∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

It's time to get serious about

trust

COUNTER INTUITIVE RULES

&

5-STEP PROCESS

By Slim Lambert

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

∞◦∞◦∞◦∞◦◦∞◦◦

Table of contents

Preamble: The trust project.

∞◦∞◦∞◦∞◦◦∞◦◦

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

<u>Preamble: The trust project</u>

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

Why I wrote this book.

During more than 15 years as an executive in international organizations and as a consultant, I observed that most issues and solutions boil down to tackling a trust issue!

It seems that today, trust is a hot topic, to one degree or another, in most organizations.

The reasons are numerous and are unique to each organization.

For example, in some organizations, trust is the most important remaining competitive advantage, because access to capital is easier, entry-tickets to most businesses are lower, customers have easier access to information regarding competing products, and so on.

Some organizations realize that there is a growing expectation that leaders be collaborative, which requires that they are experts at managing trust.

Some organizations realize that time is precious and rare, and thus that control and monitoring is less efficient than is trust-based empowerment. The latter requires that managers and leaders are experts at managing trust.

Finally, lay-offs, bad managers, the recent financial crisis, scandals and the like have taken trust to crisis levels. Thus, some organizations have put trust on their business agenda, even if they previously did not have a specific focus on it.

So trust is an important topic.

However, I felt that there was a gap in the resources addressing the topic of trust. I had never found a satisfactory book or resource to share with others. Most were simplistic and, for example, reduced trust to a dozen types of behaviors.

They missed out on the subtleties of trust. For example, they recommended that you should be reliable, but there were no in-depth recommendations regarding how to be reliable, and they missed out on the fact that "being reliable" means different things depending on the level of trust you have established so far.

Finally, what was typically missing was a set of principles regarding trust that would enable you to adapt and modify recommendations in order to suit different, specific situations.

Another trigger for writing this book came from a more personal experience: wanting to sell my flat. I met several brokers, but could not differentiate between them based on facts or on what they offered as services, and they were all nice people. The only differentiator would have been whom I trusted most. The problem was that not one seemed very trustworthy, although they all honestly thought they were trustworthy.

So, I selected one by flipping a coin! Then, although I usually trust people by default, I started to hate myself for acting in a controlling manner, checking and controlling the broker's activities. Clearly, I was acting like someone who does not trust. I wanted to establish a more trusting relationship and thus stop this behavior, but felt that this would require several lengthy discussions. What I would have wanted to have was a book I could ask the broker to read and then just pin-point what I would like the broker to do in order for us to have a trusting relationship.

Therefore, I decided to summarize all I had learned over the years and had read about trust and put it into a book.

However, I also wanted to ensure that my answers to the trust question were relevant in today's world. Therefore, I set up a project called the "1 trust project" on LinkedIn. The goal was to collect as many answers as possible to the six questions below:

1. Do you believe that trust between two people is possible? Why?

2. What makes you want to trust a person?

3. What strengthens your feeling of trust once you have given your trust to a person?

4. What would make you feel unconditional trust towards a person?

5. Have you felt unconditional trust towards a person?

6. What are the domains in which you want to be able to trust your employer (e.g. job security, well-being, career, having a good boss …)?

∞◌∞◌∞◌∞◌∞◌

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

What you get:

With this book, I hope to provide and create a new common language for the process that creates trust.

The goal is to be precise while still having a down-to-earth approach towards the topic of trust, which is too nuanced and complex to be addressed through simplistic advice.

I will articulate a 5-step process for managing trust and the specific behaviors you will need to demonstrate in each of these steps. The aim is to provide hands-on and actionable insights. I will not describe character or personality traits. I will propose concrete behaviors and actions. This will aid you in making choices and planning actions in order to ensure that a person or a group of people feels trust towards you.

I will articulate some simple yet counter-intuitive principles regarding trust management. Once you understand them, they are not as counter-intuitive as they appear, although they might seem counter-intuitive as long as trust is approached in a simplistic manner. These principles are a way of looking at a problem, rather than a formula for its solution.

Finally, I will articulate why managing trust is so important.

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

Who should read this book?

Any person for whom the fact that others trust them is important.

The approach to trust presented in this book is applicable in both your personal and in your professional life.

You can, for example, use this book to design and implement organizational interventions to increase trust levels between people and groups of people, or use this book to enhance the trust level with your loved ones.

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

The topic of trust

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

What is trust?

Trust is more than confidence.

Trust is:

A leap of faith into the unknown

A feeling of certainty

A lack of fear towards a person and in the company of a person

A true desire to learn and search for solutions together with the other person with regard to the thing with which the other is entrusted.

A true desire to allow the other person to stretch your own comfort zone

A state of readiness for unguarded interaction with the other person

An expectation that the other person will not allow you to be harmed at a time when you are vulnerable.

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

∞◇◇◇◇◇∞

The business case for trust.

Most issues and solutions boil down to tackling a trust issue!

Discussing trust is an excellent entry point
to uncover real and rarely addressed root-causes or issues
that are important for people!

1. You can't interact with impact without trust.

If people trust you, they will at least listen to you and take you seriously.

A trusting environment is a pre-requisite for developing innovative ideas, resolving conflicts with "win-win" solutions, delegation, influencing and so on.

For most skills, the fact that other people trust you is the difference between you demonstrating a good versus an average level of this skill.

2. You can't lead without trust.

Most leaders require followers to jump into the unknown.

This requires trust.

The trusted leader is followed and, if they are trusted, their leadership style is of lesser importance.

Practicing leadership behaviors that are considered to be "best practices", without followers trusting you not only makes these behaviors quite impact less, but can also backfire.

Indeed, followers will probably perceive the behaviors as artificial, therefore seeing you as artificial and, as a result, trusting you even less as a leader.

As Warren Bennis put it, "Leadership without mutual trust is a contradiction in terms."

3. Trust has the ability to accelerate or destroy any business or organization.

The lower the trust, the more time everything takes, the more everything costs, and the lower the loyalty on the part of everyone involved.

Lack of trust significantly contributes to creating additional activities that do not create value, such as double checking, bargaining, auditing of departments, politics, turf guarding, resistance to change, lack of collaboration, not listening, blaming games, silo protection, and so on.

If even a small part of such valueless work could be removed, the savings would be significant and engagement levels would increase, thus increasing performance.

Worse, lack of trust directs your attention towards threats that may be imaginary or threats that are the result of your initial lack of trust. For example, if there is trust, meetings are no longer about reporting but are about finding solutions.

An environment of trust *functions as a releasing process.*

It allows you to focus your energy on creating rather than on defending.

Trust promotes risk taking and courage.

Trust favors accountability - remember, people often end up acting according to the way you treat them.

Customers will pay more to work with suppliers who they trust.

Thus, trust is a re-requisite for growth.

A recent Watson Wyatt study showed that high-trust companies outperform low-trust companies by nearly 300%!

At the same time, there seems to be a consensus that we have given up on having trust in organizations!

As one participant in the trust project put it:

"I think what makes corporate trust so entirely different from personal relationships is the level of corporate hierarchy attached to it. In any company, there is predominantly a top-down approach to all decision making and project management (no matter how much a company cares to also get bottom-up input). This makes a trust relationship difficult, as it is initially forced on you. You can, of course, develop a more personal trust level alongside the hierarchy. However, when things get tough for the company, the level of trust is immediately weakened."

4. Today, trust levels are typically extremely low. **Therefore, excelling at trust will make you unique and set you apart.**

Widespread cynicism, approximating crisis levels, prevails regarding those who hold positions of leadership, as well as towards organizations.

Recent surveys from the Richard Edelman's Trust Barometer, the Harvard Business Review survey and the Conference Board report numbers such as:

"50% of employees have reservations in trusting their senior leaders"

"62% trust corporations less than they did a year ago"

"17% trust information from a company's CEO"

"trust levels towards CEOs ranked lower than those towards used car salesmen".

At the same time, trust is probably companies' number one, or only, true competitive advantage.

Indeed:

It is rare.

It is highly valued by your employees and customers.

It cannot be acquired or bought.

It has a domino effect on the potential to build other competitive advantages.

Not having it blocks you from fully developing other competitive advantages.

It is applicable to most situations, interactions, and transactions.

<p style="text-align:center">∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞</p>

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

Nine Counter-intuitive principles that govern trust

1. Trust is built in five steps:

1. Readiness to trust somebody
2. Desire to trust you as a person.
3. Confidence in entrusting you to do a particular thing.
4. Reinforcing the trust given to you.
5. Unconditional trust towards you.

In other words, there is a spectrum of trust, from unconditional trust towards you, to not trusting anybody.

Also, trust can be quite confusing for the person that wants to trust you. The person might have a strong desire to trust you, but will never trust you. They might actually trust you, but struggle with the fact that they actually do not want to trust you.

As one of the participants in the trust project put it, "We cannot decide to trust simply because we want to".

2. Trust is a linear PROCESS, which is sometimes best addressed in a non-linear manner.

Trust is a process, a bit like the "sorrow curve". Therefore, if you do not fully achieve a step it will come back to haunt you and will undermine the full realization of the step you are in. Also, excelling in one step does not allow you to do less well in other steps of the trust process.

However, it does not mean that if a step is not fully achieved you should stop everything and focus only on this step. Moving on to the immediate next step can have a retroactive positive effect and can be an enabler as you go back to the previous step you did not fully achieve.

For example, excelling at step 3 (confidence) renders it easier to achieve steps 1 (readiness) and 2 (desire).

3. There is not a one-size-fits-all way to lose trust or to rebuild it.

Because trust is a process, losing trust means not doing what is expected at the step of the process you are at. Things you do that make you lose trust are therefore specific to the step of the process you are in.

To restore trust, you have to re-achieve the previous step of the trust process and achieve the step you were in when you lost the other's trust.

As one of the participants in the "trust project" put it,

"There are several levels of trust, from basic level to that in a marriage/personal relationship. Once damaged, you have to start from the very low level and slowly rebuild. Rebuilding also depends on how the trust was broken, (unintentional - just failed to deliver on a commitment: intentional - cheated or "backstabbing") if intentional it is extremely hard to trust that person again as the behavior is part of their makeup."

4. The trust process is the same for all, but needs to be managed differently each time.

Each person values the importance of each of the five steps of the trust process differently, depending on their preferences and the stakes.

For example, in high-stakes situations, step 2 (desire) and step 5 (unconditional trust) are the most important steps.

In low-stakes situations, step 3 (confidence) is most important step.

For people who typically have difficulty in trusting others, step 1 (readiness) is the most important step.

Another example is how to manage losing someone's trust.

Imagine you have achieved step 4 of the process, and that achieving step 1 (readiness) was difficult. If you then lose the person's trust, you might need to focus on step 1 rather than on steps 3 or 4.

