Communication Research Trends

Volume 40
Issue 1 *The Measurement of Trust in Communication Research (part 2)*

Article 1

2021

The Measurement of Trust in Communication Research Part 2

Paola Pascual-Ferrá
Loyola University Maryland

COMMUNICATION RESEARCH TRENDS

Centre for the Study of Communication and Culture

Volume 40 (2021) No. 1

IN THIS ISSUE

The Measurement of Trust in Communication Research

Part 2

Paola Pascual-Ferrá
Loyola University Maryland

A QUARTERLY REVIEW OF COMMUNICATION RESEARCH

ISSN: 0144-4646

Table of Contents

Communication Research Trends
Volume 40 (2021) Number 1
http://cscc.scu.edu

Published four times a year by the Centre for the Study of Communication and Culture (CSCC), sponsored by the U.S. West Province of the Society of Jesus.
 ISSN 0144-4646

Editor: Paul A. Soukup, S.J.
Book Review Editor: Heather Crandall

Subscription:
Annual subscription (Vol. 40)   US$55

Payment by check, MasterCard, or Visa (US$ preferred). For payments by MasterCard or Visa, please go to the Santa Clara University secure payment website: https://commerce.cashnet.com/COMM3Trends.

Checks and/or International Money Orders (drawn on USA banks; for non-USA currencies, add $10 for handling) should be made payable to Communication Research Trends and sent to the managing editor
Paul A. Soukup, S.J.
Communication Department
Santa Clara University
500 El Camino Real
Santa Clara, CA 95053 USA

Transfer by wire: Contact the managing editor. Add $10 for handling.

Address all correspondence to the managing editor at the address shown above.
Tel: +1-408-554-5498
Fax: +1-408-554-4913
email: psoukup@scu.edu

The Centre for the Study of Communication and Culture (CSCC) is an international service of the Society of Jesus established in 1977 and currently managed by the U.S. West Province of the Society of Jesus, P.O. Box 519, Los Gatos, CA 95031-0519.

Trust

Editor's Introduction

This issue of Communication Research Trends publishes the second part of the review of the concept of trust and its measurement, as it appears in communication research. This part includes measures of interpersonal trust, group trust, trust as used in strategic communication and organizational studies, and other areas including computer-mediated communication and instructional communication. Professor Pascual-Ferrá's purpose remains as stated in the last issue of Trends:

> The overall purpose of this review essay, then, is to help advance research involving the concept of trust in communication by identifying the scales and measures that have been used to measure the concept, related concepts, and constructs. A review of scales and measures helps to understand how researchers have conceptualized and operationalized trust and to identify what we may have missed and where we should go next within our current historical context. (p. 4)

The historical background of the concept of trust, outlined in the last issue, begins with those researchers whose orientation began with distrust (in propaganda studies, for example) and continues with other researchers whose orientation starts with trust (in relationship studies, for example). Out of these, Professor Pascual-Ferrá cites a number of definitions of "trust," giving special attention to that of Deutsch (1958): "An individual may be said to have trust in the occurrence of an event if he expects its occurrence and his expectation leads to behavior which he perceives to have greater negative motivational consequences if the expectation is not confirmed than positive motivational consequences if it is confirmed" (p. 266).

After the review of the background and definitions of trust, the first part of Professor Pascual-Ferrá's study turned to the development of the scales used to measure trust. The relevant studies, published between 1937 and 1999, include concepts such as credibility, ethos, "faith in people," source credibility, interpersonal trust, and "generalized belief." These studies originated in work on credibility and persuasion, and deception. Still other approaches to trust come from mass media, news, and media research, published between 1974 and 2020. Here the reader encounters concepts like political media gratifications, perceived realism, attitudes toward news media, news credibility, photo credibility, and social media credibility.

Part 2 continues from here, turning to studies that attend to the other contexts in which people make judgments of trust. As mentioned in the introduction to the last issue of Trends, "trust appears as one of those concepts that everyone understands, but few people can accurately define, much less measure" (p. 3). Here again, in Part 2, the reader will see researchers wrestling with both conceptual and operational definitions, slowing building on prior studies, but drawing more from communication studies as well as those in psychology and sociology. Here, we can repeat what appears in the introduction to Part 1: "Professor Pascual-Ferrá provides a real service to researchers by assembling not only the story of research into trust but also the key scales with which people examined trust. Taking even a brief look at the tables accompanying this study of trust, one easily sees how unsettled this research area remains" (p. 3).

As mentioned in the last issue of Trends, the reference list for this issue includes the entire reference list not only those cited in the second half but those also in the first half so that the reader might have the entire list easily at hand.

* * *

Dr. Paola Pascual-Ferrá is Associate Professor in Communication at Loyola University Maryland. She teaches courses in strategic communication, communication research and methods, health communication, and emerging media. Her research interests include interpersonal, intercultural and computer mediated-communication. Before teaching, she spent almost 10 years as a communications professional managing strategic communication campaigns for companies and organizations in the United States and abroad. She has a B.A. in Political Science from Princeton University (1999), M.A. in Public Communication from American University in Washington, DC (2008), and Ph.D. in Communication Studies from the University of Miami in Florida (2013).

The Measurement of Trust in Communication Research

Part 2

Paola Pascual-Ferrá
ppascualferra@loyola.edu

Introduction to Part 2

When I finished writing the first part of this narrative review in late October of last year, many people in the United States, as well as in other parts of the world, were feeling particularly anxious about the 2020 U.S. Presidential election. I started my essay with a quote from David Brooks of *The New York Times* reflecting on the epidemic of distrust in this country prior to the election. As I reread those words now and reflect on the aftermath of the election, the word *prophetic* comes to mind: ". . . a third of all Americans think violence is sometimes justified to achieve their political ends" (Kelly, 2020 October 9). Unfortunately, the aftermath of the election did little to ease people's anxiety. On the contrary, it further played on people's fears and sense of distrust. Conspiracy theories abounded marked with allegations of election fraud, actions by social media platforms that fueled the fire of de-platformed voices who felt that their freedom of speech had been taken away, continued loss of life due to the COVID-19 pandemic, and a national vaccination drive that, combined with a shortage of vaccines, highlighted the continued racial and social inequities in our country and has the potential to emerge as another form of violence against communities of color—the list goes on. And of course, add to all that the events that took place in the U.S. Capitol on January 6, 2021, when rioters violently forced their entry into the building, resulting in several deaths, and threatening the safety and stability of the U.S. government. It is in light of those events that the words from David Brooks strike me as particularly prophetic. He suggested that violence justified for political ends came down to an issue of trust: "it grows out of a sense of distrust. People don't trust the institutions. They don't think they're legitimate. They don't trust each other." The United States is a nation deeply divided, more so now than we probably were before the election took place. The rift has spread beyond the political; our faith communities have become further divided, many family members and friends with differing political views have a hard time speaking to each other, if they do so at all, and the question of how we get over the impasse when we don't trust one another enough to even talk to each other seems a timely question.

Between the writing of the first and second part of this essay, I spent a lot of time doing social media research related to COVID-19. Because of this essay, I recently looked up how the words "trust" and "distrust" have been used in social media. On Facebook, the word trust seems to appear more often associated with accounts posting religious content (through faith-based organizations or individuals), while the word distrust has been linked more often to accounts posting political content (either political figures or news media organizations featuring political figures or posting political content). On Twitter, a word cloud visualization of the use of the #trust reveals that it is more often used with #love, #faith, and #God, while #distrust is more often used with #TalkRadio, #BestTalkRadio, and #POTUS. It seems that trust is a word related most often with faith and religion and distrust with media and politics. With the crackdown on users promoting conspiracy theories, dis/misinformation, and extremist content on both platforms since the pandemic started last year, an analysis of how those words are used in alternative platforms such as Gab.com, and until recently Parler.com, may very well reveal a different picture, or not. The fact that we are so divided that now we need to look at additional, alternative platforms to have a more complete picture of how Americans feel about issues of national importance is problematic. The public is so fragmented that we may come to inhabit completely different worlds with different pictures of "reality," and it may not become unreasonable to ask oneself, which picture of "reality" can I trust?

I begin the second part by reviewing measures of trust in interpersonal communication, starting with the foundational work done by sociologist Morris Rosenberg who developed the first scale to measure generalized trust—the Faith in People Scale (1956). His scale informed the development of other scales measuring interpersonal trust. In his article *Misanthropy and Political Ideology*, Rosenberg (1956) wrote that an individual's view of human nature (e.g., whether one believes people to be generally good or bad, honest or dishonest, hardworking or lazy) influences whether one trusts others, and that faith in people "may be related to attitudes toward the *principles*, *practices*, and *policies* of a political system," in particular, an individual's "image of the public and the legislator, attitudes toward freedom of speech, and the view of the state as a system of suppression" (pp. 690–691). Not surprisingly, Rosenberg found that the misanthrope (someone who has a low opinion of people generally speaking) is less likely to trust or "have faith" in others and suggests that this lack of "faith in people" might be a component of the authoritarian personality. If we are to extend that thinking to political regimes and the societies that they rule over, the further we move away from trust in each other and in our institutions, the closer we may be moving toward that kind of society. In other words, a healthy level of trust is not a social ideal or a positive "add-on," but an absolute necessity for democracies to thrive (Jamal & Nooruddin, 2010; Triffit, 2018; Uslaner, 2003). Rebuilding trust in the political and institutional sense is not a public relations strategy or following a social responsibility norm; it is the most urgent task that we are faced with as a society at the moment. Ultimately, the burden of trust in a democracy lies on government representatives and the ultimate choice to trust belongs to the people whom they represent. Since government consists of individuals interacting with other individuals, then our ability to trust each other, and to act and communicate in trustworthy ways, is crucial; interpersonal communication is the building block for that.

*

To remind the reader of the overall structure of this review, Part 2 continues the exploration of the scales developed to study trust. Part 1 examined scales developed for credibility studies and mass communication studies. Part 2 will begin with interpersonal communication, then turns to those used in small group and organizational communication studies. Next comes a review of scales used in strategic communication studies and those in other kinds of communication study.

And, as a reminder, I repeat here what I wrote about Part 1. The goal of this essay, then, is to examine how communication research has approached the concept of trust by examining the measures that we have developed, particularly in the areas of mass communication and media studies, interpersonal, strategic and political communication, so that we may better understand how we think about trust, what are our motivations for studying trust, and the possibilities for research moving forward. The essay covers some of the most frequently used scales measuring trust in communication research in the last 100 years. Information about funding and research sponsors will be included where appropriate and relevant. The overall purpose of this review essay, then, is to help advance research involving the concept of trust in communication by identifying the scales and measures that have been used to measure the concept, related concepts, and constructs. A review of scales and measures helps to understand how researchers have conceptualized and operationalized trust and to identify what we may have missed and where we should go next within our current historical context. The tables included in this essay should help the reader quickly identify the most relevant measures for her or his study. Those starting out a new line of empirical research should ask themselves the following questions: What theory informs my research? What concept(s) or construct(s) are we interested in studying? How have others measured them? Can we integrate instruments that others have been validated and shown as reliable in the literature? When is it a good time to develop a new instrument? What can we learn about trust from these measures? Finally, the essay concludes with insights gained and recommendations for future research dealing with trust in communication.

3. Scale Development

C. Interpersonal trust

Rosenberg's (1956) Faith-in-People Scale broke new ground as a way to measure an individual's generalized trust in others, for which he used a Guttman scale. Wrightsman (1964) built on Rosenberg's and others' work to measure an individual's level of generalized trust in others using Likert scale-items in his Philosophies of Human Nature Scale. Developed through work partially funded by a grant from the National Institute of Mental Health, it consists of six components, with the first labeled Trustworthiness. The Trustworthiness sub-scale consists of 14 items scored on a 6-point Likert scale measuring level of agreement/disagreement. Items gauged respondents' generalized trust in the honesty, fairness, ability to do a good job, decency, and morality of others (for sample items, see Adams, Bruyn, & Chung-Yan, 2004). In 1967, psychologist Julian "Jules" Rotter, best known for his social learning theory of personality and developing the concept of locus of control, introduced the first interpersonal trust scale. Rotter defined interpersonal trust as "an expectancy held by an individual or a group that the word, promise, verbal or written statement of another individual or group can be relied upon" (Rotter, 1967, p. 651). With funding from the National Institute of Mental Health, Rotter developed and tested the scale that included 25 items measuring trust and 15 filler items to hide the real purpose of the scale. Items were scored on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree." Items measuring trust included: "In dealing with strangers one is better off to be cautious until they have provided evidence that they are trustworthy"; "Parents usually can be relied upon to keep their promises"; "Parents and teachers are likely to say what they believe themselves and not just what they think is good for the child to hear"; and "Most elected public officials are really sincere in their campaign promises" (Rotter, 1967, p. 654). Based on the various studies of trust in two-person non-zero-sum game situations Rotter notes that "One might conclude that Americans at least are a highly suspicious and extremely competitive group who would give up many benefits rather than cooperate with someone else" (p. 652). However, he was skeptical of this interpretation and instead wondered how much of this "suspicion" resulted from the experimental ("laboratory") situation itself. As expected, the following decades would see a surge in the development of scales measuring trust by researchers in psychology, social psychology, and group dynamics (Adams, Bruyn, & Chung-Yan, 2004; Lyon, Möllering, & Saunders, 2015).

Kim Giffin (1967a) published the first definition and theory of *interpersonal trust* in communication, which he defined as "reliance upon the communication of another person in order to achieve a desired but uncertain objective in a risky situation" (p. 105). He borrowed extensively from previous work measuring source credibility or *ethos* and theorized that five dimensions comprise interpersonal trust—*expertness* (related to the topic under discussion), *reliability* (of the information source), *intentions* (towards the listener), *dynamism* (active versus passive), and *personal attractiveness*, but did not provide a specific measure for these, instead citing examples from existing measures at the time. He later extended his theory of interpersonal trust to group communication (Giffin, 1967b). Pearce (1973) measured *cognitive* interpersonal trust in communication drawing from game theory and using the Prisoner's Dilemma matrix. In his research he asked participants to predict another player's choice in two social situations—one with a person whom they trusted and another with a person whom they did not trust. Then participants were asked to interpret the choices made by each of the two imagined persons. The adoption of game theory and the use of a game matrix showed a departure from traditional measurement in communication, which so far had relied on semantic differential and Likert-type scales. One of the first theories of interpersonal communication that indirectly touched on the concept of trust was Berger and Calabrese's (1975) uncertainty reduction theory. According to this theory, individuals seek to "make sense" and reduce uncertainty in a situation by making up explanations and predictions about the other person's behavior, referred to as retroactive and proactive attributions. One way to reduce uncertainty involves gaining information about the other person that is considered adequate to help guide one's interaction with the other.

Clatterbuck (1979) defines attributional confidence as the "*perceived adequacy* of information to make retroactive and proactive attributions," *retroactive attributional confidence* as "the summative confidence expressed in factual knowledge of the other," and *proactive attributional confidence* as "the summative confidence in predictions about the other" (p. 148). To measure retroactive attributional confidence, Clatterbuck (1979) developed the 65-item CLUES questionnaire adapted from Taylor and Altman's (1966) list of topics of conversation as a measure of intimacy for their foundational work in social penetration theory. To measure proactive attributional confidence, Clatterbuck developed the 7-item CLUES measure, also known as the Attributional Confidence Scale. While none of the items in this scale mention "trust" explicitly, the concept of *confidence* in one's ability to predict someone else's behavior is often included in many conceptualizations of trust. Other interpersonal communication concepts that involve the measurement of trust include self-disclosure and solidarity. According to Wheeless (1976), self-disclosure helps develop meaningful relationships with others. The more we learn about others, the more we can potentially trust them. The more we share with others, the more they can potentially trust us. He defined interpersonal solidarity as a feeling of "'closeness' derived from 'similarity' [that] finds expression in sentiments, behaviors, and symbols of that closeness" (p. 48). Wheeless suggested that interpersonal solidarity consisted in self-disclosure, trust, and liking. He developed an initial Interpersonal Solidarity Scale, which consisted of 10 items on a 7-point Likert-scale measuring level of agreement/disagreement with the statements presented, of which nine were kept in the recommended measure. These included the items "I trust this person completely" and "I believe what this person says about anything" (p. 52). Wheeless and Grotz (1977) used measures from Rotter (1967), Berlo, Lemert, and Mertz (1969) and McCroskey and colleagues (McCroskey, Scott, & Young, 1971; McCroskey, Jensen, & Valencia, 1973b) to establish a relationship between trust and self-disclosure. They found that higher individualized trust in specific others led to more intentional and greater amount of self-disclosure. They defined *individualized trust* as "a *process* of holding certain relevant, favorable *perceptions* of another person which engender certain types of *dependent behaviors* in a *risky situation* where the expected outcomes that are dependent upon that other person(s) are *not known* with certainty" (p. 251). Constructed as a 15-item 7-point semantic differential scale, their Individualized Trust Scale borrows from Berlo, Lemert, and Mertz (1969) and McCroskey's Character scale (1966). They found *individualized trust* measured by the ITS to be unidimensional and distinct from Rotter's *generalized trust*. In a study to establish the relationship between trust, self-disclosure, liking, and interpersonal solidarity, Wheeless (1978) expanded the Interpersonal Solidarity Scale to 21 items that include positively- and reverse-worded statements, including "I trust this person completely" and "I distrust this person" (p. 147). As expected, perceived trustworthiness correlated positively with self-disclosure and interpersonal solidarity.

Not surprisingly, the concept of trust appears in many scales in the literature on romantic relationships, relationship maintenance, and attachment theory. Larzelere and Huston (1980) developed the Dyadic Trust Scale to measure trust in romantic relationships. They defined dyadic trust as "the extent that a person believes another person (or persons) to be benevolent and honest" (p. 596). The final measure consists of eight items including "I feel that I can trust my partner completely" and "There are times when my partner cannot be trusted" (p. 599). Other statements included notions of fairness, honesty, reliability, consideration for the other/selfishness, truthfulness, and sincerity. They found the measure unidimensional and distinct from generalized trust and social desirability. Burgoon and Hale (1987) developed the Relational Communication Scale measuring eight dimensions—immediacy/affection, similarity/depth, receptivity/trust, composure, formality, dominance, equality, and task orientation. The number of items per dimension vary, but all are measured on a 7-point Likert scale of agreement/disagreement. The Receptivity/Trust factor is considered part of intimacy and includes the items "He/she was sincere with me," "He/she wanted me to trust him/her," and "He/she was honest in communicating with me" (p. 37). In their research on attachment styles, Feeney, Noller, and Hanrahan (1994) developed the Attachment Style Questionnaire, based on Hazan and Shaver's (1987) three attachment styles and Bartholomew and Horowitz's (1991) four-group model of attachment. Both included difficulty in trusting others as part of the avoidant and fearful styles, respectively. In developing their measure, Feeney and colleagues used positive and negative views of self and others, including trust and a lack of it, as constructs. The resulting forced choice measure asked respondents to indicate their level of agreement with 40 statements using 6-point Likert scales including “I feel confident that other people will be there for me when I need them,” “I find it difficult to depend on others,” and “I find it hard to trust other people” (p. 150). They conceptualized attachment styles as either a three-factor solution consisting of Security, Avoidance, and Anxiety following Hazan and Shaver’s suggestion of three attachment styles, or an alternative five-factor solution following Bartholomew’s model consisting of the dimensions Confidence (in self and others), Discomfort with Closeness, Need for Approval, Preoccupation with Relationships, and Relationships as Secondary to achievement.

