**Study the impact of collective trust based on individualism and collectivism employees in team**

**Introduction**

Global economy has benefited over the past two decades from an increasing number of multicultural corporations. Global economy has become a remarkable transformation in emerging economies. (Luo & Tung, 2007). With the increasing globalization of business and economic activities, international job mobility is becoming a more common experience for a growing number of employees (Bonache, 2005). According to Bonache (2005), multinational enterprises play a pivotal role in the development of many emerging economies. In consequence, they became the focus of scholarly research by economists and policy analysts (Meyer, 2004). Those different Culture background employees contribute to the multicultural team performance. Factors that have been found to affect multicultural team performance are:(1) managing cultural diversity, differences and conflicts; (2) dealing the problems with working in different places; (3) solving the issues about coordinating between team members and control problems; (4) maintaining communication richness; and (5) developing and maintaining team cohesiveness (Marquardt & Horvarth, 2001), team social support (Jones & Lindley, 1998) and trust (Kirkman et al., 2000). As people come from different cultural background, their ways of thinking can be classified as *individualism and collectivism*, these two thinking pattern will cause the negative influence to *collective trust*, thus lead to the working efficiency down.

Although researchers in different periods had already looking for the influence of the communication between people with different cultures. Lauring & Selmer (2011) found that language differences in multicultural team affect interaction communication and performance between employees.Moreover, the previous research analyzed a multi-objective project involving two areas of skill enhancement: ethical reasoning and technology (Roxas & Lucia K, 2008). Holden (2002) also researched that using the latest technology might have an impact on teamwork activities. Because Hofstede et al. (2010) saw individualist cultures “as placing priority on personal goals and self-actualization, whereas collectivist cultures place priorities on the group and seek satisfaction from a job well done as defined by the group rather than by oneself” (p.340). Triandis (2001) also stated that people in individualist cultures give priority to their own goals over those of groups; conversely, those in collectivist cultures are concerned with relationships (p.908-910). Besides, this in Gundlach’s research (2006) about the relationship between individualism-collectivism and team performance, researchers found out that compared with collectivists, individualists in the groups and teams have low working efficiency than collectivists because of their being low cooperative with other members. Individualists can spend much less time than others to finish their tasks when tasks require little cooperation with team. The relevant studies of how employees’ culture backgrounds influence collective trust within team performance is insufficiently (Hofner Saphiere, D. M., 2006; Wiseman & Shuter, 2004). Moreover, in recent years’ researches, people found that the cultural diversity has an extremely complicated connection with the working efficiency of the team (Matveev & Nelson, 2004; Sangeeta, 2008). To figure out the factors that influence working efficiency in multicultural workplaces, researchers try to conduct the researches through following ways as collective trust between employees from multicultural background, national culture orientations of the employees, and team performance with different cultural background (Matveev & Nelson, 2004).

Moreover, to better understand the characteristic of members in the team. Researchers raised more index to help people to figure out that. Since its inception, core self-evaluation (CSE) has been recognized as an important factor influencing individuals’ judgments of well-being in different life domains (Chang, Lance Ferris, Johnson, Rosen, & Tan, 2012). It is defined as “fundamental premises that individuals hold about themselves and their functioning in the world’’ (Jiang, 2015, p. 68). Perceptions of group potency (PGP) are members’ collective performance beliefs regarding the group’s effectiveness (Neubert, Simon, & Steven, 2006). According to Neubert et al. (2006), groups with high levels of collective performance beliefs are likely to use high quality group processes, perform well, and yield increased group potency and performance over time. Like organizational climate, group potency may be viewed as both an objective property of the group or as an individual perception (Neubert, Simon, & Steven, 2006).

Thus, the purpose of this review of the lit erature is to examine how different cultural background employees might affect multicultural teams in terms of forming collective trust perspective. To figure out the aspects that work in these situations, we will review the researches about individualism and collectivism in cross-culture organizations to draw a distinction between individualism and collectivism in the multicultural corporation. We will also review the literature about the collective trust to analyze the aspects it might could be connected with employee’s culture background. The primary question of this paper is how might the employees from different culture background influence collective trust in teams.

