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Abstract: The objective of this article, through an ample bibliographical revision, is to construct links between the areas of the knowledge that deal with the subjects as collaborative networks, social capital and relationship marketing, approaching concepts as cooperation, contribution, confidence, relationships and exchanges of values. As result, the present study demonstrates the complementarities between the concepts in the different fields, establishes the utility to approach the complex systems with a ampler specter of analysis tools that make possible the communication beyond the borders of the established knowledge, and open an interesting agenda of future researches that allows verify the creation of value in the interior of networks of companies, being surpassed the financial aspects and of regulation and including the context social that involves the networks.
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I. INTRODUCTION

World-wide the economic order has pressured the organizations around of the world to seek new alternatives to compete face to the challenges of the global economy, what implies in the adoption of a systematic of simultaneous competition and cooperation (BENGSTSON; KOCK, 2000). These pressures on micro and small companies evidence the necessity of structural changes in the business-oriented concepts, mainly the relational ones, and this denotes the necessity in such a way to create and to keep structural strategies guided by contextual values of the technical environment of the institutional one. In the relation scope, the concept of cooperation appears, that accord Pires et al (2001), it is supported in the perception of that a company is not isolated in its environment, but is part of an interdependent world. In terms of complex organization, the format of collaboration networks it comes being an alternative so that these companies, due the synergy formed in virtue of its association, reaching a bigger potential of exploitation of the chances of the marketing environment. That is corroborated by Amato Neto (2000) that states the necessity of the companies on account to pressing to have flexibility, to improve abilities, to generate develop quick answers to the requirements of the market and the competitive pressures. For in such a way, one becomes technological and management qualification, to keep the access to the market and to be in tune with the international changes. For micro and small companies this is, many times, a too much including roll of abilities that does not allow them to act separately, emphasizing the increasing importance of the inter-companies and inter-institutional relations.

In relation to the reasons that take the companies to cooperate between itself, Amato Neto (2000) points out as associative advantages: to combine abilities and to use know-how of other companies; to divide the responsibility to carry through technological research, sharing the acquired development and knowledge; to share risks and costs to explore new chances, carrying through experiences in set; to more offer a line of products of diversified superior quality and; to exert a bigger pressure in the market, being increased the competitive force in benefit of the customer; to share resources, with special it has detached to that are being underutilized; to strengthen the purchase power and to get more force to act in the markets where the companies are inserted - what is called by Schmitz (1996) of collective efficiency, and to Piore and Sabel (1984) it represents a paradigm of the flexible entailing of ability relations objectifying broader markets.

The inter-organizational relations appear from small informal agreements and, initially, demand little trust, a time that the involved risk is low. These transactions repeat themselves with passing of the time and they normative themselves, informally, by means of the fairness and of the efficiency. This is an increasing process to trust resources and expectations cycles of a relation in terms of inter-organizational cooperation, increasing the trust of the parts through the previous interactions. If these will be perceived as being efficient and equitable, is increased the probability of that the parts want to effect, in future transactions, riskier and significant investments (RING; VAN OF VEN, 1994).

However, the construction of these relationships has supportive by the trust, a delicate process of construction that it intends to level the behavior of the participants. To perceive that a partner trusts other starts to be more important of what the trust existence. When a partner...
perceives that the other attributes trust to it, is more easy the creation of a cycle of reliable construction (THOBEN; JAGDEV, 2001).

It points out, however, that despite the advantages already observed in this type of approach, such as the scale gains and market power, provision of solutions, learning and innovation, reduction of costs and risks, social relations and leadership opportunities (VERSCHOORE; BALESTRIN, 2006; BARCELOS et al, 2007), it is imperative that the social capital is present in the foundation of these relationships.

Social capital here is defined as the value of the social networks between people and organizations - characterized for trust, cooperation, involvements and information sharing - that constructs the capacity to decide problems and to reach goals in mutual benefit (SCHUURMAN, 2003; KRISHNA, 2004; MANSUTI; RAO, 2004). The social capital of an organization can be esteem by intermediary of the evaluation of its social network, which is defined as a map of the relationships between linked individuals for diverse familiar bows of familiarity that they vary since the relation of cause until the contractual association (BARNES, 1954).

