

Research Article

Management of Natural Resources and Impact on the Environment

Afrim Selimaj[†] and Adem Dreshaj^{*†}

[†]Universiteti Haxhi Zeka Peja, Kosovo

Accepted 05 March 2015, Available online 15 March 2015, Vol.5, No.2 (April 2015)

Abstract

The opinions and views expressed in this article are the views and opinions of the authors, there are those approved by the Kosovo government. Accuracy does not need to rely on it and should be independently verified with primary sources of information. It will not be liable for any loss, actions, claims, proceedings, costs, expenses, damages and other liabilities caused arising directly or indirectly from use. Can be used for research, teaching and private study purposes. Terms and conditions of access and use multidimensional, uniting large enterprises. This article represents an attempt to break down the concept of trust in its constituent parts. In an effort to reorganize the theory of trust, in a powerful and practical way for joint management of natural resources. We describe four forms of belief and collaborative natural resource management: a) trust dispositional, b) rational belief, c) affinitive faith, and d) procedural faith. By describing the various forms of belief, ancestors and their potential consequences for the joint management of natural resources, we aim to provide a useful lesson and stable framework for use by researchers and practitioners in human dimensions of management natural resources.

Keywords: Cooperative management organizations, planning, theory, and faith.

Entry

Union of large enterprises has historically been repeatedly identified as an important element of the multiple forms of processes of natural resource management and economic results. Non-commercial reuse, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, with original working conditions properly attributed and not altered, transformed, or built in any way, that is allowed. The belief held by members of the community to natural resource agencies has also been shown to increase public approval requirements for management decisions and minimize resistance efforts. Studies from multiple disciplines have identified trust as important co-factor in the resolution of conflicts, and enhanced performance of the group in different contexts. The concept of faith, however, is operationalized in many ways, sometimes contradictory, in all literatures natural resources. No single perspective chapters in complexity and subjectivity of faith in the context of natural resource management. For example, the difference between social trust and rational, defining social trust that is based on the perception of shared values, identities, and experiences with a potential Trustees, and as rational belief based on the evaluation of expected results an organizational

relationship. Some statistical analyzes suggest that multiple dimensions of trust can be difficult to separate from each other and support one-dimensional interpretation, at least in the case of public trust to a government agency.

The importance of trust as an essential ingredient for effective management of natural resources and particularly for collaborative efforts, has been known for more than two decades in the field of natural resources. Theory of confidence remains to research in this context, when compared with other areas, including the management of natural resources. One exception is that the literature of Smith and other scientists of the year (2013), who shared the concept of trust in the dimensions of faith dispositional, trust in government, shared values, and moral and technical competencies. Our conceptualization differs somewhat from that, Smith and his colleagues offer a more general framework for understanding belief in collaborative contexts in natural resource management. By identifying different forms of belief and their possible consequences for the joint management of natural resources, we hope to provide a useful lesson and stable framework for use by researchers and practitioners in human dimensions of natural resource management.

*Corresponding author: Adem Dreshaj

Union of large enterprises and the components of trust

Theory of uniting large enterprises (trust or), can be conceptualized in many ways, but most definitions coalesce around the idea that faith is a psychological state in which an actor (trust or) accepts infringement form, based on positive expectations of the intentions or behavior of another, despite the uncertainties inherent in this expectation. Hardin (2002) describes faith as a tripartite relationship in which the entity believes an entity (b) to make the action (c). In other words, trust is the specific context that has to do with a trust or (one unit), a trustee (entity b) and possible action (action c).

The administrator trustee may take the form of an individual, a process, an object, an organization, or institution. In the context of natural resource management based on natural potentials can take several identities

- They may be organizations, such as the managing authority;
- Individuals, such as a park superintendent, a planning officer or a representative of an environmental non-profit organization;
- Processes, such as a public involvement process associated with national environmental policy act (NEPA);

Set of rules, such as those developed to govern a group of cooperative planning.

In some cases, reliance can be placed on an object, such as a report or map which can serve as a catalyst for cooperation or other forms of belief. In any case, trust in countries Trust or (large enterprise union) into something to serve some predictable services. The main components of the theory of belief include features trust or, believe in interactions and relationships between them, in particular sets of actions and the context of trust (or distrust) is developed. Characteristics of trust help to determine their predispositions to be generally believed. While some authors argue that these predispositions are relatively stable and others emphasize that faith dispositional can be largely context dependent. Rather, the trust or will have varying degrees of vulnerability and power in different situations, which outlines the form and degree of risk in different decision. The salience of the issue fixed for each trust or will also vary, or raising or lowering the pressure to develop trust with the gravity of the potential outcome. Different trust or may have varying degrees of tolerance for risk and uncertainty. As such, individuals may have different requirements for the amount of information needed to formulate trust or distrust. Personal stories play an important role in developing

not only the relative importance of various criteria, but also the general tendency of trust or distrust. Trusted features are typically discussed in terms of the four elements of credibility, as perceived by the Trust or:

