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Introduction

The ongoing research is oriented to achieve a measurement scale that allows the measurement of results of a Corporate Social Responsibility program; particularly those directed to community, based on the community’s valuations or perceptions of the organization’s brand. There are several theoretical references that approach the concept of brand, brand from the product or service offered by the organization, but little for the organization as a whole.

However, less than a decade ago, Don and Majkea Shultz have been establishing new concepts oriented to the brand in a more integrated way, where the organization mobilizes to interact with all the stakeholders that the company wants to reach and engage in dialogue.

In this paper a conceptual frame is presented to expose the development of topics related to the research, where social responsibility is included, community stakeholders, as well as intangible attributes that constitute the organization’s image and reputation, and the monitors that measure the corporate behavior.

Some preliminary results of the first case study, allows us to present some first approaches and basis about the importance for an organization to systematize, and value the attributes as intangible value for the organization’s brand.

Objectives

General

To identify how a corporate brand is perceived by a community, based on the results of the implementation of a Corporate Social Responsibility program that will contribute to the formulation of a measurement scale. Case study of three local companies from Barranquilla, Colombia.

Specific

- To define the attributes that should be taken into account by an organization when measuring their corporate brand, from the implementation of a Corporate Social Responsibility program.

- To determine, to what extent, the perceptions a community has of their corporate brand, based on the results of the implementation of a Corporate Social Responsibility program, benefits the organization.
Research Questions

- Which are the perceptions formed by a community of a corporate brand, based on the implementation of a Corporate Social Responsibility program executed by a company?

- What is the importance of identifying a measurement system that will allow the companies to quantify their results in Corporate Social Responsibility, based on the community’s perception?

Corporate Social responsibility

During the 1999 Davos World Forum, The Secretary General of the United Nations, Kofi Annan, announced the Global Pact with the objective of promoting a social dialogue for the creation of a global corporate citizenship. A Citizenship that would allow conciliation between the interests of the companies and the values and demands of the civil society, the projects of the UN, unions and NGOs, over ten principles related with the areas of human rights, work, environment and corruption. Companies then passed from being considered a legal body which only purpose is to generate profits, to be considered a person with feelings, with responsibility for the rest of the society, and as a good corporate citizen (Carey, 2001). In other words, they turned into companies with corporate Social responsibility.

Matten (quoted in Tracey, Phillips & Haugh, 2005) states that corporate citizenship can be seen in two ways: the limited vision and the equivalent vision. Under the limited vision, the company does voluntary work on communities. On the other hand, the equivalent vision considers that corporate citizenship equals Corporate Social Responsibility, through which corporations seek to minimize the negative consequences of their activities while maximizing the positive ones. The equivalent vision will be addressed in this study, where there is a major involvement of the company with the community, with the objective of achieving long term benefits for its environment.

The nonprofit organization Business for Social Responsibility (quoted by Abuderne, 2006), following this equivalent vision of corporate citizenship and Corporate Social Responsibility, defines CSR as a “set of policies, practices and programs that have financial success at the same time they honor the ethical values and respect people, communities, and the natural environment”. In words of the European Union, the social responsible companies are those companies that are environmentally and socially committed with their commercial activity. In other words, that not only pay attention to their productive process, but also to matters that before were not important, but today are fundamental, like it is to consider that what goes in there are not only machines but also human beings, and what surrounds it are not only goods to be consumed or used in the productive cycle, but also an environmental and social setting to identify with (Barrachina, 2003, p.23).

To follow this socially responsible behavior is, according to Patricia Abuderne (2006), the right way to proceed in a world where half of the population lives with less than two dollars a day, where one thousand million people can’t write or read, and where five hundred million
human beings never try a glass of pure water. As Corporate Social Responsibility contributes to the development of social and environmental conditions, it is also related to good financial performance of the companies in the market. Abuderne (2006) states that “Corporate Social Responsibility is the herald of a good administration, and a good administration is the best indicator of financial performance”.

**The Stakeholders in Corporate Social Responsibility programs**

In order to materialize the responsible behavior of a company in a Corporate Social Responsibility program or action, Paul Tracey (2005) affirms that a company must include a dialogue with stakeholders, the search for long term solutions that build capacities, rather than fast contents, and must be receptive to the local needs and priorities. In the case of this research, we understand stakeholders as “a broad category of personas that can be affected or affect the managerial decisions of a company – such as employees, suppliers and community residents” (Grunig 2001). In agreement with the objectives previously established, this study will address social responsibility programs directed to community stakeholders.

