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ABSTRACT

This dissertation explores how strategic leadership activities produce organizational trust and, in turn, how senior leaders’ trust in organization emerges across multiple levels in nonprofit organizations (NPOs), more specifically in the church setting. It shifts the research focus from subordinate’s trust in leadership to senior leaders’ trust in the organization they run. The data of the social constructive case study consists of fourteen senior leaders’ interviews and documentary material. The case study contributes to the strategic leadership theory discourse by proposing that the capacity for empowering the mission and for innovation supplement the current concept of strategic leadership theory of capacities, such as those to learn, to change, and to apply managerial wisdom. Further, it discusses the applicability of organizational theories in NPOs. Currently, strategic leadership theories are mostly developed for business organizations. Thus, NPOs have used the tools or discarded the models and theories as inapplicable. Recently, NPOs have been required to be more business-like and focus more on financial performance, perhaps at the cost of achieving their mission.

The study adds value to trust research by introducing a process of trust development incorporated with strategic leadership. Accordingly, senior leaders can purposely design and develop trust through the introduced circular or cyclical issue-based mission-down and potential-up process. Further, this study tentatively proposes an idea to deepen the concept of organizational trust through the positive characteristics of the trustor, such as spirituality and well-being. A trustor’s propensity as a general disposition alone is not satisfactory without mental and physical well-being and passionate drive. The metaphorical modeling of trust has promoted the anthropomorphic character of the trustor as an active doer, that is, one who is creative, self-corrective, and innovative. Further, the also study adds value by paying attention to spirituality within organizational theory discourse. Regarding the emergence of trust within an organization, it is vital that the senior leadership commits spiritually to the mission, as well as the respective individuals bring their unified innate attributes of spirituality in the organization. Spirituality originates from the dyadic relationship with God, and hence has an influence within the third-party relationships. Accordingly, senior leaders’ purpose and spiritual congruences have a significant effect on leadership dynamics and organizational spirituality.

From the senior leaders’ perspective, it is critical for the emergence of trust that the mission evokes confidence in a meaningful mission and purpose and that the organizational systems assure interconnectedness and functionality. The cornerstone
is, however, that the leadership creates a sense of trustworthiness and communality so that the trustors perceive usefulness and meaning.
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1 INTRODUCTION

This study explores strategic leadership and trust from the senior leaders’ perspective in a nonprofit organization (NPO), more specifically in the church setting. It provides an insight into how the top management can maintain an environment that enhances organizational trust and top management’s trust in an organization (hereafter, senior leader, strategic leader, strategic leadership, top management or executive). Thus, I shift the research focus from the question of subordinate’s trust in leadership, in general, to the question on which conditions senior leaders could trust in the organization which they run through strategic leadership practices. Strategic leadership focuses on the way senior leaders impact the organization through their leadership (Phipps & Burbach, 2010).

In recent years, strategic leadership and trust have become prominent themes in organizational and management research domains. However, previously, the research topic, strategic leadership and trust, has been explored separately, but not precisely in terms of the senior leaders’ perspective. In this study, I explore how strategic leadership and trust are in continuous interplay. This study aims to add value through extending theoretical and practical understanding of how strategic leadership activities produce organizational trust and, in turn, promote senior leader’s trust in an organization across multiple levels. First, in this chapter, I explain the justification of the study and further highlight the importance of senior leadership’s perspective before proceeding to introduce trust and the context of the study.

1.1 JUSTIFICATION AND PERSPECTIVE OF THE STUDY

Justification of study
Today, people in general, and particularly the younger generation, GenMe, value the centrality of work, lifestyle, and general idioms differently. New technology and globalization challenge strategic leaders both to sustain stability and secure transformation. New operating environments include an increasing demand for innovation, continuous learning, and changing employee expectations (Hitt et al., 2010). Thus, senior leadership must navigate in dynamic and uncertain environments. Senior leaders have become aware of the need for trust when it has become problematic. Gone are the days of living in a small village where everyone knows one another. Consequently, confidence in organizations is wavering. In such circumstances, organizations trying to respond to all ideas, initiatives, or demands ultimately become lost in the middle, and consequently are unable to realize any strategies successfully. The church’s declining membership and, hence, decreasing financial resources have raised the question of whether trust can be developed, and confidence rebuilt. After all, spirituality has taken on a new form: “I may be spiritual but not religious” (MacDonald et al., 2015). Secularization and the postmodern world are proposed as an explanation for changes (Perttilä, 2014). It is no wonder that a new type of strategic leadership is needed due to the ambiguity, complexity, and information overload (Hamrick, 1989), as well as the incremental hyper-turbulence (Eisenhardt, 1989) of working environments.
There seems to be a justifiable argument that strategic leadership contributes to NPOs’ performance consistent with strategic leadership theory (Dirks & Ferrin, 2001; Phipps & Burbach, 2010; Dirks & Ferrin, 2001). Consequently, the senior leaders’ perspective is key to trustworthy strategic leadership, that is, the leadership of an entire organization. Aptly, Hardin (1996, 20) has proposed that “the best device for creating trust may be to establish and support trustworthiness.” Not only environmental and philosophical stances have had an impact on this research, but also specifically the lack of sound and specific studies on trust and strategic leadership as incorporated in this context. Most strategic leadership (theory development) concerns the for-profit and public organizations (Ronquillo, 2011). Strategic leadership research has been done less in the nonprofit sector (Phipps & Burbach, 2010). Thus, there has been an emphasis that more research is needed to explore the transferability of leadership theories to NPOs. However, there is still a lot to learn about strategic leadership, developing change, and maintaining a competitive advantage in NPOs (Miller, 2002), specifically in the church setting. Yukl (2010) argued that, with some relatively minor modifications, strategic leadership can be extended to include nonprofit and public organizations. Moreover, Boal and Hooijberg (2001), Phipps and Burbach (2010), Ronquillo (2011), and Grandy (2013) and Boal and Hooijberg (2001) have called for further research on strategic leadership in the nonprofit setting because the leadership and management theories have been mostly examined and applied in for-profit settings (e.g., Kaplan & Norton, 2004; Mintzberg, 1979; Phipps & Burbach, 2010).

Grandy (2013, 622) claimed that “no research has looked directly at strategic leadership in churches.” Neither new and emergent leadership theories nor Top Management Team’s theories and strategic leadership theories have paid much attention (with a narrow scope) to the organizational and environmental context (Boal & Hooijberg, 2001). Thus, applicability of strategic leadership practices and styles in NPOs, particularly in church settings (Ronquillo, 2011; Grandy, 2013; Ronquillo, 2011), is needed. Despite the shortage of research on nonprofit and church settings, organizations carelessly apply the existing theories and models. Hence, there is a risk of misusing these tools. Maslow advises distinctly: “if the only tool you have is a hammer, you treat everything like a nail” (De Wit & Meyer, 2005, 4). In other words, tools developed for for-profit organizations (firms) may not be useful as such for NPOs. Thus, it is first essential to examine a problem and only then find suitable tools to solve the problem. Despite the ideological foundation and theory development in for-profit settings (e.g., Mintzberg, 1979; Kaplan & Norton, 2004), the notions will be applied and, hence, their suitability will need to be discussed. Also, strategic leadership is different in NPOs (Phipps & Burbach, 2010). Thus, the nonprofits have used the tools or discarded the models and theories as inapplicable. Recently, the nonprofits have been expected to be more business-like and focus more on financial performance, perhaps at the cost of the mission (McDonald, 2007).

In this study, I use a divergent approach which integrates strategic leadership and trust theories. Thus, these theories are in continuous interplay. Empirical research explores a phenomenon that exists per se (Rauhala, 2005). According to Whitener and colleagues (2006, 141), referring to for-profit organizations, “little is known what causes managers to behave in trustworthy manner, and consequently, what managers can do to build trust.” Thus, it is vitally important to acknowledge what is

---

known about building trust and the actual nature and experience of trust. After all, we know very little about how trust appears from the perspective of top leadership (e.g., Möllering, 2006). As indicated before, there is a limited (Phipps & Burbach, 2010, cited by Grandy, 2013) amount of strategic leadership research on NPOs, and hardly any in the church setting. I would argue that it is even more so as trust and strategic leadership are not connected in the research concerning NPOs.

Further, in terms of the research on trust, it has been studied mostly in narrow settings and scopes as a relational phenomenon. The vast majority of research focuses on employees’ trust, mostly from an individual point of view, and, thus, there is little research on trust in employees from the leaders’ perspective or on employees being trusted (Fulmer & Gelfand, 2012). The microlevel studies, such as those about traits and style, have focused on leaders, information processing approaches, implicit theories of leadership, sociological approaches, and substitutes of trust (Vera & Crossan, 2004). Studies have paid attention to consequences and to antecedents (e.g., Möllering, 2006). Further, the macrolevel studies have focused on impersonal phenomena (Bachmann, 2011) and groups (Whitener et al., 2006), but not on holistic perspectives. This is a vitally important standpoint to understand because strategic leadership is leadership of an organization. Thus, the microlevel research should not be applied without question to macrolevel contexts. Trust research on incorporated multilevel analysis remains limited (Fulmer & Dirks, 2018). Instead, there is research on trust at different levels of analysis in teams and organizations at the focal point, such as trust in leaders, but this has been rarely incorporated into multilevel analysis. Consequently, failure to specify referents may lead to confusion in levels of analysis (Mayer et al., 1995). For future research, Fulmer and Gelfand (2012) encouraged increasing the theoretical specification (diversity) in examining trust constructs.

Trust research has proposed that trust may be more important for service organizations, NPOs, or organizations participating in social investment because they place more emphasis on people, training, and knowledge (Fulmer & Gelfand, 2012 referring to, for example, Brouthers and Brouthers, 2003). Despite the various definitions of trust, there is a conceptual cap (Atkinson & Butcher, 2003) and definition of trust which remains elusive and highly unattended (e.g., Atkinson, 2004; Kramer, 2004; Savolainen, 2011). Consequently, trust should be studied as a holistic phenomenon representing the whole organization and in different contexts and situations instead of being narrowly defined. System theory and structural theory also indicate a demand for trust (Bachmann & Zaheer, 2006). Finally, McAllister (1995) claimed that trust can be managed, and that trust is possible to purposely design and develop it. However, Bachmann and Zaheer (2006) asked contradicting questions: whether and how trust can be purposely designed and developed in an organizational context. Thus, scholars have disagreed whether trust can be built (Sydow, 2006). Not only the essence of strategic leadership and the power of leadership, but also the power of leaders’ power of trust supports the importance of this research (Atkinson & Butcher, 2003; Atkinson, 2004; Arnott, 2007).

This study involves the fields of management and organization theories. The context makes the study even more relevant and useful because theological (ideological,
religious) and spiritual issues may have an influence on the informants’ views and, hence, theirs the interpretations. Recently, in the West, significantly, interest in research on spirituality has increased (MacDonald et al., 2015). According to these researchers, definitions of spirituality vary from universal domains to religious and well-being concepts.

Strategic leadership perspective
Senior leaders look at the entire organization and how it can achieve its mission (Kaplan & Norton, 2004). Currently, strategic leadership acts in incrementally hyper-turbulent environments (Eisenhardt, 1989). Thus, the pivotal question is why some organizations succeed better than others. Hitt and Ireland (2002) argued that it depends on the extent to which strategic leadership is exercised. Boal and Hooijberg (2001) concluded that such operational changes highlight the essence of strategic leadership, more specifically its capacities. Effective strategic leadership is expected “to use a successfully strategic management process as they guide the firm in a way that results in forming a vision and mission” (Volberda et al., 2011, 401). They also noted that the “strategic management process is the full set of commitments, decisions and actions required for a firm to achieve strategic competitiveness and earn above-average returns” (9). Thus, leaders need to facilitate the development of strategic actions and determine their implementation. This is an issue of ability and a capacity at the level of strategic leadership (Volberda, et al., 2011; Boal & Hooijberg, 2001). In addition, strategic management refers to the most important task of the top management, that is, achieving the mission (Kaplan & Norton, 2004). Accordingly, I encapsulate strategic management as utmost important activities advancing the mission.

Thus, strategic leadership is manifested through the senior leaders’ abilities and capacities (e.g., Boal & Hooijberg, 2001; Phipps & Burbach, 2010). As such, strategic leadership capacity is complex and multifaceted. Provisionally, I introduced two definitions that highlight abilities and capacities: “Strategic leadership is an ability to anticipate, envision, maintain flexibility, think strategically, and work with others to initiate changes that will create a viable future for the organization” (Hitt & Ireland, 2002, 4), and “strategic leadership is an ability to create and sustain three capacities, capacity to learn, capacity to change and capacity for managerial wisdom” (Boal & Hooijberg, 2001, 539). The study primarily applies the ability and capacity perspectives. However, I consider that the definitions are not exclusive of each other.

Strategic leadership is the job of top management (Hambrick & Mason, 1984). It refers only to the top of the organization and the practices which are involved in the transformation for competitive advantage. A strategic leader acts as a catalyst for renewing strategic resources and abilities, such as structural capital, human capital, and social capital (e.g., De Wit & Meyer, 2005; Kaplan & Norton, 2004). The senior leaders’ job is different from that of the managers (Hambrick & Pettigrew, 2001). In addition, Norbun (1989) argued that the senior leaders’ role and behavior differ from that of middle management. Strategic leadership (strategic theories of leadership) is leadership of an organization, but leadership (supervisory theories of leadership) is leadership in general in an organization (Boal & Hooijberg, 2000; Hunt, 2004). Thus, leadership refers to all leaders focusing on relationships, and strategic leadership refers only to the top of the organization. Thus, strategic leadership concerns the development of the whole organization, including the aims of change and capabilities (Boal and Hooijberg, 2001, referring to Selznick, 1984). Previously, scholars have focused on the characteristics of leaders as individuals (Mintzberg, 1979) and what leaders do (Kotter,
1999). However, less attention has been paid to the context, operational conditions, timing, and means of strategic leaders’ actions (Boal & Hooijberg, 2001).

Strategic leadership aims at not only strategic change in an organization (e.g., De Wit & Meyer, 2005) but also change and transformation of people (e.g., Northouse, 2013). One principle leadership goal is to change people’s minds (Santalainen, 2006). Moreover, strategic leadership challenges traditions, certainties, working practices, and assumptions which are the foundations of trust (Skinner, 2005). It includes challenging the status quo and leadership practices and sharing the vision and culture of the community and learning. Change requires commitment and goodwill from all parties, and it has been claimed that trust increases both commitment (Lämsä & Savolainen, 2000) and effectiveness (Skinner, 2005, referring to Roy and Dugal, 1998). Competing for the future is one of the most essential strategic leadership abilities and strategic activities (Hamel & Prahalad, 1994). In addition, strategic leadership capacities have been shown to be essential aspects of trust in renewing organizations (e.g., Mayer et al., 2006; Phipps & Burbach, 2010). Senior leaders play an important role in establishing and developing trust (Gillespie & Mann, 2004) and sustaining the overall level of trust within organizations (Puusa & Tolvanen, 2006). Strategy making requires cooperation and interaction abilities for which trust forms a base.

Having briefly introduced the top management task, I now describe the factors affecting the senior leaders’ perspective. Strategic leadership is realized through strategic actions (cf. Porter, 2000; Boal & Hooijberg, 2001). Its actions emerge (cf. Savolainen, 1997) through strategic thinking, strategy formation, and strategic change processes (cf. De Wit & Meyer, 2005; cf. strategic management process by Volberda et al., 2011). Thus, it is vital to also pay attention to senior leaders’ mental capacities and mental maps and schemas. Actions embed attributes not only of the strategy but also the senior leaders’ personality, influence, perceptions, experiences, energy, motives, and interests (self and interest group’s interests). Further, the influencing powers are context and situation specific during the career life cycle (cf. abilities: Mayer et al., 1995; mental reasoning: De Wit & Meyer, 2005). The past may influence the present and the future, and the incorporation of causes (Weider, 2010). Thus, senior leadership’s influencing power emerges through a similar process such as ideologies. Finally, the realizations of actions are the outcomes of thoughts, words, and determination (cf. Savolainen, 1997).

Strategic leadership is often interpreted only through actions and practices. Nevertheless, we must also consider senior leaders’ interests, motives, aims, and ideological stances. Consequently, the perspective can be illustrated through some key theories. It is notable that the same theories appear also in trust development processes. Thus, senior leaders’ perspective (referents) and trust development (referents) appear to involve an interplay. Nevertheless, upper echelon theory (Hambrick & Pettigrew, 2001) highlights the influencing power of senior leaders’ position, values, personality, and cognitions. Thus, the fundamental principle is that these ultimately affect senior leaders’ decisions, preferences, and values (Hambrick & Mason, 1984; Phipps & Burbach, 2010), and, hence, have an impact on the whole organization. Also, agency theory (Eisenhardt, 1989) emphasizes the principals and agent’s motives, interests, behavior, and roles, and the social exchange theory and economical exchange theory (Eisenhardt, 1989) have revealed dynamic factors and voluntary and reciprocal relationships. Finally, the power of trust in an organization (Mayer et al., 1995; McKnight et al., 2006; Mayer et al., 1995) emerges among members of the organization. Nevertheless, the pivotal question still concerns when the senior leader’s influence
has the greatest impact during the life cycle (models of leadership effects; Boal & Hooijberg, 2001, referring to Balia and Hunt, 1998) and in what conditions.

The upper echelon theory proposes that the job of strategic leadership is different from the managers’ job (Hambrick & Mason, 1984). The executive’s work is not only relational (activities), but also strategic and symbolic (activities) (e.g., Kotter, 1999). Upper echelon and system theories together claim that, in order to be effective, the development capacity of a senior leader must match well with complexity of the work (Phipps & Burbach, 2010). Organizations perform better only to the extent to which strategic leadership is trained and developed (Hitt & Ireland, 2002).

The agency theory involves the principals and agents’ motives, behavior, and roles (Eisenhardt, 1989). Accordingly, socialization of corporate values and the policies and norms control moral failures. Both parties aim to maximize and protect their own interests through monitoring and controlling. The theory emphasizes leaders’ motivation to minimize the probability of risk through tight control or close behavioral monitoring (Eisenhardt, 1989). The theory also highlights economic interest and self-interest motives, followed by behavioral consequences. Thus, such an action minimizes the need to trust another party. That may lead to weak trust and, hence, poor performance. However, according to Handy (1995, 44), “trust is the heart of the matter.” Accordingly, relational trust is a critical factor for survival and growth (Whitener et al., 2006). However, the economic aspect is hardly concerned about trust. Monitoring and control, however, impact on trust perception. While protecting their own interests, senior leaders aim to perform effective leadership practices in a trustworthy manner in order to balance between their own interests and their organizational commitment.

From a principal’s perspective, the most important task of a strategic leader is to achieve the mission (Kaplan & Norton, 2004). However, interests may conflict due to a senior leader’s abilities, motives, and preferences (Eisenhardt, 1989; Whitener et al., 2006). Senior leaders are often formally installed in an office to run the organization that maximizes the nominators’ interests. However, different interest groups have an impact (internal and external) on the leadership’s diversifying of mutual interests. Senior leaders may make decisions that do not reflect the nominators’ interests, but the agents’ own or others’ interests. In such a situation, conflicts of interest may arise which may result in distrust and, hence, inefficiency or even damage. The agency theory also proposes an economic exchange relationship. Thus, there is a risk of opportunism, that is, the practice of taking advantage of any situation or people to achieve an end, even without regard for principles or consequences.

Social exchange theory (Blau, 1964) is also an important theory for understanding the executive perspective. Senior leadership develops context for social exchange through strategic leadership practices which, in turn, can impact the senior leadership’s trust. Accordingly, information, advice, social support, and recognition enhance trust in reciprocity. Social relationships influence strategy work through a participatory approach (Mantere & Vaara, 2008; Burrell & Morgan, 2011). Senior leadership cannot be separated from reality. Naturally, all actors belong to a specific social system but only in relationship to others (Blomqvist & Ståhle, 2011). Related to social relations, social information processing (Salancik & Pfeffer, 1978) and attribution theories (Weider, 2010; cf. Heidet, 1958) need to be mentioned as well. These have also influenced

---

senior leaders’ perceptions. Social information theory focuses on how people form beliefs and attitudes (sense-making) through the social environment by determining information received (past, present, and future), that is, what others think. Attribution theory considers perceived trustworthiness of the trustee, highlighting its generalized propensity (psychological, inherited, or childhood) (Mayer et al., 1995) and, hence, its impact on behavioral type, style, and dynamics. Accordingly, causal attributions determine affective reactions to success and failure.

Senior leaders strive to achieve objectives through transformation (Schmitt, et al., 2018) by advocating talents and inspiring people, employees, and teams to utilize their skills in their full potential, thus enhancing the well-being of people (e.g., Savolainen, 2011; Ikonen, 2013). Moreover, the exchange theory explores individual, group, and organizational factors that enhance trustworthy strategic leadership practices. Social exchange theory also highlights the dynamic factors and the voluntary and reciprocal relationships by emphasizing the exchange process. These lead to lowering control and, hence, promoting trust. Relationships emerge in economic contexts, such as employment, but develop through interaction in which written and binding agreements are not always necessary (Blau, 1964). Consequently, social exchange differs from economical exchange because voluntary relationships do not necessarily have economic interest but rather social support or concern. Thus, there can be an obvious risk of non-reciprocation or regret (Blau, 1964; Whitener et al., 2006; Blau, 1964).

The referred perspectives constitute a multilevel perspective on trust formation in an organization. Accordingly, trust exists within an organization not only based on relational variables but also on organizational antecedents (Fulmer & Gelfand, 2012). The more discretion is involved, the more impact the senior leaders have on organizational outcomes (Finkelstein & Hambrick, 1996). Also, functionalists have admitted that social relationships have meaning and therefore influence strategic leadership (Burrell & Morgan, 2011). Thus, discretion enhances the capacity to make a difference. Vera and Crossan (2004) explained that theories describing the relationship between a superior and a follower ought not be interpreted upwards. Consequently, leaders must not apply strategies and tactics that worked in other cases (Kotter, 1999; Anderson et al., 2017). Not only the essence of strategic leadership (power of role and position) but also leaders’ power of trust support the importance and focus of this study (Atkinson & Butcher, 2003; Atkinson, 2004; Arnott, 2007).

These perspectives are critical because senior leaders are not only responsible for the outcomes of an organization, but also have power to make strategic initiatives and enhance trust (e.g., (Hambrick & Mason, 1984; Mintzberg, 1989). In addition, senior leaders’ high versus low leadership dynamics can have a great influence. Furthermore, the senior leadership must also believe in the possibilities to perform trustworthy practices – that is, to have a positive impression about the organization (McKnight et al., 2006). In other words, they must believe that essential interpersonal structures are available so that they can further believe in a successful future (e.g., Zucker, 1986). Structure may give the feeling of security and order (i.e., situational normality) (e.g., Lewis & Weigert, 1985). In other words, things are in order, roles are defined (Baier, 1986), and legal resources (i.e., promises, contracts), regulations, and guarantees are in use (i.e., structural assurance) (McKnight et al., 2006).
1.2 ORGANIZATIONAL TRUST

According to Kramer et al. (2004), interest in trust was initially stimulated by Butnam’s (1993) findings specifically about social trust (social capital). Fukuyama (1995) continued this research by investigating how trust is important in societal functioning as a resource within social systems. In the recent research, trust has been widely discussed among management and organizational theorists and practitioners, and in the sciences such as sociology, economics, political science, psychology, and social psychology (e.g., Lewicki et al., 2006; Sztompka, 1999; Burke et al., 2007). Thus, each work represents a unique view concerning the definition of trust. However, currently, trust has been a central issue particularly in the area of organizational studies. The existing base for social cooperation, solidarity, and consensus has been eroded, and hence, there is need for new alternatives (Misztral, 1996). There is an increasing interest in trust because we are now more dependent on trust because the confidence in systems has declined (Möllering et al., 2004). Trust is described as a social mechanism in addition to authority and related factors (e.g., Möllering et al., 2004). Consequently, we become more aware of trust when situations become problematic.

Trust is an abstract, multidimensional, and multilevel phenomenon (e.g., Currell & Inkpen, 2006; Arrott, 2007). Definitions range from personality traits to structural phenomena (McKnight & Chervanu, 1996). Thus, such definitions focus on integrity, competence, ability, openness, vulnerability, reliability and positive expectations (e.g., Kramer, 2006; Bachmann & Zaheer, 2006; Nooteboom et al., 1997). Furthermore, definitions vary from distinctions among the bases of trust to those related to attitudinal and behavioral trust (Kramer, 2004), dimensionality of trust (Lewicki, et al., 2006), and the conceptualizations of trust (Rousseau, et al., 1998). According to Fulmer and Gelfand (2012), positive expectations of trustworthiness and willingness to accept vulnerability are the most common dimensions of trust. However, positive expectation (future orientation) has been a major focus. Expectations can be specific characteristics of the trustee, such as in Mayer et al. ‘s (1995) conceptualization: ability, benevolence, and integrity as specific competencies of a trustor. Likewise, vulnerability is considered across levels and referents as an essential consideration.

Lewicki and Bunker (1996) proposed three different types of trust: calculus-based trust, knowledge-based trust, and identification-based trust. The first indicates the economic perspective where parties risk losing too much if they cheat. Knowledge-based trust is based on prior information about the other and, thus, the one’s predictability. With identification-based trust, the trustor assimilates the preferences and identity with the one. At the higher levels, definitions highlight multiple dimensions (e.g., Dirks, 2000). However, there is no theoretical consensus about why certain dimensions are relevant and others are not (Fulmer & Gelfand, 2012). Further, some definitions do not specify a referent at all which makes definition elusive. Hardin (2002) has proposed a solution to conceptual diversity by defining trust as a three-part relationship, including the properties of the trustee, attributes of the trustor, and the specific context or domain wherein trust is discussed. Thus, strategic, calculative, and instrumental considerations would be dominant in some organizational contexts, and in other contexts, relational aspects may be salient.

McKnight and Chervany (1996) have categorized (clustering the prior research) trust as dispositional, personal/interpersonal, and impersonal/structural. Dispositional trust means that trust is based on personality attributes of the other. Thus, trustor has
a tendency to trust across situations (cross-situational) (cf. Rotter, 1967; Mayer et al., 1995) or has faith in humanity (McKnight et al., 2006). Personal trust refers to trust in a specific person or thing in the specific situation (cf. Mayer et al., 1995; situation specific on trustworthiness). Interpersonal trust refers to specific a group of people, that is, trust in each other in a specific situation (cf. relational trust, e.g., Mayer et al., 1995). Structural/impersonal trust is based on social and institutional structures in the situation (situation-specific) but not on the person specifically (differentiates among states, personalities, beliefs). It provides an assurance through social structures and regulations (cf. McKnight et al., 2006). Further, according to Bachmann (2011), interorganizational trust is particularly dependent on and mediated by the institutional framework in which the relationship is happening. Institutional trust is based on roles, systems, and reputations, whereas judgement is based on trustworthiness. Interest in social-psychological aspects have changed the attitudes towards managerial practices and, thus, need to be further explored (Möllering et al., 2004). According to Möllering, there are three areas to be explored related directly to competitiveness: flexibility, cooperation, and learning.

Trust is also a multilevel phenomenon. It is essential for divergent areas. Thus, multilevel analysis of trust may provide integration in the field of organizational sciences (Fulmer & Gelfand, 2012). They highlighted that trust definitions are different at a level and trust in a referent. Trust appears at individual, group, and organizational levels and between organizations, not to mention at the societal level (e.g., Fulmer & Gelfand, 2012; Kramer, 2004; Puusa & Tolvanen, 2006). Thus, trust in the referent can be interpersonal, team-based, or organizational. Interpersonal trust is specifically (directed and focused) in a person but differentiated from the disposition of generalized trust (trust in people, in general) (cf. Mayer et al., 1995). The team referent refers to interdependent people with common goals and group dynamics. Thus, it highlights reliance of an organization. In addition, the organization referent focuses on trust in an organization as an entity. Previous research has focused mostly on various individual level referents and at the group level on interpersonal and team referents. At the organizational level, the focus has been on coworkers and organizations (Fulmer & Gelfand, 2012).

At the individual level, trust demonstrates an individual degree of trust, as it is question about the willingness to cooperate and commit to organizational goals and changes. Trust at the group level corresponds to the collectively shared trust by individuals. Thus, groups represent collective values and identities. Groups have common rules (rule-based trust) which manage practices and appropriate behavior. At the organizational level, trust is based on a consensus among members in an organization. Trust refers not only to a collective commitment and cooperation to achieve common goals but also to the effort to keep structures together (Atkinson & Butcher, 2003). Thus, there are conceptual challenges regarding the notion of individuals trusting in an organization that on which bases another individual and the organization trusts. Naturally, from a theoretical perspective. trust in different referents may have different antecedents and impacts (Fulmer & Gelfand, 2012).

An important aspect is how trust can be experienced and created. An individual has his or her own value system which forms a foundation for the experience of trust (Jones & George, 1993). Values may more likely enhance the propensity to trust because they are more permanent than specific situations and relationships (Jones & George, 1993; cf. Mayer et al., 1995). Experiences may change values and, hence, both attitude and behavior. Consequently, trust and interdependence are “interdependence
grounds for interaction” (Ståhle, 1998, 89; Blomqvist & Ståhle, 2011). In organization or team people are who trust not organizations per se. However, an organization may reflect a predisposition (a function of management ideology), characteristic similarity (organizational actions and structures), and the experience of reciprocity (organizational context) (Creed & Miles, 1996; cf. Blomqvist & Ståhle, 2011).

Such a diversity of definitions is typically the result of a narrowly defined research frame or perhaps a poor prior conceptualization. Thus, widely divergent ways (overly generalized) are not necessarily comparable (McKnight et al., 1996). Continue that several types of trust are effective only if they can be related to another construct and, hence, be cross-disciplinary in nature. Diverging approaches have been used to study trust resulting in inconsistent empirical results. However, trust may be difficult to define narrowly and only from one point of view or within one discipline. Most of the previous research has focused on the critical conditions of trust, such as ability, benevolence, and integrity (Mayer et al., 1995; Whitener et al., 2006). Consequently, this implies that senior leaders’ actions and behavior can have an impact on building trust. Thus, at the system level, position power indicates a given trust based on its role and formal structures (cf. Atkinson & Butcher, 2003; McKnight et al., 2006).

Trust has shown its importance and has proven its role as a source of benefits to organizations. Moreover, strategic leadership plays a pivotal role in establishing and developing organizational trust (Gillespie & Mann, 2004; Hambrick & Mason, 1984). It has broad relevance. An essential aspect of leadership is to activate a trustful working environment (e.g., Yukl, 2010). Such an environment is created, built, and maintained by and among people (Savolainen & Lopez-Fresno, 2018). Trust is a leadership resource (e.g., Dirks & Ferrin, 2001; Kramer, 1999). Thus, it is a necessary factor not only in leadership development but also in the enhancement of organizational vitality (Nurmio & Turkki, 2010; Savolainen, 2011). Trust has proven to be a vital element of success, leadership resource, and social capital at the for-profit organizations fostering motivation, inspiration, innovativeness, and creativeness (e.g., Mayer et al., 1995; Lewicki et al., 2006; Savolainen, 2011). Trust is a necessary factor not only in leadership development, which fosters competitiveness of operations, but also in terms of the vitality of the organization, which enhances peoples’ motivation, enthusiasm, and competencies (Nurmio & Turkki, 2010; Savolainen, 2011). Trust has also been shown to be a means for facilitating functionality and being a resource of organizational effectiveness for leadership (e.g., Dirk et al., 2001). Trust has a role of sociability within an organization. In addition, trust facilitates adaptive forms of defense for organizational authorities (Kramer & Cook, 2004). Trust also supports sustainable productivity and longer professional careers (Nurmio & Turkki, 2010). It has also shown evidence of enhancing organizational performance and wealth in for-profit and public organizations (e.g., McEvily et al., 2003; Lewicki et al., 2006; Rowe, 2001; Savolainen, 2011).

Despite the increasing number of studies and agreement on the positive effects of trust, scholars do not have consensus about the definition (e.g. Atkinson, 2004; Fulmer & Gelfand, 2012. Trust research focuses predominantly on trust at the individual level (e.g. Mayer et al., 1995; Fulmer & Gelfand, 2012). However, organizations are multilevel systems, and as a result, trust appears at the individual, group, and organizational levels. Yet, it remains unclear whether the antecedents and impacts at one level can be applied at other levels. Consequently, trust at a level and trust in a referent should be considered.
Trust seems to be a significant factor not only in enhancing organizational performance but also societal prosperity. The Finnish Innovation Fund has initiated a program referred to as “new leadership by trust” for sustaining competitiveness (Nurmio & Turkki, 2010). Accordingly, human capital may drive not only the economic growth for nations but also the growth of individual organizations. Trust forms human intellectual capital (Savolainen & Lopez-Fresno, 2018). Organizations need vitality through leadership by trust so that they are enabled to maintain renewals, competencies, and competitiveness, even during times of uncertainty. According to Savolainen (2011), vitality is energy, spirit, emotions, activity, influence, collaboration, courage, and the ability to determine opportunities for trust building. Vitality has sound roots in the social and cultural foundation and heritage of organizations. Organizational vitality enhances the organization’s ability to compete and succeed (Ikonen, 2013). That is why I am interested in exploring trust in the context of NPOs from the strategic leadership perspective.

1.3 IMPORTANCE OF CONTEXT

The recent strategic leadership literature has directed more attention to contextual issues (Boal and Bryson, 1988), such as individual characteristics (e.g., locus of control, job involvement, commitment) and group and organizational characteristics (e.g., cohesiveness, technology, structure) (Boal & Hooijberg, 2001). Thus, it is essential to consider the nature of a subject (e.g., Eriksson & Kovalainen, 2010). Elenkov and Manev (2005) and Phipps and Burbach (2010) argued that the sociocultural context not only is a pattern-setting model for strategic leadership but also moderates the leadership and organizational innovations. Hardin (2002) conceptualized trust not only to properties of a trustor, and the attributes of a trustee but also to a specific context or domain over which trust is conferred. Further, the trust constructs implicitly include the situation because dispositional means cross-situational, and personal/interpersonal and impersonal/structural are situation-specific (Mayer et al., 1995; McKnight & Chervanu, 1996). The relational aspect is more salient and exerts more influence over how trust is constructed. Thus, context determines the extent to which A considers B to be trustworthy.

Characteristics of the nonprofit context

This study explored trust from senior leaders’ perspective in NPOs, specifically in a church setting. The church as an NPO and as a context has its own specific characteristics. Usually, organizations are categorized as for-profit (firms) and nonprofit organizations, according to revenue logic or as being private and public organizations (POs) according to ownership. In Finland, the most important POs are the governmental organizations (GOs), such as municipalities and other institutions, and non-governmental POs, such as the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland (ELCF) and the Orthodox Church. The action and arrangement of the public sector is legally prescribed by the government 4 and it does not participate directly in the market. The for-profit organizations are owned and funded through sales and private

4Source of definition: http://tieteentermipankki.fi/wiki/Oikeustiedejulkisyhteis%C3%B6, and https://www.minilex.fi/a/mit%C3%A4-tarkoittaa-julkisyhteis%C3%B6.
equity. In other words, they are driven by profit which benefits the owners and investors (Perry et al., 1988). GOs are owned and funded by the government or have special rights to receive tax revenue. The ELCF is an NPO despite its public status and right to tax. Thus, it differs from other types of NPOs. NPOs are run to help the community and financed by donations or fundraising.

NPOs such as churches operate in an abstract and unselfish world among the toughest and endless problems that exist, while for-profit firms operate in a less demanding and more concrete world per se. The purpose of for-profit firms is to make money and, hence, add shareholder value instead (e.g. Mintzberg, 1979; Kaplan & Norton, 2004). Thus, for-profit and nonprofit organizations are ideologically entirely different. Dargie (1998) defined the differences between public and private executive roles such as different informational, interpersonal, and decisional roles. Taliento and Silverman (2005) identified five differences of nonprofit strategic leadership compared with for-profit leadership: 1) smaller scope of authority, 2) a wider range of stakeholders who wait for consensus, 3) the need for innovative metrics for monitoring performance, 4) the request for more attention to communication, and 5) the challenge of building an effective organization with limited resources and training. Phipps and Burbach (2010) noted that nonprofit strategic leaders must understand how to develop and maintain fruitful relationships with the board (e.g., Gulati and Westphal, 1999). Renz (2001) observed that too many strategic leaders in capacity are behind the strategic level.

NPOs aim to deliver mission outcomes, “not superior financial performance” (Kaplan & Norton, 2004, 429). They can earn money to execute their mission and develop its operations but cannot distribute money to those holding a management position (Steinberg, 1993; Drucker & Kankkunen, 2008; Agard, 2011). NPOs usually have different and limited resources, financing, and revenue logics. Thus, reputation is a key to financial prosperity. The more an organization focuses on its mission, the better its reputation may become. Finally, a contextual perspective is important. Contextual powers have an influence on all levels.

**Target organization**

The target organization of this study was the ELCF. The Finnish government approves the ELCF’s Church law and the Church order. The church organization has a very special culture which is rather ideological in an organizational sense. Thus, it is a richly developed and deeply rooted system of values and beliefs (Mintzberg, 1989). This study considered the ELCF as an NPO and particularly as a church, a place of worship, in an organizational sense despite its public status. As a clarification, I did not study the church as a place of worship but as an organization which facilitates its clerical services and executes its mission. Consequently, theological and organizational issues may overlap because of the ideological context.

Nevertheless, the ELCF’s financial resources have declined, and membership has decreased, which may be a sign of declining trust. The nonprofit sector faces the most challenging situations regarding its charitable, human (idea of man), and spiritual (in a religious or non-religious sense) (MacDonald et al., 2015) needs together with the impact of GenMe’s worldviews. The global environment is threatened because of political changes, power shifts, terrorism, refugee movements, and climate changes, just to mention a few (Burrell & Morgan, 2011). In our society, trust is declining due to decreasing confidence, which is an experimental feeling of uncertainty (Putnam, 2000). Because trust is declining, perceived trustworthiness is consequently declining.
as well (Hardin, 2002). Uncertainty escalates because urbanization fragments social interaction (e.g., Möllering, 2001; Misztal, 1996; Mishra, 1996). We do not live any more in a small village, home, or working environment where relationships are native and stable, and all neighbors and workmates know each other. Hardin (2002) describes this by using the analogy “bowling alone.”

Our worldviews are altered and fragmented. Mega-trends have influenced our minds, beliefs, and values or cultures. Our ultimate reality may lie rather in spirit or idea than in observed data (e.g. Burrell & Morgan, 2011). Postmodern people create truth based on their own individual mixed beliefs, ideologies, and interests in daily emerging realities (Burrell & Morgan, 2011). Ideology means a set of ideas to achieve hidden goals and interests by distorting social and constructed realities. Despite the fact that ideology is an abstract mental construct (model), it will strongly impact management practices and strategies. According to Senge (1990, 8; Savolainen 1997), a mental model “ingrain[s] assumptions, generalizations, or even pictures or images that influence how we understand the world and how we take action.”

The ELCF has been omnipresent in our life and society for centuries. The ELCF is also very important for Finnish societal values, economy, and even political discourse. It has very long history, going back to the fifteenth century if not earlier. It has inherited governance, practical, and theological traditions from the Catholic Church, despite the fact that the Protestant Reformation caused the turmoil, initiated by Martin Luther, that changed Western Christianity. That was the birth of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. The ongoing patterns of interaction and roles are clearly defined in and required by the Church law and the Church order. The argumentation and interpretation of definitions are based on the Scriptures (the Bible) and the Church’s Traditional Books. In the past, trust was not an issue because of the hierarchical organization structures, functions, and positions. However, the current operating environment and worldviews have influenced the Church. Consequently, the leadership and people ask a relevant question: Can trust be developed once again in and within the Church? That question is relevant because trust has been argued as being very vitalizing and powerful in various ways.

The ELFC invites people to fellowship with God and encourages them to take care of their neighbors and the created world. It is an Episcopal Church consisting of three bodies: the General Synod, Dioceses, and Parishes and Parish Unions (Figure 1.). The General Synod is the highest legislative, financial, administrative, and theological body. It makes key decisions regarding the Church’s doctrine and ministry. It has an important legislative function: the drafting and presenting of the Church law for approval or rejection by the Finnish Parliament. In addition, it manages the overall finances, buildings, and administration. Also, the Bishops Conference and the Church Council have very important roles dealing with doctrine, mission, and diocesan administration.

The Diocese (altogether nine dioceses) consists of three bodies: the Bishop, the Diocesan Chapter and Deaneries, and the Diocesan Board. The bishop is an ex officio member of the General Synod because of the position the one has. The Bishop is the spiritual overseer of the diocese and chairs the Diocesan Chapter. The Bishop directs the administration and operations, the Chapter manages the administration and operations, and the Diocese’s Board supports and advances the Church mission in the Diocese. The Diocese is divided into the Deaneries and further into Parishes and Parish Unions. There are currently 384 Parishes in Finland. The Parish operates as an independent unit and can form Parish Unions in larger urban areas. The Parish
Council holds the decision-making power. The Church's work is led by the Parish Board. The Vicar is a privileged member and the chairman of the Parish Board. Hence, the Vicar represents the Episcopal tradition. Then, there is the common Parish Union which manages common duties, such as cemeteries, real estate issues, finances, specific ministries, and various other tasks.

The ELCF reflects Finnish cultural inheritance and individualism by characterizing faith as a private matter. Finnish people sing from their heart and tend to pray inwardly and quietly. The rural file style and pietistic movements may have affected Finnish spirituality. A strong tradition of pietism has impacted the approaches and theological positions, particularly boosting revival movements. Some movements began as protest movements such as the Awakened Movement, the Prayer Movement, the Laestadian Movement, and the Lutheran Evangelical Movement, but later found a place in the Church. Recently, some new groups have emerged, such as the Charismatic Renewal Movement, the Thomas Mass, and various other movements (Kirkko 2020, 2010).

Over time, this picture has been challenged by a turbulent operating environment and various worldviews, and hence, this has raised a question as to how we identify ourselves as a church today. Now, that is particularly an issue because the membership of the Church is declining. Consequently, the rigid structures and governance forms have been questioned. The ongoing patterns of interaction (e.g., loose relationships and social media) may not enable open and trustworthy discourse about the purpose and direction of the Church. The management system may not be flexible enough to meet demand for change. Consequently, the relevance of the Church has been questioned.
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Figure 1. The management structure of the Church, ELCF
In the 1980s the Church’s membership was over 90 %, but since then, it has declined. At the beginning of 2019, it was only 69.9 % (3.9 million) of the population. In Helsinki, 47 % of the population belong to the ELCF. In addition, the number of people not belonging to any domination has doubled within the last 10 years. There are also significant regional differences in membership. At the beginning of 2019, there were 384 local churches and about 20,000 employees. In the capital area, membership has declined even more. In 2017, there were 1,756 pastors of which 52.7 % were male and 47.3 % were female. Females hold 20 % of the vicar offices. There were 29.3 % males and 70.7 % females in the total number of employees. In 2017, the Church received tax revenue of 885 million euros. The Finnish government also donates specific societal activities, such as maintaining cemeteries, culturally valuable buildings, and churches, and it keeps the parish registers.

1.4 RESEARCH TASK, QUESTIONS, AND GOALS

Research task
This study explored trust from the strategic leadership perspective in NPOs, more specifically in the church setting. The research context was nonprofits, the target of the study was the church, and the research object was the phenomenon of trust and strategic leadership from the senior leaders’ perspective. In the theoretical framework of the study (Figure 2.), I built the bridge for the interplay of strategic leadership and trust. Ability (capacity) is a common nominator for trust (Mayer et al., 1995, 2006) and strategic leadership (Hitt & Ireland, 2002). Capacity (Boal & Hooijberg, 2001), competence (Gabarro, 1978), and capability (Hitt et al., 2010) are used as synonyms for ability. Thus, I chose the theory of strategic leadership capacity and activities based on Boal and Hooijberg (2001) because the existing nonprofit literature provided at least initial support for three essential elements (Phipps & Burbach, 2010).

Strategic leadership is a leader’s ability to create and sustain three capacities (abilities) within the organization: the capacity to learn (or absorptive capacity), the capacity to change, and the capacity for managerial wisdom. Supporting my decision, I referred also to Hollenbeck and Morgan (2001) who claimed that executive development should focus on competence (synonym for ability) instead of developing leadership traits or personality. Accordingly, outcomes depend on what gets done instead of what one does.
Further, in most definitions of trust, expectations are referred and, likewise, the willingness to accept vulnerability. Accordingly, trust is a psychological state (Rousseau, et al., 1998) comprising the willingness to accept vulnerability based on positive expectations of a referent (Fulmer & Gelfand, 2012). According to Zucker (1986, 54), “trust is a set of expectations shared by all those involved in an exchange,” including both social rules and legitimately activated processes. Expectations concern ability, benevolence, and integrity. Consequently, I chose the integrated model of organizational trust by Mayer et al. (1995, 2006) as a tentative theoretical frame. Thus, trustworthiness consists of ability, benevolence, and integrity, which are the bases for trust. Risk and vulnerability are essential aspects of trust. The willingness to be vulnerable is to take a risk. In other words, there is something very important to lose. The model applies in trust building and the evaluation of subordinates’ trustworthiness, along with the trust dimensions introduced above (Long & Sitkin, 2006). At the same time, from an organizational perspective, there are various forms of trust that affect managerial trustworthy behavior, such as organizational, relational, and individual factors (Whitener et al., 2006). Through trust building efforts, managers also build trust in themselves (individual trust) and in the organization (institutional trust) (Long & Sitkin, 2006; Nooteboom, 2003; Rousseau et al., 1998).

Methodological approaches also impact research (Eriksson & Kovalainen, 2010). I adopted a social constructivist research approach and qualitative case study due to the purpose of the study which was to add to the understanding of the elusive concepts of trust and strategic leadership (Yin, 1994; Eriksson & Kovalainen, 2010; Brunel & Morgan, 2011). Further, the research task can be best understood by exploring people’s socially and symbolically constructed and maintained meanings, relationships, and
organizational realities (Burrell & Morgan, 2011; Eriksson & Kovalainen, 2010). Hence, information can be understood only in the context and through interaction in situ (e.g., (Tuomi & Sarajärvi, 2004). Qualitative methods allow us to understand practices in a social context rather than to explain and control the organization (Koskinen, et al., 2006).

A case study relies on interpretive and constructivist epistemology (Eriksson & Kovalainen, 2010). Accordingly, the case will be made by carrying out the research by turning the object of the research into an object of interpretation and understanding. A case study explores people, organizations, and processes holistically in their social, financial, and cultural context. Myers (2009) argued, emphasizing organizational focus, that the case study is synonymous with a study of some aspect of an organization. It is a philosophically neutral, creative, and credible approach (McGloin, 2008), and as such, it is a good method to study strategy work (Stenfors, 2007).

The data for this study were gathered through 14 interviews of vicars and web material at the ELCF in the southern Finland. In addition, I used, as secondary data, a wide range of well-recognized reports, articles, e-libraries, internet and web material, and books to build a means of follow-up (longitudinal), as well as a strong foundation and interpretation for the study. The article searches on the internet and the university’s web-library were conducted using combinations of words, such as trust, strategy, strategic leadership, nonprofit, church, leadership, and top management, particularly in the context of and from the strategic leadership perspective. The data were analyzed using abductive thematic (Eriksson & Kovalainen, 2010) and conceptual metaphor analysis (Johnson, 1987; Lakoff & Johnson, 1980). Themes and definitions reveal the tacit knowledge and tacit expertise that are the conceptual and fundamental aspects of thinking, serving as the foundation of all abstract thoughts.

Research questions
The research questions were based on the strategic leadership perspective in a nonprofit setting. They were as follows:
1. How do strategic leadership activities produce organizational trust and, in turn, emerge as the senior leaders’ trust in an organization?
2. How do senior leaders perceive emerging trust at multiple levels?
3. How do senior leaders characterize trust using a metaphor?

Goals of the study
First, my aim was to contribute to the originality (Corley & Cioia, 2011) of the strategic leadership and trust research by linking these concepts in the nonprofit context from the strategic leadership perspective. Second, I wanted to develop a theoretical pattern to describe specific practices of strategic leadership that enhance the building (Corley & Cioia, 2011) of organizational trust and, in turn, senior leaders’ trust in an organization. NPOs (religious, ideological, and value-driven organizations) do not only have financial measurements but also important qualitative measures linked directly to the mission and context of the organization (Grandy, 2013, 616). Furthermore, as an incremental advantage of the study, I aimed to introduce a new dimension to trust which extends the conceptual diversity and trust development process from the strategic leadership perspective. The context, I believed, would further reveal the introduced dimension. Thus, this study will be practically useful (Corley & Cioia, 2011) for strategic leadership of the same kinds of organizations. Strategic leadership activities matter in terms of trust as a revitalizing attribute. Finally, I have introduced opportunities for research, such as testing the theoretical extensions and exploring findings.
1.5 OUTLINE OF THE STUDY

The theoretical review will follow the introduction (Section 1). In Section 2, I outline the key theoretical dimensions of strategic leadership: strategy research and the essence of strategic leadership. In Section 3, I offer a theoretical review of the theory of multifaceted and multilevel organizational trust. The theoretical review is followed by Section 4 which describes the empirical case study with philosophical stances, case study research, and empirical data, as well as the analysis methods. In Section 5, I report the findings questions by question. Last, in Section 6, I discuss the plausible findings and summarize the contributions and suggestions for further research and implications.

