Diana Stolarska*

METHODOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF INTRA-ORGANIZATIONAL TRUST MANAGEMENT

Abstract

Trust management in a company is a relatively new concept in management studies, yet it is attracting increasing attention. So far, interest in trust in the context of commercial organizations has focused mainly on its importance in the relations with external stakeholders in the company, especially customers and shareholders. However, still new empirical evidence and theoretical reasons suggest that building a relationship based on trust within the organization is equally important to the greater efficiency of the companies, their innovation, flexibility and resilience to crises. The article presents the essence of the concept of trust in the context of relations within the organization and its importance for the company's success and development. Furthermore, it discusses the building process (evolution) of trust. The aim of the article is to identify possible methods and tools for building trust within the organization. This has been achieved through the analysis of specialist literature, as well as collection and systematization of the proposed means of building intra-organizational trust.

Key words: trust, trust management, intra-organizational trust, methods of building trust in organizations

1. Introduction

In most recently published books on economics, finances, or organization and management, one can read about phenomena which have drastically changed economic reality, conditions and requirements for conducting business activity. Globalization, internalization of

business, informational and IT revolution connected to the development and distribution of new technologies, chiefly the Internet, resulted in, among

* MA, PhD student, full-time Doctoral Studies, Cracow University of Economics.

other things, increased awareness and quality in managing business and human resources, increased competition, increased requirements of the customers and stakeholders, depletion of existing sources of gaining competitive advantage as well as means of improving efficiency and increasing profits. In consequence, both theoreticians and practitioners of management turned towards company's intangible assets, such as reputation, expertise, organizational culture, or finally trust, all significant due to the fact that in large measure they determine the utilization of the company's remaining material resources and they also possess the ability of creating values.

Trust is a phenomenon which is considered to be a factor facilitating efficient cooperation, or even to be its prerequisite. Moreover, the role of trust gains gravity along with the increasing ambient uncertainty, complexity and variability, that have dominated in the recent decades the image of the modern world, including the business world. Trust in the context of organization may be viewed in two ways, as perceived within a single organization (intra-organizational trust, internal) and between organizations, or between organizations and third parties (inter-organizational, external) [Grudzewski et al., 2009].

2. The essence of intra-organizational trust

Intra-organizational trust occurs within an organization (e.g. trust between co-workers, teams, trust between the employees and the leader). As W.M. Grudzewski et al. [Grudzewski et al., 2009] rightfully notice, trust is a phenomenon easily and intuitively recognized by people, though clarification of its meaning is a difficult matter. There is no one, widely accepted definition of trust, thus it is crucial for explanation of its essence to quote a couple of them, widely popularized in literature:

- F. Fukuyama [1995]: "Trust is the expectation that arises within a community of regular, honest, and cooperative behaviour, based on commonly shared norms, on the part of other members of that community."
- N. Lin [2001]: "Trust is confidence or expectation that an alter will take ego's interests into account in exchanges."
- N. Luhmann [1979]: "To show trust is to anticipate the future. It is to behave as though the future were certain."
- A. Seligman [1997]: "Trust is a some sort of belief in the goodwill of the other, given the opaqueness of other's intentions and calculations."
- P. Sztompka [2007]: "Trust is a bet about the future contingent actions of others (…) it is connected to commitment through action."

- A. Zaheer, B. McEvily, V. Perrone [1998]: Trust is "an expectation that an actor can be relied on to fulfil obligations, will behave in a predictable manner, and will act and negotiate fairly when the possibility for opportunism is present."

All of the abovementioned definitions indicate, in fact, similar understanding of the concept of trust, namely that trust is a belief in the goodwill of the trust recipients, theirs future credibility or consideration for the interests of the person who places trust in them. However, many authors point out that one can only speak about trust on condition that the decisions and actions taken by the trusting person rely on this conviction.

Another important issue is the fact that trust has to be based on a prior assessment of the partner's credibility (with available basis for assessment). Whereas when trust is not supported by this assessment, or when the partner is trusted in spite of all the information or evidence pointing to his or her unreliability - this is so called blind trust, which is erroneously confused with trust.