Following Bartholomew and Horowitz’s four-group model, Guerrero (1996) developed scales to measure five attachment style dimensions—General Avoidance, Lack of Confidence, Preoccupation, Fearful Avoidance, and Relationships as Secondary. Trust was part of the first scale item for both General Avoidance and Fearful Avoidance in the form of “I find it easy to trust others” (reverse coded) and “I would like to trust others, but I have a hard time doing so,” respectively (p. 278). Dainton and Aylor (2001) developed a theoretical model of relational uncertainty by looking at the relationships among jealousy, trust, and maintenance in long distance versus geographically close relationships. They defined *relational trust* as “the expectation that a partner can be relied upon to behave in a responsive and benevolent manner (Rempel, Holmes, & Zanna, 1985)” (p. 177). To measure it, they used a short, 4-item version of Larzele and Huston’s (1980) Dyadic Trust Scale that included the following statements: “My partner is perfectly honest and truthful with me,” “My partner treats me fairly and justly,” “I feel that I can trust my partner completely,” and “I feel that my partner can be counted on to help me” (p. 180). They found that trust was effective in reducing uncertainty and established it as an important uncertainty reduction strategy in maintaining relationships. Strom (2003) developed the Personal Report of Marital Virtues Scale to measure five communicator virtues that he theorized contributed to better marriage quality—*self-control*, *wisdom*, *humility*, *industry*, and *faithfulness*. He defined faithfulness as the quality of

> being true in carrying out one’s duties, keeping promises, and being reliable. Faithful people are committed to their relational partners and their relationships; they could be called loyal. People who are unfaithful are fickle and untrustworthy. They fumble on obligations, fail to deliver on promises, and, generally, are not committed emotionally or physically to their partners or the relationship. (p. 25)

He used five 6-point bipolar scales to measure faithfulness: “Is committed to me/Is not committed to me,” “Follows through on promises/Fails to deliver on promises,” “Is disloyal/Is loyal,” “Fumbles on obligations/Fulfills obligations,” and “Is unreliable/Is reliable” (p. 26). Perceived spousal faithfulness correlated equally strongly with marital satisfaction for both men and women, surpassed by the perceived virtues of wisdom and self-control in their husbands (for women) and the perceived virtue of being industrious in their wives (for husbands). In contrast, wives’ ratings of marriage quality correlated highest with husbands’ self-ratings of faithfulness, while husbands’ ratings of marriage quality did not correlate significantly with the wives’ self-report scores on any of the five scales.

While not explicitly mentioning trust, scales in the relationship maintenance literature can be examined to identify strategies for building trust and measuring distrust in romantic relationships. The Relational Maintenance scales developed by Stafford and colleagues (Canary & Stafford, 1992; Stafford & Canary, 1991; Stafford, Dainton, & Haas, 2000; Stafford, 2011) includes sub-scales about self-disclosure, relationship talks, assurances, and sharing of tasks that, consistent with other studies, can be considered key in developing trust within romantic relationships. Similarly, Ledbetter’s (2013) Relational Maintenance Communication Scale offers concepts such as the sharing of resources, perspectives, tasks, and verbal affection, which can serve as a form of assurance, that can also contribute to building trust in romantic relationships. At the same time, scales measuring jealousy and conflict in relationships can be examined for measures of distrust. For example, even though the terms “trust” or “distrust” are not explicitly mentioned in Guerrero et al.’s (1995) Communicative Responses to Romantic Jealousy Scale, distrust informs the Surveillance/Restriction strategies under the general responses to jealousy, evident in statements such as “Look through my partner’s belongings for evidence of a rival relationship,” “Spy on or follow my partner,” and “‘Check up’ on my partner more than usual.” Similarly, a lack of trust is offered as a reason for conflict in the last item on the Interactional Reactivity sub-scale (i.e., “My partner and I often argue because I do not trust him/her") in Zacchilli, Hendrick, and Hendrick's (2009) The Romantic Partner Conflict Scale to identify the use of conflict strategies in romantic relationships (p. 1081).

Another area of research that involves trust but measures it indirectly appears in the research on interpersonal deception and deception detection. Two main groups of communication research scholars pioneered work in this area during the late 1980s and through the 1990s—Buller, Burgoon, and colleagues (Buller & Aune, 1987; Buller & Burgoon, 1994, 1996; Burgoon et al., 1994, 1996), who started with a focus on nonverbal indicators of deception and continued to develop the Interpersonal Deception Theory in 1996, and McCornack, Levine, Parks, and colleagues (McCornack & Parks, 1986; Levine & McCornack, 1989; McCornack & Parks, 1990; Levine & McCornack, 1991; Park et al., 2002) who pioneered the use of experimental design paired with accuracy tests as a way to measure an individual's ability to detect deception. Buller et al. (1989) integrated Burgoon and Hale's (1987) Relational Message Scale and included two items measuring attributions of honesty (i.e., "He/she was honest; he/she was not sincere") to form "an initial honesty attribution scale" (p. 158). Levine, McCornack and their colleagues continued working on deception detection well into the 2010s, resulting in Levine's Truth Default Theory (Levine, 2014, 2019). The evidence emerging from this line of research established what they referred to as truth-bias. McCornack and Parks coined the term in 1986, building from work in social psychology by Zuckerman et al. (1981, 1984). McCornack and Parks defined truth-bias as the presumption of honesty about another person that occurs in the absence of suspicion. They showed that the truth-bias "operates to reduce a person's search for the behavioral cues or background information that might reveal the lie" (McCornack & Parks, 1986, p. 380). According to Levine and colleagues, the truth-bias is more prevalent than unwarranted suspicion of others. This goes against the decades-long narrative from media credibility and public opinion research that suggested the opposite—that most people seem to have a tendency to distrust. Levine, Park, and McCornack (1999) tested and found evidence for a strong veracity effect across multiple studies, meaning people are better at correctly judging truths than they are at detecting lies. Levine, Park, and McCornack provide several possible reasons for this, including the long-established truth-bias, familiarity with content, the way humans process incoming information (it takes more work to re-label incoming information as false rather than accepting it as truth), and overall, people's exposure to more truths than lies on a daily basis, conditioning them to be more trusting than distrusting of information. Deception detection continues as a fruitful area of research, particularly considering increased concern over the prevalence of misinformation, disinformation and "fake" news. Recently, others have applied the concepts to political communication as well (Clementson, 2016, 2017, 2018abcd, 2019).

Table 3 (pp. 10–11) shows some of the measures of trust in interpersonal communication research discussed in this section.

D. Small group and organizational communication

Measurement of trust in small groups and organizations emerges at the same time as the field of human relations and the study of group dynamics in the 1960s. The work of Jack Gibb (1961, 1962), in addition to that of Deutsch, Lewin, and Loomis, had a significant influence in the conceptualization of trust within small group and organizational communication research. Gibb served as Director of Research for the National Training Laboratories in Washington, DC, and Vice President for Research of the Society for the Advancement of Management. Trained in psychology at Stanford University, he served as member of the faculty there, as well as in Michigan State University and Brigham Young University. Over a nine-year period, he conducted studies funded by the Group Psychology Branch of the Office of Naval Research. During the 1950s, his work focused on problem-solving and defensive communication in groups. He showed that reducing threat in groups increased creativity measured in the amount and quality of ideas (Gibb, 1951). Gibb understood early on the importance of interpersonal communication in the group dynamic process: "If one is to make fundamental improvement in communication, he must make changes in interpersonal relationships" (Gibb, 1961, p. 141). For Gibb, changes in the degree of defensiveness seemed critical to improve group dynamics. Defensiveness happens when a person feels threatened or anticipates a threat. An obvious way to counteract that sense of threat comes from building environments conducive to trust. In his Defense-Reduction Theory (Gibb, 1962), Gibb lays out four dimensions that contribute to lessen defensiveness: acceptance, data flow, goal-formation, and con-

Table 3 . Sample Measures of Trust from Interpersonal Communication Research, in Chronological Order

Authors (year)	Concept	Operationalization (number of items)	Scale or Choice options	Sample Items
Wheeless (1976)	interpersonal solidarity	Interpersonal Solidarity (20)	7-point Likert from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree"	"I trust this person completely"; "I distrust this person"; "I feel very close to this person"; "I willingly disclose a great deal of positive and negative things about myself, honestly, and fully (in depth) to this person."
Wheeless and Grotz (1977)	individualized trust	Individualized Trust (15)	7-point semantic differential scales	"trustworthy," "distrustful of this person," "deceptive," "respectful," "inconsiderate," "honest," "unreliable," "faithful," "insincere"
Clatterbuck (1979)	attributional confidence	Retroactive (65), and Proactive (7)	0%-100% scale ranging from "total guess" to 100% "total certainty"	"How confident are you of your general ability to predict how he/she will behave?"; "How well can you predict his/her feelings and emotions?"
Burgoon and Hale (1987)	relational communication	Immediacy/affection (9), Similarity/depth (5), Receptivity/trust (6), Composure (5), Formality (3), Dominance (6), Equality (3), and Task orientation (4)	7-point Likert from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree"	"He/she wanted me to trust him/her"; "He/she was sincere"; "He/she was honest in communicating with me."
McCornack and Parks (1986)	judgmental accuracy, presumption of honesty ("truth-bias")	Calculated proportion of times a specific answer was given for judgmental accuracy (when correct) and presumption of honesty	dichotomous	Whether partner was "lying" or "completely truthful" in their answers to 12 items from The Machiavellianism Scale
Levine and McCornack (1989, 1991)	suspicion	Generalized Communication Suspicion (14)	7-point Likert from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree"	"The best policy is to trust people until proven wrong"; "Anyone who completely trusts someone else is asking for trouble"; "When I am talking to others, I tend to believe what they say."
Burgoon et al. (1994)	perceived truthfulness	Truthfulness of answers to 15 interview questions	10 point-Likert from "completely un-truthful" to "completely truthful"	"If you found a wallet containing $1,000 and no identification, what would you do with it? Why?"; "If your best friend was cheating on his or her spouse, what would you do? Why?"; "How do you think I could improve my physical appearance?" (Table 3 continues on next page.)

Table 3, continued.

Authors (year)	Concept	Operationalization (number of items)	Scale or Choice options	Sample Items
Burgoon et al. (1994)	accuracy and truth-bias	Judgment accuracy (when correct) and Truth-bias	discrepancy scores	same as above
Burgoon et al. (1994)	suspiciion	Deceptive (3), Vigilance (3), Motivation to Detect Deceit (3)		"I had a feeling something was wrong with my partner's answer"; "I expected my partner to tell the truth"; "I was very motivated to determine if my partner was telling me the truth"
Guerrero et al. (1995)	communicative responses to jealousy	Rival-Focused (18), Destructive (16), Constructive (11), Avoidant (6)	7-point Likert from "never" to 7 "always"	"When I felt jealous I . . ."; "'checked up' on my partner more than usual"; "looked through my partner's belongings/computer for evidence"; "spied on or followed my
Guerrero (1996)	attachment style	General Avoidance (7), Lack of Confidence (5), Preoccupation (8), Fearful Avoidance (10)	7-point Likert from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree"	"I find it easy to trust others"; "I would like to trust others, but I have a hard time doing so"; "I would like to depend on others, but it makes me nervous to do so"; "If something needs to be done, I prefer to rely on myself rather than others."
Dainton and Aylor (2001)	relational trust	Relational trust (4), a short version of the Larzelere & Huston (1980) Dyadic Trust Scale	Not specified by authors	"My partner is perfectly honest and truthful with me"; "My partner treats me fairly and justly"; "I feel that I can trust my partner completely"; "I feel that my partner can be counted on to help me."
Strom (2003)	marital communicator virtues	Self-control (4), Humility (4), Wisdom (4), Faithfulness (5), Industry (6)	7-point bipolar scales	My husband/wife . . . "Is committed to me"; "Follows through on promises"; "Is disloyal"; "Fumbles on obligations"; "Is unreliable."
Hayes, Glynn, and Shanahan (2005)	willingness to self-censor	Willingness to Self-Censor (8)	5-point Likert from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree"	"I tend to speak my opinion only around friends or other people I trust."
Zacchilli, Hendrick, and Hendrick (2009)	romantic partner conflict	Compromise (14), Domination (6), Avoidance (3), Separation (5), Submission (5), Interactional Reactivity (6)	5-point scale from 0 ("strongly disagree") to 4 ("strongly agree")	"My partner and I often argue because I do not trust him/her."

trol. Representative behaviors of greater acceptance include self-confidence, confidence of others, trust of self, and trust of others; while fear of self, distrust of self, fear of others, and distrust of others appear typical of defensive environments. Representative behaviors of data flow include openness, spontaneity, expression of feeling, and listening. At one time or another, researchers have considered all of these behaviors in the operationalization of trust and trust-related constructs in communication research. Gibb's theory establishes that acceptance is the most important dimension, and that improvements on the other dimensions will follow only after acceptance has been addressed (Gibb, 1963, pp. 10–11).

When it comes to trust in organizations, two main areas of focus appear: trust as an aid in group identification and facilitating group work, and employees' trust in the supervisor or managerial role and overall management. Researchers have seen supervisee-supervisor trust as an extension of interpersonal dyadic communication, but overall the literature seems more influenced by organizational psychology. The first measure listed in Table 4 (pp. 13–14) is Falcione's (1974) 30-item measure to evaluate the source credibility of immediate supervisors, borrowing items directly from the source credibility measures by Berlo, Lemert, and Merz (1969) and McCroskey (1966). Falcione found four dimensions: safety, extroversion, competence, and emotional stability. The measures by Falcione (1974) and Horan and Chory (2013) both borrow from McCroskey's work. Another very influential measure in the study of small group and organizational communication is the International Communication Association (ICA) Communication Audit (see Goldhaber & Rogers, 1979). According to Goldhaber (1976), who served as the director of the ICA Communication Audit Project, ICA's Organizational Communication division decided to develop its own measurement system in 1971. The project took almost the entire decade between development and refinement of the instruments, and over 100 people contributed to the project. Trust is clearly present in the section "Organizational Communication Relationships," which includes statements such as "I trust my coworkers," "I trust my immediate supervisor," and "I trust top management." Some of those statements have been borrowed or adapted in other measures of trust in organizational communication, and to an extent they have influenced language used in measures of trust and credibility used to assess organization-public relationships (discussed below).

E. Strategic communication (advertising and public relations)

In a market economy, everyone wants to sell something, if not for money and tangible goods, then for intangibles such as prestige, love, and trust, among others. Measures developed in advertising and public relations tell of the key role trust plays in our market economy. Many consider developing trustworthiness and credibility essential ingredients for brands to ensure their success. Many times a loss of trust leads to a loss in dollars and market value, though examples in recent history might indicate that trust does not always seem a requirement, especially if the product is addictive. To answer Tsfati and Cappella's (2003) driving question—why do we consume news that we do not trust, or do anything that we know is not good for us?—people indicate, "Because we can and sometimes because we become addicted to consuming them." Research in advertising and public relations has concerned itself with measuring credibility, especially driven by marketplace competition and the ability to claim the title for "the most trusted brand," or at the very least "the most" trusted brand, in a given product category.

Raymond Bauer and Stephen Greyser at the Harvard Business School carried out one of the earliest and most comprehensive research studies about consumer attitudes toward advertising. They conducted their research in collaboration with the American Association of Advertising Agencies, which had worked on some pilot studies of consumer attitudes. Bauer and Greyser (1968) dedicate a section of their comprehensive study to trust and deception in advertising. They state that "there is a prevailing belief about the relationship of advertising and the conditions of trust in our society as a whole," referring to recent studies by Roper that found a generalized sense of distrust among people. In fact, in Roper's 1959–1961 studies cited earlier, 67% of respondents answered that they considered "advertisers making false claims" a serious moral problem in December 1959; by November 1961, that percentage had dropped to 48% as other concerns, specifically the testing of atomic bombs, took precedence in people's minds (Roper & Hausman, 1962, p. 17). Bauer and Greyser believed that given the volume and complexity of commercial transactions in American society, there seemed no other option but to trust in the other. In addition, they pointed out that customers had a right to directly sue manufacturers over false advertising as court rulings had established that "the manufac-

Table 4. Sample Measures of Trust from Small Group and Organizational Communication Research, in Chronological Order

Authors (year)	Concept	Operationalization (number of items)	Scale or Choice options	Sample Items
Falcione (1974)	source credibility of immediate supervisor	Safety (13), Competence (5), Extroversion (8), Emotional Maturity (4)	semantic differential	"honest—dishonest," "safe—dangerous," "just—unjust," "fair—unfair," "expert—inexpert," "skilled—unskilled," "experienced—inexperienced"
Roberts and O'Reilly (1974)	organizational communication	Trust apears as one of 12 factors	Likert-type	"How free do you feel to discuss with your immediate superior the problems and difficulties you have in your job without jeopardizing your position or having it 'held against' you later?"
Goldhaber and Rogers (1979) (Part of ICA Audit survey)	organizational communication relationships	Supervisor (9), Top Management (3), Coworkers (3), Personal Influence (3)	5-point Likert from "very little" to "very great"	"I trust my coworkers," "I trust my immediate supervisor," "I trust top management"
Costigan and Schmeidler (1984)	communication climate	Supportive (18), Defensive (18)—second-order factors with six indicators each, three items per indicator)	5-point Likert-type from "almost never" to "almost always"	"My supervisor does not have hidden motives in dealing with me"; "I feel that I can be honest and straight-forward with my supervisor"; "I seldom say what really is on my mind, because it might be twisted and distorted by my supervisor"
Glaser, Zamanou, and Hacker (1987)	organizational culture	Teamwork & Conflict (6), Climate & Morale (5), Information Flow (4), Involvement (4), Supervision (7), Meetings (5)	5-point Likert from "To a very little extent" to "To a very great extent"	"People I work with are direct and honest with each other"; "There is an atmosphere of trust in this organization"; "This organization treats people in a consistent and fair manner"
Wheelan and Hochberger (1996)	group development	Dependency and Inclusion (15), Counterdependency and Fight (15), Trust and Structure (15), Work and Productivity (15)	5-point Likert from "never true of this group" to "always true of this group"	"We can rely on each other. We work as a team." (The survey is proprietary and commercial; only several items are publicly available.)
Anderson, Martin, and Riddle (2001)	relational satisfaction in small groups	Relational Satisfaction (12)	5-point Likert from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree"	"I can trust group members"; "We can say anything in this group without worrying"
Ellis and Shockley-Zalabak (2001)	organizational trust	Trust in Top Management (6), Trust in Immediate Supervisor (14)	5-point Likert from "very little" to "very great"	"I trust top management"; "Those in top management keep their word to employees"; "I trust my immediate supervisor"; "My immediate supervisor keeps confidences" (Table 4 continues on next page.)

Table 4, contimued.

