

Dr hab. Marcin Bukowski, professor of the Jagiellonian University

Instytut Psychologii Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego w Krakowie

Review of the doctoral dissertation of Maryam Khan entitled:

“Psychological Specificity of Trust in Communal Sharing and Market Pricing Relationships”,

prepared under the supervision of prof. dr hab. Agata Gąsiorowska and

dr Anna Kuzminska.

Ms. Maryam Khan examines in her doctoral dissertation the question of how interpersonal trust functions across different relational contexts. Specifically, she focuses on the role of two relational mindsets proposed by Alan Fiske (1992), that is, communal sharing and market pricing. The broader goal of the thesis is to determine to what extent trust is context-dependent but also, whether and how it varies across relational frameworks. The dissertation consists of three articles; the first one is a meta-analysis of the effects of market and communal mindsets on trust game behaviors. The second article is also a meta-analysis but focusing on the role of emotions on trust in the two relational contexts of communal sharing and market pricing. Finally, the third article examines how monitoring (as a form of interpersonal control), affects trust across the different relational contexts. Articles two and three were published in peer-reviewed social psychological journals: *Basic and Applied Social Psychology* (Impact Factor = 1.1) and the *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* (Impact Factor = 3.2), Ms. Khan being the first author in former, and second author in the later article. The thesis entails a rich body of analyses of existing research and a set of six very well-designed and executed experimental studies. The main aim of the dissertation was to portray trust as a context-dependent construct, which is shaped by relational frames,

emotions and structural mechanisms related to monitoring and control. Overall, I believe that this general goal has been successfully achieved. Below, I provide a more detailed evaluation of the dissertation referring to the two main criteria stated in the statutory requirements for doctoral theses set by the Polish Ministry of Science and Higher Education (Article 187), that is whether the thesis proposes an original solution to a scientific problem, and also whether it presents broad theoretical knowledge of the candidate and the ability to conduct scientific work independently.

Regarding the originality of the questions raised and obtained outcomes of the research described in the thesis, there are three key novel and important findings, in my opinion. Firstly, that the experience of trust depends on the relational context, in which people encounter themselves. Secondly, that emotions impact trust beyond the relational frames and thirdly, that the interplay of trust and control processes is contingent upon the relational context. There are several strengths of this dissertation. The research presented in this thesis provides new theoretical insights for the psychological literature on trust – it suggests that trust is not a unitary construct but rather a behavioral outcome influenced by different psychological processes. It informs research on relational frameworks, by showing that market placing and communal sharing are not mutually incompatible mindsets but two relational frameworks that value cooperation but for different reasons – strategic or care for the other's welfare. The role of emotions (incidental and integral) in trust behavior is also explored in the dissertation, which appears to be itself a novel and understudied topic. The results of the analyses lead to an interesting conclusion that positive emotions are a strong determinant of trust beyond the influence of relational mindsets. Finally, the role of control in relational frameworks was studied and the findings revealed that reasons to introduce interpersonal control are different depending on the context (communal vs. market). All

research is methodologically sound and strong (including the meta-analyses and experimental designs). All research was also done in accordance with the best open-science principles of transparency and reproducibility, including pre-registrations (reporting changes and deviations from the protocol as well), power analyses, but also availability of data, analyses codes, outputs and study materials. This is a very strong aspect of the dissertation.

Further on, I would like to raise some questions related to selected, specific elements of the articles that the thesis consists of, but also to refer to broader, conceptual issues. In the first article, analyses showed that communal but also market mindsets increase trusting behavior to a similar degree. This is itself a very interesting and counter-intuitive finding. One could ask whether people may activate the two relational mindsets in parallel in a context of a trust game and not in an either – or manner, and apply them differently depending on the salient norms? Cooperation could be in general a more effective means to achieve goals, as many of the problems to be solved require joint action. In this sense, could it be that the specific relational framework does not matter that much (whether it is strategic or relation focused) as long as the type of interaction guarantees a basic level of interpersonal trust?