Figure 3. Outline of the study
2 STRATEGIC LEADERSHIP

In this section, I build a bridge between the strategic management and strategic leadership research highlighting the theoretical development. Igor Ansoff (1918–2002) is known as the father of strategic management (Vuorinen, 2013). The definition of strategy varies, and hence, to some extent, it is an elusive concept (De Wit & Meyer, 2004). This presents a difficulty for those seeking simplicity and certainty. There have been various attempts to define the concept. “Strategy is an integrated and coordinated set of commitments and actions designed to exploit core competencies and gain a competitive advantage,” according to Volberda et al. (2011, 7). Strategy is a stream or a flow of activities, a pattern in a stream of actions (e.g., Porter, 2000; Mintzberg et al., 2003; De Wit & Meyer, 2005). Strategy consists of the five Ps: plan, pattern, position, perspective, and ploy (Mintzberg, et al., 2005). Further, strategic management highlights the rational aspects of the process, such as design, plan, and position.

Also, it has been said that the “Strategic management process is the full set of commitments, decisions and actions required for a firm to achieve strategic competitiveness and earn above-average returns” (Volberda et al., 2011, 9). Because the definitions of strategy and the strategic management process refer solely to the success of the firms, these definitions must be applied in their specific contexts. Thus, the concept of strategy is still elusive and does not define precisely the overall concept. Thus, I define strategic leadership as the most important activities advancing the mission. That refers to the most important task of the top management, that is, achieving the mission (cf. Kaplan & Norton, 2004). Moreover, it is important to note that theoretical development has undergone an update or rejuvenation through a metamorphosis. Thus, the strategist should be able to synthesize different management schools and perspectives (Mintzberg, et al., 2005).

Effective strategic leadership is expected “to use successfully the strategic management process as they guide the firm in a way that results in forming a vision and mission” (Volberda, et al., 2011, 401). Thus, they facilitate the development of strategic actions and determine implementation. From the research point of view strategic leadership is essentially an issue of the ability and capacity of the leadership (Boal & Hooijberg, 2001; Volberda et al., 2011). Thus, I begin with the evolutionary review insofar as it is appropriate instead of an all-inclusive theoretical review.

2.1 STRATEGY RESEARCH

Organizations have always faced the same challenge of how to survive and be successful. Consequently, management theories have developed through a process to determine the best model (classical theories, the best way of doing a task/production), the best practices/activities (strategic management, strategy orientation), the best leadership style/type (strategic leadership, people orientation), and most important leadership capacities (top management’s capacity). Thus, all theories have added something on effective strategic leadership. However, the paradigmatic shift originates from a change in the environment (Santalainen, 2006).
The classical management theories were developed mostly in the context of business and industries and were further developed and applied in other areas. The scientific management theory developed by Frederick Taylor⁵ (1911) aimed to find the best way of doing a task. Max Weber (1864–1920) launched the theory of bureaucratic organization. The bureaucracy referred to the exercise of control which was based on knowledge, expertise, and/or experience. The modern management theory launched by Henri Fayol (1916) introduced a management theory that was aimed at being applicable to all types of fields and administrations. Organization theories define the management as (a) person/s who is/are responsible for an organization (Mintzberg, 1989). This applies to any form of organization from managing directors to vicars and bishops. Thus, they all have formal authority, their status unites interpersonal relationships, and this enables access to information which helps them in strategizing and decision-making. Also, the management has specific roles within a structured organizational setting (e.g. Mintzberg 1989; Kotter, 1999).

Gradually the focus has turned to a wider scope, such as that of strategic leadership (Boal & Hooijberg, 2001). Consequently, strategic leadership has emerged from the upper echelon (Hambrick & Mason, 1984; Finkelstein & Hambrick, 1996) and the top management teams (TMTs) theories which are considered new leadership theories (Bryman, 1992; Hunt, 1999). Thus, strategic leadership concerns people at the top of the organization (overall responsibility). According to Boal and Hooijberg (2000), these new theories include charismatic theories of leadership (e.g., House, 1977), transformational leadership (Bass, 1995), and visionary theories of leadership (e.g. Bennis & Nanus, 1985). Some theories have focused on the behavioral and cognitive complexity of leaders (Quinn, 1988; Hunt, 1991), as well as flexibility and social intelligence (e.g., Hooijberg, Hunt, & Dodge, 1997). Supervisory theories of leadership (e.g., path-goal, contingency, and LMX) highlight the task- and person-oriented behavior of leaders providing guidance, support, and feedback to subordinates, whereas strategic leadership stresses the creation of meanings and purpose for the organization.

Supervisory theories of leadership are about leadership in organization. Thus, leadership refers to all leaders focusing on relationships. Strategic theories of leadership are about the leadership of the organization (e.g., Hunt, 1991). In comparison, but not contrary to this, according to Kotter (1999), leaders keep people moving in the same direction, as leaders work through people and culture. Instead, managers keep the system running, as they work through hierarchy, order, and systems. Thus, the essential difference between these approaches is in its standpoint. Leadership is inductive and management deductive in nature (Kotter, 1999) (Table 1). Strategic management (e.g., Mintzberg, 1989), as another end of the strategic leadership continuum, emphasizes primarily the top management roles, tasks, practices, and aims, and thus, it describes what senior leaders are expected to do and to get done. Top managers and leaders are different from operational leaders (Norbun, 1989; Kotter, 1999).

Table 1. Strategic management roles and activities adopted from the referred scholars

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Division of Work</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Figurehead</td>
<td>Leaders set direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority and Responsibility</td>
<td>Organizing</td>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>Leaders align people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td>Staffing</td>
<td>Liaison</td>
<td>Leaders motivate people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unity of Command</td>
<td>Coordinating</td>
<td>Monitor</td>
<td>Managers plan and budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unity of Direction</td>
<td>Controlling</td>
<td>Disseminator</td>
<td>Managers organize and staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordination</td>
<td></td>
<td>Spokesperson</td>
<td>Managers control and solve problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remuneration</td>
<td></td>
<td>Entrepreneur</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centralization</td>
<td></td>
<td>Disturbance Handler</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scalar Chain</td>
<td></td>
<td>Resource Allocator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order</td>
<td></td>
<td>Negotiator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability of Tenure of Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esprit de Corps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The management strives to achieve objectives through exerting influence on organizational activities. Prior strategic management research defines strategy work as the management’s task and the implementation as the responsibility of others. However, Fayol’s (1916) five management functions are still relevant to some extent. The functions focus on the relationship between the personnel and the management. The management can add value by creative problem solving, motivating employees and making sure that the organization achieves objectives and goals. Those are actualized through 14 principles of managerial activities⁶ which are achieved by planning,

---

⁶Fayol’s 14 principles: 1) Division of work: this ensures performance through balanced effort, 2) Authority and responsibility: responsibility is included in authority, 3) Discipline: this involves respect and obedience to superiors, 4) Unity of command: all will receive orders from only one senior, 5) Unity of direction for a group of tasks with a common objective: there must be a single supervisor and a single plan, 6) Subordination: this means that individuals must understand that their own interests are secondary to the common good, 7) Remuneration: wages must be in line with maximum satisfaction to the employees and the firm, 8) Centralization: this means that the management can decide about the amount of authority to be dispersed within levels, 9) Scalar chain: the leaders and followers’ relationship should not be harmful for the organization, 10) Order: all resources must have a link to an appropriate process, 11) Equity and equality: these must be principles indicating kindness and justice, 12) Stability: the tenure of personnel will be ensured though minimal employee turnover, 13) Initiative: this is the managers’ responsibility, and 14) Esprit de corps: the emphases are on teamwork and effective communication for achieving it.
organizing, staffing, coordinating, and controlling. Hence, the forming (planning-based) of strategy becomes the focus (e.g., Kettunen, 1997; Näsi, 1988) (Table 1).

Mintzberg (1989) defined the essential management roles: figurehead, leader, liaison, monitor, disseminator, spokesperson, entrepreneur, disturbance handler, resource allocator, and negotiator. Another standpoint on management tasks is that of Kotter (1999) who explored management roles through activities, that is, “what leaders do”: leaders set direction, leaders align people, leaders motivate people, and managers plan, budget, organize, staff, control and solve problems. Failures are common because managers have relatively low understanding about strategic management because strategy has been in existence only few decades in the field of strategic management. However, military strategy has been in existence thousands of years. Nevertheless, strategy is a matter of competency. According to Hennelly (2017), leaders confuse their managerial authority, given by the organization, with their leadership influence, granted by the trusting followers. Consequently, people are more likely to trust the plan if they trust the leader.

Kotter (1999) argued that the higher the person goes in the organization, the more he or she must engage in the work of leadership. He emphasizes that top management should lead 80% and manage 20%. Because of changes in environment, this shift is dramatic just because leadership and management are different and have different functions, even though they are other positions in the continuum. Nevertheless, the leadership depends more on informal relationships instead of formal power of position. An effective strategic leader talks to people, not just to their subordinates, asking questions instead of giving orders. Consequently, the leadership must have the right abilities to inspire and motivate people and operate through complex relationships. According to Atkinson (2004), the reasons for the relatively minor attention paid to the relationships of the top management are the agent and leadership models, as the theories have not adequately considered leadership relationships. The leadership’s relationships have a positive impact on organizational success (Westphal, 1999; Butcher & Atkinson, 2002).

Advancement from operational (leadership in organization) to strategic leadership (leadership of organization) is challenging. Strategic leaders must constantly respond to the demands of the operating environment and create a new type of alignment; in other words, they need to establish the consistency of the relationship between the environment and the mission (Kotter, 1999; Kaplan & Norton, 2004; Hitt et al., 2010). Hitt and colleagues (2010) argued that strategic leaders must have a global mind-set because all organizations are affected by global events. However, such a strategic change in mid-set would have an impact on the way the leadership executes the mission, and the way it organizes the organizational systems, such as structures, processes, and culture. Operational leadership maintains the strategic mission and organizational systems (e.g., Appelbaum et al., 2019; De Wit & Meyer, 2005). Top management is crucial to outcomes because of the decisions they are authorized to make and overall responsibility (Hambrick & Pettigrew, 2001; Hambrick & Mason, 1984). Thus, multifaceted management development is called transformation (Santalainen, 2006). Accordingly, senior leaders support coordination and resource allocation (Rumelt, et al., 1991) and execution of activities to establish organizational performance. Thus, their decisions matter for their organization and environment. The most important leader’s responsibility and, hence, the key role is to advance the mission (Kaplan & Norton, 2004). Next, I will discuss important topics involved in the management perspective, such as external environment and strategic resources.
2.1.1 Strategy work aims at change

The strategic management perspective suggests that the external environment determines strategic actions (Volberda, et al., 2011). Yet, strategy is more than planning (Santalainen, 2006). It is an abstraction being born in the brain of the strategist. Since strategic management and thinking have been in the mainstream of 2000s management, leadership and strategy definitions differ due to emerging nature of theories over time. An organization’s strategy must be grounded on resources, competencies, and competitive capabilities. Hence, added value discussions are in focus.

The aim of strategy work is how it intends to create value and generate strategic change (Kaplan & Norton, 2004). Hence, it consists of simultaneous and complementary issues. According to Kaplan and Norton (2004, 13), “strategic alignment determines the value of intangible assets,” such as human capital, information capital, and organizational culture. They point out that an organization’s agenda of change integrates and aligns organizational capital in the areas of strategic issues. Above all, accordingly, the leadership must possess the ability to mobilize and sustain desired changes. Without shared understanding, strategy will be in vain and even harmful.

The way the strategy process is organized has an impact on strategy content (De Wit & Meyer, 2005). Making strategy is not an ultimate end, but it is integral to achieving desired goals. The vital question is, however, before making the strategy: Why does the organization exist? There are many ways to the destination, and hence, various strategy making theories and models can be used. Strategy work is primarily leading to transformation (Santalainen, 2006). Strategizing and reflection are the core of strategic thinking (e.g., Näsi, 1988; Thompson & Strickland, 1996; De Wit & Meyer, 2005; Santalainen, 2006). Strategy is a course of action for achieving the organization’s purpose/mission (e.g., Porter, 2000). Moreover, differentiation essential. It is based on both the choice of activities and how they are performed. These activities define the mission, strategy, and values, and they communicate these effectively. They not only align accountability with performance (Kaplan & Norton, 2004), but also help to achieve vision and ensure financial backbone (Rowe, 2001).

The distinct paradigmatic shift is visible. The strategic leadership approach places more of an emphasis on values of capital and resources and pays more attention to human and social aspects per se. Also, the sociocultural context sets patterns and models for the strategic leadership. It moderates the leadership and organizational innovation (Elenkov & Manev, 2005; Phipps & Burbach, 2010). Thus, attention has been increasingly paid to social and participatory interactions, and to the emerging strategy work (e.g., Mantere & Vaara, 2008; Stenfors, 2007). Mantere and Vaara (2008) identified three participatory approaches to strategy work/making: self-actualization, ideologization, and concretization. In addition, they identified three nonparticipatory approaches: mystification, disciplining, and rephonologization. Thus, participation is a fundamental principle of strategy work.

Organizations seek competitive advantage based on the business system, including its mission, resources (inputs), activities (throughputs), and products or services (outputs). Specifically, the ideological base of the mission, knowledge/know-how, and relationships are important factors (e.g., Mintzberg, 1989; Kaplan & Norton, 2004; De Wit & Meyer, 2005). These responsibilities refer to leadership abilities. However, traditional organizations have failed, to some extent, to create a motivating environment and enhance hidden potential. According to Kaplan and Norton (2004,) the executive motivates and leads the efforts of other people using their characteristic behavior.
Thus, success will be created through the performance of internal processes supported by intangible assets, such as learning and growth. An organization’s intangible assets represent more than 75% of its value. As a result, the organization must mobilize its intangible assets. Moreover, the most substantial problem is not strategy, but its poor execution. Kaplan and Norton elaborated on this, stating that strategy formation and execution must focus on the mobilization and alignment of intangible assets. Thus, an organization should carefully utilize its intangible assets.

An organization’s competitive advantage (e.g., Kaplan & Norton, 2004; Mintzberg et al., 2003) depends on its ability to create, recombine, and transfer knowledge within the context of its operating environment. This, in turn, requires the ability to change or reinforce existing patterns. Phipps and Burbach (2010) pointed out that is the reason strategic leadership is positioned to create an organizational context where learning can take place. However, it is worth mentioning that, in terms of the research subject context, we do not primarily talk about competition with or against other NPOs, but rather about competing for the minds and souls of people. Also, strategic leadership makes strategic changes that concern the whole organization. According to Hambrick and Mason (1984), strategic leadership is responsible for the outcomes of an organization. Thus, strategic leadership enhances performance beyond an average level, whereas managerial leadership may only reach the average level at best (Rowe, 2001).

Change is axiomatic phenomenon caused by external and internal factors. Through the leaders’ ability to change or reinforce existing action patterns, they create a context for learning (Boal & Hooijberg, 2001). Strategic renewal and strategic change are distinct concepts (Schmitt et al., 2018). Strategic change is an umbrella concept referring to various types of changes. Strategic renewal refers only to a specific type of strategic change, such as the transformation of an organization’s current capabilities and intents. Thus, it excludes strategic extension, additions, or deletions (Schmitt et al., 2018). Strategic renewal research analyzes how organizations transform their strategic initiatives and capabilities (Alder, et al., 2015). There is no consensus either about what strategic renewal means or how it differs from other conceptions, such as strategic change and strategy process. In this study, I referred to its definition as relating to the activities that an organization takes to revitalize, redeploy, or replace attributes. Strategic renewal refers to actions for transforming competencies considered to be a competitive advantage. As I have stated earlier, the issue is strategic when it considers the whole organization and aims to achieve the mission. Finally, based on these definitions (Schmitt et al., 2018), we can determine three elements that define the concept of renewal. It involves a transformation of competencies, concerns the entire organization at all levels, and ensures long-term survival. Thus, strategic renewal describes the process that allows an organization to alter its path dependence by transforming its strategic intent and capabilities. Organizations face the dilemma to continue as usual or to execute a renewal process. Continuity gives cohesion and reliability in terms of psychological contracts, whereas renewals enhance innovations and evolution (Schmitt et al., 2018).

2.1.2 Strategic resources and trust

Next, I describe the strategic resources which have the potential to create a competitive advantage (Harney & Hansen, 1995, as cited by Bachmann, 2006). The resource-based approach suggests that an organization’s unique resources and capabilities are critical
aspects of competitive advantage (Volberda, et al., 2011). Often, organization is understood as being structure and power and that success depends on the planning system or form of decentralization (e.g., Porter, 2000; Mintzberg, 1994). Strategic leadership is not only a management issue but eminently a leadership issue. Therefore, the ultimate essence of strategic leadership is to take care of the core capitals by building a shared perspective and common purpose (Madhok, 2006; cf. Ghoshal & Moran, 1996). Strategy and organization have more to do with how an organization’s resources, capabilities, competencies, and knowledge can best be developed, coordinated, and deployed for value realizing. As a result, trust relationships are crucial for this process (Madhok, 2006).

Resources must be optimally enhanced to develop capabilities (Hitt & Ireland, 2002). According to Madhok (1997, 2006), value is an overall capital, whereas knowledge is the base. The strategic leadership approach places more emphasis on the values of capitals and resources, and thus pays more attention to human and social aspects per se. According to the resource-based approach, intangible capitals, such as human capital (experience, knowledge, skills, talents, and capabilities) and social capital (tasks, community, relationship, norms, values, obligations, and opportunities) are claimed as essential to contributing to achievement of a competitive advantage (e.g., Hitt & Ireland, 2002; Mintzberg, 1989). Also, knowledge management is seen as the most important asset to achieve competitive advantage (e.g., Hedlund, 1994; Teece, 1998; Madhok, 2006). Sociocultural context establishes patterns and models for strategic leadership and moderates the leadership and organizational innovation (Elenkov & Manev, 2005; Phipps & Burbach, 2010). Organizations are changing more towards group-based or team-based approaches and increasingly have adopted remote work arrangements, which increases leadership challenges. Strategic alignment determines the value of resources (Kaplan & Norton, 2004). That is very important in empowerment because, otherwise, individuals may empower the whole group to move in the wrong direction (Senge, 1990; Kaplan & Norton, 2004). Senge (1990) stressed that wide organizational changes need alignment, empowerment, innovation, and risk-taking. In addition, trust is a leadership resource (Savolainen & Lopez-Fresno, 2018), and it facilitates desired outcomes. Trust has been connected widely with relationships, social interaction, and knowledge management. There is evidence that trust supports organizational effectiveness, creativity, and success, which are the key elements of competitive advantage (e.g., Kramer, 1999; Dirk & Ferrin, 2001, 2002).

**Human capital**

Hitt and Ireland (2002) argued that human capital is the most important resource. Nevertheless, knowledge is the most important asset of human capital, which is delivered through social capital. Trust is described as being pivotal to improving and facilitating knowledge sharing. Madhok (2006) stated that, without trust, managers’ initiatives to promote knowledge sharing may face resistance. Thus, coordinating knowledge activities are enabling activities. Coordination is even more important and challenging between interorganizational units. Consequently, the flow of information is different in trustworthy relationships. Trust contributes to competitiveness because trust is difficult to replicate or imitate (Gillespie & Mann, 2004). Cooperation and co-creating skills may be the key success factors for competitiveness (Savolainen & Lopez-Fresno, 2018). Such an asset enables an organization to develop an explicit competitive advantage (e.g., Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1988; Savolainen & Lopez-Fresno, 2018).
People’s perspectives about trustworthy leadership have become very important if not the most critical. Trust can be developed though open dialogue and knowledge sharing between the leaders and the followers (e.g., Gillespie & Mann, 2004). According to Coleman (1988), the definition of human capital emphasizes a person’s education, experience, and specific skills. Hitt and Ireland (2002) argued that, together with structural capital, human capital represents an organization’s intellectual capital. Human capital is a unique and socially complex and intangible resource. Trust is intangible and an intellectual capital and resource (Savolainen, 2011). The importance and significance of human capital from the performance point of view have been proven. Hence, it is worth investing in it as a critical competitive asset which can speed up economic performance (Hitt & Ireland, 2002). Human capital includes explicit and intangible knowledge, whereas tacit knowledge is critical and difficult to imitate. It should be utilized effectively and managed well through a strategic leader’s social capital.

Hitt and Ireland (2002) pointed out that, from a knowledge-based perspective, human capital indicates organizational potential that will be realized along with intensive development and the use of social capital (see also Zahra and George, 2002). Human capital serves an organization’s systems and structures (Drucker, 2002). Trust provides the foundation for enhancing, creating, sharing, and utilizing knowledge. Hence, the leadership must develop the talent to utilize their skills at their full potential and enhance the well-being of people (e.g., Savolainen 2011; Ikonen 2013). In particular, tacit knowledge is shared through people in social and interactive processes. Therefore, sharing increases the willingness to change, which in turn leads to better development activities (Savolainen, 2011). Consequently, tacit knowledge must be shared and thereby converted into specific and explicit knowledge, otherwise it is useless. Tacit knowledge is defined as intuitions, feelings, observations, and beliefs reflecting the way of thinking, talking, and working, and relationships. However, it is difficult to interpret, transfer, and share without a supportive atmosphere (Savolainen & Lopez-Fresno, 2018).

**Social capital**

Social capital is relational among individuals and within an organization (Hitt & Ireland, 2002). Trust is pivotal in developing social capital. Managers build teams to develop effective possibilities for interactive relationships and trust. Social capital consists of relationships between individuals and organizations, and it reflects the value of relationships and prevailing quality (Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1988). Members are encouraged to express feelings and acknowledge weaknesses. Doing so, they take risks, and possibly expose their vulnerability (Mayer et al., 1995, 2006). Strategic leaders must ensure integrity, justice, reward, fairness, and the health of relationships (e.g., Hitt & Ireland, 2002). Social capital is essential for coordinating teams and units in a community. This requires active leadership within any team, particularly in promoting participation in discourse. In this way, the strategic leaders enhance commitment to the vision and common goals. Through continuous interaction with community, they develop an atmosphere of trust (Hitt & Ireland, 2002).

Strategic leaders must also build new relationships outside the organization (Hitt & Ireland, 2002). Thus, a strategic leader’s ability to create relationships, particularly beneficial for social capital, may become challenging in respect to informal and formal stakeholders. Building such capital first requires trust, that is, relational competence, according to Hitt and Ireland. They have defined abilities as those which help to form
and manage relationships and the ability to be sensitive to stakeholders. Scholars suggest that both leadership (e.g., Northouse, 2013) and trust evolve over time (Mayer et al., 1995). Thus, leaders gain experience with the mission and with each other through facilitating task accomplishment (Drescher, et al., 2014). In this way, people can focus on task-related activities and practices which, in turn, facilitate social relations (Kozlowski & Bell, 2003). Drescher and colleagues (2014) suggested that, once formed, emergent social processes shape the leadership and trust, and that trust is an attitude directed towards the common goals. Trust research has shown that trust is related to an individual’s efforts beyond the official role to help others and the organization to achieve goals (e.g., Drescher et al., 2014). Accordingly, the employees’ response to the activity is related to the level of organizational trust.

Advanced systems and communication technologies, together with post-bureaucratic organization, have highlighted the problem of trust (Bachmann & Zaheer, 2006). People now work more often in virtual and distance workstations and other facilities. Hence, the internet and other digital means have replaced face-to-face interaction. Projects conducted through global virtual teams (GVTs) and temporary teams such as swift starting action teams (STATs) have developed different kinds of social relationships and trust. Swift trust (Meyrsson, et al., 1996) provides the necessary, initial cognitive confidence as a temporal substitute for trust. People in temporary systems rely more on roles than individuals. Routines are an integral part of the organizations’ daily life. Hence, initial trust is based on individual dispositions to trust (McKnight et al., 2006) in roles and assignments. Using traditional control means that monitoring and controlling are less transparent, but digitalization has renewed the concept of controlling and monitoring (e.g., Bijlsma-Frankema & Koponen, 2004; Malkamäki, 2016). Systems are developed to monitor and share information instead of people sharing information through interaction and discourse. But, there is a risk that the working environment can become a place of outsiders and insiders (cf. leaders-member exchange theory; cf. Häkkinen, 2012; Ikonen, 2013), as information is shared differently. Thus, structure and processes may be changed that do not necessarily support trust building.

**Structural and organizational capital**

Structural capital (used to transmit intellectual capital) consists of everything that remains when the employees go home, such as infrastructure, technology, physical systems, and information capital, including databases, information systems and networks, and technology infrastructure (Hitt & Ireland, 2002; von Krogh et al., 2000). Thus, institution-based trust is predicated on the idea (e.g., Zucker, 1986) that essential interpersonal structures are available so that one can believe in a successful future. Intuition-based trust (McKnight et al., 2006) considers the need for structural assurances, such as legal resources (i.e., promises, contracts), regulations, one’s own and others’ roles, and guarantees, to be acceptable (Baier, 1986). Changes in trust level will be seen in different structures and processes primarily benefitting organizational and social life. However, the individual cannot utilize trust alone or be solely responsible for negative consequences. Trust has a collective effect on relationships, structures, and social life. Hence, on an individual level, trust may be invisible and

---

Trust, in swift trust theory, is where a group or team assumes trust initially, and later verifies and adjusts trust beliefs accordingly (Meyrsson et al., 1996).
tacit (Savolainen & Lopez-Fresno, 2018). However, its multifaceted effects can be seen among agents and on other levels as well.

The system trust (Luhmann, 1979) is based on functions and systems, not in person that the system is functioning. The object of trust is the well-functioning system itself. In summary, institutions can be the base, carrier, and object of trust. Institutions are affected if they are trusted (Möllering, 2006). Sen (1970, 1977) suggested that “our economic system would collapse, and organizations could not visibly exist in the absence of trust.” Bachmann (2006) argued that trust is an effective means to control social relationships between individual and organizational actors. Different forms of power and trust are specified by an institutional environment. Power and trust are alternative forms of coordinating relationships. In business, system power may foster the development of trust, but relationships foster trust. Today societies function based on collective trust in the competence and goodwill of professionals (Bachmann & Zaheer, 2006).

In an organizational setting, people rely on cognitive and behavioral rule systems. These rules reflect, according to Ross (1997), an individual’s theories about people and situations (Kramer, 2006). Accordingly, rules are a basic reality of individual and social life. Individual and collective actions are organized by rules, and social relations are regulated by rules (e.g., De Wit & Meyer, 2005). Thus, rules help us to classify and categorize prior to making decisions or taking action. A model also helps to monitor decisions made and actions taken, how the rules impact social reality, and how they are applied. A model helps us to analyze if the individual was trustworthy or was possibly trusted too much. Kramer (2006) emphasized that rules help to determine the benefit of trust and minimize the costs of untrustworthy behavior.

Organizational capital consists of culture, leadership, employee, alignment, teamwork, and knowledge management. Organization capital is a form of organizational capacity or an ability (Kaplan & Norton, 2004). Thus, it is active and dynamic in nature. Organization capital is an ability to mobilize and sustain the process of the strategic change required (e.g., Kaplan & Norton, 2004; Kotter, 1999). Hence, the organization has a common understanding about the vision, mission, values, and strategy, thus forming a performance culture with the strategy (Kaplan & Norton, 2004). Culture refers to attitudes and behavior characterizing the function of an organization. Culture is an interaction system, controlling and coordinating people’s behavior and how they do things within their environment (De Wit & Meyer, 2005). Culture may be either a barrier or an enabler (e.g., Kaplan & Norton, 2004) and culturally incompatible. Thus, open communication is appropriate for strategies that require a high degree of integration. Shared values have an important role in trust building. According to Lewicki and colleagues (1998), a high level of trust relationships can depend to some the extent on how parties identify with each other’s values. In addition, Jones and George (1993) suggested that shared values are the basis on which parties experience trust unconditionally. However, Barber (1983) argued that shared values help to create relationships based on trust, and hence, trust maintains and manifests shared values. The more complex and dynamic the social system is, the more trust is needed as a lubricant (Arrow, 1994; Bachmann & Zaheer, 2006). Yet, there is an essential question about how organizations can not only be trusted, but, as social systems, how they can also actively trust themselves (Sydow, 2006).
2.2 ESSENCE OF STRATEGIC LEADERSHIP

Having briefly reviewed the various streams of management theories, I next introduce three major perspectives of strategic leadership: transactional and transformational leadership (Bass, 1985; Bass & Avolio, 1990) and strategic leadership capacities and abilities (Hitt & Ireland, 2002; Boal & Hooijberg, 2001; Ireland & Hitt, 1999). They are the most relevant theories from the point of view of this study’s research task.

Strategic leadership (Finkelstein & Hambrick, 1996) is an expansion of the upper echelon theory. Moreover, Pawar and Eastman (1997) noted that the content of strategic leadership and transformational leadership theories are the same (Boal & Hooijberg, 2001). The upper echelon theory, crafted by Hambrick and Mason (1984), expresses not only the instrumental aspects for producing outcomes but also the social aspects in respect to the conception of leadership (Hambrick & Pettigrew, 2001). Strategic leadership theory explores the psychological side of top management and how that influences information processing and decision-making. Thus, strategic leadership theory highlights how top leaders’ specific knowledge, experience, values, and preferences influence their assessments and their strategic choices. Moreover, there is a consensus that strategic leadership makes a significant difference (e.g., Phipps & Burbach, 2010).

Strategic theories aim to develop capabilities and change (Selznick, 1984). Usually, activities focus on managerial practices (transactional perspective). However, strategic leadership is different from the perspective of visionary and managerial leadership. It has strong and positive expectations concerning performance (Rowe, 2001). Strategic leaders enhance individual, group, and organizational capabilities to combine tacit and explicit knowledge. Strategic leaders utilize visionary and managerial skills, abilities, and knowledge. Strategic leadership refers to people who are responsible for all members and the whole organization. Consequently, the contextual and operating environments are equally important factors.

New leadership theories, such as charismatic, transformational, and visionary leadership, have contributed to the overall theory emphasizing the interpersonal processes between the leader and followers (Boal & Hooijberg, 2001). A charismatic approach stresses personal identification and execution of goals related to core values and identity (Yukl, 2010). Thus, personal identification is a key factor in charismatic theories of leadership. Charismatic relationships enhance implementation of strategic decisions (e.g., Camella & Monroe, 1997). Charismatic theories focus on individual level outcomes, such as affect, loyalty, identity, commitment, motivation, and performance (e.g., Beyer, 1999; Boal & Hooijberg, 2001). Charismatic leaders act in specific ways, using the charismatic effects of their followers. Visionary leaders are future-oriented, value-driven, and willing to invest in human capital, particularly tacit knowledge and effective culture (Rowe, 2001). In this way, visionary leadership is quite similar to transformational leadership per se. Visionary leader’s opinions and mind-sets may change according to opinions (Rowe, 2001). Control will be done through social networks, common values, and norms and beliefs. Zalenznik (1977) argued that visionary and managerial leaders are different points on the continuum.

Managerial leaders apply impersonal and passive attitudes towards goals. Managerial leaders differ also in terms of attitudes. For them, goals are necessities rather than desires or dreams (Rowe, 2001). They are sensitive to the past, and that hinders them. They have a poor level of emotional involvement because they lack a sense of empathy. This limitation is obvious as managerial leaders only have
influence on actions and decisions of coworkers, despite the fact that they have an influence on others within the organization. Transactional leadership is quite similar to that of managerial leaders (e.g., Rowe, 2001; Northouse, 2013). Transition (change management) for managerial leaders is a difficult task. That is why organizations need leaders to cope with change and managers to cope with complexity (Kotter, 1999). Managerial leadership looks at the world rationally. But, visionary leadership takes risks and, by doing so, may risk the organization even more so than managerial leadership (Rowe, 2001). Visionary or managerial type of an organization discourages the exercise of different types of leadership (e.g., Kotter, 1999; Zalenznik, 1977), whereas strategic leadership is a combination of both aspects of leadership (Northouse, 2013). Managerial and visionary leadership are not all bad, despite some of their negative aspects. Organizations need managerial and visionary leadership. In the end, good and unsatisfactory leadership can be transposed, and hence the leadership of an organization may end up to poor leadership whereby leader’s personality and operating culture are in a big role (Juuti, 2018).

2.2.1 Transactional and transformational leadership

The definition of strategic leadership expresses two leadership types or styles: transactional leadership and transformation leadership (Hambrick & Mason, 1984; Northouse, 2013). Transactional leadership was first proposed by Max Weber (Northouse, 2013) followed by Bernard Bass (1981). According to Tyssen and colleagues (2014), transactional leadership focuses on task-related exchanges and, thus, is related to the path-goal theory (Winkler, 2009) and the vertical dyad theory (Den Hartog et al., 1997; Graen & Uhl-Biem, 1995). Transactional leadership has been defined using two factors. The first factor, contingent reward, is an exchange process whereby efforts of followers are exchanged for special rewards. It emphasizes what must be done and what the payoff will be for doing so. Second, management-by-expectation includes corrective action, negative feedback, and negative reinforcement. It is either passive or active. Thus, transactional leadership does not promote trust as transformational leadership does. However, Shamir (1995) pointed out the contradictory view that transactional agreements described by contingent reward may develop trust in the leaders.

Transactional leadership style (cf. manager; Kotter, 1999) keeps the system running not only by setting goals and communicating expectations but also by rewarding employees for providing feedback. Transactional leadership aims to improve the current situation through such action as controlling and maintaining the existing strategy, structure, culture, policies, and procedures. Hence, the leaders are more internally oriented, such being a coordinator and monitor or producer and director. In addition, transactional leaders do not focus so much on individual needs and development. They are influential because subordinates fulfill leaders’ expectations and preferences (Northouse, 2013; Nishii et al., 2007). Transactional leadership does not focus on followers’ personal development. Northouse (2013) noted that transactional leaders are influential because they support followers’ interests to do what the leaders expect (cf. Kuhnert & Lewis, 1987). Leaders provide help and rewards based on performance. But, transactional leadership does not require a significant level of trust (Gillespie & Mann, 2004).
Transformational leadership was first presented by Downton (1973) and was further developed by Burns (1978), according to Northouse (2013). Transformational leadership (cf., leader; Kotter, 1999) follows more charismatic, inspirational, and visionary leadership approaches. Bass placed more emphasis on followers rather than leaders’ needs, as well as on the emotional elements and origins of charisma. Conversely, transformational leadership emphasizes a person-orientation through the alignment of followers’ needs with organizational tasks and objectives (Tyssen et al., 2014). Avalio and colleagues (1999) argued that transformational leadership builds on transactional leadership. Hence, through transactional agreements, the leadership builds trust and respect related to transformational leadership (Vera & Crossan, 2004). Transactional leadership stresses outcomes, but transformational leadership focuses on performance instead. Transformational leadership highlights factors such as intellectual stimulation, individual consideration, and inspirational motivation (Bass, 1985, 1995).

**Figure 4. Transactional and transformational leadership factors.**

Source: Adapted from The Implication of Transactional and Transformational Leadership for Individual, Team, and Organization’s Development by B. M. Bass and B. J. Avalio (1990) and from Research in Organizational Change and Development, 4, pp. 231–272 (Northouse, 2013, 194).

Burns’s leadership approach was different regarding power because it cannot be separated from followers’ needs. Thus, transactional leadership refers to a number of leadership models focusing on exchange, whereas transformational leadership focuses as a process on the level of motivation and morality of parties. Thus, it helps followers to achieve their fullest potential (Burns, 1978). Transformational leadership is a process that changes and transforms people (Avalio et al., 1999; Northouse, 2013).
Burns (1978) considered transactional and transformational leadership styles as being the opposite ends of the continuum, whereas Bass (1998) considered them simply as different things. That view enables us to see styles both or neither (Vera & Crossan, 2004). Thus, transactional and transformational leadership behaviors are task- and people-oriented, incorporating earlier leadership approaches.

The strategic leadership may sometimes have to act in transactional and, at other times, in transformational leadership situations. In times of change, transformational leadership is recommended, but in the times of stability, transactional may be more appropriate (Northouse, 2013). Leadership must adapt to ever-changing and parallel circumstances. Thus, transformational (Figure 4 and Table 2) leaders plan strategies for advancing an organization to the next level by generating strategic change for the future. Transformational leadership is a new paradigm that emphasizes the more charismatic, inspirational, intellectually stimulating, visionary, and affective aspects of the leadership (Northouse, 2013). It emphasizes individually considered motivation and follower development as being a process of change and transformation, where leaders inspire others with vision, excitement, and the prospect of future developments and successes. These leaders enhance change in the organization.

Table 2 summarizes transformational leadership practices, factors, components, abilities, and capacities. The table shows that definitions have common elements and somewhat overlapping characteristics. The theory of transformational leadership emphasizes four transformational leadership factors (Bass, 1995): idealized influence, which includes communicating important values and a shared sense of purpose; inspirational motivation, such as confidently communicating an attractive vision and goals; individual consideration which involves treating followers as individuals and supporting their development; and intellectual simulation such as challenging old ways of thinking and encouraging different perspectives. Transformational leaders help achieve common goals, inspire by the vision, create excitement, and challenge outdated thinking patterns (Bass & Avalio, 1990). Further, transformational activities communicate and model important values and a shared purpose, confidently communicate a compelling vision and goals, question old ways of doing and thinking, and treat followers in an equitable but individual manner and encourage their development. Both styles or roles have their place as there is not a standard or best leadership style that fits all environments. That is why leaders should not rely on one role or style. According to Quinn (1988), a transformational leader expresses the role of the open system as an innovator and broker, and in human relationships as a facilitator and mentor (Vera & Crossan, 2004; Northouse, 2013). Bass (1995) suggested that the best leader is the one who behaves according to both styles.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transformational leadership practices</strong></td>
<td>Develop and communicate a vision</td>
<td>Determine the organization’s purpose or vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate and model important values and a shared purpose</td>
<td>Build dynamic core competencies</td>
<td>Exploit and maintain core competencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidently communicate a compelling vision and goals</td>
<td>Emphasize and effectually use human capital</td>
<td>Develop human capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question old ways of doing and thinking</td>
<td>Invest in the development of new technologies</td>
<td>Sustain effective organizational culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treat followers in an equitable but individual manner and encourage their development</td>
<td>Engage in valuable strategies</td>
<td>Emphasize ethical practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transactional leadership practices</strong> (Bass &amp; Avalio, 1990)</td>
<td>Build and maintain an effective organizational culture</td>
<td>Establish balanced organizational controls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingent reward: facilitate the achievement of agreed upon objectives and appropriate rewards</td>
<td>Develop and implement balanced controls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrective (active): manage by monitoring and focusing on mistakes</td>
<td>Engage in ethical practices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrective (passive): intervene only when things go wrong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transformational leadership factors</strong> (Bass et al., 1990)</td>
<td>Strategic leadership abilities (Ireland &amp; Hitt, 1999; Hitt &amp; Ireland, 2002, 4)</td>
<td>Strategic leadership capacities (Boal et al., 2001, 539; Phipps &amp; Burbach, 2010, 139)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Idealized influence</td>
<td>• To anticipate</td>
<td>• Capacity to learn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Inspirational motivation</td>
<td>• To envision</td>
<td>• Capacity to change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Intellectual stimulation</td>
<td>• To maintain flexibility</td>
<td>• Capacity for managerial wisdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Individualistic consideration</td>
<td>• To think strategically</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transactional leadership factors</strong></td>
<td>• To work with others to initiate changes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Contingent reward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Management-by-exception</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2.2 Leadership activities and capacities

Rowe (2001) defined strategic leadership as an individual’s style. According to Rowe, strategic leadership creates greater wealth in the organization than visionary and managerial leadership. Strategic leadership has the ability to influence others to voluntarily make decisions beneficial to the organization that not only enhance the long-term vitality of the organization but also transmit its mission to others (after Rowe, 2001).

According to Ireland and Hitt (1999, 2002) strategic leadership is a person’s ability to anticipate, envision, maintain flexibility, think strategically, and work with others to initiate changes that will create a viable future for the organization. Thus, a leader’s capacity must effectively match the work. Hitt and colleagues (2010) listed eight activities that execute abilities: develop and communicate a vision, build dynamic core competencies, emphasize and effectively use human capital, invest in the development of new technologies, engage in valuable strategies, build and maintain an effective organizational culture, develop and implement balanced controls, and engage in ethical practices. They argued that, if these elements are in place, strategic leadership becomes an origin of competitive advantage for an organization. Further, they stressed that better performance depends on the extent to which strategic leadership is exercised.

Phipps and Burbach (2010), referring to Ireland and Hitt (1999), proposed six components of effective strategic leadership: determining an organization’s purpose or vision, exploiting and maintaining core competencies, developing human capital, sustaining an effective organizational culture, emphasizing ethical practices, and establishing balanced organizational control. A more integrative framework explains senior leader’s influence on organizational performance describing the process whereby they influence outcomes. Boal and Hooijberg (2001) proposed that strategic leadership is about a leader’s ability to create and maintain three capacities within the organization: the capacity to learn, the capacity to change, and the capacity for managerial wisdom. The most successful strategic leadership is that which provides direction, influence, and facilitation, and it empowers its members to act to realize their full potential (Ireland & Hitt, 2005).

Phipps and Burbach (2010) referred to the constructed theory of Kegan (1982) and Lewis and Jacobs (1992), claiming that leadership capacity is more important than values and leadership style. Further, the theory was linked to Jaques and Clement’s (1991) system theory which claims that capacity escalates as the leader moves up the hierarchy (Phipps & Burbach, 2010). To stay consistent with the position and the task, the leader must be a complete match (Lewis & Jacobs, 1992). Consequently, building capacity to change in nonprofits demands wide and solid experience that makes one become a strategic leader. Thus, the best performance is heavily supported by a strategic leader. Thus, the best performance is heavily supported by a strategic leader (Hambrick & Mason, 1984). A senior leader’s decisions and actions increase the capacity to change. A strategic leader has an impact on organizational performance and outcomes. Thus, strategic leadership must have an ability to develop an organizational capacity (Boal & Hooijberg, 2001). There are not only activities that enhance capacity development but also reflections on the endeavor of how capacities have been developed in an organization. Thus, strategic leadership works through people supported by the organizational systems and, particularly, by the motivating mission. Moreover, scholars have suggested that learning capacity is unique in the nonprofit sector (e.g., Dargie, 1998; Taliento & Silverman, 2005). Strategic leaders have
a pivotal role and are a major factor for innovation by providing a vision and road map that enhance development and innovation. A vision enhances organizational learning and innovation because it has a meaningful role in development. Learning is an active process through studying, doing, and using new patterns. Such a learning process focuses on why, how, and what issues (Phipps & Burbach, 2010).

The capacity to change refers to the strategic flexibility to change operations accordingly. Organizational flexibility depends on the top leaders’ ability, that is, cognitive and behavioral flexibility. Strategic leaders should have the ability to change or renew existing patterns. Strategic leaders are catalysts for change and prepare the organization for change. Peterson and Van Fleet (2008) found two nonprofit leader behaviors compared with for-profit leaders which are valued by nonprofit employees: role clarification and compelling direction. Strategic leaders affect organizational performance and outcomes through their capacity to change (Boal & Hooijberg, 2001). The key behavioral actions, during stable and turbulent times, include setting a direction and clarifying roles. Lewis and Seibold (1998) stated that communication is an important factor for the expected outcomes of planned change. Further, to develop organizational change, leaders must emphasize communicating the need for change more than the strategies for implementing change. Senior leaders should spend time in functional areas to advance learning and extend mind-sets. (Phipps & Burbach, 2010).

The capacity for managerial wisdom refers to the ability to do an assessment of the environment and social relationships. Any situation has momentum. Thus, relational competency (social capital), such as social awareness (e.g., empathy) and social skills (e.g., conflict management), refers to social intelligence (McCauley, 2000). Strategic leaders exert influence through managerial wisdom. Managerial wisdom is the ability to act at the right time in the right way in the context and helps solve problems. Because NPOs’ public benefit relies on the mission, managerial wisdom plays a pivotal role in ethical practices. Thus, managerial wisdom is practical and social. Senior leaders need detailed knowledge about the substance, ability, and willingness to communicate with and learn from others at all levels (Phipps & Burbach, 2010, referring to Koremenos, 2005). Organizations reflect the top leadership’s values and preferences, and hence, the job is different from that of a middle management job (Hambrick et al., 1984). Overall, this indicates that strategic leadership must have a higher capacity to execute strategic assignments. Strategy refers to actions aiming at the transformation of the capabilities regarding competitive advantage (Schmitt et al., 2018).

Finally, a critique can be expressed based on the dominant unit of analysis, that is, the solo or stand-alone leader’s perspective (Gronn, 2002). Accordingly, we must ask if the unit of analysis should be distributed leadership instead of top management and, specifically, strategic leadership instead of strategic management. Based on the research task of this study, the conception of the focused leadership of top management was most appropriate. The exclusion of other levels of analysis did not undermine the other units of analysis but provided room for evaluating the relationship between senior leadership and distributed leadership. Further, situational and environmental issues have emphasized leadership ability more so than management activities, which aim to maximize the utilization of resources in relation to objectives (Bracker, 1980). This is rather a macro definition of strategic management.
3 ORGANIZATIONAL TRUST

In this section, I provide an overview of trust research, that is, multifaceted and multilevel notions of trust. Trust research reflects different approaches among North American scholars and European-based researchers. Europeans tend to be more theory-driven. Americans are more empirically focused and specific in their approaches and references (Bachmann, 2006).

Trust research has emerged during the last decades (Möllering, et al., 2004), albeit there is not yet a commonly accepted definition of trust (Kramer, 2006). In the 1950s and 1960s, behaviorism was dominant in the mainstream of management theories that attempted to observe the phenomenon of a person’s trustworthy behavior, in other words, if a person cheats, steals, and lies. In the 1970s and 1980s, there was a cognitive turn in the social sciences which emphasized intentions, rational thinking, strategizing, and sense-making (Bachmann 2006). In the 1980s, trust was defined using two dimensions: confidence and predictability in one’s expectations. This was a cognitive, risk-based view of trust because there was imperfect available information at the time (e.g., Zucker, 1986). There has been a change of paradigm in the focus of research, moving from risk to trust research in the 1980s. We are now living in a trust society, instead of society of risk, because most of our well-being depends on trust and trustworthiness (Bachmann & Zaheer, 2006). In the 1990s researchers did not forget behavior, cognition, and emotions, even though they not only focused more on emotions, affects, and moods but also on situations when describing irrational and impulsive behavior such as greed, envy, and hate. Mayer et al. (1995) proposed a model of trust in which the roles of risk, vulnerability, and expectations were central and related to the factors of trustworthiness, such as ability, benevolence, and integrity. More recently, trust has also been intensively explored in the research group entitled “trust within and between organizations” at the University of Eastern Finland under the supervision of professor Savolainen (Kinnunen & Savolainen, 2011; Häkkinen, 2012; Ikonen, 2013; Savolainen & Ikonen, 2016; Karhapää, 2016; Malkamäki, 2017). The group is also an active partner in the Nordic Researcher Network Project.8

Recent studies have emphasized religious faith, claiming that, finally, people have come to rely on faith to reconcile inexplicable events that are beyond their control and to which they are vulnerable (Delbecq, 1999). Van de Ven and Ring (2006) explained that development of management theories and trust as a multifaceted phenomenon encompass behavioral, cognitive, emotional, and faith dimensions in a situation or an event. However, according to Bachmann (2206), a situational relationship is difficult to understand. Fulmer and Gelfand (2012) criticized the trust researches noting that not only trust referents but also multilevel analysis are less often considered

3.1 MULTIFACETED TRUST

Next, I review trust in terms of multidimensionality and across multiple levels. Thus, I begin by briefly reviewing trust as a small-scale phenomenon (Hardin, 2002) and a

---

8See the website: http://trust.ruc.dk/.
relational exchange (Mayer et al., 1995; Blau, 1964). I introduce an integrated model of organizational trust by Mayer et al. (1995, 2006), followed by a discussion of trust qualities, characteristics, and definitions. Hardin claimed that trust is a microlevel phenomenon, as individuals are the ones who trust and who are trustworthy. Trust is usually understood as a relational (e.g., Mayer et al., 1995) or dyadic phenomenon, and thus it falls within social exchange theory (Blau, 1964). Nevertheless, different definitions of trust may provide a reasonable definition for multifaceted trust (e.g., Möllering, 2006; McKnight et al., 2006). According to Colquitt Scott and LePine’s (2007) summary, trust is a behavioral intention (e.g., Mayer et al., 1995; McKnight et al., 2006) or an internal action, such as choosing, judging, or preferring (e.g., Lewis & Weigert, 1985). Some define trust as a synonym for trustworthiness, referring to personal traits (Butler & Cantrell, 1984) or as a personality that develops early in childhood (Rotter, 1967), or even as synonymous with cooperation or risk-taking (Zand, 1972; Lewis & Weigert, 1985). Further, there are definitions based on behavior versus attitudinal trust (Kramer, 1999, 2006), dimensionality of trust (Lewicki, et al., 2006), and conceptualization of trust in different disciplines (Rousseau, 1998). Thus, positive expectations referring to perceptions, beliefs, and expectations, and the willingness to accept vulnerability referring to uncertainty, are the key dimension definitions (Fulmer & Gelfand, 2012).

Various definitions of trust have been anchored in social exchange theory (Blau, 1964). The theory highlights organizational, relational, and individual factors (Whitener et al., 2006). Social exchange emerges within an organization and between people. Past cooperation can forecast future cooperation (e.g., Zucker, 1986). In relationships, the parties voluntarily offer a benefit to one another, expecting reciprocal behavior and social support or concern (Blau, 1964). Through senior leadership roles and practices, the leadership impacts trust and specifically develops the context for social exchange (Whitener et al., 1998). Consequently, relationships decrease agency risk. The theory further explains the dynamic factors of relationships, the exchange process, and voluntary and reciprocal aspects. These factors can lead to lower control and thus promote trust. Vulnerability and risk are not only natural but also issues for all parties (e.g. Mayer et al., 1995; Whitener et al., 2006). Hardin (1996, 20) has proposed that “the best device for creating trust may be to establish and support trustworthiness.”

