

Organizational trust

الثقة التنظيمية

أيت مجبر دليلا Ait medjber Dalila

Departement os psychologie / Abderrahmane-Mira , Bejaia, Algeria

dalila.aitmedjber@univ-bejaia.dz

DOI: 10.46315/1714-014-002-056

Received: 31/ 01/ 2025 Accepted: 14/ 04/ 2025 Published: 16/ 06/ 2025

**

Abstract :

Organizations are social systems where members interact to achieve common goals, which necessitates strong relationships built on trust. Organizational trust plays a pivotal role in ensuring both the effectiveness of the organization and the well-being of its employees. Trust within an organization fosters cooperation, enhances communication, and leads to higher employee satisfaction and performance. This article explores the significant role of trust within organization, examining its antecedents, such as participation, empowerment, organizational justice, and communication. It also investigates the consequences of trust, including increased cooperation, innovation, job performance, and communication. In the second part of the article, we focus on the potential for trust violations in the workplace, highlighting the causes and effects of such breaches. Furthermore, we discuss various strategies for repairing trust, including apologies, compensation, and forgiveness.

Keywords: Organisational trust, antecedents of trust, violation of trust, repair trust.

ملخص باللغة العربية

تعتبر المنظمات نظم اجتماعية يتفاعل فيها أعضاؤها بغية تحقيق أهداف مشتركة، وهو ما يستدعي وجود علاقات قوية مبنية على الثقة. تلعب الثقة التنظيمية دورًا محوريًا في ضمان فعالية المنظمة ورفاهية موظفيها. تؤثر الثقة على معظم المخرجات التنظيمية، فهي تعزز التعاون، وتحسن الاتصال، وتؤدي إلى زيادة رضا الموظفين وأدائهم. يستعرض هذا المقال الدور الكبير للثقة في المنظمة، من خلال فحص العوامل المساعدة في بنائها مثل المشاركة، التمكين، العدالة التنظيمية، والاتصال. كما يستعرض نواتج الثقة، بما في ذلك زيادة التعاون، الابتكار، الأداء الوظيفي، والاتصال. في الجزء الثاني من المقال، نلقي الضوء على انتهاكات للثقة في مكان العمل، مع تحديد أسبابها وتأثيراتها. بالإضافة إلى ذلك، نناقش استراتيجيات مختلفة لإصلاح الثقة، مثل الاعتذارات، التعويضات، والمغفرة.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الثقة التنظيمية، محددات الثقة، انتهاك الثقة، إصلاح الثقة.

**

1- Introduction

Trust is a cornerstone of modern organizational life, influencing numerous aspects of workplace dynamics. To thrive in today's competitive environment, organizations must establish a strong foundation of trust at all levels- whether among senior management, supervisors, or colleagues. A culture of trust enhances organizational reputation, bolsters relationship with stakeholders such as shareholders, customers and suppliers, and fosters psychology safety and well-being among employees. As noted by Hoy (2006), trust is an invaluable social capital that supports economic and social exchanges. Organizations that prioritize trust create an environment where individuals are encouraged to innovate,

take calculated risks, and embraced by opportunities without fear of making faults. (Tingle, J.K., 2011, p25).

Trust fosters both horizontal and vertical relationships, directly contributing to organizational success. (Argyris & Schön, 1974; Likert, 1967; McGregor, 1967 as cited in Fraser, W.L., 2010, p11).

This paper aims to expand the existing body of literature on trust by emphasizing its critical role in improving workplace relationships and outcomes. It seeks to identify the factors that nurture trust, the causes behind its deterioration, and the mechanisms that enable its restoration.

The discussion begins with an overview of how scholars have defined trust, followed by an exploration of its importance in driving organizational outcomes. Subsequently, the paper examines factors that contribute to the development of trust, those that lead to breaches, and strategies for repairing trust when it is compromised. Our research questions are thus :

- Why do organizations need trust?