Relationship Marketing, that in accordance with the economic paradigm that reigned approximately in practical the marketing ones per three decades, occupied of the existing relationships in dual relation purchaser-salesman with sights to the maximization of value and reduction of the transaction costs, each time more extends its target of form to include the networks of companies and to consider different actors and its multiple interactions, what Gummensson (2002) it calls total relationship marketing.

The objective of this article, for intermediary of an ample bibliographical revision, is to construct bridges that establish links between the areas of the knowledge that they deal with the subjects, networks of companies, social capital and relationship marketing, approaching concepts as cooperation, contribution, trust, relation value of the relationships and relational exchanges.

### II. Theoretical Background

#### A. The collaboration networks and the social capital development

So that it is possible the cooperation between business partners, the opportunist behavior must be minimized. Axelrod (1990) says that the social relations limit the opportunist behavior in way that, limiting the opportunism, the social capital potencializes collaborative practicies (COLEMAN, 1990). In this in case, the collaborative networks are the mechanisms for the development of the social capital, therefore they allow experiences of mutual aid (VERSHORRE; BALESTRIN, 2008), in the form of interaction and reciprocity. This model has the advantage to diminish the necessity of contractual procedures, that raise the costs and reduce the efficiency (RING; VAN DE VEN, 1994), to fight the opportunism (WILLIAMSON, 1985), a time that the opportunist behavior will not be accepted by the network and the agent will lose its collective benefits (SIDE BOYD; HANLON, 1990), what it would evidence a bigger cost for this type of behavior in the cooperation networks (GULATI, NOHRIA AND ZAHEER, 2000).

The class action, however, has its reasons in strategically and economic roots (PERROW, 1992), where the cohesion, the negotiation and the cooperation reign on the competition (RATTNER, 2003). The trust it is pointed as indispensable factor with respect to the cooperation between the inter-organizational relationships, therefore it is the guarantee of that the partners do not explore the vulnerabilities in the transactions (BARNEY; HANSEN, 1994; MCALLISTER 1995). It allows the people deals with high levels of uncertainty, making possible the understanding of interactions without controlling or anticipating the behavior of others, reducing the necessity of the formal mechanisms that diminish flexibility (LUHMANN, 1979). This demand, however one adjusted management of the relationships (HEIDE, 1994; KIM, 1999), therefore the people make emotional investments in the relationships that consider trustworthy, searching to reach a period of training where they do not need or they want evidences you add to trust (LEWIS; WEIGERT, 1985).

#### B. Cooperation

The cooperation between companies or inter-organizational relations got prominence from changes in the competitive environment. To Wittmann (2004) the complex of relationships in a context marked for the information and technology had appeared, where isolated behaviors find each time little spaces. In this same line of reasoning, the enterprise competitiveness became complex due to influence of the global phenomena that affect the local organizations. In this context, Lastres and Cassiolato (2003) detach that the formation of inter-organizational relations is characterized by the geographic proximity and generally meets “associated the historical trajectories of construction of identities and formation of territorial bonds (regional and local), to leave of a social, cultural base, common economic politics and representing, therefore, environments more favorable to the interaction, the cooperation and the trust between the actors”.

