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ABSTRACT
This paper gives an overview of major issues in trust research, identifying common foundations and multiple constellations of organizational trust. In doing so, the paper also addresses important implications of theory development and empirical research. It provides a historical sketch of different approaches to understanding the phenomenon of trust. It deals with important issues of connected with reason, routine and reflexivity. Finally, it briefly summarizes the research done in Polish enterprises.
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INTRODUCTION
Trust is a topic that has been studied a lot lately. Across various societies the process of globalization has bound people in a network of tightening interlink ages. Extremely high uncertainty has become the institutional context of postmodern societies, and therefore there is great need for trust. Trust is important in all spheres of social life. Trust is recognized as an important factor in intra- and inter-organizational relations, significantly influencing everything from the behaviour of teams to the performance of strategic alliances and supply chains. It binds friendships ( Gibbons 2004, 238-259), facilitates bargaining and negotiations (Olekalns, Smith 2005, 1696-1707), reduces transaction costs in interfirm exchanges (Bharadwaj, Matsuno 2006, 62-72), and even resolves international political conflicts (Kelman 2005, 639-650). Trust is broadly recognized organizational construct that allow supervisors to promote positive working relationships and the attainment of desired organizational outcomes. Currently, trust in superiors is the focus of investigation by many management theorists and researchers. It has often been argued that trust is essentially important for successful cooperation and effectiveness in organizations (Zand 1972, 229–239; Zand 1997; Lewis, Weigert 1985, 967–984; McAllister 1995, 24–59; Lane 1998, 1–30; Rousseau, Sitkin, Burt, Camerer, 1998, 393–404; Nooteboom 2002; Simmons, Nelson, Neal 2001, 63–74; Tan, Tan, 2000, 241–260; Konovsky, Pugh 1994, 656–669; Lagace 1991, 49–50

1 Article connected with the realization of research project entitled “Orientation on trust and organizational performance” (No. N N115 549238) financed by Ministry of Science and Higher Education in Poland.
58). Trust leads to the kind of constructive and cooperative behaviour that is vital for long-term relationships (Morgan, Hunt 1994, 20-38).

This paper gives an overview of major issues in trust research, identifying common foundations of trust. In doing so, the paper also addresses important implications of theory development and empirical research. It provides a historical sketch of different approaches to understanding the phenomenon of trust. Finally, it briefly summarizes the research done in Polish enterprises. The purpose of this research is to investigate the level of trust among managers from the best Polish enterprises from Mazovia Province.

**TRUST DEFINITION**

Trust has been defined in many ways. The great philosophers have written very little about trust. For example, Plato and Aristotle, have only indirectly implied trust while discussing cooperation and friendship and the virtues of the human being (Baier 1986, 231-260; Hosmer 1995, 379-403). Philosophers see trust in a variety of forms and versions. For example, Herzberg (1988, 307-322) trusting another person means having trusting attitude towards the other person. Thus trust is implicit, not given on grounds and is never a rational option.

Economics have not traditionally paid much attention to the role of trust in market exchange. The neo-classical ideal market, with perfect information and pure competition, does not involve trust as a central concept: the economic system is rendered transparent to all agents thereby negating trust as an issue (Platteau 1994, 533-577). The shifts in focus towards imperfectly competitive markets in which a small number of traders build long-term relationships and make relation-specific investment, has drawn attention to this issue. Those economists who do see the notion of trust as relevant and useful, regard it as mutual confidence, where by an individual or firm trusts second individual or firm to do what they promised to do (Zucker 1986, 53-111). For example according to M. Sako (1992) trust can be treated as a state of mind, an expectation held by one trading partner about another, that the other behaves or responds in a predictable and mutually acceptable manner.

Personality psychologists such as Wrightsman (1966, 328-332) and Rotter (1967, 651-655) have viewed trust as a personality trait that reflects the general expectancies of the trustworthiness of others. These expectancies are relatively stable dispositional characteristics that depend on personal experiences and previous socialization. Author (Paliszkiewicz 2010) see trust as the belief that another party: a) will not act in a way that is harmful to the trusting firm, b) will act in such a way that it is beneficial to the trusting firm, and c) will act reliably d) will behave or respond in a predictable and mutually
acceptable manner. Trust can be seen as a bridge between past experiences and anticipated future.