- 1) Ability
- 2) Integrity
- 3) Kindness
- 4) Visionary leadership

Ability - Refers to the trust or trust entrusted skills to effectively carry out the action c, resulting in the expected outcome of trusties;

Integrity - Refers perception trusties trustee, who consistently adheres to a set of principles acceptable. As such, integrity is based primarily on perceptions of trustees in systems of values;

Friendliness - Refers trusties perception that a trustee feels positively towards trust ores and is likely to act on that positive orientation;

Visionary leaders - often generate higher levels of trust and their followers dealing with different people with competent which do not have this.

Each of these characteristics (ability, integrity, kindness, and visionary), may be important to differentiate for different people in different situations. Contextual factors also may dictate to some extent the relative importance of different types of estimates of confidence. Various settings or organizational contexts may affect provisions in setting baselines of creeds. In other words, in different situations, anyone can start from a position of trust or confidence to engage with another entity.

For example, employees in a work environment that is generally strengthened and encourages creative thinking and risk of the enterprise may be more likely to believe that others within that environment. Other variables particularly important in the context can be referred to as " control system ". Control systems generally reduce the importance of interpersonal trust in predicting the behavior setting rules, contracts or other official mechanisms for monitoring forced or otherwise affect individual behavior.

These mechanisms reduce the risk in transactions and relationships, as long as all parties to abide by the rules. While control systems may affect more reliable behavior, such behavior can be interpreted as responses to the controls in place as signs of confidence. Control systems can have either positive or negative impact on the development of interpersonal trust. In each context, estimates of confidence can be based on emotional recognition or conscious psychological processes. Usually require a degree of specific information about the possible outcomes of action (c). Emotional processes include more emotional judgments about the qualities of trust. The

same class of psychological processes can form the basis of mistrust, which is conceptually distinct from a simple lack of faith. While a lack of confidence reflects the absence of a specific decision about trust. Mistrust refers to a state in which the trust or (subject, a) believes that the Trustee (the entity, b) will perform an action that will actually be detrimental to the trust or. Mistrust means an active doubt entity (b) by an entity (a). In any case, the trust may exist on a continuum, ranging from a complete distrust by lack of confidence in the full confidence. In summary, trust and distrust are specific states, psychological, in which a trust or accepts or refuses to accept vulnerability to the actions of another. These decisions, in theory, should result in specific behaviors taken by the entity or (trust or).

We refer to these behaviors as 'response d' to show what makes trust or as a result of their faith or unbelief. Summary of our basic conceptualization of trust and serves as a guide for our discussion. We focus on examination to distinguish different forms of faith because they can operate at multiple scales and levers provide tangible, but potentially the manipulation of faith

Theory application for trust

Natural resource management trust antecedents effective ecosystem, often requires collaboration between multiple stakeholders across social boundaries, political, legal, and natural. Cooperation is credited with producing a variety of ecological and social benefits, including conflict resolution, making good decisions, and the chances for improved natural resource decisions will be implemented (Innes 1996; Wondolleck and Yaffee 2000). Faith serves as a vital lubricant for collaborative processes, relying on more effective process group performance and effective communication. Meanwhile, confidence could limit meaningful dialogue and negotiations. Developing trust in collaborative processes can be quite challenging, interesting as values, and definitions of problems, conflicts often, the distribution of power are often not equal, and various forms of risk and vulnerability are not separate in order to equals (Bálint et al 2011; Margerum 2011). The issue of different forms of trust (or distrust) can develop in these situations and their effects on the results of processes is important for the improvement of natural resource management.

Rational belief

Rational belief in an entity primarily based on a calculation of the enterprise, the perceived expected result of the establishment, in faith in another entity. Estimates of the information about previous performance and predictability entity b more recent and evaluation of possible outcomes. Belief in an entity based mainly on emotions and judgments associated

resulting from both assessments. Rating cognitive or emotional or sympathetic to believe, that results from these:

- 1) The assumptions and values
- 2) Common concerns

Belief systems procedural or other procedures that reduce the vulnerability of potential trust ores, enabling a move to the absence of other forms of belief. This form of trust is similar to recognizing the legitimacy of the terms " routine ", reflecting a " existing authority or expertise. Circumstances may further affect the confidence dispositional setting a general rate for individuals within an organizational or cultural context. P.sh, in an open and supportive organizational, individuals may be more inclined to believe that in a competitive environment. The importance of trust dispositional for joint management of natural resources is that it sets a preliminary basis for the formation of any other faith emotional evaluation. Faith dispositional can be especially important in large-scale efforts, because the number of players may be more for individuals to gather enough information about, or to build credible relationships and potential. Planning efforts and high trust management dispositional can typically reap the benefits of more open communication. Those with greater distrust dispositional likely to face major challenges of communication in the process. Smith and others (2013) state that individuals with higher degrees of confidence dispositional may be less likely to participate directly in the processes of natural resource management, as authorities generally trust to do the right thing. High levels of trust dispositional may not be the norm in many instances, placing a hard base from which to develop other forms of belief. Trust is based largely on the expectations of reciprocity or perceived utility of a strategic interaction.

