

Organization and Trust. A Look From The Sociology Of Organizations

Augusto Renato Pérez Mayo¹, Jose Alberto Hernandez Aguilar²

¹Department of Studies of the organizations and Sociology of Organizations Faculty of Accounting, Management, and Informatics, The Autonomous University of the State of Morelos (Cuernavaca, Mexico)

²Department of optimization and decision making in Organizations, Faculty of accounting, Management, and Informatics, The Autonomous University of the State of Morelos (Cuernavaca, Mexico)

Abstract: *The Trust is a bet, made in the present time, toward the future and that is based on the Past [1]. The purpose of this research is to offer an approach to the conceptual relationship between the trust and the organization on the basis of the integration of approaches and perspectives of the organizational theory and the Sociology of Organizations. We reviewed the close relationship that has always existed since the dawn of the administration between organization and confidence. The value and power of the confidence in the organizations has been explained from different theoretical perspectives, both in its positive and negative effects on the organizational dynamic and very particularly in the field of enterprises where, in addition to considering it as a moral value is also used as a strategic tool to improve the efficiency and competitiveness. This allows us to display the close relationship that keeps the trust with the legitimacy of the company, with all its processes creating positive orthogonal structural couplings between organizational subjects: businessman, employee, union, and customers.*

Keywords : *Administration, confidence, behavior, company, sociology, organization,*

I. Introduction

The trust is and has been a concept of great interest for the social sciences, the organizational theory and the sociology of organizations in the field of formal organizations, better known as enterprises, due to that increasingly it is noted that the organizational commitment in social relations is becoming increasingly unlikely, i.e. the organizational loyalty.

Peter Blau in his study on the exchange and power in social life mentioned: "the initial problem is to demonstrate that one is a trustworthy person [...] implies the risk of rejection of the opening through the refusal to respond and to enter into a relationship." [2, p. 82]. Thus, trust in the other people no longer automatically is conceived as something obvious [1] and as you can not trust the people, there is confidence in the institutions as mediators [2] and confidence generalizers [3]. In other words, the confidence not only builds on interpersonal relations but also on those structures which allow the processing of the disappointments that are becoming increasingly frequent in social life.

Already the theoreticians of the organization had as the object of study the category of trust as a key factor in the development of formal collective called Company [4, pp. 158-162]. Following this same critical path, the organization is the most important feature of modern societies [5, pp. 4-5], is the basis through which collective action occurs [6, p. 114]. And the most relevant, given that the state is too far from the individual, can only be sustained if between both stand a series of secondary groups, called organizations [7, p. 9].

Under this context, from the sociology of organizations [1], of the organizational theory [8] [9], the economy [10] [11], the anthropology ([12] [13], the psychology [14], the political science [15] and others, have been making a number of very diverse studies on trust. As this example mentioned by Barbara Mitzal [16], "the research becomes more specialized, definitions more specific and now writers do not talk about trust in general, but rather about various categories of trust or about trust in different contexts, such as trust in organizations, political systems or in families" [16, p. 372]. Studies on the application and conceptualization of the confidence in the administration [17], in science [18], in the democratic public spaces [16], in trans-organizational relations [19], in the economic spaces [20] or in the International Relations [21] would be some of the many studies that have been conducted on that term in the field of the Social Sciences.

The trust has been the engine of the organizations to keep them in motion [22, p. 464], because this concept of great interest for the social and human sciences, has moved from being a moral value to also be an instrument that helps organizations to maximize the effectiveness of their activities, to use it as a dynamic element of organizational success.

Since Josipovici [23], raised that the problem is how to prevent the suspect becomes cynicism and that the trust is to become superficiality. The trust without suspicion is the recipe for an art false and prostituted, but

the suspicion without confidence is the recipe for an art petty and empty (...). The trust now becomes something that has discovered or recognized or something to which delivered.

That is why this binomial organization and confidence generate collective prosperity and can ensure sustainable development in any society. The reality proves it; there is no developed country, innovative and competitive, in which there is a high degree of confidence, both between individuals, as of them toward the organizations.