3. The role of trust in organizations

Researchers who focus on the phenomenon of trust [Fukuyama 1997, Coleman 1988, Knack and Keefer 1997] unanimously declare that trust on the macroeconomic level contributes to the competitiveness of economies. P.J. Zack and S. Knack [2001] claim, on the basis of economic data analysis concerning 41 market economies and their levels of trust (according to the research conducted by the World Values Survey), that the increase of trust by 10% increases the annual rate of GDP per capita income by about 0.5%. K. Arrow, Nobel laureate in Economic Sciences, states that trust (as well as other values such as truthfulness and loyalty) has measurable, economic value because it increases the effectiveness of the system and contributes to the increase in global production [Arrow, 1974].

Another, equally significant, role of trust is observed on the level of single companies. In recent years, a number of hypotheses were presented concerning the significance of trust in organization's performance and success, as well as a number of empirical evidence for proving it at least partially, was provided. The basic functions of the role that trust plays within an organization are presented in the following table.

Table 1. The role of trust – literary review.

The role of trust	Proponents of the viewpoint
1. Trust is necessary in conditions of high ambiguity, uncertainty and complexity.	Lewis and Weigert (1985), Shapiro (1987), Nooteboom (1996), Shaw (1997), Nahapiet and Ghoshal (1998), Lane (1998), Deering and Murphy (1998), Sako (1998), Rousseau et al. (1998), Senge et al. (1999), Overlaet (2000), Costa (2000)
2. Trust provides a sense of security that allows one to function in the above mentioned conditions	McAllister (1995), Ellinor and Gerard (1998), Ryan and Oestreich (1998), Reina and Reina (1999), Senge et al. (1999), Overlaet (2000)
3. Trust enables the taking of risks necessary to act in the above mentioned conditions	Katzenbach et al. (1995), Shaw (1997), Lewis (1999), Senge et al. (1999), Reina and Reina (1999), Costa (2000), Overlaet (2000)
4. Trust enhances flexibility, increases the ability to change, and supports going through the process of radical changes.	Argyris (1970), Katzenbach et al. (1996), Shaw (1997), de Geus (1997), Ellinor and Gerard (1998), Deering and Murphy (1998), Ryan and Oestreich (1998), Reina and Reina (1999), Senge et al. (1999), Overlaet (2000), Costa (2000)
5. Trust supports learning, creativity and innovation	Senge (1990), Zand (1997), McAllister (1997), Shaw (1997), Ghoshal and Bartlett (1997), Nahapiet and Ghoshal (1998), Rousseau et al. (1998), Lazaric and Lorenz (1998), Sako (1998), Ryan and Oestreich (1998), Lane (1998), Deering and Murphy (1998), Reina and Reina (1999), Senge et al. (1999), Lewis (1999), Overlaet (2000), Costa (2000)
6. Trust is the "lubricant" of human relations that increases their effectiveness	Blau (1964), Zucker (1986), Fukuyama (1995), Hosmer (1995), Hollis (1998), Deering and Murphy (1998)
7. Trust improves and sustains cooperation through favouring sharing of information, enriching relations, increasing openness and mutual acceptance, streamlining conflict resolution and cooperative problem solving.	Argyris (1970), Zand (1972, 1997), Deutsch (1973), Zucker (1986), Shapiro (1987), Senge et al. (1994, 1999), Katzenbach et al. (1995), Mayer et al. (1995), Ross and LaCroix (1996), Wheatley and Kellner-Rogers (1996), Shaw (1997), Ghoshal and Bartlett (1997), Deering and Murphy (1998), Lane (1998), Tsai and Ghoshal (1998), Elangovan and Shapiro (1998), Whitener et al. (1998), Rousseau et al. (1998), Zaheer et al. (1998), Lewis (1999), Reina and Reina (1999), Costa (2000)
8. Trust reduces the need of compiling detailed contracts and continuous control.	Bradach and Eccles (1989), Shaw (1997), Lane (1998), Rousseau et al. (1998), Zaheer et al. (1998), Deering and Murphy (1998), Lewis (1999), Nooteboom (1999a), Senge et al. (1999), Sen (2000), Costa (2000)
9. Trust is a value in itself.	Blau (1964), Bradach and Eccles (1989), Powell (1996), Helper (1993), Sako (1998), Gulati (1995) Nooteboom (1996), Ryan and Oestreich (1998)

Source: [Six, 2004].