**An integrated model of organizational trust**

The theory of trust, according to various scholars, should more systematically include the social and relational grounds of trust-related choices (Mayer et al., 1995; McAllister, 1995). “Trust is not only calculative orientation towards risks but also social orientation towards other people and society,” according to Kramer (2006, 5). Relational trust requires, as a product and driver of relationships, two parties within a dyadic relationship. Trust and distrust are ongoing challenges as relational phenomena (McEvily & Zaheer, 2004). Trust as relational has been defined from different perspectives. Relational trust is called affective or value-based trust (Lewicki & Bunker, 1996), which concerns values, emotions, affects, and faith (e.g., Delbecq, 1999; Dirks & Skarlicki, 2004). Interpersonal trust is cognitive-based or affective-based (McAllister, 1995). Trustee and trustor are the ones who interact within a social system. The trustor sets himself/herself up for risk and being harmed by acting on trust without being able to control one’s actions (e.g., Möllering et al., 2004). Trust is like a sentence with a subject (trustor), verb (trust), and direct object (trustee) (McKnight & Chervany, 2001). In relationship-based trust, actors are in a reciprocal exchange relationship whereby trust develops over time (Kramer et al., 2004).
Trust is not taking-risk, but rather, it is a willingness to take risks (Mayer et al., 1995). However, risk is not an obligate condition because cooperation does not put another at risk. If the direct object is a person, then the construct is interpersonal trust or disposition to trust. If the direct object is an institution, the construct is institutional trust. In these cases, the subject must be a person. McKnight & Chervany (2001) argued that distrust differs from trust because of the intensity of the emotions inherent to each. Concepts are useful up to the extent which they can be measured. Barber (1983, 164–165) emphasized that “trust is socially learned and confirmed expectations of each other, and of the natural and moral social orders that set the fundamental understanding for their lives.” A trusting attitude is separate from trusting behavior (Möllering et al., 2004). The moralistic and ethical facets of trust describe trust as the expectation of ethically justifiable behavior (Hosmer, 1995).

An integrated model of organizational trust (Figure 5.) includes the factors of perceived trustworthiness (Mayer et al., 1995, 2006). Trustworthiness is a base for trust. Factors creating trust are ability, benevolence, and integrity. Ability is task-specific in a situation or in a function. It is a combination of skills, competencies, and characteristics that enhance influence within a group. Benevolence refers to willingness (positive character) to do good without benefit to the self. Also, intentions and motives have been considered as being important to trust (e.g., Cook & Wall, 1980; Giffin, 1967). Loyalty and altruism are suggested nuances of benevolence (Butler & Cantrell, 1984; Mayer et al., 1995). “Benevolence is the extent to which a trustee is believed to want to do good to the trustee, aside from an egoistic profit motive,” according to Mayer et al. (2006, 92). These definitions include an aspect of belief in a person’s orientation towards others and even for profit motives.

Integrity is a widely accepted factor related to trust (Lieberman, 1981; Mayer et al., 1995, 2006). It refers to a set of principles that a trustee notices as acceptable (Mayer et al., 1995). McFall (1987) referred to moral integrity. Hence, past events and experiences are also important when judging the party. Sitkin and Roth (1983) proposed a notion of value congruence, more specifically, “the compatibility of an employee’s belief and values with the organization’s cultural values.” Adherence and acceptability are important principles connected to integrity (McFall, 1987). Thus, a person’s actions must be acceptable and consistent from others’ points of view. That is, parties must believe in a sense of justice. Butler and Cantrell (1984) stressed integrity and consistency, and later Butler (1991) added fairness, as the factors of trust. Integrity and benevolence are personality traits, and openness of management may complete the notion of integrity (e.g., Butler & Cantrell, 1984). No matter, integrity is more often used as an informal concept related to trust than honesty. In fact, Mayer et al. (2006, 94) defined as follows: “trust for a trustee will be a function of the trustee’s perceived ability, benevolence, and integrity and of the trustor’s propensity to trust.”

According to Mayer et al. (2006), ability, benevolence, and integrity are separate and unique elements of trustworthiness, but they are interrelated. Hence, one factor alone just shows that there is a possibility to be helpful in the relationship. Thus, all factors must be at a reasonable or acceptable level so that trust can occur. It might be that the situation is to be considered as well because of ever-changing antecedents and environments. The model of Mayer et al. (1995) indicated that parties have time to collect information and knowledge about the other party; therefore, based on knowledge and experience (knowledge-based trust), they can build relationships gradually. New work relationships and coworkers become more common because of organizational changes, mergers, and integrations. Also, cooperation requires a
certain level of trust (e.g., McKnight et al., 2006). There is not always time to do this, but people are hired just for the project such as a swift (Holmes, 1991; Lewicki & Bunker, 1996). Despite this, they have initial trust from the very beginning based on roles rather than the institution (cf. McKnight & Chervanu, 1996).

Differences among the various notions of trust are grounded in the conception of trustworthiness. Somebody is trustworthy because I know her/him. The one is morally sound, and I have an ongoing relationship which has good characteristics (Hardin, 2002). Competence, benevolence, predictability, and integrity are the most common and generic themes and indicators in operationalizing trustworthiness (Mayer et al., 1995). There is not a common understanding as to which of these are preconditions, if all are needed, and in which order they define trustworthiness. In all, the literature has concluded that the trustworthy actor is a person who is able and even willing to interact but does not intend to harm the trustor in any way.

### 3.1.1 Qualities of the trust phenomenon

Trust has been described using metaphors, as well as specific dimensions, orientations and processual aspects. The following metaphors emphasize the dynamic nature of trust. Trust is a state of mind (e.g., Möllering et al., 2004), trust is social glue (e.g., Laine, 2008), trust is oil and lubricant (Lane, 1998; Mistral, 1996), trust is a building block (Zaheer et al., 1998), trust is a leap of faith (Möllering et al., 2004), and trust is a plant (Savolainen & Ikonen, 2016, 247). A social glue advances cooperation, positive feelings, sense of communality, commitment, and organizational performance (e.g., McEvily et al., 2003). Arrow (1974) noted that trust is needed as a lubricant to keep the motor running. Oil (lubricant) which advances fluency in both processes and personal interactions (e.g., Laine, 1998; Mistral, 1996). Trust is also compared to a building block advancing social cohesion, high work ethics, social capital, and competitiveness (Zaheer et al., 1998). Trust is a leap of faith (Möllering et al., 2004), which indicates a
firm belief and active trust in taking risks but not blindly continuing in case of harmful consequences. Trust, as a plant, describes the growing nature of trust (Savolainen & Ikonen, 2016). As another comparison, trust, using a simile, is like a wave or wavelike force (Ikonen, 2013).

The nature of trust has been also described from other perspectives highlighting the specific dimensions of trust: multi-disciplinary, multilevel, and multifaceted (e.g., Bruke et al., 2007; Fulmer & Gelfand, 2012; Creed & Miles, 1996), paradoxical and polemic (Nootenboom, 2002), and enigmatic constructs (Dietz, 2011). In addition, trust is a conditional (Jones & George, 1998), coincidental (Hardin, 2006), future-oriented (expectations; Rotter, 1976), time-sensitive (Ikonen, 2013), ongoing (Connell, et al., 2003), elusive (e.g., Kramer, 2006), and robust (e.g., Zand, 1972) process moving in an upwards progressing spiral and dynamic (e.g., Burke et al., 2007). The following definitions reflect social exchange, such as social orientation (Kramer, 2006, 5) and relational (e.g., Meyer et al., 1995), reciprocal (Dirks, 2006; Katcher, 2002), voluntary (Whitener et al., 2006) and conscious dependency on another (Zand, 1972). Trust is processual, instrumental, functional, and orbicular, and, hence, it has causal and consequential aspects (e.g., Ilmonen & Jokinen, 2002; Savolainen 2011). In addition, trust is a situational, contextual (e.g., Zucker, 1986; Mayer et al., 2006), functional, and instrumental (Savolainen, 2010) phenomenon.

3.1.2 Definitions of the trust phenomenon

Considering the above observations, I agree with Hardin (2002) that trust is more complicated than one would expect in terms of definitions. Because the universal definition of trust is elusive (e.g., Atkinson & Butcher, 2003; McEvily et al., 2003), the notion of trust is used in a variety of, but not comparative, ways (Kramer, 2006). The situation is even more difficult because many scholars do not include in their definitions the referent of trust. Thus, the definition is more of a continuum emphasizing different scientific perspectives as the following compressed summary indicates. On one hand, there are ethical and moralistic issues (expected behavior and morally correct decision) and on the other hand, there are in the other end strategic and calculative dimensions (anticipated cooperation and office politics) (Kramer, 2006). Rotter (1967, 651) defined interpersonal trust as an expectancy referring to word promise. Hosmer (1995) defined trust as “the expectation ... of ethically justifiable behavior, that is morally correct decisions and actions based on ethical principles.” The issue of ethics arises in specific situations and contexts, when there is a question about whether a trustee lives up to the trustor’s expectations or not. The economist accepts ethics as trust element (Banjee et al., 2006), while the sociologist does not (Bachmann & Zaheer, 2006). Consequently, definitions are not satisfactory to all scholars because they see trust not only as a psychological state but also as another kind of phenomenon (Hardin, 2002). In the social sciences, the terminology and conception of trust are also, to some extent, inconsistent and volatile.

Hardin (2002) noted that, in order to understand trust, we must understand the capacity for trust, that is, the capacity to read the commitments of others. That a street-level trusting capacity can be learned through everyday life is common sense. Dunn (1988, 88) claimed that “in communities there can be well-founded rule-based confidence which is rather collective utility.” The learned capacity to trust is a form of human capital (Hardin, 2006) and intangible, intellectual, and social capital
(Savolainen, 2011). Human capital can be developed, while investments cannot, because the premises are based on experiences which one has little control over, or in which one does not even participate. Hence, a high capacity to trust is a result of coincidences. Human and social capitals (resource-based approach) contribute to the achievement of a competitive advantage (e.g., Mintzberg, 1989; Hitt & Ireland, 2002).

There are also other trust research streams, such as knowledge-based trust, calculative-based trust, personality-based trust, intuition-based trust, and cognition-based trust (McKnight et al., 2006). Trust is based on knowledge, competence, benevolence, predictability, and solid reasoning (e.g., Mayer et al., 1995; McAllister, 1995; McKnight et al., 2006). Trust is cognitive-based or knowledge-based (Lewicki & Bunker, 1996). Cognitive-based trust depends on integrity or the capability of another party (Dirks & Skarlicki, 2004), and includes integrity, capability, and confidence (Deutsch, 1960). Other scholars have emphasized the affective and motivational components in addition to these cognitive components (e.g., Lewis & Weigert, 1985). McAllister (1995) has proposed two critical dimensions: emotional trust and cognitive trust. Accordingly, emotional trust is a spontaneous emotional bond between two or more people while cognitive trust refers to judgement and reliability about the other member of a team. Also, affective-based trust is grounded on relationships where a trusted person shows concern about others’ welfare and a sense of benevolence (Dirks & Skarlicki, 2004). However, they might have an impact through different processes, and hence, the impact might be mixed. In all, trust is a general attitude and expectancy about people or the social system (Luhmann, 1978).

Calculative-based trust relies on rapid intuition and cognitive impressions (e.g., Meyerson et al., 1996). Trust is based on reasons for judging the trustworthiness of the potentially trusted other (Hardin, 2002). Trust without rational bases is credible only to a specific extent (e.g., Meyrsson et al., 1996; Nooteboom, 2003). Trust is also described as a choice of behavior that can be seen and measured (e.g., Kramer, 2002, 3; see also Arrow, 1974; Miller, 1992). According to Kramer’s overview of previous studies, trust can be rational and calculative which, from a rational choice perspective, has been highlighted in the sociological (Coleman, 1990), economic (Williamson, 1993), and political (Hardin, 2002) sciences. Hardin’s (2002) definition is based on reasons for judging the trustworthiness of the potentially trusted. The rational approach requires knowledge of a person to be able to trust that person, and vice versa, that interest fulfills that trust (Kramer, 2006). Trust is not only calculative towards risks but also in terms of the social orientation towards people and society (Kramer, 2006). A manager’s trust building may fall into the following categories: calculative-based trust, which is also called a cognitive trust, or knowledge-based trust. This perspective comprises the idea of benefitting others as well (Lewicki & Bunker, 1996). In addition, managers intend to build relational trust which is also called affective- or value-based trust.

Classical sociologist Simmel (1858–1918) was ahead of his time, suggesting the definition of trust as a state of mind (e.g., Möllering et al., 2004). According to Rousseau and colleagues (1998, trust is a psychological state. As such, trust is a cognitive process and orientation. It includes the aspect of risk, expectations, assumptions, or beliefs about the other which will be beneficial and favorable to one’s interests (e.g., Lewis & Weigert, 1985; Robinson, 1996), comprising the intention to accept vulnerability and risk based upon positive expectation of the intentions or behavior of another. According to Nooteboom (2003), trust is, at the same time, a mental stage and an action, which is competence- and intention-targeted, emotionally and rationally based, and positive and negative in its outcome.
In character-based trust, followers act in accordance with the leader’s preferences, and thus, they are willing to put themselves at risk (Kramer et al., 2004). Interpersonal trust is cognitive-based or affective-based (McAllister, 1995). Trust develops according to personality-based trust in childhood (e.g., Erikson, 1968). Various scholars have rationalized trust as being character-based (e.g., Dirks & Skarlicki, 2004) related to inherited traits or childhood influenced upbringing (e.g., Erikson, 1968). Thus, trust is dispositional (Mayer et al., 1995). Some people are more likely to trust than the others. That can be argued as being from a general perspective as a willingness to trust (Mayer et al., 1995). This refers to personal traits and character. In new contacts, willingness will be tested. Rotter (1967) discussed such expectations, and Mayer et al. (1995) further generalized these expectations.

The specific aspects of trust refer to character or personality, such as emotion (e.g., Dirks & Ferrin, 2002), disposition (Rotter, 1967), vulnerability (e.g., McAllister, 1995; Möllering, 2006), and risk (Mayer et al., 1995; Möllering, 2006). Vulnerability includes the cognitive, affective, and behavioral aspects of trust, and it is related to risk and the propensity to trust (Mayer, et al., 1995), and in addition, to uncertainty and complexity (Savolainen, 2010). Trust includes the possibility of being betrayed. A person has some preliminary expectation (propensity), but takes a risk to be harmed when entering to a relationship or an interaction (Rotter, 1967). Trust is a belief that the other party will respect his or her responsibility (Casson & Giusta, 2006). Also, propensity contributes to variances in trust definitions. It is related to risk determinants (Sitkin & Pablo, 1992) and the discussion about risk propensity as a tendency in a situation. However, propensity to trust must be different from a tendency because it is a trait of a stable character. Trust is not only a feeling, but the role of affect must also be emphasized (e.g., Lane, 2008). Trust is easy to lose and difficult and time-consuming to build it. There is a perceived vulnerability and risk in an individual’s uncertainty in terms of motives, intentions, and actions and on whom they depend (Kramer, 2006). Propensity to trust is a stable trait. Consequently, people differ in terms of inherited propensity to trust due to character, childhood, and cultural-related issues.

### 3.1.3 Counterparts of and synonyms for trust

Synonyms for trust help us to clarify the phenomenon. Notions referring to trust are competence (functional or specific), cooperation, confidence, predictability, and experience. In addition, risk propensity may be more related to situations (Sitkin & Pablo, 1992). Trust does not necessarily lead to cooperation because cooperation does not necessarily include risk (Mayer et al., 2006). In addition, cooperation can be possible even when there is no trust because cooperation may be a must. Willingness is related to the behavior and performance of a person (Mayer et al., 2006). In general, people are willing to trust. Factors affecting trust may be trait-specific, such as curiousness, willingness to trust, or the habit of keeping promises in relationships (interpersonal trust) (cf. Rotter, 1967; Mayer et al., 2006). However, people are not the same in this respect because their backgrounds, such as education, upbringing, culture, and capacity, vary considerably.

According to Deutsch (1960) confidence means that an “individual must have confidence that the other individual has the ability and intention to produce it”. Luhmann (1988) suggested that both concepts point to expectations leading to disappointment. Confidence occurs when there is no alternative but to trust when you have the possibility to
choose (Luhmann 1988). Instead, trust and predictability have a relationship because they include uncertainty (Lewis & Weight, 1985). However, trust is more than predictability (Deutsch, 1958). Predictability can either advance or hinder the likelihood of trust and, hence, the vulnerability depending on past behavior (Mayer et al., 2006). As a result, predictability is a factor influencing cooperation. Trust refers to previous knowledge about the other party and accepts that risk exists, but regarding confidence, risk is not that obvious (Luhmann, 1988). Predictability and trust aim to deduce uncertainty (Lewis & Weigert, 1985). Deutsch (1958) argued that, to be meaningful, trust must go beyond predictability. Thus, predictability influences cooperation.

In addition, definitions of trust as an expectation (Good, 1988) refer to previous knowledge and experiences about the other party. Lieberman (1981) related this to the expectation to believe in a person’s competence and integrity. Thus, it is an inference about the other. Furthermore, belief is connected to the expectations limiting belief only to knowledgeable realities. The trustor (characteristics) plays his or her role in relationships. Managers must consider themselves trustworthy from the other party’s point of view because there is a risk in any transaction (cf. Whitener et al., 2006). The credibility of a manager’s assets is based on expertise and trustworthiness (Mayer et al. 2006, referring to Hovland, Janis, & Kelleu, 1953). Furthermore, Good (1988) proposed that trust is based on expectations of how one may behave, and Lieberman (1981) noted that the trust relationship is based on competence and integrity (cf. Mayer et al., 2006).

Developing further the concept of relational trust, I pay attention to the fact that people are dependent upon one another. Most of experimental trust can be classified into three categories whereby dependency is obvious: relations and interaction, trust supported by institutions, and relationships where the third party (non-institutional) acts as an agent (Hardin, 2002). Trust in persons and in systems is different even though there is a link between them (Sydow, 2006). Organizations cannot be treated as persons (Zaheer, et al., 1998), despite the fact that the leadership represents the organization. Social interaction sustains trusting intention through institution-based trust (McKnight et al., 2006). The critical aspect of dependencies is a person’s willingness to engage in interactions. The system enables interaction, but a person can also be passive in a system. Trust in organization or organizations trusting in each other is an even more polemic phenomenon (e.g., Nooteboom, 2003). Risk and trust can be also ascribed to an organization and not just to persons (Möllering, 2006).

Finally, there have been attempts to address the question of trust in wider and more thoughtful considerations and contexts (e.g., Hardin, 2004; Kramer, 2006). Recently, scholars have raised a question concerning the relationship between technology and trust (Kramer, 2006). In addition, scholars have uncovered evidence concerning the third party’s role in trust building (McEvily & Zaheer, 2004). Trust as a concept also may need rethinking, considering ethical aspects and blind spots (Kramer, 2006). To further develop the relational trust notion, scholars studied trust in macrolevel structures, networks, and governance systems within and between organizations (e.g., Burn & Knez, 1995). Their findings supported the motivational, cognitive, and affective grounds of trust. Kramer (2006) noted that social psychological research has more often emphasized the social rather than the instrumental (resource-based) motives driving trust behavior. These include self-preservation concerns and identity-related needs and motives which influence trust-related cognition and choice. Trust can have a strong influence on the structure and dynamics of senior managers’ personal and institutional relations. There are well functioning relationships which are based on mechanisms other than trust (Atkinson & Butcher, 2003; Atkinson, 2004).
3.2 MULTILEVEL TRUST

Next, I review trust research across multiple organizational levels, such as individual, group (team), and organizational levels (Kramer & Cook, 2004; Fulmer & Gelfand, 2012). The review aims to cover the trust research across divergent areas and analyses. According to Fulmer and Gelfand (2012), the research focuses mostly on the individual level. An organization is a multilevel system, and hence, strategic leadership operates across levels. Thus, it is vital to explore trust at the individual, group, and organizational levels. Consequently, it is unclear if antecedents (unique) at one level are applicable to the other levels. Fulmer and Dirks (2012) argued that an incorporated multilevel perspective is important to emphasize the role of trust in a changing environment. People trust in another influencing party based on disposition at the individual level, history at relational level, norms at the network level, and values at the institutional and societal levels (Fulmer & Dirks, 2018).

Trust has shown evidence of being beneficial in various ways. Fulmer and Gelfand (2012), referring to various referents, summarized how trust has been linked to outcomes at micro- and macrolevels. Microlevel trust thrives on employee satisfaction (e.g., Edwards & Cable, 2009), efforts and performance (e.g., Aryee, Budhwar, & Chen, 2002), citizenship behavior (e.g., Mayer & Gavin, 2005), collaboration and teamwork (e.g., Sargent & Water, 2004), leadership effectiveness (e.g., Dirks & Ferrin, 2001), human resource management perceptions (e.g., Graham and Tarbell, 2006), and negotiation success (e.g., Lee, Yang, & Graham, 2006). At the macrolevel, trust has been linked to organizational change and survival (e.g., Gibson and Birkinshaw, 2004), entrepreneurship (e.g., Blatt, 2009), strategic alliances (e.g., Fryxell, Dooley, & Vryza, 2002), mergers and acquisitions (e.g., Karhapää & Savolainen, 2018; Maquire & Philips, 2008), and national-level economic health (Fukuyama, 1995).

Multilevel analysis is important in differentiating referents from antecedents and outcomes at each level. Different antecedents and outcomes may characterize different referents, as well. Mayer and colleagues (1995) found that failure to specify referents may lead to confusion in the levels of analysis. Trust in a referent refers to the target of trust (i.e., trustee). According to Fulmer and Gelfand (2012), within each level there are at least three referents: interpersonal, a team, and an organization. The interpersonal referent is a specific other or others. The team referent refers to trust in a collectivity of interdependent people (reliance) aiming at common goals with unique dynamics. The organizational referent refers to trust an entity of an organization.

Consequently, different referents may have different antecedents and consequences. That is because of changing dynamics across referents. Research at the individual level tends to focus on multiple referents. However, at the group level, the research has focused on interpersonal and team referents, but not that much on organizational referent. Correspondingly, at the organizational level, the research has focused solely on trust in coworkers and an organization, and hence, rarely on interpersonal and teams (Fulmer & Gelfand, 2012). However, we should consider why trust is that different of a phenomenon across levels and referents per se. Hence, there may be similarities or upwards emerging characteristics of trust.

People can form formal and informal relationships which can change the interpretation of information about organizations. The multilevel perspective focuses on multiple referents, such as individual, group, and organizational levels, and antecedents and theoretical perspectives are dominant at each level (Fulmer & Gelfand, 2012). As an example, trust develops over time across strategic processes and morphs
from calculative-based to identity-based trust in the course of the integration process (Karhapää & Savolainen, 2018). Similarly, Lewicki and Bunker (1996) proposed that trust relationships move from calculus-based trust to identification-based trust. There is also a sign in retail collaboration that a dyadic relationship transforms into one whereby a third party may change the dynamics of the one or dyadic relationship (Julkunen, 2010). Next, I review the multilevel trust literature at individual, group, and organizational levels.

### 3.2.1 Trust at the individual level

Classically, trust is understood as an individual or a relational dyadic phenomenon with a wide range of referents (e.g., Mayer et al., 1995). It is individuals who trust and are those in organizations who are trustworthy. Hardin (2006) pointed that it is one’s tendency to trust in somebody. Hence, one trusts first and then chooses to continue to trust, whereas the probability of possibilities to function well matters in such choices.

Trust at the individual level can be defined as a personal belief about the degree to which a specific referent is trustworthy and to what degree one is willing to accept vulnerability. Thus, positive expectations are used broadly to represent trustworthiness (ability, benevolence, and integrity; Mayer et al., 1995). At the individual level, trust in an interpersonal referent is a psychological state (Rousseau, et al., 1998), including the willingness to accept vulnerability based on positive expectations of a specific other or others. According to Zucker (1986, 54), “trust is a set of expectations shared by all those involved in an exchange,” including both social rules and legitimately activated processes. Consequently, interpersonal trust in a team and in an organizational referent as a psychological state refers to the degree of trust collectively shared by individuals within a unit (Fulmer & Gelfand, 2012). Thus, trust at a higher level is conceptualized as a consensus, and that trust in a specific referent is shared among individuals in the unit. Trust in a group among team members, and likewise in an organization among organizational members, is a shared psychological state including willingness to accept vulnerability based on positive expectations of a specific other or others (Fulmer & Gelfand, 2012).

Trust at the individual level involves an individual tendency to trust. Willingness to accept vulnerability has been used across the levels. Expectations may be generalized or specific. At the individual level, specific refers to specific characteristics of the trustee, and hence, this supports Mayer and colleagues’ (1995) definition of specific ability. Consequently, an interpersonal referent focuses on benevolence (will act beneficially or will not be harmed or behave in a benevolent manner) (Mayer et al., 1995). Thus, from the senior leadership perspective, trust is based on a specific ability to run the organization. Interestingly, the conceptualization of trust is a shared construct beyond trust at an individual level. The definition at the higher levels tends to omit the emergent nature of the construct. As an example, self-efficacy (cf. Bass, 1985; Bennis & Nanus, 1985) at the individual level can be defined as “beliefs in one’s capabilities to organize and execute the course of action required to produce given attainments” (Fulmer & Gelfand, 2012, 1173, referring to Bandura, 1997, 3).

At the individual level of analysis, diverse theoretical approaches have been used to study antecedents and outcomes of trust, such as social exchange theory (Blau, 1964; cf. Homans, 1961), social information processing theory (Salancik & Pfeffer, 1978), attribution theory (Weider, 2010; Heider, 1958), and social identity theory
(Tajfel & Turner, 1970). However, the research at this level is widely based on social exchange theory which examines the exchanges in interactional relationships and situations (Luhmann, 1979; Fulmer & Gelfand, 2012). Hence, trust is vital in personal relationships. Social exchange theory also includes aspects of self-interest and reliance. Thus, parties have some value to each other which they can exchange. Individual self-interests are related to psychological and economical needs (cf. Homans, 1961). Accordingly, self-interest can enhance interpersonal relationships and, hence, advance the parties’ interests. Moreover, self-interest and interdependence are the key factors in exchanges. Ability also includes self-evaluation aspects, in other words, the ability to enter into interactions (e.g., interests and mental-maps). It is important to consider how senior leaders use their own interests in terms of the common good (Convey, 2014). Nooteboom and colleagues (1997) noted that trustworthiness may be based on self-interest in two ways. One party may make an agreement because he or she is forced to do so, or there is a material interest. Nooteboom (2003) argued that, in that case (motives of self-interest), it might be better to talk about interdependence rather than trustworthiness. An important condition for trust or trustworthiness is the need for it. Risk-taking is part of trust, but people are not neutral in risk-taking (Mayer et al., 1995). People must trust without a rational basis for trust, in cases such as swift working conditions, initial relationships, and emergency rescue teams. In those cases, the question is not whether to trust but to what extent (e.g., Meyrsson et al., 1996; Nooteboom, 2003).

The basis for trust is individual capacity, including character and situations. Whitener and colleagues (2006) stated that, despite the fact that the formal contractual relationship concerning employment is economic, relationships usually are based on a social element. In social exchanges, people voluntarily offer a benefit to another expecting a reciprocal benefit in return. Social exchanges may offer valuable benefits (regarding economic value, information, or advice) and, at the same time, value without economic benefit, such as social support (Whitener et al., 2006). Hence, relationships without financial value may have a strong impact on the social dimension. However, due to the voluntary nature of the relationship, there is no guarantee of reciprocity. Whitener and colleagues (2006) found that factors may create the impression of trust and what supports actions promoting trust. They looked at the phenomenon using exchange theory and studied the relational (exchange) and individual indicators enhancing trustworthy behavior. According to the theory, risk is quite static, whereas social exchange theory emphasizes the dynamics of the relationship and its development over time. However, according to social exchange theory, risk of opportunism is limited (Whitener et al., 2006).

In terms of the social information processing theory, the research focuses on sense-making, that is, how people form beliefs and attitudes through the social environment by judging information provided by others. Before a person develops a statement about attitudes or needs, she or her uses the most relevant and salient social information about past behavior and what others think in order to develop socially acceptable and legitimate reasonings for actions (Salancik & Pfeffer, 1978). This includes information about past behavior and about what others think. People do not have absolute knowledge as we have limited information. People are neither perfect in terms of comprehending surroundings nor processing information. As a result, people are limited and ineffective as they have different kinds of mental maps or schemas affecting their abilities. In addition, in relationships or interactions, there can be recognized power and power games (Cuevas, et al., 2015). Thus, power
impacts the way in which certain actions configure the actions of others. Cuevas and colleagues (2015) indicated that the actions of a powerful party influences the nature of the response of the other party.

Cognitive trust is based on cumulative relevant knowledge and experience (Lewicki et al., 1955). People aim to interpret complex and incomplete information so that it matches with their own and previous beliefs (McKnight et al., 2006). Good (1988) argued that cognitive inertia refers to the use of mentally stored procedures to deal with a situation despite its changes. In other words, people tend to use similar situational strategies (e.g., McKnight et al., 2006). Belief-confirming cognitive mechanisms impact information. Hence, people select, interpret, consider relevant, and recall information that is consistent with their earlier beliefs (e.g., McKnight et al., 2006). However, information sharing has influenced trustworthiness (Dyer & Chu, 2003). According to Carson and colleagues (2003), information processing capabilities were found to enhance the ability to assess partner trustworthiness, reducing the risk of misplaced trust. Neither trust nor distrust is possible as a universal attitude (Luhmann, 2006). Trust is not only learned from experiences but also results from choices because trust does not need to be intentional.

Attribution theory (Weiner, 2010; Heider, 1958) considers perceived trustworthiness and relationship with the trustee. It proposes that the antecedents of trust are the generalized propensity to trust (Mayer et al., 1995) and ethically justifiable behavior that is morally correct, which lead to decisions and actions based on ethical principles. Cognition affects behavior and action, more specifically, their style, type, and dynamics. Our capacity and incapacity to trust may be related to our social background. The capacity to enter into relationships and the propensity to trust are learned, that is, through experiences of trust or distrust (Hardin, 2006). The process of building propensity is psychological. However, according to Hardin (2002), trust cannot be developed at will. Accordingly, he stated, capacity to trust is a form of human capital which can be developed. Hence, high capacity for trust is a result of coincidences. The situation is important when involving risk (Williamson, 2006), whereby risk depends on the performance of another party. Thus, interaction is based on the individual disposition to trust (McKnight et al., 2006).

Initial trust is based on faith in humanity and has a trusting stance (McKnight et al., 2006). It concentrates on cognitive factors such as belief and intention. Disposition to trust has an impact on trusting belief and intention. Disposition is a consistent tendency to be willing (McKnight et al., 2006). Yet, intention is willing to be dependent, and belief means that another is trusted to be benevolent, competent, honest, or predictable in a situation. People trust in another to the degree that the incentives are the same (Hardin, 2006). However, the other one may have a different capacity to trust. The issue is more epistemological than psychological, and hence, pragmatic and rational. According to Hardin, the capability for commitment and trust are learned based on previous experiences (Hardin, 2006). Trust is related to what one knows about the other party’s past and future. Knowledge-based trust involves previous knowledge and information about the other due to previous interaction or stories (McKnight et al., 2006).

Social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979) is used to analyze why interpersonal trust, as well as trust in groups and in organizations, increases. It emphasizes the influence of context and the past choices, more than individual dispositions and rational decision-making processes. According to the theory, people aim to create a positive image of the self through judging shared similarities or group membership.
Self-interests and coercions are most likely not the foundation for cooperation (Nooteboom, 2003). Parties reason that trustworthiness is based on experience, reputation, records, ratings, and behavior, as such (Nooteboom, 2003).

As explained earlier, trust research has focused mainly on individual trust in an interpersonal referent as a psychological state, including the willingness to accept vulnerability and expectations of ethically justifiable behavior. However, research on an individual’s trust in a team referent is minimal, and hence, has explored a limited set of antecedents (Fulmer & Gelfand, 2012). Antecedents of trust include the characteristics of the parties. Integrity and benevolence were found to build trust when contextual uncertainty was high (Fulmer & Gelfand, 2012). Role-based trust, such as that of group members or functional roles, fosters swift trust development (Meyrsson, et al., 1996). Research has also drawn on agency theory to explore conflicts of interest between principals and agents. When a chief executive officer belongs to the same family and there is family ownership, perceived benevolence is most likely (Fulmer & Gelfand, 2012). Likewise, value consensus fosters individual trust in teams because of social identification (Jehn & Mannix, 2001). According to Fulmer and Gelfand (2012), there is evidence that individual trust in teams increases satisfaction.

Not only an organization’s ability, benevolence, and integrity but also its justice foster individual trust in an organizational referent (Fulmer & Gelfand, 2012). Likewise, supervisory support, value congruence, and communication with the organization advance individual trust in an organization. Consequently, individual trust in organizations increases job satisfaction, organizational identification, co-operative relations, sharing knowledge and information, and intention to stay with the organization. Efforts to reciprocate the trust in senior leaders would be indicated towards senior management (Dirks, 2006). In this way, people may indicate their trust in top management with a high commitment to the organization and the mission. According to Dirks and Ferrin, trust is seen differently in a supervisor than in senior management. Trust in leaders has individual-level effects and group-level effects. Finally, most of the research has focused on employee’s trust but fewer studies have explored trust in employee or an employer being trusted from a leaders’ perspective. Fulmer and Gelfand (2012) noted that the fit, regardless the referent, may still be important, such as with value and vision congruence.

3.2.2 Trust at the group level

There is a common agreement that trust is a relational, natural microlevel phenomenon (Hardin, 2002). Behavioral trust is the most complicated due to its many causes of action (Nooteboom, 2003). Hardin (2002) explained that, if experienced trust is relational, then relationships and interactions with people, institutions, and third parties form a kind of relationship. Thus, there is a distinction not only between trust at the individual and group levels but also between a group as a referent and as a level, which is important because group members seem to have a lower level of trust in one another (Song, 2009). Thus, trust at the group level refers to trust collectively shared among (i.e., satisfactory consensus among members in a unit) members despite the trust referent. Consequently, trust in a specific referent is shared among individuals in a unit.

Positive expectations and willingness to accept vulnerability, as the key dimensions of trust, have been considered beyond the individual level with a variety of referents.
However, many definitions of trust do not include a referent of trust, and thus conceptualization is unpredictable. As a result, there is not a theoretical justification throughout the level (Fulmer & Gelfand, 2012). Social exchange theory with the reciprocal principle has been adopted as a major perspective at the group level. Trust provides the condition for relationship under which trust indicates how one assesses the future behavior of the leader. Rational trust is based on the expectation that the other party will fulfill trust and holds a belief in trustworthiness. Further, trust has an impact on how one interprets the past or present actions of the leaders and the motives of the actions (Dirks & Ferrin, 2001). However, the past does not necessarily determine their future behavior.

The social information processing theory has helped us understand how people in groups make sense of relationships and trust in others. Social identity theory and in-group and out-group dynamics, a question about the us and them comparison, are important in studying trust within a group or team (Tajfel & Turner, 1979; Fulmer & Gelfand, 2012). Self-efficacy at the group level can be defined as “the group members collectively believe in their capabilities to perform their job” (May & Schwoerer, 1994, 30). Fulmer and Gelfand (2012) argue that it is typical for a group level analysis to have a perspective of conflict management because of social relationships. Conflicts and trust are closely related phenomena, and thus, Hempel and Zhang (2009) highlighted the essence of the way group members approach conflict with each other. Thus, conflict may be either an opportunity for or a hindrance to trust. Therefore, previous research has focused mainly on the effects of trustee characteristics underlining leadership styles, communication, and team conflict as the antecedents of group trust.

Group trust is linked to various positive outcomes. Employee trust for the general management is an integral organizational characteristic enhancing competitive advantage (Davis, et al., 2000). Accordingly, team trust in leaders enhances competitive advantage and team performance more than team trust in groups (Dirks, 2000). Trust matters concerning organizational performance (McEvily et al., 2006) and team performance (Hempel & Zhang, 2009). Dirks and Skarlicki (2004) noted that trust impacts a group or organizational effectiveness by maximizing individual efforts and performance towards a common goal and mission. In other words, experienced individual trust in a supervisor enhances performance and trust in senior leadership, promoting the achievement of a common goal. According to McEvily and colleagues (2006), interorganizational trust and interpersonal trust directly affect performance. They argued that deterrence-based trust is an effective means to sustain the initial momentum created in the trust formation process (Burt & Knez, 1996).

The power of leadership is grounded on trustworthiness (Mayer et al., 1995). Trust provides the foundation and possibility for social life and, hence, influence (Savolainen & Lopez-Fresno, 2018). In other words, the classical definitions of Mayer et al. (1995) of how the trustworthiness of the leadership is realized in everyday life. Leadership enables a reciprocal process, that is, human activities which create relational essential resources. McEvily et al. (2003) stressed the current understanding that there is a connection between trust and organizational performance. Dirks and Ferrin (2002) argued that trust plays an essential role in employee attitudes and behavior. In addition, mutual trust eases and guarantees the use of know-how and expertise (Häkkinen & Savolainen, 2008). Trust in leaders is associated with the leaders’ effectiveness (Gillespie & Mann, 2004), to improve team performance (Dirks, 2000) and results (Gillespie & Mann, 2004; see also Davis et al., 2000). Gillespie and Mann (2004) referred to Creed and Miles (1996), noting that trust in leaders is essential
for effective team and organization functions where interdependence, cooperation, and information sharing are required.

Trust in coworkers may enhance knowledge exchange between coworkers (McAllister, 1995). Dirks and Skarlicki (2004) pointed out that the party that holds power is more important in terms of trust. Thus, trust is a critical factor of effective leadership, impacting followers and the organization. Trust encourages employees to go beyond their job description even without extra compensation. Trust has been, in terms of leadership theories, connected to positive job attitudes, organizational justice, psychological contracts, effective communication, organizational relationships, and conflict management (Dirks & Skarlicki, 2004). Team trust among TMT members has been found to nullify the negative impact of the CEO’s legitimate right to instruct TMT members (Fulmer & Gelfand, 2012).

Trust building consists of trustworthy behavior in interactional relationships (Häkkinen, 2012). Edmondson (2004) and Kramer and Cook (2004) found that psychological safety indicates people’s sense of security. That is particularly the case when they take risks, such as proposing new ideas, reporting mistakes, or making personal disclosures. In such cases, people calculate (tacit mental) or assess whether others may be given the benefit of doubt. Hence, there is a form of collective-level team psychological safety. According to Edmondson (1999), there are three leader behaviors promoting psychological safety: accessibility, explicitly inviting input and feedback from others, and modelling openness and fallibility. In such a situation, members are willing to seek help and feedback, be open to errors and concerns, and show innovative behavior (Edmondson, 2004).

Individuals are more likely to accept authority’s views as valid in the context of a high level of trust in authorities (Kramer & Cook, 2004). There are various factors supporting trustworthiness, such as behavioral consistency, accurate and open communication, and demonstrated concern, and in addition, cognitive factors such as social categorization and perceived similarity (Kramer et al., 2004). The relationship-based approach is predicated on social exchange and emphasizes the leader’s care and consideration towards the followers (Dirks & Skarlicki, 2004). The consideration of the followers shows a willingness to promote the leader’s preferences by expected behavior. However, the character-based perspective focuses on how the leader’s character impacts vulnerability in a hierarchical relationship. In such a case, if the followers find that the leaders have high enough ability, benevolence, and integrity, they may be more likely willing to put themselves at risk in the relationship (e.g., Mayer et al., 1995; Dirks et al., 2004). Nevertheless, both perspectives may result in improved behavior and performance (Dirks & Skarlicki, 2004). Finally, there is still a relatively small amount of research at the group level, despite that groups demonstrate prominent strengths.

### 3.2.3 Trust at the organizational level

On one hand, the trust definition (continuum) involves ethical and moralistic issues and on the other hand, strategic and calculative dimensions (Hardin, 2002). Organizations such as social systems can not only be trusted but also have to be active in trusting. Thus, trust is “both an ingredient and an outcome of structuration process” (Bachmann & Zaheer, 2006, 9). In addition, trust in a person is different from trust in systems, albeit they are linked. According to organization research, trust is a
governance form which provides a framework to guide and direct an organization and coordinate economic activities (McEvily et al., 2003; Bachmann, 2006). According to Curel and Inkpen (Bachmann & Zaheer, 2006), trust should not only be studied at the focal level but also at the cross level. Strategy and organization have more to do with how an organization’s resources, capabilities, competencies, and knowledge can best be developed, coordinated, and deployed for value realization. Trust relationships are crucial for this process (Madhok, 2006). Uncertainty and demand for flexibility have changed structures and organizational relations. Hence, there is little in common between the classical and current management knowledge or theories (e.g., Zaheer, 2006). In addition, ideological views have changed how people see the world.

Research on trust at the organizational level is progressing specifically in terms of interorganizational referents. At this level, social exchange theory provides the main theoretical perspective. Further, it adds specific and different aspects, such as functional commitment, support, and structural advantages, at this level (e.g., Zucker, 1986; Fulmer & Gelfand, 2012). However, attribution theory (Heider, 1958; Weider, 1974), which examines how a trustor makes sense of relationships and events, and information processing theory, which explores interpersonal communication, have so far been used mainly at the lower level, despite their possible contributions. Research on relational embeddedness explores how shared networks and reputation influence interorganizational trust. Also, structuralism is a new perspective at this level, which includes the systematic and external forces of an organization. An organization does not operate in a vacuum, and hence, culture and environment are parts of a wider structural context enabling or hindering employees in their trust of an organization (Hodson, 2004). Consequently, organizational identification is linked to trust in an organization. In this case, a referent is another organization, and it poses a question about interorganizational trust. Regarding the organization, the referent characteristics of an organization (e.g., integrity, organizational climate, and ability) and its communication ability are important for encouraging trust (Fulmer & Gelfand, 2012).

Trust in an interpersonal referent at the organizational level is “a psychological state comprising the intention to accept vulnerability based upon positive expectation of the intentions or behavior of another” (Rousseau et al., 1998, 395). Likewise, trust in an organization referent is a shared psychological state at the organizational level, including the willingness to accept vulnerability based on the positive expectations of an organization (Fulmer & Gelfand, 2012). Thus, trust at the organizational level emphasizes a degree of trust shared with adequate consensus among members in an organization. Organizational trust in organizations has an important output for attributes and preferences. Consequently, failures and violations at the corporate level are more serious than at the lower levels. The research has suggested numerous antecedents, including organizational practices and external environment, and further, as consequences, knowledge exchange and organizational adaptability (Fulmer & Gelfand, 2012, referring, for example, to Collins and Smith, 2006). Fulmer and Gelfand added that interorganizational trust research has incorporated variables from micro- and macrolevel antecedents, such as relationship history, joint dependence, open communication, and outcomes, which include contract compliance, knowledge transfer, and relationship satisfaction.

Zaheer and colleagues (1998) found that interpersonal trust and interorganizational trust are related. If one trusts in a collective entity or function, trust is placed in its individual members. Thus, trust does not exist separately. An organization can be an object of trust due to its competence and intentions (Nooteboom, 2003). According to
Nootenboom, the salient point is that an organization per se does not have an intention, but it can regulate the intentions of its workers and members to serve those interests. Organizational discourse reflects these intentions. Further, trust in an organization is based specifically on one’s own experiences with the organization. Thus, one may trust in an individual because of that individual’s link to the organization. Nootenboom (2003) considered an organization as possibly enabling, constraining, or guiding actions because one may have no possibility to choose them.

Organizational trust becomes visible when employees trust the commitment of the employer. Trust can be strengthened by open dialogue and knowledge sharing (e.g., Gillespie & Mann, 2004; Bijlsma & van de Bunt, 2003). Moreover, shared values and cultural similarities develop trust (Lewicki et al., 2006). Not only are managers’ efforts the key mechanisms for enhancing organizational effectiveness, but also managerial trust (Barney & Hansen, 1994), commitment to organizational goals, and work beyond their roles (Barney & Hansen, 1994; Dirks & Ferrin, 2001) are essential factors. Managers who build trust usually reduce monitoring of employees, and instead enhance their capacity to achieve goals (Long & Sitkin, 2006; Kramer, 2006).

Trust in the system, which an individual is part of, can enhance the means to reduce vulnerability (e.g., Zucker, 1986). A system can also foster individuals to follow the leader, and not only invest beyond the standard but sustain limited confidence in the specific leader per se. Hence, trust as system trust in the leader appears as a multilevel phenomenon. Support functions, structural systems, and power systems shape the relationship functions, including culture, schemas, and values, and act as informal governance systems and complement the formal one (Cuevas et al., 2015). Success will be possible in normal situations (situational normality, things are in order) (e.g., Lewis & Weigert, 1985). Normality may refer also to roles (Baier, 1986) and to structural assurance, such as legal resources (i.e., promises, contracts), regulations, and guarantees which are in use and are how one’s own and others’ roles are determined (Baier, 1986). McKnight and colleagues (2006) suggested that social interaction sustains the trusting intention through institution-based trust. In addition, according to them, social interaction sustains situational normality beliefs. Situations and structures may enable or hinder motivation and cooperation, and hence, they develop trust and trustworthiness. Thus, trust is considered a relationship that exists between individuals.

Intuition-based trust (McKnight et al., 2006) involves an impression about the organization. In other words, institution-based trust is grounded in the belief that essential interpersonal structures are available so that one can believe in a successful future (e.g., Zucker, 1986). Institution-based trust implies that structure may give a feeling of security and order (Lewis & Weigert, 1985). An institution may impact trusting intentions. Similarly, cognitive knowledge provides a sense of security (Kramer, 1994). Structural assurance is more powerful, and it is the belief that the other is benevolent, competent, honest, or predictable in a situation. Trustworthiness of the organization relies on survival conditions. Concerning organizations, one also needs to take into account the reliance of people dealing with the organization and organization. Therefore, various antecedents of an organization, such as structure, ownership and control, culture, and procedures for guiding, supporting, and monitoring the image and reputation have a mediating role in trust building (Nootenboom, 2003).

In a bureaucratic organization, there was no problem of trust (Bachmann & Zaheer, 2006). The senior leadership must have the capacity to perform with intuition, which is the ability to comprehend surroundings with limited available factual knowledge,
sound evidence, or conscious reasoning. The need for trust comes up in risky situations, such as environmental changes, diversity of employees, participatory working cultures, and technologies at the organizations (Mayer et al., 1995). Mayer et al. argued that trust in superiors is related mainly to job level, and trust in senior management is related to organizational issues. According to their findings, organizational commitment is closely related to senior management. Bromily and Harris (Bachmann, 2006) noted that trust is the best definition for specific types of behavior. Ring and Van de Ven (1992) referred to trust as faith in the goodwill of others. Gargiulo and Ertug (Bachmann, 2006) claimed that trust has a positive impact on lessening the need for monitoring, produces commitment, and empowers relationships creating trust beyond an optimal threshold, and it therefore affects organizational performance (e.g., Dirks & Skarlicki, 2004).

Organizational practices (as organizational characteristics), such as relational- and commitment-based practices, supportive employment practices, and management competence have an influence across all levels (Fulmer & Gelfand, 2012). Interpersonal trust is pivotal for sustaining team and organizational effectiveness (Dirks & Ferrin, 2002). Fairholm (1994) emphasized the importance of trust in leaders by arguing that an organization cannot exist without interpersonal trust, and leaders cannot disregard the elements of trust. According to Gillespie and Mann (2004), trust has a relation with a range of productivity-related processes and outcomes, such as the quality of communication and problem solving, discretionary efforts, organizational citizenship behavior, organizational commitment, and the rate of employee turnover. Dirks and Ferrin (2002) have also highlighted the role of cooperation in trust development. Thus, cooperation (intra- and interorganizational relationships) is even more essential due to changes in working culture. Declining trust is not only seen from a global perspective but also from an organizational and individual perspective.

Management is responsible for leading or guiding people. Leaders play pivotal roles in establishing and developing trust (Gillespie & Mann, 2004). Trust is not only the essence of leadership but also a common orientation (e.g., Kramer, 2006; Mayer et al., 2006). In such an ethos of relational and common orientation, knowledge and information will be shared freely and daringly. Consequently, trust develops common interests and expectations, and hence, it facilitates flexibility within relationships. Too much attention has been paid to the cost detriment of value creation. Value can be created by taking care of relationships in which trust is at the core. Organizations, especially hierarchical organizations, rely on interorganizational relationships, which are value-bearing assets (Madhok, 2006; cf. according particularly to early theorists such as Barnard, 1938 and Foyol, 1949). Trust is an intangible asset, but its benefits are real and tangible (Convey, 2014). That is because trust multiplies organizational efforts. In other words, it allows one to act independently and still meet expectations (Convey, 2014). In turn, people must know the expectations, and that leads into relationships where knowledge can be shared. Trust develops in relationships, but it is not a given, nor can it be taken for granted.

Trust can be built through the relationship of followers and leaders evaluating managerial initiatives according to Long and Sitkin (2006). However, their argument has combined perspectives of trust building and control as key managerial activities, which are related to activities for the task and the relational context. Nooteboom (2002) pointed out that trust also involves conflicting dilemmas, such as who should be in control and who should be trusted. Organizational trust relationships between task control and trust-building activities are important from the managers’ point of view. The correct balance between control and trust is seen as an important enabler of
organizational performance. Task control relates to both formal (i.e., written contracts, monetary incentives, and surveillance) and informal control (i.e., values, norms, and beliefs). Managers also utilize input control, such as training and socialization, to guide the selection and preparation of human and material production resources (Arvey, 1979). Managers also apply process control on followers performing organizational tasks. Managers use output control for measuring outputs and what employees produce (e.g., Mintzberg, 1979).

There is little consensus on the relationship between trust and control (Das & Teng, 1998). Trust impacts not only individual performance but also the end results of the organization. Simons and McLean (2002) and Bachmann (2006) have reported that senior managers’ behavioral integrity creates common trust in senior management, and therefore improves performance (Dirks & Skarlicki, 2004). According to Dirks (2000), trust and performance are reciprocally related. Trust in leadership enables employees to focus their energy on a common goal. Despite the various research on managerial activities, there is not yet a clear understanding about managers’ actions to promote organizational trust (Long & Sitkin, 2006). Thus, the current state of research is unclear and inconclusive about the relationship between trust and control. Nooteboom (2003, 85) stated that “opportunities to promote trust may be overestimated by trustees.” Dirks and Ferrin (2001) stressed that scholars may have overly focused on the role of trustors in exchange relations.

