaliation Fairness/nonexploitation Extraversion Agreeableness Conscientiousness Emotional stability Autonomy Social value orientation | Valence of other's past behavior Reward versus punishment reaction |
| Sinclair and Tetrick (1995) | Exchange ideology (Eisenberger et al., 1986) | Union instrumentality Union support perceptions Exchange ideology (M) | Union commitment – Union loyalty – Responsibility to the union – Willingness to work for the union – Belief in unionism |
| Wit (1991a) | Exchange ideology (Eisenberger et al., 1986) | Perceptions of equal opportunity Exchange ideology (M) | Job satisfaction Procedural justice |
| Wit (1991b) | Exchange ideology (Eisenberger et al., 1986) | Job satisfaction Perceived organizational support Organizational commitment Exchange ideology (M) | Organizational citizenship behavior |
| Wit (1992) | Exchange ideology (Eisenberger et al., 1986) | Participation in decision making Exchange ideology (M) | Job satisfaction Perceived organizational support |
| Wit and Broach (1993) | Exchange ideology (Eisenberger et al., 1986) | Procedural justice Exchange ideology (M) | Satisfaction with training experience |
| Wit, Kacmar, and Andrews (2001) | Exchange ideology (Eisenberger et al., 1986) | Procedural justice Exchange ideology (M) | Manager-rated commitment |
| Wit and Wilson (1990) | Exchange ideology (Eisenberger et al., 1986) | Perceptions of income sufficiency Exchange ideology (M) | Job satisfaction Organizational commitment |

Figure 1. Studies Examining Individual Differences in Reciprocity (Adopted: Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005 - Journal of Management, Vol. 31 No. 6, December 2005 874-900 -DOI: 10.1177/014920630527960.

From the author view, the Figure 1 above is clearly showed that SET implication is huge and really related to the service industry. From the studies that have been made by the researcher according to the theory, it can be sum up that SET are the social enhancement towards all the employee and vice versa to the organization. The studies are relying into commitment, job satisfaction, organizational citizenship behaviour, and justice. In the world of hospitality that elements are must be fulfilled in order to increase the satisfaction and decrease turnover rate. More over, from a social exchange perspective the word 'resources' is used very broadly and includes both materialistic and non-materialistic aspects unlike in economic exchanges where the focus is on 'wealth' as a resource for the partners.

RELATIONSHIP WITH HOSPITALITY INDUSTRY



Figure 2. Sustainable Development Goals (2015) – Sources from Department of Statistics Malaysia, 2018.

Based on the Figure 2 above, shown the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) which is designed by the United Nations Development Programme in 2015 to end poverty, protect the planet and ensure prosperity for all. There are 17 goals to make our world better and obviously by implementing SET, SDG will be achieving because lots of exchange can be develop with SET such as organizational exchange, social exchange and economic exchange. This is supported by lots of researcher. Obviously, by applied SET in the hospitality industry goal no 8 can be increase and achieving in future. This is supported by researcher Byrd et all. Although many theories have been put forward to explain residents' perceptions of hospitality, the most widely utilized one has been the Social Exchange Theory [5]

In line with the SDG, In Malaysia perspective regarding hospitality industry, data from Department of Statistic Malaysia presents statistics on accommodation services which obtained from the Annual Economic Survey 2018 for reference year 2017 shown that accommodation services recorded gross output value of RM15.8 billion in 2017 as compared to RM13.9 billion in 2015 with the annual growth rate value of 6.7 per cent. Hotel in Malaysia are growth like mushroom, wrote by Ng (2018), in the article title "Hotel mushrooming in Malaysia" the number of hotels in the country have gradually risen over the past 10 years till 2017. Based on the Malaysia statistic services industry that including the accommodation and food and beverages (hospitality) the fourth quarter of 2018 the revenue of these industry are RM 342.76 billion. From the research made by the author, finds that there are lots of hotel newly open in 2018 and 2019 in Malaysia as followed:

| | |
|---|--|
| Four Seasons Hotel Kuala Lumpur (209 rooms) | Ibis Kuala Lumpur (684 rooms) |
| Banyan Tree Signature Kuala Lumpur (100 rooms) | Hyatt House Kuala Lumpur (298 apartments/suites) |
| W Hotel Kuala Lumpur (150 rooms) | Riverside Majestic Astana Wing (272 rooms) |
| Pavillion Hotel by Banyan Tree (337 rooms) | Movenpick Hotel & Convention Centre (333 rooms) |
| Alila Kuala Lumpur (126 rooms) | The RuMa (253 rooms) |
| Hatten Place Melaka (270 rooms) | Marriott Waterfront Kota Kinabalu (355 rooms) |
| Doubletree by Hilton Melaka (273 rooms) | Aloft Langkawi (208 rooms) |

The following properties are target to open or have opened, in 2019:

EQ Kuala Lumpur (440 rooms, opened)
 CitizenM Kuala Lumpur (210 rooms, opened)
 TH Hotel & Convention Centre Kuching (237 rooms)
 Courtyard by Marriott Penang (200 rooms)
 Westin Desaru Coast (275 rooms, opened)
 Hard Rock Hotel Desaru Coast (365 rooms, opened)

Figure 3. Adopted from: 2019 Malaysia Hotel Industry Survey of Operations by Horwath HTL.