This economic perspective trust is usually based on predictability and past performance with regard to costs and benefits of action to review its . Development requires sufficient information for the trust or to make a calculated estimate of the expected results of the action. Perceptions of trusted ability are especially important in a rational assessments. Integrity, may also come into play in terms of sustainable performance.

Rational Faith is built when the entity (a) have sufficient information to assess potential outcomes trusted entity (b) to be personally rewarding. Similarly, rational distrust occurs when the entity (a) has information about the likelihood of adverse outcomes believe. The presence of rational belief allows for the exchange of information and other social goods (eg, favors, concessions) when individuals believe that they will receive a benefit explains that this form of trust is based on exchange rates. Consequently, the values of individuals affected in how they evaluate reliability. For individuals who have strong security value, the

ability to predict a useful result makes rational belief, then, exchanges as possible orientations individuals with security values may rely more on rational belief in making decisions than other forms of belief.

Estimates trust affinitive

Affinitive faith focuses more on the trust or's perception of kindness, integrity, and other social characteristics trusted and their interactions. Faith affinitive can occur through feelings of social connection, shared positive experiences, perceptions of identities, or assumptions remarkable similarity of values.

The main difference between faith and belief rational affinitive is focus on the qualities of the person, rather than a direct calculations of the expected outcome of the action in question. This is similar to what it described as believing that an entity that is separate from the trust or without clear action review. Faith affinitive can usually developed through a clear assessment of the character of a trustee and potential. Affinitive forms of belief and unbelief are shown to be particularly strong in the areas of natural resource management. Mistrust affinitive is based on perceptions and experiences incompatible values or other forms of general bitterness between the two entities. Research on the relationship between protected areas and the people living around them suggests that this type of confidence may be stronger carrier of the reaction of people against some forms of initiatives to natural resource management. Research shows that perceptions of similar values in bonds outstanding issues such as threatened species and endangered or manage wildfire flame that can lead to greater trust natural resources, decision making and public approval agency practices the agency.

Faith procedural

Trust is based on positive interactions between control systems and other forms of belief. As mentioned earlier, control systems can have positive or negative effects on the development of trust. On the one hand, they reduce the risk of creating a basic network security, if possible trustee is supposed to be in compliance. On the other hand, reliable operations can be attributed to the control system, instead of reliability. In both cases, the presence of the control system reduces the need for other forms of belief. The case of a negative control system will be one that removes the need entirely from the system when the control system is removed, basic belief may actually be lower if the control system has not existed in the country of first. This may be the case of some coercive or competitive systems. This is somewhat different from procedural misgivings, which can occur when a process or procedure is perceived to be unfair and unlawful. We submit that the procedural faith develops

when procedures (system of control in the case of joint management of natural resources) are seen as legitimate by all stakeholders. In this case, the control system can be relied upon primarily to reduce risk and develop, purpose and common identities, rather than to impose specific behavior. The literature suggests that the legitimacy of this can come from multiple sources, including joint development of procedural transparency in decision-making, power-sharing and equitable distribution of benefits and risks. Depending on the intensity, form, context, and the entity in which the trust is established, additional responses can include apathy or avoidance. If a person has faith in the organization but not the managers of the process, he or she may be more motivated to participate for the chance to save the results of his or her desired, ensuring that managers do not slip authority them. The possible configurations are countless and depend not only on estimates of confidence at different levels, but also on the importance and extent of the weakness and strength of the trust or in addition, the discrepancies in estimates of confidence in varying degrees, different forms of trust can result in completely different sets of responses. Interactions between different forms of trust are not well known or studied, although some theorists believe that there may be some predictable sequences.

Existing theory generally suggests that each form may be important to successful cooperation managers of natural resources. Interference variables high degree of any form of trust or distrust, necessarily not lead to any specific behavior. Faith instead describes a psychological condition that indicates a general willingness to accept a degree of risk, while disbelief shows the opposite. Acting on that willingness is not an automatic response of psychological state. Any interested party outside of the agency may experience similar tensions. For example, a representative of a non-governmental conservation organization can develop strong interpersonal trust with industry representatives. However, it may not feel able to act on that belief based on its accountability to constituents non-participation she represents. Individuals may also find themselves in states thankful following the development of trust in a collaborative context. States thankful describes the internal situation in which two beliefs or develop conflicts with each other, or a belief conflict with a targeted action. A participant can develop strong social trust to another participant, but disagree on moral grounds about a certain action.