Authors (year)	**Concept**	**Operationalization (number of items)**	**Scale or Choice options**	**Sample Items**
Hubbell and Chory-Assad (2005)	managerial trustworthiness	Behavioral Consistency (3), Behavioral Integrity (5), Manner and Quality of Information communicated (6), Demonstration of Concern (7)		"I believe that my superior/manager. . .": "is honest with me," "generally tells the truth," "is someone I can rely on to keep his/her promises," "would 'stab' me in the back," "is genuinely interested in my welfare," "works to further my interests"
Hargie and Tourish (2009)	organizational communication audit	Working relationships (6), revised from the ICA Audit survey	5-point Likert from "very little" to "always"	". . . how much you trust each of the following in terms of working together. I trust the following: " (followed by a list of categories of colleagues by rank or position within the organization)
Forward, Czech, and Lee (2011)	communication climate	Collaboration (19), Authoritarian (8), Descriptive (5), Manipulation (3)	5-point Likert-type from "almost never" to "almost always"	"My chair does not have hidden motives when dealing with me"; "My chair tries to manipulate faculty to get what he or she wants to make himself or herself feel good"; "My chair twists and distorts what I say when I speak what is really on my mind"
Horan and Chory (2013)	trust in organizational peer relationships	Adapted McCroskey and Richmond's (1996) Generalized Belief Measure (1)	7-point semantic differential scales	"I trust [target] as a colleague." (Scales: (1) Agree/Disagree, (2) False/True, (3) Incorrect/Correct, (4) Right/Wrong, (5) Yes/No)
Wagner (2017)	communication climate	Six continuums: Evaluation-Description (10), Control-Problem orientation (12), Strategy-Spontaneity (12), Neutrality-Empathy (10), Superiority-Equality (12), Certainty-Provisionalism (12)	7-point semantic differential scales	The respondent evaluates him- or herself first, and then the supervisor, e.g.: "I have hidden motives during conversations with others in my ward/unit"; "The operational manager in charge of my ward/unit has hidden motives in conversations"; " I am honest when dealing with others in my ward/unit"; "The operational manager in my ward/unit has hidden motives in conversations"

turer's advertising constitutes an implied contract with the eventual costumer" (Bauer & Greyser, 1968, p. 365). For those reasons, they believed that the interest of manufacturers required accountability and not misleading or making false claims in their advertising; in that way, they believed that advertising already had served to increase trust in society. They did acknowledge that this "fresh perspective" probably went against the prevailing view of advertising at the time. If just as Gerbner and Gross (1976ab) theorized—the more violence people watch in television, the more violent and mean they believe the world to be—could the opposite be true as well? Namely, that the more people view truthful advertising (whether by choice or by government regulation) and "reality" TV, does the exposure increase the extent of our truth bias? Whatever the answer to that question, the issue of trust and credibility in advertising has been extensively researched and remains an ongoing concern.

In terms of measuring trust in advertising, Sandage and Leckenby (1980) and Beltramini (1982) developed some of the first scales that involve some measure of trust in advertising. Sandage and Leckenby (1980) used 7-point semantic differential scales that included the word pairs "Honest-Dishonest," "Sincere-Insincere," and "Safe-Dangerous," among others. They distinguished between attitudes toward the institution of advertising as different from those toward the instruments of the institution (i.e., the ads themselves). They found participants held more favorable views toward the industry itself than toward the instruments. They concluded that the scales "Good-Bad," "Strong-Weak," "Valuable-Worthless," and "Necessary-Unnecessary" applied to evaluate advertising as an institution more, and that the scales "Clean-Dirty," "Honest-Dishonest," "Sincere-Insincere," and "Safe-Dangerous," applied to evaluate advertising as an instrument more. Beltramini (1982) developed a measure of advertising believability made up 10 semantic differential scales, including "Unbelievable-Believable," "Untrustworthy-Trustworthy," and "Not credible-Credible." Beltramini and Evans (1985) used the scale to measure the perceived believability of ads that included research results and the perceived believability of warning labels on cigarette advertising (Beltramini, 1988). The measures most cited in the literature, however, appear to be the ones developed by MacKenzie and Lutz (1989) and Ohanian (1990). In trying to evaluate a model for antecedents of attitudes towards advertising (AAD), Lutz, MacKenzie, and Belch (1983) conceptualized ad credibility as determined by three factors: the perceived claim of an ad, the credibility of the advertiser, and the credibility of advertising in general. To test the AAD model, they developed an advertising credibility index that asked respondents to evaluate the ad itself, the advertiser, and advertising in general separately using three 7-point semantic differential scales: "convincing/unconvincing," "believable/unbelievable," and "biased/unbiased." Ohanian (1990), on the other hand, conceptualized credibility of celebrity endorsers as a function of their perceived expertise, trustworthiness, and attractiveness. He built from previous findings in the literature that established that an attractive, well-liked celebrity has perceived expertise and is likely to be trusted. He had respondents evaluate two television celebrities, Linda Evans and Tom Selleck, each on 15 7-point semantic differential scales that included the word pairs "trustworthy," "sincere," and "reliable," to measure the trustworthiness dimension. However, he did note that sources high in credibility do not always appear more effective than less credible one.

Table 5 (pp. 16–18) shows some measure of trust in the advertising literature to date. Several employ semantic differential scales, or at least make use of similar adjectives often used in the source credibility research tradition, while others ask respondents to evaluate the credibility of an ad or advertising using Likert scales. Two of the scales measure levels of skepticism towards advertising (Obermiller & Spangenberg, 1998) and perceived deception in advertising (Chaouachi & Rached, 2012), respectively, which, despite some arguments construing them as distinct constructs, are still related to trust.

Public relations in the United States traces its roots back to the work done by Edward Bernays in the late 1920s. Bernays, whom many professionals, academics, their students consider "the father" of public relations, has proven a complex figure: on the one hand advocating for a code of ethics for public relations professionals early on and, on the other hand, using medical doctors to endorse bacon and women suffragettes to endorse cigarette smoking in designing public relations campaigns. A history of the evolution of public relations into a two-way, mutually beneficial strategic communication process lies outside the scope of this essay (for that, see Grunig & Hunt, 1984; Grunig,1992). Much of the most notable research in public relations since the 1980s has tried to help the profession shed associations with wartime propaganda and manufacturing of consent. In 1985, the

Table 5. Sample Measures of Trust from Advertising and Public Relations Research, in Chronological Order

Authors (year)	Concept	Operationalization (number of items)	Scale or Choice options	Sample Items
Bauer and Greyser (1968)	attitudes toward advertising	Attitudes toward advertising (8); for dimensionality see Andrews (1989)	5-point Likert from "generally agree" to "genrally disagree" with "don't know/ no opinion" option	"In general, advertising presents a true picture of the product being advertised."
Sandage and Leckenby (1980)	attitudes toward advertising	Institutional (4), Instrument (4)	7-point semantic differential	"Honest—Dishonest," "Sincere—Insincere," "Safe-Dangerous"
Beltramini (1982)	believability of advertising	Advertising Believability (10)	7-point semantic differential	"Unbelievable," "Untrustworthy," "Not credible"
MacKenzie and Lutz (1989)	advertising and advertiser credibility	Ad Credibility Index (3), Advertiser Credibility Index (3)	7-point semantic differential	"convincing/unconvincing," "believable/unbelievable," "biased/unbiased"
Ohanian (1990)	celebrity endorser credibility	Attractiveness (5), Trustworthiness (5), Expertise (5)	7-point semantic differential	"dependable," "honest," "reliable," "sincere," "trustworthy"
Morgan and Hunt (1994)	interorganizational trust	Trust (7), adapted from Dyadic Trust Scale by Larzelere and Huston (1980)	7-point Likert from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree"	"In our relationship, my major supplier ...": "cannot be trusted at times," "can be counted on to do what is right," "has high integrity."
Alwitt and Prabhaker (1994)	attitudes about TV advertising	Informational benefits (7), Availability (5), Offensive (4), Non-informative (5), Ad format/frequency (4), Negative to content (2)	5-point Likert	"You can trust brands advertised on TV more than brands not advertised on TV"; "Most TV ads try to work on people's emotions"; "There is a critical need for more truth in today's TV advertising"
Coombs and Holladay (1996)	perceived organizational image	Perceived organizational image (10). (Adapted from McCroskey's, 1966, Character scale)	5-point Likert from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree"	"The company is basically honest"; "The company is not concerned with the well being of its publics"; "I do trust the organization to tell the truth about the incident."
Obermiller and Spangenberg (1998)	skepticism toward advertising	Ad Skepticism (9)	5-point Likert from 1 "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree"	"We can depend on getting the truth in most advertising"; "Advertising is a reliable source of information about the quality and performance of products"; "Advertising is generally truthful"
Shavitt, Lowrey, and Haefner (1998)	personal confidence in advertising	General attitude (1), Enjoyment and Indignity (4), Trustworthiness or Usefulness (6), Effect on Product Price and Value (3), Regulation of (3)	5-point Likert	"In general I feel that I can [cannot] trust advertising," (Favorable and unfavorable versions presented separately.) (Tabke 5 continues on next page.)

Table 5, continued.

Authors (year)	Concept	Operationalization (number of items)	Scale or Choice options	Sample Items
Bruning and Ledingham (1999)	organization-public relation-ship	Professional (6), Personal (5), and Community (5)	10- point Likert from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree"	"I feel I can trust [Organization] to do what it says it will do"; "I think that [Organization] is not honest in its dealings with customers"; "[Organization] does not act in a socially responsible manner."
Hon and Grunig (1999)	reputation man-agement, PR relationship out-comes	Trust (Integrity, Competence, and Dependability) (6-11), Control Mutuality (5-8), Commitment (5-8), Satisfaction (5-8), Communal Relation-ships (5-7), Exchange Relationships (4)	9-point Likert indicating the extent to which each statement described the organization	This organization . . . "treats people like me fairly and justly," is "con-cerned about people like me," "takes advantage of people who are vulnera-ble," "gives or offers something to people like me," and "generally expects something in return"
Huang (1997, 2001)	organization-public relation-ship assessment	Trust (4), Control Mutuality (4), Re-lationship Satisfaction (4), Relationship Commitment (4), Face and Favor (4)	4-point Likert-type from "never" to "often"	"Members of the organization are truthful with us"; "The organization treats me fairly and justly, compared to other organizations"; "Generally speak-ing, I don't trust the organization"; "The organization keeps its promises"
Kim (2001)	organization-public relation-ship	Trust (4), Commitment (5), Local or commu-nity Involvement (3), Reputation (4)	7-point Likert	"(The organization) treats people like me fairly and justly"; "Sound principles seem to guide (organization)'s behav-ior"; "Whenever (organization) makes an important decision, I know it will be concerned about people like me"
Coombs and Holladay (2002)	organizational reputation	Organizational Reputation – Reduced Scale (5)	5-point Likert from "strongly disagree" to 5 "strongly agree"	"The organization is concerned with the well-being of its publics"; "The organization is basically DISHON-EST"; "I do NOT trust the organization to tell the truth about the incident"
Greer (2003)	ad credibility	Ad Credibility (adapted from Beltramini, 1988) + one item (6)	5-point semantic differential	"unbelievable," "not convincing," "not credible," "dishonest," "untrust-worthy," "distracting"
Cotte, Coulter, and Moore (2005)	ad credibility	Ad credibility (3)	5-point Likert	"believable," "truthful," "realistic"
Soh, Reid, and King (2009)	trust in advertis-ing ("ADTRUST")	Reliability (9), Usefulness (4), Affect (3), Willingness to rely on (4)	7-point Likert from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree"	"Honest," "truthful," "credible," "I am willing to make important pur-chase-related decisions based on ad-conveyed information." (Table 5 continues on next page.)

Table 5, continued.

Authors (year)	Concept	Operationalization (number of items)	Scale or Choice options	Sample Items
Chaouachi and Rached (2012)	perceived deception in advertising	Perceived veracity (4), Ethic (4)	5 point Likert-type scale from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree"	"This ad is not entirely truthful about its offerings," "This ad is dishonest," "This ad is trying to dupe the consumer"
Yang, Kang, and Cha (2015)	organization-public dialogic communication	*Mutuality*: Collaboration (3), Grounding (3), Empathy (3), Equality (3), Responsiveness (3), Respect (3); *Openness*: Access-ibility (4), Genuineness (3), Transparency (3)	5-point interval "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree"	"Is honest in communicating with publics," "Is not deceptive in interpreting publics' opinions," "Is transparent in sharing the org's intent of communication," "Has the ability to accomplish what it says it will do"
Munnukka, Uusitalo, and Toivonen (2016)	peer-endorser credibility	Attitude toward brand (3), Attitude toward ad (4), Trust (4), Expertise (4), Similarity (3), Attractiveness (4), Product Involvement (4), Perceived Normalcy (2)	5-point Likert	"I feel the endorser was honest," "I consider the endorser trustworthy," "I feel the endorser was truthful," "I consider the endorser earnest," "I consider the endorser an expert on the product," "The endorser and I are a lot alike"
Lock and Seele (2017)	CSR – perceived credibility	Truth (5), Sincerity (3), Appropriateness (3), Understandability (5)	not specified	"I am confident that the statements are true," "The text reflects the genuine intentions of the company"
Sarofim and Cabano (2018)	perceived ad credibility	perceived ad credibility (7)	not specified	"credible," "realistic," "convincing"
Andreini, Fetscherin, and Zarantonello (2020)	CEO brand image	Performance (3), Personality (3), and Leadership (3)	5-point Likert-type from "not at all" to "extremely"	how descriptive/representative these are of the CEO: "clean records," "integrity," and "balance"

International Association of Business Communicators (IABC) Research Foundation committed to invest in a long-term study of best practices. Led by James Grunig at the University of Maryland, public relations scholars from around the country collaborated in the effort. Out of this effort came the excellence theory of public relations, which focuses on a two-way symmetrical communication model built on trust. Theoretical development in public relations has evolved to adopt a more dialogic framework (Kent & Taylor, 2002), emphasize feminist values (Grunig, Toth, & Hon, 2000), social capital theory, and public advocacy (Dodd, 2016, 2018). Trust becomes imperative when public relations are conceptualized in that way, just like in advertising, as Grunig does in the excellence theory of public relations. In introducing their theory of relationship marketing, which is widely cited in the public relations literature, Morgan and Hunt (1994) established commitment and trust as requirements for a successful marketing relationship. They advocated for a commitment based on trust, thus the name Commitment-Trust Theory. The key mediating variables (KMV) model of relationship marketing posits that shared values, communication, and opportunistic behavior form the three major precursors of trust, and that trust in turn influences relationship commitment as well as three relationship outcomes—increases cooperation and the perception of future conflict as functional, and decreases decision-making uncertainty. To test their model, they adapted the Larzelere and Huston's (1980) Dyadic Trust Scale (originally used to measure trust in romantic relationships) to make sense within the context of marketing relationships. For example, they modified the item "There are times when my partner cannot be trusted" to "In our relationship, my major supplier cannot be trusted at times" and asked respondents to indicate their level of agreement with the statement using a 7-point Likert scale. To measure the perceived image of an organization based on attribution and responses to crises, Coombs and Holladay (1996) developed a 10-item measure adapted from items in McCroskey's (1966) source credibility scales. They had respondents indicate their level of agreement using a 5-point Likert scale with statements such as "The company is basically honest," "The company is not concerned with the well being of its publics," and "I do trust the organization to tell the truth about the incident." They later reduced this measure to a 5-item Organizational Reputation Scale (see Coombs & Holladay, 2002). Bruning and Ledingham (1999) developed a multidimensional scale to measure the organization-public relationship. They included three statement for each of the main dimensions of the organization-public relationship suggested in the literature—trust, openness, involvement, investment, commitment, reciprocity, mutual legitimacy, and mutual understanding—and had respondents answer to them on a 10-point Likert scale from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree." After factor-analyzing responses, they extracted three factors, which they labeled "professional," "personal," and "community." Some of the statements which involve trust include "I think that [Organization Name] is not honest in its dealings with customers" (Professional), "I feel I can trust [Organization Name] to do what it says it will do" (Personal), and "[Organization Name] is open about its plans for the future" (Community). Hon and Grunig (1999) developed a set of guidelines for measuring relationships in public relations based on six elements or components: control mutuality, trust, satisfaction, commitment, exchange relationship, and communal relationship. The Reputation Management Scale has a Trust sub-scale that measures three dimensions of trust-integrity, competence, and dependability—with items such as "Whenever this organization makes an important decision, I know it will be concerned about people like me" (Integrity), "This organization can be relied on to keep its promises" (Dependability), and "This organization has the ability to accomplish what it says it will do" (Competence).

Table 5 (pp. 16–18) shows other measures of trust in public relations research that have been developed since these. For a full review of the measurement of trust and credibility in public relations research see the work by Stacks and colleagues (Carroll & Stacks, 2004; Stacks, 2002; Stacks, Dodd, & Men, 2013; Stacks, & Watson, 2007) and Rawlins (2007). Recent trends in public relations research include the measurement of authenticity (Kim, Kiousis, & Molleda, 2015; Molleda & Jain, 2013; Sisson, 2017) and corporate social responsibility (Joo, Miller, & Fink, 2019; Lock & Seele, 2017) as related to trust. Outside academia, the Edelman Trust Barometer is one of the most longstanding and anticipated annual large-scale study of trust done by a public relations organization. In its latest report, trust is measured on four items, each using a 9-point scale from "disagree strongly" to "agree strongly": "[COMPANY] is good at what it does" (ability), "[COMPANY] is honest" (integrity), "[COMPANY] keeps its promises" (dependability), and

"[COMPANY] is trying hard to have a positive impact on society" (purpose) (Edelman, 2020). Their special report, "20 Years of Trust," identifies potential reasons for the rise in mistrust, including trends like the emergence of social media networks and the rise of automation (Edelman, 2020).

F. Other areas of communication

So far, this essay has covered four major areas of communication that very actively developed scales and measurements of trust or trust-related variables: mass communication and media studies, interpersonal communication, small group and organizational communication, and strategic communication (advertising and public relations). As previously stated, however, the measurement of trust and trust-related concepts in communication seems ubiquitous and many other areas of communication research also utilize trust as a concept, many areas that this review has not covered thus far. Table 6 (pp. 22–23) includes some of the measures developed and used in other areas of communication that might interest the reader and can provide a starting point for deeper exploration into the specific areas. *Instructional communication*, for example, has seen a lot of activity focused on measuring source credibility, specifically teacher credibility. Much of the research in this area stems from the work started by McCroskey in 1966 and continuing through the 1970s. McCroskey, Holdridge, and Toomb (1974) developed an instrument for measuring the source credibility of basic speech communication instructors; the 14-item measure included 7-point semantic differential scales that measured the dimensions of competence, extroversion, character, and sociability. However, they later replaced that scale with the Source Credibility scale as finalized by McCroskey and Teven (1999), which remains the preferred version today. Finn et al. (2009) conducted a meta-analysis of the instructional communication literature looking at teacher credibility and its associations with teacher behaviors and student outcomes. The results, drawn from 51 studies, indicate a moderate, meaningful relationship between teacher credibility and overall student outcomes, and highlight that perceived caring and teacher credibility facilitate student learning. The study of teacher credibility as a moderator of teacher effectiveness and its impact on student learning outcomes continues as an important concern for communication educators and researchers.

Computer-mediated communication has also shown substantial activity in the measurement of trust and credibility. Some of the studies in this area have already appeared in the mass communication and media studies section. Other studies have focused on trust in online communities, support groups and interactions, virtual workgroups, credibility of websites, blogs, and other ways of presenting information online, including the trustworthiness of online dating profiles. Measurements of trust in the area of *health communication* tend to focus on trust in the clinical (physician-patient) interaction as well as the credibility of health information presented to the public through public communication campaigns, social media. and online. Most *political communication* and political marketing studies, as well as studies in *sports communication*, have adapted items from McCroskey's source credibility scales or Ohanian's (1990) celebrity endorser credibility scale to evaluate the credibility of political candidates, political information, and athletes as endorsers. I have included one measure from research in *family communication* (excluding studies looking at trust in marriage and romantic relationships or partners, which I covered in the section on interpersonal communication). Surprisingly, of all the areas explored in this essay, that one seemed to have the least amount of studies measuring trust or trust-related concepts.

Finally, religious communication is another area in communication scholarship that has often emphasized the importance of trust. The journal *Church, Communication and Culture* recently devoted a special issue to the topic of trust in institutions. The editors cited results from surveys conducted by Edelman, Gallup, and the Pew Research Center that indicate lack of confidence in religious leaders and institutions (Narbona, Pujol, & Gregory, 2020). Thus, rebuilding or repairing trust will continue to be a priority in religious communication research; the articles by Guzik (2020) and O'Brien (2020) suggest some models to follow. They highlight the concepts of trustworthiness and transparency. O'Brien in particular provides specific ways to measure transparency through a close examination of diocesan webpages responding to the clergy sexual abuse scandal. Scales measuring an individual's trust in religious leaders and institutions that reflect the dimensions inherent in some of the models suggested in the literature, would be a great contribution to this area of scholarship. Gil and Gili (2020) and Gara and La Porte (2020) offer some additional dimensions for consideration that, taken together with the scales discussed in this literature review, can provide a good starting point towards the development of such measures.