Taylor (quoted in Muthuri, Chapple & Moon, 2008) defines a community as a “relationship between elements of ‘locality’, ‘alignments of interest’ and ‘collective action’”. In this case, the community is a non geographic gathering of interests. In other words, a group with a common issue or interest, where geographic localization does not matter.

An organization can manage its social responsibility actions or programs with community in two ways: through the collaborative way or through the structure of an in house project. The authors establish that the collaborative form allows companies and third sector organizations to develop, and implement, joint strategies to deal with social problems, giving both, NGO’S and companies, a measure of responsibility and control in the delivery. Although this form builds capacities within an organization, such as developing real expectations in relation to social results, and the management of resources to support the third sector effectively, the barrier between the company and the community does not disappear. The third sector organization or NGO will always have more involvement with the community.

According to the objectives of this project, the criteria for the selection of the social responsibility program is the structure of a in- house project which, as Tracey (2005) affirms, through the establishment of a department or area within the organization, responsible of developing and delivering the company’s social responsibility objectives, “allows to build a coherent group of integrated activities that are consistent to the company’s strategic objectives and organizational capacities.” This way facilitates the participation of the organizations in the community, due to the fact that the company interacts in a direct way with its local stakeholders. An in – house project is only viable when the Corporate Social Responsibility objectives are aligned with the company’s main objectives.

**The value of the corporate brand in Corporate Social Responsibility Programs**

It is important that the Social Responsibility objectives are aligned with the organization’s objectives, because there must be coherence between the company’s behavior and its strategic vision in order to achieve an alignment between the perceptions of the external stakeholders and the way the organization wants to be defined. What the present study seeks to achieve is to be able to look at the results of a CSR program from what its brand represents to its beneficiaries. In order to do so, we will start by defining brand as:
Alignments between the origin and everyday practices of the organization (organizational culture); where the organization aspires to go (strategic vision); how the organization is perceived by external stakeholders (images); all nested in perceptions of who the organization is (identity). (Schultz, Antorini & Csaba, 2005, p. 24).

According to Schultz (2005), the brand originates from the different combinations of symbols, values and beliefs that come out from the organization and its dynamic relations with the internal and external stakeholders. In this sense, corporate branding is the way in which an organization can build relationships with its environment in a strategic way (Schultz, 2006, p. 26). It represents the idea that an organization and everything it stands for, mobilize to interact with the stakeholders the company wants to reach and engage in dialogue (Schultz, et. als., 2005).

Hatch & Schultz (2001) developed the Corporate Branding Tool Kit under the premise that every company should align three essential and interdependent elements – known as strategic stars – in order to create strong corporate brands: vision, culture and image. It consists of a series of questions designed to reveal the misalignments between these elements. The first series of questions look at the relationship between vision and culture; the alignment between the management and the employees. The second refers to the culture and image, finding possible gaps between attitudes of the employees and the perceptions of the outside world. The third explores the gap between vision and image – Is management taking the company into a direction that is supported by the stakeholders?

The authors define the vision as what the management aspires for the company. By culture they understand the organization’s values, behaviors and attitudes; the way the employees feel about the company. And finally they conceive image as the general impression the outside world has of the company, including all the stakeholders: customers, shareholders, media, and general public, among others. The gaps between these “strategic stars” constitute an obstacle for the creation of a strong corporate brand (2001).

The gaps that, according to Hatch and Schultz (2001), may appear between these elements are:

The gap between vision and culture, that occurs when the top management takes the company into a strategic direction that the employees do not understand or support.

The gap between culture and image, which occurs when the lack of alignment between the image of the company and the organizational culture makes the clients confused about who is the company and what does it stands for. In most cases this means that the companies don’t ‘walk the talk’ tarnishing its image between key stakeholders. (Hatch y Schultz, 2001).

The gap between image and vision is the third obstacle that hinders a strong corporate brand, and it consists of the conflict between the outsiders’ images and the management’s strategic vision. Companies can’t afford ignoring its stakeholders; even the vision most carefully built will fail if it is not aligned with what the clients want from the company (2001).

Hatch and Schultz state that even though the vision and the corporate culture are powerful tools, once these are aligned with the stakeholders’ images, the corporate brand can become a center of power.

