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Abstract

Japanese companies have begun integrating their businesses to reduce costs and increase competitiveness. In the previous study, we organized various studies on organizational Conflict, Trust, and Trustworthy behavior; clarified the results of their studies; and proposed a trustworthy behavior model that solves the issue of corporate integration by organizing and integrating the previous studies. The Trustworthy behavior model seems to be closely related to actual corporate integrations. This study shows the process of recognizing Conflict from the perspective of trustor party and trustee party and cultivating Trust by extracting three processes from the trustworthy behavior model. Furthermore, this study proposes three hierarchy structures and performs subjective verification, indicating the potential for practical use in corporate integrations. This study shows that the trustor party and the trustee party in corporate integrations use three processes to indicate how to perceive Conflict, address Conflict, perceive Trustworthiness, perceive Trustworthy behavior, and cultivate Trust.
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1. Introduction

Many Japanese companies have begun integrating their businesses to reduce costs and increase competitiveness. Regarding corporate integrations, Matsuura et al. [1] interviewed and found a number of conflicts among integrated companies. Their study also organized previous studies on organizational Conflict, Trustworthiness, Trustworthy behavior, and Trust; clarified the subject of the previous studies; and proposed a trustworthy behavior model (TBM) that solves the issue of corporate integrations by organizing and integrating previous studies. However, Matsuura et al. [1] failed to show how the TBM could assist with corporate integrations and how to respond conflict, trustworthiness, trustworthy behavior, and trust.

Previous studies describe frameworks and mechanisms of organizational conflict, model conflict types, and discuss approaches to conflict management. Thomas [2] defined Conflict as a process, whereas Pondy [3] described the dynamics within an episode of Conflict. Jehn [4] categorized organizational group Conflict into three Conflict types. Thomas [5] presented a two-dimensional taxonomy for Conflict-handling modes. Walton et al. [6] categorized conflicts occurring among units within an organization into nine major types of Interdepartmental conflicts. Mayer et al. [7] specified a Trust model that described three characteristics of the trustee party and Risk-taking behavior by the trustee party. Whitener et al. [8] provided an exchange framework that mapped out Trustworthy behaviors and suggested a method by which a trustee party could cultivate trust.

Ayoko et al. [9] modeled interactions among Conflict types, Conflict features, open Communication, and workplace Trust.

The previous studies have all failed to indicate whether a useful corporate integration technique could be established between the trustor party and the trustee party. If we can demonstrate a process for recognizing Conflict by utilizing the TBM to respond to corporate integration, the users (i.e., the trustor party and the trustee party) of the TBM can enable the issue related to Conflict within a corporate integration to be solved. The purpose of this study is to describe the process of recognizing Conflict from the perspectives of the trustor party and the trustee party and cultivating trust by extracting three processes from the TBM through which the issue related to Conflict within corporate integration can be addressed.

Next, we describe the process for recognizing Conflict from the perspectives of the trustor party and the trustee party and for cultivating trust by extracting three processes from the TBM.

First, we describe (1) the conflict-recognition process (CRP) in Figure 1. The CRP establishes the components for the trustor party regarding the three Conflict types (i.e., Task, Relationship, and Process) [4] and Interdepartmental conflict (i.e., mutual task dependence, task-related asymmetries, performance criteria and rewards, organizational differentiation, role dissatisfaction, ambiguities, dependence on common resources, communication obstacles, and personal skills and traits) [6] in the TBM, as perceived by the trustee party. We illustrate the reason for aforementioned as follows. Conflict includes Conflict types that occur in an

*Corresponding author: t.matsuura@sdm.keio.ac.jp

Received: April 3, 2020
Accepted: November 19, 2020
organization. Similarly, Conflict encompasses Interdepartmental Conflict within an organization. From the abovementioned, if the trustor party and the trustee party can select Conflict types and Interdepartmental Conflict within the TBM, they can grasp the misunderstanding between the trustor and trustee in both Conflict types and Interdepartmental Conflict. However, this study does not focus on the Conflict features.