**Multicultural Team Based on Culture Level**

The team members which made up of collective consciousness, are more cohesive. Despite this, there is also a lot of unique differences between multicultural team and monoculture (national) team, we are more focus on differences between each other. There is one obvious difference between these two teams. The multicultural team is a team which is members are coming from different countries. They have differences in language, culture and so on. In contrast, the monoculture (national) team which is composed of similar individuals, has no diversified members. Because of this difference, it also brings advantages and disadvantages to the two team types. Talking about the multicultural team, because of cultural diversity, in this context, compared with monoculture (national) team it can get more potential. In more details, first, the multicultural team has an additional competitive advantage (Raguz et al., 2014). According to Garrison (2010), because of its diverse cultural background, the multicultural team has more knowledge and skills than the monoculture team, so it has more information and opinions for the team, they provide a “diversity of thought that results in better business solutions” (Sangeeta, 2008, p79). This makes it get more capable of innovation, and group decisions also make the team more flexible and faster. Although multicultural team's cultural diversity has brought many advantages to the team, it has some disadvantages such as hindering team cohesion and personal performance (Garrison, 2010), at the same time, there is also have problem with an uneven power in the company, time-consuming by the interaction between the manager and the team (Raguz et al., 2014).

When talking about multicultural teams, researchers generally analyze them from the perspective of western and eastern countries. In more detail, it can be divided into two types of culture: individualism and collectivism. These two types of culture can be considered as opposites. This is the biggest difference between the eastern and western cultures in the multicultural team. Some previous studies have shown that African and Asian tend to be collectivism, while the United States and Europe tend to be individualism (Murphy et al., 2006). According to Ibrahim et al., individualism is “the degree to which a person acts as an individual rather than as a member of a group” (2018). This means that individualistic cultures are more independent, individualists put personal views first, are more focus on personal development and pay more attention to personal goals rather than team goals (Arpaci et al., 2018). Moreover, Geert explained that individualisms only consider themselves and their immediate family, and individualist societies pay more attention to “I” instead of “we” (2001). They focus on autonomy, the sameness initiative, privacy, and want to seek pleasure, financial security and specific friendship. In addition, Hoorn (2014) mentioned that individualism is about personal rights and goals, which is more than collectivism, but the individual does not the duty and responsibility of the collectivity. However, collectivism underline the allegiance of team members and individuals for the whole group, while emphasizing the group preference.

When it comes to collectivist culture, it can immediately be thought of as the opposite of individualistic culture. In many previous articles, researchers considered them to be opposites. According to Ibrahim et al., collectivism is the degree of individual integration into the group, these collectivists focus on interdependence and prefer to give priority to the collective interest (2018). Specifically, people usually see them as interconnected in important ways with close others. Under the collectivistic cultures, members each other prioritize relationship over their own, and members regard this as their long-term goals.

The reason we applied these two terminologies into multicultural teams is that these two terms are a point that must be discussed when talking about western and eastern countries’ cultures. A multicultural team must have members from eastern or western countries. The two types of cultures that they bring will collide, creating some advantages and disadvantages. According to Smaranda et al., the level of individualism or collectivism of members, from low to high, is evenly distributed (2010). This will reduce differences and make it easier for members to communicate.

**Collective Trust in Team**

Humanistic care and human resource management have always been top priorities for the leadership in management field. Therefore, managers have put new emphasis on workplace human relations and group dynamics, where trust is considered as one of the key elements. All members will increase efficiency through sacrificing the cooperation with colleagues and the achievement of teamwork, but no one is willing to risk first without trust (Sabel, 2003). At the same time, trust is intangible, unobservable and unmeasurable. Because of its complex characteristic and fragility that we should establish a solid trust model - collective trust to maintain a community of interest. To be more specific, Kramer (2010) found a theoretical idea in a complex organizational environment and described this generalized trust as *collective trust*. On the contrary, differing with *interpersonal tru*st (individual trust) - whose goal is another specific individual, the symbolic feature of collective trust is that its goal is to collect and organize all the members in the team as a whole. In order to considering the conceptual gap between the forms of collective trust and individual trust deeply, "…in small, close-knit communities, this prediction is based on Bernard Williams calls ‘thick trust’, that is, a belief that rests on intimate familiarity with this individual. In larger, more complex settings, however, a more impersonal or indirect form of trust is required." (Putnam, 2003, p.171) Therefore, because of complex multi-actor and collective environment in multicultural corporations, a less personal, less individuated, and less direct form of trust - collective trust is exactly what the managers seek.