1.1- Organisational trust

The concept of trust has garnered significant attention from scholars across various disciplines, with its origins deeply rooted in the field of psychology. Despite its importance, there is no universal definition of trust, largely due to the overlapping nature of related concepts such as cooperation, dependence, and predictability, as well as its connections to diverse fields like philosophy, politics, and economics. (Falih, H.M., 2010, p173).

Scholars have offered a range of definitions based on their areas of study and research objectives.

Bromiley and Cummings (1995) describe trust as an expectation that individuals or groups will act in good faith, fulfill commitments, and avoid exploiting opportunities for unfair advantage. (Tingle, J.K., 2011, p25)

Gambetta (1988) approaches organizational trust as a global assessment of an organization's trustworthiness from the employee's perspective, highlighting its role in protecting employee interests. (Tan, H. H., & Tan, C. S. F.2000, p.243). Similarly, Mayer & al. (1995) propose a widely recognized model where organizational trust is determined by three key dimensions: ability, benevolence and integrity, combined with employee trust propensity. (McLeary, C., Cruise, P.A., 2015, pp.298-299).

A more recent perspective by Fulmer & Gelfand (2012) frames organizational trust as « a psychological state that reflects a willingness to accept vulnerability based on positive expectations of &the organization ». (Legood, A, Thomas, G., & Sacramento, C., 2016, p674).While definitions vary, they all converge on three essential elements: « *positive expectation, vulnerability and risk-taking act* »

1.2- Importance of trust

Trust is a critical element in organizational success, as highlighted by numerous researchers. It serves as the foundation for several key workplace behaviors and outcomes, including cooperation, innovation, communication, enhanced job performance, and successful organizational change. Below, we explore each of these dimensions in greater detail:

1.2.1-Trust as a basis for cooperation

Scholars such as Bromiley & Cummings (1995) and Coleman (1990) emphasize that trust is essential for fostering cooperation within organizations. (Tingle, J.K., 2011, p36). Furthermore, Lewis (1999) confirms that mutual trust eliminates the need for individuals to safeguards against opportunistic behavior, thereby enhancing efficiency. When trust exists, employees are more likely to collaborate, share resources, and exchange knowledge, which in turn leads to improved organizational performance. (Pirson. M, 2007, p3). As well, a high level of trust allows organizations to maintain a competitive edge by promoting interdependence and teamwork. (Seppänen.R, & al, 2014, p 111). In other words, employees who trust one another work cooperatively, by exchanging experiences and sharing resources, knowledge and informations to accomplish thiers personal and organizational goals and they are the most confident, unlike those who tend to work individually and find it difficult to adapt to group work situations, they are the least confident.

Trust is the foundation of cooperation. When employees work together to accomplish their tasks, it leads to mutual dependence. Each person relies on others by sharing skills, experiences, and important information. In this situation, employees are more open to exchanging innovative ideas freely, which promotes creative activities.

1-2-2-Trust as a basis for innovation

Innovation means taking risks by using unconventional solutions and finding new ideas to solve problems that are not usually considered acceptable or appropriate. It also involves making mistakes. In a trusting environment, employees feel safe sharing valuable information, and it's recognized that occasional errors are simply a part of the innovation process. The exposure of new ideas to produce innovative outcomes is encouraged by management. So, employees can accept the risks associated with creativity and innovation if they trust their managers.

Politis (2003), in his empirical study, demonstrates a strong correlation between interpersonal trust and innovation (Pirson, 2007, p. 5). Because employees who trust their organizations generally, and their leadership specifically, are more willing to engage in creativity, knowing that their contributions will be valued there is no chance for opportunism.

1-2-3-Trust as a basis for communication

In general, effective communication is « ... the life blood of a successful organization ». (Wyatt, 2006, as cited in Seppänen.R, & al., 2014, p112).