Managers’ trust building can fall into two categories. Managers build calculative trust which is also called cognitive trust or knowledge-based trust. This perspective comprises the idea of benefitting others as well as oneself (Lewicki & Bunker, 1996). In addition, managers intend to build relational trust which is also known as affective or value-based trust. This form of relational trust emphasizes care and concern for the followers. Managers tend to balance actions to build trust with organizational control. Some scholars see trust as a form of control (Bradach & Eccles, 1989). Accordingly, at the same time, managers try to balance their efforts to promote trust and control (e.g., Nooteboom, 2002). However, there is not yet a mutual understanding of the determinant of those joint actions. Yet, Long and Sitkin (2006) have tried to describe how managers integrate trust-based and control-based actions.

The formal departments are key players in creating and maintaining formal patterns for interaction and the resulting trust development within the organization. In addition, trust development is often the result of actions taken by the strategic leadership together with the formal departments. Hence, trust can be developed and managed intentionally (McEvely & Zaheer, 2004). Trust is conceptualized as trust in an individual and in a collective entity (Mayer et al., 1995). Trust in a collective entity exists between an individual, and other individuals. However, participation in a functional system is not related to personal relationships (Hardin, 2006), and hence, it is question about confidence instead. Hardin pointed out that scholars should not draw the easy analogy between an individual and institutional issues (i.e., trust cannot be generalized beyond a small scale).

Some would argue that organizations must act as if individuals cannot be trusted (cf. Williamson, 1975). The nature of trust is variable rather than all-or-nothing, to some extent (Bromiley et al., 1995). Trust generates vitality and energy that enables revitalization, particularly related to human capital and goal-oriented performance. Vitality and energy will be seen in the overall enthusiasm and utilization of skills, abilities, and talents. Subordinates expect fairness, behavioral integrity, and openness from a leader. Yet, there might be contradicting expectations at the same time, thus
nullifying the impact of action (Dirks & Skarlicki, 2004). Thus, leaders may face
dilemmas because of scrutiny or dispositional factors, but not for forgetting personality
traits. Building trust is more complicated than just demonstrating appropriate behavior.
The leader must also take into account the subordinates’ reactions or impressions.

Not only is trust manageable (McAllister, 1995), but also trust can be intentionally
shaped (McEvily & Zaheer, 2004). According to the research of McEvily and Zaheer
(2004), trust can be built by network facilitators through taking specific actions, such
as sharing interest, developing common expectations, leveraging a critical mass of
influence, and comprehending networks’ physical space and time. The management
may cope better with a fast-changing environment within a trustful atmosphere.
In a trustful environment, people better understand what action is adequate from
an organization’s point of view. They are also empowered by internal and external
motivators. However, in the opposite case when there is less trust, people choose
behavior that is more adequate for their own interests. Madhok (2006) suggested,
referring to March (1994), that people tend to act according to what they know or
consider to be appropriate; that is, the way a person frames a situation influences both
what motivates the person (broadly, external or internal) and the interaction with
motivation. Strategic leadership must put their competence and character into the
process. In other words, sharing risks is a function of character, and the willingness to
share risks is also function of character (Hennelly, 2017). Trust cannot be given, rather,
it is developed. Because of the undisputed benefits of trust, it should be considered
as a critical and strategic driver of an organizational renewal.

Without sound management, things may not be in order or functioning effectively.
Hennelly (2017) that noted that soldiers may not trust their leaders because of their
tactical competence but rather because of their ability to minimize risks (as a function
of competence), and willingness to share risks (function of character). Thus, leaders
must put their competence and character into the strategy process. Trust has become
a crucial component of management ideology from the point of view of leadership
practices in the domain of organization and management theories. In addition, trust
has become a mode of coordinating organizational relationships (Bachmann, 2001;
McEvily et al., 2003) and the essence of a vital mechanism that ensures coordinated
interactions in complex relational arrangements (Bachmann & Zaheer, 2006). Kramer
(1999) argued that trust is a solution to many organizational problems. Managers can
act as organizational trustees. According to Ferrin and Dirks (2002), trust in the leader–
follower relationship can neither directly nor indirectly lead to the development
of a positive trustor attitude and a range of positive organizational behaviors and
enhancements of more positive social exchange. Managers build trust along the
trust evaluation process, according to Mayer et al.’s (1995) trust concept. They also
emphasized that, based on their argument about the work of Rousseau and colleagues
(1998) and Nooteboom (2002), when managers build trust, this might also promote
trust in themselves.

When institutional trust is weak, interactional and personal trust must become
stronger. Power can be a functional substitute for trust. Trust and power will,
however, materialize in different forms (Bachmann, 2006). People try to build
reciprocal relationships according to individual and fragmented interests (Hardin,
2008). According to the functionalists, new technologies create alternative forms for
social life (Burrell & Morgan, 2011). Modern societies are built on collective trust in
the competence and goodwill of professional specialists. The process of societal and
organizational modernization calls for trust more than ever (Bachmann, 2006). Finally,
research needs to clarify the mechanisms of how trust emerges at the organizational level, that is, how organizational members share trust in different referents. However, I would venture to say that some practices are more relevant than others. Thus, there may be emergent processes specifically relevant to the construct of trust itself. There are antecedents, still to be explored, such as trustor characteristics, justice and fairness, organizational characteristics, and external factors. For future research, Fulmer and colleague (2012) encouraged increased theoretical specification (diversity) in examining trust constructs such as the factors that affect the spread (emergent) of trust among group members.

3.3 SUMMARIZING THE THEORETICAL REVIEW

Lastly, I summarize review of trust by noting that there are a number of studies highlighting different research streams and benefits. However, the concept of trust is still elusive, and hence used in a variety of ways, but not comparative ways (Kramer, 2006). Moreover, on one hand, there are ethical and moralistic issues and on the other, strategic and calculative dimensions. Despite the multilevel and multidimensional nature of trust, trust research incorporating multilevel analysis remains limited (Fulmer & Dirks, 2018). Instead, there is research on trust at different levels of analysis in teams and organizations at the focal point, such as trust in the leader or dyadic relationships. Fulmer and Dirks also pointed out that complexity increases when trust is explored beyond the interpersonal level within a team or an organization. This multilevel perspective of trust is important in the ever-changing current environment.

Postmodern and individualistic cultures have enabled us to interpret information from individualistic perspectives. Thus, changes make trust more difficult to develop and maintain because information and relationships cannot be managed as usual. Trust has proven to be beneficial from different perspectives for driving organizational performance in for-profit organizations. Should that be the case also in an NPO and, specifically, in the Church? Thus, this study is even more important because strategic leadership has been studied far less in the nonprofit sector, and not directly in the church setting (Grandy, 2013). In addition, in this study, trust and strategic leadership theories were integrated, and as a result, were examined from a senior leadership perspective. Moreover, this contextual study in an ideological and spiritual setting is original regarding strategic leadership and the definition of trust. It ultimately produces a model of strategic leadership through activities incorporated with trust factors.

Previously, I have observed that people trust the influencing of others from disposition at the individual level, previous experiences and knowledge at the relational level, norms at the network level, and values at the institutional and societal levels (Fulmer & Dirks, 2018). Trust theories highlight social realities but underestimate the very essence of the idea of man, that is, faith in humanity (e.g., McKnight et al., 2006). However, trust research focuses on visible realities, such as human behavior, character, and communication. Trust theories consider the upbringing in childhood and one’s character, referring to propensity or disposition as natural willingness. However, those references leave open wide perspectives of the concept of spirituality. Recently, there has been a remarkable stream of research emphasizing the spiritual dimension at places of work, such as workplace spirituality, referring to atmosphere,
spirituality as an individual orientation, or spirituality of an organization. In Western culture, spirituality is understood differently compared with the Eastern cultures (MacDonald et al., 2015). Thus, I also focus on the spiritual context while analyzing the empirical data because all people bring their own innate human attributes of spirituality, as an integral part of themselves, to the workplace. This is an even more relevant issue because the target organization is ideologically oriented; more specifically, it is a church organization which is a place of worship. In addition, such an organization is most likely ideological and religious, whereby its members share beliefs, values, faith, and worldviews. Recent studies have emphasized the need to consider not only strategic leadership in the nonprofit sector, but also the contextual issues at work in specific NPOs (Phipps & Burbach, 2010).

Boal and Hooijberg (2001) argued that, through their learning capacity, strategic leaders produce better understanding about the goals, mission, and vision. Hence, by doing so, they foster the alignment of the personnel and organization. There is evidence that advancing the mission is an important aspect of nonprofit strategic leadership (cf. Kaplan & Norton, 2004). There must be a strong sense of mission because it helps to compete against external forces. Goodsell (2006) stated that the mission itself is the best source of agency self-identification, staff motivation, program coherence, organizational pride, and political support. Indeed, the mission aligns leadership activities with the board’s expectations. Achieving success in NPOs requires that leaders have a personal understanding of stakeholders’ relationships and measuring performance must be linked to the mission and context of the organization (Grandy, 2013). Stakeholders monitor senior leaders’ performance and keep them responsible not only for the present performance but also for the strategic leadership that will enable and ensure future survival (Phipps & Burbach, 2010).

Finally, this study focused on multilevel analysis. That allowed me to explore, on the one hand, the effects of the nonprofit strategic leader on organizational trust, and on the other hand, the organizations’ effects on the strategic leadership. Thus, from a strategic leadership perspective, I have emphasized activities and capacities. According to Ireland and Hitt (2005) and Phipps and Burbach (2010), the components of effective strategic leadership are determined by an organization’s purpose or vision, exploiting and maintaining core competencies, developing human capital, sustaining effective organizational culture, emphasizing ethical practices, and establishing balanced organizational controls. Trust building is not only dependent on the propensities or characteristics of the actors but also on the others’ actions and initiatives. From the management perspective, senior leadership’s capacity to trust is a key dimension of trust building (Hardin, 2002). Thus, from this point of view, strategic leadership requires the capacity to learn, to change, and to develop managerial wisdom (Boal & Hooijberg, 2001).

---

9 Business Week, June 5, 2005. The cover article: “Companies hit the road less traveled: Can spirituality enlighten the bottom line?”
4 EMPIRICAL CASE STUDY

In this section, I discuss the philosophical, ontological, epistemological, and methodological choices and issues. These choices determined the research goals and, in turn, the methodological choices. In Section 4.1., I defend my choices regarding the philosophical perspectives and the applicability of the qualitative methods to explore trust in strategic leadership. Then, in Section 4.2., I describe the case study research and empirical data. In Section 4.3., I explain the strategies and techniques of my analysis.

4.1 PHILOSOPHICAL POSITIONS

Qualitative research offers an opportunity to focus on the complexity of a phenomenon in its context (Eriksson & Kovalanen 2010). It is of essence to do qualitative research because a research phenomenon is unique and socially constructed. Further, qualitative research is very relevant when prior understanding is modest because quantitative research cannot transmit the social and cultural essence to understand reality as socially constructed, produced, and interpreted (Eriksson & Kovalainen 2010; see also, Silverman, 2001). Hence, it would be quite complicated to understand or explain subjective phenomena logically. Our actions and thinking are based on symbols and given meanings. The meaning of interaction and discourse open up through in-depth interpretations and understanding (Jones, 1988). Therefore, the researcher must delve into mental, intellectual, or spiritual realities because people are social beings who are motivated by things related to their feelings (Burrell & Morgan, 2011).

I chose interpretative research for this study because people socially and symbolically construct and maintain their relationships and organizational realities (Burrell & Morgan, 2011) (Figure 6). Thus, qualitative study is relevant, as it involves interpretative and social constructionist factors. Interpretation is an important part of any qualitative research. Further, the dominant form of interpretative research is social constructionism (Eriksson & Kovalainen, 2010). Thus, this study relied on interpretative and constructionist epistemology because they do not only focus on the content of empirical data but also on how the content has been produced through language practices (Eriksson & Kovalainen, 2010; Burrell & Morgan, 2011). Interpretations are true only in the context of theory (Cuba & Lincoln, 1994, 106). The interpretative paradigm is engaged to interactional, interdependent, and subjectivist principles. That is why the phenomenon should be studied from different angles (Hirsijärvi et al., 2005). Ultimately, the interpretation is what differentiates the research from common sense (Koskinen et al., 2006). The base for interpretative and constructionist research is in hermeneutics and in phenomenology (Eriksson & Kovalainen, 2010).

10 Constructionism sees the world and what can be known of it as facts, descriptions, etc. to be constructed through contingent rhetoric. Constructivism instead focuses on individuals and how they construct and make sense of the world (Eriksson & Kovalainen, 2010).

11 Phenomenology influences how we understand and experience a phenomenon through reductions. Hermeneutics interprets human actions and highlights the need to understand the activities and actions from the agent’s point of view (Eriksson & Kovalainen, 2010).
The position of this study was aligned with the paradigm of social constructionism. It aimed to understand how an apparent object functions, such as an industry or organization, has been formed through subjective interpretation and discourse (Eriksson & Kovalainen, 2010). However, interpretivists aim to understand the nature of a process (Burrell & Morgan, 2011). Nonetheless, the quality of a study is grounded on the plausibility of the study and the overall argument (Myers, 2009). This study aimed to explore and describe life in detail and holistically\(^\text{12}\) as it appears.

The philosophy of science considers how science determines goals, implementation, and interpretation (Koskinen et al., 2006). Theories and approaches are ways of seeing the world, and at the same time, ways of excluding things and views (Morgan, 1997). The researcher and the subject use language, symbols, and views that have given meanings (Schwandt, 1994). The interpretations happen inside and through the inherent cultural ideology (Holtein & Gubrium, 1994). From a reliability point of view, the principles of assumptions are related to the chosen methodologies and conclusions made (Tuomi & Sarajärvi, 2004). Thus, the methods and means are standardized thinking extensions (Rauhala, 1983).

Paradigms explain conceptual and/or methodological models relating to a scientific discipline (Eriksson & Kovalainen, 2010). Paradigms are part of the dominant belief system, a worldview or a filter directing actions and guiding us through the research process (Guba & Lincoln, 1994; Metsämuuronen, 2005; Eriksson & Kovalainen, 2010), such as trust, strategic leadership, and organization. Long tradition, how we see the society, emphasizes order instead of conflict (Burrell & Morgan, 2011). There is continuous battle of which one is the driver. However, the changes in ideological paradigms may change the order. Social sciences deal with this subject explicitly or implicitly. People produce and interpret their ideas based on their ideological assumptions (Eriksson & Kovalainen, 2010; Burrell & Morgan, 2011).

Different paradigms are grounded on fundamentally different beliefs and assumptions. They produce different ways of theory building or writing a good story worth reading. Hence, the research must be paradigmatically anchored. Burrell and Morgan (1979, 2011) introduced four paradigms for organizational analysis: functional, interpretative, radical humanist, and radical structuralist. The functional paradigm is characterized by an objectivist view of the organization with an orientation towards a managerial perspective, stability, and the status quo, whereas the interpretative paradigm (interpretivism\(^\text{13}\)) is characterized by a subjectivist view. The radical humanist paradigm is subjectivist, but with an ideological orientation. Finally, the radical structuralist paradigm is objectivist with an ideological concern about the radical change of structural realities (e.g., Gioia & Pitre, 1990; Burrell & Morgan, 2011). The latter two are not that relevant from this study’s research task point of view, and so I concentrated only on the functional and interpretative paradigms.

The goal of the functional paradigm is to search for regularities, and test these in order to predict and control (Gioia & Pitre, 1990). Moreover, the functional paradigm aims to develop a testable hypothesis and a theory, that are generalizable, while a positivist study aims to determine a law-like generalization (Myers, 2009). Consequently, on the

\(^{12}\) A holistic view means that social life cannot be reduced to the activities of individuals (hence, opposing individualism). Thus, social life must be analyzed at the level of social wholes (Eriksson & Kovalainen, 2010, 306).

\(^{13}\) Often used also for hermeneutics that refer to conditions of interpretations taking place in all research (Eriksson & Kovalainen, 2010)
According to Burrell and Morgan (2011), the functional paradigm supersedes an accounting for the status quo, social order, consensus, social integration, solidarity, and the need for satisfaction and actuality. Functional perspective is rather static. The social constructionism challenges the objectivist paradigm as negations and constructions of meanings occurring in discourse.

Interpretative research is a way to explore what is out there. The goal is to describe and explain in order to diagnose and understand (Gioia & Pitre, 1990). Strategic leadership often has the goal of change. Thus, stability and the status quo, characteristics of the functional paradigm, become a target for change. If we look at the borderline between the interpretivist (subjective) paradigm and the functional (objective) paradigm, structural theories may focus on the connection between human actions in the form of structuring activities (Gioia & Pitre, 1990). Thus, according to Gioia and Pitre, the structuring is not a separate form of structures, but instead, they consider the social construction processes with the objective characteristics of the social world. From this perspective, the structure is an ongoing flow of actions and traditions (e.g., Barley, 1986; Porter, 2000; Mintzberg et al., 2003; De Wit & Meyer, 2005). It is also important to acknowledge that informal structures use the power of interactions and decisions. In interpretivism, the theory helps the researcher to understand the meanings and, thus, the intentions of people. In positivism, the data supports the theory (Myers, 2009). An interpretivist study aims to form a generalization that is more context bounded (Myers, 2009).

Social constructionism aims to understand how an apparent object functions, such as an industry, organization, or technology. Understanding is revealed through subjective interpretation and discourse (Eriksson & Kovalainen, 2010). Social constructionism emphasizes more dynamic and ever-changing reality. Common to constructionism and interpretivism is that both concern subjective and shared meanings among people (Eriksson & Kovalainen, 2010). Thus, the perspective is even more relevant for this study’s research point as the research subject is an ideological organization.
4.1.1 Ontological assumptions

From an ontological point of view, reality is socially constructed (processual) and is defined through questioning (Eriksson & Kovalainen, 2010). The social world is developed intentionally by people in a context with one another (Burrell & Morgan, 2011). People create the world they live in by using language and shared meanings. Hence, there is a common cumulative history and memory among people. However, just a small amount of our experience remains in our memory (Berger & Luckmann, 2009). Thus, it is a production and projection of human mind and, hence, a complex and organized pattern of ongoing actions (e.g., Eriksson & Kovalainen, 2010). Reality, if it has existence, consists of assumptions and shared meanings. Thus, the world of people is cohesive, ordered, and integrated. The focus is on understanding the world as it is an ongoing process of everyday life. There can then be a problem if people accept an organization only on the conceptual level (Burrell & Morgan, 2011) because the reality of it emerges through social interaction and it can also be changed through interaction.

An organization is a social interaction system that is dependent on an interpreter. It is a psychological and mental product which develops meanings and symbols (Burrell & Morgan, 2011). Hence, material and concrete reality are based on a subjective construction. Strategy and organization are social processes and construction (Burrell & Morgan, 2011). Social facts dominate daily life but do not exist outside individuals because reality is about individual and group interpretations.

4.1.2 Epistemological assumptions

Epistemology involves the grounds of knowledge and how we begin to understand the world and then communicate that to others. Eriksson and Kovalainen (2010) noted, citing Vivien Burr (1995), that, according to the social constructionist paradigm, the world is not objective but subjective, and so it is known through human experience (mediated by language). Further, language is produced in interaction and context, sustained through communication, and as a result, knowledge and social actions go together. This requires ideas, such as, what kinds of knowledge exist, and which

---

14 Cf. A holistic view means that social life cannot be reduced to activities of individuals (hence, opposing individualism). Thus, social life must be analyzed at the level of social wholes. Case study research explores case(s) holistically in their social, economic, and cultural contexts (Eriksson & Kovalainen, 2010).

15 Reflexivity highlights the process and context of knowledge construction. Thus, the researcher must pay attention to one’s background and position affect (Eriksson & Kovalainen, 2010).
one is true or false. Nevertheless, objective epistemology considers a world that is external and theory neutral, whereas subjective epistemology considers an external world beyond our observation that can be interpreted. Finally, the nature of a human being reflects one’s relationship with nature and other people. Both relationships can have an impact on one another, and specifically on our thinking and mind-sets. (e.g., Tuomi & Sarajärvi, 2004; Burrell & Morgan, 2011). Knowledge is what can be collected, analyzed, and interpreted. According to many scholars, scientific knowledge (Harwing, 1991), moral knowledge (Jones, 1999), and almost all other knowledge (Webb, 1993) depends in a way on trust. That means that no one has the time, capacity (intent), and experience to learn the truth about everything. That is why Sitkin (2004) argued that trust is the basis of every moral. From the social constructivist perspective, all knowledge is of value. Hence, meanings and discourse can be studied and analyzed by being aware of reality and shared meanings (Meyer, 2009).

Concepts have different meanings for different people. Meanings are produced in a context among people in interaction and how they interpret the meanings (Tuomi & Sarajärvi, 2004). For example, structures are not real to a nominalist. For them, names are used only to describe, to make sense, or to negotiate. For them, the reality of the world stands in spirit or idea rather than in data (Burrell & Morgan, 2011). However, realism considers structure as a real and resources. Despite these differing standpoints, a structure exists for both, but in different forms. Positivists seek regulatory and causal relationships and believe that cumulative knowledge can be added. From an anti-positivist point of view, the world is relativistic, and we understand it from an individual perspective of being involved in the specific activity under exploration. In addition, an anti-positivist does not accept the term observe, arguing that science cannot produce objective knowledge of any kind (Burrell & Morgan, 2011). From an ideographic perspective, first-hand knowledge can be found only by being inside the subject and involved in the flow of life, whereas the nomothetic perspective emphasizes formal protocols and techniques or tests (Burrell & Morgan, 2011).

From the interpretative and social constructionism perspectives, an organization and a strategy are not existential in real meaning. The perspective focuses on social meanings and actions and socially constructed organization processes. The spirit of case study research is qualitative even though quantitative data can also be used to design the case (Eriksson & Kovalainen, 2010). The main interest centers on investigating, elaborating, and explaining a phenomenon, but not on the case itself. Consequently, the research topics are constructed socially at the upper level, and cases are used as instruments instead of as individual cases. Ultimately, I chose the qualitative approach instead of the quantitative approach which does not add understanding about a phenomenon but instead explains it (Koskinen et al., 2006). According to the qualitative approach, the research questions are what, why, and how questions (Yin, 1994; Eriksson & Kovalainen, 2010).
4.2 CASE STUDY RESEARCH AND EMPIRICAL DATA

4.2.1 Case study research

Case study research offers a number of methods to avoid something being taken for granted (Koskinen et al., 2006). According to Eriksson and Kovalainen (2010), the case will be made through carrying out the research by turning the object of research into an object of interpretation and understanding. The case study is a way of finding cases and analyzing them (Koskinen et al., 2006). It explores people, organizations, and processes holistically in their social, financial, and cultural context. Thus, the research questions always aim at helping to understand and solve the case (Eriksson & Kovalainen, 2010). The meanings can be understood only in their context and through interaction in situ (e.g., Tuomi, & Sarajärvi, 2004). Despite the fact that the top management represents the managerial orientation (functional view) in this study, they are considered as human and individual subjective actors (constructive view).

A case study is used as a means to gather empirical evidence to support findings and to make a contribution to knowledge (Myers, 2009). It is a form of empirical research investigating a phenomenon within a real-life context when the boundaries between the phenomenon and context are not evident (Yin, 1994). Myers (2009) stated, emphasizing an organizational focus, that a case study is synonymous with a study of some aspect of an organization. In addition, a case study is philosophically neutral, and it can therefore be conducted according to different tenets. There are two main case study approaches: extensive case study and intensive case study (Eriksson & Kovalainen, 2010). With the extensive study, the goal is to map common patterns and properties from the cases. With the intensive case study, the emphasis is more on the interpretation and understanding of the cases. In addition, it defines cultural meanings and a sense-making process in the context, that is, it attempts to learn how a specific and unique case works through a contextualized and in-depth description that is a verbalized interpretation. In so doing, the researcher prepares a story/narrative to tell about the case (Eriksson & Kovalainen, 2010; see also Stoecker 1991).

Theory plays a pivotal role in research. In an intensive case study, there is a continuous dialogue between the theory and the empirical data (Eriksson & Kovalainen, 2010). Usually, there is a demand for generalization. However, an incentive case study does not provide knowledge for generalization. The aim is to explore and understand how the case works (Eriksson & Kovalainen, 2010). Hence, the key issue is the research interest perse. The extensive case study does not focus on individuals as interest of the case. The extensive case study focuses on issues using various individuals as the instruments in the study. An extensive case study either tests and extends the theory or builds a new theory. The main interest is investigating, elaborating, and explaining a phenomenon, not the case itself. (Eriksson & Kovalainen, 2010). The researcher makes the case.

Because case study research is like solving a puzzle (Alasuutari, 2000), I chose sub-cases for several reasons: 1) they provide practical evidence of ongoing change in a strategic leadership context, 2) cases are big enough to represent the complexity regarding strategic leadership, and 3) they provide the possibility to test or develop an emerging pattern, extend a theory, or create a new theory. The selection of instrumental cases was based on theoretical aspects, such as the cases being similar enough (only vicars, the senior leaders at the same organization) to generate a new pattern or theory or to verify an existing theory. The number of cases (material) was
limited when it was determined that the contribution of more cases would have added only marginal value. Finally, this study followed the extensive case study method because various cases and individuals as instruments finally formed one case, and the study was intended to map common patterns and properties. The main interest was investigating, elaborating, and explaining a phenomenon.

4.2.2 Access to the organization

Next, I want to explain my access to the organization. Then, I introduce how the data were collected and details specified. I had easy access to the organization due to my 1) professional experience, 2) educational background, and 3) recommendations. First, my experience related to strategic leadership positions was considered to be significant. I have tens of years of senior leadership experience in various business sectors (e.g., Managing Director, International Business Director), in church ministries (e.g., pastor and volunteer), and mission organizations (e.g., Regional Financial Officer). I have also lectured as a university teacher on strategic thinking and management and human resource management. In addition, my educational background was relevant due to three master’s degrees. Two are in leadership and management sciences. During the research project, I also completed master’s degree in practical theology at the University of Helsinki because I wanted to add to my theoretical in-depth understanding of the ultimate core of the Church and its mission organizations. Furthermore, Professor Jyrki Knuutila of the University of Helsinki, Faculty of Theology, introduced me to the Church while completing the Degree of Master of Theology in accordance with the Degree Program Theological Work in Church and Society. His recommendation was very valuable and helpful. Those contacts were used to execute data collection for this study. In addition, during the research project, I worked several years as a Regional Director (Mission organization) in East African and Middle Eastern countries. Thus, I think that my qualification was considered as an advantage. Consequently, I do have deep insight into the Church and strategic leadership per se. Katila and Meriläinen (2006) argued that a researcher studying his or her own work and organization is in a better position to do the field work. However, because I do not work for the target organization, I was able to avoid subjectivism. Consequently, I may better understand the concepts, meanings, and ongoing flow of activities from a strategic perspective.

4.2.3 Qualitative interviews and ethics

The case study data were gathered through extensive interviews. The questions were thematic open-ended and semi-structured (Eriksson & Kovalainen, 2010). Each interview was started after general information was gathered, such as time in a position, number of members, and so on. The first question was: “What changes have occurred around or inside the Church which have impacted the Church?” Thereafter, the interviews continued freely from one theme to another, using what, how, why,

16M.Sc. (Econ. and Buss. Adm.) University of Lappeenranta, M.Th. (Practical theology, Line A1) University of Helsinki, and MBA, Executive MBA, University of Jyväskylä.
and open-ended questions to allow the interviewee give more information. The main strategic leadership themes were changes, strategy work, trust, organizational system, and leadership culture. Themes of trust were explored with questions such as “How do you define trust verbally?” and “How do you define trust using a metaphor.”

The case study interviews were conducted in 2011. The follow-up and updated information about the case was later collected from television, radio, printed media, online newspapers, and the internet, and the official reports. Web material and documents were collected at the time, and updated material from webpages was continuously collected thereafter (https://evl.fi). Thus, I concluded that additional interviews would not have given any additional perspectives because the discourse in the follow-up material confirmed that the case is still there. The interviews were recorded and literally transcribed. Later, some unimportant words, such as “ah” or “well,” were deleted from the transcriptions. In addition, I removed or changed the issues and words referring to known names, incident, or events. In that way, I guaranteed the anonymity of the informants, and followed the research community’s ethical rules in general (Eriksson & Kovalainen, 2010). Further, I also substituted codes for the informants’ names (H1–H14) and placed them in random order (see Appendix 1). The quoted statements in the case study are from interviewees unless otherwise noted.

I interviewed vicars in the southern part of Finland. Thus, the data consisted of fourteen interviews of the vicars and secondary data (2011–2018). I excluded specific information about the churches and informants for the sake of anonymity. The average length of the interviews was 75 minutes (from 54 minutes to 90 minutes). All informants were men who were, on average, 55 years-of-age (50–63 years) and had been in the office, on average, 9.4 years (2–21 years).

4.3 ANALYSIS METHODS

Because the topic under exploration has been less studied, there was a need for establishing greater confidence in the study through using multiple methods, such as triangulation (e.g., combined operations and mixed strategies (e.g., Alasuutari, 2000), which aims to validate research results (Eriksson & Kovalainen, 2010). This means that the researcher uses multiple theoretical perspectives, sources of data, and methodologies (Erikson & Kovalainen, 2010; Tuomi & Sarajärvi, 2004). Consequently, I used theory, data, and method triangulations. Furthermore, I analyzed the data using abductive thematic and the conceptual metaphor analysis.

4.3.1 Hermeneutics

The main goal of the study was to investigate, elaborate, and explain a phenomenon, but not the case itself. Hence, I did not focus on individuals in the case, but instead on issues using various individuals as instruments (Eriksson & Kovalainen, 2010).

---


18 In one case, the recording was accidentally stopped too soon.
Knowledge is the essence of a study, and it can be attained through either inductive or deductive and abductive processes (Eriksson & Kovalainen, 2010). According to Eriksson and Kovalainen, inductive reasoning draws from more general statements or claims of the same kind. In other words, it follows the logic proceeding from empirical research to obtain theoretical results (Eriksson et al., 2010). Interpretation proceeds inductively, and the researcher examines the phenomenon inside out (e.g., Puusa, 2005; Burrell & Morgan, 2011). Thus, one’s own role will be continuously defined in an organization depending on how things happen within common rules.

Deduction expresses theory as the first source of knowledge, while abduction uses both approaches. According to the abduction approach, the researcher explores everyday descriptions and meanings, categorizing knowledge to understand and explain the phenomenon. Consequently, abduction evokes the hypotheses, and induction confirms them with empirical data (Eriksson & Kovalainen, 2010). In this way, themes are used to sensitize empirical data, that is, develop a general sense of reference. Accordingly, abductive reasoning starts from facts (first deductive and then inductive) and then comes forward to the most determine the most plausible one.

Moreover, if the researcher aims to understand the research subject (Eriksson & Kovalainen, 2010) then the study is rather more phenomenological (an intuitive experience of phenomena) than hermeneutic (explains, interprets, and illustrates). Accordingly, the language does not mirror reality, but instead, it formulates the reality (Fairhurst & Grant, 2010). Phenomenology aims to get inside people’s world of experiences and make subjective observations and meanings. Meanings may be grounded on previous experiences, worldviews, education, and situations (Eskola & Suoranta, 2008). Thus, there must be a close interaction between the researcher and the subject. Consequently, reflexivity intervenes in constructivism (e.g., Eriksson & Kovalainen, 2010; Puusa & Juuri, 2011).

As matter of fact, the abductive logic (sensitizing concepts) and circular processes (linking empirical data to the literature review and theories) are also called the hermeneutic circle (e.g., Dubois & Gadde, 2002). In this study, my interpretive analysis followed the hermeneutic process. My intention was to add understanding, while constructing and deepening meaning during the process. Thus, I used deduction to evaluate the patterns and induction for justifying them with the data. This was a process of interpretation and conceptualizing understanding (Eriksson & Kovalainen, 2010; Puusa & Juuri, 2011). The hermeneutic approach not only adds preunderstanding based on previous experience about the phenomenon or scientific literature, but it also corrects preunderstanding (Puusa & Juuri, 2011). The theory derives the process by extending the understanding. Knowledge arises in a dialogue between the data and researcher through an orbicular hermeneutics reasoning process. Within this paradigm, I was interested in gaining an understanding. Thus, I concluded that the approach was more of a hermeneutic than phenomenological process.

### 4.3.2 Abductive thematic analysis

The intent of the analyses was to rereport the answers to the three questions, and then recapitulate them, this creating the final report. The research topic was examined from three different angles (Figure 6). In the report, I used various tables and figures to illustrate the content and findings. Consequently, I was able to form a description by linking empirical patterns to report the case. (e.g., Eriksson & Kovalainen, 2010;
Yin, 2002; Stake, 1995). I started my analysis by carefully reading each interview several times. Each analysis had its own focus, as I mentioned previously.

My orientation to the research project can be summarized as follows. The theoretical prescience was a process of observing what I needed to know, which influenced the intellectual framing of what I had to determine to enlighten theory and practice (Corley & Gioia, 2011). Thus, I focused on the future problem domain, using current empirical data provided by senior leaders, while thinking about the future success of the target organization. Consequently, the questions were future oriented, that is, how to succeed from now onward. My goal was to extend strategic leadership theory about enhancing trust to be applicable in an NPO (Figure 6). My main interest concerned investigating, elaborating, and explaining the phenomenon (Eriksson & Kovalainen, 2010).

The data analysis followed the abductive processes that were rather hermeneutic than phenomenological (Eriksson & Kovalainen, 2010). A new theory would attempt to describe and explain the phenomenon of trust from the senior leaders’ perspective in the context. Thus, I wanted to offer useful and original insights into ideas of trust and contextual strategic leadership (Corley & Gioia, 2011). Current dimensions of theoretical contribution are two axes (x and y): utility (practically useful and scientifically useful) and originality (revelatory and incremental). Thus, this advances our understanding, contributing to knowledge and offering implications. To this point, I reasoned, senior leaders must have dealt with shortcomings of contextual strategic leadership theories. Thus, they must either have interpreted or been reliant on business practices. The orientation towards a theoretical contribution also includes an explicit appreciation of applicability (Corley & Gioia, 2011). Theory is expected to be applicable in other similar contexts, thus improving managerial and leadership practices. Consequently, my analysis contributes both to strategic leadership and trust development theories from the senior leaders’ perspective in an NPO, more specifically, in the church setting.

Figure 7. Analysis methods
This study attempted to answer three essential research questions.

**RQ1.** How do strategic leadership activities produce organizational trust and, in turn, emerge as the senior leaders’ trust in an organization?

The goal of the first question was to produce a theoretically (useful) revealed strategic leadership model of practices and a model for trust development in the context (Figure 7). Data were analyzed following the abductive process as follows (e.g., Eriksson & Kovalainen, 2010; Yin, 2002): 1) I studied literally transcribed notes, 2) I categorized related descriptions (with in the case) at the first and sometimes at the second level of abstraction, and 3) I compared patterns to pre-developed themes on the basis of existing theories. Thus, I found that the existing used theory did not apply fully in the context. However, it helped to sensitize the issues. Finally, 4) I formulated a new pattern/theory identifying the emerging concepts and relationships, and 5) reviewed the theory identifying what was already known.

**RQ2.** How do senior leaders perceive emerging trust at multiple levels?

With the second question, I aimed to describe senior leaders’ perceived trust across multiple levels. Thus, I introduced a multilevel perspective for emerging trust in the context. I adopted a levels-of-analysis approach, introduced by Fulmer and Gelfand (2012), to group trust referents, such as interpersonal, team, and organization at the individual, group, and organizational levels. Otherwise, the analysis followed the abductive process as described above.

**4.3.3 Conceptual metaphor analysis**

**RQ3.** How do senior leaders characterize trust using a metaphor?

I chose conceptual metaphor theory (CMT) as a means to not only to understand trust in the context but ascertain tacit knowledge and tacit expertise. Organization research uses metaphors and looks for scientific truth, trying to elicit how we structure our understanding of complex processes. That is because a scientific phenomenon is complex in terms of defining it by words. Previously, metaphors were understood as being essentially linguistic, but more recently metaphors have been explored as conceptual, fundamental aspects of thinking (Johnson, 1987; Lakoff & Johnson, 1980). These researchers have suggested that conceptual thinking is structured metaphorically to serve as the foundation for all abstract thoughts. In this way, metaphors are examples of mental models and an expression of the structure of thoughts. Consequently, they provide a basis for understanding the phenomenon of trust because they can embody experiences.

According to Johnson and Lakoff (1980), metaphors are analogies used for mapping one experience to another. A metaphor compares one object to another which shares the same qualities. Metaphors are valuable devices for simplifying the complexities of decision-making, and analytically employed, they are helpful in revealing perceptions of change and identifying the resistance and the limits to the acceptance of values, goals, and practices (Abel & Sementelli, 2005). Lakoff and Johnson also defined a metaphor as follows: a conceptual metaphor is understanding one domain of experience, that is typically abstract, in terms of another, that is typically concrete. Kovecses (2017) explained that the CMT makes a distinction between linguistic metaphors (linguistic expressions used metaphorically), and conceptual metaphors (certain conceptual
patterns we rely on) to think about aspects of the world. Moser (2000) summarized why metaphor analysis is significant: 1) metaphors impact information processing; they affect perception, interpretation of experiences, and further actions; 2) thus, they have an effect on our mind-sets, in other words, on our cognitions; 3) metaphors can evoke tacit knowledge and tacit expertise and thus represent a linguistic manifestation of tacit knowledge; 4) in addition, metaphors and mental models make possible a more holistic representation of understanding and knowledge; 5) conventional metaphors represent automatic actions; and 6) finally, metaphors indicate social and cultural understanding.

The interviewees were spontaneously asked “How do you define trust using a metaphor?” Metaphors and similes are similar. However, metaphors do not use the words “like” or “as.” “Life is like a journey” is a simile, whereas “life is a journey” is a metaphor. In analysis, there are a source (tenor) domain and a target (vehicle) domain. The source domain is usually more abstract than the target domain. Comparing abstract with concrete, we know more about the concrete than the abstract. In this study, the abstraction that is trust was compared usually what was concrete. A conceptual metaphor is a systematic set of parities (mappings, correspondences) between two domains of experience (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980; Kovecses, 2017). A domain or a frame is an organization of human experience. The target domain changes our perspective of the source domain. In other words, knowledge from a source domain can be used to reason about a target domain.

Morgan (1997) described organizations using metaphors, for example, a machine, an organism, and a brain. Bartlett and Ghoshal’s (1995) house metaphors described strategy work in an organization. Savolainen and Ikonen’s (2016) plant metaphor described trust development in a team context. Some of these metaphors have certain limitations. Consequently, I chose the house metaphor for mappings and correspondences (cf., systematic set of parities) because it provides a solid foundation for the strategic leadership perspective and the organizational system. A house consists of members, being its base and pillars, and in an organization, these would be culture (psychology), processes (physiology), and structures (anatomy). The roof represents an overarching structural component under which all other members are located – that is, the mission and the purpose as the value-added system. The metaphorical modelling of the concept trust adds an understanding about the elusive concept of trust, and specifically reveals the incremental revelation of trust phenomena through metaphorical modelling of trust. Specific concepts are sometimes difficult to define comprehensively. Previously, trust has been defined as a state of mind and a psychological state (e.g., Möllering et al., 2004; Rousseau et al., 1998). These metaphors focus narrowly on the psychological aspects of trust and, thus, have their limitations. Next, I introduce data and analysis of the metaphorical modelling of trust (Figure 6).

To answer RQ3, I followed a methodical sequence of steps: 1) I analyzed given metaphors related to trust definitions that fulfilled conditions of metaphors; three (3/14) of the proposed definitions did not fulfill the definition; 2) I studied metaphors and verbal definitions given by interviewees; 3) I put content into the wider context of the definitions, doing so I found metaphorical similarities and differences in definitions for the given metaphors; 4) I grouped metaphors according to the house metaphor;
5) after my analysis, I integrated it with the previous analysis of the study (model, pattern) to understand their relevance from senior leaders’ perspective in the context; and 6) finally, I illustrated trust metaphors, using the house metaphor, that further develop trust in the context of the senior leadership perspective. The analysis proceeded from the identification of a metaphor to how meaning was being represented by the metaphor, in other words, how the metaphor developed meaning through techniques, effects (explanations), and links to an argument. There may be many interpretations of the same metaphor because contextual factors may influence interpretation (e.g. Moser, 2000). However, all the interpretations are potentially meaningful (Eriksson & Kovalainen, 2010). Thus, I used interviewee statements to illustrate the link between the interviewee’s expression and the researcher’s interpretation of the metaphors.
5 FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

Next, I report the key results of the study concerning how senior leaders’ activities promote trust within an organization and, in turn, emerge as the senior leaders’ trust in an organization. In Section 5.1, I describe how senior leaders’ activities promote organizational trust. Then, I focus on at what levels senior leaders trust in Section 5.2. In Section 5.3, I report how senior leaders characterize perceived trust using metaphors. Finally, an integrated model of strategic leadership and trust is built based on these three analyses. In the report, the statements link the interviewee’s viewpoints to the researcher’s interpretations.

The report consists of a multilevel analysis at individual, group, organizational, and strategic levels. I formed a new level, I called strategic, which highlights the strategic importance of the value-added system, that is, the corporate mission. It influences the whole organization, originating from the intrinsic cause of existence. The top management represents the strategic, both from the agency and the principal perspectives. Based on the data, I discovered the following crossover themes, that is, strategic leadership practices (input) incorporated with trust outcomes (output): 1) empowering mission – sent for purpose, 2) developing organizational system – enabling interdependence, 3) exerting leadership influence – fostering trustworthiness, and 4) promoting participation – releasing potential (Figure 8, #1). Consequently, practices and antecedents are in continuous interaction, that is, in circular interplay having possibilities to enhance trust within an organization.

Figure 8. A theoretical model showing how senior leaders’ activities promote organizational trust
5.1 SENIOR LEADERSHIP’S ACTIONS AND TRUST

I propose that trust can be actively developed through senior leaders’ activities (Figure 8, #1) and the mission-down and potential-up processes (Figure 8, #2). While senior leaders’ activities develop trust in an organization, in turn, the senior leaders trust emerges in an organization. Thus, the process is bipolar. However, according to the data, there are influential counterforces invalidating efforts of the strategic leadership, such as individualistic, intergenerational, systemic, and ideological issues. In addition to the external counterforces, the worst are, however, internal obstacles which cause a voluntary surrendering to the organizational complexities. Further, the permeated spirituality of the mission can become confused due to the diverse interpretations. Consequently, secular humanity attempts to overcome vertical spirituality (e.g., MacDonald et al., 2015; Meng, 2016). Thus, empowerment of the mission and participation, specifically volunteers’ participation, have become the most important success factors. Next, I introduce in detail the activities promoting trust.

5.1.1 Empower the mission for purpose

Empowering the mission for purpose is a critical action for vitalizing the church as “the mission is the measure of all things, the Alpha and the Omega” (H2). The Church has critical reasons to empower and nurture the mission (refocus), not only due to declining membership and functional and financial reasons, but also because of the Church itself. The mission and purpose are in the center of the value-added system. Some strategic leaders assume that organizations exist for the same purpose or act in the same way, that is, to make money or achieve superior results. Nevertheless, that observation is important to consider because the vision about the future Church was diverse and unclear at different levels of the strategic leadership as the interviewees indicated. Thus, in the Church, the mission was understood vaguely, to some extent. Contradicting viewpoints are existential because the origin of the mission has become more indistinct.

The Church surely has some degree of vision (hesitations), but it does not always come across to the local church, because there are too many organizations along the way that can bring something of their own into the vision or strategy (H7).

But the message, however, is the most important thing. The message is displayed. No one, except the Church, brings it up (H7).

The biggest limit is between the Church and people causing contradictory interpretations of the mission, purpose, vision, and faith at all levels. Thus, the Church has failed in communicating its mission to people, and, as a result, the media and public discourse have decided what is important to talk about. The public discourse has directed the discussion to minor issues and stigmatized the Church, thus worsening its negative public image and downward spiral. Also, members’ confidence in the Church has declined and, consequently, the opinion of its trustworthiness. The more the leadership has diverse interpretations about the mission, the more the members question the trustworthiness of the senior leadership and, in turn, the relevance of the church.
But today’s biggest problem is that... people do not believe in the same way how the Church teaches, and neither the Church quite believes... the greatest limit is between the Church and the people it serves (H3).

It would require... that we should look at what is at the heart of this issue and see/notice how damaging it is to fight about some details that are not at all relevant (H1).

As far as the Church is concerned, it is said to the Chapter and the General Synod the Bishop’s Meeting, as well as the Church Council, so the problem is that you should think about who is speaking with the voice of the Church. Because people want and the media wants, and everyone wants it. There should be one voice that would tell what is right and what is wrong. But then society and life are not black and white, but mottled. And, there are no either-or alternatives, but as well as that, so many are disappointed that the Church does not respond sufficiently clearly to these either-or options. But, the Church also speaks both-and options, so it lacks the kind of father or mother’s voice (H3).

Leadership “continues as usual,” that is, with silence and achromatism, and it increases members confusion and distrust. The leadership could advance trust and confidence through coherent actions and preaching from the pulpit and through the media. When strategic leadership is weak, operational leadership tends to focus on niche tinkering and advancing egoistic motives. Thus, the message becomes confusing. It is obvious that the mission and purpose are fundamental principles for strategic leadership. These include strong theological and ideological dimensions. They are a base for strategic thinking, which demands balanced understanding about the essence of the Church and knowledge about the leadership principles in its context. Consequently, the critical question is how the Church believes and the leadership interprets the course of its existence. Thus, the strategic leadership should have a firm and mutual commitment to the mission, and there should first be a strategic alignment before an organizational and, particularly, a people alignment (Kaplan & Norton, 2004).

I see this role of the vicar, in the presence of the basic function of the vicar and its application in each context. And, the mission is the guiding principle in the vicar’s work. It is of great importance for the creation of trust, how credibly he presents the Church’s core mission in his speeches and other work (H4).

Yes, strategic thinking starts off with the question of why do we exist? Yes, it is typical of me to start from the core mission and understanding the core mission and creating an action plan/mission statement and so on. Taking part in the Church’s mission. Another area is evaluating/pondering our strategic work, the core mission materialized to flesh. That’s it. Analyzing the operational environment is essential. For whom and to what kind of community is the mission performed (H4).

God’s given mission creates trusting faith to rely on the continuous empowerment of God. The issue of the mission and purpose become even more challenging when we take into account the principal’s perspective. The Church claims that its mission has been given by God the Father (Turunen, 2001, 13). Consequently, the leadership can be understood by exploring its mission, the very essence of the assignment. “The Church is the Holy Community, a place of worship, whereby the Gospel is preached, and sacraments are served accordingly,” according to Church Law and Church Order.
Hence, the mission is not designed or planned by the senior leadership, instead they interpret the mission in a socially constructed reality and find meanings within ideological frame.

Meaningful tasks enhance service leadership and acting in an accountable manner, which can be seen as a reciprocal driver of trust. The word mission, derived from the Latin *mittere*, means “to send,”[20] that is, someone has been sent on the way to do a specific task or a duty. Hence, the mission is a driver in a certain direction for purpose. The very essence of the Church is sending, which is mission minded, from a strategic point of view. The senior leadership has a responsibility to interpret the mission, in this context, instead of designing it to send the organization to accomplish the given task. There is also an exceptional dimension (theological and ideological) because the mission and the message have been given by God. This kind of approach is ultimately the opposite of a for-profit firm and its ownership principles as the mission can be designed by the management.

Accordingly, the spirituality of the mission permeates through the Church, enhancing confidence in its purpose and vision. The mission of the Church is to proclaim the Gospel and make disciples.[21] In this way, the mission is bounded to the authority of the Word of God (Turunen, 2001). That statement references the Bible, how Jesus sent the Church for the mission: “As you [God] sent me into the world, so I [Jesus] have sent them into the world” (John 17:18). The Church does not live for itself but focuses outwards on people.[22] Moreover, its mission is spiritual in its nature because the Sender is the Spirit (God is spirit)[23]. However, there is a tendency that the spiritual aspect, as such, and holiness are being humanized to be only operational or secular. Consequently, there is a risk of losing the power of the original mission, and its purpose may be diluted and gradually fade out. To some people, holy only means something important or valuable that is to be taken care. However, the mission of the Church is holistic and comprehensive.

The mission has also a motivational aspect that inspires individuals to work together. The Church can be experienced through its vital elements, including its beliefs, values, and definitions of its areas of work. The mission, particularly its meaning to people, has been questioned. Thus, people argue that the Church does not have relevant meaning any longer despite the fact that it has the best product. Thus, the Western churches have become increasingly unsuccessful. Despite the mentioned challenges, the importance of religion is, however, generally increasing in the world.[24] Statistics show the opposite in the Southern and in the Eastern Continents. There, Pentecostal and Charismatic churches have grown rapidly.

*Our basic problem is that we have the world’s best product: Jesus Christ. Earlier, there was no need to pitch it. People came to the Church, and the Church was their refuge*

---


[21] Matthew 28:19: “Therefore go and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them....”


[23] John 4:24: “God is spirit, and his worshipers must worship in the Spirit and in truth.”

from cradle to the tomb. Today, we must pitch Jesus Christ. We are also in a situation where people have unlimited leisure time. Now, we are in a competitive situation with the media (H5).

Value balance distances people from spirituality in a religious sense, and people argue about being spiritual but not religious. Thus, spirituality has taken on a new form: “I may be spiritual but not religious.” Religious traditions may not satisfy younger generations in terms of spiritual meaning but, instead, only as symbolic and ritualistic purposes. Furthermore, the relevancy of the church has been questioned because humanistic spirituality is achieved in other ways. The logical reasoning may lead to a resignation from the membership. Relevancy and taxation issues may also be considered as communicated reasons. So, families do not bring children for baptism nor later for confirmation school. It is said that “Let my child decide for himself.” The functions of its mission direct the Church in a certain direction by defining boundaries of activities and conveying that the Church carries out holistic activities in a proper way. The senior leadership is in a critical position to enhance confidence in their purpose. They have the pulpit and the legitimacy to preach and speak about the mission and the meaning of life.