According to the previous literatures, we found that previous scholars have different understandings of collective trust. Kramer (2010) claimed that collective trust can be applied in social and psychological aspects. Moreover, collective trust is developed when people get concern from others, they will trust this person. In other words, they thought that the collective trust must produce some conditions among work teams. While Smith and Cirsfid (2010) are most interested in how to cultivate the collective trust for work teams, and they argued that collective trust can be cultivated in different ways and layers. In addition, Smith & Rotolo (2010) mentioned that collective trust played different advantages at different levels, and they also found the connections among different types of collective trust and applying them in work teams. Kramer (2010) provided a benefit of collective trust that it plays a virtuous circle in cooperation. In the other words, they thought collective trust as a positive expectation can exert positive behavior in the team; in the other hand, the positive interaction in a team can enhance collective trust further reinforce the working efficiency. Moreover, some literatures believed that when trust exist between team’s growth, trust could encourage group members to start sharing more personal important information. So, it will bring the interaction modes, enhance problems solving and productivity (Jones, & George, 2008).

**Individualisists in Team**

Just as Hofstede (2010) talked, people with individualism background pay more attention on personal rights and goals than collectivism, and they did not really care about the duty and responsibility for the collectivity. In this way, based on the thinking pattern of individualist, they treat their personal interest more important than the needs of team they belong to. And individualist only care about themselves, thus they will ignore group interests for granted when group interests conflict with the desires of themselves. When their behaviors influence the group interests, the collective trust in the group will be damaged (Hofstede, 2005). Based on these reasons, individualists will have the following problems when they are forced to stay in a group.

The first on is when people in the team context, which means the members belong to a team will change their thinking pattern from thinking, feeling, and even acting as an individual to thinking, feeling, and acting as a member in the group. This means all the behaviors are based on the consideration of the whole team. The changing of thinking pattern will be a challenge for individualist than the people with collectivism background. Because of the reasons mentioned below, individualists treat the group interests are of low priority which does not worth them do something. Thus, individualists hardly think themselves are the members of a team or group and they will not act as collectivist think, behave and feel as a member in a group.

Besides this, as Triandis (2004) says in his article, people who grow up in the collectivism background will keep an eye on others’ behaviors and ways of speaking words instead of just the language. Unlike individualists, collectivists believe that the environment cannot be changed by single person, but people can change themselves to adapt to the environment. But individualists hold the view that whatever the environment is, people are stable and unchangeable. Collectivists believe that people’s behaviors are promoted by the external factors like norms and rules instead of the internal factor like characteristics, attitudes and people’s self-conscious which can be influenced and changed by the person’s position in the group while individualists think people are unchangeable. And people with collectivism background believe group goals are more important than individual goals while individualists have the opposite idea. Individualists think they are different and separate from the collective, and their achievement are all come from their own effort.

In general words, individualists consider themselves are autonomous and self-contained, independent from the other people and collective. As a result, individualists only considering themselves, but they are independent, autonomous, self-contained and self-reliant at the same time. They have looser relationships with others than people in collectivism as they only keep distance with others in physical, but also keep psychological distance with people in the group.

In conclusion, when tasks require higher level of cooperation, individualists start being forced to work with their team, it will take individualists a lot of time to interact and work with team members, which leads to a low working efficiency of the whole group.

Although individualists come with these problems in teams, think beforehand and make the plan carefully can help leaders use individualists as the key to the success as individualists’ ability that differs from collectivists (Minkov, 2011). For example, to avoid some of the individualists’ characteristics producing negative influence on collective trust, people should build a valuable team for individualists. Which means the team should be a place for people to practice their skills, challenge themselves, and build their social networks. In this way, teams can motivate people join the team and choose to stay in the team. Then they will get the chance to get involve into more work, the collective trust and the group identity will be enhanced which leads the team performance become better. However, in this situation, to help individualists successful can be very difficult even they are motivated to join a team. As individualists require strong support to learn the skills that help them get involved into the team successfully. Individualists can easily become upset and negative when they are critic for behaving like what they used to or just find the way they get used to cannot work in the team (Taras, 2014). In another word, individualists can experience a bigger happiness when they get successful in a team and this can help them build collective trust with the team and enhance the team performance.

**Collectivisists in Team**

According to Oyserman et al. (2002), he and his colleagues held an experiment to observe the individualists and collectivists work in teams. Based on the record from the experiment, we can find that different from individualists, in collectivism’ mind, group interests have higher priority than personal needs. Collectivists are willing to pay attention on the gains and losses of the team they belong to and they can sacrifice themselves when it is necessary for the goodness of the team. On the other hand, collectivists build their self-conscious based on the connection with the team or group, and their achievement are treat as the effort of the whole group instead of themselves. Because collectivists will ignore individual recognition, prefer cooperation rather than competition, and praise collective’s performance which is right opposite idea with individualists.