In the second article, the potential role of emotions in explaining how trust operates in different relational contexts was explored. My main question and doubt related to this analysis is why very different ways to understand and operationalize mindsets in the analyzed studies were used. From a display of facial expressions or emotion induction, through type of feedback (touch vs. visual), memory tasks, processing type and impression formation, to context manipulation (work / professional vs. personal) and more (see Table S1). This large variability may question the construct validity of the market pricing and communal sharing mindset manipulations and tap into quite different phenomena and processes. How can you ensure that these studies are comparable on the level of the activated mindsets? Would it be

possible to focus only on the studies that manipulate or activate a certain type of relational context? Did you find any studies that manipulate both contexts in one design? If so, then were the results informative? Also, the types of examples depicted on Table 2 seem to suggest that in the market context there were more instances of interpersonal interactions than in the communal one, in which more passive, evaluation-based examples were listed (e.g., face attractiveness vs. hiring an employee, economic exchange). This may also involve different levels of processing; effortless and automatic vs. more effortful and reflective in each context, not sure this was intended or simply a confound.

In fact, there's a similar problem with the trust measurement. Did you consider focusing in your analysis only on the trust game types of outcomes? If so, how would the results look like when you would relate only to this type of DV? I think that this type of analysis might make it also possible to relate the findings and conclusions directly to the ones from the first manuscript, increasing this way the consistency between the articles.

I was also wondering what is the role of appraisal themes such as control or uncertainty for the effects of emotions on trust in different relational contexts could be? For example, what could you expect if you would compare the effects of incidental anger vs. fear or anxiety? These are both negative emotions, but they differ largely in the appraisal themes.

Overall, the results of this meta-analysis are interesting and informative. Therefore, I wonder whether this line was continued or there is a plan to develop it in further research. For example, a study, in which specific types of emotions and the two relationship contexts are systematically manipulated and trust measured in a predefined way might be a potential follow up to this analysis. This meta-analysis would be a great first step for designing experiments that address the issues identified here.

Article 3 presents a set of six preregistered experimental studies (two main studies reported in the paper and two additional reported in the supplementary materials), addressing a novel and intriguing topic of how verification monitoring influences trust in different relational contexts. It is clear from the first reading of this article that it successfully went through a rigorous revision process, and I would like to applaud the Authors for the end effect, which is a brilliant publication, reporting research performed in line with the highest methodological standards in the field. I especially liked the systematic testing of the mutual relations between trust and control, and consistent emphasis on the context-dependent nature of this relation. The introduction of a behavioral measure in Experiment 4 is another clear advantage, which allows to show that the obtained effects occur also in real actions, despite the online settings of all the described experiments.

The next question regards the specific theoretical insight, showing that the trust – control (interpersonal) relation is context-dependent and that the hydraulic relation does not seem so universal as assumed, since it is diminished in context that justify economic exchange. Would other contexts weaken the hydraulic relation even more, or make it disappear? For example, what about political contexts, in which limited trust is often justified and even rational, based on previous interactions? Or more broadly, in situations, when the norm of mutual control is well-established and objectively justified?

Another question relates to the control as monitoring framing: Could it be that monitoring is inherently negative in interpersonal settings, whereas this does not have to be the case for the notion of control in interpersonal settings? Monitoring seems to involve more strongly power differences and asymmetries between people. What about other framings or conceptualizations of control as support, care or help when the other person needs it? Perhaps monitoring is negatively evaluated and decreases trust when it is exercised

beyond the other persons awareness or will and intention? However, when it is provided as a means to support the other person's goals (including autonomy), then trust would not drop but even increase? This question also relates to the power – type of control issue. A possible question is what would happen when the violation of mutual respect is diminished in relations in which power is based on epistemic authority (and thus voluntarily delegated) rather than authoritarian submission?