4. Conclusion and Future Directions

In this review of the literature I have attempted to show how researchers in different areas of communication have conceptualized and operationalized trust and trust-related concepts. Trust has been associated most with the concept of credibility, but other words that have been used to operationalize it include believability, accuracy, honesty, truthfulness, trustworthiness, sincerity, competence, expertise, reliability, and goodwill, to name some. The concept of trust, just as credibility, is multi-dimensional, and it seems to depend on the context, the person, and the task that is evaluated, as one may not necessarily trust another with a personal secret but may trust that person to complete a work-related task well. As might have become evident to the reader, our discipline's interest in measuring trust has been mostly utilitarian: trust as a means to an end (e.g., persuasion, credibility, and effectiveness of the communicator, to name some). While not all of the trust-related research in communication has been self-serving, it has focused mostly on the benefits that communicators can derive from growing others' trust in them, and less on the benefit that the act of trusting may have on others beyond the communicator, or other possible outcomes stemming from trust. One of the few exceptions has been in the instructional communication literature, where measures of trust have been used to study levels of student satisfaction, development and learning; interpersonal communication, where measures of trust have been used to study satisfaction in relationships between friends and romantic partners; and health communication, where communicating trust in the patient-provider interaction can increase the patient's self-awareness and sense of well-being. The mostly transactional and utilitarian view of trust that has dominated so far is perhaps a reflection of the increased professionalization of the discipline, the need for practical applications within the business setting and the cultures that sustain them and are in turn sustained by them. It would be interesting for future research to consider trust from the perspective of the person who is doing the trusting—what impact does trust have on them beyond being persuaded and returning as consumers of information and products? It would be interesting for future research to approach the study of trust from that perspective as well as from non-traditional (read non-Western/Anglo-Saxon) socioeconomic and cultural perspectives. At the same time, it is equally important to understand the impact of distrust in communication. Since many scholars consider trust and distrust as two separate constructs, it may require new, separate measures that have yet to be developed and whether in fact distrust can and should be measured separately.

One of the most common criticisms about communication measurement is the over reliance on surveys employing self-report measures and the less frequent use of experimental studies associating those measures with observed behavior. Limited funding, time, and access to human resources (whether in the form of student research assistants or actual subjects) are common challenges that communication faculty face across much of higher education in the United States, especially in smaller colleges and universities (see Beatty & Pascual-Ferrá, 2019). Creating in-person experimental settings, interventions, even administering in-person surveys, with the sample sizes needed to be able to generalize findings beyond the college student population are often time-consuming and will become more challenging, particularly as we continue to grapple with the COVID-19 pandemic. However, the measures are only as good as their power to predict behavior, which cannot be assessed without observing that behavior. Finding ways to do this outside the traditional, in-person, experimental setting, and being able to establish strong predictive power would be a valuable methodological contribution to the field.

Even when it is possible to observe behavior and establish significant statistical associations between measures and corresponding behaviors, other challenges include finding effect sizes large enough to render those associations significantly greater than chance, and addressing the measurement error inherent in many of the self-report measures used in communication (Beatty & Pascual-Ferrá, 2019; Beatty, Pascual-Ferrá, & Levine, 2014; Pascual-Ferrá, 2013; Pascual-Ferrá & Beatty, 2015). For the former, we observed that many of the correlations reported in the literature

Table 6. Sample Measures of Trust from Other Areas of Communication Research, in Chronological Order

Authors (year)	Concept	Operationalization (number of items)	Scale or Choice options	Sample Items
Cegala, Coleman, and Turner (1998)	medical communication competence	Physician version: Self-Competence (23), Patient-Competence (13); Patient version: Self-Competence (16), Physician-Competence (23)	7-point Likert from "disagree" to "strongly agree"	"Contributing to a trusting relationship," "Being open and honest," "Answering . . . questions honestly," "Showing the patient I cared about him/her," "Showing he/she cared about me"
Vangelisti, Caughlin, and Timmerman (2001)	individuals' criteria for telling family secrets	Intimate Exchange (8), Exposure (8), Urgency (8), Never (4), Acceptance (4), Conversational Appropriateness (4), Relational Security (4), Important Reason (4), Permission (4), Family Membership (2)	7-point Likert from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree"	"If I trusted my [relation] more than I do now, I would reveal the secret"; "If I felt much closer to my [relation] I would tell the secret"; "If I felt much closer to my [relation] I would tell the secret"; "If I knew my [relation] wouldn't tell the secret to others, I would tell him/her"
Flanagin and Metzger (2003)	verification of web content	Accuracy (1), Authority (4), Objectivity (2), Currency (1), Coverage (1)	5-point Likert from "never" to "all the time"	"Look for a stamp of approval or recommendation"; "Verify the author's qualifications or credentials"
Pace (2004)	religious leader's trustworthiness	Power/Capabilities (3), Benevolence (4)	scores calculated based on times each quality is referenced	statements that show "capabilities possessed by the leader," "love for the destiny of others," "humanity," "generosity," "selflessness"
Teven (2008)	credibility of presidential candidates	Adapted McCroskey and Richmond's (1989) General Belief Scale (5)	7-point semantic differential	"is believable," "is likeable," "is a con-artist (i.e., manipulative)"
Kang (2010)	blog credibility	Source (5), Message/content (9)	7-point Likert-type from "not important" to "very important"	"transparent," "reliable," "authentic," "consistent"
Hargittai et al. (2010)	assessing credibility of web content	Reasons for visiting (3), Information verification (7), Visits "About Us" (1)	5-point Likert-type scales	"Being able to identify easily the sources of information on the site," "Check the qualifications or credentials of the author," "Seek out other sources to validate the information" (Table continues on next page.)

Table 6, continued.

Authors (year)	Concept	Operationalization (number of items)	Scale or Choice options	Sample Items
Ishak et al. (2011)	Islamic information credibility	Authentic source (3), Visual appeal (2), Writer's reliance (3), Source-writer relationship (3), Writer's integrity (2)	5-point Likert	"The information was based on clear scripture"; "The writer shows the responsibility in writing"; "The writer has complete references"; "Writer has credibility in Islamic matters"
Toma and Hancock (2012)	trust in online dating profiles / truth bias	Trustworthiness of online dater based on profile/self-description (2)	7-point Likert from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree"	"I would expect this online dater to tell me the truth"; "This online dater seems trustworthy to me"
Housholder and LaMarre (2014)	credibility of political information (on Facebook)	Information credibility (5)	7-point semantic differential scales	"The information you just read was ... believable/unbelievable, inaccurate/accurate, trustworthy/ untrustworthy, biased/unbiased, and complete/incomplete"
Xu (2014)	product review credibility	Perceived review credibility (3)	7-point Likert from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree"	"credible," "believable," and "trustworthy"
Xu (2014)	cognitive trust	Cognitive trust in reviewer (6) (Adapted from Johnson & Grayson, 2005)	7-point scale from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree"	"I have to be cautious about acting on the advice of this reviewer because his opinions are questionable';' "I can rely on this reviewer for suggesting a product that I am interested in"; "Given the information displayed on the webpage, I have no doubt about this reviewer's competence"
Xu (2014)	affective trust	Affective trust in reviewer (5) (Adapted from Johnson & Grayson, 2005; McAllister, 1995)	7-point scale from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree"	". . . I feel this reviewer would respond caringly"; "I feel that I can talk freely with this reviewer"; "This reviewer will be very open for his opinion about a product."
Clifford and Gaskins (2016)	credibility of political candidates	Moral Character (3), Competence (3)	5-point ordinal scales	"trustworthy," "honest," "moral," "hard-working"
Susila and Nugroho (2019)	political trust (rhetorical dimensions)	Empathy (11), Character (6), Capability (9)	7-point semantic differential from unimportant to very important	"fair," "honest," "equal," "reliable," "consistent"
Kumar (2020)	health care advertising credibility	Corporate (7), Message Content (7), Endorser Trustworthiness (7), Endorser Attractiveness (6)	5-point Likert	"I trust the Company"; "The Company makes truthful claims"; "The persons appeared in the ad seems Trustworthy"; "The health care communication is believable"

follow Cohen's (1988) conventions of .30 and .50 for medium and large correlations, but that strong methods and powerful theories should yield larger effect sizes (Beatty & Pascual-Ferrá, 2019). For the latter, we observed that many of the most commonly used measures in communication as well in psychology are not congeneric, which means that the measure complies with the classical test theory assumption that item errors are independent. When those errors are not independent but instead are correlated, that signals the presence of methodological artifacts or of a latent, unintended factor. Whatever the reason, the presence of correlated inter-item errors in many multiple-indicator, self-report measures is problematic; it can lead to overestimate reliability coefficients of measures, result in inflated corrected correlations between measures when tested by Cronbach's alpha, and pose construct validity problems if a scale is measuring something other than what it is supposed to measure.

Finally, many studies have attempted to measure trust and trust-related concepts by creating one-time use scales for specific studies that are never used again. It is in the best interest of our discipline that researchers attempt to first use existing scales that could benefit from further validation, than keep coming up with new scales that are redundant. For example, communication researchers have been pretty consistent in using one of two main measures of source credibility—Berlo, Lemert, and Mertz (1970) or McCroskey and Teven (1999)—depending on the area of research. These measures are stronger because of the work of researchers who have used them in their studies and in the process provided further confirmatory factor analyses, validation, and reliability measures for them. However, there are other concepts in communication research where development of one-time use scales has exploded in recent years, most notably for measuring media credibility. While it makes sense that new and emerging media forms might bring up questions and scenarios not previously considered when it comes to issues of trust in media, researchers should start by working with existing measures before opting to customize new ones. Studies that look at validating existing scales and constructs are an important contribution that strengthen the field and should be valued as such publications in our discipline.

References

An asterisk (*) before a source means a scale or measure from that source is included in one of the tables in the article. This reference list also includes all material cited in Part 1 of this review.

History of the Roper Center. (n. d.). Roper Center for Public Opinion Research. Retrieved October 12, 2020 from https://ropercenter.cornell.edu/about-center/history-roper-center

Scientific politics.—IV. Public opinion and propaganda. (October 1922). *Science Progress in the Twentieth Century (1919-1933)*, *17*(66), 283–292. Retrieved October 12, 2020 from https://www.jstor.org/stable/43431975

*Abdulla, R. A., Garrison, B., Salwen, M. B., Driscoll, P. D., & Casey, D. (2002). *The credibility of newspapers, television news, and online news*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, Annual Convention, Miami Beach, FL, August 9. Retrieved October 22, 2020 from https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Bruce_Garrison/publication/237343900_THE_CREDIBILITY_OF_NEWSPAPERS_TELEVISION_NEWS_AND_ONLINE_NEWS/links/0046353c3ca10efe56000000.pdf

Abdulla, R. A., Garrison, B., Salwen, M. B., Driscoll, P. D., & Casey, D. (2005). Online news credibility. In M. B. Salwen, B. Garrison, & P. D. Driscoll (Eds.), *Online news and the public* (pp. 147–165). New York: Routledge.

Adams, B. D., Bruyn, L. E., & Chung-Yan, G. (2004). *Creating a measure of trust in small military teams* (No. CR2004.077). Guelph, Ontario: Human Systems Inc.Accessed October 22, 2020. https://www .researchgate.net/publication/235056209_Creating_a_Measure_of_Trust_in_Small_Military_Teams-2004-077

Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswik, E., Levinson, D. J., & Sanford, R. N. (1950). *The authoritatian personality*. New York: Harper Row.

Aldridge, E. C. (1929). *Propaganda—An instrument of war*. Retrieved October 22, 2020 from https://open.bu.edu/handle/2144/5073[PhD Thesis]. Boston University.

Allport, F. H. (1937). Toward a science of public opinion. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, *1*(1), 7–23. http://www.jstor.org/stable/2744799

*Alwitt, L. F., & Prabhaker, P. R. (1994). Identifying who dislikes television advertising: Not by demographics alone. *Journal of Advertising Research*, *34*(6), 17–30. Retrieved October 22, 2020 from https://go.gale.com/ps/anonymous?id=GALE%7CA16684534&sid=googleScholar&v=2.1&it=r&linkaccess=abs&issn=00218499&p=AONE&sw=w

*Andersen, K. E. (1961). *An experimental study of the interaction of artistic and non-artistic ethos in persuasion* [Ph.D., The University of Wisconsin - Madison]. Retrieved October 12, 2020 from http://search.proquest.com/pqdtglobal/docview/302067256/4F717C4F968249D1PQ/1

Andersen, K., & Clevenger Jr, T. (1963). A summary of experimental research in ethos. *Communications Monographs*, *30*(2), 59–78. https://doi.org/10.1080/03637756309375361

*Anderson, C. M., Martin, M. M., & Riddle, B. L. (2001). Small group relational satisfaction scale: Development, reliability and validity. *Communication Studies*, *52*(3), 220–233. https://doi.org/10.1080/10510970109388555

*Andreini, D., Fetscherin, M., & Zarantonello, L. (2020). How a CEO's personality, performance, and leadership predict advertising credibility: Conceptualizing and measuring CEO brand image. *Journal of Advertising Research*. https://doi.org/10.2501/JAR-2020-003

*Appelman, A., & Sundar, S. S. (2016). Measuring message credibility: Construction and validation of an exclusive scale. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, *93*(1), 59–79. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077699015606057

Applbaum, R. F., & Anatol, K. W. E. (1972). The factor structure of source credibility as a function of the speaking situation. *Speech Monographs*, *39*(3), 216–222. https://doi.org/10.1080/03637757209375760

Asch, S. E. (1948). The doctrine of suggestion, prestige, and imitation in social psychology. *Psychological review, 55*(5), 250-276. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0057270

Bartholomew, K., & Horowitz, L. M. (1991). Attachment styles among young adults: A test of a four-category model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 61*(2), 226–244. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.61.2.226

*Bauer, R. A., & Greyser, S. A. (1968). *Advertising in America: The consumer view*. Boston, MA: Division of Research, Harvard Business School.

Beatty, M., & Pascual-Ferrá, P. (2019). The future of communication theory and research. In D. W. Stacks, M. B. Salwen, & K. C. Eichhorn, *An integrated approach to communication theory and research* (3rd ed., pp. 545–551). Taylor and Francis. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203710753-45

Beatty, M. J., Pascual-Ferrá, P., & Levine, T. R. (2015). Two studies examining the error theory underlying the measurement model of the Verbal Aggressiveness Scale. *Human Communication Research, 41*(1), 55–81. https://doi.org/10.1111/hcre.12039

*Beltramini, R. F. (1982). Advertising perceived believability scale. *Proceedings of the South- western Marketing Association*, 1–3.

Beltramini, R. F. (1988). Perceived believability of warning label information presented in cigarette advertising. *Journal of Advertising*, *17*(2), 26–32. https://doi.org/10.1080/00913367.1988.10673110

Beltramini, R. F., & Evans, K. R. (1985). Perceived believability of research results information in advertising. *Journal of Advertising*, *14*(3), 18–31. https://doi.org/10.1080/00913367.1985.10672953

Berger, C. R., & Calabrese, R. J. (1975). Some explorations in initial interaction and beyond: Toward a developmental theory of interpersonal communication. *Human Communication Research*, *1*(2), 99–112. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2958.1975.tb00258.x

*Berlo, D. K., & Lemert, J. B. (1961). *An empirical test of a general construct of credibility.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Association of America, New York.

*Berlo, D. K., Lemert, J. B., & Mertz, R. J. (1969). Dimensions for evaluating the acceptability of message sources. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, *33*(4), 563–576. https://doi.org/10.1086/267745

Bernays, E. L. (1928). *Propaganda*. New York: H. Liveright.

Bernays, E. L. (1937). Recent trends in public relations activities. *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, *1*(1), 147–151. https://www.jstor.org/stable/2744815

Bernays, E. L. (1942). The marketing of national policies: A study of war propaganda. *Journal of Marketing*, *6*(3), 236–244. https://doi.org/10.1177/002224294200600303

Blakemore, E. (2019, April 18). The rigged quiz shows that gave birth to 'Jeopardy!'—HISTORY. History.Com. Retrieved October 12, 2020 from https://www.history.com/news/quiz-show-scandal-fraud-jeopardy

Bleyer, W. G. (1926). The press and public opinion in international relations. *Journalism Quarterly*, *3*(2), 7–20. https://doi.org/10.1177/107769902600300203

Blumler, J. G., & McQuail, D. (1969). *Television in politics: Its uses and influence*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Browning, N., & Sweetser, K. D. (2014). The let down effect: Satisfaction, motivation, and credibility assessments of political infotainment. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *58*(6), 810–826. https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764213515227

*Bruning, S. D., & Ledingham, J. A. (1999). Relationships between organizations and publics: Development of a multi-dimensional organization-public relationship scale. *Public Relations Review*, *25*(2), 157–170. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0363-8111(99)80160-X

Buber, M. (1923). *I and thou* (W. Kaufmann, Trans). New York: Simon and Schuster.

Buller, D. B., & Aune, R. K. (1987). Nonverbal cues to deception among intimates, friends, and strangers. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*, *11*(4), 269–290. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00987257

Buller, D. B., & Burgoon, J. K. (1994). Deception: Strategic and nonstrategic communication. In J. A. Daly & J. M.

Wiemann (Eds.), *Strategic interpersonal communication* (pp. 191–223). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Buller, D. B., & Burgoon, J. K. (1996). Interpersonal deception theory. *Communication theory*, *6*(3), 203–242. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2885.1996.tb00127.x

Buller, D. B., Comstock, J., Aune, R. K., & Strzyzewski, K. D. (1989). The effect of probing on deceivers and truthtellers. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*, *13*(3), 155–170. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00987047

*Burgoon, J. K., Buller, D. B., Ebesu, A. S., & Rockwell, P. (1994). Interpersonal deception: V. Accuracy in deception detection. *Communications Monographs*, *61*(4), 303–325. https://doi.org/10.1080/03637759409376340

Burgoon, J. K., Buller, D. B., Ebesu, A., Rockwell, P., & White, C. (1996). Testing interpersonal deception theory: Effects of suspicion on nonverbal behavior and relational messages. *Communication Theory, 6*, 243–267. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2885.1996.tb00128.x

*Burgoon, J. K., & Hale, J. L. (1987). Validation and measurement of the fundamental themes of relational communication. *Communications Monographs*, *54*(1), 19–41. https://doi.org/10.1080/03637758709390214

Canary, D. J., & Stafford, L. (1992). Relational maintenance strategies and equity in marriage. *Communications Monographs*, *59*(3), 243–267. https://doi.org/10.1080/03637759209376268

Cantril, H. (1940). America faces the war: A study in public opinion. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, *4*(3), 387–407. https://doi.org/10.1086/265420

Cantril, H., Gaudet, H., & Herzog, H. (1952). *The invasion from Mars*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Carroll, T., & Stacks, D. W. (2004). *Bibliography of public relations measurement*. Gainesville, FL: The Institute for Public Relations Research and Education. Retrieved October 22, 2020 from https://instituteforpr.org/wp-content/uploads/PRM_Bibliography.pdf

Carter, R. F., & Greenberg, B. S. (1965). Newspapers or television: Which do you believe? *Journalism Quarterly*, *42*(1), 29–34. https://doi.org/10.1177/107769906504200104

*Cegala, D. J., Coleman, M. T., & Turner, J. W. (1998). The development and partial assessment of the medical communication competence scale. *Health Communication*, *10*(3), 261–288. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327027hc1003_5

Charnley, M. V. (1936). Preliminary notes on a study of newspaper accuracy. *Journalism Quarterly, 13*(4), 394–401. https://doi.org/10.1177/107769903601300403

*Chaouachi, S. G., & Rached, K. S. B. (2012). Perceived deception in advertising: Proposition of a measurement scale. *Journal of Marketing Research & Case Studies*, 1–15. https://doi.org/10.5171/2012. 712622.