II. Conceptual Considerations

The Trust is a multidimensional and multifaceted concept that is characterized by the subjective relations of human behavior. The confidence, the man thinks feels and acts. This makes consensus difficult to define the term and to eliminate the generality descriptive of the models for its implementation, giving as a result that there are different perspectives and approaches to studying the confidence in the organizational management.

The classical thought that claimed the nascent management techniques in the organizations departed from the distrust that has had on the human being. Mistrust, because the specialist ex officio bargains rates and imposed its pace of work [24, p. 3]. Mistrust, because the man had a natural laziness whose origin is the instinct to take things with calm [25, p. 26]. So the traditional positions explained the confidence in the organizations from different angles, as that which refers that we hope only because we are born entrusted, confidence arose more from religious habits than of a rational calculation, since by streamlining the confidence, the individual would have immediate distrust [22, p. 469].

The Trust is an essential element for the achievement of the goals, as the executive should gain the trust of their subordinates, in order that they obeyed using rationality [26, p. 471]. The only way to achieve the resolution of conflicts within organizations is achieving an environment of confidence [27, p. 472]. In this way, the force was replaced by the confidence to build to the organizations. Organization and confidence have led to very different thoughts that regardless of the lack of consensus have enriched the conceptual framework of the organizational theory to be as evidence of its evolution.

For Luhmann for example, confidence in the broadest sense of the faith in the expectations of one is a basic fact of social life and believes that it is only possible where it is possible to the truth. However, from the organizational point of view for this author, trust is depersonalized, since those who trust does not on account of its own risk, but on account of the risk of the system [1, pp. 24-25]. From the socio-cultural perspective of Fukuyama, confidence is a social capital represented as the expectation that arises within a community of normal behavior, honest and cooperative, based on common standards, shared by all members of that community. Establishes that the capacity to create organizations to generate high levels of confidence, to handle this binomial effectively and to be a successful economy, are facts that are linked to the culture of the society [15, p. 45].

The systemic perspective divides the operations of an organization to assess the impact of the confidence in the performance of the system, this way the effectiveness, efficiency, quality, innovation, quality of life at work, productivity and profitability, are areas that indicate that the confidence composed of actions and intentions, is not optional but mandatory [28, p. 2]. The social functionality of confidence is necessary for there to be commitments and get to develop the economy and the social contract. Without confidence, the commercial agreements based on the mutual agreement of that complex details will be settled later are no longer feasible. This economic perspective indicates that without confidence, each participant of an agreement is looking around to see how and when you are going to betray the people you are dealing with. To protect against this type of results, individuals spend energy and resources to hire an insurance, to develop contingency plans and to adopt measures to ensure that, in the event that they betray, the consequences are limited [29, pp. 176-177]. Returning to Ouchi and the humanism of the theory Z establishes that the design of the organization and the maximization of its performance, are given by three core values, the trust, privacy, and subtlety. Has in the humanization, one of the main premises of its management model, respecting the intelligence and dignity of the individual, under a model that considers as tools: the collective work, consensual decisions, shared responsibility, saving capacity, generation of new opportunities, flexibility and motivation [30].

III. The Trust And Its Impact On The Organizations

Starting this reflection from the proposal of Professor Niklas Luhmann, which introduced scientific concepts and categories of transdisciplinary frameworks and not strictly anchored in the sociological tradition and that proposed confidence as a mechanism of reduction of complexity in an era in which the social phenomena were displayed as extremely complex at the beginning of the 1960s. His book Trust was edited for the first time in Germany in 1968, where poses that a complete absence of trust "prevent even that someone could lift in the morning. It would be the victim of a vague sense of fear and paralyzing fear. It would even be unable to develop a mistrust final and make it a basis for preventive measures since it would mean confidence

in other directions. Everything would be possible and such abrupt confrontation with the complexity of the world to the maximum degree is more of what supports the human being" [1].