Second, we describe (2) the Conflict-handling directionality process (CHDP) in Figure 1. In the CHDP, the components that the trustee party uses to handle or moderate the Conflict perceived by the trustee party is selected. We describe the reason for the above as follows. Thomas [5] presented a two-dimensional taxonomy of Conflict-handling modes and identified five different approaches (i.e., Avoiding, Accommodation, Compromise, Competition, and Collaboration) to managing Conflict. Ayoko et al. [9] modeled interactions among Conflict types, Conflict features, open Communication, and workplace Trust. They analyzed them by specifying linear regression hypotheses for each relationship as well as the mediating and moderating effects. Ayoko et al. [9] cited Communication openness from one of the Trustworthy behaviors of Whitener et al. [8]. Ayoko et al. [9] showed that after the Conflict types are moderated by Trustworthy behavior via the Conflict features, Trust would be cultivated. From the aforementioned, if the trustee party decides to handle or moderate the Conflict perceived by the trustor party, they can understand the misunderstanding between the trustor and the trustee by handling or moderating the Conflict.

Last, we describe (3) the behavior process for trusting the trustee (BPTT) in Figure 1. The BPTT is used to select Risk-taking in the relationship from Trustworthiness and Trustworthy behavior that the trustor party perceives by the trustee party. We illustrate the reasons for the above as follows. Mayer et al. [7] described factors of perceived Trustworthiness of a trustee (i.e., Ability, Benevolence, and Integrity). Furthermore, the Trustworthiness of a trustee enables certain people to build a foundation for the development of trust in an organization. Mayer et al. [7] demonstrated a looping connection between the factors of perceived Trustworthiness, Trust, and Risk-taking in relationship, outcomes, and the factors of perceived Trustworthiness. Whitener et al. [8] described the fact that managerial behavior is an important influence on the development of Trust in relationship between managers and employees. They defined managerial Trustworthy behavior as volitional actions and interactions performed by managers that are necessary although insufficient to engender employees’ trust in them. They cited Integrity and Benevolence of Mayer et al.’s [7] factors of Trustworthiness in their explanation of Trustworthy behavior and discussed the relationship with Trust. From the aforementioned, if the trustor party and the trustee party can select Trustworthiness, Trustworthy behavior, and Risk-taking in a relationship within the TBM, they can grasp the misunderstanding between the trustor and the trustee in Trustworthiness, Trustworthy behavior, and Risk-taking in relationship.

Next, this study performs subjective verification using three hierarchical structures of the processes, indicating their potential for practical use in corporate integration. In subjective verification, we use the interview results of two people who experienced the 2011 integration of Companies A, B, and C. We show that the writer, on behalf of the two people involved in the actual corporate integration, recognized as the trustor party and trustee party identified Conflict types, Interdepartmental conflict, Conflict-handling modes, Trustworthy behavior, Trustworthiness, Risk-taking in relationship, and Trust using the three hierarchical structures of the processes. For decision-making on the relationship between the 11 layers of the three hierarchical structures as well as the interview results, the writer must satisfy the following conditions:

1) Be involved in actual corporate integration.
2) Obtain an understanding of the position of the interviewees at the time of the actual integration and the relationship between the stakeholders and the interviewee.
3) Obtain an understanding of the intention of interviewee’s remarks.

The first condition must be met because if the writer is not involved in a corporate integration, they will have difficulty in understanding what happened in the corporate integration. For the second condition, if the writer does not know the position of the interviewee at the time of the actual integration and the positions of stakeholders, they will not be able to determine the relationship between the organizations in the corporate integration, that is, the interview results cannot be divided into data at the organizational level. Last, the third condition must be met because if the writer does not understand the intent of the interviewee’s results, they might make a different decision than the actual interview results. One of the authors in this study has first-hand experience of an actual corporate integration, so the abovementioned conditions were satisfied.

Further, if we show the plot of the relationship among the 11 layers of the three hierarchical structures and the interview results, it is possible for the trustor party and the trustee party in corporate integrations to demonstrate how to perceive Conflict, address Conflict, perceive Trustworthiness, perceive Trustworthy behavior, and cultivate Trust by using the three processes. A limitation of this study is that it does not indicate how much influence each component has in relation to the other components. Furthermore, previous studies have not shown a mutual relationship between the plot order within the processes that comprise the CRP, CHDP, and BPTT. Another the limitation is the degree of influence of the plot order on the plot results.