**Corporate Social Responsibility in branding communication and strategy**
Schultz (2005, p. 29) states that the change from product branding to corporate branding has been reflected in theoretical developments within different academic disciplines that, when integrated, provide a more dynamic and complex understanding of how organizations express themselves and engage in simultaneous relations with their multiple stakeholders. In the authors’ opinion, the disciplines that have contributed the most to the understanding of corporate branding are: marketing, visual identity, communication studies and strategy. Keller y Aaker (quoted in Schultz et al., p. 31) assure that corporate branding, under the integration of these disciplines, expands the range of image building activities as the brand opens to a new set of dimensions and attributes that can be more attractive and engaging to consumers. “For example, corporate branding enables companies to include their social programs and social responsibility activities, in the brand, thereby directly involving consumers directly” (Schultz et al., p. 32). Given the objectives of the present study, we will pay special attention to the communication studies discipline and the strategy, being these disciplines the ones that include the company’s social behavior.

In the field of communications, corporate communication has contributed to the corporate branding by showing the growing interdependence between a variety of internal and external stakeholders.

The shift from consumers to all company stakeholders, implied in the move from product to corporate branding, has been reflecting within communication studies in the concern for the social legitimacy of corporations towards all of their stakeholders. Social legitimacy among all stakeholders is seen as necessary in order for companies to obtain a license to operate within societies and has imposed demands for more transparency and more explicit ethical standards for companies. Thus, corporate branding has required companies to link who they are with how they respond to the growing demands for legitimacy. These demands address everything from corporate governance to an improved documentation of corporate behavior in areas such as environment and social responsibility (Schultz et al., 2005, p. 36).

This demand for a greater transparency has generated a more holistic way of communicating who the company is and how does it contributes to its various stakeholders (Schultz, 2005).

In the other hand, the strategy discipline has focused in the value of the intangible resources generated by the company, considering its content as the ability of the company to mobilize these resources towards activities that generate a competitive advantage (2005, p. 43). Schultz identifies corporate reputation as one of the recent developments concerning intangible assets. Forbrum & Van Riel (quoted in 2005, p. 43) define Corporate Reputation as “the longitudinal judgment of who the company is and what it stands for among multiple stakeholders”. The authors state that the importance of corporate reputation as an intangible value for corporate brands lies in the fact that they are much more invested in their stakeholder relations than product brands, exposing their organizational culture in more direct and transparent ways (2005, p. 44).

The strong focus on corporate reputation has been enhanced by the growing mistrust and skepticism towards companies in the Western part of the World that was generated by a series of corporate scandals and a global ‘cult of greed’ among
leading companies and executives. Those experiences have strengthened stakeholders’ demands for increasing corporate transparency and expectations that companies become more sincere. In essence, this implies that companies walk the talk and stand behind who they claim to be in their different stakeholder relationships. This pressure has forced companies into more and more situations where the have to care about the credibility of their corporate reputation. A deliberate move towards corporate branding implies that a company needs to be more serious when making identity claims about who it is and what it is going to deliver to its various stakeholders, as stakeholders have become more aware and attentive. (Schultz, et. al., 2005, p. 44).

The latter shows how in the corporate branding practices and methods the strategy goes from tangible to intangible assets through competitive analyses, stakeholder relations, and Corporate Social Responsibility (Schultz, 2006, p. 47).

Turning intangibles into tangibles : a value of a social responsibility program

Guiad and León (2001) define intangible as an aspect that can’t be easily perceived and can’t be assigned with an actual or approximate value, such as knowledge, intellectual assets, abilities, ideas and believes. How the organization is perceived by external stakeholders and the image they form of the company are important intangibles when measuring a corporate brand (Schultz, 2005).

Image is formed by a series of attributes and values that work as a stereotype, and that define the behaviors and opinions of the collectivity (2001). Paul Capriotti, defines attributes as the ones that identify the company as a social actor and distinguishes it from other entities of the sector. This attribute network is formed by information that the individual believes is right, and that as a consequence he or she will evaluate and probably act according to it.

