Emergent Trust and Work Life Relationships: How to Approach the Relational Moment of Trust

∎   **Tone Bergljot Eikeland**[1]
PhD Student, University of Bergen, Norway

ABSTRACT

How do we trust? What does the basic mechanism of trust look like? These questions define the starting point for a comparison of the classic ideas of how trust works by Mayer et al. (1995), Möllering's (2006) re-adaption of Giddens', Simmel's, and James' classic ideas of trust, and a phenomenological approach focusing on "emergent trust." Introducing the concept of emergent trust, the idea is to suggest a phenomenological approach to studies of trust in work-life relationships in professional organizations, as an alternative to trust as a cognitive attitude, where trust becomes a stable, individual possession. The term "emergent" demonstrates a trust that emerges in meetings between persons, it has an immediate, unconditional quality, and shows itself in situations of life where there is a potential for trust to appear. Trust's basic relationality makes the person morally responsible for the other. Trust appears between persons, as an event, constituting risk and uncertainty as a natural and positive part of our lives. Still, in larger social settings, the responsibility of trust also disperses on to the work itself, and our wider social networks.

KEY WORDS

Trust / phenomenology / emergent / responsibility / relation / risk

How does trust emerge?

Within the academic and theoretical areas of organizations and management trust is a popular subject (e.g., Lane & Bachmann, 1998; Noteboom, 2002; Kramer & Cook, 2004; Cook et al., 2005; Lewicki et al., 2006; Li, 2007; Dietz, 2011). The popularity shows an interest in organizational trust, and how different types of trust, trust as relational or psychological condition, and trust processes like trust building and trust repair, interacts with the classic organizational and business dilemmas of efficient management and economic success. Trust has several beneficial qualities within organizations and for management of organizations, such as contributing in transformational leadership and cooperation (Kramer & Cook, 2004). The main trend seems to be studies of trust where context, variation, and a multidimensional understanding are highlighted (e.g., Kramer, 1999; Lewicki et al., 2006; Li, 2007). Even so, there seems to be confusion about and need for a deeper understanding of trust's basic mechanism: what really happens when one person trusts another? Why do we trust each other? (Dietz, 2011). What makes trust so rewarding that we take the risk of making ourselves vulnerable to rejection in trusting others?

---

[1] E-mail: tone.eikeland@gmail.com

There seems to be a need for a deeper understanding of trust as a basic mechanism and meaningful experience in work-life situations and organizations. We also need to look at trust in its contexts, variations, and processes. But it is difficult to study trust when trust seems to be a scattered conglomerate of different types and contexts. To look for trust, we need to know both where to look and what to look for. Also, in organizational research, the need to separate trust from other, similar phenomena has been stated, but often the differences are outlined on a purely theoretical level (e.g., Mayer et al., 1995; Rousseau et al., 1998).

The focus and overall research question of this paper is to look at trust in just that one moment when it appears: how does trust appear—just here and now? What is the meaning of trust as it evolves and comes to life as an interpersonal experience in the moment of its appearance? To contribute to these questions, I compare different understandings of trust's appearance and basic relational mechanism. The paper discusses how trust basically is a relational experience. The paper then is a contribution to a discussion of how to analyze and interpret trust, more than an empirical analysis in itself. Some examples of how trust becomes visible in work-life relationships will be presented, but the essence of the paper is an analytical statement as to how we may understand trust to be able to "see" trust in real-life relationships. Through an experiential understanding of trust, some important characteristics of a basic, relational trust, here termed "emergent trust," are pointed out. Where and how these characteristics appear are visualized through a few situations from working life, represented by stories from the temporary, cultural organization of "Stavanger 2008".[1]

What is the meaning of "emergent trust"? For trust to fully reach its potential in work-life organizations, the moral meaning and human responsibility which is characteristic of trust as a profound human experience ought to be considered, and included, in organization studies (Eikeland & Saevi, forthcoming). To focus trust's emergent qualities implies looking for the spontaneous, immediate qualities of trust. Trust as lived experience is a part of life as it emerges, and cannot be planned for or part of any strategy. The force of trust is part of its "weak" quality—trust is risky, uncertain, and ambiguous. Trust is part of a "weak" human existence where life's own riskiness and fragility should be embraced instead of something to be erased or overcome (Biesta, 2013). This risky, experiential quality of trust represents an important alternative in the professional organization: What does the traditional organizational knowledge universe of structures, rationality, and reflection look like when it becomes blurred by experiential, bodily, pre-reflective knowledge? Other examples of studies where experiential knowledge is highlighted in an organizational context are Kupers and Statler's (2008) study of practical wisdom, Lennie's (1999) study of how managers through their embodied experiences use metaphors in their work, and Belova's (2006) phenomenological paper on how the practice of seeing as lived experience can be studied in organizations.

What is characteristic of an experiential, phenomenological methodology? In a phenomenological interpretation, we look for what makes *the experience* of trust unique and different from other, similar experiences (van Manen, 1997, 2014). The lived experience, a key term in phenomenology, refers to the pre-reflective qualities of human existence, and how we are connected to the world around us through acting and living (Merleau-Ponty, 1956; van Manen, 1997, 2014). Phenomenology states the world and phenomena does exist, but the only way to know the world is subjectively, and we can never have full understanding of the real world in which we live. We need to dig deeper

into the experience of trust itself to describe and interpret its defining and characteristic qualities. In this paper, we try to establish a starting point for an experiential under-standing of trust, as an important correction and alternative to other approaches to trust in working life organizations.

Structure

I have chosen to look more closely at two different theories or models of organizational trust, which in different ways tries to answer the basic question of how trust emerges. The understanding of trust presented here helps me outline a basic phenomenological perspective to the study of interpersonal trust in work-life organizations. I show how this phenomenological perspective may help me recognize what trust means, discussing dif-ferent sources of phenomenological philosophy, especially building my reflections on con-tributions from Lögstrup (1971/1997, 2008), Lingis (2004), and Levinas (1985, 1998).

In the first part of the paper, models by Mayer et al. (1995) and Möllering (2006) are outlined. The model of Mayer, Davis, and Schoorman (1995) refers to an inter-pretation of trust as a psychological state, a "willingness to render ourselves vulner-able" (Rousseau et al., 1998). The model is one of few that really tries to explore trust in itself, as the relational, interpersonal mechanism of trust between persons (Mayer et al., 1995; Rousseau et al., 1998; Dietz, 2011). Also, Möllering, building on the classic ideas of trust from Giddens (1990, 1991), Luhmann (1979), and Simmel (1907/1990, 1908/1950), develops an approach wherein the basics of trust are central. What makes people take the chance to trust, what makes us willing to make a "leap of faith" to trust one another? (Möllering, 2006).

