TRUSTING IN BUSINESS NETWORKS

Morten Boesen[1]
Zealand Institute of Business and Technology, Denmark

Mette Apollo Rasmussen[2]
Roskilde University, Denmark

ABSTRACT

Among others, trust and its impact on business relationships have been one of the dimensions that researchers associated with the IMP group have studied both conceptual and empirically. However, previous research has mainly studied trust as a rather static explanatory background variable that influence how business relationships develop. This paper aims at establishing a more dynamic and interaction-oriented understanding of how trust is built and maintained by interacting actors engaging in business relationships. Hence, this paper explores the research question: "*How is trusting developed through interactions in business networks?*". We use the trust literature to qualify the understanding of trust from an interactive perspective. The concept of trusting is explored empirically by analyzing observational data from three business promotion networks. The main findings are that trusting is shaped based on episodes of interactions involving three antecedents of trust: ability-based, benevolence-based and integrity-based trust.

Key words: Business relationships, trust, business interactions

INTRODUCTION

Both in research and in practice there has recently been an increasing focus on how businesses can benefit from developing relationships with each other. Specifically, researchers associated with the IMP group are concerned about the activities that occur between instead of within businesses. This 'interaction approach' (Håkansson 1982) to industrial marketing emphasize the significance of managing relationships with other companies as central in explaining success or failure in today's highly competitive business landscape (Ford and Håkansson 2006). Within and outside IMP research trust has for several reasons often been portrayed as a fundamental business relationship variable. Where previous research have identified trust as an important structural variable explaining success or failure in developing business relationships, it remains unclear how trust is formed and shaped by actors through ongoing interaction processes. The purpose of this paper is to investigate the research question: "*How is trusting developed through interactions in business networks?*". Focusing on trusting instead of trust highlights the processual, dynamic and interactive features of building and maintaining trust.

The paper begins with a review of the IMP literature on business relationships and networks followed by the trust literature. Then, the research method based on three cases is presented. Thereafter, the cases are analyzed to identify and discuss how trusting is developed and how this affects our understanding on business relationships and networks. The paper ends with a conclusion.

---

[1] Assistant professor Morten Boesen, PhD, Zealand Institute of Business and Technology, Lyngvej 19, 4600 Køge. Email: mobo@easj.dk

[2] Research assistant Mette Apollo Rasmussen, PhD, Roskilde University, Universitetsvej 1, 4000 Roskilde. Email: apollo@ruc.dk

TRUST IN IMP RESEARCH

For the last few decades, researchers associated with the IMP group have explored business relationships from a relational rather than the traditional transactional perspective. Hence, IMP researchers emphasize the importance of studying the processes between interacting businesses instead of the processes within individual businesses as the central business activities. Several models such as 'the interaction model' (Håkansson 1982) and "the ARA model" (Håkansson and Johanson 1992) have been developed to address some key issues to include when studying business relationships empirically. However, the actor dimension and how actors act during interactions is often neglected. Thus, researchers have called for more systematically and detailed studies from an interactive perspective (Esbjerg 2011; Håkansson et al. 2009; La Rocca 2011). Trust is a factor, which have also received some attention within IMP research. Morgan and Hunt (1994) finds that commitment and trust are two critical variables for successful relational exchanges. In the same vein, Takala and Uusitalo (1996) identifies trust as a main factor in long-term business relationships. Following this, Dwyer, Schurr, and Oh (1987) finds that trust is critical particularly in the initial development phase of business relationships. Huemer and Boström (2007) made a comparative study of the relationship between trust and distrust. Also in the above-mentioned models, trust is portrayed as a critical dimension in business relationships. Although trust have received some attention, the studies are mainly concerned with trust as a structural factor or variable playing upon the interaction process or relational exchange between business actors (Axelsson 2010). To understand how actors in business relationships develop and maintain trust through ongoing interactions we need to look into the most recent develop of the trust literature which emphasize the more process-oriented, dynamic and interactive features of trusting.