*Clatterbuck, G. W. (1979). Attributional confidence and uncertainty in initial interaction. *Human Communication Research*, *5*(2), 147–157. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2958.1979.tb00630.x

Clementson, D. E. (2016). Why do we think politicians are so evasive? Insight from theories of equivocation and deception, with a content analysis of US presidential debates, 1996–2012. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, *35*(3), 247–267. https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927X15600732

Clementson, D. E. (2017). *Deception detection in politics: Partisan processing through the lens of truth-default theory* (Doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University). Retrieved October 22, 2020 from https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Deception-Detection-in-Politics%3A-Partisan-through-Clementson/b3eed9c816cbc2b727a146d99c8523bbbb82efed

Clementson, D. E. (2018a). Deceptively dodging questions: A theoretical note on issues of perception and detection. *Discourse & Communication*, *12*(5), 478–496. https://doi.org/10.1177/1750481318766923

Clementson, D. E. (2018b). Effects of dodging questions: How politicians escape deception detection and how they get caught. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, *37*(1), 93–113. https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927X17706960

Clementson, D. E. (2018c). Susceptibility to deception in a political news interview: Effects of identification, perceived cooperativeness, and ingroup vulnerability. *Communication Studies*, *69*(5), 522–544. https://doi.org/10.1080/10510974.2018.1454486

Clementson, D. E. (2018d). Truth bias and partisan bias in political deception detection. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, *37*(4), 407–430. https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927X17744004

Clementson, D. E. (2019). Why won't you answer the question? Mass-mediated deception detection after journalists' accusations of politicians' evasion. *Journal of Communication*, *69*(6), 674–695. https://doi.org/10.1093/joc/jqz036

*Clifford, S., & Gaskins, B. (2016). Trust me, I believe in God: Candidate religiousness as a signal of trustworthiness. *American Politics Research*, *44*(6), 1066–1097. https://doi.org/10.1177/1532673X15608939

Coleman, P. T. (10 Aug 2017). World peace: How do we keep nations from thermonuclear war? Ten big ideas on peace and justice from the career of Morton Deutsch. *Psychology Today*. Retrieved October 12, 2020 from https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/the-five-percent/201708/world-peace-how-do-we-keep-nations-thermonuclear-war

*Coombs, W. T., & Holladay, S. J. (1996). Communication and attributions in a crisis: An experimental study in crisis communication. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, *8*(4), 279–295. https://doi.org/10.1207/s1532754xjprr0804_04

*Coombs, W. T., & Holladay, S. J. (2002). Helping crisis managers protect reputational assets: Initial tests of the situational crisis communication theory. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *16*(2), 165–186. https://doi.org/10.1177/089331802237233

*Costigan, J. L., & Schmeidler, M. A. (1984). Exploring supportive and defensive communication climates. In J. W. Pfeiffer & L. D. Goodstein (Eds.), *The 1984 handbook for group facilitators* (pp. 112–114). San Diego, CA: University Associates.

*Cotte, J., Coulter, R. A., & Moore, M. (2005). Enhancing or disrupting guilt: The role of ad credibility and perceived manipulative intent. *Journal of Business Research*, *58*(3), 361-368. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0148-2963(03)00102-4

Creel, G. (1920). *How we advertised America: The first telling of the amazing story of the Committee on Public Information that carried the gospel of Americanism to every corner of the globe*. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Curtis, A. (Director). (2002). *The century of the self* [TV documentary series]. British Broadcasting Corporation.

*Dainton, M., & Aylor, B. (2001). A relational uncertainty analysis of jealousy, trust, and maintenance in long distance versus geographically close relationships. *Communication Quarterly*, *49*(2), 172-188. https://doi.org/10.1080/01463370109385624

Deutsch, M. (1949). A theory of cooperation and competition. *Human Relations*, *2*, 129–152. https://doi.org/10.1177/001872674900200204

Deutsch, M. (1958). Trust and suspicion. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, *2*(4), 265–279. https://doi.org/10.1177/002200275800200401

Deutsch, M. (1960). The effect of motivational orientation upon trust and suspicion. *Human Relations*, *13*(2), 123–139. https://doi.org/10.1177/001872676001300202

Deutsch, M., & Gerard, H. B. (1955). A study of normative and informational social influences upon individual judgment. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, *51*(3), 629–636. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0046408

D'Olimpio, L. (2016, October 25). Fear, trust, and the social contract: What's lost in a society on permanent alert. The Philosopher's Zone. Retrieved October 12, 2020 from https://www.abc.net.au/news/2016-10-26/fear-trust—social-contract-society-on-permanent-alert/7959304

Dodd, M. D. (2016). Intangible resource management: Social capital theory development for public relations. *Journal of Communication Management*, *20*(4), 289–311. https://doi.org/10.1108/JCOM-12-2015-0095

Dodd, M. (2018). Globalization, pluralization, and erosion: The impact of shifting societal expectations for advocacy and public good. *The Journal of Public Interest Communications*, *2*(2), 221–221. https://doi.org/10.32473/jpic.v2.i2.p221

Dodge, R. (1920). The psychology of propaganda. *Religious Education*, *15*(5), 241–252. https://doi.org/ 10.1080/0034408200150502

Doob, L. W. (1935). *Propaganda: Its psychology and technique.* New York: Henry Holt and Company.

Doob, L. W. (1949). The strategies of psychological warfare. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, *13*(4), 635–644. https://doi.org/10.1086/266122

Doob, L. W. (1950). Goebbels' principles of propaganda. *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, *14*(3), 419–442. https://doi.org/10.1086/266211

Edelman. (2020). *20 Years of trust*. Retrieved October 12, 2020 from https://www.edelman.com/20yearsoftrust/

*Ellis, K., & Shockley-Zalabak, P. (2001). Trust in top management and immediate supervisor: The relationship to satisfaction, perceived organizational effectiveness, and information receiving. *Communication Quarterly*, *49*(4), 382–398. https://doi.org/10.1080/01463370109385637

*Erskine, H. (1970). The polls: Opinion of the news media. *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, *34*(4), 630–643. https://www.jstor.org/stable/2747720

*Falcione, R. L. (1974). The factor structure of source credibility scales for immediate superiors in the organizational context. *Central States Speech Journal, 25*(1), 63–66. https://doi.org/10.1080/10510977409367770

Feeney, J. A., Noller, P., & Hanrahan, M. (1994). *Assessing adult attachment.* In M. B. Sperling & W. H. Berman (Eds.), *Attachment in adults: Clinical and developmental perspectives* (pp. 128–152). New York: Guilford Press.

Fetzer Institute. (n.d.). Trust in people scale. Retrieved October 12, 2020 from https://fetzer.org/sites/default/files/images/stories/pdf/selfmeasures/Self_Measures_for_Trust_TRUST_IN_PEOPLE.pdf

Finn, A. N., Schrodt, P., Witt, P. L., Elledge, N., Jernberg, K. A., & Larson, L. M. (2009). A meta-analytical review of teacher credibility and its associations with teacher behaviors and student outcomes. *Communication Education*, *58*(4), 516–537. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634520903131154

*Flanagin, A. J., & Metzger, M. J. (2000). Perceptions of Internet information credibility. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, *77*(3), 515–540. https://doi.org/10.1177/107769900007700304

*Flanagin, A. J., & Metzger, M. J. (2003). The perceived credibility of personal web page information as influenced by the sex of the source. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *19*(6), 683–701. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0747-5632(03)00021-9

Flanagin, A. J., & Metzger, M. J. (2007). The role of site features, user attributes, and information verification behaviors on the perceived credibility of web-based information. *New Media & Society*, *9*(2), 319–342. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444807075015

*Forward, G. L., Czech, K., & Lee, C. M. (2011). Assessing Gibb's supportive and defensive communication climate: An examination of measurement and construct validity. *Communication Research Reports*, *28*(1), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1080/08824096.2011.541360

Freud, S. (1922). *Beyond the pleasure principle*. (C.J.M. Hubback, Trans.). London: The International Psycho-Analytical Press. (Original work published 1920)

*Friedlander, F. (1966). Performance and interactional dimensions of organizational work groups. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *50*(3), 257. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0023361

Gara, G. L., & La Porte, J. M. (2020). Processes of building trust in organizations: internal communication, management, and recruiting. *Church, Communication and Culture, 5*(3), 298–319. doi:10.1080/23753234.2020.1824581

Garfinkel, S. L. (1987). *Radio research, McCarthyism and Paul F. Lazarsfeld* (unpublished undergraduate thesis). Boston: Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Accessed October 22, 2020. https://www.infoamerica.org/documentos_pdf/lazarsfeld03.pdf

*Gaziano, C., & McGrath, K. (1986). Measuring the concept of credibility. *Journalism Quarterly*, *63*(3), 451–462. https://doi.org/10.1177/107769908606300301

Gerbner, G., & Gross, L. (1976a). The scary world of TV's heavy viewer. *Psychology Today*, *9*(11), 41–45. Retrieved October 22, 2020 from https://www.academia.edu/2846318/The_scary_world_of_TVs_heavy_viewer

Gerbner, G., & Gross, L. (1976b). Living with television: The violence profile. *Journal of Communication*, *26*(2), 172–199. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.1976.tb01397.x

*Gerbner, G., Gross, L., Eleey, M. F., Jackson-Beeck, M., Jeffries-Fox, S., & Signorielli, N. (1977). TV violence profile no. 8: The highlights. *Journal of Communication*, *27*(2), 171–180. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.1977.tb01845.x

Gibb, J. R. (1951). The effects of group size and of threat reduction upon creativity in a problem-solving situation. *American Psychologist*, *6*(5), 324.

Gibb, J. R. (1961). Defensive communication. *Journal of Communication*, *11*(3), 141–148. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.1961.tb00344.x

Gibb, J. R. (1962). Factors producing defensive behavior within groups [Technical Report CT Nonr-3088(00)]. Washington, DC: National Training Laboratories. Retrieved on September 29, 2020, from https://apps.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/402132.pdf

Giffin, K. (1967a). The contribution of studies of source credibility to a theory of interpersonal trust in the communication process. *Psychological Bulletin*, *68*(2), 104. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0024833

Giffin, K. (1967b). Interpersonal trust in small group communication. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, *53*(3), 224–234. https://doi.org/10.1080/00335636709382837

Gil, A. & Gili, G. (2020) Transmission or 'creative fidelity'? The institutional communicator's role in the Church today, *Church, Communication and Culture, 5*(3), 320–338, DOI: 10.1080/23753234.2020.1820881

*Glaser, S. R., Zamanou, S., & Hacker, K. (1987). Measuring and interpreting organizational culture. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *1*(2), 173–198. https://doi.org/10.1177/0893318987001002003

Golan, G. J. (2010). New perspectives on media credibility research. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *54*(1), 3–7. https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764210376307

Golan, G. J., & Kiousis, S. K. (2010). Religion, media credibility, and support for democracy in the Arab world. *Journal of Media and Religion*, *9*(2), 84–98. https://doi.org/10.1080/15348421003738793

Goldhaber, G. M. (1976). *The ICA communication audit: Rationale and development*. Paper prepared for the special edition of "Communication, Journal of the Communication Association of the Pacific" compiled for the C.A.P. Convention (Kobe, Japan, June 1976). Retrieved October 15, 2020 from https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED127637

*Goldhaber, G. M., & Rogers, D. P. (1979). *Auditing organizational communication systems: The ICA commmunication audit*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt Pub.

Graham, E. E., & Mazer, J. P. (2020). *Communication research measures III: A sourcebook.* New York: Routledge.

Graves, W. B. (Ed.). (1928). *Readings in public opinion: Its formation and control*. New York: Appleton.

Greenberg, B. S. (1966). Media use and believability: Some multiple correlates. *Journalism Quarterly*, *43*(4), 665–670. https://doi.org/10.1177/107769906604300405

*Greenberg, B. S. (1974). Gratifications of television viewing and their correlates for British children. In J. G. Blumler & E. Katz (Eds.), *The uses of mass communication: Current perspectives on gratifications research* (pp. 71–92). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

*Greer, J. D. (2003). Evaluating the credibility of online information: A test of source and advertising influence. *Mass Communication & Society*, 6, 11–28. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327825MCS0601_3

Grunig, J. E. (Ed.). (1992) *Excellence in public relations and communication management*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Grunig, J. E., & Hunt, T. (1984). *Managing public relations*. Belmont, Calif: Thomson/Wadsworth.

Grunig, L. A., Toth, E. L., & Hon, L. C. (2000). Feminist values in public relations. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, *12*(1), 49–68. https://doi.org/10.1207/S1532754XJPRR1201_4

*Guerrero, L. K. (1996). Attachment-style differences in intimacy and involvement: A test of the four-category model. *Communications Monographs*, *63*(4), 269–292. https://doi.org/10.1080/03637759609376395

*Guerrero, L. K., Andersen, P. A., Jorgensen, P. F., Spitzberg, B. H., & Eloy, S. V. (1995). Coping with the green-eyed monster: Conceptualizing and measuring communicative responses to romantic jealousy. *Western Journal of Communication*, *59*(4), 270–304. https://doi.org/ 10.1080/10570319509374523

Guilday, P. (1921). The Sacred Congregation de Propaganda Fide (1622–1922). *The Catholic Historical Review*, *6*(4), 478–494. http://www.jstor.com/stable/25011717

Guttman, L. (1944). A basis for scaling qualitative data. *American Sociological Review*, *9*(2), 139–150. https://www.jstor.org/stable/2086306

Guttman, L. (1950). The principal components of scale analysis. In S. A. Stouffer, L. Guttman, E. A. Suchman, P. F. Lazarsfeld, S. A. Star, & J. A. Clausen (Eds.), *Measurement and prediction. (Studies in social psychology in World War II. Vol.4)* (pp. 312–361). Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Guzik P. (2020). An unfinished story of conversion: Clerical sexual abuse in Poland. *Church, Communication and Culture, 5*(3), 417–455. doi:10.1080/23753234.2020.1827963

Haiman, F. S. (1948). An experiment in informative speaking. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, *34*(3), 355–360. https://doi.org/10.1080/00335634809381415

Harding, J. (1944). The measurement of civilian morale. In H.Cantril (Ed.), *Gauging public opinion* (233–258). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

*Hargie, O. E., & Tourish, D. E. (2009). *Auditing organizational communication: A handbook of research, theory and practice*. New York: Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.

*Hargittai, E., Fullerton, L., Menchen-Trevino, E., & Thomas, K. (2010). Trust online: Young adults' evaluation of web content. *International Journal of Communication, 4*, 27. Retrieved October 12, 2020 from https://ijoc.org/index.php/ijoc/article/view/636

*Hayes, A. F., Glynn, C. J., & Shanahan, J. (2005). Willingness to self-censor: A construct and measurement tool for public opinion research. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, *17*(3), 298–323. https://doi.org/10.1093/ijpor/edh073

Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. (1987). Romantic love conceptualized as an attachment process. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *52*(3), 511-524. https://doi.org/ 10.1037/0022-3514.52.3.511

Hellmueller, L., & Trilling, D. (2012, June). *The credibility of credibility measures: A meta-analysis in leading communication journals, 1951 to 2011.* Paper presented at the WAPOR 65th Annual Conference in Hong Kong, June, 2012. Retrieved October 22, 2020 from https://wapor2012.hkpop.hk/doc/papers/ConcurrentSessionsV/VD/VD-3.pdf

Hewgill, M. A., & Miller, G. R. (1965). Source credibility and response to fear-arousing communications. *Speech Monographs, 32*(2), 95–101, https://doi.org/ 10.1080/03637756509375436

*Hon, L. C., & Grunig, J. E. (1999). *Guidelines for measuring relationships in public relations*. Gainseville, FL: Institute for Public Relations. Retrieved October 22, 2020 from https://www.instituteforpr.org/wp-content/uploads/Guidelines_Measuring_Relationships.pdf

*Horan, S. M., & Chory, R. M. (2013). Relational implications of gay and lesbian workplace romances: Understanding trust, deception, and credibility. *The Journal of Business Communication (1973)*, *50*(2), 170-189. https://doi.org/10.1177/0021943612474993

*Housholder, E. E., & LaMarre, H. L. (2014). Facebook politics: Toward a process model for achieving political source credibility through social media. *Journal of Information Technology & Politics*, *11*(4), 368–382. https://doi.org/10.1080/19331681.2014.951753

Hovland, C. I. (1951). Changes in attitude through communication. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, *46*(3), 424–437. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0055656

Hovland, C. I. Janis, I. L., & Kelley, H. H. (1953). *Communication and persuasion.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Hovland, C. I., Lumsdaine, A. A., & Sheffield, F. D. (1949). *Experiments on mass communication. (Studies in social psychology in World War II, Vol. 3)*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Hovland, C. I., & Weiss, W. (1951). The influence of source credibility on communication effectiveness. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, *15*(4), 635–650. https://doi.org/ 10.1086/266350

*Huang, Y. H. (1997). *Public relations, organization–public relationships, and conflict management*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park.

*Huang, Y. H. (2001). OPRA: A cross-cultural, multiple-item scale for measuring organization-public relationships. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, *13*(1), 61–90. https://doi.org/10.1207/S1532754XJPRR1301_4

*Hubbell, A. P., & Chory-Assad, R. M. (2005). Motivating factors: Perceptions of justice and their relationship with managerial and organizational trust. *Communication Studies*, *56*(1), 47–70. https://doi.org/ 10.1080/0008957042000332241

*Ishak, M. S., Omar, S. Z., Bolong, J., Hasan, M. A., & Ghani, Z. A. (2011). Internet's Islamic information credibility scale (IIICS). *'Ulum Islamiyyah: The Malaysian Journal of Islamic Sciences*, *6*(2011), 3–28. Retrieved October 22, 2020 from http://repo.uum.edu.my/10115/

*Jackob, N. G. E. (2010). No alternatives? The relationship between perceived media dependency, use of alternative information sources, and general trust in mass media. *International Journal of Communication*, *4*, 589–606. Retrieved October 22, 2020 from https://ijoc.org/index.php/ijoc/article/view/615

Jacobson, H. K. (1969). Mass media believability: A study of receiver judgments. *Journalism Quarterly*, *46*(1), 20–28. https://doi.org/10.1177/107769906904600103

Jamal, A., & Nooruddin, I. (2010). The democratic utility of trust: A cross-national analysis. *The Journal of Politics, 72*(1), 45–59. https://doi:10.1017/s0022381609990466

*Johnson, D., & Grayson, K. (2005). Cognitive and affective trust in service relationships. *Journal of Business Research*, *58*(4), 500–507. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0148-2963(03)00140-1

*Johnson, T. J., & Kaye, B. K. (1998). Cruising is believing? Comparing Internet and traditional sources on media credibility measures. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, *75*(2), 325–340. https://doi.org/10.1177/107769909807500208

Johnson, T., & Kaye, B. (2010). Choosing is believing? How web gratifications and reliance affect Internet credibility among politically interested users. *Atlantic Journal of Communication*, *18*(1), 1–21. https://doi.org/10.1080/15456870903340431

Joo, S., Miller, E. G., & Fink, J. S. (2019). Consumer evaluations of CSR authenticity: Development and validation of a multidimensional CSR authenticity scale. *Journal of Business Research*, *98*, 236–249. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.01.060

*Kang, M. (2010). Measuring social media credibility: A study on a measure of blog credibility. Institute for Public Relations. Retrieved October 12, 2020 from https://instituteforpr.org/wp-content/uploads/BlogCredibility_101210.pdf

Katz, E., Blumler, J., & Gurevitch, M. (1973). Uses and gratifications research. *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, 37(4), 509–523. Retrieved September 29, 2020, from http://www.jstor.org/stable/2747854

Kelly, M. L. (co-host). (2020, October 9). Week in politics. *All Things Considered* [Radio broadcast]. Washington, DC: National Public Radio. Retrieved October 22, 2020 from https://www.npr.org/2020/10/09/922375769/week-in-politics-vice-presidential-debate-outbreak-in-white-house-trumps-remarks

Kent, M. L., & Taylor, M. (2002). Toward a dialogic theory of public relations. *Public Relations Review*, *28*(1), 21–37. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0363-8111(02)00108-X

*Kim, Y. (2001). Searching for the organization-public relationship: A valid and reliable instrument. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, 78(4), 799–815. https://doi.org/10.1177/107769900107800412

Kim, J. Y., Kiousis, S., & Molleda, J. C. (2015). Use of affect in blog communication: Trust, credibility, and authenticity. *Public Relations Review*, *41*(4), 504–507. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2015.07.002

King, T. R. (1964). *An experimental study of the effect of artistic and non-artistic ethos upon the immediate and delayed recall of information conveyed in a speech* [Doctoral dissertation]. Louisiana State University.