I can’t see theology as detached or separate from life, as a top-level thing, but it must touch life strongly. Of course, this Cross, the great God, and God’s confidence in us, is that he has given us this post. Our confidence in him is that he did his own mission... and then this cross beam, they are always together. I like this cross-shaped worldview and concept of man (H13).

The Kingdom also has a culture that has some preconditions to be assimilated, but not the other way around. Should the leadership discuss what it means that God’s Kingdom has come near and be sensitive to different management approaches and applications? The strategic leadership context in the Church is unique. The context sets circumstances under which strategic leadership is determined and practiced, instead of letting the ethos determine these. It is appropriate to discuss to what extent the Church should adapt, or to which part of the strategic frame adaptation should be applied. Options to be considered are the mission (purpose) and operations (Turunen, 2001). The strategy literature seems to recommend, in each “industry,” compliance or choice and, in an organization, control or chaos (e.g., De Wit & Meyer, 2005; Mintzberg, 1989).

Its mission sends the Church to reach people with the message and to holistically meet the needs of all individuals, one by one. Thus, the leadership must define whom the Church should primarily satisfy. It is open for everyone, but within the frames of the mission. Occasionally, strategic leadership tools for for-profit firms are used without proper application. Thus, the Church is treated as a firm for making money and satisfying customers’ needs as the major priorities (cf. customer orientation). In other words, the Church operates like any for-profit firm: “The belief that a customer is always right can lead to a missed mission.” (Huovinen, 2011). However, the Church has the assignment with a special, exclusive right: “We are, however, a church. Do we have something special value, that others do not have? ”H6. Bishop Emeritus Eero Huovinen (2011) summarized this topic precisely:
How do I take care not to become a mere echo that repeats what people expect? How do you listen to the field, but avoid becoming a wind line that turns to the latest breeze? People are being respected, but the belief that a customer is always right can lead to a missed mission.

The paradox between the mission and finance drives renewal initiatives, and financial decline may turn the focus to efficiency instead of the purpose. The pastoral leadership may emphasize mission, but instead, the administration may have to highlight financial issues due to decreasing financial resources. Consequently, the responsibility for achieving the mission may not be in these circumstances the most likely and attractive option. The Church is big enough not to focus on the purpose, but instead on itself. Thus, the machine may work well but just for gaining survival resources. Finally, it may pretend to represent God’s assignment, but may not have the power of its message and its purpose, but the power of a decreasing stream of tax revenue and diverse views.

They affect the future economy so that the budget total is always written with smaller amounts. And that means that we need to find ways in which we can focus on the core. And then we must be able to... act in such a way that we can find the core of the Church’s activities and find solutions that both the staff’s contribution and the financial resources are directed towards its implementation (H14).

Finally, on the strategic level, empowering the mission and the purpose must pay attention to trusting referents. A clear mission and purpose direct the flow of strategic actions throughout the levels, thus permeating senior leaders’ thinking and action. The Church has been sent for a particular purpose, an assignment that others cannot do appropriately. Consequently, leaders aim to fulfil the purpose, that is, to satisfy the principal (cf. Eisenhardt, 1989) by directing the flow of crossover themes. From this point of view, the senior leaders experience confidence in the mission, and, as a result, they not only enhance the idealized influence of communication values and a shared vision but also inspire, through its ideological origin, inspirational motivation. This is an inner experience about the deepest meaning by which people live and the Church exists. Yet, conceptual confusion has caused diversity in interpreting the mission, and the very essence of the purpose has become ideologically confused. Thus, humanistic spirituality, including love, compassion, tolerance, forgiveness, and concern for others (Karakas, 2010; Fuller, 2001), has almost faded away along with divine spirituality, which is the connection to the reality of God.

Here, trust can be seen in two dimensions. First, God has trusted us by giving the mission to the Church. Thus, trust in God is relational (personal) and spiritual (beyond), whereby faith assures confidence in continuing empowerment. I call it trusting faith because one is willing to rely on an existential value-added system, which is the mission and its purpose. This is the willingness to be empowered by the spiritual dimension (cf. access to sacred forces that impel life) (Nash & McLennan, 2001). Thus, the spiritual dimension of trust is influential, particularly in this context. In addition, the value potential that the mission represents changes through knowing the origin of the purpose. The Church’s work ultimately depends on God and his guidance. Consequently, the purpose permeates the organization. However, the following observation illustrates the main problem: “People do not believe in the same way how the Church teaches nor what the Church necessarily believes. The greatest
limit is between the Church and the people in service.” (H3). Thus, the vision is diverse, and occasionally, the financial paradigm dominates the renewal discourse. However, this research found that most of the senior leaders expressed strong confidence in their assignments and continuous empowerment. Consequently, strategic leadership empowers the mission, and through idealized influence and inspirational motivation enhance a sense of meaning and purpose. Despite that, in the end, senior leadership does not quite reach the level of strategic leadership capacity due to its acknowledged weaknesses.

The senior leadership promotes and supports the diffusion of knowledge through strategic networks. Thus, transformational leadership challenges organizational learning and encourages adopting strategic thinking. However, there is often a tendency that transactional practices aim to execute and improve existing patterns. Because the purpose and the vision are relatively unclear, innovation and a road map of development suffer from the lack of competence and passion. As a result, tightly ordered instructions and structures instead foster traditional ways of thinking without strategic innovation rooted in the purpose. In addition, new ideological views challenge the traditions. Consequently, it is question about senior leaders’ capacity.

I think that we have a future, but what are the medicines to make it meaningful to a large enough group of people, so to speak (H1).

I have a perception and a strong belief that God already is in our world and influences it. And, I also have the impression that very many people have a similar view/belief (H2).

In conclusion, I propose that trust on the strategic level, the very essence of the mission, is spiritual in its nature. This kind of trust refers to factors such as truth, truthfulness, and cordiality. Spiritual can refer also to an ideological origin and to a transcendent personality. Thus, it is beyond an innate orientation towards other people because orientation is also empowered by the Spirit. In the Church, truthfulness and cordiality would be the essence of an ideological substance. Here, trust is a ternary phenomenon: trust in top management’s commitment to KSFs, trust in the mission and purpose, and trust in God. The spiritual dimension resonates beyond humanity. Empowerment of the mission adds understanding about the purpose. The leadership must be propelled by a firm sense of meaning and purpose. Empowerment of the mission is even more important than determining the organization’s purpose or vision as it originates from the very essence of the mission’s spirituality. Finally, strategic leadership empowers the mission, and through its idealized influence and inspirational motivation enhances a sense of meaningfulness and purpose. The following table illustrates the referents of emerging trust through the mission and the counterforces to trust development.
Table 3. Strategic level referents emerging in organizational trust and, in turn, the senior leaders’ trust in an organization through empowering the mission for its purpose and the counterforces to trust development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>+ EMPOWER MISSION – SENT FOR PURPOSE</th>
<th>= COUNTERFORCES – CONSEQUENCES OF DISTRACT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REFERENT – CONSEQUENCES OF TRUST</strong></td>
<td><strong>COUNTERFORCES – CONSEQUENCES OF DISTRACT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• God’s given mission – trusting faith to rely on continuous empowerment</td>
<td>• The biggest limit is between the Church and people – contradictory interpretations of the mission and vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Meaningful task – enhances service leadership and acting on accountable manner</td>
<td>• The Church has failed in communicating its mission to people – media and public discourse decide what to talk about</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Spirituality of the mission permeates through the Church – confidence in the purpose and vision</td>
<td>• Value balance distances people from spirituality in a religious sense – people may be spiritual but not religious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The mission also has a motivational aspect - inspires individuals to work together</td>
<td>• Relevancy of the Church (purpose) has been questioned - humanistic spirituality is achieved in other ways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The God’s Kingdom - has a culture that has some preconditions to be assimilated but not the other way around</td>
<td>• Customer orientation – the belief that a customer is always right can lead to a missed mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>⇌ Strategic leadership reinforces the mission, and through idealized influence and inspirational motivation enhance a sense of meaningfulness and purpose, i.e., communicate goals, values, a shared sense of the purpose</td>
<td>• Paradox between the mission and finance drives renewal initiatives – financial decline may turn the focus to efficiency instead of purpose</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.1.2 Develop an organizational system for enabling interdependence

A management system is a well-defined skeleton and road map, and it is the strong backbone enabling trusting stances (willingness to depend on others regardless of the belief in the other (McKnight et al., 2004). The system is foreseeable because the Church Law and the Church Order define dependencies that link people and tasks: the division of labor and roles. Thus, changes of officers hardly impact organizational competence. Long traditions and a legitimate position in society as a public organization enhance confidence in objectivity and a feeling of security. Thus, in general, the system on paper creates confidence, particularly to the inherited organizational system from the fifteenth century (Episcopal inheritance). Thus, trust is grounded on a built-in cultural belief system respecting the traditional bodies of the Episcopal tradition. Interdependence and interaction are well known as conditions for trust (Rousseau et al., 1998). However, the definitions are not necessarily relational (with a person) but rather depend on another kind of entity such as a “personalized” Episcopal inheritance.

Yes, the management system gives such a foundation and hence predictability (H4).
Yes, that's true, the management system is a good skeleton, around which confidence can be built more easily when there are clear blocks ready. How and with whom things are handled. It is like a road map that integrations of the churches were based on. We need this kind of good support (H1).

However, from interviewees point of view the system is considered as being too distant, complex, rigid, impersonal, inefficient, uneconomical, bureaucratic, and authoritarian. There are too many players and layers, and overall, the leadership and the systems are quite unclear. In addition, the General Synod, the Church Council, the Diocese, and the Parish Union live their own lives. It seems that criticism against the upper levels is increasing. Indeed, the development of the management system takes too much time because the decision-making system is too complex. The common vision has also been questioned. Consequently, common interests and goals for strategic changes have become challenging. Notable is that strategic leaders at the focal point with exceptional power criticize the whole management system because it is considered unclear, complex, and rigid. The criticism indicates distrust, the positive elements of the system per se. Yet, an organization is a social interaction system and is therefore dependent on the interpreter (Burrell & Morgan, 2011).

Well, let’s say that the overall church management system is quite ambiguous. When you think about it, there is the Church Council, the General Synod who, in a way, has a life of its own. Then, we have a diocesan level that has a life of its own. Then the Parish Union level that has a life of its own... And then there is the local church, the Parish. In all the worst cases, everyone goes in completely different directions. Managing the overall Church is quite unclear. In a way, on paper, everything is very clear. We have a system that is too multilayered. … There are too many levels... some levels too much. The Church Council is too far away. It is perceived as too distant. The Church Council may no longer have a feeling of what is happening at the grassroots level. Well, the Church surely has some degree of vision [hesitations]. But, it does not always come across to the local church because there are too many organizations along the way that can bring something of their own into the vision or strategy (H7).

One of the fundamental obstacles is the permanent office holder system which enables ongoing problem of labor division, which causes frustration. The office holder system, together with an individualistic working culture, not only hinders changes but also creates leadership challenges. A solution may be to change the office to be a type of employment relationship agency and offer temporary or fixed-term assignments. The fixed-term assignments would be predictable. However, the negative side would be that the dynamics of leadership may be allocated just for the term. A shorter assignment could allow quicker rotation of competent people, which, in turn, could improve organizational competence and hence confidence. However, one main characteristic of a professional organization is the freedom to work according to one’s own interests (Mintzberg, 1989).

The Bishop’s office and the Vicar´s office should be changed to temporary. I’d be quite ready for it if, in the same way, the Bishop’s post were changed. Power corrupts, and consequently the great power corrupts even more. Then, it starts to show, taste, and stink. Thus, this system should be dismantled (H3).
Yes, people are, at least, according to studies, especially in church work, quite individualists. And someone must do quite a lot of work to remind the one who is to pay and what is their primary task. People have a big tendency to choose the kind of work they feel good about. And, it is a little such that, as a leader, we must strive as clearly as possible to say that what are the basic tasks, what are the key issues, and what is secondary. And, they need to know little about according what their work will be evaluated (H11).

Power plays and a rigid management system have caused frustration because the system enables the misuse of power and hidden agendas. Despite that, representatives to the General Synod have been elected through voting, and some office holders use exceptional power, for example, by nominating committee members perhaps representing their perspectives and interests. Such a use of power irritates senior leaders working for common good in vain. A very human response to impossibilities is to eliminate their impact as much as possible. Thus, vicars find other ways to do things or advance initiatives. When the procedure clearly instructs us to work in a certain manner, that instruction will be followed. But, in other cases, its impact will be eliminated.

It has the same system, and if there is suspicion of something, its meaning is eliminated. If any of these relationships do not work, it will give rise to another habit or channel to do these things as far as possible. There is a part of that, or rather a fraction of it, that is not selectable. Then, it leads to frustration if you can’t trust one of the parties. It leads to the fact that the one deals only with them when you must... but nothing more... treat the thing in one way or another (H4).

The parishes are supervised by the Diocese, that is, the Bishop, the Chapter and the Diocesan Board. The Bishop is the spiritual overseer, and the others are more administrative functions advancing the Church mission in the Diocese. Trust in the Diocese is good, and its technical competence is high, but they are distant and impersonal. Despite the Bishop’s role as a spiritual overseer, it is surprising that meaning of the office is narrow and limited. The Bishop does not give enough personal consideration and encouragement. The Diocese has competent officers and responds to requests quite rapidly. Personal relationships may emerge over time. However, contacts are matter-of-fact.

Confidence in the Chapter is strong, good, but in a way quite narrow. Narrow in the sense that the Chapter does not directly influence our activities. In a limited area where it is relevant to us, confidence is quite strong. As an administrative unit, it is factual (H4).

In my experience, it is true that the Chapter is very distant from our work. It is insignificant. It is almost irrelevant who the bishop is, or if there is no bishop at all (H6).

Vicars work closely with internal stakeholders as “the group of stakeholders illustrates the great diversity that exist in everyday life” (Figure 9). The Parish is independent and belongs to the Diocese. Other functions are expected to support the vicar institution. The following statement captures the nature of the power positions.
The Vicar has a very significant leadership role. It is certainly significant. It is based on the Church Law, all that is legally incorporated into it. In the Church Law and Church Order, the responsibilities and duties and the power of the Vicar are very important. It becomes apparent that the Vicar prepares, presents, and is involved in dealing with the local plans, and is also the one who follows its implementation. There is no such concentration of power anywhere else. This is a very distinct system within the Church, concerning the role of the Vicar. Then there is the risk that this person fulfills the duty in a good and responsible manner as a good leader, but if that does not happen, then a lot goes wrong. There is power/authority... when... the vicars meet once a month, it is not a so-called legislative status, but what is decided and said there, no matter, goes much further in the Parish Council or the Parish Union and Church Council. Because the Parish Union bears such a great responsibility and financial management, if we have a congruent opinion, then the voice is heard far away. We are a Protestant church, and it is evident that, at local level, there is autonomy and quite strong power. Then, in the Church, the leadership of the Parish Union has substantial power. They are usually executive teams that have a very important role and position. The third powerful body is in the Church, as far as uniformity is visible, the Bishops’ Meeting. It includes the management of the Church Council. Yes, it’s hard to ignore these bodies (H11).

The Vicar’s mandate is very strong and is based on a poll and the Church Law and Order, which promotes confidence and safety. I observed that the role of stakeholders is very dominant, even though the Vicar has extraordinary power. Hence, the issues of interconnectedness and interplay are not only referents of trust but also critical success factors. Each stakeholder has an influence intentionally or accidentally on the Parish and its legitimate actors. Each has professional, financial, or intentional power.

Figure 9. Vicars’ closest stakeholders and their roles
The independent Parishes can voluntarily form a Parish Union in larger urban areas. A Parish Union is a centralized service function which releases resources for the core mission in the Parish. Roles between the Diocese and the Parish Union are somehow overlapping. The Parish Union highlights its own views which creates the master–serving dilemma, and thus creates the possibilities for power play and tension. The Parishes are willing to outsource supporting functions to the Parish Union, providing that services are relevant and cost-effective. The Parish Union has taken a remarkable role in helping Parishes. It has the power of money and competence in management and technical issues. The Bishop has certain power but not the essential resources, that is, money. Thus, the Parish Union takes the role because it has money and the capacity for managerial wisdom. The role of the Diocese may fade out over time. During financially and operationally difficult times, financial and management issues are emphasized. Consequently, spiritual issues are moved to background due to transactional leadership practices and emphasis.

The Parish Union has caused great tension due to its managerial approach and misunderstanding of the spiritual nature of the Church. The people working on the Church projects also do not understand well enough the special characteristics of a Church (as a place of worship and theological principles). Its managerial approach is rational and based on financial reasoning, rational strategy work, and project management. In addition, they have a somewhat poor relational competence as to how to approach people in terms of language and their way of working. Clerical and strategic leadership languages are different. The Parish Union is common and makes a good technical contribution, and it has certain power to plan integrations and special projects. Yet, it seems that it applies business methods without proper adaptation within the ideological culture.

*The Parish Union influences our activities in a radical way. It brings more tension... the theological policies are different. The local church lives close to people and spiritual communality, through church services and ceremonies... The Parish Union is not a spiritual entity in the same way. It causes tensions. We do not always recognize it as our own. It reflects in the creation and planning of the practical systems and structures. Because they don’t have that experience about what concrete work at the practical level is. When the systems are done centrally and for everyone, they may not work together anymore.... It is the domination. It is the power tension that we must live with (H4).*

*Strategic work, based on the realities of the business world, where the economy has and finances have great importance, it does not convert to our language yet. At least, such a language has not been invented (H14).*

Integration of the parishes (structural development) has been a challenging process. The decision to integrate was made at the upper level, driven primarily by the Church Council, the Diocese, and the Parish Union, outside and independent of parishes. Different parties had to work together for the same goal. Despite that, interests differed very much. After all, the Parish Council and Board were also involved in the final decision-making. Hence, the decision was seemingly democratic, even though inevitable due to the circumstances and preliminary decisions. The decision was mostly rational considering the declining membership and financial reasons, even though operational issues were addressed. The reason for the decision-making at the higher level was justifiable because local initiatives might have caused some consequences
harming future local cooperation. However, it raised a question particularly about the negative role of the Parish Union.

As a result, bigger units are considered a solution from a financial and operational point of view. However, this is in opposition to the socially constructive views of the need to be people-oriented. Consolidation of the smaller churches into big units, called the “disease of a mammoth,” was first defended. According to opponents, confidence may decrease because the idea about “The Church of Encounters” may not be met. Instead, the leadership should find applications to satisfy spiritual and other needs and give individual consideration because people are individuals, not numbers or cases per se. They must show that the work is done in an accountable manner. Thus, human encounters and interactions have become even more in focus. In fact, the Church has launched this as its slogan: “The Church of Encounters.” According to this viewpoint, the life and activities of the Church must be renewed to meet the challenges of the changing world.

Unfortunately, it must be said that this mammoth disease is not the solution because it also feels like escaping from the most essential things and fleeing to systems and administration (H1).

New ways and maybe change so that we are not so building centered that we must have a church in every place and that the church is the center of everything. The ways in which we work change. But the message, however, is the most important thing. The message is displayed. No one, except the church brings it up (H7).

Ultimately, the most tangible and real work is always done in human encounters and interactions. That’s where real things happen. If he needs material help, then he gets it, but very often in it, the same person wants to become holistically taken care of. It also includes the spiritual dimension and the presence of spiritual life (H11).

The Parish Council and Board are based on democratic principles. Functionality and democratic decision-making together with shared responsibility and participation foster trust. However, recently, new groups have brought ideologically oriented views and unusual working methods from the political working culture. They have advocated their own agendas, thus disturbing the open and discursive democratic way of making decisions, and they have caused frustration and disturbed a trust-based culture. The existing culture expects all parties to seek common and shared interest for the sake of the Parish. Usually, meetings have had a common agenda to advance the Church’s work instead of an agenda of an interest group. The interest groups generate initiatives based on their philosophical origins which causes unpredictability.

Trust always depends on the Parish Council. It is, every time there is a new council, it is always a different package then. And, so not only with us, but also elsewhere, there are new people from political parties and then people who have clear agendas, quite young people, too. They really want to make a change in the Church (H1).

In our church, the Parish Council is unpredictable. New groups have come about. We have this “Come all – movement” that differs... The other groups have not kept up the group meetings, nor promoted their own policies. They have been together... It has brought unpredictability, which, again, from trust point of view is worsening... Not all activities are consistent (H4).

The Vicar has an exceptional mandate and the power to lead the Parish. This creates confidence and fosters safety. A vicar acts as a presenter of the matter, a chairman, and also has the right to vote and implement decisions which may cause a threat to the power balance. A vicar’s trustworthy behavior is based on an unquestionable position, human capacity, and relational competence. Because of the integration of the smaller Parishes, the number of members and employees doubled. In order to manage this increased workload, vicars formed a middle-management level, a management team, based on service areas wherein the vicar acts as a chairman. Hence, the vicar’s work became more strategic, even though many of the senior leaders do not necessarily have very good management competence. Due to this new arrangement, the vicar moved more away from the parishioner interface. However, the vicar can use the pulpit to preach and teach about the mission and relevant actual issues. These new arrangements added one more layer to the hierarchical organization. From the customer’s point of view, the change may be seen as an additional resource, which can add confidence through personal relationships with members.

Well, the church management system as it is known and the Church Law it presents pose infinitely more problems because, if the leader does not match the task, then everyone suffers. When in the churches, we now go to the parish first, so if there is no intermediate leadership, then there are no immediate superiors to turn to. The bigger the organization, and if there is no intermediate, then all the wires lead to the vicar, and, in the first place, his time is limited. Many of us do not necessarily have very good leadership competence. Leadership skills in the Church, should be advocated more (H3).

The congregation is for the people of the region to know that we do not do this on paper, but deeds, that is, action is in crucial role how the Church is trusted and how its activities are organized and what action gets done. It is crucial, the action, just because there is not trust, unless there is an activity that responds to their needs and if that trust does not arise. When working with elected officials, trust develops on the sides and otherwise. That is based on realization that people are genuinely trying to make good decisions and improve the rapporteur’s proposals (H6).

From the Church’s point of view, an additional layer adds bureaucracy and hierarchy. From the Vicars’ point of view, a new layer helps in daily work but does not add confidence in the Church’s management system because the upper levels are hindering strategic changes. In the current system, strategic changes are almost impossible in the short run. The aforementioned changes have taken about ten years to design and implement. Such a slow change in the management indicates that the Church will not be able to answer today’s intensity of demand. The lead will be taken by diverse groups or new forms of associations. There are already some emerging movements seeking a place in the Church. From the Parish it is too long way to the General Synod meeting. Parties should find a common course for developing management systems.
Action is needed instead of continuous committee reports. The systemic slowness and rigidity may lead to diversified Parishes and, hence, to a diversified Church.

In conclusion, I propose, as one reason for this phenomenon, that vicars have voluntarily surrendered to impossibility to change the Church faster by adding relevancy. Consequently, senior leadership must support intellectual reasoning to determine new ways of dealing with organizational issues through innovation. Moreover, strategic leadership must develop an organizational system that enhances a sense of interconnectedness and functionality. People believe that the system, despite its weaknesses and whether people are reliable or not, is reliable because they work for the Church. Such a trusting stance is calculative because it reflects a conscious choice and reasoning to be willing to depend on another regardless of the beliefs of the other.

Structural capital, supporting human capital and transmitting intellectual capital, improve trust (e.g., Zucker, 1986; Lewicki & Bunker, 1996), and thus, the structures that are fostered believe in a successful future (cf., McKnight et al., 2006). Certain types of control through the Church Law and Order as substitutes for trust (cf., Sydow, 2006) enhance trust by indicating quality, care, and concern. Consequently, trust is not only dyadic (interpersonal), but also, there are other referents that include history and heritage, ideological origins, structures, roles, and juridical stances (institutional and organizational referents). The professional officer represents the office, and the legal office acts as a platform of trust (confidence). Thus, initial trust is often based on the disposition to trust in roles and assignments. In such a case, people have to be willing to depend on and trust that persons appointed by the management are trustworthy because of the organization’s procedures and image (cf., institutional trust; e.g., McKnight et al., 2006; Dobing, 1993). In this study, I found that the senior leaders’ trust in the system was high (4/5) despite the various criticisms. Criticism (dissatisfaction with current performance) is positive in the sense that it shows strategic leadership that it needs the ability to find areas to be improved (e.g., Davies & Daves, 2004).

Perhaps due to the inherited Episcopal propensity to trust, there is a built-in disposition to trust in pastoral leadership and authoritative bodies. The vicars’ actions are seen as crucial in terms of successful change and trust building in the course of the process. Thus, appreciating the structure and responsible officers was one factor noted as fostering trust formation (cf., optimal structure and processes; Creed & Miles, 1996). Despite the attitude and behavior of the professional officers (knowledge-based trust; McAllister, 1995), a rational choice as behavioral trust (Arrow, 1974), and distant relationships (relational trust; e.g., Mayer et al., 1995), the main office was noted as deserving confidence as a legitimate actor and authority. After all, the Church is a professional organization.

Sometimes, actors behave in an overbearing manner and force their ideas on others, which causes distrust due to not appreciating the basic principles (spiritual) of the Church and good manners. In cases of distrust, I found from the interviewees, a professional officer or the office itself was eliminated from the process if possible. The role of senior leaders (vicars) is exceptionally extensive, so they have the possibility to invent new ways of doing things. Consequently, distrust can have a strong influence on the dynamics of senior leadership, that is, on personal and institutional relationships (cf., Atkinson, 2004). Thus, trust as socially learned and confirmed expectations of another, and of the natural and moral social order, can set the fundamental understanding for the Church’s work (cf., Barber, 1983).

---

26 Senior leaders were also asked to rate their trust of different stakeholders using a grading scale of 1–5.
Finally, the organizational system aims to enable interdependence and the flow of interactions by linking human capital through structural and social capital. A trusting stance is calculative and a conscious choice, a willingness to voluntarily to depend on others and a confidence in systems and the advancement of intellectual capacities. Structure, roles, division of labor, and functions enhance a trusting stance through the assurance of functionality and interconnectedness. Despite this, trust in a person and in an organization is different (Sydow, 2006). It is a question about strategic leadership abilities and capacities (Phipps & Burbach, 2010) and further about transactional and transformational leadership (e.g., Bass & Avalio, 1990). Strategic leadership develops an organizational system, and through intellectual stimulation, it enhances a sense of interconnectedness and functionality, thus challenging old ways of thinking and encouraging different perspectives.

Table 4 summarizes the issues involved in emerging trust through the organizational system and counterforces to trust development.

Table 4. Organizational level referents of emerging organizational trust and, in turn, senior leaders’ trust in an organization through developing an organizational system and enabling interconnectedness and counterforces to trust development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEVELOP ORGANIZATIONAL SYSTEM – ENABLE INTERDEPENDENCE</th>
<th>COUNTERFORCES – CONSEQUENCES OF DISTRESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REFERENT – CONSEQUENCES OF TRUST</strong></td>
<td><strong>COUNTERFORCES – CONSEQUENCES OF DISTRUST</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Management system is well defined in the Church Law and Church Order – strong backbone enables trusting stance</td>
<td>• Inherited organizational system reflects continuity – but it is authoritarian, complex, rigid, impersonal, inefficient and uneconomical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Division of labor and roles clearly defined – defines interdependencies</td>
<td>• There are too many layers and actors – leadership is missing, and, above all, the system is quite unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Changes of officers hardly impact organizational competence – confidence in continuity</td>
<td>• Developing management system takes too long of a time – complex decision-making system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A public organization with long traditions and legitimate position in society – confidence in objectivity and feeling of security</td>
<td>• The Bishop has certain power but no chips (money) – Parish Union takes the role because it has the money and capacity for managerial wisdom. Thus, the role of Diocese may fade out over time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Technical competence at the Church Council and Diocese high – but distant and impersonal</td>
<td>• Roles between the Diocese and the Parish Union are somehow overlapping – enables power play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Parish Union is centralized service function – releases resources for core mission in the Parish</td>
<td>• Parish Union highlights its own view which creates is a master-servant dilemma – power play causes tension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Functionality and democratic decision-making – shared responsibility and participation</td>
<td>• Vicars act as a presenter of the matter, a chairman, and also has the right to vote and implement decisions – risk of power balance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Vicar’s mandate is very strong based on a poll and the Church Law and Order – confidence and safety</td>
<td>• From the Parish it is too long way to the General Synod meeting – It adds voluntary surrounding and tendency to eliminate the effect. However, it enhanced innovations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>⇓ Strategic leadership develops an organizational system and through intellectual stimulation enhances a sense of interconnectedness and functionality, that is, challenging old ways of thinking and encouraging different perspectives</td>
<td>• Permanent office system enables the continuing problem of labor division – frustrates senior leadership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.1.3 Exerting leadership influence for fostering trustworthiness

Vicars are in the focal point of the leadership. The office has strong positional power to exert influence, but the actor can make it visible and distinctive through trustworthy behavior and discourse. Influence will be not only be executed through the legitimate power but also through professional and relational competence. All the senior leaders in this study sample had attended strategic management courses because few had competence in strategic management and strategic leadership. The course made senior leaders more capable of undertaking their responsibility for changes. Thus, the process of change enhanced networking and learning.

Yes, therefore, the one who uses a lot of power has a lot of trust. It’s a definite thing that, if you’re a trusted person in fame, you can deal. If you lose trust, then you have fewer possibilities to influence (H5).

The Church Law and Order loads a lot expectations on the vicar. The role of the vicar is exceedingly strong in terms of the legal background. In the past, management was different, less personal trust-based, as more formal and authoritative. The Church’s management culture has been authoritarian and based on legal order. They are useful on the one hand. They give the tools. But, on the other hand, they will be detrimental if the change of management culture is sought to move in a more interactive direction (H4).

Previously, the vicar was more of an institution with exceptional power, however, with limitations. The following statements express vicars’ feelings about the current leadership.

I came across the pattern that someone else bought players for me, and I can’t change them. It was the first one, perhaps not a knockout... The big question in leadership is how I get the best out of this crowd, which someone else has acquired. And this is perhaps the biggest challenge in leadership (H5).

Currently, the management is very different. This is like corporate management, compared to a single unit of leadership... This has been a long process, and there have been different types of management and administrative models. Originally, we started moving with a regional structure... But it was discovered that it brought no benefits... There was a shift to a working area model when we moved away from old ways of doing things, and the whole congregation was conceived holistically from the working area’s point of view. In that case, the model changed substantially to the extent that we got an intermediate administration. That is, each working area has an immediate supervisor (H4).

The management of change was expressed as being a sensitive issue. Change from the previous model to a new one has been challenging to the leadership process, as one interview noted: “the atmosphere is more intense than before.” When a vicar managed to show balanced transformational skills, she or he was seen as having the possibility to act based on the office and human and social skills. Combining transactional and transformational leadership was viewed as a powerful way to proceed.

Perhaps regionally, the Vicar holds the leadership. Yes, someone always leads. If the person who has the mandate to do so does not lead, yes, there is someone in the group...
who will lead it. That is also in the Church, if the Vicar does not use that power, then it is a Chaplain or other Church Pastor, or it is a Parish Council that takes the leadership in a certain way (H7).

The process of organizational development enhanced opinion generation and the selection of practical leadership steps. Thus, the strategic leadership possessed the ability to mobilize and sustain desired changes through relationships, that is, interactions regardless of a position or character. Consequently, the vicars acted as facilitators, and they showed commitment and local knowledge. As one interviewee stated: “when there is a strategy, it practically shows that its positive aspects and that is done with the right solutions, that’s what will happen, yes that confidence will grow just right away, considerably.” By doing so, the process was personalized, and mystification avoided. This kind of process supported self-efficacy, the belief that we will and can do it, which further developed leadership skills. By involving critical stakeholders and individual opinion leaders, the vicars took advantage of the critical mass of influence. Influencing was also founded in the missiological roots through linking arguments to the common mission. Social leaning had an additional value because changes are meant to continue into the future.

The possibilities to express opinions and to be part of meaningful work was noted as being encouraging. People need to have a voice. Participation, personal recognition, and consideration enhanced trust and confidence. Those who did not adapt to the new structure and leadership style left for another organization. The democratic governance form enabled trust development despite the disadvantages. The ability to hear all parties demands social competence and time. The vicar’s office sometimes prevented initiatives to possess the leadership, and the vicar’s power advanced confidence in the leadership instead.

Then, the Vicar is not allowed to abuse his position, but he must given room, for at Parish Council, a voice of the Church’s representation is at the heart of it. In this way, the relationship must be fruitful, so that it is possible to highlight the views of the Church’s members. Of course, in the field, the emergence of trust is not quite so straightforward. There are the general principles, justice, fairness, listening to everyone, and the democratic dimension. It is not the intention that all of them should become the Vicar’s rubber stamps. Thus, it is ideological (H4).

The Parish Union actively took part in designing the integration in an attempt to dominate. As a professional unit, it emphasized a managerial approach, such as a focus on finances and project management. Relational competence would have had positive influence on implementation and on future cooperation. Even so, the Parish Union did not have satisfactory knowledge about the spiritual dimension of the Church as a place of worship, and instead it emphasized a rational and normative approach. Thus, the leadership approach in this context becomes critical in relation to trust formation. A transformational leadership approach would have been able to communicate high expectations and to inspire people through motivation to be willing to commit to be part of a shared vision (Bass & Avalio, 1990). As a result, motivation to voluntarily get involved decreased. Perceived trustworthiness (Mayer et al., 1995) was also questioned, and trusting belief (perceived trustworthiness) suffered a setback. However, this aggressive approach fostered change more than the wait-and-see approach that seemed to be more common with a humanistic pastoral staff.
Trust is such that it can arise or not be born. When an officer has a specific position in the Parish Union, with him, we must deal with certain things, but there will be no such interaction with him. Take matters as a matter. But if there becomes interaction, then, how can I say, a person with whom confidence is created, then there is the possibility of thinking about alternatives. A person who is only officially minded with him alternatives will not be considered. You can put things in and take them forward or not (H5).

The Diocese supervises the pastoral staff by directing and counselling them. Because the counselling and directing functions are from the same source (the Bishop), deterrence is obvious. Apparently, the Bishop did not have enough time or order of importance to be in a natural relationship with dependents. One interviewee noted that “The less that is heard from the office the better.” There are signs of distrust or frustration as the statement indicates. The office produces mostly papers and instructions. The Bishop rarely gives personal consideration or counseling. However, there is occasional momentum for coincidental trust building. The problem is that prejudice is negative, despite the honoring of the Episcopal tradition. The Diocese’s professionalism was highly appreciated (4.33/5) on the grading scale of 1–5, even though relational trust was minimal. Thus, institutional trust was high but considered impersonal. Despite this criticism, people felt that the office behaved appropriately and responded quickly and professionally to requests.

The Church Council and the Diocese took the first action to integrate Parishes despite that an idea of integration was experienced as a negative and frustrating top-down approach. On the one hand, reasons were operational. On the other hand, integrations of two or more equally independent parishes would not have been voluntary. The change process focused primarily on governance forms and entities. However, when exerting leadership, there is a need to consider cultural issues. If the restructuring had been taken as an initiative of the Parish, opponents would have questioned motives. As one interview stated: “I do have a strong belief that, which has strengthened over the years, that decisions have been right… I understand that those solutions, with all those pains and discomforts, have finally been good… I understand that changes have been painful. It was such a big change that from church members’ perspective it takes one generation before we grow up into new.”

The Parish Council and Vicar’s office are the leading institutions. I see them in a sort of parallel. The office of the Vicar, as such, is a leading body in the Church, together with the Parish Council. So even when the Vicar is the chairman of the Parish Council, it is a very important principle as well. The unbroken relationship and that it is alright, it is the key to mutual trust. That is quite complex, because there are a number of different groups within the Parish Council which may have different endeavors and intentions (H4).

In the cases of distrust and conflict, the problem can be eliminated, if not prepared for, by easing its impact. Hence, new ways of doing things will be planned. Distrust is stressful, consumes persons, and finally leads to deep frustration. Vicars can build trust also by preaching and teaching from the pulpit. Still, a vicar is considered as a preacher and spiritual counselor. However, the most important is how a vicar is as a person. Relational competence is commonly emphasized, even though human capital cannot be underestimated.
Confidence is probably the result of what the Vicar is as a social person. How much he really keeps in touch with the congregation and how he is as a preacher (H6).

If there is distrust in somebody, the importance of it is eliminated. If any of these relationships do not work, it will give rise to another way of working or channel to do these things differently as far as possible. There is a part of that, or rather a fraction of it, that is not selectable. It will then lead to frustration if you cannot trust in a party (H4).

Vicars are quite alone even though they have number of stakeholders. Legitimate power gives possibilities to act, but nowadays, cooperation is more emphasized. However, the new middle management team has provided a good forum to generate ideas and create common priorities. The bishop remains distant and other offices are more matter-of-fact oriented. Consequently, personal contacts with other vicars, the Vicars’ Meeting, have become important, and even critical success factors. Such a situation demands high human and social capital, and strong professional identity to survive, that is, to have enough strength.

The work of the Vicar does not lead anyone, at least in… and does not think about anyone. All the time, different elements are brought up by different actors. The Bishop probably waits for the Vicar to present the ultimate things…. With the Vicar’s own input, this work is formed all the time (H6).

Well, the leadership culture has changed more with an example of leadership. When I emphasize the knowledge of substance, from the Vicar’s point of view it is easy, if you know the substance and the profession and manage things that are required from others (H3).

Today, there needs to be cooperation. That is a clear priority. Then, another is this management culture. The fact that authoritative management is over, the leader must be a travel mate... More and more we need one another (H5).

And the director is usually trusted that he bears responsibility and the power associated with it. And yes, in that way, it is associated that, when the director is trusted, it involves the responsibility and the power to use it for the working community and the task as it is provided, and not to try to exceed authorization. And there is also very strong confidence in that trust when he prepares the matter, and before he takes the decision and uses it, he interacts with the leaders and employees whom it is concerned about. So that one can rely on the fact that this decision, this solution, is considered, justifiable, and this power should be specifically used here (H11).

At first, the idea of integration was opposed at various levels despite the argued urgency and benefits. Initially, the rumor of integrating an independent parish created significant resistance because integration would affect traditional independence. However, people had the chance to address concerns openly in common meetings. The representatives from the Diocese, together with the Vicar, encouraged innovation, that is, to freely discuss and try to see good things in the proposed change. The aim of open discourse was to create a culture of empowerment through appreciation despite opposing opinions.
The leadership attempted to raise consciousness in its opponents and to get them to transcend their own interests for the sake of others. That was very hard because the opponents had, according to their understanding, theological, practical, and social reasons to resist the idea. The opponents were unified against the idea and developed relevant arguments. In a big church, people are far from the leadership and vice versa. Hence, such a church does not have a known face and a counterpart. According to the opponents to the leadership, that is, pastoral leadership, leadership must be closer to the congregation. The integration may distance the pastoral leadership from members even more. The Church is not for money: it is all about people (cf., customer orientation). Top-down decisions changed the opponents’ thinking and, as a result, defeated their emotion.

Well, yes, it was this top-down decision that changed my thoughts. When it is democratically done, then I see no other options... I tried to see the good sides in it. Well, yes, it was a feeling that I wanted to continue in a small congregation. And then the change... that I went into this submission, were the facts... They defeated our emotion for change (H1).

The Bishop offered support to the vicars, effectively arguing for the plan by presenting theological, operational, and financial reasons. That helped others to understand that the change was not against ideological principles. In this way, the Bishop and the office supported the Vicar in promoting integration and empowered and nurtured the leadership and employees through exhibiting professional competence and pastoral leadership. The involvement was seen as positively building trust. Here, trust was based on strategic competence, relational competence, and dedication to the common concerns. Despite opposing opinions, the parties had the same goal to accomplish but different emphases. Due to interaction and open discourse, the most important outcomes of the approach as a learning process created a basis for a successful strategy building process. The leadership set the ground rules not to harm and to lay off anybody due to the integration. In addition, they encouraged free and open discourse, assuring that everybody would be listened to and there would be tolerance of opposing viewpoints.

One important reason why the change was successful was leaders’ relational competence and legitimate and professional ties. The Vicar has a powerful position and close relationship with members and employees, including the Parish Council and Board. More important, the vicars had a long working history in different positions and a wide understanding about the Church as an organization. That was considered by most as an advantage in trust formation. According to the study data, the vicars had been in the office 9.4 years, on average, and averaged 55 years-of-age. Therefore, they had initiated various changes and had obtained not only competence but also relational ties with different stakeholders. The vicars’ professional leadership resulted in confidence in the Church among parties and trust within the organization. It became obvious that the vicars did not have their own agendas and interests.

I personally have a very strong view myself, that there is no personal interest in this. I’m doing work here for the Church (H11).

Trust in people and confidence in the Church were pivotal. The management system gave parties authority and roles to act, as well as legitimate power to perform strategic
changes. The democratic process gave the working community, councils, and boards the opportunity to express their own opinions and participate in decision-making. That created the feeling of being part of the decision-making and evoked meaningfulness. Thus, the process gradually built a sense of ownership. However, strategic leadership at the church level has been divided into various units, and thus, it is experienced as uninspiring.

But these are the elements of the administration that the Church of Finland has desired to hold, specifically the Bishop…. This leadership is, in a way, derived from so many parts, a multitude, there are the secular and spiritual. The good thing is that changing people does not really mean a crisis of leadership. But, there is a danger of distributed leadership, that is, nobody will lead when the leadership is in many places (H6).

As one interviewee remarked, the vicars’ commitment and impartiality encouraged stakeholders to act for common goals and create networks to succeed in integration. From the management point of view, each integration was distinctive and not reproducible. Leadership is an ability to exert leadership influence in variable situations and contexts – that is, it is the capacity for change. The ability to influence strengthens the sense of professional identity and the sense of self-efficacy. Despite these clear roles and responsibilities, the current situation does not provide enough possibilities to develop the system in the short run. Therefore, the senior leaders have voluntarily surrendered to impossibilities and seek other ways to proceed with initiatives. The management and administration continue to grow, so there is a risk that the focus will turn further inwards. Yet, the vicars’ exceptional power to execute leadership is positive despite its risks. In such cases, there is the risk of chaos because there may not be a first mover, as individualistic culture in professional bureaucracy is a complex phenomenon.

The risk factor was obvious when selecting group members while attempting to avoid harming the functionality of the original groups. Each group may have a relationship with representative subgroups. The Church, as a traditional, hierarchical, and professional organization, has a tendency to be a wait-and-see organization rather than a proactive one. In the case of proactivity, the Church is then slow in taking any action. Thus, slowness is a more dominant characteristic of the Church, more so than innovativeness. The professional organization directs employees’ attention by rules and orders, but the ideological organization captures employees’ hearts by shared values (Mintzberg, 1989). Thus, turning inwards risks the ideological origin of the Church by placing more stress orders and instructions.

The reformist Church should focus on innovation instead of phasing out the fundamentals of the Church. “We are, however, the Church, not a sport club,” as one interviewee put it. Due to cultural hindrances, we need to question whether the Church should exploit an individualistic working culture to be more passion and calling oriented. The vicars emphasized a common approach to change by developing a coherent image and encouraging confidence in actors and the Church. Change has increased uncertainty and fears about the future. Managerial reasoning has not helped, but the vicars’ social competence and inspirational motivation (e.g., Bass et al., 1990) have empowered successful interaction. The Parish Union is experienced at being aggressive in generating changes, but it does not know well enough the spiritual nature of Church. The Bishop, together with the Vicar, have promoted integration, thus showing that people can have confidence in the Church. Also, they extended the
trust definition in peoples’ minds about a third party, in the study that is the Bishop (cf., McEvily et al., 2004). That is an even more important point of view because the pastoral staff represents a servant leadership approach. Servant leadership does not refer to a position of power but rather to a special kind of service. According to Meng (2016), citing Greenleaf (1977, 1978), inner spirit, trust, service above self-interest, together with effective listening, form the framework for servant leadership. That is a key to successful leadership. Regarding trust in the Church, it does not only refer to the purpose, organizational systems, and personal relationships, but also to how it corresponds to one’s subjective needs and desires of being meaningful. Table 5 enumerates the issues concerning emerging organizational trust and, in turn, senior leaders’ trust in an organization, as well as the counterforces to trust development.

Intrinsic motivation is autonomy, competence, and self-efficacy. Working for a meaningful purpose creates a feeling of competence, ownership, and relatedness in intrinsically motivating work (Meng, 2016, 4). Meng specified the two essential elements of spirituality: 1) transcendence of self-manifesting a sense of calling or destiny, and 2) belief that one’s activities have a meaning and value beyond economic value and self-gratitude. Nevertheless, inspirational motivation (Bass & Avalio, 1990) is more than solely extrinsic motivation. I suppose that it is rather intrinsic as it is based on spirituality per se. Prayer and contemplation develop a leader’s inner life and spiritual experience of being a part of something bigger and, particularly, one’s own well-being.

Trustworthiness includes integrity and benevolence (Mayer et al., 1995). Collegial friendships foster trust through knowing someone you can trust. Sharing of knowledge and experiences advanced the trust building among the vicars, such as the Vicars’ Meeting. Here, the vicars’ collegial integrity and benevolence were essential. The vicars’ mediatory role in change management also helped trust building as a role model or a social architect. From the transactional leadership perspective, the role model and social architect must have high moral values and a self-determined sense of identity (e.g., Northouse, 2013). In this way, they help to shape the meaning of the organization. Moreover, a social architect uses relational competence in creating relationships for advancing initiatives. From the senior leadership’s perspective, critical for reinforcing the belief in trust is the perceived trustworthiness of strategists, perceived servant leadership practices, and institutional trust. Consequently, strategic leadership exerts its influence through inspirational motivation (Bass & Avalio, 1990) enhancing a sense of communality and trust in beliefs.
Table 5. Group level referents of emerging organizational trust and, in turn, the senior leaders’ trust in an organization through exerting leadership influence and fostering trustworthiness, and the counterforces to trust development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXERT LEADERSHIP INFLUENCE – FOSTER TRUSTWORTHINESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REFERENT – CONSEQUENCES OF TRUST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Bishop possesses authority towards the Parish – possibilities to exert spiritual leadership and power of trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Diocese has high technical competence and responds rapidly to requests – institutional trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Parish Union balances the workload of the Parish due to its special competencies – trust in future cooperation providing that it supports the work and is cost-effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Parish is independent and hence has local knowledge – locality enhances trust through membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Vicars have wide experience in Church leadership and personal contacts – relational competence and networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Vicars have the power to lead the Parish – personal dedication to the mission, and leadership through inspirational motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “As vicars, we do not seek our own, but the common good of the community” – service leadership enhances trusting in beliefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>⇒ Strategic leadership exerts leadership influence and, through inspirational motivation, enhances a sense of communality and trusting in beliefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTERFORCES – CONSEQUENCES OF DISTRUST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Bishops’ Meeting has many opinions – but there is not an opinion leader or sometimes leader at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Officers of the Church Council can use exceptional power through decision-making and proposal statements – causes frustration among senior leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Bishop seldom contacts vicars and even then, on minor matters – not personal consideration. The Bishop is distant and official – the role is limited and the meaning minimal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The upper management focuses on administration and structures – trust finally reaches the attitude of “Who cares?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Parish Union uses managerial power and approaches to church ministries just like for-profits – value imbalance leads to distrust and frustration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Relational competence is poor at the Parish Union – officers stress management and money</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Vicars have a huge workload, that is, a high focus on strategic issues instead of pastoral duties and leadership – an increasing well-being issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Minority groups’ agendas cause tension and suspicion – the result is distrust</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.1.4 Enhancing participation releases potential

Enhancing participation will be one of the most important strategic leadership actions for competing in the future. Next, I highlight members, staffs, and senior leaders’ viewpoints. Active participation in working for common goals, participating in developing a working culture, and particularly promoting volunteer work through ministries are critical success factors. However, interaction does not necessarily mean participation and vice versa. Participation enhances the feeling of being meaningful and useful. Consequently, it reveals an individual’s potential and well-being.

From the members’ point of view, participation in the mission is critical. At the same time, the Church considers volunteering as a resource. Creativity and passion are required to be of service for making people feel better about themselves and their contributions to the greater common good. It is not only meaningfulness in the
members’ lives and motivation to be of service, but also meaningfulness for the Church per se. Thus, various parties’ interests are diverse, but ultimately connected. People want to live life in a more meaningful manner, using their innate and developed potential. The Church wants to deploy volunteers as its activities cannot only be based on the work of paid staff. This is a paradigmatic shift as volunteering is even closer to the original idea of the Church.

Should... we reach the point that the Church members could be able to take genuine responsibility for a wide range of issues. Not just to collect offerings in the mass, but for the whole congregation and the Church’s work. It is the only possible outlook in the future that the Church would be meaningful. In these times, we are still able to run the Church in such a way even though there in not any voluntary congregation in attendance at all. Yes, we’ll manage the job alone. But then it doesn’t exactly match the original meaning of the Church (H2).

Employed staff will most likely defend their own jobs. At the same time, there are number of willing and capable volunteers to serve in the ministries. Currently, the system has blocked them out because pastoral ministries can be done only by clerical staff. Thus, this implies that they are not needed or worthy, and this increases distrust in the system. Practical tasks do not satisfy competent and active volunteers who have a passion for the Church. Currently, participation happens through councils and boards and, to some extent, through other kinds of volunteerism. Those activities however only concern a limited number of people. Members of the Council or Board can have a voice, but passive members do not have a voice. Hence, staff must be in close interaction with them to understand the Church from their point of view. Organized meetings for hearing them are not effective because most participants are the same as usual. Members who do not belong to the in-group are at greater risk to give notice from membership because their needs are not met.