Trust in the workplace has been shown to have a strong and robust influence on a variety of organizational phenomena, including job satisfaction, stress, organizational commitment, productivity, and knowledge sharing (Kramer 1999, 569-598). Abrams et al. (2003, 65) suggest that “trust leads to increased overall knowledge exchange, makes knowledge exchanges less costly, and increases the likelihood that knowledge acquired from a colleague is sufficiently understood and absorbed that a person can put it to use”. Precursors of trust include environmental and contextual factors and “malleable relational features” such as shared language and shared vision (Levin, Whitener, Cross 2006, 1163-1171). Other research has explored the effect of characteristics of the relationships in which trust occurs, such as strong versus weak ties (Hansen 1999, 82-111; Levin, Cross 2004, 1477-1490).

In contrast to trust, interpersonal distrust reflects negative expectations about another’s conduct (Lewicki, McAllister, Bies 1998, 438-458). The few studies that have examined distrust in the domain of safety suggest that it plays a largely negative role. For example, in the off-shore industry, Fleming and Lardner (2001) implicated a lack of trust in unsuccessful safety initiatives. Similarly, Conchie and Donald (2006, 1151-1159) report a positive association between distrust in management and incidents of poor safety. Part of the reason for the negative effects of distrust may relate to its power to promote psychological distress, cognitive strain, and withdrawal from a relationship (Dirks and Ferrin 2002, 611-628). Reactions such as these promote employees’ hyper-vigilance, reduced concentration on the current task, and increase the risk of accidents. However, although distrust may often have a negative impact on work-based performance, it can play a positive role. For example, the increase in vigilance and wariness created by distrust has been suggested as being essential for a healthy and resilient organization (Barber 1983; Shapiro 1987). This positive role is important because it indicates that distrust should not be conceptualized simply as the flip side of trust.

After literature review some of the features of the concept of trust were founded:
- Situational rather than global: trust is placed in one particular person;
- It is personal;
- Voluntary: trust must spring from choice and cannot be compulsory, sometimes is experimental;
- Committed, since each party depends on the other (without being able to control her);
- Conscious: each party is aware of the other party’s trust;
- Relevant, in the sense that the consequences of breach of trust by one of the parties cannot be considered insignificant by the other;
- Dynamic or temporal, because it evolves over time: trust is established, grows, diminishes and dies;
- Action oriented, implicit in the goal of the relationship;
- It is fragile;
- It is not simple;
- It is connected with past experience;
- It is connected with communication;
- It needs investment to build;
- It is not linear process. If damage is suffered to the relationship then trust is likely to decline. Trust may evolve through a process, but it may also devolve.

Several authors have discussed actions that have been shown to help build interpersonal action Six (2005, 82) bring together this ideas as follows:

1. Be open
   - Disclose information in an accurate and timely fashion
   - Give both positive and negative feedback
   - Be open and direct about task problems
   - Be honest and open about your motives

2. Share influence
   - Initiate and accept changes to your decisions
   - Seek and accept the counsel of other people
   - Give and receive help and assistance
   - Recognize the legitimacy of each other’s interests
   - Show a bias to see the other’s actions as benevolently intended
   - Show care and concern for the other

3. Delegate:
   - Make yourself dependent on the other person’s action
   - Delegate tasks
   - Give responsibility to other people
   - Take responsibility rather than make excuses

4. Manage mutual expectations:
   - Clarify general expectations early on and explore specific expectation in detail
   - Surface and negotiate differences in expectations
- Process and evaluate how effectively you are working together.

In the literature trust is described in connection with reason, routine, and reflexivity.

**TRUST AND REASON**

According to some researchers, trust represents a choice made “within reason” (Hollis 1998). A lot of researchers were trying to find answer for the question “how trustors are able to recognize trustworthiness in potential trustees: what makes a trustee trustworthy in the eyes of a particular trustor?” Overall, if the trustee is more likely to honour than to exploit trust, this makes him trustworthy in the eyes of the trustor, who also needs to be aware of the gains and losses at stake (Möllering 2006, 14). This emphasis on probability is also expressed by D. Gambetta, who claims that: “When we say we trust someone or that someone is trustworthy, we implicitly mean that the probability that he will perform an action that is beneficial or at least not detrimental to us is high enough for us to consider engaging in some form of cooperation with him” (Gambetta 1998, 217).

