The study of trust, as a determining factor for success in organizations. A state of the art

Augusto Renato Pérez Mayo, Daniela Beatriz Salgado Arteaga and José Alberto Hernández Aguilar

Author(s) Biography

Augusto Renato Pérez Mayo, Ph.D is Research professor of the Faculty of accounting, business administration and informatics at the Autonomous University of Morelos State, UAEM, Mexico.

Daniela Beatriz Salgado Arteaga, MAO is a student of the specialty in Human Resources Management of the Faculty of accounting, business administration and informatics at the Autonomous University of Morelos State, UAEM, Mexico

José Alberto Hernández Aguilar, Ph.D is Research professor is of the Faculty of accounting, business administration and informatics at the Autonomous University of Morelos State, UAEM, Mexico

ABSTRACT: Trust has been addressed in different branches of knowledge such as: psychology, sociology, and economy. Nevertheless from the decade of the nineties it is fundamental within the administrative literature and therefore in the concrete studies of the organizations; this is why this theoretical research reviews the types of trust that exist throughout the organizational analysis and we end with the proposal of Lewiki and Bunker (1996), as an explanatory framework that emphasizes the importance of trust for success in the organization and which establishes three types of trust: the calculative (which is based on the incentive) the cognitive (based on knowledge) and the identification (also known as cultural). This theoretical model has its theoretical and methodological roots in the school of organizational behavior of Robbins (1999), Davis and Newstrow (2003). Finally, it reflects on the trust as a value on which to base the relations of collaboration and its importance within the management of human resources.

Keywords: Trust, success, organization, state of art

Trust is and has been a concept of great interest for the theory of organizational social sciences and sociology of organizations, in the field of formal organizations better known as companies, because it is increasingly observed that organizational commitment in relationships is becoming more and more unlikely, that is, organizational loyalty (Perez Mayo and Hernandez 2016).

In line with the above mentioned, trust is a value in which the relations of collaboration in the field of the organization must be based on the reason, that is why trust has been recognized in multiple disciplines from the decade of the fifties (Argyris 1962 and McGregor 1967). Later in the nineties it becomes an essential aspect within the organizational literature (Rousseau, et. al., 1998).

Trust is important in work life and in organizational effectiveness, so it has had a substantial emphasis on the literature of the social sciences. In this sense, previous research considers that trust is essential in organizational activities representing a competitive advantage. In spite of this relevance there is a lack of studies that focus on the organizational confidence for the achievement of the organizational objectives.

In the 21st century organizations have the need to adapt to the changes that may arise in the environment, so they have to form alliances of shared collaboration of resources and knowledge. Therefore, when trust prevails, the behavior is limited because the parties involved consider that the shared knowledge will be used for the benefit and development of the alliance

That is why trust allows a balance between differences in order to generate new knowledge and thus reach organizational learning which contributes to innovation (Rubio 2009).

For the above, trust is the exchange of knowledge (Davenport and Prusak 2009) It is also a necessity to achieve quality in business interactions and teamwork (Kramer and Tyler 1996). High levels of trust lead to: effective communication, debate, learning, innovation, dialogue and more committed relationships (Dodgson 1993; Ichijo, et. Al. 2003; Mayer et. Al. 1995).

This theoretical research is fundamental for the reason that the trust has been recovered in order to understand the organizations from their own reality. Likewise, given the pressures involved in reducing costs and delivery times in the globalized knowledge society in which we are immersed, it is necessary to deepen the development of a higher quality trust in relationships (Rubio 2009).

State of the art around the concept of trust

The phenomenon of trust has been studied by the literature of the administration for more than a decade. Nevertheless, and in spite of the great number of academic works, it is not so simple to come up with a clear and complete definition of what is understood by trust.

This same diversity is the one that can be perceived when the literature is analyzed about the relevance of the trust and its influence in the organizational results (Dirks and Ferrin 2001) as shown in the following table:

Table 1. Contributions of trust in the organizational environment

AUTOR	AÑO	TEMA	CONCEPTO
Baba	1999	Cofidence	Positive attitude of the expectations that one has of the behavior of somebody and/or something in a certain situation that entails risk for the entrusted part.
Curral and Judge	1995		
Dooley	1999		
Dirks	2001		
Mc Aliister	1995	Confidence	Limit with which you think that others will not act to obtain a benefit from our vulnerability.