King, T. R. (1966). An experimental study of the effect of ethos upon the immediate and delayed recall of information. *Central States Speech Journal*, *17*(1), 22–28. https://doi.org/10.1080/10510976609362812

*Kiousis, S. (2001). Public trust or mistrust? Perceptions of media credibility in the information age. *Mass Communication & Society*, *4*(4), 381–403. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327825MCS0404_4

*Kohring, M., & Matthes, J. (2007). Trust in news media: Development and validation of a multidimensional scale. *Communication Research*, *34*(2), 231–252. https://doi.org/10.1177/0093650206298071

*Kumar, I. M. (2020). Credibility of health care advertising: An empirical understanding of its multi-dimensional structure and scale validation with special reference to children's health food drinks. *Indian Journal of Public Health Research & Development*, *11*(2), 163–168. Retrieved October 22, 2020 from https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=&ved=2ahUKEwiQ7bj88MjsAhUFlXIEHW7uArEQFjAAegQIBBAC&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.medicopublication.com%2Findex.php%2Fijphrd%2Farticle%2Fdownload%2F813%2F750&usg=AOvVaw3m828fNAkyKYo088xP9_Kf

Larzelere, R., & Huston, T. (1980). The dyadic trust scale: Toward understanding interpersonal trust in close relationships. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 42*(3), 595–604. https://doi.org/10.2307/351903

Lasswell, H. D. (1925). Two forgotten studies in political psychology. *The American Political Science Review*, *19*(4), 707–717. Retrieved October 22, 2020 from https://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/amepscir19&div=42&g_sent=1&casa_token=534Rb9wZAVsAAAAA:o6ZGyzPP31PEEiWBzfU2VDlPbHhKOnggnT0y8vwxIuG3TWMB9B7bFo6W31rTAfkypvmIvTmKtIc&collection=journals

Lasswell, H. D. (1927). *Propaganda technique in the World War*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Leathers, D. G. (1992). *Successful nonverbal communications: Principles and applications*. New York: Macmillan.

Ledbetter, A. M. (2013). Relational maintenance and inclusion of the other in the self: Measure development and dyadic test of a self-expansion theory approach. *Southern Communication Journal*, *78*(4), 289–310. https://doi.org/10.1080/1041794X.2013.815265

Lemert, J. B. (August, 1963). *Dimensions of source credibility.* Report presented to Association for Education in Journalism. University of Nebraska.

Levine, T. R. (2014). Truth-default theory (TDT): A theory of human deception and deception detection. *Journal* *of Language and Social Psychology, 33,* 378–392. https://doi.org/10.1177/0261927X14535916

Levine, T. R. (2019). *Duped: Truth-default theory and the social science of lying and deception*. Tuscaloosa: University Alabama Press.

Levine, T. R., & McCornack, S. A. (1989). *Distinguishing between types of suspicion and measuring a predisposition towards suspicion: Two studies validating a measure of trait suspicion*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, San Francisco, CA.

*Levine, T. R., & McCornack, S. A. (1991). The dark side of trust: Conceptualizing and measuring types of communicative suspicion. *Communication Quarterly*, *39*(4), 325–340. https://doi.org/10.1080/1463379109369809

Levine, T. R., Park, H. S., & McCornack, S. A. (1999). Accuracy in detecting truths and lies: Documenting the "veracity effect." *Communications Monographs*, *66*(2), 125–144. https://doi.org/10.1080/03637759909376468

Lewin, K. (1945). The Research Center for Group Dynamics at Massachusetts Institute of Technology. *Sociometry*, *8*(2), 126–136. https://www.jstor.org/stable/2785233

Lewis, H. B. (1941). Studies in the principles of judgments and attitudes: IV. The operation of "prestige suggestion." *The Journal of Social Psychology, 14*(1), 229–256. https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.1941.9921508

Lewis, J. D., & Weigert, A. (1985). Trust as a social reality. *Social Forces*, *63*(4), 967–985. https://doi.org/10.1093/sf/63.4.967

Likert, R. (1932). A technique for the measurement of attitudes. In R.S. Woodworth (Ed.), *Archives of Psychology*, *22*(140), 5–55.

Lippmann, W. (1922). *Public opinion*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company. https://www.google.com/books/edition/Public_Opinion/eLobn4WwbLUC?hl=en&gbpv=1

*Lock, I., & Seele, P. (2017). Measuring credibility perceptions in CSR communication: A scale development to test readers' perceived credibility of CSR reports. *Management Communication Quarterly*, *31*(4), 584–613. https://doi.org/10.1177/0893318917707592

Loomis, J. L. (1957). Communication and the development of trust. *Dissertation Abstracts* (1959-08085-001; Vol. 19), 378.

Loomis, J. L. (1959). Communication, the development of trust, and cooperative behavior. *Human Relations*, *12*(4), 305–315. https://doi.org/10.1177/001872675901200402

Lundberg, G. A. (1926). The newspaper and public opinion. *Social Forces*, *4*(4), 709–715. https://doi.org/10.2307/3004449

*Luo, M., Hancock, J. T., & Markowitz, D. M. (2020). Credibility perceptions and detection accuracy of fake news headlines on social media: Effects of truth-bias and endorsement cues. *Communication Research*. https://doi.org/10.1177/0093650220921321

Lutz, R. L., MacKenzie, S. B., & Belch, G. E. (1983). Attitude toward the ad as a mediator of advertising effectiveness: Determinants and consequences. In R. P. Bagozzi & A. M. Tybout (Eds.), *NA - Advances in Consumer Research* (Vol. 10, pp. 532–539). Ann Abor, MI: Association for Consumer Research.

Lyon, F., Möllering, G., & Saunders, M. N. (Eds.). (2015). *Handbook of research methods on trust* (2nd ed.). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing.

*MacKenzie, S. B., & Lutz, R. J. (1989). An empirical examination of the structural antecedents of attitude toward the ad in an advertising pretesting context. *Journal of Marketing*, *53*(2), 48–65. https://doi.org/10.1177/002224298905300204

*Markham, D. H. (1965). *The dimensions of source credibility of television mewscasters* [Ph.D., The University of Oklahoma]. Retrieved October 12, 2020 from http://search.proquest.com/pqdtglobal/docview/302196713/citation/3D8BEF01C646F7PQ/1

*Markham, D. H. (1968). The dimensions of source credibility of television newscasters. *Journal of Communication*, *18*(1), 57–64. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.1968.tb00055.x

*McAllister, D. J. (1995). Affect-and cognition-based trust as foundations for interpersonal cooperation in organization. *Academy of Management Journal*, *38*(1), 24–59. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/256727.

*McCornack, S. A., & Parks, M. R. (1986). Deception detection and relationship development: The other side of trust. *Annals of the International Communication Association*, *9*(1), 377–389. https://doi.org/10.1080/23808985.1986.11678616

McCornack, S. A., & Parks, M. R. (1990). What women know that men don't: Sex differences in determining the truth behind deceptive messages. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, *7*(1), 107–118. https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407590071006

*McCroskey, J. C. (1966). Scales for the measurement of ethos. *Speech Monographs*, *33*(1), 65–72. https://doi.org/ 10.1080/03637756609375482

McCroskey, J. C. (2007, February 5). Source credibility measures. Retrieved September 29, 2020, from http://www.jamescmccroskey.com/measures/source_credibility.htm

McCroskey, J. C., Hamilton, P. R., & Weiner, A. N. (1974). The effect of interaction behavior on source credibility, homophily, and interpersonal attraction. *Human Communication Research*, *1*(1), 42–52. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2958.1974.tb00252.x

McCroskey, J. C., Holdridge, W., & Toomb, J. K. (1974). An instrument for measuring the source credibility of basic speech communication instructors. *Communication Education*, *23*(1), 26–33. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634527409378053

*McCroskey, J. C., & Jensen, T. A. (1975). Image of mass media news sources. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, *19*(2), 169–180. https://doi.org/10.1080/08838157509363777

McCroskey, J. C., Jensen, T., & Valencia, A. C. (1973a). *Measurement of the credibility of mass media sources*. Paper presented at the Western Speech Communication Association Convention, Albuquerque, New Mexico, November 1973.

McCroskey, J. C., Jensen, T., & Valencia, A. C. (1973b). *Measurement of the credibility of peers and spouses*. Paper presented at the International Communication Association Convention, Montreal, April 1973.

*McCroskey, J. C., & Richmond, V. P. (1989). Bipolar scales. In P. Emmert & L. L. Barker (Eds.), *Measurement of communication behavior* (pp. 154–167). New York: Longman.

McCroskey, J. C., Scott, M. D., & Young, T. J. (1971). *The dimensions of source credibility for spouses and peers*. Paper presented at the Western Speech Association Convention, Fresno, Cal., November 1971.

*McCroskey, J. C., & Teven, J. J. (1999). Goodwill: A reexamination of the construct and its measurement. *Communications Monographs*, *66*(1), 90–103. https://doi.org/10.1080/03637759909376464

McCroskey, J. C., & Young, T. J. (1981). Ethos and credibility: The construct and its measurement after three decades. *Communication Studies*, *32*(1), 24–34. https://doi.org/10.1080/10510978109368075

*McLeod, J. M., & Becker, L. B. (1974). Testing the validity of gratification measures through political effects analysis. In J. G. Blumler & E. Katz (Eds.), *The uses of mass communications: Current perspectives on gratifications research* (Vol. 3, pp. 137–164). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

*McLeod, J. M., Pettey, G., Kosicki, G., & Tanjong, E. (1985). *Beyond believability: A comparative analysis of what the public knows and thinks about television and newspaper news.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, Memphis, TN, August 3–6.

McLeod, J. M., Rush, R. R., & Friederich, K. H. (1968). The mass media and political information in Quito, Ecuador. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, *32*(4), 575–587. https://doi.org/10.1086/267647

Meier, N. C. (1925). Motives in voting: A study in public opinion. *American Journal of Sociology*, *31*(2), 199–212. https://doi.org/10.1086/213852

Mellinger, G. D. (1956). Interpersonal trust as a factor in communication. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, *52*(3), 304. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0048100

*Metzger, M. J. (2007). Making sense of credibility on the web: Models for evaluating online information and recommendations for future research. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, *58*(13), 2078–2091. https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.20672

Meyer, P. (1985). There's encouraging news about newspaper credibility and it's in a surprising location. *Presstime*, 26–27.

*Meyer, P. (1988). Defining and measuring credibility of newspapers: Developing an index. *Journalism Quarterly*, *65*(3), 567–574. https://doi.org/10.1177/107769908806500301

*Miller, A., & Kurpius, D. (2010). A citizen-eye view of television news source credibility. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *54*(2), 137–156. https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764210376315

Miller, G. R., & Hewgill, M. A. (1964). The effect of variations in nonfluency on audience ratings of source credibility. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, *50*(1), 36–44. https://doi.org/10.1080/00335636409382644

Molleda, J. C., & Jain, R. (2013). Identity, perceived authenticity, and reputation: A dynamic association in strategic communications. In C. E. Carroll (Ed.), *The handbook of communication and corporate reputation* (pp. 435–445). Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

*Morgan, R. M., & Hunt, S. D. (1994). The commitment-trust theory of relationship marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, *58*(3), 20–38. https://doi.org/10.1177/002224299405800302

*Munnukka, J., Uusitalo, O., & Toivonen, H. (2016). Credibility of a peer endorser and advertising effectiveness. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, *33*(3), 182–192. https://doi.org/10.1108/JCM-11-2014-1221

Narbona, J., Pujol, J., & Gregory, A. (2020). The fragile tenets of trust. *Church, Communication and Culture, 5*(3), 293–297. doi:10.1080/23753234.2020.1825975

Newcomb, T. M. (1953). An approach to the study of communicative acts. *Psychological Review, 60*(6), 393–404. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0063098

*Newhagen, J., & Nass, C. (1989). Differential criteria for evaluating credibility of newspapers and TV news. *Journalism Quarterly*, *66*(2), 277–284. https://doi.org/10.1177/107769908906600202

Nightingale, S. J., Wade, K. A., & Watson, D. G. (2017). Can people identify original and manipulated photos of real-world scenes? *Cognitive research: Principles and implications*, *2*(1), 30. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41235-017-0067-2

O'Brien, P. M. (2020). Transparency as a means to rebuild trust within the Church: A case study in how Catholic dioceses and eparchies in the United States have responded to the clergy sex abuse crisis. *Church, Communication and Culture, 5*(3), 456–483. doi:10.1080/23753234.2020.1827962

*Obermiller, C., & Spangenberg, E. R. (1998). Development of a scale to measure consumer skepticism toward advertising. *Journal of consumer psychology*, *7*(2), 159–186. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327663jcp0702_03

Office of Public Opinion Research. (1942). Office of Public Opinion Research, Survey #813: War (Version 2) [Dataset]. Cornell University, Ithaca, NY: Roper Center for Public Opinion Research. https://doi.org/10.25940/ROPER-31095294

*Ohanian, R. (1990). Construction and validation of a scale to measure celebrity endorsers' perceived expertise, trustworthiness, and attractiveness. *Journal of Advertising*, *19*(3), 39–52. https://doi.org/10.1080/00913367.1990.10673191

Osgood, C. E. (1952). The nature and measurement of meaning. *Psychological Bulletin*, *49*(3), 197–237. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0055737

Osgood, C. E., Suci, G. J., & Tannenbaum, P. H. (1957). *The measurement of meaning*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

*Pace, S. (2004). Miracles or love? How religious leaders communicate trustworthiness through the web. *The Journal of Religion and Popular Culture*, *7*(1), 4–4. https://doi/org/10.3138/jrpc.7.1.004

Palmgreen, P., Wenner, L. A., & Rayburn, J. D. (1980). Relations between gratifications sought and obtained: A study of television news. *Communication Research*, *7*(2), 161–192. https://doi.org/10.1177/009365028000700202

Park, H. S., Levine, T., McCornack, S., Morrison, K., & Ferrara, M. (2002). How people really detect lies. *Communication Monographs*, *69*(2), 144–157. https://doi.org/10.1080/714041710

Pascual-Ferrá, P. (2013). Congenericity and the measurement of interpersonal communication constructs: A confirmatory factor analytic test of four measures (Publication No. 3563970) [Doctoral dissertation, University of Miami]. ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.

Pascual-Ferrá, P., & Beatty, M. J. (2015). Correcting internal consistency estimates inflated by correlated item errors. *Communication Research Reports, 32*(4), 347–352. https://doi.org/10.1080/08824096.2015.1089858

Pearce, W. B. (1973). *Trust in interpersonal communication*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Communication Association (Montreal, May 1973).

Pooley, J. D., & Socolow, M. J. (2013). Critical communication history | Checking up on *The Invasion from Mars*: Hadley Cantril, Paul Lazarsfeld, and the making of a misremembered classic. *International Journal of Communication*, *7*, 29. Retrieved October 22, 2020 from https://ijoc.org/index.php/ijoc/article/view/2117

*Potter, W. (1986). Perceived reality and the cultivation hypothesis. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, *30*(2), 159–174. https://doi.org/10.1080/08838158609386617

Potter, W. J. (1988). Perceived reality in television effects research. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, *32*(1), 23–41. https://doi.org/10.1080/08838158809386682

Pouliot, L., & Cowen, P. S. (2007). Does perceived realism really matter in media effects? *Media Psychology*, *9*(2), 241–259. https://doi.org/10.1080/15213260701285819

Rawlins, B. (2007). Trust and PR practice. Institute for Public Relations. Retrieved October 12, 2020 from https://instituteforpr.org/wp-content/uploads/Rawlins-Trust-formatted-for-IPR-12-10.pdf

Razlogova, E. (2011). *The listener's voice: Early radio and the American public*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Rempel, J. K., Holmes, J. G., & Zanna, M. P. (1985). Trust in close relationships. J*ournal of Personality and Social Psychology, 49*(1), 95–112. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.49.1.95

Renkus, W. (2019). National Association of Broadcasters. *Encyclopædia Britannica*. Retrieved October 10, 2020 from https://www.britannica.com/topic/National-Association-of-Broadcasters

Richmond, V. P., & McCroskey, J. C. (1990). Reliability and separation of factors on the assertiveness-responsiveness measure. *Psychological Reports*, *67*(2), 449–450. https://doi.org/10.2466/PR0.67.6.449-450

Rimmer, T., & Weaver, D. (1987). Different questions, different answers? Media use and media credibility. *Journalism Quarterly*, *64*(1), 28–44. https://doi.org/10.1177/107769908706400104

*Roberts, K. H., & O'Reilly, C. A. (1974). Measuring organizational communication. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *59*(3), 321. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0036660

Robinson, M. J., & Kohut, A. (1988). Believability and the press. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, *52*(2), 174–189. https://doi.org/10.1086/269093

Rogers, C. R. (1951). *Client-centered therapy: Its current practice, implications, and theory* (pp. xii, 560). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Rogers, C. R. (1989). *The Carl Rogers reader*. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company.

*Roper and Associates, & Hausman, L. (1962). *The public's attitudes toward television and other media: Report of a study.* Television Information Office. Retrieved October 12, 2020 from https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=uc1.b3567089&view=1up&seq=5

*Rosenberg, M. (1956). Misanthropy and political ideology. *American Sociological Review*, *21*(6), 690–695. https://doi.org/10.2307/2088419

*Rotter, J. B. (1967). A new scale for the measurement of interpersonal trust. *Journal of Personality, 35*(4), 651–665. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.1967.tb01454.x

Rubin, A. M. (1979). Television use by children and adolescents. *Human Communication Research*, *5*(2), 109–120. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2958.1979.tb00626.x

*Rubin, A. M. (1981). An examination of television viewing motivations. *Communication Research*, *8*(2), 141–165. https://doi.org/10.1177/009365028100800201

Rubin, A. M. (1983). Television uses and gratifications: The interactions of viewing patterns and motivations. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, *27*(1), 37–51. https://doi.org/10.1080/08838158309386471

Rubin, R. B., Palmgreen, P., & Sypher, H. E. (2004). *Communication research measures: A sourcebook*. New York: Routledge.

Rubin, R. B., Rubin, A. M., Graham, E. E., Perse, E. M., & Seibold, D. R. (2011). *Communication research measures II: A sourcebook.* New York: Routledge.