Communication in an organization is influenced by the degree of trust present, including the exchange of information, as well as the importance and accuracy of that information. Trust also helps facilitate the sharing of knowledge and ideas within organizations (Shazi, R.I.K., 2004, p. 32). Viherkara (2006) shows that leaders drive the communication process because they are responsible for achieving organizational goals (Seppänen et al., 2004, p. 112). Therefore, followers who trust their leaders will feel comfortable

sharing salient facts and confidential information, and they will not withhold or distort crucial information.

Trust promotes candor, which reduces the likelihood that inaccurate information will "spread." Trust fosters undistorted communication, especially during times of organizational crisis (Zand, 1972). For example, when a team works on a project and trusts each other, they are more likely to communicate openly about any challenges they are facing, share suggestions, and admit mistakes. This open dialogue helps them find solutions together and learn from their experiences.

1-2-4-Trust as a basis for job performance

Trust significantly impacts employee's performance. As Tyler and DeJoy (1996) explain, effective organizational performance can be achieved when individuals feel committed to their employer, are willing to respect policies and expectations, and are inclined to follow the organization's leaders (Fraser, W.L., 2010, p. 27). Organizational trust enhances these feelings

When organizational trust exists, employees tend to focus on performing their tasks effectively. Moreover, when employees trust their leaders, they are more likely to engage in high task performance and exhibit greater organizational citizenship behaviors.

Furthermore, scholars (e.g., Blau, 1964; Mayer & Gavin, 2005) have found that when trust levels are low, employees become more concerned with protecting themselves, worrying about organizational policies, and preparing alternative plans results in a loss of time, preventing them from focusing sufficient attention on their job duties. (Colquitt, J.A., Salam, S.C., 2009, p391).

1.2.5-Trust as a basis for successful organizational change

Organizational change period is considered a critical trust-building or trust-destroying episode. (R.Lines, & al., 2005, p 222-227).

When employees don't understand the reasons and motivations behind the changes in organizations, they are less likely to cooperate and apply the required changes in their work, so an important part of organizational changes often doesn't succeed. (Colquitt, J.A., Salam, S.C., 2009, p392).

Summing up, developing strong trust in the organization leads to flexible and successful change. But the question is how can a high level of trust be achieved within organizations?

In the following section of this paper, we present the different organizational and individual factors that develop trust.

2- Antecedents of trust

The evidence confirming the importance of trust in the workplace is apparent, but scholars still know little about the reasons that lead employees to trust the organization. (Komodromos, M., 2013, p87). However, various organizational and individual factors can play an important role in fostering trust, such as participation, empowerment, openness and transparency, organizational support, organizational justice, propensity to trust and trustworthiness.

2-1-Participation

Participation takes several forms, whether simple or significant forms can influence trust in organization. (Tingle, J.K, 2011, p52). In the same vein, Whitener and al. (1998) found that employee participation in decision making is more likely to develop trust in the organization. Similarly, Driscoll (1978) argued that when managers encourage employee participation, it demonstrates that they trust them. Furthermore, Deci & al. (1989) confirmed that employee's satisfaction with their level of participation and their ability to define their work roles increases trust in management (R.Lines, & al., 2005, p228). Leaders and managers are encouraged to involve all employees, regardless of their positions, in every possible organizational operation and project. A sense of ownership in a project requires association from the beginning. It is inconceivable to motivate others when they have not been involved from the outset. (Duluc.A., 2000, p114).

Active participation sustains a sense of belonging within organization and builds organizational trust.

2-2-Empowerment

Empowerment guarantees significant autonomy in executing tasks (Yin,Y., & al., 2019, p565) and is demonstrated through participative decision-making, delegation of responsibilities , sharing information and showing concern for employees (Bester, J., & al., 2015, p2)

Several studies have highlighted the positive impact of empowerment on trust. According to Amara and Bietry (2008) there is a significant relationship between empowerment and employees' trust in their colleagues, in their superiors and in organization. (Berraies, S., & al., 2014, p86).

