Construction Focus, Vol 14, No 1, (2021) 1 – 11

RETHINKING DISTRUST IN THE NIGERIAN CONSTRUCTION SECTOR: CRITICALLY BRIDGING CONCEPTUAL MISCONCEPTIONS WITH THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS

UMAR Bello[1], ABDULAZEEZ Abubakar Dardau[1], IBRAHIM Ahmad Doko[2], DODO Mansir[1].

[1] Department of Building, Ahmadu Bello University Zaria, Nigeria
[2] Department of Quantity Surveying, Ahmadu Bello University Zaria, Nigeria.

Correspondence: b.umarbd@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Distrust is often portrayed as the opposite of trust, with negative connotations that overshadow its functional role in project governance. In the Nigerian construction industry, where projects are complex, multi-stakeholder, and risk-prone, this view is widespread. This study critically rethinks distrust by contrasting how construction professionals conceptualize it with how it is theoretically defined in the literature. Using a qualitative research design, data were collected through semi-structured interviews with eight senior professionals across multiple disciplines and analyzed using thematic content analysis. The findings reveal three dominant practitioner interpretations of distrust: breach of agreement or obligation, loss of confidence in character or competence, and violation of relational expectations. These interpretations reflect a narrow, moralized view of distrust, which contrasts sharply with established theoretical foundations that frame distrust as a rational, proactive response to uncertainty and risk. By exposing this conceptual gap, the study clarifies distrust as both distinct from and complementary to trust, advancing theoretical understanding and offering practical insights for improving project governance, accountability, and stakeholder engagement in high-risk construction environments.

KEYWORDS: *Construction Industry, Distrust, Project Governance, Trust*.

INTRODUCTION

Trust and distrust are pivotal constructs in shaping interpersonal and organizational relationships, particularly in sectors like construction that are inherently fragmented and high-risk. While trust has been widely promoted as a catalyst for collaboration, productivity, and project success (Mayer, Davis & Schoorman, 1995; Cheung, Chow & Wong, 2011), the concept of distrust remains poorly understood, especially in the Nigerian construction industry. Rather than being treated as a distinct and meaningful construct, distrust is often mistakenly viewed as merely the absence of trust or an inherently destructive force (Kramer, 1994;Cofta, 2006).

This oversimplified perception has contributed to a prevailing misconception within the Nigerian construction industry: that distrust must be eliminated for effective project delivery. Consequently, efforts aimed at enhancing project performance tend to focus exclusively on building trust, through team building, partnering strategies, or collaborative contracts, without recognizing the contextual, rational, and sometimes beneficial role that distrust can play in managing risk, enforcing accountability, and protecting stakeholder interests (Soares, 2012; Hardin, 1993).

In reality, distrust can serve as a legitimate and rational response to uncertainty, past negative experiences, institutional weakness, or opportunistic behaviour that threaten project outcomes. When understood as a cognitive or behavioural expression of perceived risk or misalignment of interests, distrust functions not as an anomaly but as a signal, prompting stakeholders to implement safeguards such as detailed contracts, performance bonds, or third-party oversight (Lau, 2011; Jarvinen & Brenders, 2020). Yet, in Nigerian construction discourse and practice, such rational distrust is often stigmatized or mischaracterized as conflictual, unethical, or unprofessional.

The core problem this paper addresses is the widespread misconception of distrust in the Nigerian construction industry; specifically, the failure to distinguish between destructive distrust (rooted in malice or hostility) and constructive distrust (rooted in rational caution and risk awareness).

This misunderstanding has significant consequences for policy, project governance, and professional behaviour in the industry. For instance, distrust is not merely the absence of trust but can act as a functional mechanism that spurs the adoption of preventive controls, contractual protections, and third-party verifications (Sores, 2012; Cofta, 2006). More recent studies affirm that distrust, when based on evidence, can coexist with trust and even foster more prudent decision-making by exposing power asymmetries, performance risks, or reputational concerns (Issa, Zyaed & Salem, 2018; Bauer, Kastenhofer & Allgaier, 2019). Without acknowledging this duality, practitioners may continue to stigmatize rational safeguards as toxic behaviour, thereby undermining efforts to build robust, context-sensitive trust frameworks in construction partnerships. The Nigerian construction context, with its challenges of corruption, opportunistic behaviour and weak enforcement mechanisms, underscores the need to reframe distrust as a legitimate cognitive and behavioral response to institutional uncertainty (Ikuabe & Oke, 2019; Emborg, Daniels, & Walker, 2020).