Of course, listening to the Church members would be important. But, this consultation does not really succeed in organizing opportunities and events. If so, there will then be those who do not represent the majority. The majority is passive and quiet and ignores the church. On the other hand, the contact and the ability of a Church worker to realize what time we live in and what members think, that is, of course, the essential thing (H6).

The leadership is too far away from people to understand their lives. Availability of pastoral staff becomes an issue because “members expect that pastoral staff is visible and available” (H6). The Church is regarded as being removed from people’ lives and needs. Integration of churches into bigger units have made this even worse. Currently, in the East and the South, the growing churches have formed small cells on demand to enable closer relationships, and by doing so, they have enabled personal involvement. The Church did the opposite.

The majority of young people attend the confirmation school. The school has been praised and given credit for this. However, there is a question about where young people disappear to after confirmation. It seems that the school does not manage to confirm Christian faith in the proper way. In business, there is a saying that a lost customer is more difficult and expensive to get back. It may apply here as well. The Church is a community speaking about God’s purpose for our life. Trust in the Church
will be developed through meeting members’ expectations of a meaningful life. Thus, the full potential will be released.

I have tried to ask what kind education is at confirmation school. It is glorified and praised. But then, the crowd fades in a few years... A child’s faith can be taught in a way. But when it comes to the critical time of adulthood, then it is thought of as the nonsense it was and does not get into the thoughts of adulthood (H12).

We are a community that wants to talk about God and help people to love one another. That we would believe in God, love each other and take responsibility for nature. This is the vision of the Church, said a little differently in different places. This is what everyone is trying to do (H9).

I imagine that the basic trust is built, however, that the Church work strives to meet people’s fundamental needs, religious needs, the needs of children’s upbringing, etc., the longing for aesthetics, the longing for harmony (H6).

There seems to be an endeavor to live life more fully through the work people participate in. That may be related to an individual calling and the motivation to work for people. Trust in people and confidence in the Church are also related beyond the human dimension and move towards spirituality. In fact, many customer-oriented operations are managed successfully by volunteers. Assessment of the Church can be captured by the following statement: “Truly I [Jesus] tell you, whatever you did for one of the least of these brothers and sisters of mine, you did for me.”

In this lonely City... the geriatrician said, “You do not know how good the preventative work you do when someone can eat once a week in good company that you do not need seven days to eat alone.” It is run solely by volunteers. And uh, these are... the ones that the Church should invest in more in the future. And, the fact that we are valued by those people who give us time, as well (H5).

From the staff’s perspective it is important that tasks and roles, as well as interdependent relationships are well determined. However, such interaction is not self-evident, despite the system, and so one of the most important actions has been to enable participation and persuade others to cooperate to achieve common goals. People need one another on a regular basis, not only coworkers but also networks, while working for shared interests. The origin of the mission calls and directs for working together.

Yes, trust is a very fundamental aspect of today’s work and leadership. Church work is an expert in work, that is, skilled professional work. It is done with people. A top-down management is not enough alone. Thus, the authority is also positive. Regulations can also be clear and very necessary (H4).

At first, the integrations of local churches were initiated at the upper level. However, soon, senior leadership recognized the importance of participation. Some people were invited to join project teams because of their position or professional competence. These teams formed a kind of community whereby members not only felt they were part of something bigger but also felt they were being appreciated. Consequently, initial trust emerged, based on roles and assignments. The more one had possibilities to be part of a process and work in a group, the more trust emerged. As a result, people decided to trust despite their negative initial experiences.
Advantages of these groups and activities were diverse. People felt good receiving personal recognition and consideration. The most empowering factor was, however, a sense of meaningfulness which, in turn, provided opportunities to grow through learning and to contribute to the community. People had to cope with stress and productivity, not underestimation of motivational aspects. The managerial leadership approach may have enabled and, hence, caused voluntary surrendering to impossibilities.

*Perhaps one thing that comes from a certain type of fear, perhaps not fear, but a lack of motivation, is that it is given so top-down, that we have nothing to do with this. Then, a certain fear of change is how this familiar and safe job changes. There is always fear, if the work is being inflated (H7).*

*The more the oneself has been let participate in the thing the better attitude the one has towards the Church. If the strategy paper comes from the top, then the commitment to change is much smaller. But, if we are ourselves to work together on a strategy, then we will be much more committed to change, and we are prepared to take it and do it for the cause (H7).*

Individual working cultures can disrupt interaction and participation. In fact, none of the interviewees were able to see the situation being holistic, but instead employees acted only from their calling and work point of view. Pastoral work is based on personal and distinctive calling, and individualistic culture is grounded beyond the human to the spiritual reality. People tend to do work from their own origins and based on their personal or professional strengths. Leadership and self-development evolve from themselves or spirituality. That creates a leadership challenge about how to integrate internal passion to external motivational factors to foster collaboration. Understanding this dilemma demands an open attitude and willingness to voluntarily be interdependent with others, particularly with the leadership. When rumors about integrations started, people focused on their own work, defending the importance of their own roles. First, reluctance and fear added tension, but personal consideration and inspirational motivation rescued them from dead ends. Through interactive processes such as strategy work, people began to understand the meaning of interaction. The middle management teams added positive support for change.

*Yes, people are at least according to studies, especially in Church work quite individualists.… People have a big tendency to choose the kind of work they feel good about. And, it is so that, as a leader, we must strive as clearly as possible to say what are the basic tasks, what are the key issues, and what is secondary. And, they need to know a little about according to what they will be evaluated (H11).*

From the senior leaders’ perspective not only empowerment of the whole community for the mission but also senior leaders’ well-being is critical. Senior leaders’ trust and confidence were found to be based on factors such as trustworthiness, spirituality, image, professionalism, the systems, and the mission. Hence, trust leadership cannot only be defined as an axiomatic phenomenon. Media and particularly the “Divorce from the Church” movement have propagated negativity. In addition, the Church has communicated inconsistently, and this has harmed its image seriously.
Leadership is formed about so many areas that one cannot think so much that it will ever be a pure interaction. There must always be a structure and rules for decision-making. We always must talk, but at some point, we are must take the decision and the one must have the power to take the decision. If you think about trust’s point of view, it depends so much on things. There are so many things that need to be decided whether you trust people or not. All leadership does not appear to be on the trust axis (H4).

A certain number of controls must be in accordance with regulations. But then there must also be plenty of freedom to achieve the targets that are there. I have tried to say to workers that... mistakes can be made and the one will not be lifted on the wall, but the one must learn from mistakes. The first is that, if the control is very strong, it will take away creativity. Then, the one must all the time to look at how you are doing this control. If there is room to do things, however, according to common rules, it allows you to do creative things (H12).

...I once said from the pulpit that, if my image of the Church and the teaching is as a freethinker thinks, I would not be here either. It is so absolute nonsense. Thus, distrust is extremely deep (H2).

In a church context, people are also interested in power and advancement of their own interests. Attempts to sensitize their consciousness and get them to see beyond their own interests was noted as having the utmost importance. Vicars’ exceptional power is an eventually positive and very balancing factor. Despite its possible negative aspects, it was considered empowering. Then, its legitimate position reduces need to address personal interests. This position has not been questioned which, in turn, has helped vicars to tolerate opposing viewpoints and use the power of pastoral and management talk.

It is said that the Vicar has an incredibly strong position in the Church, that it is easy for me to be without personal interests. A worker does not have such a strong position; thus, the one is more dependent on what is decided on his or her behalf or with others. Then, of course, there will be personal interests.... I’m doing work here for the Church. Thus, I don’t have such personal interests that something should go according to a certain way ... But, it must go because it is sought by the interests of the Church and the achievement of the mission (H12).

The true power regarding the relationship with the Church, that is just the power of the word. And that if the message of the Church reaches man in a meaningful way, then it can have real power over the people. Otherwise, everything that the Vicar has, it is internal organizational power, the arrangement of tasks (H1).

The senior leaders studied here have acted as catalysts for change and contributed to change through developing organizational capacity for change and particularly taking care of their own capacities. Some people aim to utilize the participatory approach by advancing their own agendas. I discovered that these vicars have the ability to realize their own resources to cope with strategic leadership challenges, and the spiritual desire to fulfill the purpose of their own life and that of the Church. Vicars, before being elected through a vote, have gone through an extensive training program, and many have experience in various leadership positions.
In such a large working community, we cannot imagine a situation in which leadership would not be interested. There is at least one of the employees and then someone in the lay group who challenges. If the Vicar does not do it, then confidence will be eroded. Then, from a personal point of view, faith is a life permeable factor. Faith is not knowing nor is it a mere fact of keeping, but a gift. In this sector, the one lives from confidence, trust in direction. That eventually this project is not human, but of God. Here we are on the side of a servant. The idea of service leadership is the ideal leadership model for a vicar’s leadership ideal (H8).

In addition to its interests and motives, participation was shadowed by a misunderstanding of spiritual dimension. Likewise, the Parish Union did not experience spirituality as a directive principle. That caused problems in interaction and in setting priorities. Continuous tensions created distrust or desire to avoid further cooperation, if possible. Vicars dealt all the time with pastoral issues.

Tensions arise above all about how the Parish Union does not have contact or relationship with the Church communality. It really affects everything. It affects the theological side because pastoral leadership lives constantly in contact with the word and the sacraments and in the relationship with Christians. The perspective and theology are shaped from that perspective. We are with Christ all the time. Here and then, we again, the church members, have the advantage that the Parish Union is somehow disconnected from this connection and therefore it is seen on how they reason and underestimate theological principles (H4).

Vicars follow the same leadership principles as other leaders. Common leadership and management principles can be applied deliberately in this context. They must help people to change, create change, create a vision, and be social architects. Furthermore, the leaders’ own spiritual life makes the difference, that is, it helps them to have enough strength. The pastoral dimension adds something extra to servant leadership and self-motivation through prayers. Thus, spirituality, for example, prayer and faith, can be added to the leadership tool kit.

I would say that, if we believe that God has created all people and has given them all the senses, then the Vicar has received no more than the ordinary leader. We rely on the same gifts as any other leader. But, if you consider the issue from another perspective, the perspective of motivation regarding the vicar’s own work, it may be that the dimension of faith has some positive aspects of motivation or endurance (H3).

Of course, that in a way... all the time we are dealing with sacred affairs, dealing with the core mission of the Church. In that way, we are receiving an extra. Extras come in prayer. That’s where I get, that’s where I can clear myself out in prayer with God (H6).

Well, the faith gives according as... the extra, that it is the mainstay of all the work. It’s not so when, if you don’t believe and trust in God, then it’s useless to be a vicar (H7).

Senior leaders took advantage of sharing the workload with the management team by their sharing pastoral work (spiritual work) with them. Consequently, they moved further away from members, and so interaction with them became coincidental.
Trustworthiness is critical from the leadership and pastoral points of view, and this affects confidence in the Church.

The work must be inspiring. Then it gives a kind of energy. And it, praying done is half done. People see that this is a spiritual task. This is not just any organization providing humanist help, but our mission is to lead people to the inner knowledge of Christ (H5).

The Vicar must therefore be credible. Credibility inspires trust. But, if the impression arises that the Vicar is indifferent to what is believed, he seeks to withdraw to background when the question turns to the questions of faith. Our mission opens in the Bible, at the behest of the mission (H8).

Vicars have a special forum, the Vicars´ Meeting, which was noted by the interviewees as being very empowering. All the participants represent the priesthood. At the meeting, common issues and plans are shared. More important, however, is the spiritual and collegial encouragement which enhances collegial trust. The following statement describes the collegial trust and the possibility to be empowered on a daily basis.

Yes, I think we all have our own friends among that group. And anyway, having long been a priest, there have been a few colleagues on the way whom I want to keep in touch with, who are, in a way, the supporting people in every life situation. For some, confidence is so great that it is then that the one who opens the deepest heart, not many of such can be (H10).

Finally, from a strategic leadership perspective, not only employees’ participation but also specifically members’ participation have become key success factors for competing in the future. Until now, the Church has been managed by the employed staff, and only limited activities are handled by a few volunteers. People at all levels need personal consideration and maintenance of their own well-being. And, individualistic working culture and personal interests hinder participatory contribution. In addition, members perceived the meaningfulness of the greater good as pivotal for membership in the Church. Members need possibilities to feel they are being needed and meaningful. The Parish Council and Boards satisfy only a limited number of people, mainly those with professional and political points of view (self-interests). So, the most genuine participation is the kind that satisfies a desire to be of service to other humans. Consequently, strategic leadership can enhance participation through individual consideration (Bass & Avalio, 1990) and advance a sense of well-being and meaningfulness. Doing so, the senior leadership enhances members’ skills, connects them to others, and helps them to reach their full potential (Garcia-Zamor, 2003). Senior leadership’s spirituality influences organizational spirituality and well-being. Table 6 displays the issues in respect to emerging trust through enhancing participation and the counterforces to trust development.
Table 6. Individual level referents of emerging organizational trust and, in turn, the senior leaders’ trust in an organization through promoting participation and releasing potential, and the counterforces to trust development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENHANCE PARTICIPATION – RELEASE POTENTIAL</th>
<th>COUNTERFORCES – CONSEQUENCES OF DISTRUST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REFERENT – CONSEQUENCES OF TRUST</strong></td>
<td><strong>COUNTERFORCES – CONSEQUENCES OF DISTRUST</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mission and common vision – directs working together and advances participatory leadership, whereby all are treated equally</td>
<td>• Individualistic working culture satisfies own interests and emphases - hinders cooperation and effective leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Volunteers seek meaning in life, but the Church sees volunteers as resources – win-win situation if realized as it originates from the Bible</td>
<td>• Willingness to go among people is not very strong among pastoral staff – trusting intention, that is, the willingness to be vulnerable and take risks is weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Volunteers’ activities will be based on good governance – principles of leadership highlight trustworthy behavior and visibility and support well-being and workplace spirituality</td>
<td>• People are interested in religion but not necessarily in the same way as the Church teaches – secular spirituality dispels faith in divine spirituality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Members do not belong to an in-group, and hence feel they are not worthy and so disappear – they are at risk of terminating their membership</td>
<td>• Parish Union tends to work on its own – using managerial tools and less relational competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Free communication atmosphere – safe environment for contradicting opinions and views</td>
<td>• People would like to participate in some activity, and hence engage in the mission – but currently cannot use their full potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Vicars have strong position – they can execute leadership capacity and use the power of pastoral and management talk</td>
<td>• Vicars’ work depends solely on a person’s capacity - well-being impacts trustworthy behavior (survival) whereby empowerment of the Vicars’ Meeting is important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Every person brings their own innate human spirituality to the place of work – the desires not only to be of service for the community but also beyond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>⇔ Strategic leadership enhances participation through individual consideration and advances a sense of well-being and meaningfulness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.1.5 Conclusion

The crossover themes concerning strategic leadership practices (input) that are incorporated with trust produce organizational trust (output) and, in turn, senior leaders’ trust in an organization. These themes highlight practices such as 1) empowering mission – sent for purpose, 2) developing organizational system – enabling interdependence, 3) exerting leadership influence – enhancing trustworthiness, and 4) enhancing participation – releasing potential (Figure 8, #1). These themes became the key success factors for any organization. The referents (targets) of trust related to activities have been summarized in the Tables 3–6.

Foremost, this study highlights the mission and participation, particularly members’ participation, functionality, and quality contextual leadership. The case organization however has failed in communicating the mission and in involving members in
activities. As a result, neither people nor the Church quite believe in its message despite the Church having the best product and spiritual origin of the mission. The inherited organizational system has hindered development and has caused frustration and voluntary surrendering to develop the system per se. However, there is hope because “God is with us, and finally the work is His business,” as one participant noted. Thus, at a strategic level, senior leadership can empower the mission and, through its idealized influence and inspirational motivation, instill a sense of meaningfulness and purpose through communicated goals and values and a shared sense of purpose. At an organizational level, the senior leadership can develop an organizational system and, by means of intellectual stimulation, interconnectedness, and functionality, challenge the old ways of thinking and encourage different perspectives. Further, the senior leaders can exert their leadership influence, and through inspirational motivation, encourage a sense of communality and trustworthiness. Finally, they can promote participation through individual consideration and consequently advance a sense of well-being and meaningfulness.

Considering the above, it is obvious that leadership capacities are in focus. According to the study the data and analysis, strategic leadership capacities to learn, to change, and to gain managerial wisdom (cf., Boal & Hooijberg, 2001) are not satisfactory in the end. Thus, I propose that the capacity for empowering the mission and for driving innovation should be added to the concept of strategic leadership capacities. The mission plays more of a pivotal role in an NPO, specifically in the church setting, than in a for-profit organization. In a nonprofit setting, the mission is usually established by an authoritative body, but in a for-profit setting, an organization can create its own mission on demand. Thus, this study proves the importance of standing for the mission because that is the characteristic and special driving force of an NPO (cf., Mintzberg, 1989; Kaplan & Norton, 2004). Further innovation becomes critical due to the impossibility to develop the organization fast enough in a turbulent environment. Phipps and Burbach (2010) have given some support for this idea in a nonprofit setting. This study further supports this and shows that these ideas are even more justifiable in the church setting.

If we can understand the conditions, antecedents, and processes determining trust, we can have an influence through activities and practices on trust development (cf., McKnight et al., 2006). Thus, senior leadership activities in developing trust are strategic endeavors. As the result of the study, I have been able to create a circular and cascadable process of trust development from the senior leadership perspective (Figure 8, #2 and #3). Previously, I defined the strategic as the most important issue in achieving the mission. The process starts from the mission cascading down, mission-down, and then proceeding via enhanced participation and finally cascading up, potential-up, and back on issue-based approach (Tables 3–6 in the report). The approach stresses strategic activities and practices as drivers of trust at different levels of an organization. Thus, the mission-down process creates a context for intentional activities for building trust at these levels. Consequently, the mission permeates the strategic leadership process not only as a strategic concept but also through its ideological origin. As such, the mission characterizes the nonprofit setting and is a special driving force in nonprofits.

Individuals have potential that should be released. Thus, the potential-up process highlights the enhancement of potential though leadership styles and leadership capacities. Concurrently, individual and organizational potential evoke perceived meaningfulness and, as a result, drive individual and organizational performance.
Trust will appear differently across the various levels: trusting intention at the individual level, trusting belief at the group level, trusting stance at the organizational level, and trusting faith at the strategic level. Trust is considered as being relational, as well as being limited only to interpersonal and dyadic matters (e.g., Mayer et al., 1995). This study and my proposal provide an extension to strategic leadership theory for building trust through mission-down and potential-up and for revitalizing the crossover themes in the contextual setting. The practices and antecedents of the study are basically context- and situation-specific.

5.2 SENIOR LEADERS’ PERCEIVED TRUST BY LEVELS

Despite the fact that trust research has focused mostly on the individual level, trust occurs also at the individual, group, and organizational levels (Kramer, 2006). Thus, it is important to explore if antecedents, unique at one level, are also applicable at the other levels, and particularly from the senior leadership’s perspective. Consequently, we must determine how senior leaders perceive emerging trust at multiple levels and how this will be revealed through multilevel analysis. The multilevel analysis deepens our understanding about trust at a level and trust in a referent. There are three referents at each level: trust in interpersonal, trust in team, and trust in an organization (Fulmer & Gelfand, 2012). Referent refers to the target of trust, such as the trustee or the trustor. In addition to the typical three levels, I have added one more level, the strategic level, thus highlighting the importance of the value-added system and agency and principal perspectives. Accordingly, trust at an individual level refers to one’s degree of trust. Thus, the higher the level, the more the trust refers to the degree of collectively shared trust (Tables 7–10 and Appendix 2.).

Interpersonal trust is in a specific target, while generalized trust (disposition, propensity) is about people in general (e.g., Mayer et al., 1995; Fulmer & Gelfand, 2012). Accordingly, team trust and group trust referents refer to trust in a collectivity of interdependent people. Further, an organizational referent refers to trust in an entity. Consistently, employees may have different needs than senior leadership or an organization (Fulmer & Gelfand, 2012). Accordingly, I propose that strategic referents refer to the top management and the corporate strategy. According to previous research, positive expectations and willingness to accept vulnerability occur across referents and levels (Mayer et al., 1995; Fulmer & Gelfand, 2012). Hardin (2002) noted that, if perceived trust is relational, then relationships and interactions with people, institutions, and third parties form a kind of relationship.

Jones and Shah (2016) and Alarcon et al. (2018) have proposed trust process using three concepts: trusting intention (e.g., willingness to be vulnerable; see also Mayer et al., 1995), trusting belief (e.g., perceived trustworthiness; see also Mayer et al., 1995), and trusting action (e.g., behaviors that demonstrate a reliance on others (cf., trusting stance; McKnight et al. 2006). Similarly, the model of Fulmer and Gelfand (2018) emphasized trust in another, influence on a party from disposition at the individual level, history at the relational level to norms at the network level, and values at the institutional and societal levels. Accordingly, with the fourth level, the strategic level, I have added the concept of trusting faith to highlight the willingness to rely on an existential value-added system, that is, the corporate mission and purpose. Having introduced these points of view, I next introduce trust at the level of specific referents. The results are summarized in Tables 7–10. In these tables, the categories of
antecedents are listed in the top row and levels and the referents of trust are shown in the left column. The referents are the same at all levels, such as trust in interpersonal, trust in team, and trust in organization.

5.2.1 Individual level antecedents and referents – trusting intention

First, I introduce the findings of individual (level) trust in an interpersonal referent. The individual perspective is important not only because, in this case, the individual is the one who runs the organization and provides the services, and the current working culture is individualistic, but also because the societal culture is becoming more individualistic. The trusting intention requires the willingness to be vulnerable to another (Mayer et al., 1995). Accordingly, there is safe attachment to the other whereby the parties are willing to interact and work together. Thus, the exchange is in a balance between one’s own input and received output (cf., social exchange; Blau, 1964). Social relationships stress not only voluntary and economic interactions but also psychological contracts between people. Vulnerability has been linked to the termination of relationships (e.g., Fulmer & Gelfand, 2012). Individuals weigh value and dynamism in the long run based on previous performance. In such cases, members can participate, but the system is not participatory. Thus, limited participation in the mission erodes its vitality, and its sense of meaning and worthiness become less important. Further, individuals process information, their own identity, and their role in a relationship (Salancik & Pfeffer, 1978; Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Thus, people must assess their own and others’ trusting intention to be willing and identify this. On one hand, this refers to self-trust and, on the other hand, to others’ perceived built-in disposition to trust (cf., Mayer et al., 1995).

Having introduced the trustor’s characteristics, next I review the trustee’s characteristics, that is, individual trust in an interpersonal referent. Propensity to trust has been found to influence trustworthiness (perceived ability, benevolence, and integrity). Mayer and colleagues (1995) divided character into two components: benevolence (synonymous with loyalty, openness, caring, and supportiveness) and integrity (synonymous with fairness, justice, consistency, and promise fulfilment). Benevolence is the extent to which one wants to do good without a profit motive. In addition, intentions and motivations are critical to trust (Cook & Wall, 1980) which can be understood in a wider context than the orientation to the other. Thus, individual support and consideration are critical whereby confidential encounters and discussions (with time and room for discussion) are important. Consequently, ethical behavior and leadership style (e.g., consistent decisions, objectivity, and consideration) become critical antecedents. Accordingly, shared characteristics, including value congruence (e.g., respect, equality, altruism, and loyalty) and ethical behavior and justice, which determine future relationships and cooperation (also based on previous knowledge), are important in interpersonal trust at this level.

The communication process was found to be an important antecedent. Also, the courage to take difficult issues under consideration and discussion was considered to be critical. Similarly, transparent and open discourses, without fear of becoming stigmatized, together with information sharing (documents and arguments), were emphasized. This underlined the need to manage feelings and emotions. Indeed, a leader must act as a social architect, handling emotions, feelings, and the possible risk of stigmatization. Structures (characteristic) link people and tasks to specific
groups. People may drive their own agendas which affects the degree of trust. Further, officers must cooperate with officers without a perceived relationship. Thus, trust is more a form of cooperation if there is no possibility to eliminate the interaction through shortcuts. Consequently, senior leaders must cooperate, just based on trusting intention, because in their position, they cannot choose whether to cooperate or not. However, with strangers, it is better to be initially cautious until there is evidence of trustworthiness (Rotter, 1967).

The case determined a number of specific organizational characteristics that promote a sense of well-being and meaningfulness as trust antecedents. The organizational atmosphere is an important antecedent wherein members can experience autonomy, support, rewards, and well justified expectations, and wherein different opinions do not impact future cooperation. Because this study was from the senior leaders’ perspective, specific attention was paid to the vows that these persons have given. “If there is not faith in God, the foundation may disappear from the work,” one participant remarked, indicating that spirituality is an integral part of religion, calling for this in the work and in pastoral leadership. At the same time, spirituality regarding individual trust in an interpersonal referent becomes critical.

This study also showed that there is evidence that trustworthiness does not precisely explain the spiritual dimension of intent and potential. Consequently, I propose that spirituality is a specific dispositional antecedent because it is not a trait based on genes, an innate talent, or a skill. It is rather the willingness to believe in the beyond (willingness to accept transcendental dimension – that is to say, reliance on God), which is faith-based trust. In other words, the assurance (substance) of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen (cf., Hebrews 11:1). The definition supplements the definition of disposition – that is, trusting intention by means of a spiritual dimension. Spirituality is an empowering factor, such as one’s character, from another perspective as being an inner empowering factor. Spirituality can also be understood in other contexts as an overall and human spirituality without a religious connection (cf., MacDonald et al., 2015), but in that case, motivation originates from the human capacity.

Trust is openness, integrity, confidential encounters and discussions, willingness to work together, and courage to take difficult issues under consideration (H11). Trust accepts and tolerates differences (H11). Different ways of working, personalities, and talents support trust building (H3). Trust is transparency in opinions and actions (H13). Trust is openness in discussion and decision-making, and confidentiality of dyadic or group discussions (H5). I can trust that behind my back people do not speak about me (H13). Trust emerges through consistent decisions, objectivity, fairness, and justice (H4). Trust believes that others act consistently and soundly (H11). At the Parish Council, principles such as justice, equality, listening to all parties, and democracy may encourage trust (H4). Trust is equality which everybody must experience (H5). Trust refers to respect for other’s opinion and respectful cooperation in future (H7). Trust is the valuation of others (H11). Trust is faith and confidence, and vice versa, in God, mission, and one’s workmates (H4). If there is no faith in God, the foundation may disappear from the work (H2). The Parish Council has many groups with their own interests, so the Vicar must give time and room for discourse (H4). Trust emerges through open discourse and interaction without fear and risk of being stigmatized (H7). Openness at the Parish Union is not the same as at the Parish Council. Its decisions are not well transcribed, or they are not discussed. Decisions are just informed by the
Top management (H7). Trust is an attitude; it is not purely a feeling. It is an attitude based on experiences through which one has reached this point and possesses the energy to go further (H13).

Next, I introduce the relevant concepts related to individual trust in teams. From the trustor's perspective, group identification is an important antecedent for trust development despite the different personalities, talents, and ways of working. Furthermore, integrity and benevolence are important factors together with fulfilled team roles and predictable and sound behavior in group membership. Consequently, parties must have value congruence at the group level. Accordingly, leadership must handle emotional discomfort considering a person's needs and desires. However, an individualistic working culture and a permanent office system nullify senior leadership efforts in developing team and organizational trust. Moreover, the new working culture with remote work and swift and on-line options risks ending regular interaction. Online interaction takes a longer time to build trust.

Individual trust in an organization, at the individual level, places more value on organizational issues, such as organizational identification, perceived organizational values, organizational competence, employee-employer relationships, and new structures and processes. Further, from an organizational characteristic perspective, spiritual and purposeful congruences become pivotal antecedents for ongoing changes and developing individualistic culture and permanent office systems. The external forces are to be reconsidered, including regulatory laws and orders in the environment. Senior leaders must transcend their own dispositional limitations to evoking others' willingness to participate. Currently, participation is mainly a communal action and is only socially meaningful. Despite their limitations to serve, people bring to the Church their innate human attributes in terms of spirituality (e.g., Karakas, 2010). Accordingly, spiritual connection enhances successful horizontal spirituality, that is, compassion, care, and the likelihood to trust. This then provides a direction and a meaning for work and life. Consequently, senior leaders worry about volunteers' chances to participate and experience meaningfulness in service and life. The Spiritual dimension, the individual experience of a calling, affects the likelihood that a person will trust which indicates the potential of self-efficacy. Thus, the trusting intention relies on one's spirituality and cognitive biases (cf., Colquitt et al., 2007).

Finally, it is important that others have the intention and ability to produce the expected results (Deutsch, 1969, 125; Mayer et al., 2006). To be meaningful, trust must go beyond predictability (Deutsch, 1958; Mayer et al., 2006). Benevolence and integrity develop early in childhood, within cultural settings and through experiences, and hence remain quite stable throughout life (e.g., Rotter, 1967; Colquitt et al., 2007). Propensity will influence the degree of trust in others (Mayer et al., 1995). It reflects willingness (Mayer et al., 1995), behavior, and performance (Rotter, 1967). It appears as a risk-taking, a tendency to take or avoid risks (Sitkin & Pablo, 1992). However, human traits do not necessarily assure other drivers than character (disposition), and thus can only partially guarantee trustworthiness. Colquitt and colleagues (2007) questioned if trustworthiness and trust propensity are important only because they inspire trust. Finally, I propose that spirituality is an additional factor that affects trustworthiness.
5.2.2 Group level antecedent and referents – trusting belief

Next, I introduce the findings at the group level concerning group trust in an interpersonal referent, in a team referent, and in an organizational referent. Trusting belief indicates perceived trustworthiness (Mayer et al., 1995). The distinction between trust at the individual level and at the group level is important. At the group level, the effects of trust are most likely more contextual and situation-specific (Fulmer & Gelfand, 2012). Trust at the group level is collectively shared among team/group members regardless of the trust referent.

Group trust in an interpersonal referent relies on the belief that the trustor has high integrity and that he or she can be trusted to keep promises and fulfill expectations. Trust is critical; it is the alpha and omega in groups. Thus, monitoring whether the job is done accordingly can erode trust. Increasing workflow causes worry about employees’ well-being among group members. Consequently, their well-being influences the senior leadership’s perceived well-being. The trustee must be sure of the perceived trustworthiness and the human and social capital of one another. Thus, leadership style plays a pivotal role in organizing the possibilities for interaction and relationships whereby time and visibility are critical. Doing so, the leadership creates a shared atmosphere of esprit de corps, that is, a “feeling of pride and mutual loyalty shared by the members of a group” (cf., Foyol, 1916). It is of utmost importance that the group and the leadership can create a sense of communality and meaningfulness, the feeling within an in-group about participatory activities.

Trust is critical in a working community and in the Parish, the alpha and omega (H2). Interaction is critical in trust building (H1). Personal relationships, to know a person, enable us to build confidential relationships (H5). Physical closeness helps to interact and create relationships (H7).

Group trust in a team is the major focus at this level. Teamwork has been shown to increase cooperation, whereas fair and productive internal monitoring adds trust. There is, however, a risk that work will not be done accordingly. All kinds of doubts and concerns can erode a group’s trust in the team. Thus, leadership competence becomes a success factor when handling interactions and commitment to work and goals. Frequent time spent and physical closeness create positive relationships. Further, shared values (value congruence) and common experiences increase mutual understanding about objectives and strategies. Shared values, beliefs, and norms such as equality, loyalty, objectivity, consistency, fairness, and justice support trustworthy behavior. A feeling of equality in a professional organization is essential but also challenging. Even though there may not be sufficient trust, antecedents help to build the foundation for emerging trust.

Trust refers to loyalty to common agreements and decisions (H7). Trust is between two autonomous persons or actors, whereas either can be oppressive or dominant (H7).

In group relationships, open and transparent communication occur between autonomous people where respect of the common good and professionalism are central. Transparency also includes strong expectations of results, not only sharing information. Autonomy as a trust antecedent also has a possibly negative impact as it encourages an individualistic way of working. However, respect for others’ opinions, even if they are different and contrary, builds trust. In this case study, I found that
leaders managed to create an open workplace spirituality (atmosphere) and safe dialogue. Not only respect but also loyalty advance trust through keeping promises and the certainty of fulfilling expectations. Within relationships conflicts may occur which may be due to poor goal orientation, as well as different personalities, ways of working, and competencies.

*Trust is reciprocal sharing and mutual understanding about objectives and strategies (H4).* Trust is a certainty that the one fulfills my expectations (H11). Trust is assurance that there is no doubt that how the work is done or how work-related things are (H1). Trust is assurance that I can expect results from the staff (H2). I can trust that things are finished off (H1). Trust is keeping promises (H13). Building trust needs cooperation, time to be together (interaction), and visibility. If that is not the case, there is no trust (H13). *Time is a critical factor in trust building. If we do not show up, it indicates our care and concerns (H8).*

Leadership style is pivotal because inspirational motivation increases the possibilities for reciprocal cooperation, even with the more formal and bureaucratic officers. Critical for trust development is that people in the group are divided into in-group and out-group members (we and them) as that may cause a lack of unity. Thus, an autonomous working culture must also be understood from the trust development perspective. In an individualistic working culture, and particularly in an ideological organization, poor subordinate skills may hinder trust building. Knowledge is a key to trust, but in too close relationships, it is difficult to share information impartially. From the teams’ point of view, after the integrations, the vicars moved further from the teams, and their visibility and time for interaction then decreased. Thus, a decreasing feeling of care and concern broke the psychological contract and the emotional relationship with the pastoral leadership.

Group trust in an organization appears in diverse ways. Contrary to open dialogue, some groups in the study sample had their own agendas ruling common principles “as we are here to serve.” Strange methods (separate decision-making meetings) destroyed trust and increased suspicion, and this weakened the grounds for trust. Democratic working culture calls for listening and possibilities to freely address other viewpoints and engage in challenging discourse. As such, this democratic culture advances trust. However, the opposite of democracy was that representatives did not have equal and mutual understanding about the mission of the Church or about the organizational system. Hence, the Church had the power to sidetrack democratic efforts due to group interests. Thus, trust and confidence decreased in the system. Understandably, trustworthiness also decreased because ideological interests harmed consensus. Conflict management was needed to solve problems of communication and internal turmoil. Thus, the senior leadership’s power position was considered as a balancing factor. Nevertheless, value congruence among members together with pastoral leadership advanced trusting belief. Senior leadership also had the pulpit for delivering the message in contextual language.

*Cooperation with the officer depends on a relationship, a meeting as matter of fact or reciprocal interaction (H1).* Trust is cooperation. Thus, interaction and relational skills become critical success factors (H6). Teamwork adds cooperation, and internal productive monitoring adds trust (H10). Trust is a reciprocal sharing of mutual understanding about objectives and strategies (H4). *Different ways of working, personalities, and talents support trust building (H3).*
There was strong criticism expressed by the participants concerning the permanent office system and power balances. Despite this, the senior leaders’ power (position) built trust and balanced relationships. Senior leaders (TMT) represent the organization. Thus, the group’s trust in the organization in connected to its trust in the leadership per se. Cooperation does not necessarily lead to trust, or it is not a precondition for trust because cooperation does not put a party at risk – that is the willingness to take risk (Mayer et al., 1995). Consequently, organizational regulatory bodies and the lack of alternatives lead to cooperation without trust. The TMT assesses trustworthy behavior – particularly its ability. An organization reflects senior leadership’s values, preferences, and beliefs (Hambrick & Pettigrew, 2001). The second interesting element of trust, in addition to spirituality, is senior leaders’ concern for employees’ well-being. Leaders were interested in how employees are doing. Concern about the well-being of others also had an impact on the leaders’ trustworthiness. That antecedent is reciprocal in the sense that concern for others influences the leaders’ well-being. That indicates the leaders’ service minded attitude: “We are not here for own interest, but we are here to serve,” as one put it. This indicates an attitude that goes beyond pure managerialism, being sent for a purpose.

People expect from the Vicar know-how, competence on substance, how to manage meetings, and strong pastoral leadership (H3). The Vicar who wants to do things well and right, so he must do it also in the right way and realistically and legally, and hence build trust (H6). Trust in the Vicar is based on substance know-how and concerns about well-being of the working community (H3). The power of vicars is related to trust. The one who loses trust loses also power, and thus the power moves to others (H4). Trust is certainty of people being truly trustworthy (H11).

Senior leadership is committed to work for common goals by executing strategic leadership influence. Accordingly, they also expect employees to work passionately, avoiding personal interest and individualism. If there was concern about self-interest and poor motivation, the more such behavior decreased trustworthiness. Currently, the younger generation considers pastoral work just like any other work or employment. Hence, demands concerning wages and working conditions conflict with the existing culture. Cultural change due to new worldviews have caused concerns about motivation.

Leadership should be interactive when decisions are being prepared (H13). During strategy work, the leader must be open and interactive (H13). The top-down approach destroys trust (H9). Trust is assurance that there is no need to check or confirm how promises advance (H1). There is not trust if I have a feeling that somebody does only what is a must. She or he keeps their own things more important but receives a wage (H2). I can trust that staff is interested and committed to work and does it well (H2). Trust refers to a relationship that I can trust that staff is motivated and professional (H4). From the vicars’ point of view, the Church should also teach subordinate skills not only leadership skills to leaders (H3). The vicar is a main speaker/preacher. He must have a clear and strong message. Consequently, trust will emerge. Otherwise, people find other sources of trust (H3). Trust can be built through the pulpit and the message (H5). Trust gives energy and motivates beyond the normal level, and it provides satisfaction (H1). Too close of a relationship may become a burden due to extra information, and hence increase risk (H5).
Finally, the vicars have extra tools for leadership influence – that is, pastoral service through services and preaching from the pulpit. Speaking from the pulpit increases not only the possibilities to use contextual language to add understanding, but also to wisely use pastoral authority. Thus, it is a question about empowering people to voluntarily make decisions and work for common good per se. It is a person performing the services, not the Church itself. Trusting belief indicates that people are voluntarily willing to depend on others’ trustworthiness and their human and social capital. Thus, a sense of communality and meaningfulness becomes a key success factor. Further, according to the study data, a service leadership style is a dimension of strategic leadership, and well-being is a dimension of trustworthiness.

5.2.3 Organizational level antecedent and referents – trusting stance

Next, I introduce the findings at the organizational level in respect to organizational trust in an interpersonal referent, a group referent, and an organizational referent. The trust research at the organizational level refers often to interorganizational trust. However, the trusting stance involves behaviors and actions that demonstrate interdependence from one another and the systems (Alarcon et al., 2018). The majority of the referents concern organizational trust in an organizational referent, and hardly any other referents. Consequently, the senior leadership focused on the structures, processes, traditions, functions, control, and culture. Structure and processes link tasks and people. Interorganizational trust leans heavily on personal relationships despite the organizational referents.

Organizational identification as a Lutheran bolsters trust. It enables work to proceed without distracting turmoil. The Diocese as a competent theological and spiritual unit sustains the Lutheran identity. Thus, organizational integrity strengthens trustworthy behavior. However, recently, value congruence has been diversified due to different worldviews and current topics under discourse. Nevertheless, shared values are strong. There is an increasing demand for relevant services and actions. Members assess trust during these encounters base on previous experiences, and, hence, as an imago. In such a situation, organizational ethical competence in conducting services and responding to demands for change is a critical trust antecedent. Also, trust in instructions engenders security about the work.

Prior relationships and shared identification as Lutheran form a strong foundation for trust. Future relationships are also grounded upon historical roots and honored structures, such as liturgical texts and Episcopal structure. Thus, different units in the Church have a natural partnership. Such a partnership builds trust through joint dependence on communication processes and principals. However, reciprocal communication is challenging in such a big system. The quality of communicating and performing services is instructed by the liturgical books (cf., form of controlling). Feeling about being controlled is a synonym for distrust. However, positive control keeps the system running. Thus, interactional courtesy becomes important. After all, working in a trustworthy environment it is not only good for working together but also goals can be negotiated meaningfully for everybody.

The Diocese is a professionally competent theological and spiritual unit supporting traditions and doctrines (H11). Organizational system together with liturgical books build trust (H2). Trust is from the members’ point of view an imago, and what it looks
like, that will be formed in encounters (H5). The feeling about being controlled is a synonym for distrust. However, positive control keeps the system running (H8). In trusting workplace spirituality, it is good to work together, as goals are meaningful for everybody (H3). Trust is freedom to act without continuous fear of control (H10). Unnecessary and unpredictable control destroys trust (H8).

From the structural and system perspective, good governance plays a pivotal role in developing the trusting stance. However, “if the Church is not careful, it may disintegrate into its own system for various reasons, thus jeopardizing organizational trust in the organization” (H3). The strategic leadership represents the organization, but it risks losing senior leaders’ trust in the organization. Strategic leadership faces various hindrances, such as a disintegrated organizational system and public office system. Thus, functionality and flexibility become critical success factors. Authority is built in structures.

Good governance enhances the trusting stance and culture. Trust gives security to work in a trusting culture (H5).

These governance issues destroy senior leaders’ trust and confidence and impact dramatically on leadership dynamics. Although Episcopal structure, traditional books, and organizational procedures have strong positive significance, stagnation on rigid organizational traditions, a slow decision-making system, and contextualization undermine the strategic leaderships’ efficiency. The governance forms an ideology sustaining current rigidity and poor innovation. Now, the core purpose is hidden under bureaucracy and remains untapped. In addition, the supportive employee practices, for example, the public office system, seems to be another disabling factor decreasing organizational (senior leaders) trust in the organization (system). Consequently, the system hinders effective leadership. The current governance system enables individualistic behavior. The public office system gives the employer an ongoing right to stint on the contract, thus doing harm to the leadership and common good. Egoistic behavior may destroy the reliance of one upon another and in the organization. Participation is an issue, but it does not actualize without interdependence.

Vicars have got resources as given and inherited. The public officer system disables the “pain on your ash” because people keep holding onto a signed agreement. The system is too engaging (H3). Vicars are predestined to lead in a homogeneous group of people. Thus, most of the energy goes to leading the group. Given the group has an effect on leadership dynamics (H3). The public office system gives an ongoing right to be a contrarian (H3). Individualistic culture breaks trust (H5).

Finally, not only internal obstacles, but also external forces hinder Church development, such as global environment, competition with worldviews, and governmental policies. Coherence of the organizational system is critical for trust building. Correspondingly, disintegrated organizational and permanent office systems impede confidence in the system. It is not only problematic from the working community’s point of view, but particularly from that of the senior leaders. If the system continues to exist, the senior leaders will have voluntarily surrendered to such a predestination. The lawmaking process is too slow, and so senior leaders seek other possibilities to advance strategic initiatives. Consequently, senior leaders’ leadership dynamics decrease, that is,
confidence in the possibility to change the church declines. The trusting stance is a willingness to be dependent and involves an assurance of the functionality of systems and the advancement of intellectual capacities.

*Trust enables working community to work together (H5). Well-functioning and flexible organizational systems foster trust building and enable interdependences. However, the disintegrated system and the public office system caused senior leaders to voluntarily surrender to an impossibility and a predestination. Consequently, strategic leadership’s capacity to change is incompetent, and hence inefficient (H8).*

### 5.2.4 Strategic level antecedent and referents – trusting faith

Previously, I defined strategic as a very important action and an issue for achieving the mission. A corporate mission consists of a purpose, beliefs, values, and a definition (e.g., De Wit & Meyer, 2005). Thus, trust in the mission is a strategic issue. At the strategic level, I define trusting faith as a willingness to rely on an existential value-added system, that is, mission and purpose. Thus, senior leaders must take “a leap of faith” in a specific direction for the purpose being empowered by added value.

*Trust is faith and confidence, and vice versa, in God, the mission and in workmates (H4). The mission is the measure of all things, the alpha and the omega (H2).*

The corporate mission (Mintzberg, 1979) depends on the principal’s assignment (Eisenhardt, 1989). Factors such as the purpose, faith in God – as a source of empowerment, and faith in workmates as the key principals – defines the senior leaders’ strategic confidence. Focus of faith and trust are linked through similar conceptual grounds. From the Bible we know that “Now, faith is confidence in what we hope for and assurance about what we do not see.”**27** Such a definition can reach beyond constructed reality to the spiritual. In addition, “Faith is the driving force behind all, and our mission is to lead people to the inner knowledge of Christ” (H7). The Church’s mission emphasizes the essence of the purpose. Thus, senior leaders in this context must have a strong faith in the certainty of continuous empowerment by God. Consequently, definition is revealed through the context.

The Church has received its mission from God, which is the principal reason for its particular purpose. The mission may not be accomplished without being empowered and inspired by its significance and ability to follow the assignment. Senior leaders are strengthened through prayer or Bible reading to exert quality leadership capacities. Such an exchange relationship is a rather exceptional source of empowerment in the Western organizational cultures (e.g., MacDonald et al., 2015; Grandy, 2013). Moreover, spirituality can be added to the leadership tool kit (cf., Grandy, 2013). However, spiritual leadership and organizational leadership shall not be mixed and misused even though they are intertwined.

Without faith in God, and the mission of natural leadership practices may not progress far beyond normal limits. Senior leaders stress the service leadership approach, “I am here to serve,” which indicates their attitude towards people and

---

**27** The Bible: Hebrews 11:1.
God. According to the agency theory, such an attitude towards the principal shows altruistic motives and balances interests accordingly in leadership (e.g., Eisenhardt, 1989). Indeed, service-minded persons experience meaningfulness more than other types of persons. This study confirmed that senior leaders feel they are doing meaningful work because of service orientation. Spirituality informs the purpose of the mission and gives spiritual assurance of continuous empowerment by God which is a spiritual reality. Consequently, the spiritual dimension of trust is contextualized through a personal quality. That, in turn, empowers individual potential and becomes an ability to serve either as a volunteer or on pastoral duties.

The mission and faith in God are critical conditions for the work and create the dimension of trust in the leadership context is spiritual, rather simply faith. The senior leadership has a responsibility to interpret the mission, in this context, instead of only designing, it sends the organization to accomplish the given task (cf., Mintzberg, 1989). The Church can be experienced through its vital elements, such as beliefs, values, and definitions of areas of work such as activities. However, interests may conflict due to senior leaders’ abilities, motives, and preferences (Eisenhardt, 1989; Whitener et al., 2006). Ultimately, the mission will be implemented through the organizational system by the strategic leadership. Thus, not only spirituality of the mission but also senior leaders’ spirituality will have an influence on strategies and people.

5.2.5 Conclusion

The aim of this analysis was to examine senior leaders’ emerged and perceived trust at multiple levels in various referents. The study supports the idea that trust can be purposely designed and developed. Not only the levels of attention but also the context have an impact on needs and on the assessment of trust. At the individual level, the analysis determined that trusting intention is a permanent trait (disposition), while well-being was revealed to be a critical factor. At the group level, trusting belief in trustworthiness indicated the influence of senior leadership’s spirituality on the organization. Further, at the organizational level, the trusting stance in interdependencies emphasized the voluntary surrendering to systemic problems. Finally, trusting faith in the origin of the mission and purpose stressed spirituality and ideological principles of the mission. Consistently, employees may have different needs than senior leadership or an organization (Fulmer & Gelfand, 2012) (Tables 7–10).

At the individual level (Table 7), individual trust in an interpersonal referent, perceived sense of meaning, participation, leadership style, such as individual consideration, well-being, and spirituality were all found to be essential factors. For one’s part, individual trust in a team referent was challenged by questionable spiritual congruence and individual working culture, as well as decreased trust in teams. The combination of modern working arrangements, such as remote work and swift and on-line formats, together with individualistic culture, hindered trust development even more. Trust in an organizational referent was challenging due to perceived organizational competence, diversified value congruence, structural disintegration, and a permanent office system.