Existing research also suggests that trust develops from an individual’s beliefs about a person’s qualities, or more simply, their trustworthiness (e.g., Butler, Cantrell 1984, 19-28; Cook, Wall 1980, 39-52; Hardin 2002; Scott 1980, 319-336). In a safety context, a number of trustworthiness qualities have been shown to contribute to the development of trust and distrust. For example, Conchie and Donald (2008, 92-103) have shown that employees’ trust in management is related to qualities such as honesty, openness, and concern for others’ safety and welfare. However, while such research identifies the types of qualities that are important in the development of trust and distrust, it tells us little about the relative importance of these qualities. Typically, the available research conceptualizes the various antecedent qualities as a single, undifferentiated construct. This makes it impossible to identify the strongest antecedent of trust in management with safety, and impossible to determine whether or not the qualities that are important to the development of trust are also those that are important to the development of distrust.

Mayer, Davis, Schoorman (1995, 709-734) proposed the Integrative Model of Organizational Trust, a theoretical framework examining trust in an organizational setting involving two individuals: a trustor (the individual trusting) and a trustee (the individual being trusted). In their model, trust is defined as “the willingness of a party to be vulnerable to the actions of another party based on the expectation that the other will perform a particular action important to the trustor, irrespective of the ability to monitor or control that other party” (Mayer, Davis, Schoorman 1995, 712). According to this model, trust does not involve risk
per se, but rather a willingness to engage in risk-taking with the trustee (e.g., sharing sensitive information). Thus, trust represents an intention to take a risk in a relationship.

In assessing the trustworthiness of interaction partners, people can use a set of criteria to come with a reliable assessment. These criteria or factors of trustworthiness (Mayer, Davis, Schoorman 1995, 709-734) include ability or competence (Barber 1983; Luhmann, 1979; Mayer, Davis, Schoorman 1995, 709-734; McKnight, Cummings, Chervany 1998, 473-490), benevolence (Luhmann 1979; Mayer, Davis, Schoorman 1995, 709-734; McKnight, Cummings, Chervany 1998, 473-490), integrity or honesty (Mayer, Davis, Schoorman 1995, 709-734; McKnight, Cummings, Chervany 1998, 473-490).

Based on the characterization of Mayer et al. (1995, 709-734), parties in transactions are assessed to be trustworthy when they (1) have the required skills, competencies, and characteristics that enable them to exert influence within a specific domain – a description for the ability or competence criterion, (2) are believed to do good to trustors, setting aside an egocentric motive – thereby meeting the benevolence criterion, and (3) are perceived to adhere to a set of principles that trustors consider acceptable – a definition of integrity.

Sztompka (1999) also claims that people employ three criteria in estimating the trustworthiness of their transactional partners: reputation, performance, and appearance. Reputation refers to a record of past deeds; whereas, performance includes actual deeds, present conduct, and currently obtained results. Appearance also matters as one’s look and self-presentation can exude trustworthiness or stimulate suspicion on the part of the looker.

According to Hardin (2001, 18) “A natural and common account of trust is that certain people are trustworthy and can therefore be trusted”. This observation expresses three important ideas:

1. Trust is selective (we can only trust certain people, not everybody);
2. Trust is reasonable (we look for good reasons and, in particular, we assess the other’s trustworthiness before we trust);
3. Trust is decisive (we trust by taking a step in one direction, not the other, thereby reaching a certain state of expectation, performing corresponding actions, if required, and facing consequences).