In these regional environments, the cooperation networks occur in all the business sectors and between companies of some transports, being able to involve different degrees of in agreement cooperation the natures of the operations vary in relation to the intentions and objectives. As Barney et al (1996 apud BRAGA, 1999), it enters the reasons for the formation of alliances, are distinguished: to explore scale economies, to reduce the costs of entrance in new markets, to reduce the costs of entrance in new business-oriented segments, to learn with the competitors, to manage the uncertainty strategically, to share risks. However, although the advantages observed in function of the cooperation, it must, according to Morgan and Hunt (1994) the development of the used concepts as changeable mediating-key for the success of the cooperation nature that must be reached so that a relationship if establishes. This variability would be the commitment and the trust that represent mediators between a series of antecedents and a
set of resultants of the relationship. While the commitment represents the intention in keeping a relationship of long stated period, the trust is a basic requirement so that this relationship in fact if establishes, a time that determines the security of that none of the involved parts will explore the vulnerabilities of the other, since a relation of long stated period requires a sharing of information that eventually will exploit the fragilities of both the parts. The concepts of commitment and trust meet related e closely, in accordance with Morgan and Hunt (1994), the trust presents a stronger effect, a time that the intention to establish a relationship of cooperation, represented for the commitment, will not be accomplished without one definitive reliable level has been reached.

C. Cooperation networks
Bremer and Ortega (2000) define cooperation networks as being a group of companies what interact for the exchange of abilities, going beyond the pure relationship of purchase and selling.

According to New and Mitropoulos (1995), the network idea is important for presenting an alternative to the fatigue of the market against the economic hierarchy of the great groups. It enhances the natural stability of many commercial relations, providing a structure for the best understanding of the technological propagation by means of the practical ones, beyond promoting the profit of competitive advantage in small companies.

González (2003) when dealing with the question the cooperation between companies, salient that the main theoretical approaches on the subject are:
(a) Costs of transaction, where the cooperation between companies reduces the opportunism of the hierarchy and prevails against the limited and uncertain rationality of the market. The initial benefit if finds in the reduction of the costs based on vertical cooperative agreements;
(b) Strategically behavior, where the companies search to reach competitive advantages in the long stated period through the coo petition, mainly in horizontal agreements, that is, between competitors;
(c) Organizational approach, where the horizontal, vertical and transversal agreements produce organizational the learning due to the relations of exchange of information and knowledge, resources and qualifications.

The dynamics of the cooperation practically appears as an opposition of the perspective of the traditional competition. Research points with respect to the culture of the cooperation as one of the factor-key for the prosperity in the long stated period (FUKUYAMA, 1996; PUTNAM, 2002), mainly in the spheres economic and social (CASTELLS, 1999).

As Corrêa (1999) as Casarotto Filho (1999) agree that the birth, the development, the maintenance and, at last, the survival of the networks, depend on the quarrel and equation of three basic aspects:
(a) Culture of the trust: on aspects to the cooperation between the companies, involving culture and the interests of people and companies. The social ethics and that one established by the group for are basic for the reinforcement of the trust between the partners are the performance of the networks.
(b) Culture of the ability: to recognize the essential abilities of each partner. Take together since technological aspects technician as the intangible ones, such as the processes in know how.
(c) Culture of the technology of the information: to establish one mechanics of flow of information with rules in its depth and transparent, what it is vital to feed the network.

In 1996, Adam Brandenburger and Barry Nalebuff had published the book Co-opetition, inserting the term in the field of the strategically administration, initially used to identify and you study the strategies of relationships between companies who search complementariness for its operations. According to Ghemawat (2000, p.43) who participates of co-opetition, is “participant of which the customers buy complementary products or services or for which supplying complementary products that sell”.

However, the true intention of Branderburger and Nalebuff (1996) was to elucidate the room element of this chain of value, the proper competitor companies, forming the call value network, where the company if also relates with its competitors, starting to co-opetition. This vision brought a cooperative dimension to the competitive boarding and contributed mainly so that the complex relations of the competitive environment are understood better, in dynamic aspects as complementary, cooperation, adaptation and survival.

To Fagion (2002) three factors help in recent years to explain the success of the networks of micron and small companies in different economic scenes: the economies of scale by means of networks; the trust and the cooperation that coexist with the competition; e the state of social welfare caused by the increase of the efficiency of regional industrial sectors. The author emphasizes that the classic theories had neglected the economic power of these factors and that are related to the trust and the cooperation.

The advantages, according to Gulati et al apud Kosonen (2001), of the inter-organizational networks or networks of companies, they are summarized of the following form: strategically networks to provide an organization with potential access and socialization with the information, resources, markets and technologies, with advantages of learning and economy of scale, and allow that the companies reach its strategically objectives, sharing risks and extending to periods of training of the value chain and organizational functions.