Conversely, organizational trust can enhance empowerment because the most trusted employees feel more empowered when tasks are delegated to them, with the confidence that they will be accomplished with success.

According to Yin,Y., & al. (2009), Trust boosts empowerment practices that motivate employees to utilize their potential and create opportunities in their work. This requires openness and transparency in the work environment.

2-3-Opness and transparency

The importance of openness in the development of a trusting relationship is confirmed in many studies. (Tingle, J.K., 2011, p52).

Openness includes transparency, which is a premise for access to all information in the organization, assuming that there are no secrets other than professional secrets. As for concealing information, it does not exist. Everyone can obtain answers to their questions. (Duluc, A., 2000, p116).

Dirks and Ferrin (2001) argue that trust increases the free exchange of knowledge, which leads to guaranteeing access to information for every party. (Tingle, J.K., 2011, p. 52). Thus, openness requires not withholding vital information that is essential for building trust. In the same vein, Hoffman et al. (1994) found that openness and trust complement each other. When one party is truly open, they take a significant risk by sharing private, personal, or organizational information. (Chughtai, A. A., & Buckley, F.,

2008, p. 55). Finally, as Hoy (2002) stated, 'Openness breeds trust, just as trust creates openness.' (Tingle, J.K., 2011, p. 53).

2-4-Organizational support

The concept of organizational support is the general belief that employees are members of the organization that values them and contributes to their well-being. (Yilmaz, F., 2019, p. 969).

As well, organizational support is a feeling of appreciation and recognition as a valued member of the organization. Thus, as stated by Rhoades and Eisenberger (2002), an employee who is respected, acknowledged, fairly compensated for their effort, and supported by the organization tends to reciprocate by demonstrating high performance in achieving organizational goals. Moreover, Ristig (2009) highlights that research on perceived organizational support has demonstrated its positive impact on organizational trust.

2-5-Organisational justice

According to Greenberg & Baron (2003), organizational justice is the perception of fairness in the processes, procedures, and reward mechanisms applied by the organization's members. (Engelbrecht, A., & Samuel, O.M., 2019, p. 2). Furthermore, Kumar et al. (1995) highlighted that procedural justice is the most important predictor of trust, whereas distributive and interactional justice mainly contribute to relationship quality. On the other hand, scholars like Cropanzano and Folger (1991) found that procedural justice shapes employees' perception of the organization and its leadership. (Richa Banerjee & Subeer Banerjee, 2013, p. 39). When employees perceive procedural justice as present, they are more likely to trust the organization and participate in strategic decisions.

When employees perceive organizational justice, trust tends to strengthen. (Kim et al., 2008). Additionally, organizational justice helps employees sustain trust in their organization, even in unfavorable circumstances. (Komodromos, M., 2013, p. 88).

2-6-Trustworthiness

Caldwell & Clapham (2003) defined trustworthiness as 'an antecedent accumulated perceptual experience that leads one to trust another person, institution, or organization.' (Kimberley, N., & Härtel, C., 2007, p. 251).

Mayer & al. (1995) clearly distinguish between trust and trustworthiness and conceptualize trust as an outcome of trustworthiness. (Devlin, J.F., Roy, S.k.,& al., 2014, p3). In his model, he divides trustworthiness into three dimensions: ability, benevolence, and integrity.(Xu, B.,et al., 2016,p2).

Ability is the « group of skills, competencies and characteristics that enable a party to have influence within some specific domain ». (Kimberley, N., Härtel, C., 2007, p252). People trust those who can solve problems and achieve desired results. (Seppänen.R. & al. ,2014, p.112).

Benevolence, according to Bews & Rossouw (2002), is the treatment of others with dignity and respect, including acts that demonstrate interest in employees, such as loyalty, concern, altruism, and goodwill. (Kimberley, N., Härtel, C., 2007, p252). Important benevolence signals include the

demonstration of empathy, concern for others' well-being, and helpful actions. (Jones ,S.L., Shah, P.P., 2016, p398).