28 Research concerning two million individuals (2013) found that people working in service employments experienced more meaningfulness at their work than people in other types of employment: https://www.payscale.com/data-packages/most-and-least-meaningful-jobs/full.list.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>LEVEL OF REFERENT</strong></th>
<th><strong>Trustor characteristics</strong></th>
<th><strong>Trustee characteristics</strong></th>
<th><strong>Shared characteristics</strong></th>
<th><strong>Communication processes</strong></th>
<th><strong>Structural/network characteristics</strong></th>
<th><strong>Organizational characteristics</strong></th>
<th><strong>External characteristics of the organization</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual trust in an interpersonal referent</strong></td>
<td>Built-in disposition: willingness to be vulnerable (trusting intention)</td>
<td>Perceived trustworthiness: ability, benevolence, integrity, well-being and spirituality, and disposition</td>
<td>Value congruence: loyalty, respect, and equality which everybody must experience</td>
<td>Courage to take difficult issues under consideration and discussion</td>
<td>Type of ties: individuals and interest groups with their own agendas</td>
<td>A sense of well-being and meaningfulness</td>
<td>Interest in religion high but not as the Church teaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Safe attachment: willingness to interact and work together</td>
<td>Individual support: confidential encounters and discussions</td>
<td>Ethical behavior and justice</td>
<td>Transparent and open discourse and interaction without fear and risk of being stigmatized</td>
<td>Type of relationships: relational or matter-of-fact</td>
<td>Spiritual dimension: faith in God is an integral part of trust</td>
<td>Individualism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Long-term perspective: dynamism based on previous outcomes and performance</td>
<td>Individual consideration and support: supportiveness, giving time and room for discourse</td>
<td>Past and future relationships: dynamism based not only on previous outcomes and performance but on future cooperation</td>
<td>Information sharing: decisions well transcribed and discussed</td>
<td>Trust is more cooperation based on experiences and possesses energy to go further</td>
<td>Rewards and deterrence: orientation to task, expectations of results, credible threat of punishment</td>
<td>Sense of meaning: participation mainly communal but not participatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sense of meaning: participation mainly communal but not participatory</td>
<td>Ethical behavior: behind my back, people do not speak about me</td>
<td>Social architect: individual consideration and inspirational motivation</td>
<td>Acceptance of emotions: feelings, different opinions, and frustrations</td>
<td>Perceived organizational support: autonomous working culture without being unfairly controlled</td>
<td>Future cooperation: respect despite different opinions</td>
<td>Limited participation in mission erodes its vitality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual trust in teams</strong></td>
<td>Team identification: different ways of working, personalities, and talents</td>
<td>Integrity and benevolence: confidentiality of dyadic or group discussions</td>
<td>Value congruence: justice, openness, integrity</td>
<td>Emotional discomfort: relevant behavior to meet a person’s needs and desires</td>
<td>Individualistic working culture and permanent office system</td>
<td>New working culture: remote work, including swift, team, and online platforms</td>
<td>Team roles and memberships: beliefs that the other acts consistently and soundly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Team’s value congruence: openness in discussion and decision-making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual trust in organizations</strong></td>
<td>Organizational identification: acceptance and tolerance of differences and faith in workmates</td>
<td>Perceived organizational justice</td>
<td>Positive employee-employer relationship: listening to all parties and democracy</td>
<td>Reciprocal interactions: transparency in opinions and actions</td>
<td>New structural solutions: remote work and online working platforms</td>
<td>Spiritual congruence: faith and confidence in God, the mission and workmates</td>
<td>Regulatory laws and orders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perceived organizational competence</td>
<td>Value congruence: justice, openness, integrity</td>
<td>Regular and peaceful communication in peace</td>
<td>Individualistic working culture and permanent office system</td>
<td>Ongoing changes: changes are to continue</td>
<td>Global and national operating environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At the group level (Table 8), the more people interact, the more there are possibilities for exchange, but also for conflicts. Trust in an interpersonal referent fosters perceived well-being for both employees and senior leadership. Thus, a sense of communality or Esprit de corps and feelings about not belonging to an in-group membership were considered important. Trust in a team referent instead emphasized risk-taking, frequent interaction and communication over time, and leadership style such as inspirational motivation and developing an autonomous working culture. From the senior leaders’ perspective, an autonomous culture is risky in the individualistic culture. Team trust in an organizational referent involves senior leaderships’ well-being, competence in conflict management, its role of agency, and value congruence. Pastoral leadership as a form of servant leadership was considered a primary component of strategic leadership. It was noted that service-minded persons experience meaningfulness more than other types of persons.
Table 8. Group level antecedents and referents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL OF REFERENT</th>
<th>Trustor characteristics</th>
<th>Trustee characteristics</th>
<th>Shared characteristics</th>
<th>Communication processes</th>
<th>Structural/network characteristics</th>
<th>Organizational characteristics</th>
<th>External characteristics to the organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group trust in an interpersonal referent</td>
<td>Integrity: certainty that the one keeps promises and fulfills expectations</td>
<td>Trusting belief: perceived trustworthiness, and human and social capitals</td>
<td>“Espirit de corps” and “We can do.”</td>
<td>A sense of communality: feelings about in-group membership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group trust in teams</td>
<td>Risk-taking: assurance that there is no doubt about how the work is done or how work-related things are going</td>
<td>Frequent interaction: time is a critical factor in trust building, and physical closeness helps to interact and create relationship</td>
<td>Positive and smooth communication: between two autonomous persons or actors when either is oppressive or dominant</td>
<td>Leadership style: reciprocal sharing and mutual understanding about objectives and strategies</td>
<td>In-group and out-group (we and them): critical in working community, as the alpha and omega</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group trust in organizations</td>
<td>Leadership competence: interaction and relational skills become critical success factors</td>
<td>Shared vision: mutual understanding about objectives and strategies</td>
<td>Transparent information: assurance of expected results</td>
<td>Cooperation with the officer depends on a relationship or on a meeting as matter-of-fact or reciprocal interaction</td>
<td>Certainty of autonomy, respect of common good, and professionalism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Well-being: senior leadership’s (TMT’s) concern</td>
<td>Conflict management: if we do not show up, it indicates our care and concerns</td>
<td>Role of agency: TMT and power positions versus service leadership: “We are here to serve.”</td>
<td>Value congruence: equality, consistency, and loyalty to common agreements and decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relationship conflict: different ways of working, personalities, and talents support trust building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Permanent office system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
- Integrity: certainty that the one keeps promises and fulfills expectations
- Trusting belief: perceived trustworthiness, and human and social capitals
- “Espirit de corps” and “We can do.”
- A sense of communality: feelings about in-group membership
- In-group and out-group (we and them): critical in working community, as the alpha and omega
At the organizational (Table 9) level, trust in an interpersonal referent concerns one’s willingness to be dependent and the sense of assurance of organizational functionality and advancement of intellectual capital. Organizational trust in a team was hardly considered. Thus, trust in the entity or organization was concentrated on the coworkers, leadership, and governance system. Organizational identity as a Lutheran enabled people to work together, and long relational and educational background supported trust. Thus, members find similarities concerning values, beliefs, and language to communicate. However, the organizational system caused frustration due to complexity, rigidity, and bureaucracy. Consequently, senior leadership did not voluntarily surrender to perpetuating the system, but instead invented new ways of advancing initiatives.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL OF REFERENCE</th>
<th>Trustor characteristics</th>
<th>Trustee characteristics</th>
<th>Shared characteristics</th>
<th>Communicative processes</th>
<th>Structural/network characteristics</th>
<th>Organizational characteristics</th>
<th>External characteristics to the organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational trust in an interpersonal referent</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trusting stance is a willingness to be dependent, and assurance of functionality of systems and advancement of intellectual capacities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Organizational trust in team referents** | Organizational identification as a Lutheran and trust enables working community to work together | Organizational integrity: trust is freedom to act without continuous fear of control. | Prior relationships: shared identification, and relationships as Lutherans | Reciprocal communication: feelings about being controlled are synonyms for distrust; however, positive control keeps the system running | Good governance: good governance enhances a trusting stance and culture | Supportive employee practices: an organizational system, together with liturgical books, builds trust | Global operating environment |

| **Organizational trust in organization referents** | Organizational services and products are relevant organizational services and actions | Expected future relationships and trust provide security to work in a trusting culture | Communicative quality: theological and spiritual units support traditions and doctrines | Well-functioning and flexible organizational system | Fair and transparent practices: individualistic culture breaks trust | Government policies | Competition with worldviews and other churches |

| | Ethics and competence in conducting joint services | Shared dependence and partnerships | Communication of trustworthy behavior: in trusting a workplace with spirituality, it is good to work together, and goals are meaningful for everybody | | | | |

| | Values congruence and diversity | | | | | | |

Table 9. Organizational level antecedents and referents
At the strategic level (Table 10), individual trust in an interpersonal referent relies on willingness to accept a value-added system as the core driver. Consequently, strategic leadership capacity, perceived trustworthiness, and relevance became pivotal. Team trust within a team is essential to the TMT’s dedication to the key success factors such as value and spiritual congruence. Organizational trust within an organization depends on how well the mission has permeated an organization, and how well leadership matches with the values, spirituality, and functions. The inherited organizational system was considered as both positively and negatively impacting trust. The most important antecedent was considered to be understanding the idea of God’s Kingdom and its spiritual origin. That understanding develops confidence in meaning and purpose with continuous empowerment by God. In the end, it is only a question about God’s work, and leadership is just a servant in achieving that work.

Table 10. Strategic level antecedents and referents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL OF REFERENT</th>
<th>Trustor characteristics</th>
<th>Trustee characteristics</th>
<th>Shared characteristics</th>
<th>Communication processes</th>
<th>Structural/network characteristics</th>
<th>Organizational characteristic</th>
<th>External characteristics of the organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic trust in an interpersonal referent</td>
<td>Trusting faith: willingness to rely on value-added system</td>
<td>Strategic leadership style and capacity</td>
<td>Perceived trustworthiness, motivation and well-being</td>
<td>Relevancy of the purpose, services, and activities</td>
<td>Acknowledged gap between reality and purpose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual strength through prayer and Bible reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic trust in teams</td>
<td>TMT dedication to mission and key success factors</td>
<td>TMT’s value congruence</td>
<td></td>
<td>Diversity of structures: teams, swifts, and online units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic trust in organizations</td>
<td>Mission perpetuates and inspires working together</td>
<td>Perceived senior leadership capacity</td>
<td>Leadership style: attitude to serve emphasizes servant style</td>
<td>Idea of God’s Kingdom: spirituality of the mission permeates the organization</td>
<td>Inherited Episcopal governance form</td>
<td>Confidence in meaning and purpose: mission given by God</td>
<td>Influential societal streams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership matches spiritual and values congruence</td>
<td>Faith in God is source of continuous empowerment</td>
<td>Strategic focus: action for achieving the mission</td>
<td>Purpose is being vitalized by its meaningfulness, that is, its value-added factor</td>
<td>Well-functioning and flexible organizational system</td>
<td>Supportive traditions, law, order, and practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, the strategic leadership capacity is a key for building organizational trust, as well as senior leaders’ trust in an organization. Thus, leadership capacity is more important than values and leadership styles. This is so despite the fact that spiritual, value, and purpose congruences are critical, and even though this capacity also includes such congruences in the specific domain. Senior leaders aim to win the souls, hearts, and minds of people. People are trustworthy until proven otherwise. Individual
consideration about well-being also has a reciprocal effect on senior leaders’ well-being. That indicates that the strategic leadership has to include the servant leadership dimension. Thus, it can then be called strategic service leadership. This requires a different approach than individual consideration or inspirational motivation. Further, senior leadership’s spirituality has an influence throughout an organization, including its preferences and prioritizations. Further, the origin of spirituality permeating an organization vitalizes its actors to feel meaningfulness and well-being, as well as a sense of communality, an assurance of functionality and interconnectedness, and confidence in meaning and purpose. Thus, spirituality should be included in the strategic leadership tool kit (cf., Grandy, 2010) originating from the mission.

5.3 SENIOR LEADERS’ METAPHORICAL MODELLING OF TRUST

The aim of metaphorical modelling is to illustrate tacit knowledge and tacit expertise. The following analysis shows how senior leaders characterized trust using a metaphor. Using the interviewees’ metaphors, I have clustered their metaphors using the house metaphor (Bartlett & Ghoshal, 1995) (Figure 10). This offers a tangible picture of an organization’s psychology (culture), physiology (processes), and anatomy (structures), and in addition, supports the mission and members’ role. The roof represents the center of attention, that is, the mission and the purpose as a value-added system. In addition, I have summarized my findings through individual (members), cultural, processual, structural, and strategic (corporate mission) perspectives. Furthermore, I have used the interviewees’ statements to link their ideas and the researcher’s interpretation.

5.3.1 Individual perspective

The basement, “members at the base of the house,” emphasizes the importance of people (e.g., Bartlett & Ghoshal, 1995; De Wit & Meyer, 2005; Kaplan & Norton, 2004) and the members’ individual perspectives about their feelings of usefulness and being meaningful.

Trust is a rest

*Trust is neither charged nor tensed. It includes a dimension of friendship. It is free of feeling about being controlled.*

Trust is tranquility (rest, peace)

*Trust means that I can concentrate on things that are important and take care of those. There are not useless tensions.*

Both metaphors are incorporated as they describe the aspects of trust as a rest and tranquility. First, trust is a conscious awareness of the absence of tension, nervousness, worry, and feelings about being controlled. In other words, there is not any weariness and burden that hinders potential (disposition and trustworthiness; e.g., Mayer et al., 1995). Instead, in a trusting and friendly atmosphere (cf., workplace spirituality), trust does not only help to concentrate and take care of important things but also helps to
realize the potential to cope with the normal stress of life. Thus, a person can work productively and fruitfully and contribute to a community.

People are holistic human beings. Trust as a rest and tranquility refers to balanced physical, psychological, and social well-being. Rest and tranquility are feelings of being relaxed, of forgetting cares and concerns and being well. In a trusting atmosphere, energy is not used in coping but in liberating potential. Consequently, rest refers to refreshing and empowering, being recharged mentally and physically. Thus, a state of mind (e.g., Möllering et al., 2004) is rejuvenated and ready to be willing. In a state of rest, mental, intellectual, and physical capacities are active and positively recharged. The following interviewee statements express how it is to work in a restful and peaceful environment. Trust fosters a feeling of empowerment and revitalization.

Trust gives security to work in a trusting culture (H5). In a trusting workplace with spirituality, it is good to work together, and goals are meaningful for everybody (H3). Trust is freedom to act without continuous fear of control (H10).

The metaphors of trust being a rest and tranquility contributed to the trust research by exhibiting how trust contributes to well-being and the quality of life. Consequently, it is more than a state of mind or psychological state (e.g., Möllering et al., 2004; Rousseau et al., 1998). When a person can contribute to one’s feelings of meaningfulness, this is significant. I propose that trust and spirituality have a connection because spirituality is also incorporated with well-being, morale, and commitment. Accordingly, both concepts increase these factors along with productivity, and thus decrease stress and uncertainty (cf., Karakas, 2010). Today, trust is more important because work has become more central in our lives, and it is the source of values in society. Consequently, the organization becomes our sole community. In society, trust is declining and so too is trustworthiness. Thus, it is vital that the Church’s work counters this decline. Overall, trust is a sense of well-being and meaningfulness; however, it is not self-evident due to the changed social and working environment.

Trust is a leap of faith

Trust provides common experiences with a fellow traveler. You have courage to jump even though you don’t see far.

A leap of faith refers to the readiness and willingness to act without knowing explicitly what the consequences will be. In certain situations, a person must take a leap of faith into uncertainty. Faith grows to the extent that a person is ready to test their disposition and ability. In an initial case, there must be, however, certain antecedent factors to depend on. Faith in humanity affects the initial trusting belief or, for example, the structural assurance or situational normality (e.g., McKnight et al., 2006). Consequently, later, common experiences create an early and fragile base for trust building. “Leap of faith occurs when a child boy jumps from a table in dark

29The World Health Organization’s definitions: “Mental health is defined as a state of well-being in which every individual realizes his or her own potential, can cope with the normal stresses of life, can work productively and fruitfully, and is able to make a contribution to her or his community.” and “Health is a state of complete physical, mental, and social well-being and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity.” (https://www.who.int/features/factfiles/mental_health/en/).
room towards his father even though he does not see him. When the father calls for jumping, the boy jumps towards a voice." (H2).

A leap of faith is more likely to occur when a person feels partnership or being part of a community through common experiences and a purpose that is bigger than oneself (e.g., Brown, 1992; Karakas, 2010). Such a spirit enables sharing and gives a deeper meaning to the partnership. As a result, trust appears as a horizontal dimension between people. First, a leap of faith indicates a willingness to take a risk. Second, another party takes the responsibility for a successful leap because of a desire to be of service (cf., dimension of spirituality; e.g., Karakas, 2010). This becomes evident through service orientation and concern for others. Moreover, a leap of faith is an acceptance of vulnerability and uncertainty. It indicates illogical reasoning (cf., calculative trust) based first on disposition and then on imbalanced information and experiences. People need irrational faith when believing in invisible realities. In other words, transition (a leap) from one state to another involves various connotations and conscious action driven by faith in order to a gain desired outcome. People may change behavior from inside out because nothing external may cause a person to change, and therefore, nothing would cause a person to take a leap of faith but through subjective reasoning. The interpretation and the implication depend on the context to believe in something without evidence while others may see more risks than opportunities of success.

Furthermore, a leap of faith refers to a dilemma of thinking, doing, and specifically believing (faith). Faith is an internal movement\(^{30}\) whereby an individual must not only think but also take an action to, for example, love a neighbor. According to Kierkegaard, “thinking can turn toward itself in order to think about itself and skepticism can emerge. But this thinking about itself never accomplishes anything.”\(^{31}\) In this contextual study, the common idiom “a leap of faith” points to both a human and a divine origin. In other words, it shows a disposition beyond human limitations. Thus, neither trust nor God is concrete.\(^{32}\) Hence, we are likely to do something through faith by trusting in a known person, an entity, or God, even though we do not know or have evidence of it. Similarly, the metaphor refers to another interviewee’s definition: “Now faith is confidence in what we hope for and assurance about what we do not see” (cf. also, Hebrews 11:1). Since we cannot see God or trust, but we must trust that he/it is there, there is hope for a path forward or a way out of a problem. Trust is a positive orientation with a faith, a hope dimension. The definition involves desire (hope) and assurance through faith of fulfillment of the expected. Thus, the one is willing to take a risk and accept vulnerability (e.g., Mayer et al., 1995). That may be the faith to succeed despite uncertainty. Taking into account contextual ideology, a culture, the grounds for a leap of faith, can be found in religious faith. The statement: “Know that in all things God works for the good of those who love him” (cf. also, Romans 8:28) emphasizes hope whereby faith is active and practical, and even corrective. Thus, the trusting intention is an innate human attribute in one’s character and spirituality (cf., Nash & McLennan, 2001).

---

\(^{30}\)Søren Kierkegaard (1947, 146): Works of Love.

\(^{31}\)Kierkegaard: Concluding Unscientific Postscript to the Philosophical Fragments.

\(^{32}\)The Bible, King James Version: “God is a Spirit: and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth.”
Finally, the well-being metaphors show the importance of propensity as a trait of personality (e.g., Butler & Cantrell, 1984), trustworthiness (cf., Mayer et al., 1995), well-being, and faith, that is, the assurance of God in people’s lives. It connects well-being and spirituality to the trust definition. Responding to the human need for meaning is becoming a critical organizational success factor (e.g., Karakas, 2010). Thus, a sense of well-being and meaningfulness are critical for the trusting intention. Taking into account the definition of trust as a psychological state of willingness to accept vulnerability is essential.

5.3.2 Cultural perspective

The organizational culture is the main pillar in the house. Culture is a relationship and communality whereby humanity most likely shows its nature. Culture refers to worldviews and behavioral patterns shared in an organization (e.g., De Wit & Meyer, 2005). The characteristics of a culture are a common language, a frame of references, and a set of values. Thus, it reflects boldness, deep feelings, and behavioral patterns which can be defined as “how we do things around here.” Metaphorically, each organization has its own “base sound.”

Trust is a contrabass

When I have tuned it and practiced plenty, then the contrabass gives the sound I want to get. Trust is that the instrument is in good condition, and it gives the sound that impacts the environment. That is why it must be tuned. In the same way, trust must be created, kept in condition, maintained, and practiced.

Musical instruments, such as drums, horns and lyres, were used symbolically in ancient times. Usually, they were related to change of a specific condition or celebrations. The contrabass belongs to a classical genre. There is a wide consensus that musical experience gains meaning through metaphorical connotations. We usually relate deep voices with our deepest emotions or deepest thinking and thoughts. However, originally, it was the opposite: deep voices were considered heavenly. In addition, in the musical genre, the rhythm is made mostly by the bass instruments. Deep sounds are felt deep in the chest and belly, but the high notes touch the intellect. From the physiological perceptive, high and low voices describe frequency, and this is the reason that low notes are preferred for collective contexts, such as war or events (e.g., Tosaki, 2013; Nelson, 2015).

Trust building takes time and intentional actions just like building a contrabass. An artist must practice, play, and tune the contrabass. Only then it will give the expected sound and an empirical experience. In the same way, maintaining professionalism requires continuous training and attention to the quality of performance. The base sound gives a rhythm. Sound and participation indicate the sharing of feelings, social cohesion, interests, and appreciation of loyalty and professionalism. Thus, the contrabass (trust) creates shared feeling and loyalty among members. In other words, it is like a general idiom, such as esprit de corps (cf. Foyol, 1916), that is the “feeling of pride and mutual loyalty shared by the members of a group.”

contrabass symbolizes how trust is a deeply experienced human interconnectedness, empowerment inside out, and communal participation.

The “trust is a contrabass” metaphor communicates the fundamental aspects of trust. Trust is a base that influences deep emotions, thinking, and thoughts that give a rhythm to interaction. Trust (a contrabass) keeps the sound (tune, timing) together in the same rhythm (players follow the rules) and creates a foundation for other instruments (team, players). It assembles similar people and gives rhythm to and links their interactions. The feeling of trust can be shared and experienced but not visibly perceived except in practices, thoughts, and talks. From that point of view, trust cannot be imitated or copied. But, even when there is trust in an organization, not all may be willing to contribute (play professionally) even though they work in the same organization. Thus, the performance does not reach the level of excellence. It is possible that some do not trust in somebody, or they do not like the contrabass or the sound that trust is based on in an organization. In that case, the one may feel like an outsider or an out-group member, and even feel a lack of well-being.

Trust is humane

Trust is like going hand in hand. If there is not the hand, the Church will stay taking care of a museum. The Church is people with God.

This anthropomorphic metaphor gives trust the character of a person or attribute of a human being. Thus, trust is to a great extent the imago of human being as an active doer. Trust acts as a social function. Trust is humane, and this refers not only to relational aspects (social) (e.g., Lewis & Weigert, 1985) but also to mental capacities, including the cognitive processes of thinking and sense-making, and the deeper intellectual capacities of comprehending one’s surroundings. Without the human relational capacity (cf., hand in hand) people will stay alone creating an individualistic lifestyle or workplace culture. Similarly, the Church will become a museum without people hand in hand with God.

Previously, organizations emphasized financial measures, and social, interpersonal, and spiritual functions were less important (e.g., Kaplan & Norton, 2004). Now, the human aspect stresses not only disposition, care, and individual consideration, but also a trustful community based on a deeper sense of meaning and purpose in work and life (cf., Karakas, 2010), and even beyond that, in God. Thus, material well-being is questioned as a sole principle because people desire more meaning. Trust as “hand in hand” illustrates an existential dimension involving unity, interdependence, and connection to a community and the greater beyond. Trust as relational (interpersonal) (e.g., Mayer et al., 1995) is also compared with a relationship with God (transcendental). Consequently, interpersonal and transcendental trust are experienced as complementary, human, and genuine. Also, spirituality is considered part of normal life and humanity. Therefore, trust has a spiritual dimension which is not only based on early development in childhood (personality; e.g., Rotter, 1967) and trustworthiness (e.g., Mayer et al., 1995), but it is also a natural part of humanity like character and abilities (cf., scientific spirituality; MacDonald et al., 2015). The Church without divine and spiritual dimension, “Church is people with God,” is only a secular museum and therefore incomplete. Thus, free expression of spirituality and acceptance of being dependent upon God enables one to feel complete and authentic, and to be a more honest, courageous, and compassionate individual (Burack, 1999; Karakas, 2010). Senior leaders’ definition of trust includes work as a calling that gives
more meaning and, as a result, increases productivity and commitment (cf., Paloutzian et al., 2003; Reave, 2005; Karakas, 2010).

Finally, the anthropomorphic and instrumental metaphors gives a base sound for an organization, that is trust, enabling people to play specific sounds with their instruments (e.g., humanity, potential, talent, and ability). In other words, trust enables individuals to bring forth their own potential, feel pride, and show mutual loyalty within the in-group. Individuals’ initial disposition (trusting intention) becomes evident in day-to-day life. Thus, it creates a sense of usefulness and communality. The sound of an organization reflects the ultimate feeling of being a part of something. Figuratively, if there is not the base sound and humanity – that is, trust – individuals will produce high sounds which will most likely only satisfy themselves intellectuality and professionally. People instead seek a sense communality perceived as an esprit de corps which can be likened to a harmony created by a group of instruments.

5.3.3 Processual perspectives
The organization’s processes (e.g., Bartlett & Ghoshal, 1995; De Wit & Meyer, 2005; Kaplan & Norton, 2004) are the second main pillar in the house which include interplay and the functionality of the system. Accordingly, processes link people and tasks through rules, routines, and control mechanisms in an effective manner. Thus, processes form an interaction system that gives a sense of interconnectedness (cf., institutional trust). The metaphors of “trust is a river,” “trust is a road with heavy traffic,” and “trust is a safe boat” describe a sense of functionality (cf., McKnight et al., 2006), security (cf., Simmons et al., 2009), and particularly flow and movement.

Trust is a road with heavy traffic
Some go fast and others slowly. Collisions can happen. It is a good and wide road. The landscape is pleasant. There are some crossings, where one must be careful. Some motorcyclists drive fast and carelessly.

Trust is a road that leads past a number of waypoints to a destination. Somebody has planned, built the road from bottom-up, and maintained it for this purpose. Drucker (2002) argued that human capital serves as structures. However, here, structures serve human activity and life. That means that somebody has developed factors of trust on which others can build life or business, such as organizational and interpersonal trust. On the road, there are also other people, rules, freight, and vehicles to be taken into account. The traffic follows common rules and behavioral patterns (cf., structural assurance and situational normality (McKnight et al., 2006). However, all do not follow the rules, and thus accidents happen. A road is an enabler for heavy traffic, travelling, and logistics, and provides infrastructure and direction. Trust can be built intentionally for purpose of being the basis for a set of rules, structures, and processes (cf., Sydow, 2006; Bachmann & Zaheer, 2006). Different kinds of traffic indicate ongoing usage and testing. The road, as well as trust, is consumable, which means that it must be continuously maintained. Also, travelers must be reliable and loyal to other travel mates (cf., values). Values may more likely enhance the propensity to trust because they are more permanent than specific situations and relationships (Jones & George, 1993). The road as a form of trust is an impersonal infrastructure (man-made materials) and therefore abiotic. Thus, it provides infrastructure, roles, responsibilities, and authoritative functions (cf., deterrence-based trust; Burt & Knez, 1995). Travelers on the other hand represent a relational, human, and social
perspective whereby all can expect ethically justifiable behavior (Fulmer & Gelfand, 2012), even service-minded leadership (Northouse, 2013).

**Trust is a river**

*It flows slowly. It finds new riverbeds. It has power and energy. Trust has slowness in its nature.*

Looking at a river brings a feeling of peace, and sometimes fury and unmanageable natural power. Power of trust, as a river, can be seen, felt, and experienced. The riverbed guides the water slowly forward in a specific direction. Deepness indicates that the riverbed has gradually formed its way. The riverbed is organizational structures, processes, and people in an organization trying to have an impact on trust (cf., direction; Kaplan & Norton, 2004). Flowing water does easily change its flow because it has power like trust. However, when the level of water goes down, both power and functionality decrease. In such a case, all kinds of stones and forms on the bottom create obstacles for careers and recreation. Low water level is a consequence of dryness. Accordingly, distrust is a consequence of a lack trust or poor trust supporting antecedents.

Water contains nutrients, and flooding water can be converted to energy. Water can carry not only things, ferries, and people, but also fertilize the ground and provide recreational opportunities and a means for transportation. The river is an impersonal natural organ but is organic (a life, a form). Thus, it changes its way and forms a new way intentionally and by force. Water flows into a descent (cf., ongoing process; Connell et al., 2003). However, it can be manipulated – that is, managed like trust. The river metaphor expresses not only trust’s instrumental function (Ilmonen & Jokinen, 2002; Savolainen, 2011) as a nourishment, a carrier, and a natural resource (if utilized) but also its nature as innovativeness and creativeness. In a trusting environment, trust provides a kind of peace (slowness), it finds new ways (innovative), it has power and energy to carry and keep things in order and in movement (within the riverbed and in a direction). Water in the river is a collection of small streams, and it reflects the nature of assembling or bundling. Consequently, it reflects the power of small but combined factors and the influence of small qualities of trust accumulated and multiplied. Thus, small endeavors are worth doing and maintaining.

**Trust is a safe boat**

*It has such a floating system that it does not sink even though it falls. I trust that, whatever situations, come I will stay afloat.*

Trust as a safe boat is not only a means of rescue in turbulent times but also a feeling of security and amusement in stable times. Trust as a safe boat is purposely constructed for pleasure, travelling, and logistics. Its construction enables us to rely on its floating capability. Trust as a safe boat illustrates different forms of trust from propensity (Dirks & Ferrin, 2002), abilities (Mayer et al., 1005), norms (McKnight, et al., 2006), and values (Madhok, 2006). Values are a kind of informal governance system complementing a formal one (Cuevas et al., 2015). A boat illustrates a governance system, for example, its means, careers, security, and shelter. Regulations, rules, and safety measurements direct an interaction and life. The safe boat enables pleasure, traveling, and logistics but is an impersonal construction (material) and is consumable. The boat can provide security through impersonal structures and rescue teams. Security is not
only supported by a safety system (cf., risk-taking; Fulmer & Mayer, 2005) and the willingness to take risks (Mayer et al., 1995), but also it links the boat to external rescue teams (willingness to accept vulnerability; Fulmer & Gelfand, 2012). In other words, if an organization allows open and trustworthy dialogue, people can freely rely on internal and external resources in case of personal needs.

5.3.4 Structural perspective

The organization’s structure is the third pillar (Bartlett & Ghoshal, 1995; De Wit & Meyer, 2005) in the house which represents interdependence and participation. Structure reflects authority, functions, roles, responsibilities, and division of labor.

**Trust is a backbone**

Such a spinal column keeps upright something essentially important. It is not stiff, but it adapts accordingly to situations. It is a living organism.

Trust is a construction like a spinal column that keeps an organism together by means of different joined elements where each part has specific role. Trust as a backbone incorporates previous metaphors, such as a building blocks (Zaheer et al., 1998), glue (e.g., Lane & Buchmann, 1998), and lubricant (Mistral, 1996). Thus, trust as a backbone is made from blocks and joined together with glue and made flexible by oil. Trust is an enabler and an integrative supporting factor. Each component in an anatomy has a particular purpose. Every part is of utmost importance to the purpose. The backbone must be suitable for a purpose which demands flexibility, changeability, and design. Components are joined for the purpose not only of keeping the spinal column together (instrumental; e.g., Savolainen, 2011) but also for serving the purpose. Thus, trust is conditional (Jones & George, 1998) depending on the backbone. Contextual trust not only consists of different factors but also of patterns of interconnectedness which are rather voluntary and unofficial or official organization cultures (Whitener, et al., 2006), with and conscious dependencies on another (e.g., Zand, 1972). Trust as a backbone or a skeleton of a building cannot be easily seen, but its absence makes life chaotic. It provides an upright position, security, flexibility, and factuality for a living organism, such as an organization with the expectation of also functioning in the future (Rotter, 1967).

Structures and processes provide a sense of interconnectedness and functionality. Belief in structural assurance and situational normality impact the trusting belief in an organization (McKnight et al., 2006). On the one hand, trust is a natural resource (organic), and on the other, it is a man-made construction. Thus, trust either emerges naturally because of people’s personality (e.g., Rotter 1967), or it can be developed intentionally through the alignment of people though learning (trustworthiness e.g., Mayer et al., 1995) and renewing an organization (structural assurance and situational normality (e.g., McKnight et al., 2006). Despite the origin of trust, the development of trust must be taken care of and maintained because it involves ongoing change, consumption, and danger. Institutional trust (e.g., Dobing, 1993; McKnight et al., 2006) is in a man-made construct and has tangible or intangible resources, but it is still an abstract feeling, a fragile or robust and consumable phenomenon. In addition, it is flexible and at the same time rigid, a feeling of compatibility and sharable mutual understanding. Trust also has a function as an enabler, organizer, shelter,
floating system, container, and security measure. Building a foundation for trust is an intentional managerial action with a purpose. It is remarkable that developing trust based on impersonal antecedents is an interpersonal action. Behavior is based on parties’ trustworthiness wherein individual disposition has an essential role, an assurance of functionality and stability.

5.3.5. Strategic perspective

The roof is the center of attention, it is the mission and the purpose reflecting a value creation system (the body; Morgan, 1986). The mission and the purpose give a sense of meaning. They consist of beliefs, values, and definitions (e.g., De Wit & Meyer, 2005). It is noteworthy that the way the organization creates value is through context and is situation-specific.

Trust is a rock

*It is strong and has strength. A strong rock is predictable and stable. It indicates that we are on a solid base. We are not on unknown and dark ground but on a powerful foundation.*

The bigger the building or the more important the mission, the stronger the foundation must be, and at best it must be covered by a roof. A well-built foundation (strong and suitable) is on solid ground like a rock. Foundations must be planned and then built according to the instructions for a particular purpose. Construction is a process that must be supervised. The lowest levels cannot always be seen, but weaknesses of those levels affect everything. Usually, most failures are related to the groundwork, foundation, or frame. Trust is experimentally visible and strong if built on solid (verifiable) factors and a firm base. It has developed its form over time and will not change without intentional force or damage.

The rock metaphor illustrates the essence and nature of the groundwork on which trust is built in an organization – well-grounded trust is the alpha and omega. Trust as a rock, based on impersonal and personal antecedents, is more robust than fragile (cf., McKnight et al., 2006). The foundation of an organization is the mission, and the building is the organizational system (structures, processes, and culture). On that foundation, individual members are linked and able to link to other cells. In this context, the following Biblical reference conveys the meaning of a firm foundation:

> “He is like a man which built a house, and digged deep, and laid the foundation on a rock: and when the flood arose, the stream beat vehemently upon that house, and could not shake it: for it was founded upon a rock.” (The Bible: Luke 6:48)

Consequently, well-grounded impersonal trust cannot be shaken. It is grounded beyond the manpower to the rock. The mission is the foundation for the strategic leadership.

Trust is a foundation

*A foundation can be built. It is firm so that we don’t need to fear what stays on it. I understand the foundation as a relationship with God. It stays all the time with God. Between people, a foundation of trust becomes obvious quite soon. Then, it emerges gradually.*
A foundation can intentionally be built on solid ground. The strong foundation gives structural assurance and reflects situational normality (McKnight et al., 2006) – the security that trust is based on the mission and the organizational systems the guide members to behave accordingly. The impersonal antecedents offer operational predictability and stability. In this context, the impersonal antecedents of trust foundation are understood as having a personal relationship with God.

Finally, on the one hand, there are ethical and moralistic issues such as expected behavior and morally correct decisions, and on the other hand, strategic and calculative dimensions including anticipated cooperation and office politics (Kramer, 2006). Taking that into account, the strategic perspective considers issues being important from the mission point of view as needing to be implemented. Thus, the one should calculate adequately what kind of foundation is to be built and what kind of building and systems are appropriate. Only after that can ethical behavior or operations be maintained. Thus, Hardin’s (2002) idea of trust as a three-part relationship is worth referring to how it consists of the properties of a trustor, the attributes of trustee, and a specific context on which trust is appropriate to be built. Thus, trust can be built considering the strategic issues which are grounded on the spiritual dimension to God, the founder of the Church per se. Spirituality is a dimension of trust but is understood accordingly and contextually. God’s faith in us is stable, despite environmental changes and our incompleteness and lack of loyalty. Trust in God is the certainty of a continuous empowerment through faith. Finally, these metaphors describe how trust provides a sense of meaning and purpose. Trust has a dimension on both horizontal and vertical levels.

5.3.6 Conclusion

Metaphorical thinking as conceptual thinking is more about thoughts than language (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980), which are best understood in social and cultural contexts (cf., Moser, 2000). On the basis of the metaphorical data, my findings were demonstrated using the house metaphor (Bartlett & Ghoshal, 1995). The participants’ statements were used to propositionally link their metaphors to the house metaphor. The multilevel metaphorical modeling emphasizes the role of trust and its diversity. The house metaphor appeared to be a suitable model to incorporate different aspects of metaphors. The human (trust is a rest, trust is a tranquility, trust is a leap of faith) perspective supports importance of psychical, mental, and spiritual well-being. Thus, trust gives a sense of well-being and meaningfulness. The relational perspective emphasizes the anthropomorphic (trust is a human) and instrumental (trust is a contrabass) characteristics of trust rather than human nature and perceived mutual experience. Nevertheless, trust brings forth potential and strengthens a sense of usefulness and communality, that is, esprit de corps. Without trust, an organization advances in an individualistic way of working and living. The processual (trust is a river, trust is a heavy road, trust is a boat) and structural (trust is a backbone) perspectives provide a sense of interconnectedness and functionality. The strategic (trust is a rock, trust is a foundation) trust perspective shows the value of a solid base and foundation.

Having said the above, I must emphasize that these characteristics are of utmost importance to strategic issues. In the contextual study, the mission as the foundation has a spiritual dimension, whereas God as a reliable actor stays firm. Thus, trust in God
is a certainty of continuous empowerment through faith. Strategic metaphors express trust as a sense of meaning and purpose with a spiritual dimension. Consequently, I propose that spirituality and well-being are factors of trustworthiness in addition to Mayer and colleagues’ (1995) ability, benevolence, and integrity. The purpose gives a reason for existence and meaning. Life in the house will be done by the members. Thus, an abandoned house will soon deteriorate. There are various factors of trust but without interplay, these factors will not be realized. These new additional factors of trustworthiness appear to be critical for trust, specifically in turbulent times when people are overburdened. It does not help that many people are trustworthy, but their well-being is poor, and their spiritual drivers are extinguished. People also seek deeper meaning and purpose in life. Previously, spirituality was defined as “access to sacred force” (Nash et al., 2001, 17) and “unique inner search for the fullest personal development through participation into transcendent mystery” (Delbecq, 1999, 345), and further, that “it applies to Biblical faith, understood to refer to that relationship between God and man” (Harrelson, 1963, 252). However, a dyadic relationship with a transcendent is different from an interpersonal one because the first is an individual empowering relationship hence enhances trusting intention and trusting belief. Religion has been theorized to play a role in strategic leadership (Grandy, 2013). From senior leadership’s perspective, trust is not an end, as such, but rather a condition, state of individual and organizational well-being, and perceived meaningfulness in achieving goals and finally in fulfilling the mission. Strategic renewal of the organization concerns the whole organization (e.g., Schmitt et al., 2018; De Wit & Meyer, 2005), and hence well-being and spirituality should be considered. This extended perspective of trust is critical for organizational renewal.

Figure 10. The house metaphor applied for this study adapted from Bartlett and Ghoshal (1995)
Finally, people at work feel distanced, vulnerable, and cynical due to continuous changes (e.g., Bartlett & Ghoshal, 1995). Thus, some feel less respect, trust, and confidence in management (Burack, 1999). Organizations save us from a spiritual emptiness and impoverishment (Karakas, 2010). Karakas suggested that spirituality may solve the problems of stress, burnout, and lack of well-being. These are connected to satisfaction, happiness, self-esteem, hope, optimism, and the meaning in life (Reave, 2005). I propose that spirituality is an empowering factor of trust originating from the spirituality (cf., ideology) of the mission and people’s disposition to seek meaning in life. In the context of this study, spirituality was found to be more of a pivotal and empowering factor than a tool because the work is spiritual in nature. Both restructuring and adaptation to environmental changes are not the answer to the Church’s declining membership and financial crises. Rather, it is question about finding and then strengthening the very essence of the Church’s mission and purpose, and then helping individuals and the community to reach their full potential.
6 SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

6.1 SUMMARY OF THE STUDY

This study contributes to the ongoing theoretical and practical discussion about the applicability of strategic leadership and trust research from the senior leadership perspective in the nonprofit sector, specifically in the church setting (Phipps & Burbach, 2010; Grandy, 2013; Ronquillo, 2011). This case study explored how strategic leadership’s activities produce organizational trust and, in turn, it emerges as senior leaders’ trust in an organization. First, I offer conclusions about strategic leadership practices and theory discourse, and then describe how trust emerges and is characterized by levels from senior the leaders’ perspective. Further, I explain spirituality as a part of the organizational theory discourse. Finally, I summarize the contributions and implications of the study.

6.1.1 Strategic leadership model and theory discourse

Strategic leadership practices formed a pattern of crossover themes incorporated with the concept of trust. The crossover themes formed the KSFs for competing in the future. The themes are: 1) empowering mission – sending for purpose, 2) developing organizational system – enabling interdependence, 3) exerting leadership influence – fostering trustworthiness, and 4) promoting participation – releasing potential (Figure 11, #1). While executing strategic leadership, senior leaders not only focus on the KSFs but also build organizational trust. Doing so, they perform trustworthy leadership developing organizational capacity (cf., Boal & Hooijberg, 2001). Transactional and transformational leadership are opposite ends of the continuum (Bass, 1995, 1998; Mintzberg, 1989). Thus, strategic leadership (Figure 11, #1) creates a context for trust development (Figure 11, #2 and #3). The leadership supports the emergence of trust at that level. Trust development and leaders’ actions are in continuous interplay (see arrows).

Unless the mission and purpose are sent for a specific purpose and if they are not clear to the leadership, an organization drifts by being driven by internal or external interest groups or public discourse. Thus, an organization must be first aligned, instead of letting people align an organization. Currently, the Church aims to include all people and avoid the risk of excluding anyone. Thus, the purpose, that is, the statement of faith, is unclear per se, or as the one participant stated, “people do not believe in the same way how the Church teaches, neither the Church necessarily believes. The greatest limit is between the Church and the people it serves.” Consequently, the leadership has failed in communicating the message despite the fact that it has the best product and huge assets. Strategically, senior leaders should be more like evangelists creating confidence in a meaningful purpose through idealized influence as the ideological mission keeps an organization on track.

At the organizational level, including structures and processes, senior leaders should be stimulated to be creative and innovative though challenging intellectually old ways of thinking. The system emphasizes participation, interconnectedness,
and functionality whereby structural and human capital form an organization's intellectual capital (cf., Hitt et al. 2002). However, on the basis of the data, it appears to me that senior leaders have voluntarily surrendered to inflexibility and slowness of the structure and the permanent office system. Distrust differs from trust because of the intensity of emotions involved in each (McKnight & Chervanu, 2001). Consequently, senior leader’s confidence in developing the system has decreased, and strategic initiatives have become weaker. The inherited rigid organizational systems have pros and cons, but they do not meet the requirements of the competitive demands. The senior leadership at the focal point felt that they could not advance initiatives. The voluntary surrendering provides evidence of the frustration, distrust, and strong emotions. However, this has provoked innovativeness through learning, and senior leaders have created new ways and forms of working in order to overcome organizational obstacles. That indicates the strategic leadership’s capacity to innovate. Despite that, at the group level through culture, “how we do things around here,” they inspired a sense of interplay, functionality, communality, and trustworthiness, and hence a commitment to the shared vision. Not only applicable leadership styles or capacities but specifically justified content of management talk and senior leaders’ spirituality help trust to emerge. At the individual level, they met people at peace as individuals. Thus, they have enhanced a sense of usefulness and meaning through participatory leadership. Doing so, they have stimulated the intrinsic propensity to trust through concern for the well-being and shared spirituality.

In this respect, the senior leadership has the opportunity to empower strategic practices as KSFs in building trust. I propose that strategic actions and practices are more situation- and context-specific than a complete generalized list of strategic activities as introduced by Phipps and Hooijberg (2010). The specific actions and practices

Figure 11. Interplay of strategic leadership activities and antecedents of emerging trust
focus on the pathway of movement in pursuing the mission and developing trust whereby content and ways of acting are critical, as well. The Church tends to adapt and become one with the dominant society – the Church for people with all views inclusive. The tendency to adapt and satisfy customers’ multiple voices diversifies senior leaders’ drive, and the Church risks becoming lost in the middle. Thus, it seems that the top management does not have confidence in the organization’s capacity to advance changes accordingly. Adaptation is typical for NPOs in a declining or a slow growth phase (Rhodes & Keogan, 2005). However, I argue that the success will be achieved through pursuing the empowered mission and purpose. Thus, the study indicates the idea of standing for the mission because that is the characteristic and special driving force for a nonprofit public organization (cf., Kaplan & Norton, 2004; Mintzberg, 1989). Specifically, NPOs strive to deliver the mission instead of excellent financial performance. Thus, the strategic leadership must have a strong stance on the mission and commitment in pursuing the mission. Senior leaders exhibit better understanding of the mission through increasing learning capacity, which, in turn, results in better alignment, identification, and focus. Transformational leadership advances institutional learning and the capacity for strategic thinking (Boal & Hooijberg, 2001; Phipps & Burbach, 2010).

Consequently, I propose a theoretical extension to Boal and Hooijberg’s (2001) strategic leadership concept of capacities. I argue that successful strategic leadership depends not only on context but also on the content of how strategic leaders contribute to innovations and advance the mission. Thus, on the basis of the data, I recommend that the capacity for empowering mission and the capacity to innovate should be added along with the capacities to learn, change, and apply managerial wisdom. The mission is a driver giving a sense of meaning and purpose which permeates through an organization. The case revealed the ideological and spiritual origin of the mission. I argue that the driver of the mission is in its intrinsic spirituality and its ideological stances. Spirituality is beyond the innate and indispensable mission; it involves the obedience to the origin of the mission’s ideology and spirituality, which is the principal’s assignment. Further, in the nonprofit setting, it is not being altered to meet the changes and the good fortune that it reveals through a business idea or skills as in the for-profit organization. This study in the nonprofit context, more specifically in the church setting, indicates that spirituality is a capacity and a resource to empower purpose over time. It gives a sense of meaning and purpose and is continuously strengthened by spiritual factuality.

Further, capacity to innovate is important for success in turbulent times. Implementation of a NPO’s mission may need special innovation due to its importance for long-term success. That is even more of the essence because of labor-intensive services, individualistic organizational culture, and rigid organizational systems and practices. This study shows that strategic leadership can have a strong influence on innovations through advancing mission and vision. Successful NPOs struggle for innovation to serve the mission (McDonald, 2007). Thus, innovation and mission are connected. The mission of a nonprofit is to fulfill specific needs that cannot be achieved within the private or public sectors, even though there is pressure to be more business-like and to focus on finances at the cost of achieving the mission. In this case, voluntary surrendering to organizational disintegration emerged not only through senior leadership’s innovation of new ways of working but also through various movement’s activities within the Church. Thus, innovation is part of future-oriented renewals and spiritual leadership.
Moreover, there is evidence that senior leaders exhibited more transformational leadership, with an ingredient of servant leadership, than charismatic leadership (cf., Barnes, 1978), based on the personal qualities to influence. Thus, the strategic leadership has a servant leadership dimension particularly in this context. However, Graham (1991) argued that charismatic leadership is the theoretical base for both servant and transformational leadership because both are moral and inspirational. Senior leaders bring their own personality and disposition towards trust into a leadership situation. They have a desire to serve through their innate human attribute of spirituality (cf., Karakas, 2010) and a sense of calling without expecting a reward. However, strategic leadership, servant leadership, and spiritual leadership should not be mixed. They go together but are not mixed.

Accordingly, I agree with the clarification that leadership capacity is more important than leadership styles (e.g., Phipps & Burbach, 2010; Kegan, 1982; Lewis & Jacobs, 1992), but I disagree with them that values would not be that important. I discovered that not only senior leader’s values and preferences (Hambrick & Pettigrew, 2001) and strategic leadership capacity (cf., Boal & Hooijberg, 2001; trustworthiness, Mayer et al., 1995) are critical aspects advancing trust in an organization, but also senior leaders’ spirituality has a critical influence on their initiatives, leadership, and the organization. According to my understanding, strategic leadership style is rather an adaptive element of capacity per se. Style emphasizes traits and adaptation to situational and individualistic demands. Thus, senior leadership’s capacity to trust is a key dimension of trust building (Hardin, 2002). Nevertheless, well-being and spirituality become critical factors of trustworthiness. Thus, I propose the idea to add a dimension to Mayer and colleagues’ (1995) concept of trustworthiness by including well-being and spirituality (Figure 13).

Concerning trustworthy strategic leadership, it is question not only about practices and leadership style (Bass, 1995), but also about leaders’ capacity and ability. Thus, senior leaders’ capacity, including well-being and spirituality, must be a complete match with the position and task. One participant described the importance of capacity: “Hardly any of us have training and experience about strategic management or strategic leadership.” However, capacity may increase as the leader moves up the hierarchy (Phipps & Burbach, 2010). Consequently, senior leaders’ experiences may increase the capacity to change. This study confirmed that developing capacity to change is a significant function for nonprofit leadership (Phipps & Burbach, 2010). Correspondingly, debate on Bass’s strategic leadership styles and Boal and Hooijberg’s (2001) strategic leadership capacities, such as the capacities to learn, change, and apply managerial wisdom, is constructive.

I support the conclusion that strategic leaders contribute to nonprofit organizational performance through capacities (Boal & Hooijberg, 2001) which is consistent with strategic leadership theory (e.g., Phipps et al., 2010). At the same time, according to the flexible leadership theory (Yukl, 2008), strategic leadership’s actions in nonprofits also increase capacity to change as in for-profit organizations. Thus, as noted by Yukl (2008, 718), “with some relatively minor modifications, it can be extended to include nonprofit and public sector organizations.” However, I would add a note that the mission cannot be adequately met, as such, like in either the private or the public sectors. I must emphasize that business language and practices are strange in this context, and business concepts can be dangerous in the hands of inexperienced leaders. Thus, those tools must be used carefully and applied with caution. Furthermore, practices are situational and contextual (i.e., issue-based design) instead of a set of predetermined
strategic activities (i.e., planning-based design). In addition, this study supports the argument that strategic leadership is different in the nonprofit context (Phipps & Burbach, 2010), and on the basis of the data, more so in a church setting. However, taking in account the limitations, strategic leadership can be applied in the nonprofit context and in church settings (cf., Grandy, 2013; Ronquillo, 2011). Nevertheless, this study contributes to the demand for further research called for by Grandy (2010) specifically in churches. Grandy argued that there is not any research directly about strategic leadership in churches, even though religion has been theorized to play a role in strategic leadership. As noted by Bass (1985), transactional and transformational are opposite ends of the continuum. Grandy (2010) also stressed that measuring success is linked to the context and mission (e.g., spiritual growth in a church) in a nonprofit setting.

Finally, from the senior leaders’ perspective, strategic means that there is the utmost importance in achieving the mission. Further, strategic refers to actions aiming at the transformation of the capabilities regarding competitive advantage (e.g., Schmitt et al., 2018). Thus, strategic leadership is an ability to perform strategic actions and practices striving for achieving the mission, and an ability to demonstrate the capacity to learn, change, apply managerial wisdom, as well as the capacity for empowering the mission and capacity to innovate. Strategic activities incorporated with trust are empowering the mission, developing organizational system, exerting quality leadership influence, and enhancing participation and communality. The proposed capacities get little support from other scholars, but often strategic leadership activities are argued to be critical to maintain mission trajectory in nonprofit settings (Phipps & Burbach, 2010). Thus, the strategic leadership advances confidence in meaningful purpose, an assurance of participation and interconnectedness, a sense of interplay and functionality, a sense of trustworthiness and communality, and, most importantly, a sense of usefulness and meaning. Hardin (2002) noted that we must understand the capacity to trust in order to understand trust. Consequently, success of a nonprofit, more specifically the church, is based on these practices and factors that are relevant for an organization driven by its mission and vitalized through releasing potential.