We explain the novelty of this study. Matsuura et al. [1], who solved the problem of corporate integration by organizing and integrating previous research, proposed the TBM. However, their study did not focus on how people in charge of corporate integrations can recognize conflict and trust. Therefore, the novelty of this study is that the trustor party and the trustee party in corporate
integrations use three processes to show how to perceive Conflict, address Conflict, perceive Trustworthiness, perceive Trustworthy behavior, and cultivate Trust.

This study consists of four sections. Section 2 proposes three processes extracted from the TBM, namely, CRP, CHDP, and BPTT. Additionally, three hierarchy structures are proposed: CRP hierarchy structure, Conflict-handling directionality hierarchy structure, and behavior process hierarchy for trusting the other party. Section 3 describes subjective verification using the interview results of interviewees following the hierarchical structure procedure corresponding to each process. Section 4 presents the conclusions and prospects.

2. Cognitive behavior Process

Section 2 refers to the TBM in Figure 1 and describes how to extract three processes from this model. Cognitive behavior Process comprises CRP, CHDP, and BPTT. The previous studies have not shown a relationship among the plot order within the processes that make up CRP, CHDP, and BPTT.

First, component (1) of the CRP (the parts surrounded by the dot chain line) works by how the trustor party perceives Conflict. CRP shows a plot procedure that the trustor party recognizes Conflict types, and Interdepartmental Conflict perceived by the trustee party.

Next, component (2) of the CHDP (the parts surrounded by a dotted line) works by how the trustee party addresses Conflict and observes the trustor party’s trustworthy behavior. CHDP shows a plot procedure that the trustee party handles or moderates the Conflict perceived by the trustor party.

Finally, component (3) of the BPTT (the parts surrounded by a two-dot chain line) works by how trustor party perceives the trustee party’s Trustworthiness and Trustworthy behavior, and the trustor party cultivates trust. BPTT shows a plot procedure that the trustor party recognizes Risk-taking in relationship through the Trustworthiness and Trustworthy behavior perceived by the trustee party.

This study proposes these three processes as a cognitive behavior process that enables trustworthy behavior when integrating companies.

Figure 1 Trustworthy Behavior Model [1] (Author added three processes to the original model)

2.1 Conflict-recognition process

Figure 2 illustrates the CRP. In Figure 2, (a) recognizing and showing your thoughts support a (b) process flow in which, a party recognizes the organization design life cycle and the Conflict and selects Conflict types and Interdepartmental Conflict. The typical states of the system life cycle include concept, development, production, utilization, support, and retirement. [10] In this study, stages of the organization design life cycle include concept, design, integration, after the integration, and retirement. The concept, development, and retirement stages of organization design are the same as the typical system life cycle stages. The overview, purpose, and outcome in both the design and the integration stages of the organization design life cycle are the same as the development and production stages of the typical system life cycle. The overview, purpose, and outcome after the
integration stage of the organization design life cycle include utilization and support stages of the typical system life cycle.

First, from the first layer in Figure 2, the organization design life cycle of corporate integrations clarifies where the trustor party and the trustee party are in the life cycle and recognizes that stakeholders, the external environment, and the amount of information differ. The trustor party selects from the concept stage, the design stage, the integration stage, and the retirement stage.

Second, the trustor party documents concrete conflicts to show the trustor party’s thoughts and considerations that reflect a sense of discord, opposition to, or disputes that the interviewee considers.

Third, Conflict types and awareness of conflicts are noted. Jehn [4] described the Conflict types as follows:
- Task: Focused on the content and the goals of the work.
- Relationship: Focused on interpersonal relationships.
- Process: Focused on how tasks would be accomplished.