5. Trust is about proof, but it is also about imagination.

Trust can be triggered through experimentation that proves that you are trustworthy.

However, it is also about imagination.

As one of the participants in the "trust project" put it, "I went to drama school in a previous life and I avoid characters like Tartuffe in the Moliere play, this is my method so to speak; I imagine in what part in a play or movie people could be cast. It takes me a few hours to get a pretty good idea, then I do a little checking with their teams if necessary. It is reliable at 90% maybe more I should say."

The way you imagine a person is typically triggered by how the person achieved step 2 of the trust process (desire), and can be colored by how difficult it was to achieve step 1 (readiness).

Another example of the importance of imagination is that the "proofs" the person seeks about how you will behave in the future are in essence imagined inferences and assumptions they make about you, since the future has not yet happened and does not yet exist.

Finally, some people will judge and appreciate your intent as much or more than your actual behaviors, and intents can only be imagined when they make this judgment or appreciation.

6. You do not need to be a perfect person to be trustworthy.

Step 1 (readiness) has nothing to do with you. It is about the belief the person has regarding "Is it possible to trust people?"

Thus, being perfect is not necessary or even useful for this step, since this step is not specifically about your trustworthiness.

Beyond step 1, you just need to focus on some specific behaviors and on needs that the other person has when it comes to trust.

In fact, trust is not about "not do to others what you do not want others to do to you"; rather, it is about "do to others what they want you to do".

So, being perfect is not necessary or even useful.

In addition, sometimes it helps to not be a saint. For example, in step 3 (confidence), some people might actually trust you because they feel that you are a merciless person willing to do whatever you feel it takes to succeed, since this makes you predictable in their eyes.

Another example is in step 2 (desire), where bonding is one critical element.

In this step, some people will not bond with you if you are too perfect and nice, because this might trigger a bad self-image in them, or because this makes you different from them or from what they value.

Finally, we have been accustomed to thinking that in order to be trusted you have to be "competent".

However, particularly when stakes are high and in a world of constant change, competence is not that critical because the thinking is that "no situation is ever the same or what worked in the past will not get you there next time, so what will make me trust you is that you excel at adapting and learning from trials or mistakes, or, that you and I have the same risk tolerance towards trial and errors".

7. Behaviors that are required in the different steps of the trust process can seem to be almost complete opposites and to be incompatible.

For example, in step 3 (confidence), prudence is a valued behavior.

However, being very prudent can be seen as cowardice.

Also, in step 5 (unconditional) and step 2 (desire), prudence is not valued since it is typically seen as cowardice in these steps.

8. Trust is only personal.

You actually do not trust an institution, a group of people or an organization as such. You trust these bodies based on the experience you have had with the representative person with whom you interacted or the person that you feel influences this body the most.

If you have never interacted with this body, your trust towards it is based on its reputation. This trust is then dependent on the trust you have towards the person that triggered your view of the reputation of the body.

Therefore, trust is personal. In addition, the trust process is the same whether it is directed towards a person, a group of people, or an organization.

The principles that govern trust towards loved ones, friends, a boss, an employer, an institution, a service provider, a team and so on are the same.

9. Trust is contextual and focused.

Just because you are trustworthy with regard to one thing in the eyes of one person doesn't mean you are trustworthy with regard to a different thing or to the same thing by another person.

As one participant in the "trust project" put it,

"Relying only a prestigious personality, like a renowned CEO, a SVP or a great entrepreneur is a chimera. Believing that you can trust someone or you cannot, it is the same. In this context, you need to know what you can trust within a person, when you can trust it or not, where to trust him/her, and how to trust him/her. Most of managers rely on a routine called the principle of successive sincerity. When a manager is in a specific context, (s)he might agree with an available solution. But when (s)he shifts from this context to another one, (s)he might agree with another solution in this new context, whatever the reasons that motive this change, even if this new solution is in contradiction with the first one (this is not a value judgment. It is a fact. Each of us already experiment this)."

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

The trust process:

Are you doing the right things?

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

Step 1.

Readiness to trust somebody

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

The difficulty you face:

For most of us, it's easier to doubt than it is to trust, and it's easier to focus on what-could-go-wrong than on the possibilities-of-doing-it-right.

You can create an atmosphere that is conducive to trust, but ultimately trust is a decision controlled entirely by the person who puts their trust in you. Trust is both earned by you and bestowed upon you.

Also, trusting you is a decision and, as with most decisions, it rests on a belief or an assumption.

Many people are unwilling to trust others because of their life experiences, their surrounding views on trust, and the like. They might believe that they cannot, should not, or cannot afford to trust others.

As Christopher Pike, author of "Remember me", put it, "Relationships are mysterious. We doubt the positive qualities in others, seldom the negative … When someone is angry you don't doubt it for a moment."

Similarly, as John Ortberg, author of "Faith & Doubt", put it, "Skeptics would rather, even at their own expense, appear to be right than take the risk of trusting."

This belief is typically driven by the fears people have. The difference between constructive and destructive levels of fear is subjective and is unique to each person. There is no right or wrong level of fear.

At the same time, fear is also a requirement for survival.

Therefore, you cannot just expect or tell people not to have these fears.

In this step, the challenge is to address beliefs, such as "people cannot be trusted", "certain people cannot be trusted, and you belong to that category", "certain people cannot be trusted, so why should you be trusted?", or "I am better off not trusting others".

What makes your challenge even more difficult is that while people are typically aware of their fears to some extent, they are rarely truly aware of their beliefs, especially if these are self-limiting.

As Marianne Faithfull put it, "I never trusted anybody at all. I don't know why it was so hard, I just didn't".

As one of the participants in the "trust project" said,

"You may believe that trust between two people is possible or impossible, difficult or easy, useless or effective... We are rarely aware of our inner state..."

In this step, you will shake the person out of their comfort zone with regard to not trusting people. However, be prudent, because if they are too shaken up, they may freeze or rebel. If, however, they are simply made less comfortable by some destabilization, they are more likely to take the initiative to convince themselves that trust is possible.

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

Examples of things you need to do:

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

Prove that trust is positive.

Remind the person of times when they trusted someone and it worked out well.

Show that some people can be trusted. Show the great benefits of trusting a person.

Show examples where trusting someone actually enables or enhances their need for safety, control and certainty.

Create a motivating view of the future where the assumption is that trust is possible or is given by default until it is proven that it cannot be given.

Together with them, identify what they want to achieve rather than what they want to avoid, and how trusting you or people in general can enable them to achieve this more effectively of more easily.

Be empathic, and show that you think or feel like them to some extent, with regard to "it not being possible to trust people", but that you have overcome or managed this.

Find ways of addressing at least some of the concerns that block them from trusting people.

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

∞◌∞◌∞◌∞◌◌

Prove that some people, including you, can be trusted, even if the person holds on to their belief that trusting people is not possible.

Differentiate the fact of trusting people that are in the category of "people that cannot be trusted" into which you have been put by them, and the fact of trusting you. In other words, demonstrate that even if you belong to this category, you are different from most of the people in this category.

Engage in a dialogue concerning the person's experiences when trust was possible or did not backfire. Demonstrate that you are similar to those that they trusted on those occasions.

Engage in a dialogue about the times that trusting someone was the lesser of two evils or was the best thing to do. Demonstrate that you are like the people they trusted then.

Ask the person to identify the characteristics of people that could be trusted, even if these people do not exist; then draw the person towards discovering that such people actually do exist, and that you might even be one of them, thanks to the person by whom you want to be trusted.

Ask the person to try out an experiment assuming that trust is possible, act accordingly and observe the subsequent positive and negative consequences. Then, work together with them to mitigate possible negative consequences.

Make the person interview people they respect or like and who trust others. The objective of the interviews is for these people to share their experiences, hardships, successes, and risk-mitigation tactics with regard to trusting people. If possible, ask the person to uncover the fact that these people have been abandoned, deceived, and betrayed, but still trust others or at least some people.

∞◌∞◌∞◌∞◌◌

Focus on their beliefs, and destabilize them with regard to the relevance of these beliefs; for example, that trusting people is not possible.

Demonstrate passive care and that you will not harm them. Passive care is not the opposite of active care. The opposite of passive care is active harm, whereby you deliberately seek to harm others. By avoiding active harm, you are implementing passive care.

For example, make sure that you do not harm them in any way through your words or actions. Do not harm them emotionally by speaking harshly or unkindly to them, or act in ways that will upset them. Do not harm them socially, for example by gossiping about them or spreading stories that may make others think less of them.

You will destabilize the person because you are acting in a way that they would not expect, because they hold the belief that trusting people is not possible.

Pull the person into performing small, incremental acts that go against the mindset of not trusting others. These acts are negotiated. They are voluntary. Ideally, they might even go un-noticed by the person. Indeed, people have a deep need for consistency, and when they do something, they need to have consistency and alignment between their actions and their beliefs. When there is inconsistency, they either change what they are doing or what they believe in order to restore consistency. If they have already started doing something, then they cannot change what has been done, so they must change what they believe.

Do not make a big fuss about the fact that the person does not trust others. Assign them accountabilities that require that they trust people, ensure they succeed, and then talk about their approach towards trust.

Get them to do things that require them to trust people. The reason for doing these things can even be as trivial as a bet, or proving that you are wrong to trust people.

Put something in their way that they will naturally do, but which this time requires that they trust others while performing the action.

Challenge them to be "scientific" regarding their belief that people cannot be trusted.

Push the idea of lack of trust to the extreme, and make them realize the negative consequences of fully applying the concept.

Create the idea that trusting you might be possible as an exception to the rule that people cannot be trusted. Then focus on the steps that are a consequence of doing this.

Ask them to lead and animate a discussion where other people explore the questions, "When is it best or possible to trust others without factual proof that they are trustworthy?", "how do we prove that our trust is well-placed?", "when are our gut feelings wrong and when are they correct?", and "where do our beliefs come from?"

Make their current "lack of trust" mindset less safe.

Show them that their successful "competitors" trust people or at least some people.

Ask them to explore "leaps of faith" they have performed besides the leap of faith of trusting someone.

Create a dialogue about the beliefs that underlie and which are the origin of the belief that people cannot be trusted. Address these beliefs instead of the belief regarding trust.

Pull them into realizing that they actually have benefited from trusting some people at some time.

Find proof that they actually do trust others, and discuss this with them. For example, every day in the traffic, you trust drivers to do the right thing to keep your life intact, and most of them do.

∞◦∞◦∞◦∞◦∞

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

Reduce the risk coupled with trusting people.

If they have low self-confidence or low trust towards themselves, explore their doubts, and then demonstrate that you also have doubts about yourself but have found ways to "let go" of this and manage or mitigate it, and are thus able to trust others more easily.