Saleh, H. F. (2016). Developing new media credibility scale: A multidimensional perspective. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, *10*(4), 1351–1364. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1124519

*Salwen, M. B. (1987). Credibility of newspaper opinion polls: Source, source intent, and precision. *Journalism Quarterly*, *64*(4), 813–819. https://doi.org/10.1177/107769908706400420

*Sandage, C. H., & Leckenby, J. D. (1980). Student attitudes toward advertising: Institution vs. instrument. *Journal of Advertising*, *9*(2), 29–44. https://doi.org/10.1080/00913367.1980.10673316

Sarofim, S., & Cabano, F. G. (2018). In God we hope, in ads we believe: The influence of religion on hope, perceived ad credibility, and purchase behavior. *Marketing Letters, 29*(3), 391–404. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11002-018-9469-2

Schwartz, A. B. (2015). *Broadcast hysteria: Orson Welles's* War of the Worlds *and the art of fake news*. New York: Hill and Wang.

Schweitzer, D. A. (1970). The effect of presentation on source evaluation. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, *56*(1), 33–39. https://doi.org/10.1080/00335637009382980

Schweitzer, D. A., & Ginsburg, G. P. (1966). Factors of communicator credibility. In C. W. Backman & P. F. Secord (Eds.), *Problems in social psychology* (pp. 94–102). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Self, C. C., & Roberts, C. (2019). Credibility. In D. W. Stacks, M. B. Salwen, & K. C. Eichorn (Eds.), *An integrated approach to communication theory and research* (3rd edition) (pp. 435–446). New York: Routledge.

*Shavitt, S., Lowrey, P., & Haefner, J. (1998). Public attitudes toward advertising: More favorable than you might think. *Journal of advertising research*, *38*(4), 7–22. Retrieved October 22, 2020 from https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Sharon_Shavitt2/publication/247294509_Public_Attitudes_Toward_Advertising_More_Favorable_Than_You_Might_Think/links/0c9605324604b3b3ad000000/Public-Attitudes-Toward-Advertising-More-Favorable-Than-You-Might-Think.pdf

*Shen, C., Kasra, M., Pan, W., Bassett, G. A., Malloch, Y., & O'Brien, J. F. (2019). Fake images: The effects of source, intermediary, and digital media literacy on contextual assessment of image credibility online. *New Media & Society*, *21*(2), 438–463. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444818799526

Sherif, M. (1935). An experimental study of stereotypes. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 29*(4), 371–375. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0060783

Simonson, P., & Archer, L. (n. d.). Pioneering women in media research. Out of the Question [film website]. Retrieved from http://outofthequestion.org/Women-in-Media-Research.aspx

Sisson, D. C. (2017). Inauthentic communication, organization-public relationships, and trust: A content analysis of online astroturfing news coverage. *Public Relations Review*, *43*(4), 788–795. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2017.05.003

*Soh, H., Reid, L. N., & King, K. W. (2009). Measuring trust in advertising. *Journal of advertising*, *38*(2), 83–104. https://doi.org/10.2753/JOA0091-3367380206

Solomon, L. (1960). The influence of some types of power relationships and game strategies upon the development of interpersonal trust. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, *61*(2), 223. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0047571

Spitzberg, B. H., & Cupach, W. R. (1994). Dark side denouement. *The dark side of interpersonal communication* (pp. 315–320). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Sproule, J. M. (1984). *The propaganda analysis movement since World War I.* Paper presented at the 70th Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (Chicago, IL, November 1–4, 1984). https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED253902

Stacks, D. W. (2002). *Primer of public relations research*. New York: Guilford.

Stacks, D. W., Dodd, M. D., & Men, L. R. (2013). Corporate reputation measurement and evaluation. In C. E. Carroll (Ed.), *The handbook of communication and corporate reputation* (pp. 559–573). Hoboken, NJ: Blackwell Publishing.

Stacks, D. W., & Watson, M. L. (2007). Two-way communication based on quantitative research and measurement. In E. L. Toth (Ed.), *The future of excellence in public relations and communication management: Challenges for the next generation* (pp. 67–83). New York: Routledge.

Stafford, L. (2011). Measuring relationship maintenance behaviors: Critique and development of the revised relationship maintenance behavior scale. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, *28*(2), 278–303. https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407510378125

Stafford, L., & Canary, D. J. (1991). Maintenance strategies and romantic relationship type, gender and relational characteristics. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, *8*(2), 217–242. https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407591082004

Stafford, L., Dainton, M., & Haas, S. (2000). Measuring routine and strategic relational maintenance: Scale revision, sex versus gender roles, and the prediction of relational characteristics. *Communications Monographs*, *67*(3), 306–323. https://doi.org/10.1080/03637750009376512

*Sternadori, M. M., & Thorson, E. (2009). Anonymous sources harm credibility of all stories. *Newspaper Research Journal*, *30*(4), 54–66. https://doi.org/10.1177/073953290903000405

*Strom, B. (2003). Communicator virtue and its relation to marriage quality. *The Journal of Family Communication*, *3*(1), 21–40. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327698JFC0301_02

*Sundar, S. S. (1999). Exploring receivers' criteria for perception of print and online news. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, *76*(2), 373–386. https://doi.org/10.1177/107769909907600213

*Susila, I., & Nugroho, S. P. (2019). The new measurement of political trust rhetoric dimensions in political marketing communication: The young people perspective. *Humanities & Social Sciences Reviews*, *7*(4), 1285–1290. https://doi.org/10.18510/hssr.2019.74177

Tankard, J. W. (1972). Public opinion polling by newspapers in the presidential election campaign of 1824. *Journalism Quarterly*, *49*(2), 361–365 https://doi.org/10.1177/107769907204900219

Tannenbaum, P. H., & McLeod, J. M. (1963). Public images of mass media institutions. *Paul J. Deutschmann Memorial Papers in Mass Communications Research*, 51–59.

Taylor, D. A., & Altman, I. (1966). Intimacy-scaled stimuli for use in studies of interpersonal relations. *Psychological Reports*, *19*(3), 729–730. https://doi.org/10.2466/pr0.1966.19.3.729

*Teven, J. J. (2008). An examination of perceived credibility of the 2008 presidential candidates: Relationships with believability, likeability, and deceptiveness. *Human Communication*, *11*(4), 391–408. Retrieved October 22, 2020 from http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.615.8086&rep=rep1&type=pdf

Teven, J. J., & McCroskey, J. C. (1997). The relationship of perceived teacher caring with student learning and teacher evaluation. *Communication Education, 46*(1), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634529709379069

Thurstone, L. L. (1928). Attitudes can be measured. *American Journal of Sociology*, *33*(4), 529–554. https://doi.org/10.1086/214483

Thurstone, L. L. (1931). Multiple factor analysis. *Psychological Review*, *38*(5), 406–427. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0069792

*Toma, C. L., & Hancock, J. T. (2012). What lies beneath: The linguistic traces of deception in online dating profiles. *Journal of Communication*, *62*(1), 78–97. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2011.01619.x

Triffit, M. (2018 July 8). A growing mistrust in democracy is causing extremism and strongman politics to flourish. The Conversation.com. Retrieved February 8, 2021 from https://theconversation.com/a-growing-mistrust-in-democracy-is-causing-extremism-and-strongman-politics-to-flourish-98621

Tsfati, Y., & Cappella, J. N. (2003). Do people watch what they do not trust? Exploring the association between news media skepticism and exposure. *Communication Research*, *30*(5), 504–529. https://doi.org/10.1177/

Uslaner E. M. (2003) Trust, democracy, and governance: Can government policies influence generalized trust?. In M. Hooghe, & D. Stolle (Eds.) *Generating social capital: Civil society and institutions in comparative perspective*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781403979544_90093650203253371

*Vangelisti, A., Caughlin, J., & Timmerman, L. (2001). Criteria for revealing family secrets. *Communication Monographs*, *68*(1), 1–27. https://doi.org/10.1080/03637750128052

Venanzi, K. (1997). An examination of the television quiz show scandals of the 1950s. Retrieved September 29, 2020, from http://www.plosin.com/beatbegins/projects/venanzi.html

*Wagner, J. D. (2017). *Assessing the communication climate focus of professional nurses in selected public hospitals in the Gauteng province through the development of a measuring instrument* [Doctoral dissertation]. University of South Africa. Retrieved October 13, 2020 from http://uir.unisa.ac.za/bitstream/handle/10500/24783/thesis_wagner_j-d..pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y

*Walter, O. M. (1948). *The measurement of ethos* [PhD Thesis]. Northwestern University.

*Wanta, W., & Hu, Y. W. (1994). The effects of credibility, reliance, and exposure on media agenda-setting: A path analysis model. *Journalism Quarterly*, *71*(1), 90–98. https://doi.org/10.1177/107769909407100109

Watson, G. (Ed.). (1942). *Civilian morale: Second yearbook of the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. https://doi.org/10.1037/13983-000

Westley, B. H., & Severin, W. J. (1964). Some correlates of media credibility. *Journalism Quarterly*, *41*(3), 325–335. https://doi.org/10.1177/10776990640410030.

*Wheelan, S. A., & Hochberger, J. M. (1996). Validation studies of the group development questionnaire. *Small Group Research*, *27*(1), 143–170. https://doi.org/10.1177/1046496496271007

*Wheeless, L. R. (1976). Self-disclosure and interpersonal solidarity: Measurement, validation, and relationships. *Human Communication Research*, *3*(1), 47–61. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2958.1976.tb00503.x

*Wheeless, L. R. (1978). A follow-up study of the relationships among trust, disclosure, and interpersonal solidarity. *Human Communication Research*, *4*(2), 143–157. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2958.1978.tb00604.x

Wheeless, L. R., & Grotz, J. (1977). The measurement of trust and its relationship to self-disclosure. *Human Communication Research*, *3*(3), 250–257. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2958.1977.tb00523.x

*Whitehead Jr, J. L. (1968). Factors of source credibility. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, *54*(1), 59–63. https://doi.org/10.1080/00335636809382870

Wrightsman Jr, L. S. (1964). Measurement of philosophies of human nature. *Psychological Reports*, *14*(3), 743–751. https://doi.org/10.2466/pr0.1964.14.3.743

*Xu, Q. (2014). Should I trust him? The effects of reviewer profile characteristics on eWOM credibility. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *33*, 136–144. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2014.01.027

*Yang, S., Kang, M., & Cha, H. (2015). A study on dialogic communication, trust, and distrust: Testing a scale for measuring organization–public dialogic communication (OPDC). *Journal of Public Relations Research*, *27*(2), 175–192. https://doi.org/10.1080/1062726X.2015.1007998

*Zacchilli, T. L., Hendrick, C., & Hendrick, S. S. (2009). The romantic partner conflict scale: A new scale to measure relationship conflict. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, *26*(8), 1073–1096. https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407509347936

Zuckerman, M., DePaulo, B. M., & Rosenthal, R. (1981). Verbal and nonverbal communication of deception. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 14, pp. 1–59). Cambridge, MA: Academic Press.

Zuckerman, M., Koestner, R., Colella, M. J., & Alton, A. O. (1984). Anchoring in the detection of deception and leakage. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *47*(2), 301. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.47.2.301

Book Reviews

Davis, Jenny L. *How Artifacts Afford: The Power and Politics of Everyday Things***.** Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press. 2020. Pp. 208. ISBN: 9780262044110 (cloth) $30.00

How Artifacts Afford: The Power and Politics of Everyday Things, a groundbreaking text, delves into affordance theory, providing a much-needed update of the theory's underpinnings historically, conceptually, politically, and methodologically. Davis draws connections about affordances across fields and disciplines, continuously weaving in the ideology that technological artifacts are both powerful and political. The book eloquently pieces together work from multiple scholars and perspectives to bring clarity and salience to the term affordance. Introducing the mechanisms and conditions framework, Davis uses it to show the relationship that takes place between technology, affordances, and society. She argues the mechanisms and conditions framework shifts affordance analysis to ask *how* artifacts afford, rather than what artifacts afford. Applying a critical lens throughout the book, she successfully communicates her goals and thesis by a strategic organization and a meaningful, exciting writing style that makes it easy to comprehend her examples and vocabulary.

How Artifacts Afford has seven chapters. Most can be read either all together or independently of the others (minus Chapters 4 and 5, which should be read as a unit). Chapter 1, "Introduction," provides a great overview to the whole book. Chapter 2, "A Brief History of Affordances," provides a linear deep dive into the intellectual history and lineage of affordances and transitions from the historical to the theoretical. Chapter 3, "Politics and Power," draws the distinction between actor-network theory (ANT) and affordance analysis while focusing on both the political and theoretical foundation of the mechanisms and conditions framework. After this foundation, Chapters 4 and 5, "Mechanisms of Affordance" and "Conditions of Affordance" (to be read as a unit), paint the full in-depth picture of the mechanisms and conditions framework. Turning to methodology, Chapter 6, "Affordances in Practice," fleshes out how to use the mechanisms and conditions framework analytically. This chapter does a wonderful job of laying out other theoretical approaches that would pair well with the mechanisms and conditions framework. To close, Chapter 7, "Conclusion," leaves readers with big questions about affordances, specifically focusing on being critical, taking action, and research needed for moving forward.

Affordance theory and affordances have a long interdisciplinary history. The concept originated in the 1960s and '70s in the field of ecological psychology. Since then, affordance thought has penetrated fields such as science and technology studies (STS), design studies, engineering, sociology, communication studies, and education, among others. James J. Gibson first defined affordance as "a way to approach the mutual constitution between people and environments" (p. 6). Around 10 years later, design studies saw an uptick in the concept due to Donald A. Norman's desire to understand human-machine interactions. Davis writes specifically about technological affordances and how they are formed through interactions with humans. Davis explains that, "affordances are how objects shape action for socially situated subjects" (p. 6), while also arguing that researchers and practitioners need to critically think about and interrogate affordances. She focuses on asking the questions of how, for whom, and under what circumstances technologies afford. Her work, specifically the application and use of the mechanisms and conditions framework, falls at the intersection of design studies and the social sciences, showing both practical and analytical approaches. She references and builds upon the work of Virginia Eubanks and Safiya Umoja from a social science perspective and the work of Batya Friedman, Mary Flanagan, and Helen Nissenbaum from a design studies lens. Each piece in this foundational corpus focuses on the relationships between ethical technology, intentional design, and the relationship between technology and society.

How Artifacts Afford's strengths are its organization, clear and concise academic writing, and richness rooted in the historical, conceptual, political, and methodological. The vocabulary, explanations, and real-life examples throughout the text enable readers with little to no knowledge of affordance theory to comprehend the arguments and discussion. The critical approach to this work is seminal, thought-provoking, relevant, and vital to the mediated world we live in today. The book left me wanting to know more about affordances and how to implement change in regard to technological design and development.

Areas that could have been more developed are adding practical action items for designers and people working outside of academia and the conversation around what objects are deemed able to afford. I appreciated the conversation about the critical approach and uncovering how technologies harm those who are marginalized. In the same realm, the sections about intentional design were extremely useful, but I was left with more questions. How can we start to move the needle forward in the world of design? For example, how can we ensure intentional design is actually taking place when we function in a capitalistic society and most technologies are created for some type of financial gain? Who builds all of these technologies? Are there protocols, regulations, and/or policies for how technologies are designed and built? Who has access to apply to design jobs in the first place? What training and education should designers be required to have? Should there be a requirement that a design team have an array of members with vastly different life experiences and world views? With all this information at our fingertips, how can we bridge this work from academia to the design world in practical ways? Various strategies for change were touched on, but I would have loved to hear case studies where this critical approach was implemented and the results. In addition, a conversation about what specific types of objects afford would be enriching. I was left wondering, do any and all objects afford, or are only objects deemed technological fall into this category?

In general, Davis's text is comprehensive, logical, and fairly easy to read, giving the concept of affordance the update it needed. The book delivers in doing what it says it is going to do and meets expectations laid out by Davis. The work expands and contributes to the field of affordance theory. With everything taking place in our current climate, our critical eye and attention is needed on affordances, intentional design, ethical technology, and the relationship between technology and society. This book would be beneficial not only to students taking a college course in one or more of the disciplines mentioned earlier, but also to those working in technology design and those consuming and using technologies daily. All in all, this formative book is applicable to anyone and everyone with a smartphone or computer who is inspired to be more critical of their media use.

—Krysten Stein
University of Illinois at Chicago

O'Mara, Margaret. *The Code: Silicon Valley and the Remaking of America*. New York: Penguin Press, 2019. Pp. xiii, 496. ISBN 978-0399562181 (cloth) $30.00; 978-0399562204 (paper) $20.00; 978-0399562198 (E-Book) no price listed.

Reviewing this book suggests a question: What does Silicon Valley history have to do with communication research? I would argue that it has a lot to do with the kinds of questions we ask in our profession as researchers and people generally ask about how we communicate in our present context of global communication and social media. The question is partly about how the technology affects how and with whom we communicate. But it is also about the ecosystem from which that technology came and how it has penetrated the everyday lives of much of the world's people. The book addresses not just stars of technology, like Steve Jobs, Mark Zuckerberg, Bill Gates, or Jeff Bezos, whose stories are often told. Much has been written about Silicon Valley, but a look at its entire 70-plus year history has rarely been attempted. The present book is one of the best of those attempts to date. The author, Margaret O'Mara, is a historian who tells the story of the ecosystem that began after WWII and continues today and includes the big names of technology in Silicon Valley (and Seattle), but more importantly, emphasizes the complexity of the community of engineers, lawyers, politicians, venture capitalists, academics, and many other contributors who make up a complex and unique system. Finally, a personal note: I spent 13 years at Stanford during the early middle years of this 70-year arc, and the book has helped me better understand my own trajectory as a professor of communication.

This is a story of people and of technologies set in the unique geography of Northern California in a particular historical period from 1946 to 2020. But it is a story that is more complex than just engineers and their inventions. It includes critical elements often left out of the rise of the techno-billionaires: the importance from the beginning and continuing today of government/defense money and legislation; marketing promotion and journalists writing about the technologies who helped create the myths and heroes; the rise of venture capital as a funding mechanism; the role of Stanford and its university research symbiosis with the emerging tech companies; the role of law firms in the first stages of new companies' growth; finally, the increasing importance of political lobbying in Washington. The author uses a metaphor for this complex system, calling it a Galapagos, a unique ecosystem in Northern California (that includes Seattle, but with limitations) at a certain historical time that makes it almost impossible to replicate. The narrative structure is a straightforward chronological accounting, but it includes all of these elements woven together and makes a revealing response to the question O'Mara begins with: Why it has been so hard for others to replicate Silicon Valley elsewhere in the United States as well as internationally?

It will be impossible to give an adequate account of the almost 500 pages, so I will pick a few themes that are relevant to communication research with the understanding that the review will be limited but hopefully not compromised. O'Mara begins her story with Fred Terman, the engineering dean and later provost at Stanford University from 1944 to 1968. Such a beginning matters for several reasons: Terman promoted the idea of connecting university research both with outside funding and with close interaction of academic research with the emerging technology companies who were beginning to cluster around the university; when Terman later became provost he promoted this paradigm for the whole university beginning in the 1960s. It was this broader promotion that included the social sciences, statistics, and communication studies that led to the hiring of Wilbur Schramm for a small communication department in 1955 (see Lowen, 1997, for an incisive history of this early period for Stanford). Schramm's early connection with the tech industry was partly due to his publishing Shannon and Weaver's *The Mathematical Theory of Communication* in 1949 when he was both head of Illinois Press and dean of Communication there. Schramm would later try to connect the emerging field of communication with that of the emerging computing field, but the effort did not prosper. In later years as will be clear, a good deal of the Valley's technologies were about communication starting with communication satellites in the early 1960s and going on to networked computers (ARPANET), the Internet, and recently social media. Stanford helped train graduate students in many fields with the availability of funded research projects so that they learned how to do research besides the mandatory dissertation and could help seed early departments like computer science, space, and even communication study.