Finally, this study indicates that the trustor party can understand the Conflict faced by the trustee party by selecting its Conflict from nine major types of Interdepartmental conflicts. Walton et al. [6] described Interdepartmental Conflict as follows:
- Mutual task dependence: Two units depending upon each other for assistance, information, compliance, or other coordinative acts in the performance of their respective tasks.
- Task-related asymmetries: Differences in the way that units are ranked in the direction of initiation of action, prestige, power, and knowledge.
- Performance criteria and rewards: Flexibility versus stability, criteria for short-run versus long-run performance, emphasis on measurable results versus attention to intangible results, maximizing organizational goals versus responding to other societal needs.
- Organizational differentiation: In terms of the degree of structure, toward the environment, toward time, and toward other people.

Role dissatisfaction: Slower rates of organizational growth and of opportunities for promotion.
- Ambiguities: Low routinization and uncertainty of means to goals.
- Dependence on common resources: Depending upon a common pool of scarce organizational resources (i.e., physical space, equipment, manpower, operating funds, capital funds, central staff resources, and centralized services).
- Communication obstacles: The less units knowing about each other's job, the less collaboration.
- Personal skills and traits: Personal dissimilarities (i.e., background, values, education, age, and social patterns).

Regarding this statement, this study shows recognition and the trustee party’s thoughts as (a) in Figure 2. In addition, the process flow in (b) is created according to (a) in Figure 2.

Following this process flow, this study proposes the CRP, which is a four-layer, hierarchical structure, as follows:
- First layer: Indicate the organization design life cycle.
- Second layer: Indicate a specific Conflict that has occurred.
- Third layer: Indicate the Conflict types (task, relationship, and process).
- Fourth layer: Select Interdepartmental conflict (task-related asymmetries, organizational differentiation, dependence on common resources, performance criteria and rewards, communication obstacles, role dissatisfaction, mutual task dependence, ambiguities, and personal skills and traits).

2.2 Conflict-handling directionality process

Figure 3 indicates CHDP. In Figure 3, (a) recognizing and showing your thoughts support a (b) process flow in which the trustee party recognizes the Conflict-handling modes [4] and selects the Conflict-handling modes and the trustee party’s Trustworthy behavior.

First, from the first layer in Figure 3, the trustee party selects the first consideration that the trustee party senses from the Conflict indicated by the trustor party, and marks that consideration from the Conflict-handling modes. Thomas [5] described five Conflict-handling modes regarding the dimensions of cooperativeness and assertiveness, as follows:
- Competition: Uncooperative and assertive.
- Collaboration: Cooperative and assertive.
- Compromise: The mid-range of cooperativeness and assertiveness.
- Avoiding: Uncooperative and unassertive.
- Accommodation: Cooperative and unassertive.

Second, the trustee party observes the behavior of the trustee party and selects what the trustee party considers from the trustor party’s Trustworthy behavior. Whitener et al. [8] described Trustworthy behavior as follows:
• Behavioral consistency: Predictable, positive behavior.
• Behavioral integrity: Telling the truth and keeping promises.
• Sharing and delegation of control: Employees’ satisfaction with their level of participation in decisions and determination of their work roles.
• Communication: Accurate information, explanations for decisions, and openness.
• Demonstration of concern: Showing consideration and sensitivity for employees’ needs and interests, acting in a way that protects employees’ interests, and refraining from exploiting others for the benefit of one’s own interests.

Finally, the trustee party decides that Conflict-handling modes compare with the trustor party’s Trustworthy behavior and the question of whether any change occurs in the trustee party’s thoughts and documents Conflict-handling modes.

Regarding this statement, this study indicates recognition and the trustee party’s thoughts as (a) in Figure 3. In addition, this study creates the process flow in (b) according to (a) in Figure 3.

Following this process flow, this study proposes the Conflict-handling directionality, which is a three-layer, hierarchical structure, as follows:
- First layer: Indicate the “Avoiding, Accommodation, Compromise, and Collaboration of Conflict-handling modes.”
- Second layer: Indicate the “Trustworthy behavior (Behavioral consistency, Behavioral integrity, Sharing and delegation of control, Communication, Demonstration of concern).”
- Third layer: Document ideas received from the other party’s trustworthy behavior about Conflict-handling modes.