I found also very interesting the interpretation of the results of this research in the light of the Compensatory Control Theory. In fact, control could be also compensated by delegating it to other people when one is lacking personal control. Could delegation of control to an interaction partner help to prevent the negative effects of other forms of interpersonal control on trust? In what conditions may this happen and what other types of control would be acceptable, especially in communal sharing contexts?

Regarding the limitation mentioned in the paper that the online experiments lack ecological validity, I fully agree that it would be important to focus in future research on real-life, face to face interactions. Direct interactions between people who either know each other or belong to one group, or social category could yield different effects in terms of trust behavior. I wonder whether you would have any thoughts about it how the results could look like when such “offline” interactions would take place?

Additionally, did you control for the possible interactions between the gender of the participant and the presented actors in the scenarios? Could you please reflect upon the role of gender in these control – trust relations? For example, would stereotypical gender roles that justify power asymmetries between men and women moderate the obtained effects, and if so, then how?

Finally, I would also like to ask about a more general theoretical issue, related to the research presented in the dissertation. Could you please explain, to what extent are the relational frameworks grounded in organizational cultures and norms, related to the predominance of focus on the individual vs. the outcomes (person vs. efficiency)? The notion of mindset suggests something individual but if the relationship norms are mainly established on a collective or group level then what mechanism would lead to the internalization of these relational norms? Would there be an interaction between preferred personal relational frames and normative or collective influence? Perhaps a fit or misfit between the preferred and contextually cued type of relationship would be important to consider? I also wonder how such (mis)match may affect people's trusting behavior in specific interaction contexts.

In the last part of this review I would like to focus on the evaluation criterion that refers to the independence of the PhD Candidate in performing scientific research. Ms. Maryam Khan was the first author of one published article and co-author of the two other articles, which according to the recommendations of the Polish Academy of Science is a sufficient contribution in a type of PhD that consists of a series of articles. Also, it is important to take into account that the PhD Candidate was involved in a broader research program performed by the Principal Investigators and Supervisors, which is a common practice that facilitates high-quality outcomes. Still, it is not entirely clear what the conceptual contribution of the Candidate was in the two co-authored articles. For the first article in which Ms. Khan is the third author, I could not find a specific authorship contribution statement. In the third article it is not explicitly stated whether she was involved in conceptualization of this research, as it was for all the other co-authors according to the CRediT contribution statement reports placed in the paper. It can be understood that the

main idea was based on a project in which the PhD candidate participated and joined during the process. However, a conceptual impact (e.g., providing critical comments, participation in the study design and interpretation of the results) is also possible in that stage. Thus, it would be important to know the candidate's role in this domain – was it rather an operational, executive role or also a creative, conceptual role? Could you please specify what was the intellectual contribution in these two papers? Since all the preregistrations on “AsPredicted” were submitted by Ms. Khan, I assume that there was also some degree of involvement in the conceptual work of forming predictions based on theoretical assumptions. Thus, independently from the scope of this conceptual contribution, the dissertation reveals the Candidate's advanced abilities to design, perform and present the outcomes of a rich and diverse research program.

Conclusion

In sum, Ms. Maryam Khan addressed in her doctoral dissertation important and novel research questions in the topics of social psychological of trust and relational models. The presented series of articles reveals very high methodological and analytical skills of the PhD Candidate. This thesis not only shows her competencies in the interpretation of the analyses and findings but also the ability to discuss the limitations of the presented research. Importantly, the dissertation follows current open-science best practices. In my opinion, this doctoral dissertation completes the present statutory requirements for doctoral theses set by the Polish Ministry of Science and Higher Education. Therefore, I recommend that the Doctoral Candidate – Ms. Maryam Khan (MA) – will be admitted to the subsequent stages of the doctoral procedure.

Kraków, 28.08.2026

Podpisany elektronicznie przez
Marcin Bukowski
28.08.2026
14:35:25 +02'00'