In Part 1 (beginnings to 1970), O'Mara talks about the people of Silicon Valley *and* the ecosystem. After identifying Terman as a key early player, she goes on to the 1957 arrival in Palo Alto of William Shockley whose aim was to create a business around his Nobel Prize winning transistor. After a brief period of recruiting young engineers to his company, a group called the "traitorous eight" left Shockley to found their own companies (like Fairchild and later Intel) that marked the real beginning of Silicon Valley. She identifies one historical event, the launch of the Soviet space satellite Sputnik in 1957, that ramped up both higher education and the defense industry. Satellite development would soon lead to communication satellites that began to globalize the world with potential connections in what in the mid-1960s McLuhan called the Global Village. Other things were happening in an emerging computer science that began to move from IBM's mainframe computer to smaller computers later connected so that researchers could share data in real time. The defense contribution was the creation in the late 1960s of the ARPANET to digitally connect university research centers in a way that the links could survive if the Soviets used their nuclear bombs. At the same time, a new type of investment challenged the government contracts for tech support: venture capital (VC) that allowed private investment to support small and risky start-ups without government oversight and interference. By the late 1960s, Wall Street started to show an interest in these start-ups that had begun to make serious money for the VCs. Lockheed Missiles and Space had been the major employer of engineers in Silicon Valley from the beginning, but after the Vietnam War, in the early 1970s defense spending had slowed and the economy began a new phase that favored the emerging new technologies.

In Part 2 (1970s), O'Mara begins to build the theme of journalism and marketing success in making the newly minted name of "Silicon Valley," first used in print in 1971, into both a brand but also a myth. Several stories helped create the myth: Xerox PARC (Palo Alto Research Center) created in 1970 generated the beginning of the microcomputer and its mouse; the creation of the Home Brew Club (also in Palo Alto) for budding young tech enthusiasts; and the well known story of the Two Steves (Jobs and Wozniak). But O'Mara is careful to note the critical importance of Regis McKenna as the marketing genius of the new Apple II computer as well as the equally important role of Mike Markkula as the early venture investor and advisor. She also notes that President Carter's tax cut for capital gains in 1979 helped the tech start-ups to keep more of their money for growing their companies.

Part 3 (1980s) deals with a shift from large defense contracts for technology to the new microcomputer that had begun to enter the market with Apple, Tandem, and others. But Apple had the advantage of marketing by McKenna and the "storyteller" role of Jobs who helped convince Wall Street of the myth of "changing the world" through the personal computer. Toward the very end of 1979 Apple's IPO sold enough shares to make the modest start-up worth $2 billion and garner the attention of Wall Street. But it would not be a happy end of the decade as Jobs was fired from his own company, and the Japanese began to produce more and cheaper microchips to run the personal computers that began to explode in U.S. homes (from 724,000 in 1980 to 2.8 million two years later). But the Apple bubble burst when IBM entered the market with its PC in 1981. Its machine was not as elegant as Apple's, but using Microsoft, it shared an open system as opposed to Apple's closed system. What was important to both competitors was that gradually over the decade the personal computer began to be used not only for personal tasks but also began to cater to the business world. Networking was a consequence of connecting computers to one another for tasks of data transfer but increasingly for communication, both personal (email) and professional (meetings and marketing). Added to the growth of this infrastructure was the resurgence of defense spending under Ronald Regan's eight years as president (1980–1988).

Part 4 (1990–2019) includes one of the key technologies created outside of Silicon Valley, the gradual introduction of the Internet as a widely used means of communicating. Granted that the Internet was invented by someone outside this Galapagos, it was quickly recognized as a critical component for the future of modern communication—especially by businesses like Google, Facebook, Amazon as well as the NASDAQ stock market system that exploded in the 1990s for tech investors. The downturn of 2001 and the general great recession of 2008 did not ultimately suppress the enthusiasm for the technologies that had emerged in the early years of the new millennium. The appearance of social networks in the second decade would have major impacts on politics as well as culture where everyone with a computer could be their own content developer seeking an audience. The book ends without much of a synthesis, but this is the nature of the strategy: to gather all of the details and leave the reader to make something of it. The critique that seems valid to make is that aside from constant concern about the lack of gender equality through this long story, the author expresses few concerns about the size and dominance of Silicon Valley in the everyday lives of all of us nor its dominance in the market place within the U.S. and elsewhere.

I return briefly to my original question about how this very comprehensive history of Silicon Valley might be of value to those in the Communication Studies. To begin with, many of the basic technologies developed are critical to understanding how much of the world communicates today, not so much with the old media of film, radio, television, print, but with the vast array of digital media that is the focus of much current communication study. Grasping the consequences of this infrastructure is essential in our understanding of how deeply interconnected we all are. Communication research into this ecosystem in which we all live seems relegated to the edges of the field. There are a variety of ways that the communication field might move this research toward a central focus. One common way to understand the structure of this digital phenomenon is with a political economy approach broadly speaking. This book provides the historical development of an international communication system dominated by four of Silicon Valley's largest businesses, Google, Facebook, Amazon, and Apple, that dominate so much of our communication. The EU has, over the past few years, attempted to control their dominance, and as recently as October, 2020, even the U.S.

Congress began to question this power. A second important consequence for communication may be to better understand the political impact of the Internet and its content, with the U.S. as a very good case in point. Another focus might be on the arrival of streaming technology for film and video distribution and now into content production as well. Netflix and other streamers have begun to challenge the very meaning of Hollywood. And the influence of the large streamers in the international market may return communication researchers to the old debate about cultural imperialism. The impact of digital technology on the field of journalism is evident in the U.S. by the disruption of the economic model, as Google and Facebook have sucked away advertising from much of the news industry. These are just a few of the kinds of questions to be answered by today's communication scholars in light of this book's history of Silicon Valley.

The book has copious notes and a good index, indicating that O'Mara is a serious researcher.

—Emile McAnany
Emeritus Professor, Santa Clara University

References

Lowen, R. (1997). *Creating the cold war university: The transformation of Stanford*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Schramm, W. (1955). Information theory and mass communication. *Journalism Quarterly, 32*, 131–146.

Shannon, C. E. & Weaver, W. (1949). *The mathematical theory of communication*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Schiller, Dan. *Digital Depression: Information Technology and Economic Crisis*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press. 2014. Pp. 376. ISBN 9780252038761 (cloth) $95.00; ISBN 9780252080326 (paper) $28.00; ISBN 9780252096716 (e-book) $14.95.

Dan Schiller builds on his work in *Digital Capitalism* with this publication. This text is a heavily-researched tome, evidenced by the 100 pages of notes for 246 pages of text which explore how Information and Communications Technology (ICT) laid the framework for the economic collapse of 2007–2008 and continues to affect the political, economic, and social aspects of our daily lives.

The book's three major sections provide a historical approach to how ICTs intertwine with the capitalistic economy. In 15 chapters, Schiller traces the way technology was first touted as an equalizer and then morphed into its opposite, furthering the reach of digital capitalism and the transnational state where financial and political gain are the goals. Part I, "Digital Capitalism's Ascent to Crisis," reviews ICT history and how the use of networks within the areas of production, finance, and the military contributed to and brought about the economic collapse. Schiller begins by explaining how the labor shift from artisans, to manufacturing, to large scale industry was the start of using technology networks to reorganize labor into a more efficient and productive process. This reorganization increased profits and simultaneously led to wage depression resulting in social and political pressures. Schiller continues by explaining how the use of networks within those three areas weakened the United States' labor force. Within production, the use of networks severed the previous tether to only one physical location. Schiller uses the automotive industry as an example of how increased investment in ICTs weakened the American auto worker. The networked financial industry compounded the economic problems of the American worker because as wages diminished, people used credit that literally and figuratively compounded the problem through high interest rates. The transformation of the industrial war complex in George W. Bush's regime showcases the reasons and plans for ICTs within the industrial military complex. "This strategy formalized reliance on weapons and intelligence capabilities that relied ever more heavily on network systems and applications" (p. 63), showcasing the insatiable need for networked technologies.

Part II, "The Recomposition of Communications," contains five chapters and concentrates on commodity chains and their deepening use and reliance on networks, which contributes to the digital depression. The very aspects of ICTs that were to provide equity, such as distance collaboration, perpetuated the decline of labor. Technology created new media and thus new products were created to take advantage of new media: "Lucrative businesses took shape around sales and rentals of new media—videotapes, CDs, DVDs—and around the playback systems needed to use them" (p. 75). Schiller then shifts to the Internet and the how the ability of web browsers to function and be used over different network systems (instead of on separate networks specific to an industry or organization) was building towards the next growth feature of ICTs.

The most heavily referenced chapter in the book is "Web Communications Commodity Chains." At 31 pages, the chapter has 289 footnotes. One main point, often ignored by the public, is how virtual spaces rely on the physicality of physical equipment and networks to exist. The digital is tethered to the physical. The physical hardware, software, and networks are commodities that shape the political, economic, and social aspects of our country and world and allow the Web to function. Schiller explains how companies started engaging in service bundling and vertical markets to maximize market share and profits. The explosion of smart phones and tablets into the market caused mass consumption of data and bandwidth, and thus the connectivity of networks became the backbone of the industry. In the next chapter, Schiller explores the impact from services and applications—including content. He discusses industries such as the book, music, and film industries, and how the Internet shaped and changed their methods of business using examples such as Kindle, iTunes, and Netflix. Part II ends with the introduction of advertising and its impact on the Web. "The Web had been constructed around advertisers' demands for user data; it both widened and intensified the sales effort" (p. 128). Schiller foreshadows what the future holds by briefly touching on privacy.

Part III, "Geopolitics and Social Purpose," assumes the Internet as now an integral part of our lives. "Internet connectivity had been woven into the global political economy, enabling new commodities, altering state policy, and revamping the ways in which ordinary people worked, played, and communicated" (p. 151). What was left to determine was who would control or continue to control the Internet and its vast network. Starting as early as 2005, the European Union began to challenge the unilateral control the United States wielded over Internet policy.

One of the main issues Schiller focuses on is the free movement of data as "Innumerable profit projects, actual and prospective, were predicated on the unrestricted cross-border movement of data" (p. 165) The United States government's policy was based on the ability of United States companies to conduct business via an unrestricted Internet. Schiller discusses how the movement of data was integral to the newest communications technology service—cloud computing, which required data centers and enacted the economic interests of real estate, IT suppliers, and power systems. This ability to move mass quantities of data also introduced problems of intellectual property and copyright issues along with net neutrality. These issues conflicted with the free flow of information, which were dealt with on economic terms rather than legal ones.

Part III closes with insights into the United States policies on cybersecurity as "networks had been made intrinsic elements within the modernized machinery of war" (p. 213). The United States military relied heavily on communications networks and technologies. Schiller uses drones as an example to explain that while these technologies enabled an easier way of conducting warfare, they also left the United States vulnerable as "The U.S. drive to deepen and extend digital capitalism itself thus accentuated a condition of chronic strategic *insecurity*" (p. 217). The conclusion of the book focuses on challenges to the United States' dominance, or competition from China's products (Huawei and ZTE) and services (Tencent's WeChat), despite U.S. efforts to ban Chinese technology. The final part also discusses the rise of online education as a profit center rather than as way to educate and address inequities (although that was their pitch) by companies (Coursera) and for-profit universities (University of Phoenix). Schiller ends with questions regarding the growth of the communication industry but understands that the digital capitalism it aligns with is not the answer. The situation is not altogether hopeless as "Resources of hope spring from awareness that no variant of digital capitalism serves the human condition—and from the concrete activisms that follow" (p. 246).

This book would be appropriate for graduate students interested in the historical significance of ICTs on the capitalist economic system and how ICTs drive political policies. Along with providing comprehensive historical information, the heavily researched book provides a rich list of valuable literature on the topic. At times, the book uses complicated language and can be a difficult read. It is meant for scholars and not casual readers interested in a robust history of the causes of the digital depression. Schiller's text certainly provides food for thought in the current political environment and the power of technology companies within this context.

—Tracey J. Hayes
Gonzaga University

Thorhauge, Anne Mette, **Andreas Gregersen**, and **Jessica Enevold.** (Eds.). *What's the Problem in Problem Gaming?* Nordic Research Perspectives, Göteborg, Sweden: Nordicom, 2018. Pp. 123. ISBN: 978-91-87957-88-8. €20,00. Free download available from https://www.nordicom.gu.se/en/publikationer/whats-problem-problem-gaming

In the various lockdowns and gathering restrictions resulting from COVID-19, many parents and teachers worry about the excessive amount of time children spend on screens. They are concerned about the negative effects of screen time, such as the decline of cognitive ability, weight gain due to inactivity, loss of social interaction, and increase in depression and anxiety. However, the research presented in *What's the Problem in Problem Gaming*? suggests that understanding these impacts is more complicated.

The book explores the role of video game playing in young people's lives. The American Psychological Association and the World Health Organization (WHO) have identified the problem of video game addiction. However, the authors in this book complicate the concept of video game addiction, proposing that rather than liken excessive video game playing to substance abuse, people should see this behavior through the lens of "problem gaming." The problem with gaming, then, is situated at the intersections of power, social roles, and social institutions. The book asks, for whom is problem gaming a problem? Drawing from research conducted in Norway, the eight chapters in the book come from a variety of disciplinary perspectives, including media studies, game studies, and youth studies.

Once the main argument is established in Chapter 1, each of the subsequent chapters looks at different ways to approach problem gaming in different contexts. In Chapter 2, Rune Kristian and Lundedal Nielsen explore "The Genealogy of Video Game Addiction." Video game addition was first identified in 2013 by the American Psychiatric Association. In 2019, the WHO also ascribed "gaming disorder" to those who lack control over their gaming habits, have a lack of interest in activities other than gaming, and even though there are negative consequences, they continue to game. Since the book is specific to the Scandinavian context, an overview of Norwegian studies on video game addiction is included. The authors are critical of the addiction framework, seeing addiction as a chronic, relapsing disease of the brain. Addiction can be both positive and negative. People can be addicted to running, for example. Addiction can also be used to describe behaviors such as gambling. Given this broad scope, the authors question the relevance of the concept. The final critique is that there are few clinical studies of video game addiction. Instead, video game addiction is determined based on responses to questionnaires.

In Chapter 3, Andreas Gregersen examines "Games Between Family, Homework, and Friends." He argues that problem gaming is about conflicts that emerge because of social expectations and social roles and apply role theory to better explain these conflicts. People take on certain roles which are determined by institutionalized norms of appropriate and inappropriate behavior. When people act as parents, for example, they are doing so based on what is socially accepted as "good parenting." Role conflicts occur because of unequal distribution of power. For example, parents determine appropriate behavior in the home, and this may conflict with the roles that children want to take on. The author interviews children as a way to better understand these conflicts. He discovered that much of the conflicts were not about excessive gaming itself, but instead about how gaming took away from children's participation in other social interactions in the home. In other words, space and time impact these conflicts. Gaming encourages a type of flow that may seem disconnected from the daily routines of the household. Indeed, because gaming takes a lot of cognitive and emotional work, children may not be giving full attention to other household activities. This sociological framework provides valuable insight into the conflicts that arise when there are different expectations of roles based on institutional norms.

Anne Brus argues that stigma is an important component of understanding problem gaming in Chapter 4, "Generagency and Problem Gaming as Stigma." Paying attention to how young people's lives are determined by a generational structure that constrains their agency, a key piece of this chapter is understanding that social constructions of both childhood and adulthood are produced and reproduced in everyday interactions. In order to study the role of gaming in kids' lives, Brus conducted a mixed methods study that included surveys, interviews, and focus groups about gameplay in everyday life. The results showed there were four different ways in which kids used gaming: gaming as a break from other activities, gaming as individual leisure, gaming as a hobby in which kids purchased gear and products to strengthen their identity as a gamer, and gaming as a social activity in which kids socialized with their peers, especially creating a competitive culture. Each type fosters a different degree of conflict with parents. The most conflict occurred in the category of gaming as a social activity. As a result, parents stigmatized these types of players for not sticking to normative expectations. In the end, Brus argues that problem gaming emerges as a result of parents' power over children as well as different perspectives on how gaming should be practiced in everyday life.

Chapter 5, "Problem Gaming as Broken Life Strategies" presents problem gaming as a crisis related to a transition into adulthood. Anne Mette Thorhauge applies Margaret Archer's concept of agential reflexivity to problem gaming. Agential reflexivity refers to the ability of people to monitor themselves within their social reality. Problems arise when someone has impeded reflexivity and cannot transform their concerns into relevant life practices. The examples show young people who stopped attending school or ran away from home because of conflicts with parents over gaming. Similar to the research findings presented in other chapters, parents see excessive gaming as a problem when it takes away from other activities. However, kids disagreed that excessive gaming was a problem. Instead, kids defined the problem as emerging in disagreements between them and their parents about video game use. In the examples provided in this chapter, gaming stands in the way of kids' happiness.

Will problem gaming always be a problem, or will it fade out of kids' lives? This is the question Faltin Karlsen explores in Chapter 6. Specifically, the author looked at the role of games in young people's lives during the transition from adolescence to adulthood. Karlsen interviews hardcore *World of Warcraft* players. In adolescence, young people can spend a lot of time playing video games because they do not have many responsibilities. However, for the participants in this study, excessive playing got worse when they had to take on responsibilities such as moving out of their parents' house, going away to college, or needing to find a job to support themselves. Problem gaming, then, was a response to taking on increased responsibilities and coping with the transition into adulthood. Thus, Karlsen argues that we can't separate the online and offline worlds of young people's lives.

Patrick Prax and Paulin Rajkowsa write about their interviews with both practitioners and patients in a gaming addiction treatment center in Chapter 7, "Problem Gaming from the Perspective of Treatment." Striking about their analysis is the difference between how patients and practitioners frame problem gaming. Treatment professionals saw gaming as problematic when it had negative consequences on other aspects of the patient's life, such as social isolation, decline in physical and mental health, and conflicts with family. Many of the patients, however, saw gaming as an escape from those negative consequences. The authors apply a network approach to look at a gamer's social functioning. They argue that to understand problem gaming, it is important to take into account co-morbidity, or the intersections of psychological and physical consequences of problem gaming as well as the suffering that gamers feel and the role that gaming plays to help them escape from suffering.

The final chapter of the book examines the ethical dimensions of game design. Ian Sturrock describes how the structure of video games often relies on intrinsic and extrinsic motivations. Game design becomes problematic when there are mechanics that encourage compulsive or collusive behavior. Problematic game design leads to problem gaming. Thus, in order to address problem gaming, we need to look at game design itself.

Taken together, the research in the book furthers video game studies. The most valuable contribution is the critique of the addictive frame to understand problem gaming. Instead, the authors look at the many factors that go into why kids play games problematically, either through escape from life stressors or because the video game design encourages it. They also look at social norms and power relations, which influences who gets to define what is problem gaming. In the end, regardless of the theoretical framework, there are clear disconnects between how kids see the role of gaming in their lives and the way those who have power over them are determining whether or not it is problematic.

The book lends itself to future research, especially in the area of gender. Most of the respondents were teenage boys. This begs the question of why problem gaming is a male problem. What would problem gaming look like for girls? Indeed, research on gender differences in video game play shows that girls prefer different kinds of video games than boys and that they play for less time. When they try to enter male-dominated spaces like the ones described in this book, they often face harassment and misogyny. There could be lots of reasons why girls do not become problem gamers, but I wonder if problem gaming were expanded to not only include excessive gaming or the amount of time playing games, what that might look like.

This book would be a welcome addition in an upper division or graduate game studies course. It not only offers theoretical frameworks for approaching gaming in everyday life, but it also offers different methods for analysis. It also provides non-U.S. perspectives, which expands our understanding of the specificity of video games in particular cultural contexts.

—Carolyn M. Cunningham
Gonzaga University