The society, in which they live, live and survive the organizations, is characterized by the continuity of the uncertainty, insecurity, the speed of the changes and the latent risk and complex almost perpetual. In this environment the trust is a mechanism for reducing the complexity and increases the tolerance to the uncertainty" [1, p. 25]. Trust is an antidote to alleviate the tensions that cause the impossibility of control and the difficulty of anticipating responses. The Trust is a bet, made in the present time, toward the future and that it is based on the past. The great complexity of the social order creates the greatest need for coordination that will satisfy every time less by means of the familiarity. In these circumstances, the confidence and familiarity have to seek a new relationship, and that it is mutually stabilizing which is no longer based on the world immediately experienced, secured by tradition, assumptions, myths or religion [31].

The role of the confidence in the environment also has an impact and is responsible for legitimizing the organizations because they are desired and accepted and is consistent with the values and beliefs of the social system in which they are located. The trust with the legitimacy which grants, helps organizations live, live and survive in their environment. The legitimacy of the formal organizations that allows them to seem useful despite its lack of technical validation, obtained through the confidence and the good faith of its internal participants and their external components [32, p. 99]. All cooperate and thus ensure retain their prestige that underpins the confidence in the organization and that strengthens the confidence in the myths that streamline the existence of the Organization. This dynamic allows relations move for the benefit of society.

However, in much the same way as the confidence reduces the doubt, the indecision, increases productivity, stimulates growth and legitimizes the organizations; their low levels adversely affect relations, prevent the creativity and innovation and hamper the decision-making process. The allocation is relevant because that in an organization the administrative activity is a group activity and the administrative processes are decision-making processes [32, p. 99], so that without confidence, the administration would cease to be an art and leave to get things done.

The lack of confidence generates costs of the transaction, imposes a kind of tax that does not have to pay the organizations with a high level of confidence, since it takes a time to checks, inspections, revisions, and re-work. When it is not trusted, ends to cooperate with a system of rules and regulations that have to be negotiated, agreed, litigated, and implemented, sometimes in a form of coercion. This legal apparatus serves the organizations as a substitute for trust [15, p. 47].

IV. The Confidence In The Company

The formal organizations are systems of controlled and coordinated activities that arise when the work is incorporated into complex networks of technical relationships and exchanges that cross boundaries [32, p. 79]. Within this formal context are all populations of Organization [6, p. 132], and in particular, whose purpose is the institutional market, is located the field of the company. This type of organization is formed by a coalition of individuals, whose members are the managers, workers, shareholders, suppliers, customers, lawyers, tax collectors and regulators [33, p. 27]. This particular type of organizations has two important functions: economic to produce a product and/or grant a service, and the human function to provide satisfaction to the members of the company [34, p. 552]. The company is characterized by the requirement of an expeditious handling, precise, clear and continuous [35, p. 731], representing generally, a model not matched by a rigorous administrative organization. For the business organization, is of vital value that the meaning of the word trust is continuously permeating all its members mainly in its three classes of direct participants: entrepreneurs who decide, employees who contribute their time and effort, and customers because they bring money to the organization in exchange for their products [36, p. 17].

Internal participants contribute in correspondence with the incentives that the organization offers and the contributions of the customers are the sources of the attractions that the organization provides to the other [36, p. 106]. Within these inducements tangible and intangible, it is necessary to deliver a certain level of confidence to strengthen organizational relationships, entrepreneurs rely on employees who work, employees rely on the employer that provides them with means of subsistence, customers rely on the product and/or service that provides the company, the company relies on the timely payment of their customers and all rely on the state as an entity grouper that supports its activities.

In a matter of confidence and for the economic dependence, companies put special attention to its customers, seeking to promote the relations and consolidating the ties of trust, to develop faithfulness, loyalty and strengthen the commercial commitment in the long term. To do this, the objectives of the company that are primarily of survival, must be very closely related to the objectives of the client [36, p. 19]. A fourth participant that has an influence on the results of the company and with whom the trust is not a regulatory element of continuous organizational relationships and that by its legal constitution have instruments that can be used for their members as union dues and toward the company to balance the factors of production is the union. In the

proper or improper use can give the unions to these instruments, are the levels of trust to make creditors. The path indicated by the theory Z to decrease the uncertainty generated by the trade unions and to stabilize the reciprocity and the confidence in them is through a humanized culture and the participatory management. The unions are legal organizations and form part of the company and it is, therefore, necessary to participate in all the strategic processes to count on their collaboration [30].