Two components of the attributes are distinguished: functional attributes and emotional attributes. Functional attributes are related with tangible characteristics that can be easily measured, while the emotional component is associated with psychological dimensions that are manifested with feelings and attitudes towards the company. (Leblanc y Nguyen, 1996)

In this structure of believes there can be cognitive elements (aspects involving real knowledge or proved things) and also affective elements (of emotional type that don’t correspond to analytical matters). These two structures (cognitive and affective) are deeply related and they influence each other. Thus, it is difficult to determine until what point the image of an organization is constituted by cognitive or emotional aspects, it could be stated that each of the attributes by which an organization is identified or associated have both components, the cognitive element and the emotional aspect. (Capriotti, 1999, p.12).

However, after a broad bibliographical research, it can be stated that organizations haven’t identified attributes that will allow them value how are they perceived in their social responsibility programs. There is no theory or bibliographic reference that supports it. Taking into account that credibility is one of the expectations to which corporate brands are faced (Schultz, p. 46) and that trust is one of the main attributes of the organizational reputation (Rawlins 2007), for the particular case of this research, these two attributes declared by the author are taken as elements that support the search of information with the case study stakeholders.
Nooteboom (quoted in Berens and Van Riel, 2006), defines trust as the “subjective probability that someone assigns to a benevolent action of an agent or groups of agents.” In this sense, trust is related with the prediction of a social actor’s behavior. Van Riel affirms that the three dimension of trust are reliability, honesty and benevolence.

Reliability, according to Berens, is understood as “the perceived ability to maintain explicit or implicit promises” while honesty is the “belief that an entity is reliable in its word, that would keep up promises and obligations, and that is sincere”. Thus, honesty is not related to the ability to fulfill promises, but with the intentions of fulfilling them. Benevolence is the “good will perceived for behaving in a way that everyone is benefited” (Berens et. al, 2006). While honesty and reliability are related to the possibility of the organization to fulfill explicit promises, benevolence is related to the possibility that an organization behaves in a cooperative way, independent of the promises it makes.

Brad Rawlins (quoting Bradach & Eccles, 1989; Cummings & Bromily, 1996), affirms that trust, from an organizational perspective, can be defined as the collective opinion of a group from another group, in terms that the other one is going to be honest, is going to fulfill the commitments, and won’t take advantage of others.

Hunt and Grunig (quoted in Rawlins, 2007), identify trust as the essential component of a satisfactory relationship between the organization and its stakeholders. These authors identify integrity, reliability and competence as the three dimension of trust. Integrity is the belief that an organization is fair, reliability is defined in a similar way to Berens and Van Riel, as the belief that an organization is going to do what it says it is going to do, while the competence is the belief that an organization has the ability and capacity of doing what it says is going to do.

According to Berens and Van Riel credibility is a very similar concept to trust. Newell and Goldsmith (2001) define it as the “expertise, trustworthiness, truthfulness of a company”. Callison (quoted in Rawlins, 2007) states that “credibility refers to the judgment made by the message receiver in terms of how much he/she believes in the communicator”. Said in few words, to be credible is to be believed (Budd, 2000).

In this way we can appreciate how trust and credibility are attributes that can be adjusted to the community perceptions about the companies and their social responsibility programs. As stated by Stacks and Watson (2007, P.69) “credibility is dependent on the trust between the organization and it’s publics, which is highly correlated with both, reputation and relationship.” Relationships established through a Corporate Social Responsibility program, and the community’s perceptions about it will determine the image of the corporate brand.

**Monitors**

In terms of perceptions, there are organizations or monitors that measure stakeholders’ perceptions of different dimensions of the companies in order to measure corporate reputation. Corporate Reputation “is the result of a corporate behavior that harmonizes the organization’s hard assets and soft assets” (Villafañe, 2004).

The reputation is the consequence of good economic results and social responsible behaviors, reputed companies usually possess a quality commercial offer, at the same time that they produce an emotional appeal to their present and future employees. (2004; p. 26)
Although not all the monitors measure Corporate Social Responsibility perceptions in a direct way, they do take into account the different variables and dimensions to measure the company’s commitment with the social sector. Justo Villafañe (2004, p 100) states that all monitors share a common denominator that consists of assessing corporate behavior in order to establish rankings that classify companies followed by a hierarchy based upon the level of fulfillment of the evaluation criteria. Some monitors are the Reputation Institute, Merco, The most respected companies of the Financial Times, and the FTSE4 Good.

The Reputation Institute with the RepTrack tool evaluates the reputation of the biggest companies around the world through the consumer perceptions of 6 specific dimensions: financial performance, products and services, workplace, vision and leadership, emotional appeal and social responsibility. In the social responsibility dimension, the general public perceptions about the company’s good causes, the environmental responsibility and the responsibility with the community are evaluated.