While Mayer et al. (1995) and Möllering (2006) mainly consider trust a product of the mind, highlighting the cognitive aspects, a phenomenological interpretation directs the attention to the nonreflective aspects. The trust experience then becomes dependent on the risk-taking act of trust. To see trust as an act requires focusing on what we do instead of what we think we do. Also, the act of trust unfolds as a risk-taking act of addressing the other, as emergent trust in the moment of relationality. To focus on emer-gent trust as a risk-taking act implies the immediate, nonreflective kind of act, not an act of purpose, a willed, intended act seen from the interest of the individual. The emergent, risk-taking act is part of the ambivalent, "weak" human existence, where acts emerge instead of develop (Biesta, 2013).

Trust as a psychological state of the individual

Both Mayer et al. (1995) and Möllering (2006) are occupied with the source of trust: why does one person trust another person? The trust that emerges between two col-leagues is their main concern in outlining their theories in how trust works. Trust has its basis in the relationship between the two colleagues, and this interpersonal trust develops in an organizational setting. But how does trust between the two parties in the organization emerge? What makes us trust the other?

At the center of trust, according to Mayer et al., is a form of attitude or willingness, which also incorporates expectations toward the other. They even underline that: "Trust

is not taking risk per se, but rather it is a willingness to take a risk" (Mayer et al., 1995, p. 712). The willingness itself then constitutes trust as a kind of state of the individual.

The aspects of ability, benevolence, and integrity define the other's trustworthiness, and are the important characteristics of trust in the model by Mayer et al., or what makes trust possible. Ability describes skills and characteristics, which "enable a party to have influence within some specific domain" (1995, p. 717). This feature links trust to the situation or context where it appears, or where the potential for trust resides. For example, a person may have great technical skills in her work as an engineer, and is trusted to do technical tasks at work. This same person may not have good skills in language and writing, and is therefore not trusted to do writing tasks for example. Ability then, makes trust domain specific, or dependent on context (Mayer et al., 1995).

Benevolence has to do with the attitude of the part who shows trust, "the extent to which a trustee is believed to want to do good to the trustor, aside from an egocentric profit motive. Benevolence suggests that the trustee has some specific attachment to the trustor" (Mayer et al., 1995, p. 718). To develop trust, there is a general goodwill toward the other person, which Mayer suggests has to be followed by some kind of attachment to, or familiarity with this other person.

The last feature defining the other's trustworthiness is our interpretation of the person's integrity, meaning a kind of moral congruent with the values of society or the values or principles of the parties trusting. In Mayer's model, integrity means "the trustor's perception that the trustee adheres to a set of principles that the trustor finds acceptable" (Mayer et al., 1995, p. 719). Both following a set of principles, and the mutual accept of these principles are necessary.

These elements define the state of the trustee and really explains the trustworthiness rather than trust itself. But according to Mayer et al., these factors "contribute a unique perceptual perspective from which to consider the trustee," which in their view gives a solid foundation for empirical studies of trust (p. 717). The three aspects defining trust, or "the willingness to be vulnerable," are ability, benevolence, and integrity. These aspects together are what makes us trustworthy to others or not, although we should see the aspects together as a continuum, not as either-or. Constituent for trust then is the subject's evaluation of the other's trustworthiness. This evaluation in turn has an effect on the subject's willingness to be vulnerable to trust the other. The cognitive process of assessing the other's trustworthiness in terms of ability, benevolence, and integrity, and the willingness to risk and be vulnerable seem to define trust in the model by Mayer et al.

But we still do not get any explanation as to how trust can become real. When the person has made an assessment of the other's ability, benevolence, and integrity, and is willing to be vulnerable, what starts him or her in the act of trusting the other person? What makes the mechanism and dynamism of trust start moving?

Building on Mayer et al.'s model of trust, Rousseau (1998) also sees trust as the psychological condition per se, while trust-related behavior or the choice to trust is not part of the basic trust mechanism. Risk is a necessary condition for trust to appear, but not part of trust itself, only as potential, assessed risk. The act of trust, daring to do something, is excluded from the basis of what trust is. Still, Mayer et al. in a later paper try to incorporate the act or verb of trust into their understanding. They see how trust after all is dependent on some kind of "behavioural manifestation" to be present and real (Mayer et al., 2007; Dietz, 2011, p. 215).

Dietz (2011) further evolves the model to a form of cyclical dynamic, as he includes a behavioral manifestation of trust, and how this act or manifestation of trust feeds back information, which we consider again in evaluating the party's trustworthiness. The movement and cyclical dynamic then becomes self-fluxing. Even if the model by Mayer et al. dates almost 20 years back, Dietz claims that the model is universal and still highly relevant: "there is always an assessment (however thorough) of the other party's trustworthiness which informs a preparedness to be vulnerable that, in genuine cases of trust, leads to a risk-taking act. The results of the trusting encounter update the foundational assessment" (Dietz, 2011, p. 215). But Dietz takes the model a step further in re-establishing the assessment and willingness to be vulnerable within a dynamic: after the assessment and vulnerability, the act of trusting in itself is the next step, followed by some kind of result, which again informs the parties' assessment of one another's trustworthiness.

The trusting act, taking the risk that may hurt us, is really the decisive point where trust either emerges or not. Without the risk-taking act, there is and cannot be trust. Still, Mayer et al. (1995) and Rousseau et al. (1998) choose to exclude the act of trust, what makes trust become real, from their understanding of the trust mechanism. Following Dietz (2011), I see the act as essential to trust, as there would be no trust without the risk-taking itself. In my view, what happens in the risky act of putting ourselves out there is of vital importance for trust to happen. Instead of modeling out capacities and features defining expectations and the psychological state of the individuals involved, we direct our attention to the risk-taking act itself. Can it be this act is too difficult to understand, as it displays the irrational sides of trust as fragility, riskiness, and spontaneity (e.g., Lögstrup 1997, 2008; Lingis, 2004; Biesta, 2013)? How can we understand and relate to the risk-taking act of trust?