When disappointing the trust in the relationship between the company and its workers or vice versa, the Federal Labor Law [37] marks the roads, rights, obligations and limitations that have both parts. In principle stipulates the existence of workers in positions of trust who are those who represent the employer. It also determines the legislation, that the loss of confidence when there is reasonable cause shall be cause for termination of the contract. Along with this, the fifteen grounds for termination of the contract stipulated in article 47 of the law in question, are directly related to the loss of confidence, as are deception, violence, damages, imprudence, the immoral acts, trade secrets, absenteeism, disobedience, drunkenness and the executory judgment. In counterpart to the legal provisions, the theory Z understands that people are going to behave correctly within and outside the company, i.e. it promotes confidence in the staff, it is thought that the people are going to produce with efficiency and quality and that its external behavior will be adequate, and therefore, the controls are not so demanding, promotes the self-control between workers and with it the confidence in itself. The result is that the worker behaves according to what is expected of him. If the company has confidence in its people, the staff tends to behave correctly [38].

On the basis of the systemic proposal [1] Luhmann, in the first place, there must be four conditions in the praxis of the trust. First, there must be a mutual commitment which must be put to the test in both parties, between alter and ego. If is not tested the commitment, it would not work the ability to accept or reject the bet. Second, you must know the exact situation in which is going to be tested such commitment. The situations in which we engage, both for altering as for ego we are made known and therefore, they become familiar to us. Third, confidence can only be offered but not required. There is no order of beyond we impose on the supply of confidence since that would imply a requirement in which one cannot have the freedom to reject the offer. Therefore, trust only is voluntary does not depend on previous prescriptions or moral foundation. Fourth confidence is earned with the risks that this entails, i.e. it is to be hoped that one of the parties to accept the offer of confidence. That is why in the formality of the company, must be creating the natural conditions for a trust to be generated in the informality of the subjects.

Following the above mentioned, we must recognize that a precondition for the confidence has to do with the familiar, as what we are objectively known in the field of experience with my other me [39], and this is the condition of possibility of being able to rely on the world in which situations are contingent. That is to say, what is familiar is an unavoidable fact in our lives as something that makes sense in the world of our experiences [1]. Are conditions that we know in our daily life and that we take by pre-established. But today in a complex society it is unlikely that we can live only in a world merely familiar. The relationships that involve expectations and interpersonal links become increasingly unlikely, they are not to be sufficient in order to be able to invest in that company risky as is trust. As the evolutionary achievement of modern society was then require new processes and/or mechanisms increasingly differentiated and impersonal as the functionally differentiated systems. Thus, as indicated by Niklas Luhmann [1], interpersonal trust is replaced by the systemic confidence, i.e. confidence in the different social systems of society as interactional systems, organizational and functional. That is, if confidence in the interactional systems depends on the expectations that are built on mutual perception of people in real time [40], the Trust also operates when "is appreciated the differentiation of the organizations from the eaves of the partial systems as the political, economic, religious, educational or legal, when re-specify functional problems such as power, shortages, the significance of the selection or the legitimacy, to make them operable by specialized units of organizational decision" [41, p. 18].

V. The confidence And Organizational behavior

The initial problem faced by individuals within an organization is to show that it is a trustworthy person, which implies the risk of rejection. In the organizational dimension, trust becomes a prerequisite to accept or reject the risk that the other party meets my expectations. Both the "strange" as "I" need to troubleshoot a problem first personal and then organizational, in a present, in a given situation, so that the confidence probabilizes a solution but also a contradiction, which implies a risk in the social relations that we face reducing complexity, however, the risk and uncertainty will always be present:

"First of all, there has to be some reason to expose the confidence. There has to be some situation defined in that the person who trusts depend on your partner; otherwise the problem does not originate. Their behavior must then commit it to this situation and make the risk of who betray their trust. In other words, it must invest in what we call before risky investment [1, p. 73].