Integrity and consistency reflect honesty and a commitment to keeping promises (Mayer et al., 1995). A trustor can have confidence in the trustee's ethical behavior. (Sekhon, H., et al., 2014, p. 418). Perry and Mankin (2004) explained that organizational trust consists of common opinions of employees regarding trustworthiness of different actors in the organization. Employees' perception of an organization's trustworthiness (ability, benevolence and integrity), combined with employee trust propensity determines the organizational trust relationship. (McLeary, C.,& al., 2015, p299).

2-7-Propensity to trust

The dispositional theories of trust suggest that certain individual characteristics push people to trust or distrust strangers. (Ping, H., et al., 2012, p. 1003).

Propensity can be considered the general willingness to trust others. Therefore, individuals differ in their propensity to trust based on their personality types, past experiences, and cultural backgrounds (e.g., Hofstede, 1980). It is possible that some individuals frequently trust in situations where most people do not. Conversely, others are unwilling to trust in most situations, regardless of circumstances that might justify doing so. (Mayer, R.C., & al., 1995, p715). Furthermore, Hardin (1993) argued that individuals tend to avoid cooperative activities if they have a distrusting predisposition. For this reason, distrusting employees in organizations may be expected to seek roles with limited dependence on others and resist job changes that increase their reliance on coworkers (Ping, H., & al., 2012, p1003).

This article explores the development of trust. In the first section, we examine the factors that contribute to trust-building. The second section focuses on the causes of distrust—such as decline, violation, and possible breach—as well as the mechanisms for restoring trust.

3-Violation of trust

In the trust literature, the terms trust decline, distrust, erosion, violation, and breach are often used interchangeably.

Davis and Landa report that 43% of employees believe their superiors lie, while 68% express mistrust in their superiors. (Savolainen, T., 2014). Grovier (1994) defined distrust as 'a lack of confidence in the other, a concern that the other may act in a harmful way, does not care about one's welfare, or tends to act harmfully or with hostility.'

Tomlinson et al. (2004) argue that trust violations occur when individuals behave in a way that disappoints the positive trusting expectations of a trustee. A trust violation is considered an incident or action that breaches commonly accepted moral or ethical principles or norms (e.g., by acting in a dishonest, exploitative, unethical, illegal, or unsafe manner).

The timing of a trust violation is critical. In the early stage of a relationship, the violation can be more damaging than later violations (Lewicki & Bunker, 1996; Lount Jr., Zhong, Sivanathan, & Murnighan,

2006). Conversely, trust violated later in established relationships can cause deeper damage (Grovier, 1998; Tomlinson, Dineen, & Lewicki, 2004; Tomlinson & Mayer, 2009). (Fraser, W.L., 2010, pp. 33–34).

Lewicki and Tomlinson (2003) demonstrate that trust violations have negative consequences on mutual support, communication, and knowledge and information sharing (Savolainen, 2008; Savolainen et al., 2014). Beyond trust deterioration trust, individuals experience negative emotions such as disappointment, frustration, anger, and outrage following a transgression (Dirks et al., 2009).

Fraser (2010), in his thesis, mentioned key factors contributing to trust deteriorations, such as *Disrespectful behaviors* (belittling individuals or their contributions, ignoring feelings, and blaming others when problems arise) ; *Communication problems* (failure to listen, misunderstandings between individuals, and lack of communication during critical situations or periods of change); *Unmet expectations* (broken promises, psychological contract abuse, and breaches of confidentiality, contribute to trust breakdowns) ; *Incongruence* (where actions go against core values, mission, or practices, and inconsistencies between words and actions contribute to trust deterioration) (Kramer & Lewicki, 2010, p. 251); *Ineffective leadership and organizational work* (include incompetency in defining clear goals or guidelines, making poor decisions, and committing mistakes, unpredictable changes in mind and decisions); *Neglectful behavior* (including a lack of support and appreciation, and other negative behaviors); *Excessive intervention* (such as high control, surveillance, and micromanagement).