The theses presented on the role of trust for organizations are supported by numerous confirmations in empirical research. The research results are, as following [La Porta et al., 1997, Grudzewski et al. 2009, Raes et al. 2006]:

- trust improves cooperation, especially while concerning large organizations [La Porta et al., 1997],
- trusting employees leads to gaining competitive advantage, which offsets the risks of opportunism and breach of trust [Handy, 1995],
- trust reduces transaction's costs [Dyer, Chu, 2003],
- trust supports organization's innovation [Herting, 2002], tendency to trust may be explained by as much as 6% changeability of company's innovation in the second degree regression [Sankowska, 2007],
- companies, whose employees strongly trust their superiors, report better financial results:
- companies, whose employees strongly trust their superiors, report 108% shareholder return within 3 years, in comparison to 66% in companies with low levels of trust [Watson Wyatt Worldwide: Hacker, Willard, 2002 report],
- employees' trust in the managers influences profitability: company whose managers improved their evaluation in terms of honesty by just 1/8 point on a five-point scale report a 2,5% annual income increase [Simson, 2003],
- trust has a positive effect on the level of job satisfaction of the employees [Ward, 1997],
- trust has a positive effect on the process of communication in a company [Boss, 1978; Zand, 1972],
- trust has a negative effect on the occurrence of conflicts in the organization [Porter, Lilly, 1996],
- trust has a positive effect on the effectiveness of team performance [Raes et al., 2006].

In consequence of the advancement of knowledge on trust and its importance for company's success as well as the development of societies and economies, the need to cultivate trust is more widely recognized, on both the macro and microeconomic levels. This is reflected, among other things, through the usage of the term "Age of Transparency" in relation to the modern world (era characterized by the increased level of trust and credibility as the foundation of cooperation), and even, in the context of economic life, "trust-based economy" and "trust-based organization". Hence, in terms of business management, the need for trust management, management through trust, or "trust-sensitive management" is more often mentioned. Many of the investigations on these issues focus on ways and means of consciously developing trust within the organization.

4. Trust building within organizations

4.1 The process of trust building

Trust is a dynamic phenomenon that changes over time. Changes apply to strength, turn (distrust: "-", trust: "+"), scope and bases. A characteristic feature of the process of trust evolution is the fact that its construction is usually slow, gradual, while destruction (loss of trust and turn towards distrust) is relatively quick.

Different authors describe the building (evolution) process of trust differently, mainly due to the fact that they analyze this problem from viewpoints of different scientific fields (among others: economy, sociology, psychology), different theories, adopting different criteria as the key ones to distinguish consecutive phases of the process, as well as identifying different sources of trust (although in this case, the differences mainly concern terminology). Nevertheless, those viewpoints are not mutually exclusive, but they complement each other and present different dimensions and features of the same phenomenon [cf. Grudzewski et al. 2009].

An example of the description of the trust building process is a three-stage model by R. Lewicki and B. Bunker [1996]. They distinguish three types of trust – based on calculation, knowledge and identification, which at the same time constitute successive levels of trust development. The transition from the level of trust based on calculation to the trust based on knowledge is caused by replacing the image of contrast between the one and the other with the vision of assimilation, while the next transition is connected to the development of identification with the other.

A different model of the trust building process is presented by S. Covey [Covey, Merrill 2006], who distinguishes five "waves of trust". He believes that the first stage of this process is building trust in oneself, which conditions personal credibility, while successive waves of trust are: relationship trust and credibility, organizational trust, market trust, and societal trust.