The leap of faith

"What is the important missing element which captures the true essence of trust that makes it a unique phenomenon and such a powerful concept?" Möllering (2006) asks (p. 106). With the terms "suspension," "bracketing," and "leap of faith," Möllering tries to outline a way of understanding the mechanism of trust. In his model, the bases of trust are reason, routine, and reflexivity, but the essential feature which really defines trust is "the leap of faith" or suspension. In Möllering's model, suspension is the driving force of trust that "enables actors to deal with irreducible uncertainty and vulnerability" (p. 110). Acknowledging ambiguity and uncertainty as vital and characteristic traits of what trust is all about, Möllering looks for the attitude or knowledge that enables us to cope with the uncertainty and vulnerability that trusting necessarily implies. There are three ways in which we may understand suspension: as an as-if attitude, resembling a form of fiction, as a kind of bracketing, a temporary blending out of uncertainty and vulnerability, and a will to believe, where willpower makes us trust (Möllering, 2006).

Drawing on the lessons concerning trust in Lewis and Weigert's classic paper, the as-if attitude is explained with the following sentence: "to trust is to live as if certain rationally possible futures will not occur" (Lewis & Weigert, 1985, p. 969). To Möllering (2006) then, the as-if attitude of trust shows how "trust does not rest on

objective certainty but on 'illusion'" (p. 112). The illusion or fiction is a constructed reality in which uncertainty and vulnerability is unproblematic. In a world of trust as socially constructed fiction, both trustor and trustee are active players in a performative act of creating the image of themselves as trustworthy. Still, although fictious, actors behave as if the socially constructed trust is real (Möllering, 2006).

Actors blend out the issues that cannot be fully resolved, called "bracketing." They can live and interact with each other as if doubts are unproblematic. Vulnerability is not really managed, only set aside for the time being. Such a suspension technique has to be learned in infancy (Giddens, 1991). Although the as if-attitude largely rests upon a controllable self-presentation, building the image of trust through a highly reflective cognitive construction of self and surroundings, the bracketing relies on a "practical consciousness" (Giddens, 1991). The practical dimension represents a tacit, routine-like upholding of trust, securing a constitutive normality of any situation. Bracketing shows how "suspension itself is irreducible. It may be identified and described, but not explained or justified" (Möllering, 2006, p. 118). The as-if attitude largely rests on an assumption of trust as a controllable, rational feature for us to construct and uphold together with others. The bracketing dimension though incorporates trust as a verb, where the act of trust is as much about the actual movement, the behavior that makes trust emerge, as the cognitive attitude of trust.

Last, Möllering (2006) brings in the classic essay of William James "The will to believe" (1896/1948). We may wonder how the process or act of trust really gets started: who or what makes us dare to open up for risk, uncertainty and trust? To Möllering, James has the answer: faith meaning "the actor's genuine but not conclusively justifiable conviction that what he believes is 'true' in the pragmatist sense of being useful, giving expectations and (thus) enabling action. This sentiment produces the 'will' to believe" (Möllering, 2006, p. 120). Faith then not only helps getting the process of trust started, it is also self-fulfilling, as faith in something helps create this something, says Möllering. Again, the fictious dimension is highlighted, and our capability of creating and upholding our own reality through a combination of faith and self-control. But the main point in how trust may emerge for Möllering is agency: the person's will and «irreducible agency» cannot be forced or even requested, to make the leap the person himself or herself has to decide and be willing to act.

From individual to relational trust

Can we answer our initial question, what makes trust emerge or what makes us dare to trust on the basis of the models of Mayer et al. and Möllering? In the model by Mayer et al., trust becomes a state of mind, a willingness to take a risk, and make ourselves vulnerable on the basis of an assessment of the other's trustworthiness. But this "psychological state" view of trust does not explain how we dare to throw ourselves into the act of trust (Dietz, 2011). Something has to happen for trust to be made real, an act or some kind of behavior (e.g., Schoorman et al., 2007; Dietz, 2011). In Dietz' view, the act of trust as cyclical dynamic is established as the outcome of the act feeds back with information which then continually updates the assessment of the other's trustworthiness. Further, this cyclical dynamic is really what constitutes trust as "The universal trust experience," according to Dietz (2011).

Möllering (2006) is occupied with the individual's ability to cope with ambiguity and uncertainty. Through the techniques of an as-if attitude, bracketing, and faith, trusting or not is up to the individual himself or herself and the decision and will to make this leap of faith. Möllering includes both trustor and trustee in his reflections, and is assuming trust happens in social contexts. But when it comes to what initially makes trust happen, it seems relationality fades and the individual himself or herself decides whether to trust or not. Cognitive aspects, like attitude, expectations, faith, and will, are what make trust happen, says Möllering—but the trusting act itself is not further described or explained. In Mayer et al.'s (1995) view, the description of the trust mechanism seems mainly occupied with the cognitive attitude of trust and what constitutes this mechanism of cognition and reflection. Even though Möllering includes the act of trust in the trust mechanism, the act also becomes cognitive, and trust seems to happen mainly as some sort of technique of managing uncertainty and risk.

Both Mayer et al. and Möllering are occupied with the individual, and the individuals' ability to trust. They both focus on the psychological state of individuals (Mayer et al.), and agency and the will of the individual (Möllering) as the core elements of trust. In a social science world that seems afraid of the singular person, where all phenomena are in some way related to societies and groups of people (Sørhaug, 1996), the individual and personal aspects of social phenomena are important corrections. Still, when trust turns into an individual project, and the other party in the relational trust experience becomes part of the contextual background, it seems necessary to further explore the relational characteristics of trust. In Solomon and Flores (2001) relational understanding of trust, the dynamic, free, and still risky aspects of trust are highlighted in a statement of trust not being some kind of state, but rather in motion, an act, a choice, and practical skill making relations and communities ever changing. The relationality in a phenomenological interpretation is still of another kind, in trust we as persons are constituted as moral, responsible subjects in the presence of the other, in the experience of oneself and this other (e.g., Levinas, 1985, 2006; Løgstrup, 1997). How does this responsibility show itself in the relationships between colleagues, and how does responsibility and trust interact as parts of larger social settings as teams and corporations?

Mayer et al. and Möllering dig deep into the basics of trust as a cognitive asset, and show us that trust must embrace vulnerability and risk to be understood. Still, to make trust happen, it seems necessary to re-visit the understanding of trust as an act in the light of relationality and ethics. Do we not have to look further than the will, faith, and assets of the individual to understand how trust happens? Is trust always responsible, or a kind of response toward the other?

The personal risk of trust

Mayer et al. (1995) introduce benevolence as a personal dimension to trust, and say benevolence as a goodwill toward others develops when we have some kind of attachment to this other. The authors feel that benevolence introduces a personal orientation to the model. What does it mean that trust is personal? Does personal imply we know the other person and has some kind of attachment to this other?