Confidence is derived from rational thought patterns (cognitive basis), coupled with an examination of one's feelings, instincts, and intuition (affective basis). |
| Panteli and Sockalninga | 2005 | Confidence | The components of trust are: willingness to be vulnerable and expectations of trust. |

Author	Year	Type	Description
Lewicki	**1998**	Confidence	Trust in our daily lives is a combination of feeling and rational thinking.
Mc Night et. al.	**1998**	Confidence	Tendency of the human being to be trusted, because he has faith in humanity.
Dibben	**2000**	Confidence	Faith in humanity is widely known as a provision that has confidence; so some individuals may have a natural tendency toward trust; while others have confidence according to certain situations and circumstances.
Newell and Swam	**2000**	Conditional Trust	We can find it in the initial stages of relationships and when there is no obvious reason for mistrust.
		Unconditional Trust	It is based on the synergy of the relationship; which is essential to obtain good yields and is a direct consequence of knowledge; Experience and trust in the other party.
Boon and Holmes	**1991**	Confidence	These authors argue that it is a dynamic concept that evolves over time; so it can take a different character at the beginning, in the development and mature state of the relationship. Because of this, trust changes as individuals feel more comfortable with each other and a greater awareness of the integrity and competence of others develops.
Shapiro et. al.	1992		
Lewicki and Bunker	1995		
Lewicki and Bunker	1995	Calculative Confidence	Based on the incentive.
Rousseau et. al. and	1996	Cognitive Confidence	Based on knowledge.
Lane	1998	Identificative Confidence	Based on identification, also called normative or cultural trust.
Robbins	**2009**	Confidence	It is a process that occurs over time, requires familiarity and is effective when a person can become vulnerable. Likewise, it establishes three types of trust: **Confidence by deterrence:** part of the fear of reprisals if it withdraws. The consequences of not complying with obligations are feared; and it is possible to apply a punishment, the consequences are clear and a punishment is effectively applied when the trust is broken.

Author	Year	Term	Description
			Trust by knowledge: based on the predictability of behavior after a time of treatment. This occurs when one has enough information about someone to understand well and accurately predict their behavior. **Trust by identification:** given when the parties understand each other's intentions and appreciate their likes and dislikes. This mutual understanding implies that one can act perfectly for the other.
Echeverría	2001	Confidence	It is the foundation of any social relationship that is not sustained by force.
Luhmann	1996	Confidence	The person who decides to trust, no longer does it at his own risk; But at the risk of the system.
Kramer, (quoted by Omar, 2010)	2010	Confidence	Set of socially learned and confirmed expectations that people have about the organizations and institutions with which they relate. On the other hand it affirms that it is necessary for the stability, well-being and survival of the organization.
Bachanan, (quoted by Omar, 2010)		Confidence	Organizational trust is developed when individuals generalize their personal trust to large organizations composed of individuals with whom they have little familiarity, little interdependence, and poor interaction.
Searle and Ball		Confidence	It is the inherent strength, with which the individual identifies himself within his organizational environment.
Lewicki and Benedict (1996)		Confidence	They identify three perspectives for their proper analysis: 1.- The perspective of the disposition or the personality. 2.- The sociological and economic perspective, which focuses on trust as an institutional phenomenon. 3.- The perspective of social psychology that focuses on interpersonal transactions between individuals.

.- Miller and Mitamura (2003) Couch and Jones (1997)		Social Confidence	General confidence towards all people; this would be an expectation about the goodwill that would have the human beings.

Source: Own elaboration, based on a review of the literature and the authors cited.

As can be seen from Table 1, given the breadth of the study of confidence in the revised literature, it is necessary to emphasize that the two antecedents of trust are: social trust and the characteristics that are perceived in who is going to Trust (Mayer, Davis and Schoorman, 1995). On the other hand, Lewicki and Benedict (1996) expose different perspectives from which the confidence has been studied, as can be seen in the following table:

Table 2. Disciplines of study about trust

Analytical perspective assumed	Conceptualization of trust
Theory of personality (Individuality of the human being)	• Beliefs • Expectations • Feelings
Sociology and Economics	• Institutional Phenomenon • Social Characteristics • Interaction between parties
Psicológico-Social	• Interpersonal transaction • Expectation about behavior

Source: Own elaboration, based on Lewicki and Benedict (1996).