FROM TRUST TO TRUSTING

Bringing people together in business networks and making participation valuable is far from being a simple task. The business networks of study are considered as context where participants can *"engage in extensive signaling, communication, interaction and interpretation in order to maintain the continuous process of trust constitution"* (Möllering 2006). The trust literature provides strong arguments for, that trusting relationships lead to increased knowledge sharing (Dirks and Ferrin 2001; Levin et al. 2002; Mayer et al. 1995) creates a willingness to share, listen and absorb (Tsai, et al., 1998), (Zand, 1972), (Mayer et al., 1995), supports the dynamic organizing practice and facilitates cooperation in and between members of organizations (Adler, Hechscher, and Prusak 2011; Dirks and Ferrin 2001; van Ees and Bachmann 2006; Huotari 2004). In general, it is recognized that the trust-based organizing practices creates transparent decision making processes based on open and honest communication and increases organizational learning based on knowledge sharing (Covey 2006; Jagd 2008). Therefore, when relationships in business networks are embedded with trust, the transfer and development of knowledge is more likely to be smooth, effective and valuable. Hence, trust is considered important for business networks and clusters (Bøllingtoft et al. 2012). Trust is studied as a phenomenon that is formed and developed within relationships, and which becomes a special characteristic of relationships formed by parties involved. While there is a number of definitions and conceptualizations of trust, most definitions seems to have a common conceptual core focusing toward (mutual) expectations (Blomqvist and Snow 2010; Dirks and Ferrin 2001; Ellonen, Blomqvist, and Puumalainen 2008; Jagd 2008; Kramer and Lewicki 2010; Luhmann 1999; Mayer et al. 1995; Möllering 2006).

Mayer, Davis, and Schoorman (1995) propose that trust is *"the willingness of a party to be vulnerable to the actions of another party based on the expectations that the other will perform a particular action important to the trustor, irrespective of the ability to monitor or control the other party"*. Whereas Rousseau et al. (1998) describe that, trust *"is a psychological state comprising the intention to accept vulnerability based upon positive expectations of the intention or behaviors of another"*. Lewicki, McAllister, and Bies (1998) suggest that trust is based on "*confident positive expectations*. Common for all, is that they establish trust as a relational phenomenon based on expectations. Hence, trust is not considered as a substance that can be disabled, but rather a term for describing the conditions that the parties engage in and *"The level of trust will evolve as the parties interact"* (Mayer et al. 1995). In general, it can be argued, that trust is formed among participants in business networks and can be defined as mutual positive expectations about participants intentions and actions. Even though trust has been researched within many traditions, trust as a social dynamic mechanism in networks still needs to be

unfolded. To do so, we apply the framework of Mayer el al. (1995) who has identified "ability", "benevolence" and "integrity" as antecedents of trust. When deciding whether to trust, the trustee will make assessments of the other party when it comes to ability, benevolence, and integrity: *"Trust for a trustee will be a function of the trustee´s perceived ability, benevolence, and integrity and of the trustor's propensity to trust"* (Mayer et al. 1995).

These antecedents of trust are attributions in the trust relationship, attributions that vary independently and thereby establish the variation and development in the trust relationship.

Ability-based trust is linked to competences and thus relevant in order to establish collaboration. Because the outcome of the collaboration is depended on that participants have relevant expertise to unfold and that they can influence the practice; *"You have relevant expertise and can be depended upon to know what you are talking about"* (Abrams et al. 2003). It is a quite specific antecedent because the actor can be competent in one area, but without education or experience in another area. For example, if collaborators are to trust one another, they must trust each other's abilities to share knowledge in a competent way in order to gain from the collaboration.

Benevolence-based trust derives from the belief that participants in a collaboration cares about one another and thus will act in ways that are in the participant's best interest; *"You care about me and take an interest in my well-being and goal"* (Abrams et al. 2003). Benevolence as described by Mayer et al (1995) define a connotation that focuses on that the trustor in this understanding ignores own profiting and focuses on a common goal. Characteristics that has much in common with the antecedents for trust described in theorizing of collaborative community (Adler, Hechscher, and Prusak 2011).

Integrity-based trust derives from the established social order between the collaborative partners. The integrity-based trust is based on how the individual*"adheres to a set of principles that the trustor find acceptable"* (Mayer et al. 1995). Thus, integrity can vary depending on what principles the social order is based on, in the given context.

According to Mayer, Davis, and Schoorman (1995), the three above mentioned antecedents for trust are connected indicators for how the trustee is seen as trustworthy. Summarizing, the above-mentioned antecedents are attributes that stimulates trust and thus collaboration.

METHODOLOGY

The data for this paper consist of episodes unfolded in three particular business networks of study (Apollo Rasmussen 2016). Data are collected in two different locations but all three networks are situated in Region Zealand, Denmark. The three networks might differ in focus and value for their participants but all three networks have in common that participants are trying to solve (mutual) challenges based on activities in the networks.