Despite the differences in the way the process of building trust is described, and the terminology used, experts agree on the basic elements and features of the process. While placing trust is not a single act, but the beginning of a long relationship, during which the recipient's credibility is usually tested on subsequent stages and, depending on the outcome of these tests, trust is withdrawn, left at the same level or expanded and deepened. The credibility of the potential trust recipient is assessed at all times. Initially, trust is limited and the trusting person bears relatively small risk. With each successive act the trusting person takes bigger risk (or smaller, in the case of the withdrawal of trust), but at the same time previous "tests of trust" make the risk-taking more reasonable. [Sztompka, 2007].

4.2 Means and tools of intra-organizational trust building

The above mentioned arguments emphasizing the importance of trust within organizations are gradually and empirically confirmed, thus a question that arises from management and organizational science, seems natural – whether and to what degree one can intentionally create trust within a company. Such a possibility is confirmed by numerous empirical research (cf. e.g. Six, Sorge, 2008]. Nevertheless, analysts of the phenomenon of trust within organizations unanimously claim that this task is very difficult, requiring thoughtful, comprehensive, multifaceted activities [Greiling, 2007]. Therefore, we speak more and more of trust management, management through trust or, according to J. Sydow, "trust-sensitive management", which should rely on considering ways in which decisions, actions, organizational arrangements, procedures and other elements of business management influence trust [Sydow, 2000].

Since trust is a phenomenon deeply rooted in culture and individual personality traits, it does not submit to modelling easily. As once placed trust meets with the expectations of the trusting person, it has a tendency to reinforce itself (analogical tendency is demonstrated by distrust), the key is to create within an organization suitable conditions for developing trust, as well as factors supporting, or even coercing, credibility. One has to keep in mind that building trust within an organization is a lengthy process, very sensitive to manipulation. If the will to trust employees is not authentic, but it is ostensible and serves as a way of management, designed mainly to improve organizational performance, then such trust is harder to build and easier to lose. Therefore, on the one hand it is desirable to raise awareness about the importance of trust within an organization and the need to include strategies of building trust in management, on the other hand, the management should not "show off" with the intention of trust-sensitive management, as it may produce effects contrary to what was intended - arouse mistrust among employees [Grudzewski et al., 2009]. Nevertheless, building intra-organizational trust is a task far easier than building trust in a society, due to the closeness and frequency of contact between the members of the organization. Of course, it is easier to build a culture of trust in the organization, which from the beginning has a certain level of mutual trust among members or is characterized by neutrality in this respect, in contrast to the organization which is characterized by widespread distrust.

In specialist literature, one may read of many proposals of methods, actions and solutions that contribute to building organizational trust. The table below provides examples of such methods, grouped by the dimensions of trust to which they relate to, and the corresponding bases on which trust is built. The classification of these methods is a result of literature study and the author's own reflection, and it is based on the division of dimensions and bases of trust

proposed by P. Sztompka [2007], since it is one of the most comprehensive descriptions of the bases (sources) of trust that can be found in specialist literature and contains most of the proposals of other authors [cf. Grudzewski et al. 2009, p.28].

Table 2. Dimensions of trust and corresponding means of building intra-organizational trust.

Dimensions of trust	Pillars (bases) of trust	Detailed bases (sources) of trust	Possible means and tools of building intra-organizational trust
Trust as a relationship with other people	Evaluation of partner's credibility	1. Perspective of a person who is to be trusted: - person's motivations and interests, individual tendencies to specific actions, declarations and promises, possibilities of meeting the expectations of the trusting person	- solutions that make assistance and cooperation important for the personal interests of the employees (e.g. salary dependent on team's performance and organization, providing employees with mainly positive feedback on their activities) - allowing employees to act, equipping them with appropriate tools and autonomy, delegation of authority,
		2. Individual traits of the person who is to be trusted: - personality, openness, status and role, reputation – actions and individual traits present as well as the ones observed in the past, along with competence, image – appearance, bearing	- little opportunity to shape individual traits - emphasis on the recruitment of employees with the right qualities - openness, honesty, kindness, etc. - clearly defined organizational roles and corresponding expectations, - many possibilities to develop competences of organization members, for example through courses, coaching, mentoring, supporting organizational learning, knowledge sharing. - noticing and appreciating voluntary cooperation and actions that build trust and credibility,
		3. Context, in which partners operate: - possibility of enforcing credibility by the partner through internal agendas, self-limited capacity for action – for demonstrational increase of credibility, situational circumstances	- creating institutional conditions and procedures for the indirect enforcement of credibility of other employees (e.g. 360^0 assessment, evaluation of the employee not only in terms of results, but also means leading to them) - respecting employees rights, caring for their needs (e.g. fighting against discrimination, outplacement, opinion surveys) - reducing psychological distance (e.g. informal meetings, social events)