In the same way, The Merco Monitor of Justo Villafañe & Associates uses six variables similar to the ones employed by the Reputation Institute: Economic and financial performance, quality of the commercial offer, internal reputation, company’s international dimension, innovations, and ethics and social responsibility. The last dimension is subdivided into ethical corporate behavior, commitment with community, and social and environmental responsibility.

This case shows perceptions taken from the top management’s perspective of the highest incomes companies in the countries where the study takes place, followed by a documental analysis of annual reports and memories, and finally the evaluation of experts for each of the variables mentioned before.

The objective of the reputation monitor of the Financial Times Most Respected Companies, is to identify the most respected companies by their colleagues from other organizations and the reason why are considered this way. In relation to Corporate Social Responsibility, the executives are asked about the importance of CSR in their business, and they are asked to number three companies they consider the most socially responsible.

FTSE4 Good and the Dow Jones Sustainability Monitors measure the Social Responsibility from the company’s perspective based on its own performance. Then, it is evaluated by experts to finally publish a ranking. The FTSE4 Good has four variables: environment, sustainability, stakeholders’ relations, and human rights. On the other hand, Dow Jones Sustainability Index promotes that investments should take place with social responsible companies. This monitor measures Corporate Social Responsibility having in consideration the following variables: corporate government, investor relations, strategic planning, measurement systems, risk and crisis, conduct codes, customer relations, supplies procedures, bribe and corruption, social dimension, remuneration and job satisfaction.

This is how we can see that none of the monitors previously mentioned measure Corporate Social Responsibility from the perspective of the community benefited or affected by the organization’s activities. Statement that is not coherent with the concept of corporate brand, which requires that the brand perceptions come from the stakeholder that directly relates with the organization. In the case of social responsibility programs the community is the stakeholder that directly relates and receives the organization’s behavior.

There are also different measuring systems that have as an objective, to establish models that allow companies to measure performance in their Corporate Social Responsibility programs.
These are created by non governmental organizations or consultancy organizations, among which you can find: Ethos, Acción Empresarial , United Nations Global Reporting Initiative.

The Brazilian NGO, Ethos, has the objective of mobilizing and helping companies to manage their business in a social responsible way. For achieving this, Ethos provides to interested companies a questionnaire to measure their social responsibility performance. The companies should answer yes or no to each of the questions in the following topics: transparency and government, internal public, environment, suppliers, consumers and clients, government and society, and community. Each topic is divided into indicators that help companies evaluate their performance in each of the areas. In the Community area, the indicators measure philanthropy, social investment, strategic actions and social area.

In Chile, the organization Acción Empresarial establishes that indicators allow companies to auto-evaluate their practices, policies and strategies in different aspects that involve the responsibility of a corporative citizen. The indicators cover five areas: corporative ethics, responsible marketing, work life quality, environment, and commitment with the community. Each one of these areas has its own indicators that are valued by the use of a likert scale. In the particular case of community commitment, it is divided into: impacts of the organizations’ activities in the community, relationships with the community organization’s (hospitals, Schools etc), mechanisms that support social projects, actions strategies and criteria in social investment, support to the voluntary personnel work, leadership and social influence, and participation in government’s social projects.

GRI (Global Reporting Initiative) is a model developed by the United Nations for the elaboration of sustainability memories that allow companies to inform about their economic, social and environmental performance. In the social area, indicators focus their attention in the impact that organizations have in the community in which they operate. These indicators take into account the next aspects: community, corruption, public policy, disloyal competitive behavior, and normative fulfillment. The main indicator in the community topic is SO1, that refers to the nature, reach and effectiveness of the programs and practices to evaluate the impacts of the operations within the community, including the entrance, operation and exit of the organization” (Guide for the Elaboration of Sustainability Memories, 2006).

The majority of the organizations usually report performance indicators that can be quantified and easy to measure, but not necessarily indicators that are more meaningful when it comes to understand the impact on community in terms of changes in external conditions. Performance indicators monitor and evaluate the efficiency and determine if planned activities or expected results are achieved with a define budget and time. On the other hand, impact indicators evaluate the effectiveness of a particular intervention and describe if projects outputs have intention or unintentional implications on the community (Reporting on Community Impacts, 2008). Implications reflected in the community’s perception of the organization’s corporate brand.