Trust as a social fact

Luhmann (2006) asserts that trust in a broad sense of faith in one's expectations is a basic fact of social life; so that the man in various situations can decide whether to give confidence or not. On the other hand, the need for trust is considered as the starting point, from which rules for appropriate behavior are derived. Trust cannot be considered a waste of time; it is not even the perception of time itself, until it predominates in the process of experience, it avoids the development of trust.

Trust can only be secured and maintained in the present; since neither the uncertain future nor the past can arouse confidence; On the contrary, the basis of all confidence is the present as a continuum of events that can happen. Because of this, the problem of trust is centered on the fact that the future has more possibilities than the present, and from the present we return to the past. The uncertainty that exists is the consequence that not all futures can become present. Because of the above, trust has the effect of reducing uncertainty and complexity, which allows us to offer present security and future planning. So, by acting with confidence you can manage the future easier; but this cannot mean eliminating the danger, because whoever trusts risks being defrauded. All this allows establishing a basic relationship between trust and human action Luhmann (2006).

Confidence and its impact on organizations

Organizations are relevant to the human being, since we are close to them, because "we are born, we live, we grow and we die in them". (Scott,1981: 1). For the above, it is important to clarify what is an organization? So, two of the most complete definitions are:

An organization is a collectivity with a relatively identifiable boundary, a normative order, levels of authority, communications systems, and membership coordination systems; this community exists continuously in an environment and engages in activities that are usually related to a set of goals; the activities have results for the members of the organization, the organization itself and society (Hall, 1996: 33).

The organizations are social entities that are directed to the goals, that are designed like systems of structured activities , deliberately coordinated that are linked to the surroundings; So that the key element of an organization are the people and the relationships between them; So, an organization exists when people interact with each other to perform essential functions that help achieve the goals (Daft, 2011: 11).

The true meaning of the organization resides in all those areas that cannot be perceived as intemperate, apart from human knowledge and experience; therefore, the struggle of the academic effort to make it intelligible is important.

As can be seen from these definitions, we can say that whenever the human being interacts daily within the organization; then the two key elements are: human resources and the relationships between them. Therefore, these elements must be unconcerned by uncertainty or risk; this is because one must have confidence in others in order to achieve success in the organization.

Fukuyama (1995), says that the most effective organization should be valued in terms of trust. Likewise, when different people working in the same organization, act according to the ethical rules and trust in each other; will decrease long-term costs

favorably. Contrary to the above, a working environment that is characterized by lack of confidence will attract failure (Marden, 1999).

The society in which the organizations live and exist is characterized by the continuity of uncertainty, insecurity, the speed of change and the latent and complex risk. Because of the above, trust is an antidote to relieving the tensions that cause the inability to control and the difficulty of anticipating the responses. It is also a bet, made in the present time, towards the future and based on the past (Luhmann, 1996).

Within organizations, trust must begin through senior management and disseminate it to the lowest levels of the organizational structure, which implies a downward diffusion of trust. Likewise, it is necessary to transfer trust upwards to create a cycle where the trust issuer is feedback when received through their receivers (Ramírez, 2011).

The mutual trust between human resources is now a key factor in working together towards the same objective and thus achieving administrative functions. Trust is the primary basis for good relationships between leaders, partners and clients to increase the expected results of the organization (Zenke, 2000).

Theory of organizational behavior, as a basis for the study of trust

The theory of organization is considered as a territory in dispute, due to the participation of different knowledge; So that there is no unification of criteria regarding the specific theories to study the organizations; Given that it is a multidisciplinary knowledge. This leads us to understand that in the study of organizations is not the structure, nor the environment, nor behavior, nor processes; But rather the conglomeration between all of them, which helps to define them (Ibarra, 1999).

Trust has been addressed in different branches of knowledge such as: psychology, sociology and economics; So that although the object of analysis is the same, the point of view from the discipline in which it is studied differs according to the interest of the studied area; the material object is the same, the formal object is diverse (Rubio, 2009).

However, since this research deals with trust from the organizational point of view, it is necessary to resort to a theory that supports it, for which Hernández, et. al (2010) argue that a theory is a set of interrelated propositions, capable of explaining why and how a phenomenon happens, in this case the development of organizational behavior theory, is defined as follows:

Organizational behavior is the study and application of knowledge about how people either individually or in groups act in organizations. " It therefore seeks to identify ways in which individuals act with greater certainty and provide managers with tools so that they can observe the behavior of individuals within the organization and examine the dynamics of small groups, whether formal or informal" (Davis & Newstrow, 2003: 26).

Likewise, these authors affirm that the organizational behavior has the following objectives:

· Constantly describe how individuals behave in diverse contexts.