All three studies have been conducted as longitudinal studies using participant observations of steering group meetings and workshops as primary data collection technique. The observation technique was suitable for capturing how the participants managed to build trust through interactions at the observed meetings (Borch and Arthur 1995). The observation was documented inspired by 'rich descriptions' (Geertz 1973) and was made into narratives suitable for analysing how trusting appears in interactions. The observational data was supplemented by interviews. The data was coded using the 'temporal bracketing strategy' (Langley 1999), identifying specific episodes in the data material which represents the three forms of trusting discussed in the previous section.

Because our study aims to contribute to trust in interorganizational networks, we define episodes here as changes in expectations negotiated in interactions. The challenge here is to define episodes capturing signification interactions and the consequences and separating them out. We do this by zooming in (Nicolini 2009) on micro-levels actions in the network where participants mutually negotiate network expectations and further analyze how these actions contribute to trusting (Hansen, Bosse, and Apollo Rasmussen 2016). By applying temporal bracketing, we give longitudinal depth to the analysis and show how various trusting episodes in the three network unfold over time.

Description of the Transport & Logistics network
The network was established in August 2016 aiming at facilitating collaboration among its members around the latest trend in the industry. The members are managing directors from transport and logistics companies in the Region of Zealand as well as represents from various business promotion institutions.

The first years of activities was financed by the Region of Zealand. The activities include steering meetings workshops, mini conferences, company visits and open labs.

Description of the CSR network
The network was established April 2012. The CSR network was established with the purpose of stimulating and supporting local business development in a new and more dynamic way. The reason for applying CSR as focus was primarily the increased demand for CSR profiles within the public sector and in larger building projects. To develop the network and to support the network with knowledge, a steering group was established.

Description of the network of Managing Directors
The network started October 2012 and was closed down in 2015. The members are Managing Directors from various businesses in a medium sized municipality in Region Zealand.
The purpose of the network was twofold: First, the municipality had an interested in getting to know the managing directors for the larger companies better, and secondly, the managing directors seemed to have in interest in getting together in order to discuss mutual experienced challenges.

Network	Transport and Logistics	CSR	Managing Directors
No of participants	Approx 20	Approx 20	Approx 11
Participants work level	Managing directors and business promotion stakeholders	Middle Managers, HR Assistants, consultants	Managing Directors
Organized by	Steering group and facilitator	Steering Group and facilitator	Facilitator
Organized round	Challenges related to transport and logistics	Topic based related to CSR	Mutual learning processes
Meetings interval	Every second month	Every 6 weeks	Every month

ANALYSIS

The analysis is structured based on specific episodes from the three networks. Hence, each episode is analyzed separately by bringing in examples from the empirical data and analyzing it using the three forms of trusting; ability-based, benevolence-based and integrity-based trusting.

Episode from the CSR network
This narrative describes an episode from the CSR network where the facilitator proposes to divide the CSR network into two workshop groups for the rest of the meeting. The facilitator suggest that participants, in two groups, discuss and present their individual CSR work / profile. However, the participants turndown the facilitator's proposal. Especially one participant, Rasmus is not satisfied with the program for the meeting. Rasmus wants all participants to be together to share their work and reflections. He wants to be able to share and gain knowledge from all his new CSR companions. Most participants agree with Rasmus. They refuse to be divided into two groups. Participant Lars says"*I am curious about the others' work and I don't want to miss out on any knowledge sharing*". Finally, the facilitator changes the agenda for the day, while she realizes that all participants agree and want to stay together. Participants finds that knowledge has to be shared equally in plenum if they are to learn from one another and develop new relations.

This episode illustrates participants' awareness of the importance of getting to know one another through interactions. It shows how participants have a need for developing relationships where they can challenge their own understandings of CSR. Furthermore, it shows how benevolence-based trust is developed through joint actions when participants engage with one another and mutually develop new understandings related to the specific topic they are together to unfold.

The following episode is from a meeting where CSR network participants are presenting their individual work with CSR profiles. Participants from the steering group have encouraged participants to present their CSR profiles in plenum. Irene grasps the opportunity of presenting her CSR work. Irene has done a lot of work on her company's CSR profile and she is willing to share her reflections upon the work but also to share and pose challenging questions.

Later on in an interview, Irene explained how she had been feeling insecure when participating in network meetings, due to lack of knowledge of participants and the CSR topic. It had taken her quite some time to feel secure enough to present her work on the CSR profile. Irene was under the impression that interaction processes, supported by the facilitator, getting participants to socialize and share knowledge, had done a lot of difference. In general, Irene had experienced that network participants were more willing to share knowledge because they seemed to have found a form or a structure for the meetings that seems to work.