4-Repair trust

Scholars indicate that the restoration of broken trust may be challenging but is possible (Savolainen, T., Ikonen, M., & Laitinen, M., 2018, pp. 776–778). Lewicki and Bunker (1996) suggest four strategies for repairing trust in an organization: acknowledgment, identifying the cause of the violation and assuming culpability, acknowledging the harm, and accepting responsibility for the consequences.

Trust can be restored through different approaches, but the choice of an appropriate method depends on the underlying causes of its deterioration. Various verbal strategies may help rebuild expectations after a trust violation, including apologies (Kim et al., 2006), denials (Kim et al., 2004), promises (Schweitzer et al., 2006), reticence (Ferrin et al., 2007), justification (Cody & McLaughlin, 1990), and excuses (Tomlinson & Mayer, 2009). In this paper, we examine the role of explanations, apologies, compensation, and forgiveness in the trust restoration process.

4-1-Explanations

Attribution theory suggests that individuals tend to seek an understanding of the circumstances surrounding events, particularly negative and unexpected ones (Wong & Weiner, 1981). However, using an inadequate method to explain the causes and context of a trust breach can complicate the process of trust repair. Additionally, both the nature of the explanation and the characteristics of the explainer influence the ability to forgive and rebuild trust (Kramer et al., 2010, p. 252).

4-2-Apologies

According to Schlenker and Darby (1981, p. 271), an apology is 'an admission of blameworthiness and regret for an undesirable event' (Schweitzer, 2006, p. 4).

An apology conveys courtesy, humility, effort, and concern, as well as remorse toward victims (Smith, Bolton, & Wagner, 1999). When the trustee acknowledges responsibility and accepts full consequences for their actions, the probability of restoring mutual trust increases (Cui et al., 2018, p. 33).

The apology typology, according to Tomlinson et al. (2004), consists of three types: **no apology**, but an acknowledgment of the harm caused to the victim; **an apology with an internal attribution** (justification) for the trust violation, where the person fully takes responsibility for their actions, acknowledging that the mistake resulted from their own decision. For example: *"I totally screwed up; I couldn't fulfill my agreement because I was lazy."* The third type is **an apology with an external attribution** for the breach of trust, where the person justifies their actions by attributing the cause to external factors rather than taking full personal responsibility. For example: *"I'm apologizing for not delivering on time, but my computer crashed, and I lost all my work."*

Tomlinson, Dineen, and Lewicki (2004) found that a victim's willingness to forgive a broken promise significantly depended on the type of apology, the timing of the reconciliatory act (Lewicki & Bunker, 1996; Tomlinson, 2004), and the perceived sincerity of the apology. (Wendyl Fraser, 2010, p. 40).

The effectiveness of an apology mostly depends on its sincerity. The apology is perceived as more sincere when the individual responsible acknowledges the mistake and admits responsibility for the consequences of their actions. Apologies given quickly after a violation of trust seem to be more effective. Finally, the apology tends to be more successful when the parties have a good relationship, especially when the breach of trust is perceived as an isolated incident (Kramer et al., 2010, p. 253).

4-3-Compensation

Compensation plays a crucial role in the process of restoring trust. There are many forms of compensation: **a direct compensation** for the value of what was lost due to the violation. For example, if I were the reason for losing an important project, I would work to obtain another one. (Lewicki, R. J., Brinsfield, C., 2017, p 299). **A symbolic compensation or penance**, aims to reduce the effects of the violation and restore trust. For example, helping a coworker following a professional misunderstanding, such as offering support or advice to resolve the situation.