Against this background, the aim of this paper is to identify and examine how professionals and practitioners within the Nigerian construction industry understand the concept of distrust, and to compare these perspectives with the theoretical and empirical definitions established in scholarly literature. While distrust has gained increasing recognition as a legitimate construct in project governance theory, its meaning and role remain poorly conceptualized in Nigerian construction practice, where it is often conflated with interpersonal failure or moral breakdown.

This misalignment between practice and theory constitutes a critical conceptual gap that undermines effective project governance and stakeholder collaboration. By critically bridging this gap, the study not only clarifies the conceptual boundaries between trust and distrust but also highlights the strategic and functional role of distrust in governance, risk management, and collaborative project delivery. The significance of this research lies in its potential to inform both scholarly debate and practical interventions aimed at fostering more balanced trust–distrust dynamics in complex construction environments.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Trust: Meaning and Related Constructs

Trust is a foundational concept in human relationships and organizational interactions, frequently cited as a prerequisite for cooperation, collaboration, and performance. However, despite its widespread use, trust remains a complex and multifaceted construct, defined differently across disciplines and cultural contexts (Mayer et al., 1995; Jiang *et al*., 2016). In the construction industry, where multiple stakeholders with diverse interests must work together under conditions of uncertainty and limited oversight, trust becomes particularly significant (Cheung, Chow, & Wong, 2011).

Early conceptualizations of trust, such as that by Deutsch (1958), framed it as an expectation of behaviour that carries more potential negative consequences if unfulfilled than positive consequences if fulfilled. This introduced the essential element of risk inherent in trusting relationships. Building on this, Gambetta (1988) emphasized trust as a belief in the high probability that another party will act beneficially or at least not harmfully, even in the absence of direct oversight. These definitions highlight trust as a psychological state rooted in both expectation and vulnerability.

A widely accepted and influential definition by Mayer, *et al* (1995) describes trust as "the willingness of a party to be vulnerable to the actions of another party based on the expectation that the other will perform a particular action important to the trustor, irrespective of the ability to monitor or control that other party" This understanding introduced the integrative model of trust, incorporating key antecedents; ability, benevolence, and integrity, that shape perceived trustworthiness. In construction contexts, this model has been influential in evaluating interpersonal and interorganizational relationships (Lau, 2011).

In recent years (from 2011), trust has been operationalized in construction management as the willingness of project team members to share information and collaborate without fear of opportunistic exploitation (Pinto *et al*., 2009; Cheung *et al.,* 2011). It supports coordination, encourages knowledge sharing, and reduces the need for extensive contractual controls, especially in complex and fast-paced project environments.

However, trust is often conflated with related concepts such as trustworthiness, cooperation, and reliability, though these represent distinct constructs. Trustworthiness refers to the qualities or attributes (e.g., competence or integrity) that make an individual or organization deserving of trust (Hardin, 2002; Chen, Saparito, & Belkin, 2011). Trust is the decision to take a risk based on the perception of trustworthiness. Similarly, cooperation is an outcome of trust but can also occur in the absence of trust when regulated through external controls or mutual benefits (Lewicki et al., 2006). Reliability, though related to trust, pertains to the consistent fulfilment of obligations or expectations over time, it may contribute to trust but does not constitute it (McEvily & Tortoriello, 2011).

Distinguishing trust from these related constructs is essential to accurately interpret stakeholder behaviour in construction projects. For example, a contractor might be reliable in delivering work on schedule, yet still be viewed with distrust due to perceived opportunism or lack of transparency. Conversely, a stakeholder may be trusted based on reputation, even in the absence of consistent prior interactions, because of perceived alignment of interests.

Ultimately, trust in construction projects is more than a moral ideal, it is a strategic decision informed by perceptions of risk, expected benefit, and the institutional environment. Recognizing its complexity helps lay the foundation for contrasting it more meaningfully with distrust (Cofta, 2006; Kramer, 1999; Issa, Zayed, & Salama, 2018). This will be explored further in the next section.