Dimensions of trust	Pillars (bases) of trust	Detailed bases (sources) of trust	Possible means and tools of building intra-organizational trust
Trust as a relationship with other people	Evaluation of partner's credibility	inducing trust – clarity, transparency, closeness of relationships, dependence on the partner, consequences of failure to meet the expectations (e.g. deterioration of company's results)	- delegation of authority from top to bottom in the organizational hierarchy, - including employees into the decision-making process - reducing control - promoting open and effective communication (vertical and horizontal) and sharing knowledge, - clarity and transparency of procedures (e.g. performance assessment, criteria for promotion), duties assigned to positions, - clear communication of mission and vision, organizational aims and organizational units, expectations and responsibilities - overt and truthful way of informing employees, - accepting the employees' right to make mistakes and to promoting joint problem solving and constructive discussion – demonstrating management's confidence in the employees and their skills (e.g. by assigning challenging tasks, increasing scope of authority) - applying the same standards of evaluation to all members of the organization.
Trust as a psychological tendency	Individual impulse of trust	1. Innate personality traits 2. Acquired (resulting from a particular course of life experience) tendency to trust 3. Influence of emotion and "intuition"	- little possibility of intentional shaping - impulse of trust will be shaped gradually along with the real, systematic occurrence of positive experiences associated with the bestowal of trust and meeting the expectations in the organization, - methods and techniques of shaping organizational culture (among others: exercises and courses building up group morale, skills and will to cooperate, feeling of unity and solidarity; jointly creating a code of conduct in organization and abiding it; endowing trust, central importance of kindness and honesty, creating culture focused on relationships, giving

Dimensions of trust	Pillars (bases) of trust	Detailed bases (sources) of trust	Possible means and tools of building intra-organizational trust
Trust as a psychological tendency	Individual impulse of trust		example of the desired behaviour from "the top" of the organization, stigmatizing opportunism) - initial impulse of trust (trust test) coming from "the top" of the organization
Trust as a cultural rule	Cultural norms	1. Solid experiences with various kinds of trust, accumulated and converted into norms and rules – norms and rules indicating acceptable way of conduct in a given group, e.g. requiring trusting and demonstrating credibility	- difficult and long-lasting process of changing organizational culture - methods and techniques of shaping organizational culture (among others: exercises and courses building up group morale, skills and will to cooperate, feeling of unity and solidarity; jointly creating a code of conduct in organization and abiding it; endowing trust, central importance of kindness and honesty, creating culture focused on relationships, giving example of the desired behaviour from "the top" of the organization, stigmatizing opportunism)

Source: Own work based on classification of dimensions and sources of trust by P. Sztompka [Sztompka 2007].

Even on the basis of a cursory analysis of the above table, it can be stated that some of the dimensions and foundations of trust submit to modelling in a greater extent than others. Most of potential possibilities of influence can be identified in the first and the last dimension of trust. While the pillar of trust that is the most elusive one for the organizational policy (with the exception of the recruitment policy) is the individual impulse of trust (innate and acquired during the socialization process tendencies to put trust in others) as well as the area of personal traits of the individuals creating the organization.

Among the researchers of the phenomenon of trust there is a broad agreement on the need to adapt trust building plans and actions to the specificity of a particular organization. Out of already mentioned ways of building trust and creating conditions for its development, probably the most widely postulated in the literature are: the formation of appropriate attitudes, norms of conduct and organizational values (kindness, honesty, openness, credibility, willingness to trust others etc.), ensuring effective, open communication, caring for the rights and needs of the employees and enforcement of credibility.