· Reason why people behave as they do within the organization.

· Forecast the future behavior of employees within the organization.

· Controls and develops certain activity at work.

For its part, Robbins (1999: 11) defines organizational behavior as: "a field of study that investigates the effect that individuals, groups and structures have on behavior within organizations, for the purpose of applying such knowledge to improve the effectiveness of the organization." For Rendón and Montaño (2004), organizational studies are not a discipline itself, but a meeting point open to the argued debate and respectful of ideas. It is not an applied sociology or a critical administration, although it contains some of them; it is both an organizational effort that addresses the organization always in its relationship with the individual and society, the group and the community.

The levels of organizational behavior are based on individuals, groups and the organizational level. Therefore, the levels of organizational behavior are:

1. - Individuals are the primary component of organizational behavior, which enters the organization with demographic and personality characteristics that can influence their performance such as:

· Biographical characteristics (gender, marital status and age)

· Characteristics of the personality (ability, attitudes, values, perception, learning, motivation and individual decisions).

The initial problem facing individuals within an organization is to show that they are a trustworthy person, which implies the risk of being rejected. In the organizational dimension, trust becomes an accepting or rejecting the risk of the other party meeting my expectations. Both the "stranger" and the "self" need to solve a personal problem first and then the organizational, in a present, in a given situation, so that

trust proves a solution but also a contradiction, implying a risk in relationships, which always will be present. In organizational relationships and as in all, trust is built over time (Pérez Mayo and Hernández, 2016). Within the individual level, Curral & Judge

(1995) define trust as the behavior of one individual believing in another under risk condition.

2. - Groups: the individuals within the organization are not conducted in isolation; this is so because they belong to formal and informal groups. Therefore, the role of individuals' behavior includes the following factors: values, norms, patterns of communication, groupal decision-making processes, power, politics, leadership,Intergroup relations and conflict. Behavior in groups is no more than the sum of individuals within the organization and therefore, it analyzes how individuals in groups are influenced by desired behavior patterns.

3. - The organizational level: both individuals and groups interact with the organizational structure and therefore organizational behavior is further complicated when the formal structure is added to individual and group behavior.

The difficulty in organizations where there is a low level of trust is that work normally occurs under conditions of stress, staff spend much of their time covering their backs, justifying past decisions, and feeling guilty when something does not work, this prevents them from focusing on work and makes it impossible to exchange ideas, creativity and innovation. The bond of trust is the factor that allows organizational relationships to be permanent and as necessary as life itself.

Trust is situated in the field of management sciences, and is related to the results of the organization. That is why, trust is a transcendental element in the management of organizations; But for this to become a reality, a transformation in the structures and behaviors of the company is necessary in order to orient decisions towards the quality of information flows (Savall and Zardet, 2004).

Variables that have been addressed for the study of trust in the organization

According to Echeverria (2001), trust is related to other variables such as:

Power: It is exercised by authority and without resorting to force; since it is a fundamental criterion to grant or revoke power is trust.

Vulnerability: When there is trust, we feel more secure, more protected and less vulnerable. However, when there is no trust the threats are greater, because we have the feeling that we are dormant to danger. Therefore, lack of confidence increases fear.

Uncertainty and Complexity: Luhnmann (1996) indicates that trust has the effect of reducing uncertainty and complexity. It also allows us to offer present assurances and future orientations. By acting with confidence, we reduce all things that could pass and make the future more manageable; however, it does not give us the certainty that there is no risk.

Control: Baba (1999), states that trust is a substitute for hierarchical control within organizations. On the other hand, Omar (2010) tells us that trust is the main element through which the processes and results of employees can be controlled; since control without trust is not enough. Therefore, trust ensures adherence to the rules of the organization in a way that is not imposed in a coercive manner and in terms of interests. Therefore, if there is mutual trust, the operating cost of an organization will be lower.

Organizational Change: Matthews and Bullen (1995) studied the incidence of trust in organizational change, as any attempt to achieve meaningful change would necessarily imply a set of actions. Trust between individuals and groups provide continuous motivation to produce any real change in an organization. The trust that people have in the person in charge implies change is crucial.

Teamwork: Confidence involves an expectation and willingness to take the risk that a person acts in a predicted way. Without trust it would be difficult to achieve cooperation.

Risk: Confidence does not make sense if there is no degree of uncertainty.

Interdependence: involves two or more actors that are related within a social context.