To Lingis (2004), trust is an act of taking a personal risk that opens up for the other to reject or ridicule us—an act which exposes us as persons, in which we cannot hide

who we are. Trust is a profound personal experience, an experience involving the whole person, not only parts or roles. When trust becomes a personal matter, we are deeply involved in the trusting and cannot set ourselves or any part of the experience on hold. The presence of the Other demands our full attention and involvement. Personal trust then is about "trusting the other as an Other,"[2] which is different from "dealing with the other in terms of institutionalized roles and rules" (Frederiksen, 2014, p. 37). Lingis describes the very personal and instant moment of how trust emerges in this way:

> It happens every day that I feel a force that breaks out of the passing forms and takes hold of me: 'Hey you!' 'Hey Al!' Isn't it astounding –really our theories do not account for it – that I feel these words coming straight at me, hitting me, clamping on to me? An appeal is being addressed to me, a demand put on me. The words have penetrated right through the role, the social identity, the visible and interpretable form, to the very core that is me. (Lingis, 2004, p. 9)

Lingis shows us the very fragile, but at the same time powerful force of the movement, the addressing act we may call trust. But this kind of trust does not presuppose any long-term attachment to one another. Its impact has to do with calling the other by name, but really we do not need to know this other to address the person.

In addressing, in the act of trust, its personal dimension makes it impossible to hold back and not be vulnerable to rejection or indifference. The story below told by Line working in the temporal organization of "Stavanger2008" clearly shows how vulnerable we are in trust, and the significance of the personal experience of trust.

Line and the departments of communication and information were engaged in a book project. In the planning phase, she, two of the other employees, and one external advisor went to Oslo to meet with the publisher. Shortly after their return from Oslo, her boss John comes to talk to Line.

> John turns up at my desk and he says, 'I only wanted you to know this, people are talking internally about the fact that you all went to Oslo. You should know that other people react when the whole department goes away for a day like this'. (…) 'I hear you', I answer, 'but we ought to be very happy with us being there, all of us'. And John replies, 'Yes, but you should know it gets noticed'. And then he leaves.

The anger really gets to Line shortly after John left. She writes him an e-mail, pointing out that she reacted to the way he spoke, and she wanted to know what he really meant by what he said.

John meets Line with suspicion, he is critical of her decision to go to a meeting in Oslo with three of her colleagues. When Line looks at John, she knows nothing about his suspicions, she meets him with an open mind, being vulnerable to whatever is acted out or said from the other person present. She is present in the moment as herself, as Line, already personally involved as her boss approaches her (Lingis, 2004).

Trust as a given and natural part of life

For Line, the humiliation and anger is very real and really a personal matter. Line meets her boss in a kind of natural trust following Lögstrup's (1997, 2008) view seeing how

trust is part of our lives all the time—it is always present as a potential without us being conscious of it. Initially, we trust one another, Lögstrup says (1997, p. 8). To trust initially means trust precedes even our consciousness, and the human being itself. Trust is already there, it is given, as a sovereign expression of life that resides in the situation. We naturally trust one another, before we start thinking that there might be any other option. To trust precedes decisions and even the ability to decide (Lögstrup, 1997, 2008).

> It is a characteristic of human life that we normally encounter one another with natural trust. This is true not only in the case of persons who are well acquainted with one another, but also in the case of complete strangers. (…) Initially we believe one another's word; initially we trust one another. This may indeed seem strange, but it is a part of what it means to be human. (Lögstrup 1997, p. 8)

Frederiksen (2014), in an analysis of Lögstrup's and Williamson's understanding of trust, see their different understandings as modes of conduct or engagement in interaction. In familiar situations then, we trust naturally, as our way of being in the world. Familiarity "is the diffused experience and expectation of repetition: social interactions in the future will generally develop as social interactions did in the past (…) Familiarity allows us to interact without guarding ourselves in advance" (Frederiksen, 2014, p. 38).

In the context of familiarity, the personal experience of trust seems to appear without risk and uncertainty. Lögstrup's trust (1997) is a natural attitude of life in which we do not experience risk as such, although risk as potential is always part of trust. Line in her trust is vulnerable and takes a risk, but has no conscious reflection of this risk. The humiliation is experienced even stronger when there is no reservation or reflection following the trust. Still, trust is a risk-taking act where risk and vulnerability play an inherent part, even though we are not conscious of the trust experience. Risk is embraced and integrated as a constitutive part of trust, not as an opposite or outwards reflection. We do not know how trust will affect us and what will happen when we trust. The risk and uncertainty demands courage to trust. Trust without risk seems impossible. Trust is an experience where we are open to others and our surroundings; in trust, the control over our life or some of it is handed over to the ones we trust (Lögstrup, 1997). Thereby we, in the defining moment, even risk our life, handing over power and the possibility to harm us to the other.

Revealing our true selves in trust

To be honest and tell the truth takes courage. So does exposing oneself in the act of trust. To trust demands the courage to show one's true self—and let go of control over our life, handing over power to the other. Foucault (2001) considers truth and honesty closely connected to danger: Only when we risk something and expose ourselves to vulnerability, do we really speak the truth. Some would risk their life to speak out loud what he or she believes in. We trust that a person is honest when something significant to him or her is at stake.

The measure of truthfulness and honesty is above all how personally or relationally dangerous something is to reveal. What may happen if I tell this in public? "Parrhesia then, is linked to courage in the face of danger: it demands the courage to speak the

truth in spite of some danger. And in its extreme form, telling the truth takes place in the 'game' of life or death" (Foucault, 2001, p. 16).

To risk ourselves and be vulnerable in trusting becomes very real when our trust is not met, when our ethical demand of responsibility and care from the other (Lögstrup, 1997) is ignored or met with suspicion. In trust, we expose ourselves without having the possibility of correcting or creating the image of ourselves we want to present to others. To Arendt (1998), all acts have such a revelatory character. Through action we reveal who we are. To show the true character of self is part of the essence of an action, without the person acting being conscious of it. "This unpredictability of outcome is closely related to the revelatory character of action and speech, in which one discloses one's self without ever either knowing himself or being able to calculate beforehand whom he reveals" (Arendt, 1998, p. 192).

The real, unique person, the I, will be revealed in every act and uttering. Both Mayer et al. (1995) and Möllering (2006) are occupied with how we, through different cognitive techniques, try to create a trustworthy image of ourselves, to build trust. To transform and adapt well, and play our roles may contribute in other's trust in us (Giddens, 1991; Möllering, 2006). But interacting in our social roles does not have to be trust. In the addressing act of trust, we lose control of our self-performance, and the shelter of the social role, and are suddenly present before the other in trust as ourselves, in person (Lingis, 2004).