According to Möllering (2006, 14) one line of the research looks at the trustee’s specific incentives to honour or exploit trust in a given situation. Another line of research identifies more general and less situation-specific indicators of trustworthiness for example character that the trustor attributes to the trustee. The two lines should be connected because, whenever the choice of trust needs to be made, incentives and character need to be considering together.
TRUST AND ROUTINE

Some kind of trust is associated with routine. Every day, people trust countless others without being able or required to perform any detailed reasoning about weather or not this is justified. Routinely, we are in position of vulnerability towards others, expecting no harm from them or even presuming their benevolence and solidarity – and this often applies to others about whom we know very little, too. I refer here to the situation where literally, or at least from the point of view of the trustor, “nobody would ever do this” or “everybody would always do that”. When trust is matter of routine, it can still be reasonable, but the main point is that the routine is performed without questioning its underlying assumptions, without assessing alternatives and without giving justifications every time. It is a procedure or programme that people follow regularly and habitually (Misztal 1996), a recurrent action pattern (Nelson, Winter 1982; Feldman, Pentland 2003, 94-118; Becker 2005, 249-262). According to Zucker (1986, 53-111) institutional-based trust, trustor can trust a trustee without establishing “process-based trust” in a personal relationship. However, as Sydow (1998, 31-63) argues, this makes institutions an object if trust, too, and not only a source. An analytical distinction therefore has to be drawn between the influence that institutions have on the trustor-trustee relationship on the one hand and the trust that actor have in the institutions on the other. Institutions can be seen as bases, carriers and objects of trust: trust between actors can be based on institutions, trust can be institutionalized, and institutions themselves can only be effective if they are trusted.

For modern economies, what is more important is generalized trust. This is the trust people have in a random member of a group or of a society, somebody they do not know and do not necessarily expect to encounter again in their life. This is the trust that allows markets to develop, trade to prosper, advanced civilization to progress. This is the type of trust that seems to be captured by the World Value Survey question: “Generally speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted or that you need to be very careful in dealing with?” (Yang, Mossholde 2010, 50-63).

This generalized trust is an essential element for a developed economy to work. In fact, much of economic backwardness is due to lack of trust. But while there is a lot of discussion about trust as a factor driving growth (see, for example, Knack and Keefer 1997, 1251-1288), there has been no attention to the role trust (or lack of thereof) might have in major financial crises. Bibb and Kourdi (2004, 4-5) described different type of trust like: faith, predictability, dependability, elementary trust, advanced trust. The examples are presented in the table 1.
Table 1: Differences between trust

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of trust</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faith</td>
<td>A religious belief: trust in a deity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictability</td>
<td>My dog will not bind me. The volcano will not erupt. The tree will not fall on my house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependability</td>
<td>My car will start. The shoes I have bought won’t fall apart. The rain will show up on time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary trust</td>
<td>I am safe walking down my street. My company will pay me every month. The doctor is qualified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced trust</td>
<td>My partner will remain faithful to me. My friends will support me when I need them. My parents will be there for me no matter what happens.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


According to Bibb and Kourdi (2004, 5) advanced trust is not blind trust. It requires commitment, action and boundary setting, so people have to create it, pay attention to it and actively develop it.

**TRUST AND REFLEXIVITY**

Researchers also were trying to find the answer for the question “whether trust is possible at all in situations when it may be needed most, that is in highly uncertain and unfamiliar circumstances”. Möllering (2006, 77-104) states clearly that actors can engage actively in processes that might create trust, and in doing so modify the processes and assumptions that were in place at the time. They can engage in signaling and in communications in a reflective way that enhances the potential for trust. In this fashion an actor can move forward having ‘blind’ trust, and hope through an ‘as-if’ state that trust will develop from the situation that had insufficient data to be ‘reasoned’, or from situations where there are no ‘routines’ perceived to be meaningful to the potential trustor. So the potential trustor thinks, or acts intuitively, but really moves forward in an ‘as-if’ manner so that later data acquisition may confirm trusting behaviour, or suggest the need to cease relationships.

Zand (Zand 1972, 229-239) is one of the few who propose an interactive model connected with reflexivity: “Let P denote one person and O the other. If (1) P lacks trust, (2) he will
disclose little relevant or accurate information, be unwilling to share influence, and will attempt to control O. (3) Assume O also lacks trust, (4) perceives P’s initial behaviour as actually untrusting, and (5) concludes he was right to expect P to be untrustworthy; then (6) he will feel justified in his mistrust of P. Since (7) P sees O’s behaviour as untrusting, he (8) will be confirmed in his initial expectation that O would not be trustworthy and (2) P will behave with less trust than when he entered.”