Although trust is something natural and is something we can not stop living [42, p. 162], trust or delivered to anyone, nor occurs overnight. In organizational relationships and as in all, trust is built over time, with actions that seem to join and are determining the quality of trust that feels against another person. Organizational Psychology shows a fundamental distinction between two independent conceptual aspects, but related to the confidence: The construct seen as a subjective state and the confidence that is defined behavioral operationally as the subjective confidence put into action [43, p. 145]. It is noteworthy that although the theorists see these two sides of the confidence conceptually distinct, are closely linked to the real life of the people. These two sides are reflected in parallel, when the trust in a relationship, increases security and reduces the inhibitions and the narrow-mindedness defensive (subjective state), allows you to be yourself and defend the personal opinions without worrying about the rejection (action state).

The difficulty in organizations in which there is a low level of confidence, is that the work normally occurs in conditions of stress, the staff dedicate a good part of his time to covering their backs, to justify decisions of the past and to snitch guilty when something does not work, this prevents them from focus on work and makes it impossible to have an exchange of ideas, creativity and innovation is lost, you lose the future of the company. The confidence in the organizations is like love in the couple, a tacit loop that is not written anywhere but facilitates the relationship, unites people and makes them stronger and more efficient, it is an essential ingredient for which there is a good relationship that provides tranquility and calm, leading to the satisfaction and safety and triggered, that by not decouple the individuals of their condition of human beings, increase productivity and at the same time the self-esteem [38]. Without a doubt, that although weak and elusive but with the necessary strength especially when you feed him daily with the emotional intimacy and cognitive, the link of confidence is the factor that allows organizational relationships are permanent and is as necessary as life itself.

All people are in need of a job, an organization and company, including those that are disconnected from the others and feel uncomfortable or suffer the presence of other, do not generate conditions or there is easy to generate confidence because they are not accessible emotionally. This is the greatest difficulty of an individual to work in a team and achieve professional success. The team work only works when there is trust and for both components, is an investment for the future and essential for the organizational progress and human development. Teamwork is essential for the organizations because it allows them to strengthen capacities and individual competencies, and because it is clear that individually is difficult to achieve common goals and get great achievements so that the trust is an asset for the organization to be responsible successful.

VI. Conclusion

We believe that its program on the theory of social systems and their frame of reference can have higher returns to work with the issue of trust because it allows us to work more rigorously in the complexity of the social. And since the concept of trust is a transdisciplinary concept, we can extrapolate the scope of formal organizations. We also say that trust must be built from a systemic perspective since that dictates the absorption of certain functions and attributes of the familiarity (and, therefore, is beyond the trust or mistrust generated personally). Trust in the system one is continually conscious of the fact that everything is a product that every action has been decided after comparing with other possibilities. Confidence in the system has explicit processes for reducing complexity, i.e. with subsystems, with organizational communities.

The major processes of transition toward the civilizing confidence in the system make the man can have social awareness of the contingency of the world. The major processes of transition toward the civilizing confidence in the system, give humanity a stable attitude toward what is contingent on the complex world, makes it possible to live with the awareness that everything could be another way. We could maintain that confidence is one of the key elements to accept or reject those organizational and social commitments in which we move from day to day. The fact of placing confidence in the high address, in the companion (or) work, in the mayor, is also reflected in our everyday life we when we link with a doctor, an official or even with someone we know in our love life. The confidence we are then shown as a basic fact of our social life [1] and without it, hard, we would be able to move from one point to another point in the world of our existence is a formal or informal organization.