Distrust: Concept, Evolution, and Differentiation from Trust

Distrust, although often mentioned alongside trust, is a distinct construct with its own theoretical foundations, behavioural implications, and psychological markers. Historically, distrust was treated as the mere absence of trust—a default state when trust is lacking (Gambetta, 1988). However, this simplistic view has been challenged by contemporary scholarship, which increasingly recognizes distrust as a separate, active, and context-dependent belief system (Issa, *et al,* 2018; Cofta, 2006; Kramer, 1999;).

According to Cofta (2006), distrust is best defined as a "confident expectation that another individual's motives, intentions, and behaviour are sinister and harmful to one's own interests". This definition emphasizes that distrust is not a passive void but a cognitive and emotional stance grounded in perceived or experienced threat. It is frequently shaped by prior experiences, institutional weaknesses, and social cues that signal the potential for betrayal or opportunism.

Within the Nigerian construction industry, distrust is often prevalent due to the complexity of stakeholder relationships, limited transparency, and perceived opportunistic behaviors (Ikuabe & Oke, 2019). Empirical evidence indicates that such environments foster not only trust where conditions are favourable but also justified distrust when contractual breaches, misaligned incentives, or communication failures arise (Ikuabe & Oke, 2019). Thus, distrust should not be dismissed as irrational hostility but rather understood as a response to contextual risk and uncertainty.

Recent research, such as Marsh & Dibben (2017) further differentiates distrust from related constructs such as untrustworthiness, suspicion, and cynicism. While untrustworthiness refers to a demonstrated failure to meet obligations over time, distrust may emerge even in the absence of direct violations, often driven by anticipation of harm or institutional failures (Marsh & Dibben, 2017). Suspicion involves a tentative concern or doubt, typically at early stages of a relationship, whereas distrust manifests as a firm belief in the harmful intentions of others. Unlike cynicism, which reflects a general negativity toward human nature or institutions, distrust is situational and targeted, it is directed toward specific individuals or entities whose actions are perceived as threatening (Lewicki, Mc Allister & Bies, 2006).

Importantly, distrust has evolved from being seen as the negative mirror image of trust to being recognized as capable of coexisting with trust in the same relationship. This "dual mode" perspective acknowledges that parties may simultaneously trust someone to perform certain tasks while distrusting them in others, based on the perceived risk involved (Bauer, Kastenhofer, & Allgaier, 2019). For instance, a client may trust a contractor's technical competence but distrust their financial transparency.

In project environments, particularly in construction, distrust may serve a strategic role. It can lead to the implementation of safeguards such as tighter contracts, performance bonds, or independent audits, not as a sign of dysfunction, but as an indicator of proactive risk management (Jarvinen & Brenders, 2020). Recognizing distrust as a legitimate behavioural and managerial response to uncertainty aligns with contemporary governance models, which value both vigilance and cooperation.

Therefore, distinguishing distrust from related concepts and understanding its strategic and behavioural dimensions is essential. Rather than treating distrust as an aberration, practitioners and scholars must acknowledge its potential to enhance accountability, strengthen due diligence, and, paradoxically, support the formation of more resilient trust structures in the long term.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study adopted a qualitative research design, using a semi-structured interview approach to explore the varying interpretations of distrust among professionals in the Nigerian construction industry. The qualitative design was considered most appropriate given the exploratory nature of the study, which aimed to understand the meanings and misconceptions attached to the concept of distrust as experienced by practitioners across different disciplines and roles in the industry. A constructivist paradigm underpinned the research, recognizing that the participants' insights are shaped by their social and professional contexts.

Data Collection Method

Data were collected exclusively through semi-structured interviews, a method well-suited for exploring complex social constructs like distrust (Creswell & Poth, 2018). An interview protocol guided the sessions to ensure consistency while allowing flexibility for participants to elaborate on their perspectives. The interviews explored three key domains:

1. Participants' understanding and conceptualization of distrust in construction relationships;
2. Perceived triggers and manifestations of distrust in project settings; and
3. How distrust is managed or expressed in professional interactions.

Each interview lasted between 45 and 120 minutes, was audio-recorded with consent, and transcribed verbatim for analysis.

Participant Selection

Participants were selected purposively from a pool of twenty construction cases previously analyzed (which serve as the population of the study) in the broader study. Eight senior-level professionals (the sample size) from seven different organizations participated, with one organization providing two respondents to represent distinct project departments (building and civil engineering).