### 2.3 Behavior process for trusting the trustee party

Figure 4 illustrates the BPTT. In Figure 4, (a) recognizing and showing your thoughts support a (b) process flow in which the party takes the following actions based on the trustee party’s trustworthy behavior and factors.

First, from the first layer in Figure 4, the trustor party clarifies what the trustor party considers from the Trustworthy behavior of the trustee party or organization and documents the specific Trustworthy behavior of the trustee party.

Second, the trustor raises awareness by considering the aspects of the trustee party that the trustor party can trust and select the “other’s factors of perceived Trustworthiness.” Mayer et al. [7] described Trustworthiness as follows:
- Ability: Group of skills, competencies, and characteristics that enable a party to have influence within some specific domain.
- Benevolence: The extent to which a trustee being believed to want to do good to the trustor, aside from an egocentric profit motive.
- Integrity: The consistency of the party’s past actions, credible communications about the trustee from other parties.

Third, the trustor party observes the behavior of the trustee party and selects what the trustor party considers about the “other’s Trustworthy behavior.”

Finally, what makes the trustor party take action even if it should take a risk? Furthermore, the trustor party considers what to do if the trustor party has no intention to take action, document the actions that generate risk, and trust the trustee party beyond that risk.

Regarding the aforementioned, this study shows recognition and the trustor party’s thoughts as (a) in Figure 4. Additionally, this study creates the process flow in (b) according to (a) in Figure 4.

Following this process flow, this study proposes the behavior process, which is a four-layer, hierarchical structure for trusting the trustee party, as follows:
- First layer: Indicate the trustee party’s specific Trustworthy behavior.
- Second layer: Indicate the trustee party’s factors of perceived Trustworthiness (Ability, Benevolence, and Integrity).
- Third layer: Indicate the trustee party’s Trustworthy behavior (behavioral consistency, behavioral integrity, sharing and delegation of control, communication, and demonstration of concern).
- Fourth layer: Indicate Risk-taking in relationship.
3. Subjective verification

Section 3 provides the actual description method, results, and considerations for performing a subjective verification. A subjective verification follows a cognitive behavior process (CRP, CHDP, and BPTT) that enables TBM based on interviews of the trustor party and the trustee party concerning corporate integrations.

3.1 Description method

Figure 5 shows the description result of the cognitive behavior process. Two parties use the description method in this study. One is the trustor party, and the other is the trustee party. The description methods of this study include how to describe the CRP, CHDP, and BPTT, as follows. In Table 1, we show interview results which are Comments [a], [b], [c], [d], and [e] in Figure 5 on the subject.

| Comments | Interview results                                                                 |
|----------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| [a]      | The organization engaged in a parallel rather than absorption integration. When I looked at the completed organization, the organization was biased toward headquarters personnel. |
| [b]      | We wanted the factory organization to be equal.                                    |
| [c]      | We agreed on the direction of the management innovation and accepted the organization proposed by Company A. |
| [d]      | I was glad that members of Company B’s common department recognized that its improvement was not enough and promoted innovation. |
| [e]      | I realized Company B’s cooperative members knew their situation and that Company B was competent. |

Table 1 Interview results

First, this study describes how to describe the CRP. The trustor party refers to Figure 5, decides its thoughts in accordance with both (a) and (b) in Figure 2, and selects and fills in the items at each layer of the CRP hierarchy structure in Figure 5, as follows:
- First layer: Select one of the Conflict-handling modes that occur from the trustor party’s statement for the trustee party.
- Second layer: Select one of the trustor party’s Trustworthy behaviors.
- Third layer: Document the impression received from the trustee party’s Trustworthy behavior about the Conflict-handling modes.
- Fourth layer: Document the impression received from the trustee party’s Trustworthy behavior. Document Risk-taking actions in relationship.

3.2 Description result

Figure 5 provides the hierarchical structures corresponding to the results of each process description. In this section, the trustor party is president of Company A, and the trustee party is an officer of Company B.