Prove that the risk of trusting a person can be mitigated and managed. Together with them, identify how to reduce, manage, or eliminate the risks that come from trusting someone. Help them to feel confident in their ability to trust themselves to handle their emotions if a person "betrays" them. Together with them, identify situations in which trusting people (or you) does not present a significant risk for them.

Prove that the cost of being betrayed is less important than is the benefit of trusting.

Ask them to explore situations in which trust is actually not such a big leap of faith.

Ask them to reframe the trust topic as an expectation management topic.

Discuss the following statement with them: "Most people would say that a liar is untrustworthy, but they haven't broadened their view of what it means to trust. If I expect someone to be who he or she is not, then I will be disappointed and thus lose trust. However, what really happened is that I trusted my assumptions or expectations. When they fail to meet these, then I mistrust myself and that hurts. I then put the blame on them for not meeting my expectations. When I drop my expectations, then trust can be given freely and without issues."

Also, consider discussing the following statement with them: "People are trustworthy towards some people and not towards others. You can trust a person fully in a specific domain but not in others. Trust is not about judging the character and quality of another person. Instead, we come to trust the person to honor a specific commitment, and we do not come to trust that person as a whole. Trusting another person is not about saying, "You're good, you're safe"— it is about saying "I know that I can count on you these areas, and I acknowledge and understand the areas where I can't.""

Provide them with a lot of information regarding the "5-step trust process". Create a discussion about the "counter-intuitive principles" presented in this book. Pull them into adapting this knowledge to their specific preferences.

Have a discussion with them, asking "how do you feel when you meet somebody, and immediately sense that they don't trust you?" Ask them, "Are those the feelings you want to bring out in other people or yourself?", and discuss this with them.

Have a discussion with them regarding the following statement: "The only way we can know if we're able to trust someone is by first giving them trust".

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

Step 2.

Desire to trust you, as a person.

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

∞◌∞◌◌◌∞◌∞

The challenge you face:

Beliefs are not based on facts, or they would not be beliefs.

Nonetheless, you can lead the person to have the belief that you, as a person, are trustworthy.

However, your trustworthiness is not what you want to achieve at this step. It is too early for that! Indeed, the belief, feeling, or thought that you are trustworthy is a big thing.

Therefore, before this can happen, you need to make it easy for the person to have these beliefs, feelings, and thoughts.

You need to assist the person to create the foundations for the latter.

This step is all about emotions and the impact you have on the person. It is about the desire to trust you.

Let us not forget that a person can realize that you are trustworthy but not actually want to trust you, either consciously or unconsciously.

Also, the person's perception of you is critical.

As Maria V. Snyder, author of "Poison Study", put it, "Trusting is hard. Knowing who to trust, even harder".

In this step, your goal is to get the person to open up so that, in the next step of the trust process, you will have the chance to be trusted.

As George MacDonald put it, "To be trusted is a greater compliment than to be loved."

At the very least, you want the person to give you the benefit of the doubt, translated into the fact of wanting to trust you.

The goal is not yet that the person trusts you, but that you lead them to feel or think that trusting you would be a nice thing.

You want to create the belief that you are so trustworthy that it would be a natural thing to want to trust you.

So, how can you influence the other person's mind into triggering the desire to want to trust you?

Two rules in particular will govern your tactics.

Firstly, whilst "minds" are not directly observable things, we tend to think a lot about them, forming theories about beliefs, values, emotions, motivations, thought processes and so on. And we rationalize to prove that these guesses are true. When we are interacting with others or thinking about them, we make guesses about what is going on in their minds; in other words, what they are thinking and feeling. In particular, we predict the intent of others. We then often go on to assume that our guesses are true, interacting with others and acting as if they were.

For example, if you make the person feel good, they will rationalize that they actually like you; if you like them, they will want to bond with you.

Secondly, we usually open up more towards people whose lives seem similar to ours. We are drawn to others' values, beliefs, and actions because we "identify" with them, in that we recognize our own "identity" in these actions. The tendency to distrust difference is so strong that we have created "diversity" education and roles in companies just to help us to overcome it.

As participants in the "trust project" put it,

"Trust is possible because we want to trust and because people are trustworthy (enough)."

"The reason for me to want / desire to trust someone, is gain or at least not drain mental energy, result and time. Mistrust is cumbersome. I think a good mixture of high integrity, balanced prestige level, being up-front, self esteem would make me trust a person more."

"What makes me want to trust a person? The fact that I like them or believe that they have good character/judgment and the feeling seems mutual."

∞◦∞◦∞◦∞◦∞

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

Examples of things you need to do:

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

Make it easy, obvious or natural to want to trust you as a person.

Find common ground. Prove that you share core values, beliefs, backgrounds, life-shaping experiences, principles, or mindsets that are important to the other person. Highlight that you share the same friends, role models, or trusted advisors.

Identify shared dislikes – this creates stronger bonds than shared positives. Create an "us against them" feeling.

Create "synchrony", whereby you both feel that you are 'in tune' with each other. Combine their and your ideas in order to form an even better idea. Use their idea as a brainstorming trigger and let your mind wander. Invite them to bounce back an even better idea, thereby creating something you both own.

Get them to like you or admire you.

Prove that you are similar to those that they have trusted before.

Prove that you are similar to those that have trusted them.

Share examples in which people similar to them trusted you.

Highlight that you are popular, respected and trusted by a lot of people.

Prove your goodwill and favorable intentions towards the person. Demonstrate active care. Go out of your way to help them without being asked to do so. Be proactive in identifying how you can take some of their daily load off them. When they are upset by something, take time to listen to them. Do not look for thanks, just be happy to help.

Make it easy for them to get to know you. Disclose some things about yourself, because it is difficult for people to relate to an enigma. Expose your vulnerabilities and imperfections. Prove that you are aware of them, comfortable with them, and that you can avoid them becoming liabilities. If some of them are shared by the person, that is even better. Be open about yourself, your feelings and what you have done. When asked, tell the truth, even it is embarrassing. Do not make excuses for your weaknesses. However, be careful about exposing too much of yourself too early. Reveal yourself a step at a time

and roughly at the same rate as the other person. Use personal truths to gently encourage the person to also expose himself or herself.

Display emotions that stimulate their emotions. This can be done by showing your sadness, or that you laugh, that you apologize, and so on. However, display your positive emotions rather than your negative ones whenever possible, or you may be seen as an energy drainer.

Stand up for those who are less able to defend themselves, especially if they have some common ground with the person. Defend them when they are being attacked, even when they are not present. Put yourself in harm's way to protect them.

Create familiarity. Be nearby and around as often as possible. Arrange to be near the person on a regular basis. Start by just saying hello in passing and gradually build the relationship from there.

Encourage them to talk about whatever is on their mind. Give them time and space to talk about a subject that is bothering them, especially if they currently do not want to talk about it with just anybody. In order to generate this "pull" effect, demonstrate enthusiasm for the subject, mention the subject, and then stay quiet and let them fill this silence gap, nod as they mention a topic related to the subject, make encouraging noises such as 'uh-huh' or 'mm', build on what they say about the subject or elements related to it. Use phrases like "so what you are saying is that…", or "so the problem this causes might be …"

Reflect what you hear them saying, not by parroting the same words but by paraphrasing, using your own words to rephrase what they have said. Summarize what they have said in fewer words, and ask whether your summary is correct.

When having a discussion with them, focus on the "here and now" of what is going on between you and them, instead of on what was or what might be.

Look at their face and into their eyes, almost as if you cannot drag your eyes away. However, be careful with this. Do not stare - use a soft and flattering gaze that says 'you are wonderful'. If they start to look at all uncomfortable, pull your eyes away reluctantly with a brief, apologetic smile. If they are less comfortable, look more at their face and less into their eyes, glancing into their eyes occasionally.

Use mirroring with a 3-second delay. Echo their body language and other non-verbal communication, including sounds, voice tone, and so on. However, make sure that you mirror, and do not copy. Thus, if they lean to their right, then you lean to your right, not your left. Be careful about over-doing it, it should feel natural.

Give praise often and with warmth.

Listen to any of their requests for information.

Value and accept them, even if you do not agree with what they have to say or how they say it. Disagree with the argument, not with the person. When they make comments and suggest ideas, do not dismiss them, no matter how stupid or bad they may seem, because these are the other person's truths.

Ask for their advice about things. Pay attention to what they say and show that you are taking their advice seriously. It is usually better to ask for advice than for opinions, since this creates a stronger intimacy.

Tease them, as a proof that you trust them, and thus that they could easily trust you. Teasing demonstrates trust in them, since it proves that you make the assumption they will not see it as an insult or a threat, and that they will laugh rather than become angry with you. Also, teasing is seldom a one-way thing. Therefore, as they tease back, they are acting as if they want to or actually do trust you. However, ensure that the teasing is not perceived as disguised bullying or as an act of domination - if the teased person does not tease in return, then there may be something wrong.

Allow them to do you a small favor. Create empathy and concern towards yourself.

Do not position yourself as a victim if they perform a hurtful action. Do not make them feel guilty because of you.

Listen to how they are copying you: it may be a signal that they are seeking your approval.

Be congruent – make sure your words, gestures, facial expressions, and tone match the message you are sending. For example, smiling while disciplining sends a mixed message.

∞◌∞◌◌◌∞◌∞

Trigger the fact that trusting you equals serving their own interests.

Encourage them to assume that if you ask them to do something for your benefit, they will feel as if they are doing it for their benefit too.

Prompt their feedback. Ask them for harsh and direct feedback on what you are doing well and less well - this acts a bit like the teasing process. If they are reluctant to give criticism, help them by making self-appraisal statements rather than by asking questions, saying, "I think I talked too long on that topic in the meeting, what do you think?"

Prove that you are able to understand them. Prove that you are able to listen to what they say and to their underlying emotions. Give feedback on your understanding or perception of them, and ask for their quality-check of the latter. Make this a consequence of you having listened to them. For example, listen in order to understand their needs, including statements they make about themselves, about safety, about belonging, and the like. Listen in order to understand their beliefs, assumptions and other leaps. Listen in order to understand the "musts" and "shoulds" that indicate their values.

Prove that you feel that they are unique. Prove that you feel that they are important in your eyes. Demonstrate that you respect them as a person, in other words for who they are.

Prove that trusting you will enable to have a relationship that has the characteristics of a friendship, even if you have a work or business relationship and do not necessarily aim to become best buddies.

Prove that trusting you will enable them to trust themselves more.

Prove that trusting you will enable them to feel hope, security, comfort, and excitement.

Prove that you are different from them in ways that compensate for their lack, but that you share with them a strong and unifying vision or mission nonetheless.