Robbins (2009), expresses that the key dimensions of the concept of trust are:

· Integrity: Related to honesty and truthfulness.

· Competence: Covers the interpersonal skills and technical knowledge of the individual.

· Congruence: Related in how much you can depend on an individual and how predictable and good judgment is when handling a situation.

· Loyalty: Willingness to defend and give face to another person.

· Openness: possibility that a person tells the whole truth.

Parties involved in relationships of trust

1. - Trustor: is the party that is willing to trust others. This part is set to be vulnerable to trust to be operational, and must take the risk of losing something important and depend on exploiting the vulnerability of the trustees.

2. - Trustee and / or Trustee: is the one who reacts to the good will of the trustor.

In this relationship can be given several types of risks: financial, functional, social, physical, emotional and identity, which must be evaluated and controlled by both parties to build trust.

Demographic, personal and professional characteristics are generally accepted by the trustor and the trustee, further facilitating trust between the two parties. These two concepts represent each of the two vital parts involved in relationships involving

trust. Both terms refer to the parties involved, whether people, organizations or products and, of course, those between competitors, is one of the critical success factors of these relationships (Ybarra et al., 2009).

Analysis of the confidence model according to Lewicki and Bunker (1996). The model proposed by Lewicki and Bunker (1996) provides us with a theoretical tool, in order to understand more clearly the evolution of the confidence necessary to foster collaboration and how these favors learning in the organization. Therefore, these authors propose three types of trust, which are interrelated and can be measured and observed; So that they can be applied to people, to living beings, objects and phenomena, which acquire different values with respect to the referred variable (Hernández, 2010). In the present investigation, the dependent and independent variables to investigate can be seen in Table 3.

Table 3. Types of organizational confidence.

Confidence	Calculative trust
A positive attitude of the expectations of the behavior of someone and / or something in each situation which are at risk for the confident party.	Relates to the results that follow the relationship or the fear of reprisals, in case of violating the trust derived from the agreement.
	Cognitive trust It is based on the information that is exchanged and in the form of interpretation; which has consequences in terms of knowledge management.
	Identification Trust It is characterized by a mutual understanding between all the parties involved; To the extent that each can act on behalf of another. Therefore, the other party can trust that their interest will be protected without the need for vigilance.

Source: own elaboration based on Rubio (2009), Lewicki and Bunger (2009), Baba (1999), Curral and Judge (1995), Dooley, et. to the. (1999) and Dirks et. to the. (2001)

Conclusions

Confronted with the growing difficulty of facing the ever more complex demands of society, it is advisable to assume in a different way the management of the organizations; So, it is considered necessary to adapt the structures and processes to the historical requirements of the moment, since each organization operates in the way it believes is the most correct (Perrow, 1984).

In addition to this, once the literature has been reviewed and given the breadth of the study of trust, it is necessary to emphasize that the different perspectives from which trust has been studied is psychology, sociology and economics; So that, depending on the analytical perspective assumed and the complementarity between them, will have an implication of theoretical and methodological wealth.

In the 21st century, organizations need to adapt to the changes that may arise in the environment; therefore, they have to form partnerships of shared collaboration; it is for this reason that trust is a factor of success that allows the improvement in organizations; because their development rely on the people who develop the work.

The organization scenario is a space in which there are interactions between individuals; which are mediated by factors and resources aimed at achieving a purpose. From this point of view, the organization must be seen as a socio-economic unit, constantly built with the contribution of each of its collaborators, without which it would have no raison d'être. (Ramirez, 2002: 111).

Confidence is a variable that has a positive effect on multiple aspects of the organization, since its analysis allows the rapid generation of hypotheses on other relevant issues of the organization, some of which were raised during the literature review, such as; Teamwork, organizational change, power, vulnerability, risk, control, power, complexity, loyalty, frankness, integrity, competition. Likewise, the three main characteristics that influence the development of trust relationships are demographic, personal and professionals.

The main aspects that could positively affect trust are shared judgment, emotions, feelings and values. Negatively, they are risk and uncertainty. The concept of trust as multidimensional is under debate as it can explain any process of economic activity.

The majority of research in confidence studies it in a static way and takes it as a dependent variable to measure it as a simple point in time. The confidence measurements developed in the time are proposed in four areas: the approach to the behavior and three specific concepts of the psychological approach (unidimensional, two-dimensional and transformational models). Thus, these measurements are compared and analyzed to identify unanswered questions and formulate guidelines for future work (Lewicki, 2006) (Pérez Mayo and Hernández Aguilar 2016).