It's shown that hospitality industry is the importance industry that contributed to the economics of Malaysia [18]. SET help the industry with three elements below.

Organizational Exchange

All exchanges are done on some main points [12]. The exchange resources introduce six kinds of exchange resources: Love, situation, information, money, good and service [7]. Apart from that, it's identifies two kinds of exchanges: social and economic exchanges [3]. In social exchanges there is concentration on social-emotional resources within a long term; whereas, there is concentration on short-term exchanges of economic products. Its means that in hospitality industry they have vision and mission that need to accomplish. There have identifies four main factors distinguishing between social exchanges and economic exchanges: level of trust, amount of investment, time (short term versus long term), emphasis on exchanges (social-emotional versus pure economic and financial)[25].They added , in social exchanges there is a high level of trust, there is high investment on employee, there is concentration on long-term relations and emphasis on social-emotional relations [16].From the best author experience, trust are relate of leader and employee, once leader are being trusted as the one that can guide the employee, the exchange part will held.

Social Exchanges

Hospitality are closely related in social exchanges. Social exchanges which are based on communication and have subjective exchanges between employers and employees are identified by profit of social-emotional exchanges, mutual commitment and trust, long term concentration, endless commitment and etc. Some determinants have effects on quality of social exchanges between employers and employees: commitment, trust, identification and perceived support. Employees identify their exchange relations after perception of organizational support of the employee. When employee think their organizations pay enough attention to their needs, their social exchanges with their organizations turn more valuable [17]. This is clearly state by the researcher and being supported that once employee being care, they will repay back to the organization.

There are two main forms of social exchanges, perceived organizational support and organizational distributive justice on basis of how employees evaluate these exchanges. Organizational distributive justice refers to employee's evaluation of degree of just reward for more cooperation and help. Other studies also relate SET with the relationship between these two forms and OCB [1].

Economic Exchange

SET not only focus on social, the economies of the employee also being a vital part of the theory. Employees identify their economic exchange relations after perception of their received rewards like salary, situation and promotion. The employee thinks the more just these economic rewards are in comparison with other organization's opportunities and demands, the more valuable these exchange relations are. Positive perception of economic exchange cause economic dependence of employee on organization to increase. Positive perception of economic exchange relations does not only depend on reward system but also on other opportunities in other organizations and individual cost to change the current jobs. [7]. Furthermore, Social exchanges are difference from economic exchanges in several fundamental/basic ways. While benefits involved in economic exchanges are formal and often contractual, such benefits and their exact nature are rarely negotiated in social exchanges [3]. Exchange of benefits is an intentional action and entails unspecified future obligations.

In the social exchange, benefits do not occur on a calculated base (Konovsky and Pugh, 1994). There is also no guarantee that there will be a reciprocation/transaction of benefits. Thus, social exchanges involve ambiguity and uncertainty, particularly in the first stages of the relationship [28]. However, like economic exchanges, in social exchanges, there exists an expectation of some future returns for contributions between the exchange partners although the exact nature of the returns is not known or negotiated in social exchanges [3]. Social exchanges are also characterized by long-term or vision fairness in contrast to short-term or mission fairness that characterizes economic exchanges [18] According to SET, the social exchange involves economic and/or social outcomes [8]. Whitener et al. (1998) stressed that exchanges may involve benefits with economic or without any objective utility and further argue that the latter may have a significant impact on the social dimension of the relationship. From the best author knowledge, SET is spread the good contribution in the economic and also help the industry at the same time. Base on all the information gain by the researcher before.

FUTURE AGENDA

Building on these straightforward ideas, social exchange theory is one of the most enduring and widely used conceptual frameworks [7]. At one time or another, many of the most important topics in organizational behaviour have been analysed through the lens of social exchange theory. For example, organizational citizenship behaviours [23-24], commitment [2] justice [26] and both supervisory and organizational support [19] have been fruitfully explored using this conceptual model. In line with the relationship with the SDG 2015 and hospitality industry all the conceptual can be investigate in the future to unfold the strength of SET. Resources exchanged and Relationships that emerge need to be discussed in other studies that related to the other conceptual or ideas to enhance the foundation of SET. From the best author view, SET and hospitality industry are really close related but there has some ambiguity that have been discussed by the other researchers [6].

CONCLUSION

Although theorists diverge on particulars, they do converge on the central "essence" of SET: Social exchange comprises actions contingent on the rewarding reactions of others, which over time provide for mutually and rewarding transactions and relationships. [7] Its mean that, how many differences of studies about the output of the theory the basic or the foundation of this theory which is repayment element need to be clearly understood in order to achieve the social, economic and organizational exchange of employee and organization especially in the hospitality industry that help a lots of contribution toward GDP of Malaysia.

Regarding to Nunkoo, R, SET is really related to Hospitality industry and will have a significant toward employee and guest. Moreover, the SET has been one of the most widely used theories to investigate the topic [22]. This paper highlights the importance concepts of the SET and how the content helps the hospitality industry that being one of the critical industries nowadays to survive.