Many collaborative effort involving government authorities or other large organizations Accordingly, each entity has different types, depending on the specific shares that the entity has in cooperation. In international protected areas and conservation projects integrated and development, forms of government data for local people in decision-making can vary greatly. Similar findings have emerged in international conservation organizations (Stern 2010). These risks arising from the challenges of foreign

relations and domestic, availability of resources for performing the tasks, skills and abilities of individuals and groups involved, and cooperative relations between the processes that lead to the degree of power sharing and exchanges important information, not only between agencies and various participating organizations, but also within them. Formal control systems also play a strong role in curbing, adopting behavioral goals based on trust. Bureaucratic procedures or other forms of rules and regulations (or even their misperceptions) may exclude certain actions cooperative. They can also bind other behaviors that can compete with faith-based purposes. Institutional mechanisms and political interference can similarly result in cooperative behavior without requiring trust between collaborators. For example, a leader of the processes may have been convinced by someone who she believes to hold a public cooperative meeting, but it may be afraid to do this because it is uncertain how the structure is so effective or how to deal with conflicts that may arise (eg, see Hoover and Stern 2014). It may also be afraid of poor impact on meeting could have on its relationship of trust with the person or organization to persuade it to its importance.

Conclusions

In this article, we sensitize the managerial, which includes social sciences and business disciplines to label and describe the four forms of belief, we feel important, a joint effort of natural resource management, trust dispositional, rational belief, faith affinitive, and procedural confidence.

Each shape is largely determined by the unique ancestors who may serve to predict disbelief. Similarly, little is known about what form will lead to action under which conditions, or about how different forms of faith together.

- How can a form of trust lead to another?
- Are there patterns in these sequences in different situations?
- For example, does the belief in a boundary object, such as a model or map, lay the groundwork for the development of other forms of faith?
- Trust faith affinitive usually precede or follow a rational belief?
- When a form of trust is lost, how can it be restored, and in what form?
- If both affinitive and rational beliefs are built, are more flexible relationship that if one exists?
- In addition, there is the existence of many different forms of belief of a buffer system against external disturbances?
- The existence of strong faith to provide adequate procedural functional redundancy to strengthen the resistance of the group's cooperative?
- Similarly, if the procedure or other relevant systems change, the presence of other forms of interpersonal trust do the same?

Considering the totality of the different values of the participants, it would be unwise for managers to assume that processes focusing exclusively on the development of any form of trust will be useful for collaborative efforts. Given the levels typically low in confidence dispositional complex problems and poor natural resource management, management processes can take into account the importance of providing opportunities to reduce uncertainty among stakeholders doing enable safer evaluation of any form of religion.

References

- Armstrong Michael (2005), Human Resource Management Practice, 9th edition, south Asian edition 2004, reprinted, ISBN 0 7494 4215 8.
- Dessler, Gary, Human Resource Management, tenth edition, Prentice Hall, ISBN 978-81-317- 1303-7, Dorling Kindersley (Indi) Pvt. Ltd., licensees of Pearson Education in South Asia.
- Fisher, Schoenfeldt, Shaw, Human Resource Management, third edition, All India Publishers & distributors Regd., ISBN -81-85502-30-7.
- Bruce E. Kaufman, Strategic Human Resource Management Research in the United States: A Failing Grade After , Academy of Management Perspectives.
- Sandeep Krishnan, Manjari Singh, Strategic Human Resource Management: Three-Stage Process and Influencing Organisational Factors. Personnel and Industrial Relations Area, D-18, Indian Institute of Management, Ahmedabad.
- Ketchen, David J, Jr; Elyssa Blanton Schultz Human Resource Management (1986-1998); Spring 1998; An Examination of Factors Associated with the Integration of Human Bennett, Nathan; 37, 1; ABI/INFORM.
- Stephen P. Robbins, Timothy A. Judge, 12th Edition, Prentice Hall Of India, ISBN: 978-81-203- 3090-0.
- Dan P. Lovallo & Oliver Sibony, Article/Mckinsey (8th Nov 2013), Distortions and deceptions in strategic decisions www.mckinsey.com/insights.
- N. Shani and Narayanasamy.P.S (2011), The Role of Employee Engagement and Strategic Tool in HRM, International Journal of Management (IJM), Volume 2, Issue 2, pp. 25 – 32, ISSN Print: 0976-6502, ISSN Online: 0976-6510.
- V.Antony Joe Raja (2012), Emerging Trends in Human Resource Management with Special Focus on

Outsourcing in Various Sectors, International Journal of Management (IJM), Volume 3, Issue 1, pp. 197 - 204, ISSN Print: 0976-6502, ISSN Online: 0976-6510.

N.Shani and P. Divyapriya, A Role of Innovative Idea Management in HRM, International Journal of Management (IJM).