Financial compensation, whether in small or large amounts, is one of the most effective methods for restoring trust. However, open compensation, which allows the victim to define the terms and conditions of reimbursement, tends to be more effective than specific targeted offers. (Kramer et al., 2010, p. 254-255). Nevertheless, providing compensation without an explanation can be perceived as an admission of guilt and lead to more negative evaluations (Bitner, 1990). Therefore, combining an apology with compensation is often a more effective way to restore trust (Cui, Y. et al., 2018, p. 34).

4-5-Forgiveness

Archbishop Desmond Tutu stated, "Without forgiveness, there is no future" (Enright, Freedman, & Rique, 1998; Tutu, 1998 as cited in Wendy L. Fraser, P44).

Forgiveness is both an acknowledgment of a transgression of trust and an admission of guilt, in which individuals demonstrate regret to the victim and a promise to safeguard the trust in the future (Kramer et al., 2010, p. 255).

According to Fitzgibbons (1998), forgiveness calms anger and negative emotions, such as bitterness and hostility, by reducing their intensity in both the mind and heart.

The literature on trust repair often highlights several steps to forgiveness: acknowledging wrongdoing ("I know I'm wrong"), offering an apology ("I'm truly sorry for what happened"), recognizing and expressing the other person's pain ("I know I hurt you"), emphasizing the importance of reconciliation ("This reconciliation will strengthen our cooperation"), making amends for the fault, committing to avoid future harm ("I promise this will never happen again"), and ultimately forgiving. (Wendy L. Fraser, P45)

5-Conclusion

This paper contributes to the organizational literature by emphasizing the significant role of trust within the organizational context.

We have emphasized the significance of trust in supporting various organizational outcomes. Many studies have demonstrated that trust is crucial for fostering cooperation, improving communication, increasing employee job satisfaction, and enhancing job performance. Additionally, employees who feel trusted are more likely to engage in organizational citizenship behaviors and refrain from counterproductive actions. We have first identified the main antecedents that contribute to building trust, and we have clarified the effect of each in strengthening trust.

As previously mentioned, in order to cultivate trust, it is essential to treat employees with sincerity, openness, and consistency, show them respect, and involve them in the decision-making process. In environments where ideas and opinions are openly shared, and where leaders and managers demonstrate trustworthiness, fairness, and a commitment to valuing employees through practices such as empowerment, participation, and organizational support, an atmosphere of trust is more likely to develop within the organization.

The possibility of trust violations in workplace settings can arise. In this paper, we have explored several critical aspects these violations and proposed strategies for addressing them. We have examined explanations, apologies, and forgiveness, along with compensation, as mechanisms for repairing trust.

**

6- The bibliography

Books

- Colquitt, J.A., & Salam, S.C. (2009). Foster trust through ability, benevolence, and integrity. In I. Locke & E.A. Blackwell (Eds.), *Handbook of principles of organizational behavior* (pp. 390-401). Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- Duluc, A. (2000). *Leadership et confiance, développer le capital humain pour des organisations performantes*. Dunod.
- Dupuy, C., & Torre, A. (2004). Confiance et proximité. In B. Pecqueur & J.B. Zimmermann (Eds.), *Economie de proximités* (pp. 1-25). Hermès.