Another participant Signe elaborate on "getting to know each other" when she was interviewed: *If you don't show up on a regular basis, people sit thinking, 'Who are they?' They can't develop a trusting relationship. I think trust is developed when we meet on a regular basis, and then it becomes possible to use one another in different ways*. Irene as well as Signe acknowledge that they feel insecure until they get to know each other.

These episodes show how ability-based trust is linked to the specific context - or topic. Ability-based trust seems to build up when participants have the relevant knowledge to share. At the same time, it also shows that both trustee and trustor has to build up the ability to feel trustworthy. At the same time, the episodes show how trust is built up over time, and that trust based on benevolence is central because it takes time to get to the point where you are capable of both sharing and giving. Thus, lack of benevolence-based trust is a major challenge when trying to facilitate sharing and discussion of knowledge in networks.

Episodes from Managing Directors network
The following episode highlight a general challenge in the Managing Directors Networks about lack of participation. At this meeting, only five participants have shown up. This troubles not only the facilitator but also the present participants. Therefore, the meeting starts with a discussion of why participants do not show up at the meetings. The facilitator has received cancellations from participants not present. She does not consider it as lack of interest of participation. The present participants discuss that they are not always in control of their calendars because of international meetings, board meetings, etc. The present participants agree that they will still prioritize participation.

A feeling of being let down among the participants is observed, and even though participants agree to the "calendar excuse", it shows that not all participants prioritize participation equally and it becomes a challenge to develop a relationship based on trust.

From this episode, it stands out that there is a feeling of being let down present and this relates to motivation of participation in the network or even the commitment to a common best. Participants seem to prioritize other activities and this influences their activities in the network and thus, how trust develops. Integrity establishes and maintain social but needs to be created in collaboration based on the individual's commitment. Trust based on integrity seems to be challenged here when participants do not show up at the meetings. As discussed before, participants do find ability important but they do not relate to other participants pure based on ability. Integrity, understood as following the social orders or norms established in the network are of great concern for the participants. Further, this challenges the benevolence-based trust since participants experience that some participants do not adhere to the common goal but prioritize their own way and winning instead.

During an interview participant, Ole told how he through participation in the Network for Managing Directors had become aware that a couple of the other participants worked with LEAN. It turned out,

that these two companies were way ahead of Ole´s company in regards of LEAN and after a network meeting he had contacted one of the the managing Directors. They had met up and it had given Ole knowledge and inspiration about LEAN that he had been searching for. Ole explained that it might not as such be the interactions taking place in the meetings that matters the most, but it is the relationships that become valuable. Ole explained how he at first was doubtful about value of participation in network but he has experienced that: *"At each company I have been inspired. Relations have been developed, and we are identifying mutual topics of interest. In that sense it [the network] creates value. Leadership challenges can be solved in the network but not until trust is present because you expose yourself when you share knowledge"*.

This episode show how trust changes and develops over time. First of all, network participants have to get to know each other and ability-based trust will develop when participants share their knowledge. Ability-based trust seems to be related to the specific context and will change according to knowledge needed. Secondly, it becomes apparent that due to time spent together, participants come to know one another and they take care of each other by sharing and solving challenges in a way that does not indulge self-interest.

Episodes from transport and logistics network
The following episodes stems from the start-up meeting where transport and logistics companies are invited to join the network. Prior to this meeting, the steering group had met only a few times mainly to plan the activities and themes to be dealt with in the network. The purpose with the start-up meeting was to introduce the potential members of the network to the background and organization of the network as well as four focus themes (sustainability, automation, combi transport and supplier relationships). During the meeting, the atmosphere gets tenser. Although the facilitator of the meeting several times tries to involve the participant in the discussion, it seems like the participants have difficulties relating to the agenda. Suddenly, a participant suggests: *"We need to network instead of all this"*. Another participant supports this: *"Yeah, you are talking about trips here, there and everywhere. I would actually very much like to know who I am along with"*. The assembly agreed to stop the facilitator's presentation and socialize instead. A participant concludes: *"Let's eat some of that nice looking apple pie, talk to each other and see which challenges each of us are dealing with and find out how we can exploit [ironically] each other"*.