Trust is a word, that yes indicates something but is not descriptive explanatory or by itself, yet it is a previous and necessary condition for solving the problems of human collaboration [4, pp. 161-162]. The solution of the problems far because it is an important resource for communication, leadership, the work equipment, the minimization of risks, the reduction of costs, the disposition to change and relations in general. These relations are as a garden that must be nurtured. That a popular saying that should be applied. Another relevant aspect which the organization, should take care to generate confidence inward and outward, is the image. The behavior of the entire organization is the best letter of presentation. The care in the generation of a good image must be based on the daily actions of the Organization. Within this care of image, for organizations means caring for your processes, your product, its service, its relations, its systems and their participants, to

achieve this, many enterprises are looking to the certification to grant a guarantee of quality that inspires the confidence that the organization will fulfill the requirements marked with a rule such as the ISO-9000.

At the organizational level, the formal limits of confidence are identified in policies, rules and regulations of the organization and the informal limits on the level of the interactions that are not represented in the formal organization [34, pp. 558-559]. All the patterns of interaction that arise between individuals or between the different groups can be classified according to the degree of intimacy involved in the relationship and expressed in terms of social distance that involves physical and psychological distance and, therefore, confidence. The confidence level is related to the appropriate behavior (which grants benefits), at the appropriate times (timely and/or agreed), to the fulfilment of commitments (the secrecy and confidentiality), with the environmental conditions (in people, places or things), but especially, with the self-control and the skills to discriminate stimuli and issue, the correct answer at the right time and to the right people.

Observing the trust from the functional point of view and multidimensional is that it is addressing the problem from a gaze of the complexity. The concept that operates depending on: the system to which we are participating in the contingency and in the concurrency, in which we must accept the risk that as the other person meets my expectations for getting organizational trust. Without a doubt that today, organizations have the certainty that the management of the trust is the key element in ensuring the effectiveness required to produce extraordinary results, although, in principle in the organizations, it is possible to talk of confidence that generates entry distrust.