Although the sample size may appear small, it was methodologically justified based on the principle of data saturation, which was reached after the eighth interview—when no new conceptual themes or perspectives were emerging from the data. This aligns with qualitative research guidelines suggesting that in-depth interviews with 6–12 participants are typically sufficient for exploratory studies focused on conceptual depth rather than statistical generalization.

The selection criteria emphasized relevance to the subject matter, professional qualification, industry experience, and availability. This purposive approach ensured that data were obtained from information-rich participants who possessed both theoretical understanding and practical experience with distrust in construction (Patton, 2015).

Data Analysis

Interview transcripts were subjected to thematic analysis using an iterative coding process (Braun & Clarke, 2021). Initial open coding was carried out to identify recurring phrases and meanings, followed by axial coding to cluster related codes into emerging themes. Finally, selective coding refined these into three dominant conceptual categories.

To ensure credibility, the coding process was independently reviewed by a second researcher to validate theme consistency. Dependability was strengthened through the use of a structured coding framework and an audit trail of analytic decisions. Confirmability was supported through verbatim quotations from respondents to ground interpretations in the data.

Trustworthiness of Analysis

The trustworthiness of the study was enhanced through several strategies. Credibility was achieved by prolonged engagement with participants, triangulation of professional backgrounds, and peer debriefing during coding. Dependability was addressed by documenting the entire research process, including interview procedures and analytic steps, to enable external scrutiny. Confirmability was ensured by maintaining a transparent chain of evidence linking raw data, codes, and themes. While transferability is context-bound, rich contextual descriptions were provided to enable readers to assess applicability to other settings

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Profile of Respondents

The participants represented a cross-section of built environment professionals, including architects, builders, civil engineers, quantity surveyors, and land surveyors. This diversity ensured that perspectives on distrust were not limited to a single profession but captured from multiple disciplinary lenses.

Academic Qualifications: All participants held at least a bachelor's degree

Years of Experience: The respondents had between 15 and 40 years of post-graduation professional experience. Notably, six out of the eight participants had more than 20 years of active construction industry practice, qualifying them as credible informants on complex behavioural dynamics such as distrust.

Fields and Areas of Practice: The professionals were drawn from various sectors of the industry, including building, civil engineering, general contracting, consulting, and client representation; across both public and private domains.

Participants' Understanding of Distrust

To gain insight into how distrust is conceptualized by professionals within the Nigerian construction industry, a thematic analysis was conducted on eight semi-structured interviews. The focus was strictly on capturing participants expressed understanding of what constitutes *distrust*, rather than its causes or consequences. Using an inductive coding approach, responses were carefully reviewed, categorized, and grouped into themes that reflect distinct conceptual interpretations across disciplines and roles.

The analysis yielded three major themes that represent the shared and divergent views among respondents on the meaning of distrust. These themes, along with the supporting codes, verbatim excerpts, and interview sources, are presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Understanding of distrust among construction professionals in Nigeria

Theme	Freq (n)	%	Representative Code	Verbatim Excerpt	Interview Source
Breach of Agreement or Obligation *(most dominant)*	7	87.5%	Failure to fulfill contract terms	"Distrust is an inability of one of the parties in a contract to meet up with the contract obligations."	Informant 3
			Not keeping promises	"Distrust is basically a breach of trust… when you fail to carry out what was agreed."	Informant 8
			Defaulting on agreements	"Distrust is simply not meeting the terms of agreement."	Informant 5
			Not honoring commitment	"Distrust is when a party you're working with suddenly withdraws from the agreed path."	Informant 4
Loss of Confidence in Character or Competence .	6	75%	Lack of trust in ability to deliver	"Distrust is when you are not sure about the person's character—you don't believe they will do what is right."	Informant 1
			Doubt in credibility	"Distrust is lack of confidence in someone's ability or credibility."	Informant 6
Violation of Expectations in Relationships .	5	62.5%	Acting contrary to expectations	"Distrust is when someone acts in a way you don't expect, like disrespecting an agreement even informally."	Informant 7
			Disregard for professional norms	"Distrust is acting outside what is considered professional or acceptable."	Informant 6

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

This study set out to investigate how construction professionals in Nigeria understand the concept of distrust and to compare these understandings with established theoretical definitions. Through thematic analysis of eight semi-structured interviews, three dominant practitioner interpretations of distrust were identified: breach of agreement or obligation, loss of confidence in character or competence, and violation of expectations in relationships. While these themes offer meaningful insights into how distrust is experienced in project environments, they reveal an important gap between practical perceptions and theoretical understandings of distrust.