The infinite responsibility for the Other

When we act, we establish or withhold contact with others. It is in the nature of action to reach out to the other. "Action, moreover, no matter what its specific content, always establishes relationships and therefore has an inherent tendency to force open all limitations and cut across all boundaries" (Arendt, 1998, p. 190). Trust reaches out to someone other than oneself, and connects two or more persons. But what kind of relationality does trust represent?

Cook et al. (2005) put interest first in their understanding of trust. The encapsulated interest model of trust is their preferred view: "we trust you because we think you take our interest to heart and encapsulate our interest in your own" (Cook et al., 2005, p. 4). Here, trust is something we do when there is something to gain; what can I get out of this relationship? But is trust really dependent on the response we get, or rather think we get?

In Giddens' classic term of the "pure relationship" (1991), where the relationship in itself is what makes us both form and keep the relation, trust is vital for this kind of relationship to exist. Relationality here implies a kind of trust where both individuals must contribute, and trust must be worked at continually. The individuals in the relationship continually consider their roles and openness compared with how much the other party contributes to the relation. Relationality becomes a calculated assessment of whether to trust or not, and how much. The individual motivation and project of trust is also the main message of the analysis of the trust mechanism in studies by Möllering (2006) and Mayer et al. (1995). But is this really how trust as a risk-taking act emerges?

In the meeting between Jean Valjean and the bishop of Digne from Victor Hugo's novel Les Miserables (1987) (Saevi & Eikeland, 2012), quite another kind of relationality

shows itself. Jean Valjean is an ex-prisoner in 1814 in France. He has recently been released from prison, and has no home or place to stay. He knocks on several doors to ask for a place to stay and a bed for the night, but no one will let him in. Valjean enters the house of the bishop spontaneously, unexpectedly, abruptly interfering with their lives demanding attention. The abrupt interference is a moment that in itself becomes moral as "the instant when a decision to trust or not, is made" (Saevi & Eikeland, 2012, p. 91). The unexpectedness of the Other's arrival demands our attention and forces us to consider the Other's needs instead of our own. There is no time to consider, reflect, and decide. The Other's presence and needs require immediate and full attention and action. The moment is filled up with the Other; there is no longer any room for considering our own role or needs (Levinas, 1998).

The mere presence of the Other triggers our trust in this Other. We may try to ignore the person, but most often we acknowledge the person, sometimes only with a smile, or in a more direct addressing of the Other. In Levinas' (1985, 1998) thoughts, we are caught up in the trust of another in the moment our eyes meet, when we stand before the Other face-to-face. The moment of this personal meeting demands our responsibility and care for the Other. Responsibility has the etymological meaning "answerable (to another, for something)," and is clearly related to the term "respond." The term "respond" refers to "answer to, or promise in return."[3]

To Levinas though, responsibility is even more than simply responding to the act of another person. Responsibility is an unconditional response that does not presuppose reciprocity (Levinas, 1985). Bauman (1993) says with reference to Levinas:

> My responsibility is not the desert the Other has earned and 'has the right' to claim. It is not even something I owe the Other for the services rendered. It is not a remuneration or compensation for anything, as nothing has yet happened and the 'moral party' between me and the Other starts only now. Morality is the *absolute beginning.* (Bauman, 1993, p. 74)

Responsibility is an all-encompassing and eternal quality, always present in the relationality of human beings. My obligation, ever present, to care for and to see the vulnerability in the other, is a responsibility that cannot be turned over to someone else or split into smaller parts and shared with others. The responsibility is only mine, which also implies I cannot expect anything in return from the Other. I am only responsible for my responsibility. What others do with their responsibility has nothing to do with me (Biesta, 2013).

Still, our responsibility represents an infinite responsibility. To Levinas, responsibility is the definition of subjectivity, what defines us as human beings and subjects (Levinas, 1998; Biesta, 2013). We cannot choose to have responsibility or not. Responsibility is the subject, there is no I, no ego before the Other. Responsibility for this Other defines and constitutes the subject, even before the subject. The subject has no substantial center, no initiative or will on its own, no existence or concern with himself or herself before the Other. An infinite responsibility defines being before being, before any subject can act or think.

> I am responsible for a total responsibility, which answers for all the others and for all in the others, even for their responsibility. The I always have one responsibility *more* than all the others. (Levinas, 1985, p. 99)

To be concerned with the Other's needs states a basic moral quality to the experience of trust. To meet the other represents an ethical obligation to take care of this other according to Lögstrups ethical demand (Lögstrup, 1997). In real-life meetings, Levinas though inserts the social dimension into the experience of responsibility. Lived responsibility and trust then becomes modified by the different people we meet, into something which is still moral and concerns the Other, but rather includes the needs of more than one other. The ideals of equality and justice are made real in our relations with several others (Levinas, 2007).

The spontaneous action of the emergency

Emergencies show us how fast we as unexperienced, ordinary people can act when life is at stake. But even more, how the rescue services like ambulance, firemen, and police are able to act quickly and still coordinated (Klein, 1998). There is no time to check plans or consider different alternatives in evaluating the situation, it turns out rescue operators act on practical knowledge like experience and intuition in emergencies. In these extreme situations, the trust in our own evaluation, and the trust in others—that they know what to do, and have the ability to do it—is absolutely necessary to progress in the rescue operation. The idea of a swift trust is related to these kinds of situations where the time every act and evaluation takes are vital to save lives (e.g., Meyerson et al., 1996; Jarvenpaa & Leidner, 1999; Hyllengren et al., 2011). A theoretic tradition of swift trust within organizational research was originally developed to meet new organizational forms and conditions of work, where changes and short-lived organizational forms are present. Swift here refers to a kind of efficiency especially suited for emergent situations where action has to be fast, and evaluation, situation, action, and outcome are highly uncertain and risky.

At Utøya near Oslo, Norway, during the terror attack of July 22, 2011, a massive disaster took place as a large number of young people attending a political summer camp were brutally killed. This is the situation that triggers Aasland's (2014) question of whether it is possible to come up with the right way to act without conferring plans and strategies, or theoretical evaluations. There seems to be a shortcut, he says. In such an abrupt emergency, the acts that are performed are not the result of individual, theoretical evaluations—there would not be enough time. Instead, there seems to be a direct link from experiencing the situation, to the act that is the right one for this situation. This link seems far from the general comprehension of how the correct way to act follows from plans of action, which again often follows from explicit strategies (Aasland, 2014).

When we are in the actual situation or moment of drama and terror, we act immediately, spontaneously, as the situation in itself requires immediate action. But what does acting spontaneously really mean? Spontaneity, etymologically, is related to acting of one's own accord, willingly addressing something or someone, and is connected to the immediateness of the moment and to human mental and bodily movement (Minkowski, 1967). Linda, one of the employees of "Stavanger2008", uses the term spontaneity in her characteristic of Julia, one of the leaders.