**Methodology**

The characteristics of this project are considered to be under an exploratory study model, due to the fact that there are very few theoretical antecedents of studies focused on the effect of Corporate Social Responsibility programs on corporate brand, particularly those programs intended for the development of communities in which an organization is interested. The studies that have been consulted direct the knowledge of corporate branding towards the product or
service provided by the company, and only a few authors have developed proposals and
generated new knowledge about corporate brands in a more integrated sense.

The first stage of the study, as it is stated in the first specific objective, seeks to identify
variables or categories of analysis that will allow the development of a series of attributes or
values related to the perceptions that a community has of a Corporate Social Responsibility
Program over the brand. In order to do so, following this purpose, twenty in depth interviews
took place with the recipients of the program Reiniciar, which is the first case study from the
multinational company Electricaribe – Unión Fenosa located in the city of Barranquilla.

The qualitative interviews allowed the data analysis that was followed by the codification
of topics. The relevant topics were grouped in relation with the questions from the interview and
then in the form of answer categories. Some of the categories used in the interview are supported
by the conceptual referents addressed in the Conceptual Frame.

Being consistent with the previous statement, the nature of the research problem indicates
the need to find a better understanding of the effect of Corporate Social Responsibility on
branding through the exploration and interpretation of the managerial perceptions (ontology) that
the social actors have of CSR. That’s why the qualitative approach was chosen and an empirical
stage took place as a start point for this research.

Results

The following are some preliminary results of the perceptions delivered by the members
of the group Reiniciar, based on their experiences as beneficiaries of a Corporate Social
Responsibility program leaded by the multinational company Unión Fenosa. This program had
as an objective to help an unemployed and vulnerable population with empirical knowledge on
electrical work to reinitiate their live project with better opportunities of economic and social
development.

1. All of the 20 individuals that participated in the two focus groups agreed that the program
completely accomplished the objectives that the organization traced for the electrical
training of a group of people in Santa Marta. More than the acknowledgement of the
fulfillment of objectives that Reiniciar received from the community members, cognitive
and emotional attributes were also valued, as stated by Capriotti (1992: 12), to refer to
elements that influence an individual when forming an image towards an organization.

In the case of the program Reiniciar, the cognitive attributes are related to the degree of
real knowledge that the members of the community showed about the nature and
fulfillment of objectives of the program during the process. The emotional attributes are
related to the significance and positive assessments that the consulted group assigned to
the program related to better life, working and family conditions for them.

2. When looking to the perceptions that the members of the community have about
Electricaribe – Fundación Unión Fenosa and Energía Social as a single organization or
group that leaded the project, it was found that the members of the program only
recognized Unión Fenosa as the only leader of the project interested in giving resources
and initiatives to a vulnerable community. When refereeing to Unión Fenosa, they
professed feelings of gratitude and appreciation, and acknowledged how the project
Reiniciar showed them new employment perspectives through the expedition of a diploma
that accredited them as ideal workers in the area of electrical installations. Contrary to this, they referred to Electricaribe and Energía Social as companies providers of electrical service that were chaotic and that charged too much for the service.

The latter shows the little clarity that the beneficiaries of the program had about the brand Electricaribe – Unión Fenosa and Energía Social as a sole company or group that leaded Reiniciar. As stated by Schultz (2005: 29), the difference between product branding and corporate branding lies in the way the organizations express and engage in relationships with their multiple stakeholders.

3. When comparing the attributes of remembrance that the organization would expect to achieve in the communities where Reiniciar was implemented, and the ones perceived by the benefited, it was found that there is no alignment between these two.

The organization seized to be remembered as a brand that is close to them and that had recognition. It was found that there was a high valuation of the program, but it didn’t meet what the company stated before. The community members identified the following attributes and defined them based on the experience they had with the program:

- **Credibility**: the degree in which Unión Fenosa fulfilled and materialized the promises they made at the beginning of the program.
- **Trust**: The autonomy and personal growth that the diploma gave them as carriers of a knowledge that allows them to have professional perspectives.
- **Closeness**: The communication that remains between the organization and the members of the community, even after the program ended.

These intangibles can be defined as those non monetary values, without material substance, that allow the organizations to capitalize assets in the minds of their stakeholders based on the actions that determine their organizational attitudes.