D. Social Capital
In accordance with D’Araújo (2003), the social capital represents an innovative concept as for analyzes them of development, therefore express potential of a society in establishing interpersonal trust and networks of cooperation with the objective to produce good collective. It stops Tsai and Ghoshal (1998), the term was originally used in the description of the relation, involved resources in individual bows, used for the development of individuals in the social community of the organizations. However, the target of the concept comes if extending, accumulating of stocks aspects
of the society, in the form of the relations inside and outside of the family (COLEMAN, 1998), and relations intra and inter companies (BURT, 1992).

As Milani (2004), the term social capital mentions the association to it where the pertaining capital to a collective or community, is shared, not being of private property. It stops Putnam (1993), the term mentions the aspects to it of the social organization - networks, norms and bows reliable - that they act as people who become things easier of coordination and cooperation for the search of mutual benefits. In accordance with the author, still mentions itself to the connections between the individuals, for way of norms of reciprocity and resultant social networks of the trust between the same ones. The engagement emerges of the resultant interaction, aiming at a common benefit. To Grootaert and Van Bastelar (2002) still can be understood as the capacity of interaction of the individuals, its potential of interaction with around and the capacity to recognize new behaviors, intentions, values and abilities.

In agreement with Krishna and Uphoff (1999), two types of social capital, the structural one can be observed, of external character, that as determines the functions in the interior of structures based for rules and procedures, as the networks, facilitate to the flows of communication and class actions; and the cognitive, of internal character, that if they relate to the sharing of the beliefs, norms, values and trust between the members. It stops Rattner (2003), the capital one helps to keep the social cohesion, to establish negotiations at the moments of conflict and to the maintenance of the cooperation on the competition. It bases itself on the fact of the social actors to possess obligations and expectations in common and, therefore, to search to establish relations, stimulating the trust to speed the flow of information.

Social researchers had started, recently, to around investigate the social capital in diverse communities of the world. They have used, frequently, the concept of social capital considered by Robert Putnam as starting point, that is, the notion of social capital as the “characteristics of the social life - networks, norms and trust - that they qualify the participants to act in set of form more effective to pursue mutual objectives” (PUTNAM, 1995, p. 67).

E. Trust

The inter-organizational relations of cooperation, to Ring and Van de Ven (1994), they appear, only they grow and if they make solid with passing of the time, as a consequence of individual positions and recognition of these on the part of the too much actors of the network. Three forms exist for which the individuals affect a inter-organizational relation of cooperation: defining on degree of uncertainty to the change; specifying the interpersonal reliable extension for the conflict resolution; e defining expectations of waited results. TomWitmann et al (2004), frequent obstacles in the relations in enterprise networks are the individualism, the diffidence, the lack of engagement and the inefficient communication, among others. In the enterprise way, Das and Teng(2001) and Nooteboom (1996) differentiate trust as: trust based on the ability (competence trust) and trust based on the intention (goodwill trust). Nooteboom (1996) observed that trust can become related with the ability of the partner in carrying through definitive in agreement performance the waited one, or its intentions in making this. The first described reliable form is based on the capacities (competence trust), while second, in the intentions (goodwill trust).

The literature of administration and sociology, according to Ring and Van de Ven (1994), presents two visions reliable: the vision of business risk, according to which the parts, by means of contractual formalizations, guarantees and mechanisms of security, creates safeguards that they regulate the business relations; e the vision of the good will, that emphasizes the faith in the moral integrity and objective common, that is produced by means of interpersonal interactions that they direct for partner-psychological bonds of mutual norms, feelings and friendships when dealing with the uncertainty.