> She is spontaneous; she keeps coming up with spontaneous thoughts. She is unbelievably creative and comes up with lots of exciting ideas long before we have got our heads into it. But at the same time, we need to systematize and do things the correct way.

Describing Julia, Linda tends to see spontaneity as a dilemma or even the opposite of what work or organizations should be. She, as do many of us, understands organizations as being structured, rational entities, where the goals and tasks being performed should reflect an ideal mix of the rational and the reflective. Spontaneity is all but rational, and rather unconditional, emotional, and unstructured.

Looking again at the etymological meaning of the term *spontaneity*, being "willing, or of one's free will," and the opposite *forced*, "not spontaneous or voluntary,"[4] the spontaneous expression stands for something connected to freedom and independence, something which is not possible to control. Spontaneity is unrestrained and free. Minkowski (1967) refers to spontaneity as a "direct and natural projection, without external stimulation, of all forms of psychic activity" (p. 168). The term "without external stimulation" means that spontaneous activities come from somewhere else than from direct external influence (Saevi & Eikeland, 2012).

> Direct and natural projection gives the impression the activity is not wrapped up or fenced in by anything. Also this natural and direct manner excludes reflection. Not to say that the spontaneous are unreflecting, but more that an excess of reasoning kills spontaneity. (Minkowski, 1967, p. 172)

Re-introducing Möllering's model of suspension (2006), the concept of the will is absolutely decisive for trust to become real. The one person or individual who risks himself or herself in trust is the key to make trust become real—it only depends on how strong his or her will to trust is. As such, Möllering builds up on an image of the individual's freedom to decide for herself or himself. But the spontaneous willing or freedom seems to be of another kind; although we are free to trust, this freedom is not necessarily the same as individual control and reflected willingness. The instant, spontaneous quality of trust leaves no time for reflecting and control (Lingis, 2004).

Work-life organizations: a world of responsibilities and trust

In emergencies, crises, and accidents, we respond abruptly to the Other's needs. As Aasland (2014) notes, there seems to be a direct link from the experience itself, to the act which is the right one for this exact situation and task. But what is really fascinating is the complex web of different acts and the timing involved, which unites the team of rescuers in a rescue operation (e.g., Klein 1998). The team does not only act on a kind of overwhelming responsibility toward the person(s) in need of help. They also unite their working in a team, and gather around a common object of work uniting them. Skjervheim (1996) is critical of a relational concern focusing only the Other. When contrasting ourselves toward this Other, we only become more aware of ourselves according to Skjervheim. In cooperation, the attention toward the other highlights the differences between us, as we contrast ourselves toward the other. Another way of cooperation unites us in a common project, where the relation also consists of the object to be worked at. Working together as participants united in a common task makes it easier to forget about the differences between us, and unite in finding new understanding and solutions to the task at hand. To really understand what goes on at work, and the expressions of trust in real work-life relations, we need to look at work itself: the projects and tasks we try to solve, together with colleagues. We need to

consider the object of work, of cooperation, and also consider the object itself as part of the work-life relation.

In establishing a common subject, a "we" to work at a common project, the "we" points to another dimension worth considering. Working life is what goes on in different relational settings, in organizations where different groups and individuals meet and work together. The sole responsibility and ethical demand toward the one Other necessarily needs to find a different expression in the social world of work and different relational constellations. While Lögstrup is mainly occupied with the relation between the I and the one other, Levinas (2007) goes a step further, including also the third, the fourth, and so on in the social world of the subject. We then may work together, and be fellow subjects, without the infinite responsibility for the other always confronting us. The responsibility for the Other is established before being, in being we belong in communities of several others, where rules and routines are established to help us maintain a kind of justice and equality (Aasland, 2011).

Sara works as a project advisor in Stavanger 2008. She is in a process of finishing the contracts with several external projects, and has signaled to the project leaders that there is a tight schedule for the contracts to be signed. Suddenly, the situation changes. The financial director tells her to put the contracts on hold, due to uncertainties considering finances. Sara says:

> My first reaction was, what do we do now, what do we do first? But then I had to find out whether we were going to finish these contracts at all, because we had an obligation to the projects concerned and their owners, so we couldn't just put the whole thing off.

Sara's dilemma shows us some of the challenge when Responsibility turns into responsibilities. And in work we are devoted to, and feel responsible for the project and work in itself, as well as the persons we meet and work with. So, how does the Infinite responsibility for the Other look like when confronted with the others around us? Levinas does not provide any simple answers to this question, but still the need for a kind of social modification of the Infinite responsibility is stated. In our story of Line, who is taken by surprise by the lack of support from her boss, we may also need to know that Line's reaction concerns and happens within a social reality of a work organization and society. She feels let down by her boss, but her anger may also concern her credibility as leader herself in the organization, and how the others act and think concerning how her boss acted. How does she feel when being criticized for a decision concerning her whole department, in an open office landscape where other employees may hear what is said?

The profound, human experience of trust

To study emergent trust does not imply studying any special kind or type of trust. The terms emergent and emergency connect to an approach to the study of trust, to trust's characteristics as a human phenomenon. It is the profound, human experience of trust as lived through by human beings, which is at the core of the phenomenological study. But how can we find, explore, and describe trust's experiential qualities?

When looking for the lived experience of trust in work-life situations, or trust in its' emergent moment, in principle, this experience has the same qualities whether we look

in working life organizations or other kind of contexts. The experience, what is lived through, is already in our human surroundings as a given life expression (Lögstrup, 2008), which we only need to open up to. The moment of trust may be all-consuming, joyous, and exciting, as in the first meeting with someone new. Also, the experience of suspicion, not being met, of distrust, may inform our knowledge of the experience of trust. But the moment is also silent, practical, experiencing in the doing, as the trusting involved in a common work project, where we share our competence, and the solution depends on all of the contributors' effort.

To find this one moment, we depend on informants telling us of situations of lived through experiences of trust, in retrospect. The moment itself has faded, what is left is the person's memory of the experience. Through interview or conversations with people about their lived experiences of trust, cooperation, and interaction in the work place, the phenomenological study resembles other qualitative studies wherein we need to be informed of the subject's own experience of a phenomenon. But the phenomenological focus is lived through experiences' both universal and vocative quality (van Manen, 2014): how can we describe the experience in a way that makes us both recognize the experience as if it was our own and at the same time makes us wonder and reflect on what it means to be a human being?