References

- [1]. N. Luhmann, *Confianza*. Universidad Iberoamericana/Anthropos, 1996.
- [2]. M. Blau, *Intercambio y poder en la vida social*. Barcelona: Hora, 1982.
- [3]. C. Offe, "How can we trust our fellowships?", *Trust Democr.*, 1999.
- [4]. E. Mayo, *Problemas humanos de una civilización industrial*. Buenos Aires, Argentina: Nueva Visión, 1972.
- [5]. R. Scott, "The Subject is Organizations", en *Organizational, rational, natural and open systems*, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1992, pp. 3-26.
- [6]. H. Aldrich y M. Ruef, *Organizations Evolving*, Segunda. Sage Publications, 2006.
- [7]. F. C. Fukuyama, "Las virtudes sociales y la capacidad de generar prosperidad", B. Aires-México Atlántida, 1995.
- [8]. J. Engle-Warnick y R. Slonim, "Learning to trust in indefinitely repeated games", *Games Econ. Behav.*, p. 54, 2006.
- [9]. D. McLain y K. Jarrel, "The perceived compatibility of safety and production expectations in hazardous occupations", *J. Safety Res.*, núm. 38, pp. 299-309, 2007.
- [10]. D. Gambetta, *La mafia siciliana: el negocio de la protección privada*. DF: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 2005.
- [11]. R. Putnam, *Making democracy work: Civic traditions in modern Italy*. New Jersey: P.U. Press, 1993.
- [12]. L. Lomnitz, *Reciprocity of favors in the urban middle class of Chile*. 1971.
- [13]. L. Adler, *Redes sociales, cultura y poder: ensayos de antropología latinoamericana*. MA Porrúa/Flacso, 2001.
- [14]. F. Petermann, *Psicología de la confianza*. Barcelona, España: Herder, 1999.
- [15]. F. Fukuyama, *Confianza: Las Virtudes Sociales y la Capacidad de Generar Prosperidad*. Buenos Aires, Argentina: Atlántida, 1996.
- [16]. B. Mitzal, "Trust Cooperation: the democratic public sphere", *J. Sociol.*, vol. 37, núm. 4, pp. 371-386, 2001.
- [17]. E. Choudhury, "Trust in Administration: an Integrative Approach to Optimal Trust", *Adm. Soc.*, vol. 40, núm. 60, pp. 586-620, 2008.
- [18]. P. Sztompka, "Trust in Science. Robert K. Merton's Inspirations", *J. Class. Sociol.*, vol. 7, núm. 2, pp. 211-220, 2007.
- [19]. R. Bachmann, "Trust, power and control in trans-organizational relations", *Organ. Stud.*, vol. 22, núm. 2, pp. 337-365, 2001.
- [20]. J. T. Murphy, "Building trust in economic space", *Prog. Hum. Geogr.*, vol. 30, núm. 4, pp. 427-450, 2006.
- [21]. A. Hoffmann, "A Conceptualization of Trust in International Relations", *Eur. J. Int. Relat.*, vol. 8, núm. 3, pp. 375-401, 2002.
- [22]. A. M. Weber en Lockward Dargam, "El rol de la confianza en las organizaciones a través de los distintos enfoques o pensamientos de la administración", *Cienc. Soc.*, vol. XXXVI, núm. 3, pp. 464-502, jul. 2011.
- [23]. G. Jospivici, *Confianza o sospecha*. Turner/Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1999.
- [24]. B. Coriat, "El taller y el cronómetro", en *Ensayo sobre el taylorismo, el fordismo y la producción en masa*, Siglo XXI, 2000, pp. 1-51.
- [25]. F. Taylor, "¿Qué es la administración científica? y Principios de administración científica", en *Clásicos en administración*, Limusa, 1979, pp. 77-107.
- [26]. A. M. Fayol en Lockward Dargam, "El rol de la confianza en las organizaciones a través de los distintos enfoques o pensamientos de la administración", *Cienc. Soc.*, vol. XXXVI, núm. 3, pp. 464-502, jul. 2011.
- [27]. A. M. Parker en Lockward Dargam, "El rol de la confianza en las organizaciones a través de los distintos enfoques o pensamientos de la administración", *Cienc. Soc.*, vol. XXXVI, núm. 3, pp. 464-502, jul. 2011.
- [28]. S. Hacker y M. Willard, *The trust imperative*. Milwaukee: ASQ Quality Press, 2002.
- [29]. J. Stiglitz, *El precio de la desigualdad*. Santillana Taurus, 2012.
- [30]. A. Ouchi en Serralde, "¿Qué tan 'Z' es la teoría 'Z' de Ouchi?", *Manag. Today En Esp.*, pp. 19-30, 1981.
- [31]. Y. Onghena, "Introducción: ¿Por qué la confianza?", *CIDOB D' Afers Int.*, núm. 61-62, pp. 7-16, 2003.
- [32]. J. W. Meyer y B. Rowan, "Institutionalized Organizations: Formal Structure as Myth and Ceremony", *Am. J. Sociol.*, vol. 83, núm. 2, pp. 340-363, 1977.
- [33]. R. Cyert y J. March, "Organizational Goals" *A Behavioral Theory of the Firm*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc, 1963.
- [34]. F. Roethlisberger y W. Dickson, *Management and the worker*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1966.
- [35]. M. Weber, *Sobre la teoría de las ciencias sociales*. Planeta-De Agostini, 1992.
- [36]. H. Simon, "El Comportamiento Administrativo", en *Estudio de los procesos decisivos en la organización administrativa*, Buenos Aires, Argentina, 1988, pp. 1-20, 59-117.
- [37]. Ley federal de trabajo. 2000.
- [38]. W. Ouchi, "La teoría Z".
- [39]. M. Heidegger, A. L. Coello, y H. C. Gabaudan, *Caminos de bosque*. Alianza editorial, 1998.

- [40]. A. Nassehi, "La teoría de la diferenciación funcional en el horizonte de sus críticas", Rev. Mad, núm. 24, pp. 1-29, 2011.
- [41]. M. ArnoldCathalifaud y D. Rodríguez, "El perspectivismo en la teoría sociológica", 1990.
- [42]. A. M. LockwardDargam, "El rol de la confianza en las organizaciones a través de los distintos enfoques o pensamientos de la administración", Cienc. Soc., 2011.
- [43]. D. Kolb, I. Rubin, y J. McIntyre, Psicología de las Organizaciones. Prentice-Hall Hispanoamericana, 1977.