Breach of Agreement or Obligation: A Reactive Framing of Distrust

The most dominant theme, breach of agreement or obligation, reflects how practitioners conceptualize distrust as a response to unfulfilled promises, defaults on agreements, and withdrawal from commitments. This post-event framing aligns with behavioral outcome perspectives of distrust but stands in contrast to the theoretical framing advanced by scholars such as Cofta (2006) and Lewicki *et al.* (2006), who emphasize distrust as a proactive stance based on confident negative expectations rather than solely a reaction to contract breaches. This difference is significant: whereas theory sees distrust as part of risk anticipation and control, practitioners view it primarily as a symptom of failure. This reactive framing may limit the strategic use of distrust in governance processes.

Loss of Confidence in Character or Competence: A Narrow Interpretation

The second theme, loss of confidence in character or competence, corresponds to the antecedents of trust in Mayer *et al*.'s (1995) integrative model, particularly ability, integrity, and benevolence. Practitioners in this study described distrust as emerging when these qualities are perceived to be absent or violated. However, this binary framing of trust versus distrust contrasts with the dual-mode view of trust and distrust (Bauer *et al*., 2019), which recognizes that both can coexist in different domains of a relationship. For instance, a contractor can be trusted for technical delivery but distrusted regarding financial transparency. This more multidimensional conceptualization is often missing in practice, where distrust is treated as an all-or-nothing condition rather than a nuanced governance mechanism.

Violation of Expectations in Relationships: A Normative Understanding

The third theme, violation of expectations in relationships, underscores the relational and normative dimensions of distrust. Practitioners framed distrust as arising from unmet professional expectations, informal agreements, and breaches of role norms. This aligns partially with social contract theories (Hardin, 2002), which highlight the role of shared expectations in sustaining trust. However, practitioners' emphasis remained moral and relational, reflecting distrust as something undesirable to be avoided rather than a strategic tool for risk management (Kramer, 1999; Emborg *et al*., 2020). The absence of a strategic perspective suggests why formal distrust mechanisms (e.g., checks, oversight, contractual safeguards) are often stigmatized as indicators of poor relationships rather than prudent governance measures.

Bridging the Theory–Practice Gap

Taken together, these findings reveal a consistent gap between practitioner perceptions and theoretical foundations of distrust. Practitioners frame distrust largely in moral and reactive terms, while theory positions it as a rational, proactive stance that can coexist with trust and enhance governance. This gap has important conceptual implications. By reframing distrust as a strategic governance mechanism rather than a symptom of relationship breakdown, the study contributes conceptually to ongoing debates in project governance and trust research. It moves beyond viewing distrust as merely destructive, instead positioning it as a necessary component of balanced and resilient governance structures in high-risk sectors like construction.

CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

This study critically examined how professionals in the Nigerian construction industry conceptualize distrust and contrasted these practitioner perspectives with established theoretical foundations. While distrust is widely portrayed in practice as a negative or dysfunctional force, the findings reveal that this perception is narrow and reactive, largely tied to breaches of agreements, loss of confidence, and violations of relational expectations. Theoretically, however, distrust is understood as a rational and proactive stance that can coexist with trust to strengthen governance and mitigate risks in complex project environments.

Conceptual Contribution

The study contributes to construction management literature by reframing distrust as a strategic governance mechanism rather than a symptom of failed relationships. It bridges the gap between practitioner interpretations and theoretical constructs, offering a clearer conceptual foundation for understanding distrust in project environments characterized by uncertainty, opportunism, and institutional weakness. This reframing advances ongoing scholarly conversations about trust and distrust as complementary—not opposing—constructs.

Practical Implications

Practically, the findings underscore the need to normalize rational distrust within project governance and risk management strategies. Embedding structured oversight, verification mechanisms, and accountability frameworks should not be viewed as signs of weak collaboration but as legitimate tools for ensuring transparency and performance. Training and professional development programs can also help practitioners distinguish between destructive distrust and strategic caution, enabling more balanced stakeholder relationships.