In studies of trust in work-life relations and situations, the phenomenological inspiration make us look for the profound, courageous, and at the same time silent, act of work where trust is lived through. There is no use in looking for the individual, intended trust, the trust that develops in a process. Trust emerges in situations wherein we open up for it to emerge, when our attention is focused toward others or toward the work or project to be completed.

Emergent trust in our ambiguous existence

The direct manner that characterizes spontaneity is related to its instantaneous quality. The spontaneous just happens, there is no pause. Minkowski sees the spontaneous as a movement, as in a constant motion. The image of movement and motion helps us see the meaning of the phenomenon, but from where and to where does the spontaneous move?

> Spontaneous movement—and here we highlight again one of its fundamental traits—is addressed directly to other persons, our fellow men and neighbors. Coming from the interior, it goes towards the other; it refers more to 'extension' (in the dynamic sense) than to depth. (Minkowski, 1967, p. 177)

As for spontaneity, the act of trust is always directed toward someone, and moves toward this someone. The risk-taking act of trust moves spontaneously as it is triggered by another, and as a result of the other's addressing of us. What does addressing look like? Addressing someone might be calling one's name, as in Lingis' example (2004), but also just a small glimpse of eye-contact is a kind of addressing. Trust as a spontaneous movement does not refer to any particular act then, but must be relational and emerges somewhere in between the I and the other. It seems the moment or situation where trust emerges is more important than just what kind of act trust is.

Biesta (2013) sees how human existence is a weak constitution, not strong and powerful. To look at the weaker sides of human existence does not bear with it any negative dimensions, what he means is our existence is wrapped up with ambiguity, uncertainty, and risk, and can never be taken for granted. Still, we live with this imperfect condition in a perfect symbiosis. Instead of seeing risk and uncertainty as problematic and aspects to overcome or manage in some way (e.g., Möllering 2006), life›s own riskiness is a natural part of what existence is about. Subjectivity and personal experience does not refer to any core of stability and authenticity inside of us, rather personal experience is what happens in an event of subjectivity, constituting the subjectivity of the subject. The personal experience of trust happens when there is an opening or situation for trust to emerge.

This small but important moment when trust appears is decisive in exploring the meaning of trust. In a phenomenological interpretation of how trust shows itself in the decisive moment in Jean Valjean's life exposes trust's potential for doing good. The question of where trust comes from help us see that it appears "when life opens up a situation for it to reside" (Saevi & Eikeland, 2012, p. 94). It becomes visible to us in the experiences and action of life itself, but seems hard to understand or pin down to reflect on and argue about. Trust has an inherent quality of the good, a positive quality which defines and marks our experience with trust as a moral moment. Trust is present before our will or plan to trust or not. We spontaneously trust without understanding why or how trust fills our world with meaning (Saevi & Eikeland, 2012).

But how does the experience of trust emerge? And how does the moment of trust become moral? What kind of ethics does the trusting moment represent? As we have seen in the relationality of trust, both Lögstrup (1997) and Levinas (1985) focus on the meeting between two persons and how the meeting in itself, acknowledging the other, also triggers our feeling of an obligation and responsibility toward this Other we have before us. To Levinas (1985), the meeting between an I and the Other defines ethics. The I is not even a subject, a responsible human being, before meeting the Other and becoming an I in response to the silent expectation from the Other. In acknowledging the Other, we see and respect the unique, different person that has his/her own existence. Still, trust may as well emerge in the forming of a community, of a "we," especially in work life where we often work together to solve a common project (Skjervheim, 1996; Aasland, 2014). Levinas' responsibility is transformed into a consideration for several others, in a community of justice and equality. Trust's immediate, spontaneous quality seems most visible in the emergency, wherein rescue operators work together to save lives.

Still, another kind of relational consideration and ethical responsibility appears in the devotion toward a common task, arrangement, or project we work hard to realize. When we work together to realize a project, often on a tight schedule, the common devotion and process of work in itself, sharing ideas and knowledge as we go along, shows a group of persons showing, acting in silent trust in all of the tiny bits of action and talk making up the whole project. These small details may all be acts of trust, acting out responsibilities and our vulnerable selves, although not visible as such. By focusing experiential knowledge, we try to highlight these small details and enlarge them to make them visible as acts of trust. Trust then is not something we can possess or have as a part of our personality or as a kind of psychological state (e.g., Mayer et al., 1995). Trust is not a commodity to be purchased and owned, but could be understood more like an unconditional gift from another which is given us to actualize or make happen. The

emergency shows us the potential for trust ever present in our life world, waiting for an opening, the right moment to be realized and emerge.

References

Aasland, D. G. (2009) *Ethics and Economy. After Levinas*. London, UK: MGP Books.

Aasland, D. G. (2011) "I begynnelsen er etikken: Emmanuel Levinas" [In the beginning is ethics: Emmanuel Levinas]. In Eide, S.B. et al. *Fordi vi er mennesker [Because we are human beings]*. Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.

Aasland, D.G. (2014) "Kapittel 2 Hvem er vi?" [Chapter 2 Who are we?]. In Grelland, H.H. et al. *Samarbeidets filosofi. [Philosophy of cooperation]*. Oslo: Gyldendal.

Arendt, H. (1958/1998) *The Human Condition*. 2nd ed. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Bauman, Z. (1993) *Postmodern Ethics*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Belova, O. (2006) "The event of seeing: a phenomenological perspective on visual sense-making", *Culture and Organization* 12(2): 93–107.

Biesta, G.J.J. (2013) *The Beautiful Risk of Education*. Boulder: Paradigm Publishers.

Cook, K.S., Hardin, R. and Levi, M. (2005) *Cooperation without trust?* New York: Russell Sage.

Dietz, G. (2011) "Special Forum Essay. Going back to the source: Why do people trust each other?", *Journal of Trust Research* 1(2): 215–222.

Eikeland, T. B. and Saevi, T. (2015) "Beyond Rational Order: Shifting the Meaning of Trust in Organizational Research", forthcoming.

Elster, J. (2007) *Explaining social behavior: more nuts and bolts for the social sciences*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Foucault, M. (2001) *Fearless Speech*. Los Angeles: Semiotext(e).

Frederiksen, M. (2014) "Calculativeness and trust: A view from phenomenology", *Journal of Trust Research* 4(1): 34–43.

Giddens, A. (1990) *The consequences of modernity*. Oxford: Polity Press.

Giddens, A. (1991) *Modernity and self-identity*. Oxford: Polity Press.

Grimen, H. (2009) *Hva er tillit?* [What is trust?] Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Hugo, V. (1987) *Les Miserables*. Cambridge: Galley Press. (Original in French 1862).

