Abstract
It has been recognized that there is importance of trust within organizations. There is also a recognized theme that trust must move beyond rational or calculative trust to various forms of social trust. It is clear that in the last several years, issues of trust have become increasingly central to the study of organizations. The findings of the present study indicate that additional processes relating to trust relationships need to be explained and researched. This research is a descriptive and applied one. The Statistic Social in this research is the employees of education organization of Neishabur city. The findings of the present study indicate that between the dimensions of trust, only honesty is good between the employees and Managers and other dimensions of trust don’t have good situation in this organization.
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Introduction

Trust affects all relationships between individuals and groups of individuals. For example, it affects relationships between couples, parents and children, teachers and students, citizens and governments, doctors and patients, school administrators and teachers, and managers and employees. Charlton (2000) sees trust as a non-negotiable – a constant learning process in any relationship and in trusting children to take responsibility (Martins, 2002: 754).

A review of the literature on trust reveals theoretical and empirical gaps regarding treatments of trust in managerial relationships. While the rationale for looking at managerial work from a trust perspective is clearly made, the phenomenon of trust and most particularly, the process of its development in the context of managerial relationships are not yet well explicate (Atkinson & Butcher, 2003: 284).

Definition of Trust

Trust is a multidimensional concept that has been revealed to contain various dimensions that make up the construct. There has been a wide range of publications during the last five decades that propose different dimensions of trust. A selection of these sources in literature is presented in the selection of sources does not pretend to be complete, but demonstrates the multidimensionality of the trust construct that may be considered in the measurement and evaluation of trust in business dyads. In the 1950s, different trust dimensions appeared. For example, Strickland (1958) identifies benevolence as an important ingredient of the trust construct (Svensson, 2005: 415). Various definitions of trust have emerged based on the individual researcher’s disciplinary focus, for instance: Belief that those on whom we depend will meet our expectations of them. There is inspiring trust in the leader and what he/she is trying to accomplish – as well as the leader trusting other people to do what needs to be done. Leaders need to be congruent and ethical in word and deed. The willingness of a party to be vulnerable to the actions of another party based on the expectation that the other will perform a particular action important to the trustor, irrespective of the ability to monitor or control that other party (Martins, 2002: 757-760). Trust is the extent to which one is willing to ascribe good intentions to and have confidence in the words and actions of other people (Cook and Wall, 1980). Trust is a state involving confident positive expectations about another’s motives with respect to oneself in situations entailing risk (Boon and Holmes, 1991). Trust is the extent to which a person is confident in, and willing to act on the basis of, the words, actions and
decisions, of another (McAllister, 1995). Trust is the specific expectation that an others actions will be beneficial rather than detrimental and the generalized ability to take for granted a vast array of features of the social order (Creed and Miles, 1996). Trust is Confident positive expectations regarding another’s conduct in a context of risk (Lewicki et al., 1998). Trust reflects an expectation or belief that the other party will act benevolently (Whitener et al., 1998) and trust is a psychological state comprising the intention to accept vulnerability to another based upon positive expectations of the intentions or behavior of another (Rousseau et al., 1998; Dietz & Den Hartog, 2006).

**Dimensions of Trust**

McCole (2002) argues that the trust literature reveals ten dimensions of the construct in relationships, such as availability, competence, consistency, discreteness, fairness, integrity, loyalty, openness, promise fulfillment, and receptivity. The selection of trust dimensions in the illustrated dimensions may tentatively be categorized according to the conceptual framework of trust dimensions developed by Swan et al. (1985) and Swan and Trawick (1987). Their conceptual framework of trust is based upon five dimensions, namely: reliability, honesty, competence, orientation, and friendliness. The illustrated trust dimensions are categorized according to their developed conceptual framework as follows: (Svensson, 2005: 419)

- **Reliability**: availability, confidence, consistency, faith, loyalty, predictability, promise fulfillment, respect, and security.
- **Honesty**: fairness, motivation to lie, and openness of management.
- **Competence**: ability, character, expertness, discreteness and integrity.
- **Orientation**: altruism, business sense and judgment, congruence, intentions, motives and receptivity.
- **Friendliness**: acceptance, benevolence, and liking.

**Different Qualitative Degrees of Trust**

Though these are usually used to depict trust being derived from different sources, we agree that the terms can also be used to describe different types of trust experience. The first degree, “deterrence-based trust”, does not comply with the definition we use here. There is no positive expectation of goodwill and only through the threat of external sanctions and force is the expectation of compliance guaranteed; there is effectively no risk and no probabilities to consider. Rather than reflecting trust, it is a manifestation of distrust. Nor, too, can “calculus-based” trust
is considered real trust in this sense since, as the name suggests, trust is only considered a worthwhile strategy on the basis of a strict cost-benefit analysis, but a deep a priori suspicion of the other remains. Moreover, the decisive evidence is likely to come from sources other than the trustee. Between “calculus-based” trust and “knowledge-based” trust a threshold is crossed when suspicions recede to be replaced by positive expectations based on confident knowledge about the other party, including their motives, abilities and reliability. As these expectations are vindicated by experience, more powerful degrees of trust may be developed. The much stronger confidence in the other party that is depicted in “relational-based trust”, it is more subjective and emotional in nature. It is derived more from the quality of the relationship over time than from observation of the other party's specific behaviors. Creed and Miles (1996) make a comparable distinction between the trustee's “characteristics”, and “process-based” evidence. Lastly, the overwhelming affection and complete unity of purpose described in “identification-based trust. McAllister (1995) has represented trust evaluations as being either cognitive-based (i.e. informed by the kind of careful evaluation discussed above) or affective-based (i.e. informed more by emotional responses to the other party). He argues that a minimum level of cognition-based trust is necessary for affective forms to materialize. Rousseau et al. (1998) and Williams (2001) interpret the former as covering “calculus-based” and “knowledge-based trust”, while the latter corresponds more to “relational-based” and “identification-based” trust (Dietz & Den Hartog, 2006: 570 - 580).