The top layer in Figure 5 shows the result of a description of the CRP. This result starts the following selection from the president of Company A’s interview results. “The organization engaged in a parallel rather than absorption integration. When I looked at the completed organization, the organization was biased toward headquarters personnel.” (Comment [a]) The arrows in Figure 5 illustrate the selection using the following procedure from the first to the fourth layer.
- First layer: Select the “Integration Stage” from the organization design life cycle of corporate integrations to express that the integration started.
- Second layer: Document a memorandum on the interview results of Comment [a]. We indicated and wrote about the specific Conflict (discord, opposition, or dispute) that it considered. This type of strong decision by the president of Company A will possibly generate Conflict.
- Third layer: Select the “Process” of the Conflict types. Jehn [4] described “Process” as focusing on how tasks would be accomplished. According to Comment [a], the president discussed the design of the organization. The reason for selecting “Process” is that the organizational design process relates to how to accomplish a task from the interview results.
- Fourth layer: Select “Role Dissatisfaction.” Company B’s officer is also responsible for this issue. Walton et al. [6] described “Role Dissatisfaction” as a slower rate of organizational growth and of opportunities for promotion. The reason for selecting “Role Dissatisfaction” is that one-sided determinations cause slower rates of growth and of opportunities for promotion.
organizational growth and opportunities for promotion. The president originally intended to create an equal organization; however, because of the president’s own leadership in designing the organization, they designed the most convenient organization for the president. The president expressed concern about conflicts arising from this one-sided determination of roles.

Select one stage from organization design life cycle in corporate integration.

Figure 5 Description result of Cognitive behavior process
As the arrow indicates, this study is able to proceed without hesitation with respect to selecting and commenting. We confirmed the description result on the basis of these results.

The middle layer in Figure 5 shows the description result of the CHDP. The description result starts the following selection from the officer of Company B’s interview results, “We wanted the factory organization to be equal.” (Comment [b]). The arrows in Figure 5 point to the selections using the following procedure from the first to the third layer.

- First layer: Select the “Competition” Conflict-handling modes to express the interview results. Thomas [5] indicated “Competition” as uncooperative and assertive. According to Comments [a] and [b], the officer from Company B perceived Conflict by the fact that the president of Company A created an organization biased toward headquarters’ personnel. The reason for selecting “Competition” is that the interview results relate to uncooperative and assertive Competition of the Conflict-handling modes. Furthermore, we wrote a memorandum on the interview results.

- Second layer: Select “Behavioral consistency.” Whitener et al. [8] described “Behavioral consistency” as Predictable, positive behavior. The officer of Company B heard that the reform policy of Company A’s president was consistent throughout the integration. According to Comment [c], the officer from the Company agrees that the president directed management innovation. The reason for selecting “Behavioral consistency” is that the interview results indicate a predictable direction and positive behavior by the president.

- Third layer: Document an idea generated from the trustor party’s Trustworthy behavior about the Conflict-handling modes. The officer of Company B remarked, “We agreed on the direction of the management innovation and accepted the organization proposed by Company A” (Comment [c]). Document the interview results.

As the arrow indicates, this study proceeded without hesitation in selecting and commenting. We confirmed the description result on the basis of these results.

The bottom layer in Figure 5 shows the description result of the BPTT. The description result starts the following selection from the president of Company A’s interview results, “I was glad that members of Company B’s common department recognized that its improvement was not enough and promoted innovation.” (Comment [d]) The arrows in Fig. 5 point to the selected procedures from the first to the fourth layer.

- First layer: Document a memorandum on the interview results, with Comment [d] as Company B’s members’ trustworthy behavior.

- Second layer: Select “Integrity.” Mayer et al. [7] described “Integrity” as the consistency of a party’s past actions and credible communications about the trustee from other parties. Company A’s president made a good impression regarding perceived Trustworthiness by Company B members. According to Comment [d], following the president’s instructions, members of Company B’s common department recognized that their own improvement was not enough and promised innovation. The reason for selecting “Integrity” is that Comment [d] indicates the consistency of the Company B members past actions.

- Third layer: Select “Behavioral Integrity” from Company B members’ Trustworthy behavior. Whitener et al. [8] described “Behavioral Integrity” as telling the truth and keeping promises. According to Comment [d], following the president’s instructions, members of Company B’s common department said that their own improvement was not enough and promised to promote innovation. The reason for selecting “Behavioral Integrity” is that Comment [d] indicates telling the truth and keeping promises.