Hyllengren et.al. (2011) "Swift trust in leaders in temporary military groups", *Team Performance Management* 17(7/8): 354–368.

James, W. (1948) *Essays in Pragmatism*. New York: Hafner Press.

Jarvenpaa S.L. and Leidner, D.E. (1999) "Communication and trust in global virtue teams", *Organization Science* 10(6): 791–815.

Klein, G. (1998) *Sources of power: How people make decisions*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Kramer, R. M. (1999) "Trust and distrust in organizations: Emerging perspectives, enduring questions", *Annual Review of Psychology* 50: 569–598.

Kramer, R. M. & Cook, K. S. (2004) "Trust and Distrust in Organizations: Dilemmas and Approaches" In R. M. Kramer & K. S. Cook (Eds.). *Trust and Distrust in Organizations: Dilemmas and Approaches*. New York: Russell Sage.

Küpers, W. and Statler, M. (2008) "Practically wise leadership: towards an integral understanding", *Culture and Organization* 14(4): 379–400.

Lane, C. & Bachmann, R. (Eds.) (1998) *Trust within and between organizations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lennie, I. (1999) "Managing Metaphorically", Studies in Cultures, Organizations and Societies 5: 43–59.

Levinas, E. (1985) *Ethics and Infinity: Conversations with Philippe Nemo*. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press.

Levinas, E. (1998) *Entre Nous. Thinking-of-the-Other*. London: Colombia University Press.

Levinas, E. (2007) "Sociality and Money", *Business Ethics. A European Review* 16 (3): 203–207. (Transl. F. Bouchetoux and C. Jones).

Lewicki, R. J., Tomlinson, E. C. & Gillespie, N. (2006) "Models of Interpersonal Trust Development: Theoretical Approaches, Empirical Evidence, and Future Directions", *Journal of Management* 32: 991–1022.

Lewis, D. & Weigert, A. (1985) "Trust as a Social Reality", *Social Forces* 63(4): 967–985.

Li, P. (2007) "Toward an interdisciplinary conceptualization of trust: A typological approach", *Management and Organization Review* 3: 421–445.

Lingis, A. (2004) *Trust*. Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press.

Luhmann, N. (1979) *Trust and Power: Two works by Niklas Luhmann*. Chichester: Wiley.

Lögstrup, K. E. (1956/1971/1997) *The Ethical Demand*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

Lögstrup, K.E. (2008) *Beyond the Ethical Demand*. Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press.

Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H. &. Schoorman, F. D. (1995) "An integrative model of organizational trust", *Academy of Management Review* 20(3): 709–734.

Merleau-Ponty, M. (1958) *Phenomenology of perception*. London: Routledge.

Meyerson, D., Weick, K. E. & Kramer, R. M. (1996) "*Swift trust and temporary groups*" In R. M. Kramer & T. R. Tyler (Eds.) Trust in organizations: Frontiers of theory and research. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 166–195.

Minkowski, E. (1967) "Spontaneity (...spontaneous movement like this!)" In N. Lawrence and D. O'Connor (Eds.) *Readings in existential phenomenology*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc.

Möllering, G. (2001) "The nature of trust: from Georg Simmel to a theory of expectation, interpretation and suspension", *Sociology* 35: 403–420.

Möllering, G. (2006) *Trust: Reason, Routine, Reflexivity*. Oxford: Elsevier.

Nooteboom, B. (2002) T*rust: Forms, Foundations, Functions, Failures and Figures*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Rousseau, D. M., Sitkin, S. B., Burt, R. S. & Camerer, C. (1998) "Introduction to Special Topic Forum: Not so different after all: A cross-Discipline View of Trust", *The Academy of Management Review* 23(3): 393–404.

Saevi, T. & Eikeland, T.B. (2012) 'From where does trust come and why is "from where" significant?', *Phenomenology & Practice* 6(1), 89–95.

Schoorman, F.D., Mayer, R.C. & Davis, J.H. (2007) "An integrative model of organizational trust: Past, present and future", *Academy of Management Review*, 32(2), 344–354.

Simmel, G. (1907/1990) T*he philosophy of money*. Second edition. London: Routledge.

Simmel, G. (1908/1950) *The sociology of Georg Simmel*. New York: Free Press.

Skjervheim, H. (1996) "Deltakar og tilskodar» [Participant and spectator] In Skjervheim, H. *Deltakar og tilskodar og andre essays*. [Participant and spectator and other essays]. Oslo: Aschehoug.

Solomon, R.C. & Flores, F. (2001) "Introduction" In Solomon, R.C. & Flores, F. *Building Trust: In Business, Politics, Relationships, and Life*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Sørhaug, T. (1996) *Om ledelse. Makt og tillit i moderne organisering* [On leadership. Power and trust in modern organizing.] Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Van Manen, M. (1997) *Researching Lived Experience*. London, Ontario: The Althouse Press (Original version published 1990).

Van Manen, M. (2014) *Phenomenology of Practice*. Walnut Creek, California: Left Coast Press.

End notes

[1] Stavanger2008 was established as a temporary project organization in 2005, in order to plan, arrange, and evaluate the EU-project *Cultural Capital of the year of 2008* of the Stavanger region. The European Union has since 1984 had the mandate of electing, promoting, and supporting European cultural capitals. Stavanger2008 was established as an inter-municipal company, run by a leader board as well as a supervisory board. The supervisory board represented its owners, as well as the cultural and business sectors of the region. As the organization was formally established in 2005, a small group of directors was hired and started working, planning the Cultural Capital year in 2008. Gradually, the organization expanded, and at its largest, counted about 30 employees in 2008. By the beginning of 2009, the organization was dissolved as the cultural year and project had come to an end. The stories presented in the paper were selected from the field work notes, interviews, and conversations with some of the employees of Stavanger2008. The excerpts address the direct meaning of the situation to the persons involved, while also addressing the universal experience of trust, like van Manen (1997) says:

> The paradoxical thing about anecdotal narrative is that it tells something particular while really addressing the general or universal. And vice versa, at the hand of anecdote fundamental insights or truths are tested for their value in the contingent world of everyday experience. (120)

The stories try to visualize an experiential meaning and some important characteristics of the "emergent trust" presented in the paper. Still, they serve more as examples to state an analytical understanding than real experiential, phenomenological anecdotes to wonder and reflect upon.

[2] The Other with a capital letter is used when Levinas (1985, 1998) is involved, and/or to mark in a special way the unique nature of the other as a person or a subject.

[3] http://www.etymonline.com

[4] http://www.etymonline.com