The episode illustrates how ability and benevolence-based trust are formed through interactions. The ability-based trust is demonstrated because the episode is from the initial phase of building up the relationship where the purpose of the network is negotiated by bringing in the participant's different domains. Moreover, the episode illustrates the need for establishing benevolence-based trust as the participants articulate their need for better knowledge about each other's motives. This illustrates that the creation of ability and benevolence-based trust is a prerequisite for the network to proceed to the next phase of its development.

This next episode is from the first steering group meeting after the start-up meeting. To make the network's activities more user-driven, some of the managing directors from the transport and logistic companies have joined the steering group. The steering group mainly consists of people with a higher education working as business promotion consultants in various organizations and people from research institutions who are all having an academic approach to the network. The users, now represented in the steering group, have a more low-practical attitude to the network's activities. At the meeting, several issues are discussed with potential value for the users. Some are talking about how innovation can create more growth companies, infrastructural challenges, digitalization, branding, positioning relative to other competitive regions etc. These challenges seem interesting but also quite complex and political. Suddenly, enough is enough for one of the users represented in the steering group: *"I don't want to be a party spoiler but what are you trying to make up here? I find it very difficult to see the world from your point of view. For me it seems like you are inventing theoretical problems that we, the companies never knew we had!"*. In the same vein, another participant challenges the basic idea with the network and adds: *"Does anyone really have a problem or is your only motivation to get some employments financed?"*.

The episode illustrates lack of ability-based and benevolence-based trust. It is clear that the two groups represented in the steering group; the users and the facilitators are talking from two different domains. Hence, the friction between the academic domain and low-practical domain illustrate a challenge for the

6

participants to build ability-based trust through their interactions. The last comment in the described episode indicates a lack of benevolence-based trust as the facilitators are accused for acting based on egocentric motives.

CONCLUSIONS AND MANAGERIAL IMPLICATIONS

Overall, the analysis revealed how trusting in the three business networks developed from a more dynamic, processual and interaction-based perspective than what is currently offered by the analysis made in the IMP literature. Hence, the analysis focused on how trusting is developed and created through social interactions among the actors participating in the network's activities. In the analysis we demonstrated how trusting was shaped based on episodes of interactions involving the three antecedents of trust; ability-based, benevolence-based and integrity-based trust. Even though the three antecedents of trust are described as separate constructs the empirical data illustrate that all three constructs must be enacted and developed simultaneously in order to create trusting relationships in the networks. It seems like the three constructs develop in a circular and crisscross manner and that they must do so in order to develop trusting long-term relationships. Furthermore, the three constructs explain trust in relationships based on the interdependent variation among ability-, benevolence- and integrity-based trust. This also means that the perceived trustworthiness, based on these three constructs, influences how collaboration in networks develops.

The managerial implications of the paper is that trust is not just a structural and static phenomenon, which can be hard to cope with. The consequence of the dynamic, processual and interaction-based approach to trust is that managers can actually influence how trust is shaped and maintained in business relationships. Managers can support the development of trust by promoting ability-based, benevolence-based and integrity-based elements of trust in the interactions with other business partners.

REFERENCE LIST

Abrams, Lisa C, Rob Cross, Eric Lesser, and Daniel Z Levin (2003), "Nurturing interpersonal trust in knowledge-sharing networks.," *Academy of Management Executive*, 17 (4).

Adler, Paul, Charles Hechscher, and Laurence Prusak (2011), "Building a Collaborative Enterprise," Harward Business Review.

Apollo Rasmussen, Mette (2016), *Facilitating value co-creation in networks. An empirical analysis of business networks in Ringsted Municipality*, Roskilde.

Axelsson, Björn (2010), "Business Relationships and Networks: Reflections on the IMP tradition," *The IMP Journal*, 4 (1), 3–30.

Blomqvist, Kirsimaja and Charles C. Snow (2010), "High-performance trust in the global knowledge economy," in *High-performance trust in the global knowledge economy*, Madrid, 1–21.

Borch, O. J. and M. B. Arthur (1995), "Strategic networks among small firms: Implications for strategy research methodology," *Journal of Management Studies*, 32, 419–41.

Bøllingtoft, Anne, Lex Donaldson, George P. Huber, Dorthe Døjbak Håkonsson, and Charles C. Snow (2012), *Collaborative Communities of Firms. Purpose, Process, and Design*, New York: Springer.

Covey, Stephen M.R. (2006), *The SPEED of Trust: The One Thing that Changes Everything*, Simon and Schuster.

Dirks, Kurt T. and Donald L. Ferrin (2001), "The Role of Trust in Organizational Settings," *Organization Science*, 12 (4), 450–67.