Highlight that you are willing to trust them, although you rarely trust others.

Illustrate that you trust yourself, but do not insist too much on this it if they do not trust themselves.

Prove you are not a threat. Be social with people that are part of their "tribe".

Be the first one to listen to the other's problems. Show plenty of concern for their problems before talking about your own.

Reassure them when they are in doubt or pain. If they are emotional, accept their emotional state without criticism and without saying "please don't cry", which really means "please don't upset me". If someone is moved to tears, allow them to cry.

∞◦∞◦◦∞◦∞◦

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

Step 3.

Confidence in entrusting you with doing a particular thing.

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

The challenge you face:

The person now wants to trust you.

You have the opportunity to piggyback on this and to make them feel and think that they are able to trust you with a particular thing, such as a task or a relationship, for logical reasons.

Here, the focus is on logical reasons for your trustworthiness.

This involves the person assessing the probabilities of gain and loss, calculating the expected utility of trusting you based on hard data, and concluding that you will behave in a predictable manner if they trust you.

The latter is critical, because people have a deep need to predict how others will behave in order to feel safe and thus achieve a sense of being in control of their own lives.

This is tricky! As Alessandra Torre, author of "To Have", put it, "Security is a strange thing, a myth that the brain allows in exchange for a brief moment of piece".

One difficulty with this is that being reliable is not something you do some of the time. It has to be all the time. An apology for not being reliable, not about the thing you did wrong, can recover the situation, but this is a "silver bullet" that you can only use infrequently. In addition, people who try to be nice to others by saying "yes" a lot and promising whatever is asked of them can easily be thought of as unreliable when they do not complete things as expected. It is often better to "do less, better".

To avoid being seen as unpredictable, you will also need to show that you are able to control yourself, including handling negative emotions and not making rash decisions.

Another example of the difficulty of being seen as predictable is prudence. Prudence has merit. Cowardice should not, although some people might actually appreciate you being a coward because this reassures them and makes you

predictable. It also gives them a positive image of themselves if they lack courage.

Being reliable does mean being nice or "at your service". When it comes to trusting another person, a reliable enemy can be preferable to an unpredictable friend, since at least one knows "how they will behave".

Finally, in this step of the trust process, the person takes the risk of jumping into the unknown and trusting you with a specific thing, so "predictability of intents or behaviors", or "the ability to manage surprises or setbacks" beats "morals" or "competence".

As one of the participants in the "trust project" put it,

"I think that trust is about credibility and you cannot get trust if you are not perceived as relevant and close. That explains why many of us think that trust is about openness, but openness is only one part of the story."

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

Examples of things you need to do:

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

Encourage the person to assume that you will deliver.

Prove that you believe it is possible to deliver and that it is a rational decision to trust you.

Prove that you are or that you behave like a successful person. Be visible, do not wait for results to be noticed or speak for themselves, market your strengths, and associate yourself with those who are successful. Get the most out of a deal. Make the most of the opportunities given to you.

Be introduced by a credible person. Prove that you have been entrusted with a similar thing before or with something that relied on the same key success factors. Get references from respected people regarding your ability to deliver.

Share examples of the fact that you have a strong sense of accomplishing your duties and the tasks assigned to you. You might even joke about a tendency you have towards perfectionism.

Demonstrate that you are aware of the impact you have on others and of their perceptions of your behaviors and attitudes.

Be solution focused. Prove that you create new options that were not part of the definition of a problematic situation. Imagine alternative scenarios.

Be the one to address typically un-discussable topics. Read between the lines, and ask the right questions to help them define what they really want. Identify the "dilemmas, ambiguities, uncertainties, risks, etc." not only in the external environment, but also in the internal environment.

Prove your "smarts" - intellectual, street, and people "smarts". Prove the correctness of your opinions. Demonstrate "systems thinking", for example that you focus on the 5% that creates the 95% impact. Look at links between events or data, question assumptions, underlying beliefs, and inferences, as well as why some data is selected or not selected. Change the definition of the problem rather than just resolving it. See the essence. Simplify the complex.

Have a clear definition of what success means. Define the different criteria for assessing an idea / a problem. Have focus and prioritize. Focus on quality rather than on quantity.

Take emotionally loaded/tough decisions. Do what is needed despite fear. Demonstrate self-confidence. Stand out from the crowd for who you are. Stand up for your preferences.

Use humor for a purpose; for example, to help communicate a difficult message, to get things done, to reduce tensions, to improve morale, to boost creativity, or to provoke people out of black and white thinking.

Give extra credit to those that enable things to stay on track or avoid surprises. Prove that you will reward those that are aligned to your expectations/direction. Take your time to decide and reflect, but be fast in implementation.

Ask for as few changes as possible. Focus on under-utilized resources before trying to acquire new ones.

Bounce back after criticism or attacks. Free yourself from negative feelings. Fix problems created by others. Take responsibility for failure, learn from it, and start all over again from a stronger position. Never blame anybody for tough circumstances or their mishaps.

Manage risks, but do not let them stop you. Don't take foolish risks and don't take risks lightly, but take risks and mitigate and minimize them

Don't spend more than you have.

Never lose sight of what really matters to you. Be disciplined in never giving in to things that are not linked to what matters to you, even if they shout for your attention.

Demonstrate flair and foresight. Demonstrate that you are able to understand or see things that others do not. See connections where others do not.

Look at the hard truth rather than at things that are nice to hear or to see.

Demonstrate your ability to analyze anything that life throws at you, uncovering the underlying methodology and then applying it in practice. Clarify a confusing situation.

Focus on why things work or do not work.

Prove that you know what is required in order for people to win.

Highlight the credibility of your sources of information.

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

Make it obvious that trusting you will serve their interests.

Prove that trusting you will make their life easier.

Prove that they are better off trusting you and having you around than if the reverse were true. Prove that the cost of trusting you is compensated for by the benefit of having you do things.

Prove that your strengths are their weakness.

Prove that they will be able take advantage of your vulnerabilities without you blaming them for it or either of you experiencing negative consequences / feelings.

Prove that trusting you will avoid the loss of valuable things.

Prove you feel guilt and shame, without which trust is rare or impossible.

Demonstrate "win-win" thinking. Adopt solutions that work for both your and their interests.

Guarantee transparency. Forbid blaming games.

Define norms, standards and expectations. Define the rules of the game.

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

Prove that you will be able to manage unforeseeable risks.

Prove that you are flexible and adaptable. Apply principles learned from different situations in a different way and in a different situation. Prove you can multi-track and can work on different things at once.

Prove that you have a high tolerance for ambiguity. When something no longer creates success, change it and your habits. Adapt to local or new contexts/constraints/data/events.

Prove that you are resilient. Be resourceful. Maintain enthusiasm and focus on the positive after disappointments or rejections. Respond to setbacks as a challenge and as an opportunity to learn. Present a positive disposition and maintain constructive interpersonal relationships when under stress. Always have a back-up plan.

Show that you and the other person have the same risk tolerance regarding trial and error.

Reveal your intentions regularly. Explain how you will make tradeoffs among the competing interests.

Deal with the causes of a conflict, not its symptoms.

Present any argument according to the following four steps: "the data that I selected, why I selected them, the interpretation that I make of them, and the conclusions that I draw".

Begin and conclude your arguments by offering a "pitch" (a description of an idea in one sentence) that shows the similarity with / difference of your solution and an existing one.

Only use arguments that can be written on a business card.

Do not use politics to get results, use it to avoid blockers.

Do not appear more brilliant than the people upon whom you depend.

Share your non-conformity and creativity with a limited group of trusted people.

Stress timeliness over relevance. Always test an idea and do not assume it is good because feelings or facts say it is. Do not give the impression of claiming to know everything.

Listen to the person's suggestions, and take actions based on them. Never allow the discussion to become a battle between your idea and the person's idea or a contest that has a winner and a loser. With regard to the first decisions you take, or for some touchy issues, collect the person's input before defining options.

Save criticism for one-on-one sessions.

Prove that you create time for increased self-awareness.

Demonstrate that you have a track record of and an approach for changing behavior following feedback. Be very teachable. Have a high degree of willingness to learn and a high degree of willingness to accept change. Compensate for your weaknesses. Develop a personal support system to achieve this. Have advisors who are both strong and independent. Have a network of dependable allies. Draw lessons from successes as well as from failures.

Decompose a difficulty into small parts that are less difficult.

Manage timescales and control when things happen. Sometimes this means slowing things down. Sometimes it means forcing the pace. Don't let things fall behind. Have a system for reporting whereby people who should be doing things report on what they have actually done.

Persuade first. If this fails, negotiate, and if this fails, coerce.

Clearly communicate your position on an issue. Clearly state your position and demonstrate that you are able to identify where there is no room for compromise.

Prove that your stakeholders share your priorities.

Prove you will embrace a competing theory if it makes more sense, regardless of the existing traditions or expectations.

Demonstrate that you are rarely affected by manipulation or sales tactics, and that you tend to know instantly whether someone is being honest. Demonstrate that you do not fall for the latest fad.

Create a flexible game plan that enables everyone to adjust to unexpected developments while still being focused on delivering on promises. Develop a game plan tied to possible futures.

Demonstrate that you are sensitive to how others see and interpret your reasons for doing things.

Prove that you are particularly attentive to what no longer surprises or that which is accepted as evidence.

<div align="center">∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞</div>

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

Prove your reliability.

Create a feeling of belonging, hope, clarity, security, calmness, caution, patience, composure, respect, and that things will be done "together".

Do what you say you are going to do. Do not do things that others do not expect. Honor promises you make. Ensure things are not left undone.

Turn up on time.

Always repay debts.

Have a clear ability to control yourself. This not only includes general self-control, but also the ability to control short-term impulses. Ideally, make your process visible in that you are seen to be experiencing inner conflicts and emotions, and yet are clearly displaying self-control, with calm outer behavior. Lose your temper very rarely, always approaching things from a calm and rational perspective.

Avoid unnecessary risks.

Do not accept success that is achieved at the expense of stability or coherence.

Respect traditions. Protect yourself and others against disorder. Respect the informal rules of a situation or a group. Be impatient with unconstructive rebels. Be at the service of a community or an organization. Be a strong member of an organization.

Walk the talk regarding "what you see is what you get".

Be detail focused. Ground decisions in solid facts. Provide plans. Provide structure and organization. Loathe chaos and always seek to come up with some kind of structure or a set or rules, regardless of what you do.

Be liked by experts. Get the best out of recognized experts. Create an atmosphere of excellence.

Be careful whom you trust to execute things. Create an error free environment. Be close to flawless in key skills.