In this context, the trust must be constructed throughout the time (JARILLO; STEVENSON, 1991; PARK; UNGSON, 2001), therefore characteristic basic as honesty, disposal and effectiveness, they are only perceived and after agreed to a long period of relation (LAJARA; LILO; SEMPERE, 2002). The trust starts to be constructed in the beginning of the formation of the network (HOFFMANN; SCHLOSSER, 2001), depending on what the partners, unilaterally, demonstrate with regard to the future commitment, idiosyncratic investments in the partner, sharing of information and you safeguard in the figure of a contract (DYER, 1997).

To establish trust between the partners is, certainly, the cited factor more in literature as prerequisite for the cooperation (HAKANSON; KJELLBERG; LUNGREN, 1993). The companies, represented for people, must want using to trust and to desire to trust its pairs (WALTERS; PETERS; DESS, 1994); without trust it does not have engagement and, as result of this lack of trust, the network will possibly go to fail, exactly that the objective is logical and beneficial for the partners (CULLEN; JOHNSON; SAKANO, 2000).

To Luhmann (1998), the trust is a social mechanism that allows the individuals to manage the uncertainty with increasing tolerance in a natural confluences behavior in the enterprise way. By this, the trust is seen as a form to legitimize the social relationships integrating the enterprise partners, the one that goes beyond established legitimately for norms and the written values. Cummings and Bromiley (1996), in agreement with the too much authors, they affirm that the main argument on the importance of the trust says respect the minimization of costs generated by this, through the reduction of opportunist behaviors in the work relations. Still according to authors (CUMMINGS; BROMILEY, 1996), the trust has left of an individual belief based by the perceptions of the dimensions affective, cognitive and intentional that is, the trust is as the human being feels, thinks and intends to act. This individual belief constructs the common belief: the perception that the too much parts of the group act of good faith, with honesty, in the relationships. These perceptions represent antecedents of the trust, for the agreement that the partners do not search extreme advantages on the others, despite the chance.
appears. This reliable definition is summarized, then, to the effort to act of good-faith, with honesty in the exchange and limited opportunism (WILLIAMS, 2001).

F. Relationship Marketing

In a seminal article, Parvatiyar and Sheth (2000) had considered at great length to trace the conceptual field of marketing and bases of marketing of relationship, as well as describing the occurred paradigmatic changes in the theory of marketing that they had lead to the emergency of marketing of relationship as a thought school. To undertake this important task, the authors evaluate a diversity of perspectives adopted for a series of authors throughout the time, since narrowest and functional until most including and paradigmatic.

Amongst the limited and functional perspectives more it is possible to cite the identifications of marketing of relationship with database marketing and retention of customers, elaborated for Bickert (1992) and Vavra (1992). Other authors still present a definition of relationship marketing as a combination of the previous approaches, that is, the integration of database marketing with the retention of customers in long stated period (SHANI; CHALASANI, 1992).

The perspectives ampest supply a more strategically vision of marketing of relationship, modifying the paper of marketing to manipulate the consumer for a genuine engagement of this, for intermediary of the communication and the sharing of knowledge, as it is the case of the approaches of McKenna (1991) and Berry (1983).

One of the main changes of perspective brought for the theoreticians of marketing of relationship it consists of the distinction carried through between exchanges you do business and relation exchanges (GRÖNROOS, 1990; MORGAN, HUNT, 1994). While the classic boarding of marketing if it guided for the call telling and selling, the orientation of the relationship marketing if return them directed activities to establish, to develop and to keep lasting relationships.

Regarding the question of the relationship, El-Ansary (1997) it raises an interesting referring question to the difference enters marketing of relationship (relationship marketing) and relationships of marketing (marketing relationships) that, according to author is more than what mere semantics, being related to the different natures and specificities of one and another one. According to definition of El-Ansary (1997), while the relationships of marketing they can assume any form, including concurrency relationships or of rivalry, the relationship marketing possess a different specificities, with focus directed to the cooperative and collaborative relationships between an organization and its consumers and, or others stakeholders.

A common aspect to all the different definitions elaborated for the diverse authors who if had dedicated to establish the conceptual beddings of marketing of relationship (ADLER, 1996; ARNDT, 1979; GRÖNROOS; GUMMESSON, 1985) if it relates to the recognition of the development and maintenance of the relationships as a process and, more specifically, as a destined process to create and to increase the economic value of the relation exchanges for all the involved parts in the relationships.