In collectivists’ mind, the agenda of the team has higher priority than theirs and they can absolutely accept this idea in emotion and behavior naturally. Therefore, people with high recognition in collectivism can easily treat themselves as a member of a group, the process of transition is natural and spontaneous (van Hoorn, 2015).

According to multiple researches, more people in the team reaches a consensus which means their thoughts, feeling and behaviors are all synchronous, the working efficiency and the collective trust of the whole team will increase. In the way, the degree of group identity, which means people recognition of regarding themselves as the member of the group has directly influence on team performance.

Group identity has significant meaning for ameliorate the team performance. According to Ruggieri et al. (2012), the level construct in the team is built on the way the members of the team think of their positions in the organization. How to help members build a correct cognition about the relationship between themselves and the team can help members apply their skills and resources create more value for the team. However, when team members cannot build the correct cognition they may still think and behave as individuals which will lead to weaken the collective trust and group performance.

In other words, collectivists can be a double-blade sword as they are loyal to the team. Once their loyalty is damaged, their group identity will decrease, and their feelings, behaviors and thoughts cannot be synchronous in a high level, the group interest and collective trust will be hurt. To make the performance of the whole team to the best, group identity should be enhanced to make sure all the members in the team can concentrate on the work and make their ability into best use to reach the goal.

**Collectivists and individualists within the same team and its impacts**

As the economic globalization deepens, an increasing number of multinational corporations (MNC) are taking as the priority in their global development strategy (Schuler, 2001), such as International joint ventures (IJVs), which create a collaborative business relationship between two or more independent companies, each with its own agenda, strategy and culture (Li, Xin, & Pillutla, 2002). In this context, the principal focus of multinational corporations is decisions on whether to staff using expatriates, host-country nationals, or third-country nationals (Zisk, Owyar-Hosseini, & DuBose, 2015). According to Hofstede (2010), cultural variables play a role in determining work-related attitudes and behavior. Recent articles pay attention to the significance of individualism and collectivism in cultural studies (Triandis, 2001). Evidence that cultural variables such as individualism and collectivism are implicated in extensive work outcomes suggests that they may also play an important role in related to other work behaviors (Sarkar, 2009. P.95). Much of the previous literature on cross-cultural variations in determining work-related attitudes and behavior is based on the assumption that whether they are individualists or collectivists, respectively (Sarkar, 2009. P.93-96). Without a dominant cultural orientation, an individual would often find it difficult to make decisions, and this would not be efficient or adaptive (Sarkar, 2009). Thus, profiles should emerge with either individualism or collectivism as dominant (O’Neill, McLarnon, Xiu, & Law, 2016).

During this part, we want to figure out the contrast and influence between personal value such as job satisfaction personal level and work-related attitude and behavior and organizational culture of an individualist working in a collectivistic organizational culture and collectivist working in an individualistic culture respectively. Based on the interpreting of definition of Hofstede et al. (2010) and Triandis (2001), the characteristic between individualist cultures and individualist cultures is quite different. Thus, individualists working in a collectivistic organizational culture and collectivists working in an individualistic culture respectively will bring about some new reactions and results. In addition, because most people spend a considerable portion of their lives in workplaces, it would seem likely that individualism and collectivism are important at the individual and organizational levels (Robert & Wasti, 2002).

Since its inception, core self-evaluation (CSE) has been recognized as an important factor influencing individuals’ judgments of well-being in different life domains (Chang, Lance Ferris, Johnson, Rosen, & Tan, 2012). It is defined as “fundamental premises that individuals hold about themselves and their functioning in the world’’ (Jiang, 2015, p. 68). Perceptions of group potency (PGP) are members’ collective performance beliefs regarding the group’s effectiveness (Neubert, Simon, & Steven, 2006). According to Neubert et al. (2006), groups with high levels of collective performance beliefs are likely to use high quality group processes, perform well, and yield increased group potency and performance over time. Like organizational climate, group potency may be viewed as both an objective property of the group or as an individual perception (Neubert, Simon, & Steven, 2006).

In order to have a better understanding of the effects of work-related attitudes and behavior for individualists working in a collectivistic organizational culture and collectivists working in an individualistic culture in a more comprehensive and objective way, we involve two concepts introduced by Chang et al.(2012) and Neubert et al.(2006), which are Core self-evaluation (CSE) and perceptions of group potency (PGP) respectively.