Demonstrate that you are able to hold rebellious elements under control. Do not let others bully you. Demonstrate that you are able to pressure or direct under-performers into performing. Demonstrate that you are able to lead people towards thinking as you do. Demonstrate that you are able to get people who disagree with you to still implement what you wish them to implement. Demonstrate that you are able to be directive when others are not "up to it". Demonstrate that you are able to do things that are tough or unpleasant if this is for the best for the group or for the organization. Demonstrate that you are loyal. Stand up for directives that are expected to cascade. Put your duties above your own needs.

Always keep the end goal in sight.

Prove that you are responsible, and that a promise means everything to you. Demonstrate that you would rather work overtime and lose sleep than fail to deliver the result that someone else is expecting. Demonstrate that you put your duties above everything else.

Prefer simple and straightforward answers.

Demonstrate that you are motivated by not losing something, rather than by gaining something.

Demonstrate that you are willing to plunge right into things and get your hands dirty.

Prove that there is a reasoned plan driving the choices you make.

Help all of the people involved to understand their core assumptions and the implications for how they have to do their work. Turn everyone into gatherers of data as events unfold.

Prove that you will do what is right according to their definition of what "right" means, rather than that which is easy.

Prove that you avoid having the weaknesses the person has or suffers from because others have them.

Prove that you know that there are always countless dangers all around that you cannot tackle, and that you therefore try to build the best possible defenses. Illustrate that if you choose to, you can sees risks and dangers in practically anything. Prove that if you choose to, you can have an "I will believe it when I see it" and a "prove it to me" attitude, or that you "don't believe anything you have not personally seen working to absolute satisfaction". You can also prove that your attitude can be "good times never last long enough, nor do they come often".

Avoid hype, flamboyance, and "big bang" approaches.

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

Demonstrate your respect for the person and the people close to them.

Keep confidential information confidential.

Do not make others responsible for your mistakes. Do not indulge in favoritism. Recognize people's efforts, achievements and results, and do so quickly after they have realized them. Do not justify bad behavior by the fact that it was not possible for you to do otherwise.

Encourage open dialogues and frank discussions, especially when what you hear is unpleasant. Do not attempt to misrepresent the facts to protect yourself or to benefit personally.

Consult people before making a decision that affects them in order to integrate their concerns, doubts, workloads, subjectivities, and questions.

When you communicate a decision, explain how and why you have taken upstream opinions into account, as well as the concerns of the individuals involved in addition to those of the experts.

Do not systematically seek to have the last word.

Judge people solely on that over which they have control or influence. Avoid people losing face

Tolerate the error that comes with learning, but do not tolerate lies. Address emotions, interpretations and perceptions, and try to highlight or uncover existing good intent.

Focus on areas of agreement. Establish peace between conflicting sides, even if a conflict is not resolved. Save or maintain relationships, even if a disagreement is not resolved. Take a neutral position. Understand the views of people on both sides of a conflict.

Prove your ability to provide feedback that becomes an encounter, not a confrontation. Focus more on the opportunity than on the problem. Focus on specifics, not on general considerations. Avoid words like "always, never, ever, and sometimes", and aim for change, not for blame. Do not simply tell people what not to do. Focus on positive behavior. Limit corrective actions to trying to prevent negative behavior. State why there is a need for change. Ask questions that point toward solutions. Define consequences clearly. Look to the future and for solutions - you want results, not excuses.

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

Step 4.

Reinforce the trust given to you.

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

The challenge you face:

In this step, your goal is to strengthen and increase the trust bestowed upon you and your trustworthiness.

You will want to maintain and anchor it.

Honoring principles such as "what got you here will not get you there" and "you are only as good as your last performance" is the challenge you face in this step.

Even if you have been proven to be trustworthy in the past, situations do not repeat themselves in exactly the same way, and you will probably have made some mistakes because no one is perfect; thus, your trustworthiness track record needs to be confirmed.

This step is also about handling mistakes and unforeseeable events in a trustworthy manner, thereby reinforcing the trust the person has towards you.

You results, communication and risk management behaviors are the criteria for the other person in this step of the trust process.

In this step of the trust process, you will need to ensure that the person who trusted you is having a pleasant journey and that the journey is what they imagined it would be.

Note that a small betrayal of trust can, in fact, actually help. If you fail in a relatively unimportant way, and then go overboard in recovery, the message sent is "I care so much about you even regarding small things, so just imagine how much I care about the bigger things".

This step is also about the management of the person's fears, and about avoiding triggering fears in them or in people who are important in their eyes.

Fear is the opposite of desire, in that desire attracts whilst fear repels.

Therefore, where there is fear, there will be less trust and less desire to trust you.

As Holly Hood, author of "Prison of Paradise", put it, "Trust to some was placing all your insecurities and beliefs in one single person, and hoping he or she wouldn't squash them".

Finally, in this step you will have to confirm and prove that the trust was rightfully granted and was the correct decision to make.

As participants in the "trust project" put it,

"Trust is earned. Mutual interest builds the relationship initially. From there, open, honest communication allows me to trust the person!"

"I believe trust comes from a mix of empathy, logics, fear, survival instinct. It is quite low in the Maslow's model as I see it."

"To trust a person, first and foremost I would say that I rely on my intuition and all the signals and different communication forms that comes through as you get to know a new person."

"What would make you feel unconditional trust towards a person? Mine and that person's will to be and stay interdependent. In my world the opposite to trust is doubt and suspicion or even despair at the far end."

"What strengthens your feeling of trust once you have given your trust to a person? Professionally speaking: getting support and coaching when doubt gets in."

"What strengthens your feeling of trust once you have given your trust to a person? That the person uses my trust in a matured way and the person behaves as I would expect, considering the type of trust. It can survive disagreement or even an argument."

"Trust is strengthened by the experience of trustworthiness: Not to be disappointed in my expectations to what the person will do, or to the reasons why he/she was not able to do what I expected."

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

Examples of things you need to do:

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

Make the journey a pleasant one.

Exceed expectations. Under-promise and over-deliver.

Create enhanced happiness and well-being as a result of having trusted you. Prove how trusting you enables them to feel pride, companionship, friendship, love, agreement, relaxation, or comfort.

Make them feel important. Publically recognize them regularly.

Avoid using trivializing phrases such as, "this is not that important". Avoid using words that block the dialogue or that create an impression of arrogance, such as "obviously, clearly, of course, I knew that, does not surprise me".

Spend time together with the person. Uses we/us rather than I. Have fun with them at least once a week. Talk about what interests them.

Prove that the experience of trusting you produces side benefits that make the person happy or happier. This can be that trusting you enables them to have time to look at what is beautiful, have time to do what they like the most, make their other challenges more achievable, help others, be experts in one or more areas, be cheerful, have fewer things to worry about, be true to their values or morals, see things positively, champion a cause, find time for a healthy life style, do something creative, beat boredom, share good news, be respected or appreciated by their "tribe", learn new skills find meaning and purpose in life, have sufficiently supportive friends and family, have interesting and challenging work, be easily amused and smile or laugh often, have a positive self-image, feel a sense of belonging, or feel less blame or culpability.

Show that trusting you enables them to look and feel good.

Show thankfulness and gratitude for being trusted or for the consequences that derive from that.

Reduce any emotional temperature of interactions they have with you.

Cheer them up when they feel down. Provide emotional support when they need it.

Do not take yourself seriously and accept that, like most people, you will demonstrate incongruity and irrationality.

Be autonomous without being independent.

Limit lecturing and telling them or others what to. Instead of lecturing, use reflective questions like "what do you think about ...?", "Have you thought of …?" and "Would you consider …?"

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

Enhance the person's sense of being in control.

Prove that, thanks to you, the person or others important that are important to them do not hesitate regarding how or what things should be done.

Show that you will not use the ceded power that comes with having their trust against them. Give them means to sanction or reward you for trust failure. Provide visible confirmation that supports their sense of control, for example by giving them choices and involving them in decisions. Give them the means to make you even more in control of things. Prove that you set up a system that creates and environment for you in which you are in control of things that might occur.

Demonstrate that you have faith in success - if you do not believe, they will not either.

Demonstrate that you are in control, including being in control of yourself. Highlight what your participation in a problem, or in allowing the problem to remain unresolved. For example, are you avoiding the problem while it grows underfoot, are you pretending the problem matters less than it does, or are you omitting communicating because "it should be obvious?" Prove that you can mitigate and solve subsequent issues.

Prove that their interests are being served.

Build trust among the person's stakeholders or customers.

Demonstrate your integrity and ability to stand firm or alone on topics important to them.

Listen to learn. Do not insert your opinion and do not judge what they say while they are speaking. Demonstrate that you are willing to listen, even though this may not result in agreement.

Speak up when people are being excluded. Ask who else needs to be in the room in order to understand the whole.

For some things, ask the person if it is okay to do them or how to best do them before doing them.

Regularly take the initiative to ask for feedback if you have made mistakes, used the wrong words, caused unpleasant surprises, or made recommendations they did not like.

Demonstrate that you are willing to make sacrifices for the good of the relationship you have with them and/or in order to deliver results.

Do the little things consistently. In every area of life, it's the little things—done consistently—that make the big difference.

Proactively address the person´s fears or their vulnerabilities, and take actions to avoid these being triggered or escalating.

Take a leadership stance that is calm and assertive.

Identify the habits that are adopted by people as a result of trusting you, and then find ways to increase the number and instances of these habits. Use formal rituals to confirm trust. When trust is demonstrated, celebrate with a party or some other ritualized recognition of the passing of a key milestone. Use these, if possible, to replace rituals that already exist

Establish process, values and habits that assume that there is a reciprocal trust.

Manage your time efficiently. Be time sensitive. Value time. Attach a monetary value to your time.

Act decisively and consistently on issues of substandard performance, resolving issues before they become serious problems. Set challenging and stretching performance targets, but remember that they must be realistic. Exercise "power", but not in order to divide and conquer.

Be accountable for the choices you have made and the choices you are making. In fact, when you point the finger at your circumstances or other people, you are communicating that, as long as you have a good excuse, you will break your agreements.

Accept responsibility for personal failure and apologize personally. Ask for lessons learned rather than for scapegoats or excuses.

Conduct post mortems. Accept feedback and act upon it. Constantly improve. Always be in a state of learning and of openness to new ideas. When people experience you as always reaching for what is next and always searching for answers and new ways of doing things, they will be more confident in your ability to succeed. The Japanese call this concept "kaizen".

Show loyalty. Talk about others as if they were present. Focus on the positive rather than the negative, and if you do talk about people´s weaknesses, do it in such a responsible and constructive way that you would not be ashamed to have the people you are talking about overhear your conversation.

Create an evidence stream. Show progress regularly, demonstrating either solid progress according to the plan or robust action to address any slippage.