6.1.2 Trust development through the mission-down and potential-up process

Next, I describe how senior leaders perceive emerging trust at multiple levels. When senior leadership practices trustworthy leadership, they advance organizational trust and, in turn, their own trust in an organization. From a performance point of view, senior leaders’ trust is critical. From the strategic leadership’s point of view, not only the context (Rousseau et al., 1998) but also the content are important factors influencing trust. Strategic leadership is different in nonprofits than in public and for-profit organizations. This study shows that senior leaders’ activities produce organizational trust not only in achieving the mission but also through releasing individuals and the organization’s potential. In turn, emerging trust develops senior leaders’ trust. Thus, senior leaders’ trust development is based not only primarily on disposition and perceived competence but also specifically on the realized KSFs driving the mission. Therefore, in this context, perceived trust in meaningfulness and in achieving the mission determine success in the future. The model gives extensive grounds for competing in the future, and any failure would most likely
indicate ineffective strategic leadership (Gill, 2003). Strategic leadership actions create a multilevel context for trust development through a circular issue-based mission-down and potential-up process (Figure 12, #2). The mission-down process reveals the importance of the mission as an origin of trust permeating through an organization. The potential-up process emphasizes the essence of releasing and realizing the potential that individuals and an organization possess.

Further, trust development comes about through specific trusting referents, such as trusting faith at the strategic level, trusting stance on the organizational level, trusting belief at the group level, and trusting intention at the individual level (Figure 12, #3). I define trusting faith as a willingness to rely on an existential value-added system, that is, the mission and purpose, as well as the faith in the TMT’s commitment to KSFs. The value-added system refers to the way an organization conducts its mission (e.g., De Wit & Meyer, 2005; Kaplan & Norton, 2004). Trusting stance is a willingness to depend on another, regardless of beliefs in the other (e.g., McKnight et al., 2006), and confidence in the systems, and the advancement of intellectual capacities. Thus, it stresses behaviors that demonstrate interdependence from one another and the systems (cf., Alarcon et al., 2018). Further, trusting belief highlights perceived communality, trustworthiness (Mayer et al., 1995), and human and social capitals in social exchange relationships. Finally, trusting intention is a willingness to trust others based on an inherent disposition (e.g., trait) to trust (cf., propensity; Mayer et al., 2006). Thus, experiences, personality types, and cultural backgrounds impact the propensity to trust (e.g., Hofstede, 1980). Trusting intention depends on a sense of usefulness and meaning. In addition, Figure 11, #3 illustrates trusting referents from the senior leadership perspective, at what level senior leaders trust, and in whom and in what. Trust develops through a mission-down and potential-up process across multiple levels. The model emphasizes the mission’s value-added origin and power of emerging potential that people possess. In trusting spirituality, the atmosphere of both the mission and potential fosters trust development. In the figure, the arrows indicate that referents are in a continuous circular interplay.

At the individual level, the individual perspective of trusting intention is linked to trust in interpersonal referents, team referent and trust organizational referents (cf., Fulmer & Gelfand, 2012) (See Tables 3–6). Trusting intention involves the propensity to trust. The metaphorical modelling of trust showed that both a person and trust can be characterized as an active doer (character of trust) who is willing to be creative, innovative, and even corrective. Thus, according to the multilevel analyses individual trust in interpersonal referents is in line with prior findings, such as a built-in disposition to trust (Dirks & Ferrin, 2002), safe attachment to others (Simmons, et al., 2009), and perceived trustworthiness (Mayer, et al., 2006). Disposition influences trusting intention and belief (McKnight, et al., 2006). In this context, trust in interpersonal referents underlines value and spiritual congruence and a sense of well-being and meaningfulness. Similarly, individual trust in team referents supports the concepts of identification as a team member (Colquitt, et al., 2007), integrity and benevolence (Mayer, et al., 2006), and perceived emotional support (Dirks, 2006) which are developed through trust in a team. However, referents within functional roles and arrangements, such as an individualistic working culture and new ways of working online, hinder trust development even though they do not exclude it. Furthermore, such arrangements test random memberships. In addition, individual trust in organizational referents, such as organizational identification, perceived organizational justice (e.g., Lewicki, 1995), psychological contracts (e.g., McKnight
et al., 2006), and positive employee–employer relationships (e.g., Fulmer & Gelfand, 2012). In this context, individual consideration and spiritual congruence support an individual’s trust development in an organization by encouraging a consistent tendency to be willing (cf., McKnight, et al., 2006).

Consequently, trust gives a perceived sense of well-being and meaningfulness, the feeling that “I can do, and I am useful.” In this way, individual potential also becomes a KSF for an organization in driving its mission. Specifically, participation in the mission helps an individual to employ spirituality to be of service to others. According to the data, not only one’s own perceived trustworthiness but specifically one’s well-being and spirituality affect the willingness and capacity to do this. Senior leaders can promote trust through actions and messengers. Having introduced the findings at the individual level, I acknowledge that referents are revealed and explained mostly through social exchange theory (Blau, 1964), social identification theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979), social information processing theory (Salancik & Pfeffer, 1978), and attribution theory (Weider, 2010) per se. However, one important precondition for trust is the need for it. But, that relationship is a financial relationship which more strongly emphasizes social aspects (Whitener, et al., 2006) because social relationships open ways to access information and networks.

At the group level, trusting belief consists equally of trust in interpersonal referents, team referents, and organizational referents in an organizational culture. Group trust in an interpersonal referent requires trustworthiness (Mayer et al., 1995) and human and social capital (e.g., Drucker, 2002; Kaplan & Norton, 2004; Savolainen, 2010) that form a base for emerging trust. In addition, in this context, perceived well-being and trustworthiness and perceived esprit de corps and communality support trust development. Group trust in teams is based on leadership competence,
team cooperation (Mayer et al., 2006), courage to take risks (Fuller & Mayer, 2005),
frequent interactions (Fulmer & Gelfand, 2012), and specifically discussions at peace,
positive communication, and the feeling of belonging to an in-group which all boost
trust development (cf., social information processing theory). Group trust in an
organization, according to my analyses, is grounded on senior leaders’ concern for
well-being, abilities of conflict management (or prevention of conflicts), clear roles
and value congruence, and particularly the ability to perform service leadership.
Because of social relationships, conflicts are typical at this level. However, conflict
and trust are closely related, and conflict management is therefore critical (Fulmer &
Gelfand, 2012). Finally, trust creates a sense of penetrating communality and esprit de
corps, as a “feeling of pride and mutual loyalty shared by the members of a group”
(Foyol, 1916). Thus, senior leaders can influence trust development by promoting the
diffusion of knowledge and spirituality about the mission and purpose through social
relationships. The team as a referent and group seems to have a lower level of trust
in one another (cf., Song, 2009). Finally, perceived trust creates an individual feeling
of usefulness and meaning, and it encourages the willingness to voluntarily make
decisions for the betterment of the organization.

At the organizational level, trusting stance requires reliance and confidence in
systems and advancement of intellectual capacities being supported by structures and
processes (e.g., De Wit & Meyer, 2005). From an organizational perspective, referents
focus mainly on an organizational trust in an organization. Thus, trust in an organization
is based on an image of ethical behavior and leadership competence (e.g. laws and
orders, integration of people and tasks), well-functioning and flexible systems (e.g.,
supervision, control, reporting, IT), supportive practices (procedures, routines), prior
relationships and performance, and fair and transparent communication practices
(e.g., McKnight et al., 2006; Kaplan & Norton, 2004; Mayer et al., 2006). Such rule-
based confidence is a more collective utility (Dunn, 1988), which will surely be tested
in real life. However, in the context of organizational identification and integrity (as
being Lutheran), relevant organizational services and activities (customer orientation),
shared dependencies for common goals and open reciprocal communication enhance
trust in an organization. However, disintegrated organizational (e.g., decision-making)
and the permanent office systems (division of labor and tasks) jeopardize emerging
trust and cause voluntary surrendering to the renewal of old the systems. There is
also a risk of devastating cynicism. Nevertheless, frustration generates innovation to
create new activities and new ways of working, which indicates the strategic capacity
to innovate.

As a comparison at the organizational level, structural and system theories
play a bigger role than at the lower levels (Bachmann & Zaheer, 2006). Attribution
theory (Heider, 1958) aims to make sense of relationships and events, whereas social
information theory (Salancik & Pfeffer, 1978) focuses on interpersonal communication.
Finally, the trusting stance creates an assurance of interconnectedness, participation,
interplay, and functionality. Thus, senior leaders can promote trust development
through positive steps to renew and by offering flexibility through networks. Trust is
a shared psychological state comprising the willingness to accept vulnerability based
on positive expectations of an organization’s referents (cf., Fulmer & Gelfand, 2012).

At the strategic level, trusting faith emphasizes the willingness to rely on the value-
added mission and purpose. Thus, trusting faith relies on strategic capacities to create
a sense of purpose and strategic competencies. Environment and culture are part
of the strategic context which affects members’ trust in an organization (Hodson,
Failures in strategic initiatives at this level, such as a disintegrated organization system, are more serious than at the lower levels. However, interpersonal and interorganizational (units) trust are related (Zaheer, et al., 1998) though trust is in its individual member, and hence at the level in the entity. From the strategic perspective, strategic trust in an interpersonal referent and team referents and strategic trust in organizational referents depend on referents supporting strategic initiatives. Strategic trust in interpersonal referents requires their willingness to rely on the mission, through perceived spiritual empowerment, prayer and worship, and experienced well-being. Also, there has to be a perceived match of one’s trustworthiness and acknowledged understanding about the limits between people and the purpose to launch relevant services and actions, which can create solid grounds for trust. Strategic trust in team referents advances trust through the TMT’s dedication to the mission and KSFs and its spiritual and value congruence. Moreover, strategic trust in organizational referents stands for how the mission permeates the entire organization, the leadership match, perceived senior leaders’ capacity, faith in God as a source of empowerment, service leadership style, perceived strategic focus, the idea of the God’s Kingdom, and well-functioning systems.

The opportunities to execute ethical service leadership can strengthen trust. Service leaders are concerned about followers’ well-being and nurturing (cf., Northouse, 2013). Accordingly, they put others first and help them to reach their full potential (e.g., Savolainen & Ikonen, 2016). In this context, service or servant leadership involves others in the greater good of the Church, community, and society. Thus, service leadership becomes strategic as it endeavors to build commitment to the mission. However, inherited organizational systems and values and spiritual disintegration disrupt strategic initiatives. Consequently, perceived trust in faith promotes confidence in meaningful purpose through existential value-added systems. Also, senior leaders exert an influence on trust development by supporting the permeation of the purpose through strategic service leadership practices. Trust in the system may then be the means to reduce vulnerability (Zucker, 1986). Strategic leadership may succeed in reducing the risk of vulnerability and develop trust as a result.

6.1.3 Discussion about factors of trust

Likelihood to trust versus necessities for trust

Having introduced the process of multilevel process of trust development, next, I review the specific characteristics of trust. This contextual study led to the conclusion that relational trust (Mayer et al., 1995, 2006) is not only with people, institutions, and third parties that form a kind of relationship (e.g., Hardin, 2002), but also specifically goes beyond those to a dyadic relationship between God and man. Thus, I argue that trust has a spiritual dimension, different but complementary to Mayer and colleagues’ definition of trustworthiness (2006, 88) (Figure 13). They defined this “ability as a group of skills, competencies, and characteristics that enable a party to have influence within some specific domain.” According to them, “benevolence is the extent to which a trustee is believed to want to do good to the trustee, aside from an egoistic profit motive.” Further, integrity refers to “perception that the trustee adheres to a set of principles that trustor finds acceptable.” They also noted that the factor of propensity is a trait that is stable across situations. It affects the likelihood to trust as a general willingness to trust others within parties. Furthermore, they argued that
the characteristics and actions of the trustee will lead to that person being trusted. However, based on the findings, I have to argue that disposition, as such, is not satisfactory because it concerns a general willingness, and by itself, it is insufficient due to not having well-being (enough strength) or spiritual (driving) factors. Likelihood to trust also needs passion and energy to act. Well-being (wellness, welfare) refers to psychological and physical capacities (enough strength) to act accordingly in a specific domain. A dimension of well-being refers to the mental capacity (ability) through which every individual perceives their own potential, can manage with the normal stresses of life, can work in a productive manner, and can contribute to the community. Colquitt and colleagues (2007) described trust as a behavioral intention. Despite a strong intention or a superior ability, an entirely burned out person does not correspond to such a level of well-being or mental capacity which are included in the definition of ability.
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**Figure 13.** A tentative theoretical idea for deepening an integrated model of organizational trust (Mayer, Davis, & Schoorman, 1995) by means of a trustor’s well-being and spirituality

Spirituality, instead, refers to intrinsic motivational factors that make a person strive for initiatives (cf., Meng, 2016). It has a dimension that extends beyond the characteristics of extrinsic motivation to the factors of faith and belief in purpose. Trust is not only a social orientation towards other persons and society (Kramer, 2006) but also a spiritual orientation towards the transcendental. Thus, trust is faith-based in potential and meaningfulness. That is seen as a perceived passion and a drive. Previously, spirituality was defined as “access to sacred forces” (Nash & McLennan, 2001, 17), and a “unique inner search for the fullest personal development through participation into transcendent mystery” (Delbecq, 1999, 345), and further, it was as argued that “it applies to Biblical faith, understood to refer to that relationship between God and man” (Harrelson, 1963, 252). Until recently, religion has been theorized as playing a role in strategic leadership (e.g., Grandy, 2013) but not yet incorporated into the concept of trust. Spirituality originates or grows within and through a relationship

34 WHO’s definitions: https://www.who.int/features/factfiles/mental_health/en/.
with God. According to the data, relationship is not only dyadic between people, but also between God and man. Consequently, it is not trait-based (intrinsic) nor extrinsic motivation but beyond human perception. For this reason, I propose a theoretical idea to expand the integrated model of organizational trust (Mayer et al., 1995, 2006) by adding the trustor’s well-being and spirituality, as well as the trustor’s propensity to trust (Figure 13). Thus, character and ability are insufficient if the one does not have balanced well-being, strength, and spiritual drive. In other words, high competence and ability to do alone instill an attitude – “I will do, and I can do.” Thus, well-being and spiritual factors inform an attitude, that is, trusting intention and trusting belief. The conclusion is first that a relationship is not only dyadic between people, but also between God and man, that is, with God as a third party. Second, I propose a theoretical idea to deepen an integrated model of organizational trust (Mayer et al., 1995, 2006) by adding a trustor’s well-being and spirituality. Accordingly, well-being and spirituality are necessities for trust as dynamic factors needed for taking action. Lastly, despite disposition being a stable trait in a changing world, we need to learn about probabilities to change our dispositions due to social media or working arrangements (cf., Kuo & Thompson, 2014).

Metaphorical observations of trust
The metaphorical modelling of trust, how senior leaders characterize trust using a metaphor, relates to understanding tacit knowledge and experiences (Figures 10 and 14) in a specific social and cultural context (Moser, 2000). The house metaphor is an appropriate metaphor for the study because it has previously been used for the Church: the “House of the Lord.” The house metaphor illustrates the importance of impersonal trusting factors, such as solid foundation, supporting pillars of trust, and a roof protecting the idea of added value as a source of trust. Metaphorical modelling of trust incorporates specific characteristics of trust and balance among referents. There is a foundation with pillars standing on it that must be equally strong, so trust is supported and maintained. Also, the house metaphor includes hard work, such as planning, building, and maintaining. System and structural theories demand trust (Bachmann & Zaheer, 2006). Similarly, people build their trust on the foundation that somebody has built and maintained. Consequently, these structures form a backbone, enabling and facilitating reliance but are not the center of the attention. These emphasize historical, generational, and genetic dependencies. Thus, trust is based on a long chain of referents (cf., long-term time perspective; Fulmer & Gelfand, 2012). In other words, it does not appear suddenly from scratch. Even in a swift case, there are people’s history, laws, and organizations that have an impact on emerging trust (cf., Meyrsson et al., 1996; McKnight et al., 2006).

The roof protects the house (structures) and life (people) by keeping all united for a shared purpose. Thus, specifically in this context, the mission and the cause of existence for a purpose are pivotal factors in directing and empowering trust development. The mission and purpose align with the organization and people. The roof needs other structures to be maintained. Structures (anatomy) keep (cf., building blocks, glue; e.g., Zaheer et al., 1998, Lane & Buchmann, 1998) the house in an upright position. Processes (physiology) link people and tasks together and lubricates (cf., oil;

35Matthew 21:13: “It is written, ‘My house shall be called a house of Prayer’”; Hebrews 10:21: “…since we have a great priest over the house of God.”
e.g., Misztral, 1996; Laine, 2008) interaction. Culture (psychology) illustrates relational life under the same roof for the same purpose. The house without people is empty and useless as they are the ones who must do the trusting.

In Figure 14, I illustrate trust from metaphorical perspectives, using a pie graph to illustrate the interconnection of factors and showing the individual's perspective as a trustor per se. Trust is defined as a psychological state consisting of the willingness to accept vulnerability based on a positive expectation of a specific other's trustworthiness (e.g., Fulmer & Gelfand, 2012) as an individual phenomenon. At the higher level, it is a shared construct or a consensus among members within a unit. Yet, individuals are the ones who trust and, specifically in this context, they conduct the services. Material well-being and general prosperity are not enough (Karakas, 2010). Specifically, work as a calling and service orientation seems to be a strong trusting factor. However, individual members or cells may act for common goals, their own interests, or private agendas, or they may play power games using the common factors of trust (cf., agency theory; Eisenhardt, 1989; and mind maps; e.g., De Wit & Meyer, 2005). Thus, the individuals are the most unpredictable and weakest link in the trust formation. Nevertheless, trust offers a base sound for interaction like a contrabass.

From an individual perspective, a leap of faith refers to the willingness to act without perfect knowledge and deal with any consequences. A leap of faith includes being open to taking a risk, but another person must also be willing to take the responsibility for an action. This is a good example of interplay and service leadership attitude related to calculative dimensions. Furthermore, it underlines the fact that change of behavior starts from inside (inside out, the first move) because nothing external may cause a person to gain a desired thing or change. A leap of faith is an internal movement whereby an individual must not only think but also take an action. According to Kierkegaard (1947), thinking may turn towards itself regarding thinking itself and then skepticism can occur. Thus, willingness without action remains pointless and turns against itself weakening self-trust. In this context, a leap of faith is related also to religious origins. Accordingly, we must acknowledge that, in all things, God works for the good of those who love God (cf., Romans 8:28). In this way, a leap of faith reaches beyond consciousness to divine reality.

Another metaphorical comparison exhibited the power of rest and tranquility. That trust is a rest and tranquility emphasizes a conscious awareness of the absence of tension, nervousness, worry, and feelings about being controlled. Thus, it reflects balanced physical, psychological, and social well-being. In the case of rest, trust in intellectual and physical capacities is active and positively charged. Thus, this adds value to the definition of a psychological state which is a rather stable domain (e.g., Möllering et al., 2004; Rousseau, 1998), emphasizing the willingness to take a leap based on one's own peace of mind. Finally, trust from an individual perspective forms a sense of usefulness and meaning through realized propensity and the traits of an active doer who is willing, creative, innovative, and corrective. Such a doer gains strength through well-being and drive through spirituality.

From a cultural perspective rather that an ideological one, an organization provides an atmosphere for communality and way of working, such as “how we do things around here.” It is vital for people that they have a feeling of belonging to an in-group and being useful. Thus, the feelings of pride and mutual loyalty shared by the members of a group form the base sound (like a contrabass and humanity) of a successful working culture. If that is not the case, people seek individualistic benefits instead of voluntarily making decisions beneficial to the organization. The anthropomorphic
modelling of trust shows trust as a part of human nature and as a compassionate and good-hearted dimension (cf., benevolence; Mayer et al., 1995) of trust. Thus, trust is an active doer, not only a state of mind, psychological state (e.g. Rousseau et al., 1998), or the propensity and likelihood to trust. In fact, trust has a built-in tendency to emerge, create, innovate, and even correct trust. Despite the poor referents of trust, it finds a way to come into being. Finally, the cultural perspective shows that it results from a sense of trustworthiness and communality through spiritual congruence, worldviews, behavior, common language, values, beliefs, norms, interaction, and sharing.

From the processual perspective, it is vital that the interplay of trusting factors are unthreatening, and processes (cf., Savolainen & Ikonen, 2016) and routines function proficiently. Metaphors such as trust is a road with heavy traffic, a river, and a safe boat emphasize the predetermined way of doing things, importance of rules, flow and direction of actions and events, power of directing and modelling, and how conflicts are managed. These metaphors depict the critical characters of trust, including nourishment, career paths, pleasure, and energy, and how trust is a natural organ and resource that can change. Accordingly, trust is formed by small streams, that is, different antecedents in an organization. Together, those streams have the power to create trust. Trust is a kind of floating system, carrier, shelter, and transporter. Finally, trust can create a sense of interplay and functionality through platforms integrating people and tasks, procedures, routines, communication networks, and conflict management.

From the structural perspective, the effective clustering of structures, functions, and units for realizing purpose provides structural assurance (e.g., McKnight et al.,
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The metaphorical backbone of trust embodies the idea of a skeleton whereby, due to the spinal column, critical organs can be kept in a specific order and position. Structure is formed by building blocks (Zaheer, et al., 1998) and glued (Laine, 2008) together. The skeleton, spinal column, backbone, or structure can hardly be seen, but weaknesses can cause serious damage. Trust is a natural resource (Rotter, 1967), while it is also a man-made construction (McKnight, et al., 2006). Despite that, trust must be maintained continuously, particularly in a changing environment. This indicates a change towards the business practice of holding leaders accountable for change (Senander, 2017). Finally, an assurance of interconnectedness and participation (flow of nutrients) are enabled through structures, units, laws and orders, division of labor/tasks, supervision, control, reporting, and decision-making.

From the strategic perspective, trust is a rock and a foundation which illustrates the importance of the mission and purpose. Thus, the more important the mission, the more solid the foundation must be. The Church cannot be founded on worldviews or opinions at the time, but on the rock, which is the word of God and the spirituality with God. Initial trust is based on faith in humanity and the trusting stance (McKnight et al., 2006). However, in respect to religious faith, people rely on faith to reconcile inexplicable events that are beyond their control and to which they are vulnerable (Delbecq, 1999). Here, the study shows that the referent (target of trust) is a source of faith and empowerment. Trust in the foundation, that is, God, is a certainty of continuous empowerment through faith. In the end, the strategic foundation secures a confidence in meaningful purpose through an existential value-added system, strategic capacities to create a sense of purpose, and strategic competencies and generate and alter all empowerment.

Finally, these metaphorical modellings support the definition of trust as the willingness to accept vulnerability based on a positive expectation of a specific other’s trustworthiness (Fulmer & Gelfand, 2012) regardless being a person, a team, an entity, or an impersonal factor. Strategic leaders’ trust in an organization, and its faith in success, depends on multilevel factors other than individualistic factors of trust. This study proposes further discussion about the anthropomorphic nature of trust as an active doer, a professional, innovative, creative, and corrective force that constitutes a base sound within an organization.

6.1.4 Senior leadership’s spirituality and trust

Senior leadership’s spirituality and trust play a pivotal role in strategic leadership and trust development. I propose that not only leader’s values, cognitions, and personality affect strategic leaders decisions, preferences, values, (Hambrick et al., 1984) capacity, and style (Boal & Hooijberg, 2001), but also that their spirituality influences their decisions and the organization’s spirituality. Spirituality is an area of human functioning that has recently received more attention in management and organizational theory discourse (MacDonald et al., 2015). The paradigmatic shift in management has changed from an economic focus to a balance of profit, quality of life, spirituality, and social responsibility, and moved further from a materialistic towards spiritual orientation (Karakas, 2010). Therefore, in the twenty-first century, the new leadership aims to develop a culture of shared purpose. Culture and languages are integrated into how spirituality is conceptualized. There are two main types of motivation: extrinsic and intrinsic (e.g., Meng, 2016). Consequently, senior
leadership’s spirituality unifies the ideological approach. But, spirituality should be added to the leadership tools (cf., Grandy, 2013). Also, strategic leaders bring the one’s innate human attribute of spirituality to the workplace (e.g., Karakas, 2010; Payne, 2018). Spirituality can be seen through behaviors, actions, and preferences, and is an experience of understanding, wisdom, and support.

The dyadic relationship with God and man as a solid foundation, despite its imperfect members’ relationship with God. Here, spirituality is related to the mission which permeates senior leaders’ strategic thinking and is a driving force in service-oriented strategic leadership. It is not a greed for power, but instead a service orientation. Thus, the relationship with God is a spiritual dimension that drives both horizontal and vertical spirituality, strengthening the individual disposition to trust. Trust can develop faster between people who have similar values, beliefs, and trusting faith (e.g., unit grouping as oneself; cf., McKnight et al., 2006; Mintzberg, 1989). A relationship with God involves passion, meaning, and compassion (e.g., Karakas, 2010). Spirituality as a relationship with God is understood in Finnish culture more as a contextual and individual issue than a public one. Thus, there is a danger of proselytism, so horizontal and vertical spirituality must be understood as separate phenomena that are interconnected (e.g., Burack, 1999). In addition, diversity must be respected as an essential factor. Another danger is that some aim to separate faith and spirit, church and state, or spiritual and secular so that the topic cannot be discussed (Mirvis, 1999). However, religion and spirituality are central to the Church’s identity and culture, which are basically matters of ideology (cf., Mintzberg, 1989). Thus, workplace spirituality and spirituality in pastoral services are separate but joined through an individual actor’s expressions of spiritual belief or faith in God.

Human resource personnel stress the importance of engaging the whole person at work (e.g., Karakas, 2010) and thus liberating potential. The leadership must compete for the minds and souls of people (Santalainen, 2006). Karakas (2010) argued that today organizations are safer from spiritual emptiness and impoverishment. Nevertheless, spirituality can solve these problems by increasing satisfaction, happiness, self-esteem, hope, and optimism about the meaning of life (Reave, 2005). Thus, I argue that the mission only as an instrumental factor aiming for material realization is not satisfactory. Trust is a dyadic relationship with God which is a spiritual relationship. For senior leaders’ empowerment, specifically in this context, spiritual empowerment is vital though their personal relationship with God. In this way, the senior leader’s spirituality influences an organizational spirituality, which creates a sense of meaning and purpose, as well as a perceived individual spirituality. Accordingly, the ultimate power of the mission is in its spiritual origin which is delivered through strategic servant leadership.

6.2 CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE STUDY

This study contributes to strategic leadership, trust research, and the developing research on spirituality in organizational theory discourse in the nonprofit sector, specifically in the church settings. The study illustrates theoretically how strategic leadership activities and practices produce organizational trust and, in turn, how it practically emerges as senior leaders’ trust in an organization. In addition, the study shows how senior leadership incrementally characterizes trust. Thus, the study offers originality and value from the senior leaders’ perspective in a nonprofit setting, more
specifically in the church setting, by describing strategic leadership activities as KSFs in developing trust through the issue-based, \(^{36}\) mission-down, and potential-up processes from the senior leaders’ perspective, adding to what is known about trust development at the multiple levels within an organization. Further, it adds to what is known about dimensions and characteristics of trust at multiple levels. The aim of the study was to explore how the top management can maintain an environment that enhances trust within an organization and top management’s trust in an organization. The main interest was to investigate, elaborate, and explain the phenomenon (e.g., Eriksson & Kovalainen, 2010). The main contributions of the study are as follows:

1. A theoretical extension to the definition of strategic leadership by capacity for empowering mission and capacity to innovate.
2. A theory development of trust development from senior leaders’ perspective by an issue-based process of mission-down and potential-up.
3. A tentative theoretical idea to deepen an integrated model of organizational trust through well-being and spiritual factors.
4. A definition of trust as a dyadic and a third-party relationship among the trustor, the trustee, and God which creates a spiritual congruence. Trust is also a dyadic spiritual relationship with God, as well as a psychological state.
5. A demonstration of metaphorical modelling of trust.

### 6.2.1 Theoretical and conceptual contribution

**Strategic leadership capacities and servant leadership**

The study contributes theoretically and practically to the strategic leadership research in the nonprofit sector and specifically in the church settings. It supports the concept that strategic leadership is an ability to perform strategic actions and practices, in striving for achieving the mission, and an ability to demonstrate leadership capacity. The findings also support the idea to expand Boal and Hooijberg’s (2001) definition of strategic leadership as the capacity to learn, to change, and apply for managerial wisdom through empowering the mission and promoting innovation. Phipps and Burbach (2010) also supported the addition of these factors to some extent.

My findings show that servant leadership is an essential dimension of strategic leadership. Thus, I call it strategic servant leadership because the top management is then more concerned with others’ well-being and nurturing. Accordingly, the amendment of servant leadership advances the potential of people (e.g., Northouse, 2013). Also, servant leadership involves others in the greater good of the Church, community, and society. Thus, servant leadership becomes strategic as it endeavors to enhance commitment to the mission. Accordingly, in this context, the ultimate power of the mission is in its spiritual origin, and it is delivered through strategic servant leadership in connection with the issue-based trust development process. The mission only as an instrumental factor aiming at material realization is not satisfactory.

Strategic leadership can be executed effectively in nonprofits. In the church setting, the management must be even more aware of the unsuitability of the models developed for business organizations. There are some limited studies on strategic

---

\(^{36}\) “Based on or concerned with specific problems or concerns rather than an overall ideology.” Source: https://en.oxforddictionaries.com › definition › issue-based.
leadership in the church setting (cf., Grandy, 2013; Ronquillo, 2011). The findings show that developed strategic leadership capacities may advance professional contextual leadership practices. However, senior leaders must not only agree on the strategy but also demonstrate value and purpose congruence as a leadership practice.

**An issue-based process of trust development**
The study contributes theoretically and practically to what is known about trust development. Trust develops through a circular issue-based process, based on or concerned with specific problems or concerns, such as an area to be developed, that is, the weakest issue (link) from a strategic perspective. The mission-down process emphasizes the importance of the mission as an origin of trust permeating through an organization. The potential-up process stresses the essence of releasing and realizing the potential that individuals and an organization possess. The influential factors are related to individual, cultural, processual, structural, and strategic referents through trusting intention to be intentional, trusting belief in trustworthiness, trusting stance advancing an assurance of interconnectedness and functionality, and trusting faith enhancing commitment in the value-added systems. Thus, these empirical findings indicate that trust emerges differently in a linear model or in a model divided in stages, whereby trust develops through stages such as competence-based trust, calculative-based trust, and identification-based trust (Lewicki & Bunker, 1995, 1996), and from a wavelike process (Ikonen, 2013). However, the introduced model is not exclusive, but rather an intentional issue-based strategic perspective that focuses on the importance of achieving the mission.

**A tentative theoretical idea to deepen organizational trust**
Based on the findings, I argue that organizational trust has specific well-being and spiritual factors not yet included in the definition of trust. Behavioral intention (Colquitt et al., 2007) and propensity to trust (Mayer et al., 1995) are traits that are stable across situations. They affect the likelihood to trust as a general willingness to trust others within a party. Thus, the characteristics and actions of the trustee will lead that person to be trusted. However, according to the findings, disposition, as such, is not satisfactory because it concerns only a general willingness. The likelihood to trust also requires spiritual passion, well-being, and the energy to act. Well-being (wellness, welfare) refers to psychological and physical capacities (enough strength), and to the mental capacity (strategic thinking) to act accordingly in a specific domain. An individual perceives their potential through well-being and through the ways which they can manage the normal stresses of life, can work in a productive manner, and can contribute to their community.

In this context, spirituality originates from a dyadic relationship with God, and this influences the third-party relationships as a drive and passion for the mission. Consequently, I propose a theoretical idea to expand the integrated model of organizational trust (Mayer et al., 1995, 2006) by adding the trustor’s well-being and spirituality. Accordingly, well-being and spirituality are necessities for trust as they are dynamic factors needed to take action. Despite the strong intentions or a superior ability of an entirely burnt-out person, the definition of ability does not correspond to such well-being and spirituality. The leadership must win the minds and souls of people (Santalainen, 2006). The idea is more of the essence because today organizations are safer from spiritual emptiness and impoverishment (Karakas, 2010). Nevertheless, spirituality increases satisfaction, happiness, self-esteem, hope, and optimism about
the meaning of life (Reave, 2005). Thus, strategic leadership is under an obligation to advance spirituality and well-being particularly in this context.

**Spirituality as a dyadic and a third-party relationship**

The study contributes to the recent research on spirituality in an organization and strategic leadership. Currently, spirituality is used in a wider context in which the term religious was formerly used (Karakas, 2010). The relationships are not only dyadic between people (e.g., Mayer et al., 1995), but also between God and man, and therefore they are spiritual. Consequently, spirituality enhances trust in the third-party relationship of the trustor, the trustee, and God, creating a spiritual congruence. Accordingly, in a dyadic relationship with people, there is also a third party (influence) based on the parties’ individual spiritual orientation. The third-party influences the relationship and the orientation as the third-party architect of trust (cf., McEvily & Zaheer, 2004).

Trust influences an organizational spirituality by providing a sense of meaning and purpose, as well as a perceived individual spirituality. Strategic leaders’ values, cognitions, and personalities affect their decisions, preferences, and values (Hambrick et al., 1984) and their capacity or style (Boal & Hooijberg, 2001). Regardless of the source of the senior leaders’ spirituality, their spirituality influences their strategic thinking, preferences, and the organization’s spirituality. Such an empowerment is beyond a human endeavor, influencing the individual trusting intention and trusting belief. Responding to the human need for meaning is becoming a critical organizational success factor (e.g., Karakas, 2010). Emerging trust in senior leaders is not only best supported by the congruence of values, decisions and behaviors, but specifically through empowering spiritual congruence that permeates strategies, leadership, and individual behavior. For senior leaders’ empowerment, specifically in this context, spiritual empowerment is vital though a personal relationship with God.

Finally, relational trust is not only dyadic between people (e.g., Mayer et al., 1995), but also between God and man. Thus, trust is a psychological state comprising willingness to accept vulnerability based on positive expectations of a specific other, at the individual and group levels, a positive expectation of an organization at the organizational level (e.g., Mayer et al., 1995; Fulmer & Gelfand, 2012), and a positive expectation of spiritual empowerment by a third party. Expectations are related to trustworthiness, that is, the ability, benevolence, and integrity, provided that not only a person’s propensity (cf., intentional behavior) as a trait is well-matured, a person has enough strength through well-being, and an intrinsic spiritual passion which drives for the mission, but also the third party who is God and who continuously empowers spiritually. Trustworthiness should be considered as a continuum rather than as the trusted or not trusted (Mayer, et al., 2006). Thus, trust at the higher levels is a shared consensus about the referents. As a result, the senior leadership being empowered by the mission’s origin may permeate their strategic thinking and adequate actions with passion, and this will revitalize an organization and release the potential of all those involved. Also, senior leaders’ spiritual and purpose congruences characterize successful leadership. Consequently, trust as an active doer enhances trust development despite any changes in the referents.

**A demonstration of trust through metaphorical modelling**

The metaphorical modelling of trust accentuated the special characteristics of trust. Trust as an anthropomorphic phenomenon appears as an active doer, a professional,
innovative, creative, and corrective actor, constituting a human base sound (contrabass) within an organization. Accordingly, such an atmosphere is created through individual, cultural, and here, ideological, processual, structural, and strategic antecedents (target of trust). Thus, it supports strategic leadership theories and the leadership of an organization (e.g., Hunt, 1991; Boal & Hooijberg, 2001). Trusting atmosphere is expressed by one interviewee as a “good atmosphere, good spirit, a drive, inspiring and good way of working.”

Trust is characterized as a well-balanced state of rest and tranquility, where one can make a leap of faith. Accordingly, it supports not only physical and mental health but also specifically spiritual empowerment (driver) and a healthy balance in one’s way of life. Spirituality refers not only to humanistic factors, such as love, compassion, tolerance, forgiveness, concern for other (Karakas, 2010), and leniency (Ikonen, 2013), but also to transcendental realities (Harrelson, 1963; Karakas, 2010; Nash & McLennan, 2001) that are grounded in the strategic foundation of the context, here the foundation of the Church per se. Further, on the basis of the processual and structural metaphorical modelling, we can see that trust morphs through different referents according to situation, need for trust, and reason to avoid risks and vulnerability (trust is a road with heavy traffic, a river, a boat). Ultimately, senior leaders need continuous empowerment through faith not only through building confidence in an organization and assurance in functionality of an organization but particularly in meaning and success.

A qualitative research task can be done following various analysis methods as they are standardized thinking extensions (e.g., Rauhala, 1983), and so interpretations may vary despite the fact that subjectivity is considered (Eriksson & Kovalainen, 2010). My findings indicate that the metaphorical modelling of trust indicates a more complete and specific depiction of trust in this context. Regardless of the firm grounds for trust, such as ability, benevolence, and integrity, together with such factors as characteristics (intention propensity), well-being, and spirituality, as well as contextual factors, trust ultimately determines the power, parties involved, perceived risk level, and available alternatives. Thus, the factors and the context must be in a reasonable balance. Not only the context but the TMT and senior leaders’ (agent selfish) motives and the principal’s aims have impact on trust. Thus, the atmosphere creates a context, and final judgment depends on the trustor’s perception and interpretation. Having said that, I must still emphasize the importance of a quality methodological approach.

6.2.2 Implications for the strategic leadership

This study provides several strategic and practical implications drawn from the findings of the study (Corley & Gioia, 2011). Strategic means of utmost importance from point of view of the mission and aims at transformation. This study emphasizes that strategic activities and practices develop trust. Senior leadership should concentrate on pursuing the KSFs for competing in the future. Thus, it is of utmost importance to pay attention specifically to empowering the mission and enhancing meaningfulness of people through participatory leadership. Senior leaders obtain a better understanding of the mission though increasing learning capacity which, in turn, creates better alignment, identification, focus, and, consequently, trust. Transformational leadership advances institutional learning and capacity for strategic thinking (Boal & Hooijberg, 2001; Phipps & Burbach, 2010). Trust can be developed
through mission-down and potential-up process taking into account trusting referents at all levels. The process of developing trust calls for understanding people’s desire to be useful and perceive meaningfulness in their life and work. Consequently, the process acknowledges the importance of the mission and purpose as a strategic driver and source of alignment. Senior leaders are challenged to align an organization instead of letting an individual or a group to align it first. Thus, they can revitalize purpose congruence that is being supported by value and spiritual congruences. They should also be more like evangelists in propagating the mission and its purpose.

Accordingly, senior leaders’ trust in an organization is a KSF in being able to compete in the future. There is evidence that trust affects organizational effectiveness and performance (e.g., Dirks & Ferrin, 2001). Senior leaders’ confidence in an organization and spirituality influences their preferences and reflects the organization and organizational spirituality. This study indicates that leadership’s daily practices must support perceived trust by promoting a sense of meaning and purpose, interconnectedness, functionality and communality, and of well-being and meaningfulness. According to these findings, which support those explained in Senge’s The Fifth Discipline (Senge, 1990), strategic change and renewal will not be successful if the strategic leadership does not have a solid commonality of purpose, values, and beliefs and an understanding of how their individualistic preferences support the overall strategy.

In the future, the permanent office system must be changed to be an agency that develops employment relationships. Likewise, the management system should be downsized, and functional units further integrated, but at the same time, they should create small cells. As financial prosperity worsens, uncertainty may increase, and it is therefore more rational to trust in moral values promoting prosperity. Thus, there is a risk that the Church’s trust will become more based on its wealth than on the very essence of the mission. The Church will not be able to spiritually exist in the absence of trust in God’s given mission. It is alarming that “people do not believe in the same way how the church teaches, neither the church necessarily believes. The greatest limit is between the Church and the people in service.” The existing mission can be made stronger through identifying its essence. Here, the data indicate that when members become involved, the Church’s mission can be a source of a meaningful life. Thus, inspirational motivation yields benefits through being part of a mission which is greater than oneself.

Capacity to change is an essential resource for nonprofit strategic leadership (e.g., Boal & Hooijberg, 2001; Phipps & Burbach, 2010). In the study context, the senior leaders have strong legal authority to facilitate change. Such an extraordinary power has given them a positive advantage in building trust through strategic leadership activities. It seems that vicars have chosen to trust (e.g., Arrow, 1974) and were partially forced to trust (deterrence-based trust, Burt & Knez, 1995) the leadership because they were not able to advance their own initiatives. Thus, voluntary surrendering to the impossibility of being able to institute any change decreased the intensity of leadership but fostered innovativeness through strong emotions of distrust and passion for the mission. Capacity to innovate has a great potential for successful strategic leadership in supporting the mission and creating a clear vision. The capacity to change is an essential element of strategic leadership. Successful strategic leadership would not be possible without subordinates who not only have adequate skill for the work but also the attitude to be effective and committed subordinates. Thus, the predestinated permanent office system should be changed.
Finally, Church membership is decreasing and baptisms as well. Also, Christian belief may not only be an educational issue or inherited through family relations. Hence, it may be that the theory of secularization as an explanation must be abandoned as something that has been taken for granted. The change may be more of an issue about postmodernism than the renunciation of a set of Biblical principles, and more a consequence of spiritual emptiness than secular and materialistic orientation. Consequently, the relevancy of the Church has become questionable. As a result, people and the Church do not encounter each other as frequently as in the past, which has become the dilemma of demand and supply. As stated, communication has failed in delivering the message. The Gospel has not been preached in an understandable manner – that is, making it clear why God is needed. According to my understanding, the reason is not related primarily to generations but instead to meaningfulness and lifestyle preferences. After all, people in general, the younger generation, Millennials or GenMe, value differently the centrality of work, lifestyle, and social general idioms.

Consequently, the humanistic qualities of love, compassion, forgiveness, responsibility, and a concern for others have become modern preferences also in Church services, and religious needs, fundamentally spiritual needs, now remain unsatisfied. That gap will be filled by other things such as self-efficacy, environmentalism, and nutritional and complacency cultures. Unfortunately, contradicting messages and conflicting outcomes from the top Church leadership have not increased confidence. The demand for change is justifiable. Here, the secular (worldly), humanistic, and spiritual interests meet at the focal point. Decline of trust in the Church might be attributed to its failure to respond to a variety of unfulfilled demands, and particularly those related to the meaning of life. Instead, the Church has focused on social, environmental, and societal issues. In the end, the goal of achieving happiness has not been reached. However, there is hope based on the fact that the leadership can revitalize the purpose of the Church and enlist people to be part of its mission. Further, the Church can evangelize, proclaim the Gospel, so that people can understand why the Church is needed. That revelation would be made through being spiritually inspired.

6.3 CONCLUDING REMARKS

6.3.1 Ideas for future research

Future research is needed to discuss the findings and theoretical contributions of this study. The study produced empirical knowledge on how strategic leadership practices produce trust and, in turn, how senior leaders’ trust emerges in an organization. The study is from the strategic leadership’s perspective, and it opens the theoretical discourse for further studies. It would be beneficial to test the proposed strategic leadership model also from the employees’ perspective, and particularly from the members’ perspective. As the model is based on an NPO setting, its applicability to a for-profit setting would also be fruitful. Despite the fact that strategic leadership research in the nonprofit sector is increasing, it is still in its infancy, particularly in the church setting.

Further, the proposed theoretical amendments, such as adding well-being and spirituality to the integrated model of organizational trust (Mayer et al., 1995), would
need further research in different settings. The factors of trustworthiness offered herein are an attempt to extend strategic leadership and trust theories in the nonprofit church setting, stressing the uniqueness of that setting. The proposed model is not the end but emphasizes rather the uniqueness of the setting. I hope that further research builds on this frame of research to explain more how nonprofit strategic leaders’ activities contribute to trust development. Moreover, further research is needed to describe how strategic leadership can be applied in different kinds of nonprofits. That is even more important in the church setting (cf., Grandy, 2013). Multilevel research would offer a more sound explanation of the influence of nonprofit strategic leadership.

As demonstrated, strategic leadership can contribute to trust development though the proposed model’s mission-down and potential-up process. Consequently, I urge scholars to explore the model in different contexts. The model outlines pivotal aspects that are different from those of other trust development processes. Specifically, the multilevel analysis of trust, at what level senior leaders trust, needs further research in different sectors. I have reason to believe that understanding about the referents at various levels would help strategic leadership to find a focused means to advance not only trust development but specifically improve the performance of an organization. Further, the metaphorical modelling of trust used here has determined new characteristics which would be useful to study.

6.3.2 Evaluation of the study

I had access to the organizations to do the fieldwork. It may be worth mentioning that, as the researcher, I was an outsider even though having professional qualifications for the Church services. Thus, the ability to understand the case supports the credibility of the results (Eriksson et al., 2010). In addition, I made interpretations on the basis of the data, goals, and methods of the study. As a social constructionist researcher studying my own area of specialty, I may have better understood the clerical language, concepts, and meanings (Katila & Meriläinen, 2006). The meanings can be understood only in their context and through interaction in situ (e.g., Tuomi & Sarajärvi, 2004). Words have different meanings, and therefore, it is difficult to accept only one meaning for a word. Within qualitative research, the researcher’s own interpretations will increase the bias of meanings, and so it is difficult to capture only one meaning for the phenomenon. The key concepts here, strategic leadership and trust, are still elusive concepts. Thus, I have worked hard to define strategic as a factor of importance in achieving the mission. I also defined trust as using different factors and perspectives. In addition, it is quite typical in qualitative research that the theoretical framework changes during the research process (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000). Moreover, the research task was continuously illuminated through the data, theory, and method of triangulation, which added credibility to the study (Tuomi & Sarajärvi, 2004).

The study targeted fourteen strategic leaders constituting one case in the nonprofit sector in a church setting. Consequently, generalizability is limited because the study did not cover all of Finland. However, senior leaders’ work in this context is quite similar and regulated, and so I believe that additional information would not have added any value. In qualitative research, the reader must rely on the interpretations done by the researcher. Thus, validity depends the referred data, the methods used,
and ultimately the reader’s judgement of the validity though following the process to its logical conclusion.

I have acknowledged the idea of reflexivity (Eriksson & Kovalainen, 2010). The researcher’s subjectivity can be offset through continuous awareness of the matter. Thus, accordingly, I have paid attention to how my background, worldview, and positions could influence why I chose the senior leadership perspective and qualitative methods, and what conclusions I have drawn. Consequently, I have included a range of the participants’ statements to support my claims based on careful transcriptions and notes. However, I am aware that another researcher could have different interpretations depending on their scientific stance. However, as the researcher, I have significant experience in the senior positions not only domestically and internationally but also in different industries, and so I may have a better understanding about what strategic leadership is all about from the senior leadership’s perspective, even though my interpretation was strictly methodological within constructivism.

I have offered a rich description and used three different perspectives. Thus, I have made a number of observations to be considered in strategic leadership in this context. Usually, contextual studies cannot be categorically generalized. However, Puusa and Juuti (2011) argued the qualitative results can be generalized to some extent. In this case, I argue that the results can be generalized to the other Parishes within the Church and to similar churches and organizations, as well. The models and theories must be carefully applied. Thus, strategic leadership’s practices are contextual and situational (issue-based design), instead of being a planning-based design. From the conceptual point of view, the pattern can also be used as a tool in wider contexts. However, I propose that the contextual idea of the pattern needs to be studied empirically in different contexts. Thus, this qualitative research lays the groundwork for further studies.

6.3.3 Closing words

In a way, the study focuses on both the past and the future by emphasizing that trust development is based not only on inherited, generational, genetic, and current factors but also on newly developed ideas at the focal point. Consequently, all the reviewed factors may have significance in one way or another. From the strategic leadership perspective, the developed theories of leadership actions and issues show how strategic leadership actions are related to trust for competing in the future. The Church must be able to empower the mission, develop the organizational systems, enhance members’ participation, and direct thinking towards leadership issues. Unless the mission and participation in a meaningful manner cannot be executed, disintegration of the Church will continue, and finally, the purpose of the Church may become watered down to nothing at all. Currently, the Church is lost in the middle due to listening to all opinions and initiatives and aiming to satisfy the loudest voices without being able to focus on the core. Consequently, the membership has decreased, and financial prosperity has vanished. However, there is hope that senior leadership can purposefully design and advance trust in the organization through strategic activities and essential principles. Finally, hope reaches farther than the current realities as we do not look at reality on the scale of years to come but to a life beyond.
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APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1. DATA AND ANONYMITY OF INTERVIEWEES

Note that the nick names and quotes H1 – H14 do not correspond with the nick names neither with the order of names as those are mixed. The transcripts are done using font Time New Romans, size 12 and line spacing 1,5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTERVIEWEE</th>
<th>Length of an interview in minutes</th>
<th>Length of a transcription in pages</th>
<th>Age of the interviewee</th>
<th>Length of the assignment in office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Isaac</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reuben</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simeon</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levi</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judah</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naphtali</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gad</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asher</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issachar</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zebulun</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1 052</td>
<td>263</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVG</td>
<td>75,14</td>
<td>18,79</td>
<td>55,00</td>
<td>10,79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# APPENDIX 2. PROCESS OF MULTILEVEL ANALYSIS: SENIOR LEADERS’ PERCEIVED TRUST BY LEVELS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGIC LEVEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal referent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team referent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational referent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORGANIZATIONAL LEVEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal referent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team referent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational referent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUP LEVEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal referent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team referent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational referent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIVIDUAL LEVEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal referent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team referent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational referent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This study explores how strategic leadership activities produce organizational trust and, in turn, how senior leaders’ trust in organization emerges in nonprofit organizations (NPOs), specifically in the church settings. The study focuses on senior leaders’ trust in the organization they run. It is critical for trust that the mission evokes confidence in a meaningful purpose and that the systems assure interconnectedness and functionality. The point is, however, that the leadership creates a sense of trust and communality so that the trustors perceive usefulness and meaning.