O’ Neill et al. first expect that an individualism-dominant profile representing relatively high individualism and low collectivism will emerge. Second, they expect that a collectivism-dominant profile representing relatively high collectivism and low individualism will emerge (O’Neill, McLarnon, Xiu, & Law, 2016, P.450). In other words, it is likely that either individualism or collectivism will tend to be most salient for a given individual. Indeed, Chen and West (2008) concluded that individualism and collectivism are distinct but related constructs based on a measurement invariance analysis. O’ Neill et al. stated that CSE was a stronger predictor of job performance in employees with an individualism-dominant cultural profile, whereas PGP was a stronger predictor of job performance in employees with a collectivism-dominant cultural profile (P.447). As such, research investigating the main effects of CSE and PGP may overlook the qualifier of individualism- versus collectivism-dominant cultural orientations. In order to identified two configurations of variables among employees and based on O’ Neill et al. article, four hypotheses are proposed by O’ Neill et al. (P.451-P. 453). O’ Neill et al. asked 260 front-line employees to complete the questionnaire. It was found that “supporting a unidimensional conceptualization of individualism and collectivism given that individuals display dominance of one over the other” (O’Neill, McLarnon, Xiu, & Law, 2016, P.455). Depending on profile membership, either CSE or PGP were most important for job performance. Specifically, CSE mattered most for individualism-dominant employees, and PGP mattered most for collectivism-dominant employees (O’Neill, McLarnon, Xiu, & Law, 2016, P.456-462). This suggest the individual productiveness variables might depend on different of cultural values (O’Neill, McLarnon, Xiu, & Law, 2016).

**Impact 1: The Individualists and Collectivists affecting on work-related attitude and behavior**

The previous paragraph mentioned that collectivism worked in the group can improve the group potency. However, changing work attitude and behavior can directly affect employees orientation of the individualism or collectivism further can improve the group potency to make the team more efficient. Ramamoorthy & Flood (2004) mentioned that combing the personal goals and the team aims closely can directly influence the employee’s attitude and behavior. Thus, when an individual can achieve their personal goal not need to depend on their team, they will behave as infidelity or easily out of group management. In the other words, a person has a high degree of individualistic tendency. When he cannot accomplish his personal goals through himself, he will seek partners with the same goals to contribute to a team. They will rely on each other to complete their goals, but he does not consider that his partner has a higher individualism orientation or collectivism orientation. On the other hand, Some people will give priority to collective interests or collective goals and use their own personal goal as subordinate goals to complete them through cooperation (Ramamoorthy & Flood, 2004). In contrast, these people start their team work not based on their own goals as a priority. They establish the team goals above their personal goals, and they think the team goals are most important than the personal goals. If it necessary, they will choose to abandon their personal goals to achieve their collective goals. “Whenever an individual’s goals and the group’s goals are in conflict, individualists tend to place the individual’s goals ahead of those of the group, whereas collectivists tend to place the group’s goals ahead of those of the individual” (Ramamoorthy & Flood, 2004, p.350). From the authors illustrated, we can obviously compare these two types of work attitudes and work behaviors.

However, when the few of individualism join in the collectivism organization climate, the work-related attitude and behavior of both individualism and collectivism in the same group will be changed. There are four possibilities will be developed. First one is the few of individualism transforms their orientation into collectivism, second one is the collective organization climate be changed by these few of individualism, third one is the few of collectivism transforms their orientation into individualism, and the last one is the individual organizational climate is changed by these few of collectivism.

**Impact 2: The Individualists and Collectivists affecting on job satisfaction**

By reading previous research, it has been found that individualism and collectivism have some impacts on work satisfaction. Amish & Singhi (2015) believed that collectivism and individualism can predict work satisfaction through some form. Moreover, Yetim & Yetim (2006) discovered that the aptitude, Collectivism, and the distance prediction abilities have an important effect on job satisfaction by using statistical tool. It means that different types of orientation can produce different influences on job satisfaction. Social-culture structure has five dimensional construct, and it includes individualism and collectivism (Yetim & Yetim, 2006). The single study for exploring the individualism or the collectivism effects on job satisfaction may lead to an incomprehensive relationship between job satisfaction and culture dimensions, so we combine the individualism and collectivism into individualism-collectivism to discover the impacts on collective trust, and further explore the influence on job satisfaction. Yetim & Yetim (2006) mentioned that the formation of individualism orientation to be related to the degree of education. If the people have the higher degree of education, they will have the tendency of individualism obviously. Nevertheless, when a group of people have similar levels of education, they may have a tendency toward collectivism because they because their cognitive abilities for things are mostly the same and their values are almost similar.