In the model of initial trust formation by McKnight, Cummings, and Chervany (1998, 473-490), propensity or disposition to trust is proposed to be one of the determinants of trusting intention. They identify two types of disposition to trust: faith in humanity and trusting stance. Faith in humanity refers to the belief that others are well-meaning and reliable; whereas trusting stance means that people believe that they will obtain better interpersonal outcomes by dealing with others as though they are well-meaning and reliable, regardless of whether those others are reliable or not. McKnight, Choudhary, and Kacmar (2002, 297-323) define trusting intention as people’s willingness or intention to depend on their interactional partners. Willingness to depend (volitional preparedness to make oneself vulnerable to the trustee) and subjective probability of depending (perceived likelihood that one will depend on the other) form two distinct subconstructs of trusting intention.

**TRUST IN ORGANIZATIONS IN OPINION OF MANAGERS**

The research was done in enterprises from Mazovia Province. The questionnaire was done among 368 managers from 189 companies from November 2010 to February 2011. The enterprises are the best enterprises according to Journal Forbes in Mazovia Province. Among 632 enterprises from the list only 189 decided to answer for questionnaires. The possible answers for the questions were: 1 - I strongly disagree, 2 - I disagree, 3 - I do not know, 4 - I agree, 5 - I strongly agree. The trust is presented here in three dimensions: reason, routine and reflexivity.

The questions connected with trust reason are presented in table 2. In this case the answers 1 and 2 are treated as negative attitude “I do not agree”, 3 – neutral – “I do not know”, and 4 and 5 positive attitudes – “I agree”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>I agree</th>
<th>I do not know</th>
<th>I do not agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Employees in your company wish others the best</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. In your company employees can openly talk about what they do not like, or how something should be changed  
   75 18 7

3. In your company your employees feel accountable for their tasks and do not have to be monitored  
   52 33 15

4. In the company motivation of employees is high because managers trust them  
   57 34 8

5. In your company all employees are treated fairly  
   64 25 11

Source: Author’s research

After analysing the data, we can see that answer for the question are mostly positive, but the number of managers, who have positive attitude is not very high. In the workplace where people do not trust each other the experience can be very stressful because people have to watch what they say and do. People expend considerable energy managing how they are perceived, making sure they make good alliances with the “right” people and are seen to distance themselves from the “wrong” ones. The effects for the organization can range from missed opportunities and unfulfilled potential to complete dishonesty and, in case of corporations, damaged customer relationships, lost business, failed partnerships, corporate scandals and collapse.

The questions connected with trust reason are presented in table 3. In this case, similarly like above, the answers 1 and 2 are treated as negative attitude – “I do not agree”, 3 – neutral – “I do not know”, and 4 and 5 positive attitudes – “I agree”.

Table 3: Question connected with “trust routine” (data in %)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>I agree</th>
<th>I do not know</th>
<th>I do not agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Most people in your company keeps promises</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>I have confidence in my subordinates</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>In your company there is a fair assessment of employees</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>In your company there are good relations between employees</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>In the company managers are primarily advisors and intellectual partners to subordinates</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author’s research

The dimension connected with trust routine show that managers have high level of this kind of trust. In the relationship where people do not trust other person, people feel constantly on gourd, wary that the person is going to let them down in some way. It is difficult to relax, people feel careful about what the do and do not do.
The questions connected with trust reflexivity are presented in table 4. In this case, the answers 5 and 4 are treated as negative attitude – “I agree”, 3 – neutral – “I do not know”, and 2 and 1 positive attitudes – “I do not agree”.

Table 4: Question connected with “trust reflexivity” (data in %)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>I agree</th>
<th>I do not know</th>
<th>I do not agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>In dealing with people never be too careful</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>You should not trust other people until you do not know them well</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Most people will lie if it will then be able to get something</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Employees in your company when the opportunity arises to gain something will be dishonest</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>In these days in your company you can only count on yourself and only trust yourself</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author’s research

The results show that managers do not trust people the answers for the questions “In dealing with people never be too careful” and “You should not trust other people until you do not know them” were mostly positive.