Establish both parties´ right and duties. Create interdependence: "In order to do my work I need your help, and this is true for both of us". Create role and process clarity, whereby it is easy to determine who is responsible for what and who controls which resources. Re-affirm priority and goal congruity, as well as other points of commonality through which you and they can work together

Define the ways of working in the partnership you have with the person. How and who makes decisions based on the topics? What is and how is the contribution of each member of the partnership measured? How to ensure that a problem is discussed or mentioned immediately, or as soon as both parties are aware of it? What tasks are critical to the success of the partnership, and which are at risk of doing harm? How to manage the departure of key players from the partnership? How to control the quality of cooperation? What could be the points of dispute penalizing the success of the partnership? What will be the operating results, both anticipated and unanticipated, and who will ensure that such exploitation is done?

Prove you reduce risks because you identify the real issues and levers.

Share your thinking when facing risks. For example, when faced with a risk, show that you ask yourself the following questions: "how to avoid the risk, how to

reduce the probability of the occurrence of the risk, how can the risk be best managed, and can we control or influence the appearance of the risk?"

Ensure all warning signals, such as questions or complaints, are detected, taken seriously and communicated. List the possible sources of crisis, the consequences and costs of prevention, and conduct regular audits of risk. Avoid improvisation and the uncoordinated taking of initiative.

Mitigate the effect of symptoms and solve or address root causes and trigger events. Critically examine the accuracy of underlying assumptions. Challenge the definitions of what the issues and the expected results are. Look for missing or ignored data, rather than just reviewing data that have already been looked into. Try to change the system within which the problem appears. Recognize what is known about an issue, what more needs to be known, and how to best obtain the relevant and accurate information needed. Use multiple perspectives to identify probable unintended consequences of various action plans. Start with the indirect problems of a problem as a way of defining the scope of a problem. Look for multiple causes, not one single cause. Use graphic representation of the topic. Divide the problem into its component pieces and examine the pieces to see if a different order would help to solve the problem. Keep asking "Why?" to see how many causes you can come up with and how many organizing buckets you can put them into. Look for patterns in data, don't just collect information. Consider whether the source of the information has values that are different from yours, or has a personal interest that could affect the perception of the facts.

Take a disciplined approach to defining the problem, asking questions such as, "what makes me believe there is a problem? What's going on there, what has happened just before and what will happen just after? Where does the problem occur? What is the chain of actions, factors and levers that led to the symptoms of the problem?"

Prove that you are solution focused. Start with something that works. Look at when is there not a problem. Find out what's happening in the present and not what happened before. Define what the ideal future will be like and what will be in the "new now". Identify what to preserve because it works well. Identify what to avoid acquiring because it is useless or harmful. Identify what not to keep doing because it's what we do today.

Have a "can-do", "all is possible" or "whatever it takes" attitude. Do what is needed even if the consequences are difficult for you.

Demonstrate that you have a decision making process that is prudent and humble. When making decisions, ask yourself if your choice is based on what is right, rather than on who is right. Solicit feedback from non-experts regarding your proposed solutions. Ask for input from those affected by the problem. Examine the feasibility of alternatives. Discover and discuss the impact of cognitive biases. Take into account the interests and expectations of the customers. Take into account abilities to implement the decision, and abilities to easily explain the relevance of the decision.

Demonstrate your ability to manage uncertainties, a novel situation, or an ambiguity.

Do not tolerate those that conceptualize or strategize while not delivering or procrastinating.

Use a sequential approach when sharing your feelings. This could be "WIRRR": When you say or do ... I felt / got the Impression that... As a Result, I felt the need to ...Thus my Reaction was to ... Maybe you could React to this and tell me if you agree with / are surprised by my inferences?

Don't waste your time making decisions that do not have to be made: be conscious that many decisions you make are unimportant – specifically, about 80% of them.

Enable individuals who are closest to the sources of information and who are the most competent to contribute to decision-making processes, but only if you establish parallel control of the implementation of the decision that allows you to be continuously alerted to possible incidents.

Let people decide for themselves, as long as the decision respects agreed arbitration using predefined criteria.

∞◌∞◌∞◌∞◌∞

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

Communicate in a way that serves their interests.

Proactively inform them of all upcoming events. Hold regular updates. Inform them about what you do in their absence.

Confirm in writing what you said, since not everyone assumes that giving your word is enough until you reach the unconditional step of the trust process, particularly if the agreement has been preceded by several negotiations.

Share the underlying intents of the things you have done, do and will do. Do not leave any unnecessary question marks. Make a point to close every interest and every suggestion in some form. When an answer isn't available, set aside a time to plan for a more thorough response.

Make an effort to check that you understand them.

Share relevant information regarding how you perceive situations, and how you approach things.

Check assumptions fairly quickly to ensure that people do not harbor negative feelings or become distrustful.

Highlight the explicit, informal rules/principles that govern situations.

Highlight the things you can control, or cannot control but can influence, or that you can neither control nor influence.

Highlight the things that are mainly dependent of the result or contribution of people other than yourself. However, do not position yourself as a victim or blame others. Simply clarify and explain how this is the basis for your solution finding, actions and risk management.

Define each situation as a series of dominos pieces in which each domino piece is an "If" -"if that occurs, then x will happen and/or I will decide to ..."

Require feedback, and make it easy for them to give it to you.

Be receptive to their feedback. Reach consensus peacefully. Give criticism calmly. Take criticism with grace.

List the important misunderstandings or frustrations from your perspective.

Try to understand the problem from the other person's point of view.

Seek first to understand and then to be understood.

Talk straight! Always tell the truth, no matter how scary, about how things are going and affecting people. Handle bad news as an opportunity to get honest feedback. Have communication that is clear, straight to the point, and which is focused on the "So what?" Use stories and anecdotes that are captivating and which demonstrate the point. Slow down your speaking speed when the message is more important. Present one idea at a time and present it fully. Take the relevant the time to reflect before responding.

Be a constructive feedback giver. Give timely feedback as things happen, and do so regularly, thus making it less of a dramatic/ big thing. Give private, not public negative feedback, but give public praise. Avoid having people lose face. Give future-focused feedback. Start with the context before giving feedback, and look for factors in the environment that have an impact. Give feedback about one issue at a time, and be specific and concrete. Differentiate perceptions from facts.

Provide a sufficient amount of time for the person to ask questions, request clarification, and provide input.

Communicate clearly, especially regarding measurements, results, and consequences.

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

Step 5.

Unconditional trust towards you.

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

The challenge you face:

It is possible to create the belief that you are trustworthy by default in the future and/or regardless of whatever happens. This is how we define unconditional trust. It is a belief, or a habit, and thus trust does not get stronger than that.

Unconditional trust is time and track record dependent.

You cannot create unconditional trust. You can only not block it from progressively appearing. It is something that is built thanks to the test of time, because time will prove that you do not do the things that are blocks to reaching this unconditional trust.

It is a bit like avoiding derailment after a promotion or a series of successes.

In addition, in this step, you will need to lead the person towards not considering that trust requires you to be predictable, since this would require that they and you could predict the future. This "predictability" pre-requisite will set you up for failure and make it impossible to build unconditional trust, since no-one can predict the future.

Finally, you will also need to guide the person towards focusing their trust not on the fact that you will deliver, but to focus their trust on the relationship they have with you instead. You ask them not trust you or your ability to deliver, but rather to trust the relationship the two of you have. Thus, there are no event-dependent conditions for them to give their trust to you unconditionally. Therefore, the threshold for trusting someone changes from "can I predict this person's behavior?" to "do I understand this person's heart and is that heart resonant with mine?"

These two beliefs are grounded in fears that are so basic in terms of enabling our survival that dialogue about them is not really efficient. Therefore, in order to achieve the above-mentioned, you will need to prove that you are not a time bomb when stressed, when stretched, or in certain circumstances.

Unconditional trust is given to those who do not derail.

One of the reasons is that the emotional cost of having gone through all four steps triggers a need for consistency which makes the person want to have unconditional trust towards you. Why? When we have made a decision or build a hypothesis, we will actively seek things which will confirm our decision or hypothesis. We will also avoid things which will disconfirm this. The alternative is to face the dissonance of being wrong. When our inner systems (beliefs, attitudes, values, etc.) all support one another and when these are also supported by external evidence, then we have a comfortable state of affairs. The discomfort of cognitive dissonance occurs when things fall out of alignment, which leads us to try to achieve a maximum practical level of consistency in our world. To release the tension we can change our behaviours or justify them. If an action has been completed and cannot be undone, then the after-the risk of lack of consistency compels us to change our beliefs. Dissonance increases with the importance and impact of the decision, along with the difficulty of reversing it. Trust is one of these high importance and high impact decisions.

As one participant in "the trust project" put it,

"Trust has to be earned. It is very hard to earn. We human being (at least me), often live like an autopilot, kidnapped by our own ego (at least me) often... For example, we asked for feedback, and to be fully trusted with a 100% honesty at 10am on Day 1. Then, autopilot directed us to a different emotional zone at 10pm on Day 30, when we really saw the feedback, or when under stress. We would sabotage (involuntarily) those who gave us the toughest feedback. We can have all the rationales, justifications also. Yes. We are 100% honest also on Day 30. We are also indeed consistently honest throughout this period, except 180 shifts of reactions. Trust has to start from WITHIN. Do I know myself? Do I trust myself? There are multiple-self in everyone...the higher level one goes, the more selfs there. ...before demanding other people to trust us. Let's work on self-trust."

You will also have to avoid that trusting you is seen as the trigger for negative consequences that could have been avoided or that are destructive.

For example, you will have to avoid triggering negative feelings in people or in those important in their eyes, such as confusion, not being understood, culpability, guilt, regret, having made bad judgments or assumptions (including the one of having trusted you), shame, doubt, lack of freedom of choice, forced personal change, vulnerability, being invisible, ignored or un-noticed, insignificance, incapacity to act, lack of control over what they have to face, isolation, rejection, weakness, being unfairly judged or perceived, having a lack of direction or purpose, chaos, not being able to be "themselves", lack of

predictability of events, missing out on opportunities, losing what they had, disrespect, anxiety, embarrassment, powerlessness, frustration, boredom, loneliness, ridicule, cowardice, exhaustion, overload, experiencing loose ends, lack of completion or lack of consistency, and so on.

This step is about avoiding certain things!

Remember, the things that will make you lose a person's trust are specific to the step in which you are in the trust process. The things we will present in this step are specific to blocking you from developing unconditional trust.

As Ziad K. Abdelmour, author of "Economic Warfare: Secrets of Wealth Creation", put it,

"Don't trust people whose feelings change with time …. Trust people whose feelings remain the same even when time changes."