However, the reality is that these two types of orientations will be mixed together. They are usually expressed as two common phenomena. First situation is that the few of individualism working in collective team climate. The other situation is that the few of collectivism to be dedicated to individual organizational climate. Yetim & Yetim (2006) argued that the employee works in collectivist countries generally expressed negative attitude toward job satisfaction. Although they did not mention how the individualistic environment affects job satisfaction, they described that consistency of personal value and collective value can lead to changes in job satisfaction (Yetim & Yetim, 2006). It means that whether the few of individualism work in collective organization climate or few of collectivism are absorbed in individual organization climate can result in transforming of job satisfaction.

**The influence of the different impacts on collective trust**

The change of employees’ work-related attitude and behavior in the team will inevitably affect the trust in the team. Someone change his attitude is a psychological process; however, due to the change in the attitude of this person, the behavior of this person has changed is belong to behaviorists. “Collective trust is predicated on schematic knowledge and stereotype beliefs regarding the organization and what membership in it presumably tells us about other members’ trust-related motives, intentions, and likely actions” (Kramer, 2010, p.83). Based on this definition of collective trust, we can understand the collective trust more easily. In addition, for establishing the collective trust, we must change the work-related attitude of the team members to eliminate stereotypes and reinforce collective trust among the group members or employees in the team. Especially for the employee who has an individualized orientation. Although the large of research pointed out the employee who has a collectivist orientation is good for building the collective trust in organizational climate, there are still a lack of improving collective trust in individualism-collectivism mixed organization.

According read large of research, we found that the job satisfaction there is a positive effect between job satisfaction and collective trust (Hannan, Suharjo, Kirbrandoko, & Nurmalina, 2017). In other words, job satisfaction and collective trust can promote each other under certain conditions. Obviously, the collectivism has more orientation on collective trust, but the individualism has the less of collective trust of their team or organization (Hannan, Suharjo, Kirbrandoko, & Nurmalina, 2017). As before mentioned that individualism willing to join the team because they cannot achieve their personal goal by themselves. On the other words, when the group or team goal adapt the personal goal which the person cannot complete by themselves, these people will have more positive attitude and enthusiasm to their work, further have full of job satisfaction because the team can help them to realize their personal goal. Based on this point, they will form the collective trust on their team. Therefore, the job satisfaction is an indirect manifestation of team member’s collective trust.

**Conclusion and Recommendation**

There is a need for high-priority research within collective trust. Found in the original study, in the process of dealing with problems, highly cohesive collectivist teams have demonstrated norms that encourage interdependence and collaboration. This shows that the team can benefit from it and gain a high degree of trust within the multicultural team (Nagarajan & Patrick C, 2004).  
 Through the emergency team that is surrounded by family security or threatened by natural disasters, a lot of team collaboration work quickly occurs in a short period of time. Because the consequences are very serious, it requires a strong trust between the teams. Rico et al (2009) found that trust is an important point that can be studied in this emergency team. These teams will benefit from the research. These studies will explain how to reduce the risk in emergency situations so as to better maintain and develop the trust in the team (Joel & Linda 2012).  
 What's more about trust research is focusing on risk. In the collective trust, there is certainly a risk. The trust of the collective to the individual is a kind of risk and needs to bear the result of the failure of the team. Groups and individuals who do not have apparently established results will appear to deal with trust issues in different ways, and in order to better study and understand the actual performance of trust, research needs to be established in the way the participants belong (Joel & Linda, 2012). The result of this research must be to have a relatively high level of value in order to have real value (Joel & Linda, 2012).  
 Another potential study is the study of time pressure. The study found that time pressure is related to task complexity (Joel & Linda, 2012). These studies have also been mentioned in many past studies, but after reviewing past research, more research work should be done to better understand and solve the relationship between time pressure and task complexity in collective trust (Joel & Linda, 2012).  
 We also found a new recommendation on the need for respect between teams, because with respect, we can better develop collective trust. In previous research, it was found that mutual respect between teams is the highest score (Ochieng & Price, 2009). In general, high mutual trust in the team is an important part of multicultural team cooperation. In practice, we can also find that highly-respected multicultural teams have a high level of collective trust.  
 In recent years we have found that interest in team trust is increasing (Murthel & Bond, 2013). The study found that the trust of the team is particularly important by forcing managers to work with strangers from different countries and religions (Murthel & Bond, 2013). Although our current research has made a preliminary contribution to this research, we hope that future research will be more in-depth and allow future people to understand these studies more comprehensively.
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