This is, without a doubt, an important change of paradigm in relation to the classic theory of the marketing. As already she is widely recognized, as much the theory how much the practical ones of marketing they must its origin to the economic thought, motivated, over all, for the disinterest of the economists in the details of the behavior of the markets and in the functions of the intermediate (PARVATIYAR; SHETH, 2000).

G. Networks of Relationships and Competitive Advantage

Macadar (2004) develops a sufficiently including understanding regarding the factors that generate competitive advantages for the organizations and, amongst them, on the played role, specifically, for the network of relationships as generating source of these advantages. The traditional economic perspective of marketing classic establishes that the competitive advantage of one determined organization is decurrently of the resources and capacities that belong and are controlled for an only company. With the emergency of the global markets and the closing of the competition, many organizations are not capable of, separately, mobilizing the necessary resources to the competitiveness in this new scale business-oriented. Of agreement with diverse authors (HUNT; MORGAN, 1995; DYER; SINGH, 1998; JAP, 1999; SRIVASTAVA; FAHEI; CHRISTENSEN, 2001), many times these critical resources exceed the borders of an organization and, therefore, productivity profits are possible when the organizations if make use to effect idiosyncratic investments and to combine its resources of only form.

As defined for Hunt and Morgan (1995), resources are tangible entities and intangible that allows that a company establishes it offers of value for the market. If these rare resources will be e, or only, it can be said that the company enjoys of a competitive advantage. This means that a comparative advantage (ownership of only resources) can be converted into competitive advantage (it offers only of value for the market). Under certain conditions of competitiveness, structure of the market and necessities of the consumers, relationships can be a generating resource of competitive advantage, a time that allow that a network of companies mobilizes resources that, of another form, none of the organizations in the interior of the relation would be capable to agglutinate if it competed on account proper.A sustainable competitive advantage can be defined as the implementation of a strategy of value creation, on the part of an organization, that is only difficult e to imitate for the competitors. This definition implies the installation of that a sustainable competitive advantage must be seen since an external perspective.

Of this definition it is inferred, also, neither that nor all the resources of a company possess the potential necessary to generate sustainable competitive advantages. It stops Barney and Hofmann (2000), only the resources that present the rarity attributes, value, incapacity to be imitation and
incapacity to be substituted can be considered as sources of sustainable competitive advantages. To the opposite of the physical resources, financial and human, that can be bought or be dislocated, the process to construct relationships of long stated period is difficult of being reproduced by other actors. Resources as loyalty, trust and reputation are intangible and constructed throughout the time and, therefore, they are possible sources of if transforming into sustainable competitive advantages, of agreement with the perspective of the attributes of Barney apud Hofmann (2000).

H. Networks of Companies and Marketing of Relationship

According to Pereira (2004) for intermediary of the analysis of some authors it is possible to affirm that the focus of attention of marketing it is passing for alterations of a microeconomic paradigm with emphasis in the competition and the relation exchanges for a politician-economic perspective that visualizes the organizations as social, dynamic, adapted systems and internally differentiated in which the relation exchanges between organizations prevail. To Grönroos (2000), this approach of interaction and networks for the management of relationships originate in Sweden, with IMP Group, according to which the networks of companies form a dominant concept and the relationship a sub-concept that explains the development and the management of the networks. The Swedish School brings for the target of marketing of relationship new elements that, according to its integrant ones, are equally important and interdependent. This element-key is: actors, activities and resources. Of agreement with this approach, the actors are defined by the activities that they play and the resources that control, being connected to the too much actors saw resources and activities, as represented in Picture 1.