Future Research Directions

Building on these insights, future studies should explore how strategic distrust can be operationalized within specific contractual arrangements, procurement models, and regulatory frameworks. Comparative studies across sectors or countries could provide additional insight into **contextual influences** on distrust dynamics. Longitudinal approaches may also illuminate how trust and distrust evolve simultaneously over the lifecycle of construction projects.

In conclusion, by reframing distrust as both a legitimate and functional construct, this study provides a stronger theoretical and practical foundation for improving governance and risk management in the Nigerian construction sector and beyond.

REFERENCES

Bauer, M. W., Kastenhofer, K., & Allgaier, J. (2019). *Trust and distrust in complex societies: Risk, uncertainty and institutional responses*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351118562

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2021). Thematic analysis: A practical guide. London: SAGE Publications.

Chen, X., Saparito, P., & Belkin, L. Y. (2011). Responding to trust breaches: The domain specificity of trust and the role of affect. *Journal of Trust Research*, 1(1), 85–106. https://doi.org/10.1080/21515581.2011.552541

Cheung, S. O., Chow, P. T., & Wong, S. P. (2011). A trust-based model for construction partnering. *International Journal of Project Management*, 29(2), 184–194. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2010.02.001

Cofta, P. (2006). *Distrust: The dark side of trust*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/1-84628-297-2

Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications

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

Emborg, J., Daniels, S. E., & Walker, G. B. (2020). Conflict and distrust in collaborative environmental governance: A study of forest partnerships in Norway. Forest Policy and Economics, 111, 102052. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forpol.2019.102052

Gambetta, D. (Ed.). (1988). Trust: Making and breaking cooperative relations. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Hardin, R. (1993). The street-level epistemology of trust. *Politics & Society*, 21(4), 505–529.

Hardin, R. (2002). *Trust and trustworthiness*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Ikuabe, M., & Oke, A. (2019). Assessment of relational trust in Nigerian public-private partnership (PPP) infrastructure projects. *International Journal of Construction Management*, 19(5), 439–452. https://doi.org/10.1080/15623599.2018.1452104

Issa, U. H., Zayed, T. M., & Salama, M. (2018). Impact of trust and distrust on team performance in construction projects. *Journal of Management in Engineering*, 34(6), 04018044. https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)ME.1943-5479.0000657

Jarvinen, J., & Brenders, F. (2020). Smart contracts and trust: Opportunities and limits of blockchain in enhancing trust in construction. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, 146(7), 04020081. https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)CO.1943-7862.0001842

Jiang, W., Chua, F., Kotabe, M., & Murray, J. (2016). Effects of cultural ethnicity, firm size, and firm age on trust in international B2B relationships: The mediating role of trustworthiness. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 55, 61–72. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2015.12.007

Kramer, R. M. (1994). The sinister attribution error: Paranoid cognition and collective distrust in organizations. *Motivation and Emotion*, 18(2), 199–230. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02249399

Kramer, R. M. (1999). Trust and distrust in organizations: Emerging perspectives, enduring questions. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 50, 569–598. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.50.1.569

Lau, E. (2011). The role of trust in project success: Perspectives of contractors and owners in Hong Kong. *Construction Economics and Building*, 11(2), 53–70. https://doi.org/10.5130/AJCEB.v11i2.1982

Lewicki, R. J., McAllister, D. J., & Bies, R. J. (2006). Trust and distrust: New relationships and realities. *Academy of Management Review*, 23(3), 438–458. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1998.926620

Marsh, S., & Dibben, M. R. (2017). Trust, untrust, mistrust and distrust – An exploration of the dark(er) side. In S. Marsh et al. (Eds.), *Trust management XI* (pp. 17–33). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-59171-1_2

Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H., & Schoorman, F. D. (1995). An integrative model of organizational trust. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(3), 709–734. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1995.9508080335

McEvily, B., & Tortoriello, M. (2011). Measuring trust in organizational research: Review and recommendations. *Journal of Trust Research*, 1(1), 23–63. https://doi.org/10.1080/21515581.2011.552424

Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods: Integrating theory and practice* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Pinto, J. K., Slevin, D. P., & English, B. (2009). Trust in projects: An empirical assessment of owner/contractor relationships. *International Journal of Project Management*, 27(6), 638–648. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2008.09.010

Soares, R. (2012). Trust and risk in the construction industry. *Journal of Civil Engineering and Management*, 18(1), 65–78. https://doi.org/10.3846/13923730.2011.643302