4.3 Building trust in vertical and horizontal relationships within the organizational hierarchy

While analyzing the processes and methods of building intra-organizational trust one should take a closer look at two different cases – building trust in vertical relationships (superior-subordinate) and horizontal (between employees of equal positions in the organizational hierarchy).

A superior, who is not trusted by the subordinates, is able to perform his duties related to team management only at the minimal, required degree. Moreover, he or she will perform them with relatively greater effort and during a longer period of time, as it can be done only with an authoritarian management style, based on inducing fear and resorting to constant control. Employees, who do not trust their superior, experience lower job satisfaction, they are less motivated (what is more, sources of their motivations to work are mostly external), and less committed to the realization of company's goals. By analogy, superior who is trusted by the subordinates, repays them with trust and demonstrates credibility, makes employees feel appreciated, more engaged in the work. Employees experience a relatively higher degree of motivation (especially internal) and are more efficient.

Furthermore, gaining subordinates' trust is a condition that has to be met by the superior in order to move from the less efficient "directing" towards the nearest to the ideal way of managing people – "leading". Without going into the question of the essence of leadership in an organization (about which there is still no scientific consensus), I shall quote only two authorities in the field of management science. R.W. Griffin writes that a leader is a person who can affect (influence) the behaviour of others without resorting to coercive measures, who is accepted by others in the role of the leader and is able to persuade members of the organization to cooperate in the interest of the organization [Griffin, 2004]. Whereas P.F. Drucker says that "the only thing you can say about a leader is that a leader is somebody who has followers", adding that "an effective leader is not someone who is loved or admired. He or she is someone whose followers do the right things." Different traits of a leader tend to be highlighted and described as crucial, yet the study shows that there is no one set of leader characteristics that can ensure effectiveness. However, even a cursory analysis of views on the essence of leadership indicates that leading employees is impossible in a situation where they do not trust their superior.

Thus a question arises, how trust can be built in relations between superiors and their subordinates. F. Bartolome postulates, that subordinates' trust should be built with six tools [Grudzewski et al., 2009]:

- Communication – with its crucial elements: to inform, to ensure feedback, to explain policies and decisions, to avoid withholding information and to use it as a form of reward,
- Support – to show concern, interest in the personal and professional matters of the employees, to be accessible and helpful, to take care of the employees' interests, to encourage innovation and expression of opinions, to be a mentor and/or a coach.
- Respect – to respect employees' dignity, their opinions and values,
- Fairness – objectivity of the evaluation, equal standards for everybody, appreciation of achievements, acting accordingly to (jointly) established rules and norms,
- Predictability – consistent behaviour, reliability, keeping promises, carrying out responsibilities
- Competence – to display great expertise and business skills, personality traits, effectiveness and ways of action

E. Whitener et al. [1998] add to the abovementioned traits and ways of behaviour, a very important element - sharing (delegating) control, defined as the delegation of authority, and considering the opinions of employees in the decision-making process. Additionally, W.M. Grudzewski et al. [2009] observe that the ideal situation is when the actions and attitudes of the leader are authentic in all of the areas mentioned above, that is with loyalty to oneself and fidelity to the professed values.

A second fundamental area of building intra-organizational trust is supporting this process in relation to teams or organizational units consisting of employees of the same position in the hierarchy of the company and having common goals. It is a process far more complicated due to the greater number and multidirectional character of relationships in which it is conducted. For synthetic and clear discussion of the critical factors influencing its course and for proposing methods and tools for building trust in the team, they are presented in the table below. This classification is the result of literature study and personal reflections of the author.