As if it can perceive clearly in the figure above, the relation aspect is extremely significant in this model. Thus, the relationships between the different actors provoke changes in the networks. This model modifies the focus of conventional analysis of the relationships, of dual for the indirect impacts of the relationships, as well as the effect that the system has on the individual relationships. To Pereira (2004), this relation approach of networks is methodological, contributing for the analysis of the connectivity of some partners, in such a way internally how much in the relationships that surpass the network, as with the final consumer, for example, of form to understand the effect of the relationships between the actors of the network in the perception and satisfaction of the customers. Consonant to this, Healy et al (2001), for considering the nature of the field of the confused marketing of relationship, they consider a classification system that it uses as base the context of the relationship and the number of participants of the exchange process, arriving at the following definitions: (a) Marketing of relationship: it understands only the interactions between purchaser and salesman; (b) Marketing of neo-relationship: it also considers others stakeholders, however it still understands the relationship as one dual; (c) Networks: it starts to consider, beyond the simple relationships (dual), for other actors. This definition understands different approaches distinct proposals for authors and schools (DOSI, 1998; DOSI; TEECE; WINTER, 1992; HODGSON, 1998; NELSON; WINTER, 1982; NELSON, 1987), that they focus the cooperation as alternative for increase of the competitiveness level. In this context, to marketing of relationship the paper of manager of the relationships between the different actors inside and outside of the network would fit (value chain).
In this direction, the environment of work in networks, highly recommendable in the current competitive environment, requires on the part of the organizations the development of new abilities and management capacities, which can benefit of the discoveries and proposals brought for the field of the administration for marketing of relationship.

III. ANALYSIS OF THE RESEARCH

Objectifying to locate complementarities between the concepts in the different fields, one searched, on the basis of the bibliographical revision, the construction of a map (figure 2) verifying the convergence between the concepts, of form to guide the analysis of the content. Limiting it the context of networks (FUKUYAMAM; PUTNAM, 2002), it was observed that the following categories had emerged: cooperation, trust, social capital and management of the relationships.

Of these, one searched to evidence the conceptual definition of the authors, in the measure where they contributed for the formation of the central idea. What it is observed, is that Marketing of Relationship it emerges as boarding for the management of the social capital of the cooperation networks, and contributes for the increase of the collective efficiency and competitive advantage. The trust and cooperation are constructs closely on, in a relation where the reduction of the opportunist behavior is indispensable for the maintenance of a flexible relationship of long stated period (Cummings And Bromiley, 1996; Barney And Hansem, 1994; Mcallister, 1996; Morgan And Hunt, 1994; Ring And Van Of Come, 1994). At The Same Time Where These Relations If Establish, The Network Constructs The Social Capital, In The Form Of The Organization Based For The Trust And Cooperation (Schuurman, 2003; Krishna, 2004; Mansutti; Rao, 2004; Putman, 1993). It Is Converged, Therefore The Management Of The Relationships, That It Aims At To Create And To Increase The Value Of These Relation And Collaborative Exchanges, Is They Intra- Organizations Or In The Relation With The Consumers Adler, 1966; Arndt, 1979; Grönroos; Gumensson, 1985; Grönroos, 1990; Morgan; Hunt, 1994, El-Ansary, 1997).

Picture 1: Model of networks: actors, activities and resourcesSource: adapted of Project ION (2002)
The picture 2, as a result of this convergence analysis, evidences the similar aspects between Relationship Marketing, Thrust, Social Capital And Cooperation, which are: reduce opportunism and costs, respect vulnerabilities for long term relationship, sharing, seek mutual benefits, mutual collaboration and increasing value of sharing and exchanges.

Arrived in port for this convergence, one wants, therefore, to evidence, as the model of Project ION (2002), the complementarities of the model of networks, where if the existence of the social capital in this arrangement must make gift, already constituted of the cooperation and trust, but with the economic objective of generation of collective efficiency.

Being the relation aspect of extreme importance for the supportive of this model, it is pointed Marketing of Total Relationship, in its target to consider different actors and multiple interactions, as a natural boarding for the efficient management of these interactions between the actors is it in the interior of the network or graviton in its around.