References

Baba, M. (1999). "Dangerous Liaiasons: Trust, Distrut, ad Information Technology in American

Work Organizations". Human Organzation, Fall, 58, 3, pp. 331-346.

Curral, S. y Judge T. (1995). Measuring Trust Between Organizational Boundary Role Persons". Behaviour And Human Decision Proceses, 64, 2, pp.151-170.

Daft, L. R. (2011). Teoría y diseño organizacional. México: Cengage Learning.
Davis, K., & Newstrom, J. (2003). Comportamiento humano en el trabajo. México: McGraw-Hill.

Dibben, M.R. (1993). "Learning , trust and technological collaboration". Human Relations, 46,1, pp. 77-95.

Echeverría R. (2001): "La empresa emergente, la confianza y los desafíos de la transformación". Buenos Aires: Granica.

Fukuyama, F. (1995) Trust: the social virtues and the creation at prosperity. The Free Pres, New York

Hall, R. (1996). Estructuras, procesos y resultados. México: Prentice Hall

Hernández, S. R., Fernández , C. C., & Baptista, L. P. (2010). Metodología de la investigación. México : Mc Graw Hill.

Ibarra, C. E. (1999). Los saberes sobre la organización: etapas, enfoques y dilemas. Economía, organización y trabajo: un enfoque sociológico, 95-154.

Marden, T. (1999) Model of national culture a management review. Cross Cultural Management

Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H. & Schoorman, F. D. (1995). An integrative model of organizational trust. Academy of Management Review, 20, 709-734.

Montaño, H. L. (2014). Los estudios organizacionales. Revisando el papel de la crítica en la Administración. Universidad del Valle, 21-46.

Matthews R.; y Bullen G.: "La confianza es la clave" Revista Gestión, V2, N° 5, (sep - oct 1997):pág. 148 a 156.

Omar, A. (2010): "Fundamentos de Psicología Positiva". Argentina: Ed. Paidós

Morgan, R.M. y Hunt S.D. (1994). "The commitment Trust: Theory of Relation Ship Marketing", Journal of Marketing, 58, pp. 20-38.
Nonaka, I. (1991). "A Dynamic Theory of Orgaizational Knowledge Creation". Organization Science, 5, 14-37.

Lewicky, R. J. y Bunker, B.B. (1996). "Developing and Maintaining Trust in Working Relationships". In Trust in Organzations: Fronteries of Theory and Research,

Kramer, R.M. and Tyler, T.R.(eds), Sage Publications. Thousand Oaks, CA.

Pérez Mayo, A.R and Hernández Aguilar, J.A. (2016) Organization and Trust. A Look From The Sociology Of Organizations. IOSR Jornal of Business and Management (IOSR-JBM), Volume 18, Issue 3 .Ver. II (Mar. 2016), PP 93-99.

Ramirez A., H., T., C. (2002). Impacto de la confianza en la organización. Publicado en el libro: Innovación, confianza y pequeña empresa. México D.F. UAM-X, CSH. Primera edición ISBN:970310097X.

Ramirez A., H., T., C. (2011). Interacción social con la confianza y apertura como factores que propician el apren dizaje en las organizaciones. Administración y organizaciones26, Junio 2011, año 14. Pp. 27-46.

Rendón, C. M., & Montaño, H. L. (2004). Las aproximaciones organizacionales.Caracterización, objeto y problemática. Facultad de Contaduría y Administración de la UNAM, México, 111.

Robbins (1999). Comportamiento Organizacional en el Trabajo. Editorial Prentice Hall, México D.F.
Rokeach, M. (1973). The nature of Human Values. New York, Mc Milan.

Rousseau, D.M.; Sitkin, S.; Burt, R., y Camerer, C. (1998). "Not so Different After All: A Cross Disciplinary view of Trust". Academia of Management Review, 23 pp. 393-404.

Savall, H. y Zardet , V. (2004), Maítriser les Couts el les Performances Cachés. Ed. Económica, 1a. 1987, 4Ş Edición, France.

Scott, R. W. (1981). Organizations. Rational, natural and open systems. México: Prentice Hall.

Ybarra, C., Turk, T. "The Evolution of trust in information technology alliances". Journal of High Technology Management Research 20. Pp.62-74. (2009).

Zenke, D. (2000). Can you manage trust? Training 37(2)