Dwyer, Robert F., Poul H. Schurr, and Sejo Oh (1987), "Developing Buyer-Seller Relationships," *Journal of Marketing*, 51 (2), 11–27.

van Ees, H. and R. Bachmann (2006), "Transition economies and trust building: a network perspective on EU enlargement," *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 30 (6), 923–39.

Ellonen, Riikka, Kirsimarja Blomqvist, and Kaisu Puumalainen (2008), "The role of trust in organisational innovativeness," *European Journal of Innovation Management*, 11 (2),

160–81.

Esbjerg, Lars (2011), "Relationally-responsive interaction in business," in *27th IMP conferenceonference*, Atlanta, 1–19.

Ford, David and Håkan Håkansson (2006), "The Idea of Interaction," *The IMP Journal*, 1 (1), 4–20.

Geertz, Clifford (1973), *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays*, Basic Books.

Hansen, Uffe Kjærgaard, Maria Bosse, and Mette Apollo Rasmussen (2016), "Expectations Matter When Studying Trusting as a Process: Developing Trust Based on Expectations Between Investment Managers and Entrepreneurs," in *Trust, organizations and social interaction: studying trust as process within and between organizations*, S. Jagd and L. Fuglsang, eds., Cheltenham: Elgar, 209–30.

Huemer, Lars and Gert-Olof Boström (2007), "Is control expressed distrust ?," in *23rd IMP conference*, Manchester.

Huotari, Maija-leena (2004), "Managing Knowledge- Based Organizations Through Trust," *Trust in Knowledge Management and Systems in Organizations*, (M. Huotari Maija-Leena Iivonen, ed.), 1–29.

Håkansson, Håkan (1982), *International Marketing and Purchasing of Industrial Goods: An Interaction Approach*, Chichester: John Wiley and Sons.

———, David Ford, Lars-Erik Gadde, Ivan Snehota, and Alexandra Waluszewski (2009), *Business in Networks*, Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.

——— and Jan Johanson (1992), "A model of industrial networks," in *Industrial Networks: A New View of Reality*, B. Axelsson and G. Easton, eds., London and New York: Routledge, 28–34.

Jagd, S. (2008), "Tillidsbaseret ledelse: En ny udfordring for ledere?," in *Leadership*.

Kramer, Roderick M. and Roy J. Lewicki (2010), "Repairing and Enhancing Trust: Approaches to Reducing Organizational Trust Deficits," *The Academy of Management Annals*, 4 (1), 245–77.

Langley, Ann (1999), "Strategies for Theorizing from Process Data," *Academy of Management Journal*, 24 (4), 691–710.

Levin, D.Z., Rob Cross, L.C. Abrams, and E.L. Lesser (2002), "Trust and knowledge sharing: A critical combination," *IBM Institute for Knowledge-Based Organizations*, 1–9.

Lewicki, R O Y J, DANIEL J. McAllister, and Robert J Bies (1998), "Trust and Distrust : New Relationships and Realities," *Academy of Management Review*, 23 (3), 438–58.

Luhmann, Niklas (1999), *Tillid : - en mekanisme til reduktion af social kompleksitet*, Reitzel.

Mayer, Roger C., James H. Davis, and David F. Schoorman (1995), "An Integrative Model of Organizational Trust," *Academy of Management*, 20 (3), 709–34.

———, David F. Schorrman, James H. Davis, and F David Schoorman (1995), "An integration model of organizational trust," *Management*, 20 (3), 709–34.

Morgan, Robert M. and Shelby D. Hunt (1994), "The Commitment-Trust Theory of Relationship Marketing," *Journal of Marketing*, 58 (3), 20–38.

Möllering, Guido (2006), *Trust: reason, routine, reflexivity*, Emerald Group Publishing.

Nicolini, Davide (2009), "Zooming in and out: Studying practices by switching theoretical lenses and trailing connections," *Organization Studies*, 30 (12), 1391–1418.

La Rocca, Antonella (2011), "Interaction and actors identities in business relationships," Università della Svizzera Italiana, Lugano.

Rousseau, Denise M, Sim B Sitkin, Ronald S Burt, and Colin Camerer (1998), "Not so different after all : A cross-discipline view of trust," *Management*.

Takala, Tuomo and Outi Uusitalo (1996), "An alternative view of relationship marketing: a framework for ethical analysis," *European Journal of Marketing*, 30 (2), 45–60.