Arrived in port for this convergence, one searches, therefore, to evidence, as the model of Project ION (2002), the complementarities of the Model of networks, where if the existence of the social capital in this arrangement must make gift, already constituted of the cooperation and trust, but with the economic objective of generation of collective efficiency.

The collaborative networks, representing a new form of social morphology that follies the specificities of the new competitive reality, contribute in basic way so that individuals and organizations can amplify of exponential form its possibilities of performance and extend significantly its efficiency, of a form that would not reach acting as isolated entities.

As demonstrated, the trust it is a mediating variable of extreme importance so that relationships in fact if establish, a time that determines the security of that none of the involved parts will explore the vulnerabilities of the other, since a relation of long stated period requires a sharing of vulnerabilities for long term relationship.

IV. CONCLUSION

The bibliographical revision of the fields of networks of companies, social capital and marketing of relationship makes possible a series of inferences concerning the complementarities between its concepts. In certain direction, it is possible to state that these knowledge if support in one same conceptual base, allowing a more including understanding of an extremely complex reality for its proper nature.
information that eventually will display the fragilities of both the involved parts in the relationship.

The social capital that emerges of the relationships between the diverse involved in the network, understood actors as the value of the social networks between people and organizations - characterized for trust, cooperation, involvement and sharing of information - and that it constructs the capacity to decide problems and to reach goals in mutual benefit, express the potential of a society in establishing interpersonal trust and cooperation networks with the objective to produce good collective.

In this perspective, the social capital can be defined as one consequence of the interactions accomplished between actors, resources and activities, making of the relationship marketing a natural boarding for the efficient management of these interactions between me the actors, are they in the interior of the network or graviton in its around.

The contributions originated in such a way in the relationship marketing how much in the contribution networks they emphasize the necessity of deeper interactions with the customers and too much actors of the marketing process, as well as stand out the importance of the management of the proper relationship, stop beyond the traditional management of the marketing composition.

The main representatives of the related Swedish School proclaim the necessity to identify, to establish, to keep, to extend e, in case that necessary, to finish relationships with the different groups of interest, with profit. In accordance with this perspective, is of basic importance, the establishment and fulfillment of promises on the part of all the involved ones in the relationship, so that the different objectives are reached. Therefore, are presented in picture 3 the additional constructs for the Project Ion proposed model.

It is important for the understanding of the focus of marketing of relationship, as already mentioned, the change of paradigm of the discrete transaction for the relation exchange that bases the establishment of relations. The relation exchange, in contrast of the discrete transaction, occurs throughout the time and, therefore, it needs to be measured not by its immediate consequences, but in terms of

![Figure 3: Proposed Model](Source: Authors, based in Project ION (2002))
vision of anticipated, express future in the concept of lifetime value.

The consolidation of the concept of lifetime value, in contraposition to the only perspective of selling, it practically compels the organizations that adopt this position to assume an orientation for relationships in all its transactions with excessively public consumers and. This perspective force the installation of the exchange relations as a process of creation of mutual value, guiding the development of models of management of these processes that take in consideration the quality of the contacts established between the different ones stakeholders in all the extension of the value chain.

This boarding of networks and its relationships focus the creation of value for way them interactions between the actors, beyond the purely economic aspects. According to this boarding, the strategy in the network is constructed collectively, what it demands the coordination of the activities and resources for the constitution of a true network of value creation.

Therefore, those outcomes can be summarized in a academic and in a business dimension: The theoretical outcomes can be described as: a) convergence of the concepts; b) collaborative networks are a new form of collective efficiency; c) trust is a moderator variable for relationships in this context. And the managerial outcomes can be described as: a) change the paradigm of discreet transition to relational exchange; b) learn how to use Total Marketing Concept to manage the actors interaction; c) focus on lifetime value.

As result, the present study it demonstrates the complementarities between the concepts in the different fields, establishes the utility to approach the complex systems with a wider specter of analysis tools that make possible the communication beyond the borders of the established knowledge and open an interesting agenda of future research that allows to measure the creation of value in the interior of networks of companies, being surpassed the financial aspects and of regulation and including the context social that involves the networks.
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