- Fourth layer: Document an idea generated from Company B members’ Trustworthy behavior, acting to take risks, and trusting the trustee party beyond the risk. The president of Company A remarked, “I realized Company B’s cooperative members knew their situation and that Company B was competent” (Comment [e]). Furthermore, a memorandum was written on the remarks.

As the arrow indicates, this study proceeded without hesitation in selecting and commenting. We confirmed the description on the basis of these results.

### 3.3 Discussion

In this section, we consider the description result. First, we consider the description result of the CRP.

- First layer: Select one stage from the organization design life cycle of corporate integrations to make the trustor party and the trustee party recognize where it is in the life cycle stage of corporate integrations. We indicated through the checking stage of the organization design life cycle that it would be very helpful to determine the stage that would create the most Conflict.

- Second layer: Document an impression of the trustor party’s thoughts. The trustor party recognized its real Conflict and that it would be possible to determine one correct selection of Conflict types in the third layer and Interdepartmental conflict in the fourth layer.

Second, we consider the description result of the CHDP.

- First layer: Select one Conflict-handling mode to make the party recognize the Conflict that was in its mind through the trustee party’s statement.

- Second layer: Select one trustworthy behavior to make the trustee party recognize the trustor party’s real mind under its statement or behavior.

- Third layer: Document the impression of the party’s thoughts. The party reviewed its real Conflict-handling modes, making it possible to determine one correct selection of Conflict-handling modes.
This study noted that the conflict-handling modes of the party changes from competition to collaboration after recognizing the trustor party’s Trustworthy behavior and proceeding with the process.

Third, we consider the description result of the BPTT.

- First layer: Document the impression of the trustor party’s thoughts, the trustor party recognized their real feeling for the trustee party’s trustworthy behavior.
- Second layer: Select one of the trustee party’s factors of perceived Trustworthiness to make the trustor party perceive the trustee party’s real mind under its statement or behavior.
- Third layer: Select one of the trustee party’s Trustworthy behavior factors to make the trustor recognize the trustee party’s real mind under its statement or behavior.
- Fourth layer: Document the impression of the trustee party’s thoughts. The trustee party recognized its real feelings about the trustor party’s Trustworthy behavior.

Furthermore, the trustor party acted to take a risk and trust the trustee party beyond the risk. This study noted that the trustor party was able to recognize the trustee party in the context of less information at the time of integration.

4. Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to demonstrate the process of recognizing conflict from the perspective of trustor and trustee as well as cultivating trust by extracting three processes from the TBM. Furthermore, this study proposed three hierarchy structures and performed subjective verification to indicate the potential for practical use in corporate integrations.

This study showed that the trustor party and the trustee party in corporate integration used three processes to determine how to perceive conflict, address conflict, perceive Trustworthiness, Trustworthy behavior, and cultivate Trust. In other words, in the future, if TBM users can write individually each recognition (the recognitions of both the trustor party and the trustee party) within TBM, the TBM users can recognize misunderstanding between the trustor and trustee.

Subjective verification followed a cognitive behavioral process (i.e., CRP, CHDP, and BPTT) that enabled TBM based on interviews of the trustor party and the trustee party concerning corporate integration. We analyzed the interview results that we collected from three companies within one mother company.

The limitation of this study is that by verifying each the process layer selection, we tested only one case. This means that the remaining components within each layer were not verified. However, we believe that each layer was constructed according to previous studies, effectively determining how to perceive conflict, address conflict, perceive Trustworthiness and Trustworthy behavior, and cultivate Trust. Therefore, future research should verify the components in all of the layers.

Additionally, this study did not indicate how the cognitive behavior process should be used in an actual corporate integration. We believe in assisting in a discussion on how the cognitive behavior process should be used in actual corporate integrations. Therefore, future research needs to embody a method and have it completed by a person experienced in integration to obtain an evaluation. Furthermore, future research needs to conduct third-party verifications for the method presented and confirm that it can be used in actual corporate integrations by several experimental analysis or quantitative evaluation for providing more evidence.
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