Managers for the answer connected with their employees answered positively, but for the answer, which were connected with their general attitude to trust show that they have to know somebody to trust him. The new people in organization need time to build a trust. It is difficult to work with managers who do not trust employees. It can be frustrated; people constantly feel that they have to prove themselves to that person. They start to feel let down and disillusioned, no matter what they do sometimes they cannot create trusting relationship. Sometimes it turns to bitterness, anger, rejection and either withdrawal or ending of the relationship. It is difficult to create trust in organization because it takes investment and is fragile. It can take a great deal of time and many actions to build trust, but a short time and only one action to lose it. Trust is easier to destroy than to create. If we lose it, we invariably have to increase our investment massively to claw is back little by little. People tend to trust people if they do what they say they are going to do, if they practise what they preach and if they tell the truth. These are the building blocks for trust, but they are not enough to create durable, positive, trust-based relationships, particularly in organizations, also important are: authentic communication, skilled and competent people, freedom in described boundaries in organization, personal contact between people, positive intent. For interpersonal trust to be
built in long-term work relations, both individuals need to have their actions guided by a stable normative frame. There are four operative conditions that play an essential role in stabilizing normative frames:

- the suspension of opportunistic behaviour, or the removal of distrust;
- exchange of positive relational signals;
- avoiding negative relational signals, i.e., dealing with trouble;
- the stimulation of frame resonance, or the introduction of trust-enhancing organizational policies.

If an organization’s management wishes to promote interpersonal trust-building in the organization, then a combination of three types of organizational policies can be effective:

1. By creating a culture in which relationships are important and in which showing care and concern for the other person’s needs is valued (relationship-oriented culture);
2. Through normative control rather than bureaucratic control, because acting appropriately is the goal in normative control;
3. Through explicit socialization to make newcomers understand the values and principles of the organization and how “we do things around here”.

Within organizations, managers obviously play a central role in determining both the overall level of trust and the specific expectations within given units. Managers initiate most vertical exchanges; thus, whatever level of trust or mistrust is evident in their actions may well be reciprocated. Moreover, managers designed rewards and control systems that are visible displays of base levels of trust or mistrust within departments or the organization as a whole. In addition, managers control the flow of certain types of information and the opportunities to share or not share key information in ways that influence the level of trust between or across organizational levels or units. Finally, managers are the primary designers of the total organizational form employed – the combination of strategy, structure, and internal mechanisms that provide the overall operating logic and resource allocation and governance mechanisms of the organization. Managers affect trust levels in several ways that work along the lines of the three factors economics, from a position of distrust, emphasizing the likelihood and/or potential for opportunistic behavior.

In the presented research situation is good, managers have positive attitude to trust. They declare that they trust their subordinates and that in organization there are good relations between people. Several limitations to the proposed theory should be recognized. First, the theory presented here is limited to trust declared by managers to subordinates and further research is needed to extend it to other forms of trust such as trust in organizations or trust
among all members of organizations. A second limitation is that the article focused on work relations within organizations, and the research was done only in the best enterprises.

CONCLUSION
Trust has for sure an enormous importance in economies and in economics (for exchange, market and contracts, for agency, for money and finance, for organizations, for reducing negotiation costs, and so on), as well as in politics (the foundational relations between citizens and government, laws, institutions). In organizations the importance of trust is known, but managers rarely focus on what it really means and how to develop it. In the ideal organization (Bibb, Kourdi 2004, 2), where people trust each other, people tell the truth, share information, and do not feel afraid of getting it wrong or being a failure. When people make mistakes, they are able to admit to them openly and ask for help. Managers are more interested in what lessons have been learnt from mistakes than apportioning blame. Gossips are uncommon. People can disagree or challenge each other with positive intention. People are open, the atmosphere is supportive, and problems are solved easily. Because of this strong element of trust, people worked better and relationships – weather with customers, colleagues or suppliers – are stronger and more successful. In the surveyed organization I did not find a place quite like this. It may seem unrealistic or naive to expect or even imagine that organization like the one described above could exist, but maybe it is a time to change the situation to get a success on the market in the changing environment. Without trust, a leader is much less able to: foster innovation and creativity, and exploit synergy between people, recognize and learn from mistakes, analyze competing options or help others to find their own solutions, delegate decision making to others, motivate people, manage in changing circumstances, communicate and make and successfully implement critical decisions.
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