As participants in the "trust project" said,

"Often it takes courage to really talk and develop trust below the surface."

"Trust is very complex and in most cases needs a lot of time or maturing processes."

"What would make you feel unconditional trust towards a person? Very long time and many proofs. The more existential the trust is for my life, the more time and proof is needed. We all need to learn to manage our levels of trust, when you are still young and innocent your trust is unconditional, over time this changes."

"Trust me (message) should trigger doubts in everybody's mind. Do you trust Your Banker, Politician, Doctor, Boss or Spouse? You have no other choice other than to trust an "expert" when you are incompetent yourselves (often the case). Unfortunately the experts are often wrong too. 80% of dead patients died because the Doctor made the wrong diagnosis. Economists (even Nobel Price winners) in economy are on a "Cloud" missing the point because economics is Physics in a sense. Trust is built on ethical values and beliefs - which most in the West have abandoned to the God of short-term profit. A consistent record of

results showing capabilities and capacity plus the clarity of intentions he is able to communicate"

"Unconditional trust comes through significant time investment and demonstrated integrity. I have unconditional trust with my wife but can't think of anybody else right off the top of my head. I suppose it depends on the context. I can offer complete trust to someone in a specific task or role based on their track record but it doesn't come carte blanche..."

"I would feel unconditional trust ...- if that person (or organization) makes his, her, or its intentions undoubtedly clear, and if they are complementary to mine. But can I ever be sure ...?"

"Unconditional trust... the important part is un-conditional. That might not be so easy to achieve - guess you first have to trust, be honest to and love yourself unconditionally before you can give that to another person. If we see fear as the opposite of trust - than unconditional trust towards a person could be about feeling totally safe, having full faith and being honest with each other without fear. Is this possible to achieve? or as William Shakespeare said Love all, trust a few."

"I think the only time in one's life where one really feels unconditional trust is between day one and... say 3years of age (at the latest) towards one's father and mother. Then you realize they also do mistake. Then of course you unconsciously feel the same feeling when you fly on a plane or drive on a bus or train, because if you didn't trust the manufacturer and the driver "unconditionally" you would never get on their machines. In a professional environment, I believe one has only experienced this kind of feeling at the early stages of a career (between day 1 and 3 yrs?). Then the actual question is "unconditional", because if you don't trust anyone I don't think you can do anything."

"Is there really such a thing as unconditional trust (as a distinct entity)? Is not all trust unconditional? If you trust someone conditionally, what you are really saying is that you are prepared to suspend disbelief until proven otherwise - is that really trust? To trust someone is to surely have complete faith in their ability to do / say / behave / think in the way that they have committed to. If you only have partial faith (subject to proof) I am not sure whether that is "true" trust. Or, possibly contradicting myself, is there a clear and unequivocal distinction

between trust and faith, and as humans we misuse and interchange the terminologies?"

"Trust will always be conditional, unconditional trust would mean you run the risk of losing your identity. In love this happens, but if you do not safeguard and develop your self or ego such relationship will always encounter an imbalance."

"I am uncertain whether unconditional trust ever truly exists (given all the opportunities we each have to hurt, deceive and dishonor each other). However, there is one condition under which I would have unconditional trust for another: that myself and the other person had gone through a near-death, crisis or trauma together. For me, this type of experience would elevate the relationship to something so much bigger than this world, and, as such, my identity would give way to a collective identity, leaving a sense of communion and only trust."

"What would make you feel unconditional trust towards a person? You need to take the risk to trust first, and build on it. Sometimes you need to VERIFY to stretch that trust. We often judge others by their behavior and judge ourselves by our intention."

"Trust is undoubtedly the basis of cooperation. But it doesn't mean blind faith. Because we all have weaknesses and potential failures. For that reason, we can't even give unconditional trust to ourselves. However, unconditional trust could be considered as an asymptote, a target to get closer and closer but impossible to ever reach. In such a way, trust is constantly work in progress, consolidated by commitment, results achievement and sincere feed-back."

" "Building trust" - "becoming better at building trust" is one of my personal development goals during the first years in the corporate world. I try that, every day, but since there are regular setbacks, where people disappoint you or let you down, it seems to become a challenging, long-term personal project. "Unconditional trust" in the corporate world? Right now, it seems virtually impossible for me to reach in a world where "the survival of the fittest" exerts influence. This does though not mean, I wont aim for it..."

"I don't believe that unconditional trust works for either party in a relationship. Trust is best built and maintained as a set of ongoing assessments made between individuals as to their competence, sincerity, reliability, and mutual care in

making and keeping commitments. I can trust someone in a specific domain of performance/expertise and that trust can grow and become stronger due to a track record of reliability. Trust is built and maintained in part, by equal shares of appreciation and complaint in an open, honest, and sincere set of conversations with clear intent and rigorous communications."

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

Examples of things you need to avoid doing:

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

Judgment errors to <u>avoid</u>.

Probability calculation thinking, such as "just because it has rained, the probability of it raining again is lower", or "after bad luck there is more probability of good luck". Estimating the probability of an event based on the characteristics of the event, for example thinking it is more probable that an enemy will attack. Inferring the characteristics of an element based on their belonging to a group or based on this element being similar to others elements with other characteristics. Believing that past success enhances the probability of future success, or that a person would act in a certain way based on what you would do in that situation.

Making conclusion or meaning inference estimations, such as "because the result is positive the choice was good". Use words like "always, never, or all". Do not think that if A is not false then it is true; for example, "if he is not mean then he must be good". Not differentiate correlation and causality, either by not defining the context and its existing forces/factors, or by thinking that because a things is more/less frequent in an environment this frequency is due to the environment. Not let one characteristic or the global impression you have of a topic influence the analysis of another, not really related topic – examples of this would be forgiving/finding excuses for a friend, or tolerating a specific toxic behavior because other behaviors are good.

Focus mainly on facts and not enough on perceptions.

Think in black and white terms such as right or wrong, good or bad, either this or not this. Inaccurately perceiving a relationship between two unrelated events. Put ideas or events into a box or according to a rule that is known to you, but that is not actually relevant to the idea or event.

Planning mainly for risks that have happened in the past, or overestimating the likelihood of negative things happening (This prioritizes the fears of losing things, rather than the possibilities of gain).

Not see or look for commonalities, analogies, or parallels between different situations or problems. Wrongly assuming that because a correlation exists between two variables, there is a causal link between the two.

Assuming that if some arguments in favor of a conclusion are wrong, then the conclusion itself is wrong. Look for a unique or small number of causes, or reject arguments or evidence if these contradict your own paradigms, beliefs, assumptions, or widely "accepted truths". Demand more arguments when asked to stop doing something or to believe in a view than when asked to pursue things as they were. Accepting the first alternative that looks as if it might work, or preferring choices that provide immediate payoffs or satisfaction.

Estimate how likely something is based on how available it is in your memory, for example how unusual it is, or how familiar or attractive it is. Paying most of your attention or giving preference to the most recent information, or what is novel, thrilling, or risky.

Undervalue what you cannot have, or overvalue what you can have. Overestimate the likelihood of positive things happening.

Be unwilling to admit to being wrong, or to neutralize criticism by seeing it as unfair or exaggerated. Rationalizing an injustice you have imposed on a person by thinking "they deserve it".

Exaggerate your own importance, greatness, achievements, and talents. Over-estimate your abilities, or think you have all the answers.

Becoming jealous or envious easily, or believing that others are jealous or envious of you.

Ignore a problem, hoping it will go away or get resolved by itself or by others, and justifying a failure or delay by saying, "I tried, but the others would not be constructive or helpful".

Be content with the available data without questioning it or its origin.

Slow down or become paralyzed when things get difficult or when you are faced with obstacles.

Take decisions that force you to give up some options.

Holding grudges or having difficulties forgiving and moving on to next thing. Have little patience for those you consider to be wrongheaded or unintelligent, and avoid showing little restraint in demonstrating this.

Underestimate an organization's or peoples´ ability to implement or buy into new ideas. Overestimate the extent to which others agree with you. Have difficulties reading the impact you have on others.

Not trusting yourself, and not trusting others.

Lack the ability to recognize and understand your moods, emotions, and drives. Ignore the filters, emotions, and assumptions that shape and color your thinking. Not being able to see that you are, or could be, the problem.

Be stubborn or dogmatic, or see things mainly from one angle. (If you have very strong beliefs, values or opinions, ensure this is not to the point of being seen as being rigid).

Set unrealistically high standards.

Make lessons learned from successes of failures simplistic, and advocate "making it simple" to the point of things becoming simplistic rather than simple. Give the same weight to minor and major aspects of a problem situation, or make hasty generalizations. Not going into issues in depth and being satisfied with superficial explanations, with a temporary fix, or with only skimming the surface of things or issues.

Follow fads and gossip, or limit yourself to plausible explanations.

Make decisions and behave according to what is expected from your role, rather than according to your values, preferences, or knowledge.

Not having clear decision-making criteria, or relying on others for direction or for defining your priorities.

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

Gaps in interpersonal skills <u>to avoid:</u>

Expect favorable treatment, automatic compliance to your expectations, or act as if the world needs to adapt to you, rather than the opposite ("You just have to accept me the way I am"). Acting as if your problems are the only ones that need attention. Use "self-preservation" as an excuse for being selfish. Refuse to pay attention to that which may distract you from your agenda or goal.

Brag about yourself, be insolently proud, or allow success to go to your head.

Defend your opinions until others get tired of arguing with you.

Avoid emotionally loaded situations.

Not be very approachable and available, and have difficulty expressing affection, tenderness, or emotions, or be "flat" in situations where others show feelings. Being cold, distant, or isolated, keeping to yourself, or being indifferent to or disinterested in others.

Lack the ability to relax or have fun, or not to focus on the task / work. Acting as if humor is out of place when focusing on a task, and not take or create the time for "small talk", for putting people at ease, or for talks that are not focused on the task-at-hand. Create a passionless environment in which people are asked to leave their emotions at home.

Display abrupt or sudden and unexpected changes in behavior or emotions, or emotionally strong outbursts that are disproportionate to the importance of the issue.

Attack the person rather than their arguments, accuse the person voicing a problem of being the problem, or get upset at the messenger who brings bad news. Present your opponent's argument in a way that makes the person appear ridiculous, use sarcasm, or criticism disguised as humor.

Minimizing the gravity of your attacks by saying that they were only a joke or by wrapping them up in humor. Suggesting that any harm you did was unintentional or was not actually done.

Not ask for additional feedback after feedback has been given to you, and not making it emotionally easy for other to give feedback.

Use boring and uninteresting language, or complex and difficult language, as well as a flat speaking tone. Be dull, talk about things that are not of interest to the listener, put on a "poker face" or be hesitant to show your feelings.