REFERENCES

- Artis, SH. (2007), "The effects of perceived organizational support on training and safety in Latino and non-Latino construction workers" (doctoral Dissertation), Proquest, Faculty of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.
- Bishop, J. W., Scott, K. D., & Burroughs, S. M. 2000. Support, commitment, and employee outcomes in a team environment. *Journal of Management*, 26: 1113-1132.
- Blau, P. M. 1964. *Exchange and power in social life*. New York: John Wiley
- Coyle-Shapiro, J. A.-M., & Conway, N. 2004. The employment relationship through the lens of social exchange theory. In J. Coyle-Shapiro, L. M. Shore, M. S. Taylor, & L. E. Tetrick (Eds.), *The employment relationship: Examining psychological and contextual perspectives*: 5-28. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Byrd, E. T., Bosley, H. E., and Dronberger, M. G. (2009). Comparison of stakeholder perceptions of tourism impacts in rural eastern North Carolina. *Tourism Management*, 30, 693-703.
- Cropanzano, R., Rupp, D. E., Mohler, C. J., & Schminke, M. 2001. Three roads to organizational justice. In J. Ferris. (Ed.), *Research in personnel and human resources management*, Vol. 20: 1-113. Greenwich, CT: JAI.
- Cropanzano, R., et al, 2017. *Social Exchange Theory: A Critical Review with Theoretical Remedies*. *Academy of Management Annals*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5465/annals.2015.0099>.
- Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005 - *Journal of Management*, Vol. 31 No. 6, December 2005 874-900 - DOI: 10.1177/014920630527960.
- Cook, K. S & Rice, E., 2014. *Social Exchange Theory*. Chapter in *Social Forces* • January 2006. doi: 10.1007/0-387-36921-x
- Department of Statistics Malaysia, Series 1/2019 Released 20th February 2019. Retrieved from: https://www.dosm.gov.my/v1/uploads/files/7_Publication/Infographic/PocketStats/Pocket_Stats_Q4-2018.pdf on 12th March 2020
- Emerson, R. M. 1976. Social exchange theory. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 2: 335-362
- Foa, U. G., & Foa, E. B. 1974. *Societal structures of the mind*. Springfield, IL: Charles C Thomas.
- Emily Ma, 2011. *Social exchanges as motivators of hotel employees' organizational citizenship behavior: The proposition and application of a new three-dimensional framework*. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*
- Gergen, K. J. 1969. *The psychology of behavioral exchange*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Gouldner, A.W. 1960. The norm of reciprocity: A preliminary statement. *American Sociological Review*, 25: 161-178
- Homans, G. C. 1958. Social behavior as exchange. *American Journal of Sociology*, 63: 597-606.
- Kramer, R. M. (1991), "Intergroup relations and organizational dilemmas: The role of categorization processes", In B. M. Staw & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (Vol. 13, pp. 191-227). Greenwich, CT: JAI.
- Konovsky, M. A., and Pugh, S. D. (1994). Citizenship behavior and social exchange. *The Academic of Management Journal*, 37(3), 656-669.
- Ladd, D., & Henry, R. A. 2000. Helping coworkers and helping the organization: The role of support perceptions, exchange ideology, and conscientiousness. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 30: 2028-2049.
- Malaysia Hotel Industry Survey of Operations by Horwath HTL. Retrieved from https://cdn.horwathhtl.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2019/10/2019_Malaysia-Annual-Study_Summary.pdf on date 12th March 2020.

- Mohd Uzir Mahidin, 2019 Department of Statistics Malaysia, 2019, Siaran Akhbar Statistik Ekonomi Tahunan 2018 Perkhidmatan Penginapan.
- Nunkoo.R, 2016. Toward a More Comprehensive Use of Social Exchange Theory to Study Residents' Attitudes to Tourism. 3rd GLOBAL CONFERENCE on BUSINESS, ECONOMICS, MANAGEMENT and TOURISM, 26-28 November 2015, Rome, Italy.
- Organ, D.W. (1988), "Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome", Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Organ, D.W. (1990), "The motivational basis of organizational citizenship behavior", *Research in Organizational Behavior*, Vol.12, pp.43-72.
- Shore, L.M., Tetrick, L.E., Lynch, P., & Barksdale, K. (2006), "Social and economic exchanges: Construct development and validation", *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, Vol.36, pp. 837-867
- Tepper, B. J., & Taylor, E. C. 2003. Relationships among supervisors' and subordinates' procedural justice perceptions and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Academy of Management Journal*, 46: 97-105.
- Shawn Ng May 25, 2018. Retrieved from: <https://www.edgeprop.my/content/1350899/hotels-mushrooming-malaysia> Hotels mushrooming in Malaysia Element Kuala Lumpur by Westin. (Photos by Low Yen Yeing/EdgeProp.my).
- Whitener, E. M., Brodt, S. E., Korsgaard, M. A., and Werner, J. M. (1998). Managers as initiators of trust: An exchange relationship framework for understanding managerial trustworthy behavior. *The Academy of Management Review*, 23(3), 513-530.