Figure 1: The continuum of degrees of intra-organizational trust
(Dietz & Den Hartog, 2006: 570 - 580)
**Trust Models**

Research done during 1995/1996 by the Center of Industrial and Organizational Psychology at the University of South Africa (Unisa) into the possible antecedents of trust (or mistrust) led to the assumption that trust within companies is probably created by personal factors and managerial practices. The “big five” personality aspects were measured by means of the adapted “big five” questionnaire. The “big five” personality aspects can be described as follows:

- **Conscientiousness.** This includes traits such as being organized and hardworking as well as dependable, trustworthy and responsible.
- **Agreeableness.** This reflects being liked, courteous, good-natured, cooperative, forgiving and soft-hearted.
- **Emotional stability.** This reflects the absence of anxiety, depression, anger, worry and insecurity.
- **Resourcefulness (openness to experience).** This reflects imaginativeness, creativeness, broad-mindedness and intelligence.
- **Extraversion.** This reflects sociability, cheerfulness, talkativeness and activity.

A more pragmatic approach was followed in regard to managerial practices. Interviews were conducted with more than 100 employees to establish what managers and supervisors can do to enhance trust in their organization. These responses were operationalized by compiling a questionnaire with items related to the presence of managerial practices which enhance trust within an organization. A sample of 475 employees from six companies participated in the preliminary analysis of the proposed model. The managerial aspects were measured by the following managerial dimensions:

- **Credibility.** This includes a willingness to listen, consider proposals, and allow others the freedom to express feelings, tolerate mistakes and ensure that employees enjoy prestige and credibility in the organization.
- **Team management.** This dimension refers to the effective management of team and individual goal accomplishments and the handling of conflict within groups.
- **Information sharing.** This dimension indicates willingness to give individual feedback on performance and to reveal company-related information in an honest manner.
- **Work support.** This dimension deals with willingness to support employees when necessary and to provide job-related information for the accomplishment of objectives (Martins, 2002: 757 - 760).
Figure 2. The “big five” and managerial practices (Martins, 2002: 757-760)

**Methodology**

This research is a descriptive and applied research. The numbers of employees that work in the education organization of Neishabur city are about 115 persons but by using the formula of limited society, we select and sample about 82 person of them.

The basic instrument in this research is questionnaire. For giving kronbakh coefficient of this questionnaire, we use of SPSS software that is 0/9147 and means that this questionnaire is good.

**Reliability Analysis-Scale (Alpha)**

Reliability Coefficients

\[
\text{Alpha} = 0 / 9147
\]

**Friedman Test**

By using of Friedman Test, we can rank dimensions of Trust between the employees and Managers. Following table shows this ranking:
### Ranks & Mean Rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Honesty</td>
<td>4/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>3/96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>3/71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendliness</td>
<td>3/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>3/11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Test Statistics

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>17/167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-square</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0/004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp sig</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0/004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### T-Test

The consideration of this test shows that, only dimension of Honesty is good between the employees and Managers and other dimensions don’t have good situation in this organization.

### One-Sample Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>2/4000</td>
<td>0/811</td>
<td>0/137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendliness</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>2/29</td>
<td>0/74</td>
<td>0/126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>2/600</td>
<td>0/88</td>
<td>0/149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>2/500</td>
<td>0/88</td>
<td>0/129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honesty</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>2/714</td>
<td>0/85</td>
<td>0/145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### One-Sample Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>-4/37</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>0/000</td>
<td>-0/600</td>
<td>-0/88 -0/32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendliness</td>
<td>-3/138</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>0/011</td>
<td>-0/44</td>
<td>-0/73 -0/157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>-2/67</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>0/011</td>
<td>-0/400</td>
<td>-0/704 -0/096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>-3/138</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>0/004</td>
<td>-0/44</td>
<td>-0/73 -0/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honesty</td>
<td>-1/96</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>0/58</td>
<td>-0/285</td>
<td>-0/58 0/0097</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusion

The subject of Trust is a basic factor for organizational development. Trust is an attitude that is relative to the job and in the past decade many research is done about it.

It has been recognized that there is importance of trust within organizations. There is also a recognized theme that trust must move beyond rational or calculative trust to various forms of social trust. Trust is a very important factor in organizational management, that lack of it makes many charges for the organization and this subject is a basic factor for organizational development. Despite significant theoretical work over the past decade, the phenomenon of trust and its development in managerial relationships remains elusive in theory and practice. We have argued that the pursuit of scientific clarity has clouded the concept of trust with confusing and distracting conclusions that do not necessarily accord with the reality of trust experienced in lay practice (Atkinson & Butcher, 2003: 300).

The findings of the present study indicate that additional processes relating to trust relationships need to be explained and researched. The findings of the present study indicate that between the dimensions of trust, only honesty is good between the employees and managers. Honesty is telling the truth and is straightforward conduct. In the relation between managers and employees, a harmful truth is better than a useful lie and Honesty is the best policy.

Other dimensions of trust for example, Competence and orientation, don’t have good situation in the education organization of Neishabur city.

each level of responsibility has its own requirements, competence can occur in any period of a person’s life or at any stage of his or her career. (Managers should point Competence).

New employee orientation effectively integrates the new employee into organization and assists with retention, motivation, job satisfaction, and quickly enabling each individual to become contributing members of the work team (Managers should point orientation).

Managers should perform and maintain the functions in routine circumstances, as well as hostile or unexpected circumstances (Managers should point reliability).
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