Table 3. Factors influencing the trust building process within a team and corresponding ways of action

Group of factors	Factor influencing team's trust	Factor's influence on building trust (The difficulty of building trust usually increases when:)	Actions designed to support the trust building process in a team
Team characteristics	1. team (among others: number of members, prior relationships, hetero-/ homogeneity – differences in professed values, way of conduct, personality traits)	- increasing the size and heterogeneity of the group, - team members did not know each other before,	- Appropriate selection of team members (in terms of the appropriate number of members in relation to the requirements of the task, the similarity of personality traits, shared values, etc.)
	2. substantive competence of team members and their complementarity	- decreasing level of substantive competence of team members, - decreasing level of competence complementarity (necessary to perform the task) of team members	- appropriate selection of team members (in terms of their competence, taking into consideration task requirements),
	3. skills and attitude to cooperation and teamwork	- reluctance to cooperation increases, - decrease of teamwork skills,	- promoting positive attitude to cooperation and supporting teamwork (e.g. by assigning teams "training" exercises, courses, coaching, development of appropriate organizational culture),
	4. Communication skills	- decrease of effective communication skills and openness to others	- supporting openness and effective communication skills (e.g. through exercises, courses, coaching, modelling organizational culture and the example coming from the top)
	5. team cohesion (dependency and compatibility of personal motivations and the motivations of the team)	- decreasing level of dependency and similarity between team motivations and personal motivations of the members	- ensuring the greatest possible compatibility between personal motivations and team motivations (e.g. through an appropriate system of rewarding members for the team's success, appropriate selection of team members - eliminating units where conflict of interest would occur),

Group of factors	Factor influencing team's trust	Factor's influence on building trust (The difficulty of building trust usually increases when:)	Actions designed to support the trust building process in a team
Team characteristics	6. other characteristics of team members (among others: personality traits, attitudes and social skills, reputation)	- declining number of members with traits facilitating trust building	- appropriate selection of team members: appropriate number of members with traits facilitating trust building (openness, honesty, kindness, high level of competence, etc.),
	7. expected timespan of the relationships between team members	- short-term, temporary relationships	- in case of recruiting team members from one organization long-term relationships are usually ensured, - appropriate selection of team members
Task characteristics	1. dependency between team's success and individual effort and cooperation	- decreasing level of dependency between team's success and individual effort (because of the decrease of the need for harmonious and effective cooperation)	- appropriate task design (ensuring each member's contribution to the success of the team, but also tools of control and enforcement of credibility)
	2. Consequences of failure or success	- decreasing value of the result (reward) achieved by realization of the task by the team	- informing employees about the team's goal and the importance of carrying out the task for the whole organization - establishing and presenting appropriate system of rewards and penalties, depending on the performance of the team (positive reinforcements valuable for the team are proffered),
	3. task characteristics (interdependence, comprehensiveness, difficulty and complexity)	- decreasing degree of interdependence of the components of the task realization, comprehensiveness and complexity of the task	- if the task to be performed by the team is relatively easy, the team can be assigned with "training" exercises unrelated to the team's goal, but designed to boost cooperation, creativity and trust building, - if tasks are of high level of difficulty and interdependence, then appropriate conditions, tools and scopes of authority must be provided,

Group of factors	Factor influencing team's trust	Factor's influence on building trust (The difficulty of building trust usually increases when:)	Actions designed to support the trust building process in a team
Organizational context	1. external factors of the team (organizational context in which the team operates, including, e.g. organizational culture, procedures, management style)	- external factors of the team do not facilitate trust building (see: Table 2)	- see: Table 2.

Source: own study based on the classification of factors influencing trust building in teams of employees A.C Costa et al. [2001], B.D. Adams [2003], P. Sztompka [2007].

The above presentation of the ways individual factors influence trust building within a team is a mere simplification for analytical purposes. In reality, these factors may influence each other (e.g. the level of difficulty of building trust within a team decreases when the level of dependency between team's success and individual effort and cooperation increases; but when, for instance, team's success does not correspond to personal motivations of team members, this effect is no longer obvious, due to the increasing risk of failure).

A. Costa, on the basis of research conducted on a group of 131 teams, found that the team characteristics are the most important for the team trust, among which the author distinguishes: teamwork preferences, skills adequate for work, employment stability and team's cohesion. According to the research of this author, work specificity and organizational context play a lesser role in this regard [Grudzewski et al. 2009].