Articles

- Bachmann, R., Gillespie, N., & Priem, R.L. (2015). Repairing trust in organizations and institutions: Toward a conceptual framework. *Organization Studies*, 36(9), pp. 1123-1142.
- Banerjee, R., & Banerjee, S. (2013). A study of perceived organizational justice, trust, and organizational citizenship behaviour. *IJOSR Journal of Business and Management*, 12(4), pp. 36-43.
- Berraies, S., Ben Yahia, K., & Chaher, M. (2014). Employee empowerment and its importance for trust, innovation, and organizational performance. *Business Management and Strategy*, 5(2), pp. 83-103.
- Bester, J., Stander, M.W., & Van Zyl, L.E. (2015). Leadership empowering behaviour, psychological empowerment, organisational citizenship behaviours and turnover intention in a manufacturing division. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 41(1), pp. 1-14.
- Brower, H.H., Lester, S.W., Korsgaard, M.A., & Dineen, B.R. (2009). A closer look at trust between managers and subordinates: Understanding the effects of both trusting and being trusted on subordinate outcomes. *Journal of Management*, 35(2), pp. 327-347.
- Cambor, M.P., & Alcover, C.M. (2019). Integrating distrust antecedents and consequences in organizational life. *Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 35(1), pp. 17-26.
- Chughtai, A.A., & Buckley, F. (2008). Work engagement and its relationship with state and trait trust: A conceptual analysis. *Journal of Behavioral and Applied Management*, 10(1), pp. 47-71.
- Colquitt, J.A., & Salam, S.C. (2009). Foster trust through ability, benevolence, and integrity. In *Handbook of principles of organizational behavior* (pp. 390-401). United Kingdom.
- Cui, Y., Zhang, X., Peng, X., & Chu, J. (2018). How to use apology and compensation to repair competence-versus integrity-based trust violations in e-commerce. *Electronic Commerce Research and Applications*, 32, pp. 37-48.
- Devlin, J.F., Roy, S.K., & Sekhon, H.S. (2014). The impact of fairness on trustworthiness and trust in banking. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 31(9-10), pp. 996-1017.
- Donada, C., & Nogatchewsky, G. (2007). La confiance dans les relations interentreprises. *Revue Française de Gestion*, 33(175), pp. 111-124.
- Downey, L.A., Roberts, J.B., & Stough, C.K. (2011). Workplace culture, emotional intelligence, and trust in the prediction of workplace outcomes. *International Journal of Business Science and Applied Management*, 6(1), pp. 30-40.

- Einwiller, S. (2003). When reputation engenders trust: An empirical investigation in business-to-consumer electronic commerce. *Electronic Markets*, 13(3), pp. 196-209.
- Engelbrecht, A.S., & Samuel, O.M. (2019). The effect of transformational leadership on intention to quit through perceived organisational support, organisational justice, and trust. *South African Journal of Economic and Management Sciences*, 22(1), pp. 1-8.
- Gillespie, N., & Siebert, S. (2018). Organizational trust repair. In R. Searle, A. Nienaber, & S. Sitkin (Eds.), *The Routledge Companion to Trust* (pp. 284-301). Routledge.
- Harvey, M., Reiche, B.S., & Moeller, M. (2011). Developing effective global relationships through staffing with inpatriate managers: The role of interpersonal trust. *Journal of International Management*, 17(2), pp. 150-161.

Theses

- Fraser, W.L. (2010). *Trust violation and repair: An exploration of the views of work group members* (Doctoral dissertation). Fielding Graduate University.
- Pirson, M. (2007). *Facing the trust gap: Measuring and building trust in organizations* (Doctoral dissertation). Graduate School of Business Administration, Economics, Law and Social Sciences (HSG), University of St. Gallen, Germany.
- Resh, W.G. (2011). *Rethinking the administrative presidency: Trust, intellectual capital, and appointee-careerist relations* (Doctoral dissertation). The Faculty of the School of Public Affairs of American University, Washington.

-Conferences

- Savolainen, T. (2014, November 30). Trust and innovation interplay: How to sustain competitive advantage by leadership. 5th *Innovation and Entrepreneurship International Conference*, Daegu, South Korea.
- Savolainen, T., Ivakko, E., & Ikonen, M. (2017). Trust development in workplace relations during change: A multi-level analysis of narratives from leaders and followers. 5th *International Conference on Management, Leadership and Governance*, University of Witwatersrand Johannesburg, South Africa, pp. 393-400.
- Seeger, A-M., Neben, T., & Heinzl, A. (2017, July 9). Information failures, trust violation, and customer feedback in Web-enabled transactions: The role of causal transparency as a trust repair mechanism. The 25th *European Conference on Information Systems (ECIS)*, Guimarães, Portugal.