5. Conclusion

The development of theories on trust and still new empirical evidence confirming its influence on company's performance and success, lead us to concludethat this factor should be taken into consideration in the organizational management systems. The observed tendencies, on the one hand, to the increasing importance of trust in today's business world, – while on the other hand, the erosion of trust in companies, have serious implications for both theory and practice of management. Among other things, it is necessary to develop the concept of trust management, along with the development of a comprehensive set of guidelines, methods and techniques for building trust

in the organization. For this purpose, it is crucial to broaden the knowledge on mechanisms underlying this process.

Despite some gaps in current knowledge and the diversity of numerous viewpoints, it can be stated, with a small margin of error, that although the process of building trust is extremely difficult, long lasting and probably never ending, the undertaking of this effort seems to be fully justified.

References

1. Adams B.D., *Trust Development in Small Teams*, Department of National Defence, Guelph 2003.
2. Arrow K., *The Limits of Organization*, Oxford University Press, New York 1974.
3. Coleman J. C., *Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital*, „American Journal of Sociology", 1988, no. 94.
4. Costa, A.C., Roe, R.A. Taillieu, T., *Trust within teams: The relation with performance effectiveness*, „European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology", 2001, no. 10(3).
5. Covey S., Merrill R., *The Speed of Trust: The One Thing That Changes Everything*, Free Press, New York 2006.
6. Drucker P. F., *Przedmowa: zbyt wielu generałów uszło z życiem*, [w:] *Lider przyszłości*, ed. Hesselbein F., Goldsmith M., Beckhard R., Business Press, Warszawa 1997.
7. Fukuyama F., *Zaufanie. Kapitał społeczny a droga do dobrobytu*, Warszawa – Wrocław 1997.
8. Greiling, D., *Trust and performance management in non-profit organizations*, „The Innovation Journal: Public Sector Innovation Journal", 2007, no. 12(3).
9. Griffin R.W., *Podstawy zarządzania organizacjami*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa 2004
10. Grudzewski W.M., Hejduk I.K., Sankowska A., Wańtuchowicz M., *Zarządzanie zaufaniem w przedsiębiorstwie*, Wolters Kluwer Polska, Kraków 2009.
11. Knack, S., Keefer, P., *Does social capital have an economic pay-off? A cross country investigation*, „Quarterly Journal of Economics", 1997, no. 112(4).
12. Lewicki R, Bunker B., *Developing and Maintaining Trust in Work Relationships* [w:] *Trust in Organisations: Frontiers of Theory and Research,* ed. R. Kramer, T. Tyler, Sage Publications, London 1996.
13. Lin N., *Social Capital: A Theory of Social Structure and Action*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2001.

14. Luhmann N., *Trust and Power*, New York 1979.
15. Seligmann A. B., *The Problem of Trust*, Princeton 1997.
16. Six F., Sorge A., *Creating a High-Trust Organization: An Exploration into Organizational Policies that Stimulate Interpersonal Trust Building*, „Journal of Management Studies", 2008, no. 45/5.
17. Six F., *Trust and trouble: Building interpersonal trust within organizations*, PhD thesis, Erasmus University Rotterdam, Rotterdam 2004.
18. Sydow J., *Understanding the Constitution of Interorganizational Trust*, [w:] *Trust in and between organizations*, ed. C. Lane and R. Bachmann, Oxford University Press, Oxford 2000.
19. Sztompka P., *Zaufanie. Fundament Społeczeństwa*, Wydawnictwo Znak, Kraków 2007.
20. Whitener, E.M., Brodt, S.E., Korsgaard M.A., Werner, J.M., *Managers as initiators of trust: An exchange relationship framework for understanding managerial trustworthy behavior*, „Academy of Management Review", 1998, no. 23.
21. Zack P.J., Knack S., *Trust and growth*, „Economic Journal", 2001, no. 111.
22. Zaheer A., McEvily B., *Perrone V., Does trust matter? Exploring the Effects of Inter-organizational and Interpersonal Trust on Performance*, „Organization Science" 1998, no. 9(2).
23. Raes A., Heijltjes M., Glunk U., Roe R., *Conflict, Trust, and Effectiveness in Teams Performing Complex Tasks: A Study of Temporal Patterns*, Research Memoranda, Maastricht Research School of Economics of Technology and Organization, 2006, no. 8.