Talking for too long and not giving the listener the opportunity to reply.

Listening without hearing, listening without focus, or listening while doing or thinking about other things at the same time. Interrupt people as they speak or develop your response to what you are hearing while the other person is still talking to you.

Be slow to catch on when faced with a topic that is outside of your expertise domain, have a narrow or limited number of interests, or rely mainly on a single skill.

Focus mainly on problems for which you already have available solutions because you want to be the one who has the answers to questions. Focus more on finding answers than on finding the right questions to ask, or feel that things are not done right unless you do them.

Not be aware of a lack of subtlety in pushing others emotional buttons, and try to convince others with rational arguments and/or "shoulds" to which these people do not relate.

Be overly flirtatious or overdo your warmth or friendliness, or be charming or cajoling only when you want to and for a purpose. Talk others into doing things against their better judgment.

<div align="center">∞◇◇◇◇◇◇∞</div>

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

Unconstructive reactions to events <u>to avoid</u>. Gaps in implementation and execution abilities <u>to avoid</u>.

Being upset when things are not done according to "the one unique right way", or being picky about things being a certain way. Not finishing things because they could be done better, or having a strong need to close or finish things before doing something else. Not being willing to try out something again, if it was not a success in the past. Be upset by surprises, by unpredicted events, by exceptions to the rule or by things not going as planned. Postpone decision-making until you have gathered and analyzed every possible piece of data, and be content with the "very best possible".

Lack attention to detail or be disorganized (At the same, you should avoid focusing or being stuck on the petty or minutiae of details, thereby harming your ability to focus on the major details or to supervise larger concerns).

Jump from one thing to another without fully implementing anything. A lack tolerance or patience for frustration, for opposing views, or for setbacks, and do not jump into action or respond without truly listening or thinking. Care more about the form or appearance than about the content.

Not resist or delay an impulse, a drive or a temptation to act. Have emotionally strong outbursts that are disproportionate to the importance of the related issue. Suddenly changing your tone of voice, or changing the subject of the conversation without having finished addressing the previous point, if this point was important or relevant for you. Be capricious, impulsive, volatile or displaying ill-considered or "spur of the moment" responses to others. Lose your temper easily, or let anger, frustration, or anxiety show without any filters or at the wrong time.

Have an excessive need for novel, thrilling, and exciting stimulation, for taking chances and doing things that are risky, as this taste for novelty can create a sense of anarchy. Give undue preference to creative people who propose new or risky ideas.

Wanting to get things done in a hurry and being intolerant of slower people. Display agitation rather than results, and ensure that you implement decisions fully.

Avoiding being the one making the decision, wait too long to make decisions, or have difficulty choosing between options. Focus most of your efforts on getting the approval and acceptance of others or on complying with authority figures. Be dependent on a mentor, a boss or a respected person to succeed, to make decisions, or to get started. Blindly follow the advice of some. Not being comfortable in defining what you want.

Engage in a lot of thinking or discussion if little action or few are the outcome.

Change established processes and timetables in order to respond to unreasonable requests, or be willing to allow many exceptions to the rules.

Choosing to stay safe or to not taking on things that stretch you out of your comfort zone. Avoid situations that induce anxiety. Not take stands. Replace high-priority actions with tasks of lower priority from which you derive enjoyment, or reframe the task you want to avoid doing as not being important. Live in a comfort zone or have a low standard of excellence.

Stop, or make a mistake, just as you are about to succeed.

View most things as risks, difficulties, or threats.

Not standing up for the weak, for the underdog, or for an apparently lost cause or for the views of the minority. Not taking the initiative, focusing mainly on immediate concerns, fighting "just to survive" or rarely taking the "luxury" to consider the long-term. Be a frequent "Yes but" user, or wait for the other to take a stance before taking a stance, in order to avoid expressing your true opposing views.

Place less importance on people's subjective or specific needs compared to those of the organization or its customers.

Not being straight-to-the-point enough, or focused on the "so what" in explanations or thinking.

Be irritated when a subordinate makes decisions without consulting you, even if the decisions are within their level of authority. Jump in easily or quickly to perform duties assigned to another. Prioritize or create problems that you are the only one able to solve.

Lose interest in others when they have given you what you want. Be restrained mainly by fear of being punished or of damaging your reputation.

Use others mainly to serve your interests, or interact with people the same way you would play a game of chess. Only appreciate people as long as they do that which you want or which will enable you to reach your own goals. Treat people according to their status or power, or frame decisions based on who will win or lose power.

Exclude or ignore some people regularly, either by omission or by choice, and give preferential treatment to those who are part of your group of followers.

Violate the rights of others or their well-being. React to criticism, feedback, or being interrupted with anger, disdain, or rage. Run over people if you see them as being an obstacle to reaching your goal, or want to win at all costs. Attack the person instead of their ideas.

Be aggressive, rude, unscrupulous, authoritarian, or display a "My way or the highway" attitude. Creating an environment in which a correction suggested from below is considered to be a challenge to authority or to the ability to be in control of things.

Expect compliance or fear-based respect from others. Create compliance rather than gaining commitment from others, and display little interest in anyone else's opinion. Acting in ways that surround you with "yes-men/women".Be unprepared to compromise, or lack patience with those who do not share the same vision or who are not pursuing the same goal as you.

Not display a lack of remorse, shame, or guilt, act as if you have more rights than duties, or act as though you do not need to follow the norms of regular people.

Promoting yourself at the expense of others, taking credit for other's work, or taking credit without acknowledging the contributions of others' that influenced, helped, or supported you.

Being late for appointments or deadlines, or making last minute requests. Underestimate the time required to do a task, or have difficulties setting self-imposed deadlines.

Complaining about the same things for a long period, while not doing what is required to change or to avoid them. Pretend to be incompetent or helpless, or position yourself as a victim of circumstances or of others. Use the fact of belonging to a category, a role, or a minority as a reason for being treated differently or for others having bad intentions towards and prejudices against you.

Be avoiding or passive until things are as you want them to be, and create confusing or unclear reasoning in order to enable you to avoid certain issues or to highlight only certain other issues.

Guarding yourself against becoming intimately attached to others, or displaying self-protective body language. Keeping your feelings to yourself unless asked about them. Have an "ostrich" attitude,

Stick with doomed projects or poor performers for far too long.

Having difficulty in managing "difficult people", being hesitant to give negative feedback, or having a hard time disagreeing with people.

Reject help after having asked for it.

Fail to acknowledge the effort others make.

Escalate the email chain, hitting "reply all" and copying in the person's bosses.

Over-promise and under-deliver.

Lack awareness regarding how your actions are perceived by others.

Being unable to identify the true triggers of your habitual response patterns.

Be a victim of "paralysis by analysis", needing a significant amount of data in order to feel comfortable when taking a decision or coming to a conclusion. Engage in ambivalent thinking, and "doing a lot of planning to plan doing plans", or conduct study after study that produce conflicting results and creates so much data that it is impossible to decide on a course of action. Not wanting to fail to the point of putting off the moment of truth by perpetually getting ready.

Being "bureaucratic", and being bogged down in following certain procedures and regulations. Display a rigid conformity to your self-imposed or self-defined rules, regulations, moral and ethical code. Ignoring exceptions to the rule in order to avoid questioning the rule. Following the rule strictly to the letter instead of following its mindset or purpose.

Set others up to fail by not giving them sufficient resources or latitude

Being too comfortable doing the same things in the same order and in the same way. Live in the glory of the past or be stuck in the past, or stick to thought patterns that have been used in the past although current circumstances are different.

Rely mainly on advice from "experts", or advocate "why change that which is not yet broken or has been a winning formula" to the extreme.

Assume that because something could happen, it will happen, or focus more on blockers than on enablers.

Put people in boxes.

Forgive yourself but not others.

Accept success that is achieved at the expense of significant indirect or long-term negative impacts, and pursue power at all costs or lack normal inhibitions in its pursuit.

Solving the symptoms but not the issue. Make a big splash and then move on leaving a trail of loose ends and not following through on a plan.

Over-estimate what is possible to do in a situation, and not be unable to adapt to other's risk tolerance preferences.

Propose bad timing for changes or the launch of projects because of not being able to identify the best time for doing something, or because of having difficulty reading between the lines.

Achieving results through politics rather than through action.

Be preoccupied with fantasies of unlimited success, power, brilliance, beauty, or ideal love.

Act as if "punishment" is banishing others from your presence or your support and/or making it impossible to be devoted to you. Require constant attention and positive reinforcement or approval from others.

Respond to a sign of affection or submission with a nasty power move – for example, if the person says "please don't do that again -- it hurts", you turn around and do it again harder. Acting as if the surest way NOT to get what one wants from you is to ask for it. Not care what others think unless you afraid of them. Display contempt for the weak.

Promise to change and then not change. Say what you need to say to get through a meeting, a tense situation or a transaction, although you have little intention of doing what you said you would do.

Run away, be evasive or avoiding, and rationalize away failures or not learn from experience.

Fail to address problems when they arise because they have big issues, and wait until it is too late.

Lose your ability to think clearly when under stress or distress.

Attack in order to provoke the other into attacking you, and then claim to be the victim.

Let others take advantage of you easily or often, and appeal to pity in order to gather support.

Hesitate to express controversial opinions, and stop if there is resistance. Avoid taking sides. Say things just to go along and not cause trouble, or to avoid making waves. Give up easily. Not able to judge when the consequences of not arguing and getting along are worse than the consequences of offending people.

Not walking the talk when the stakes are high or when you can "risk losing it all" if you do so.

Be fearful of failure or of making a fool of yourself, and take the easy way out.

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

End words: So What?

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

∞◦∞◦∞◦∞◦∞

Whether you are person or an organization, it is probably beneficial to map the things you do or the time you spend because you do not trust someone or they do not trust you.

In most cases, the latter is not justified, and can be avoided if people build a specific skill and/or the skill of being able to build trust.

This book can offer support for this process.

You can thus chose to eliminate some of the things you do or the time spent because you do not trust someone or they do not trust you.

You will feel better, have more time for what is really interesting, creates value, and makes you unique and fun!

What else can you do?

∞◦∞◦∞◦∞◦∞

∞◌∞◌∞◌∞◌∞

You, as a person.

You might want to use this book as a basis to practice how to build trust. Ideally, you will find your own ways and adapt the book's content to your preferences.

If you do it well, other people will probably give you the earth! Trust is a bit like a self-fulfilling prophecy. Someone has to begin the cycle of trust. It's no use waiting for the other person to make the first move. They're probably waiting for you.

Will your trust sometimes be misplaced? Of course! Life isn't perfect and some people aren't trustworthy, but will increasing your willingness to trust produce a positive benefit on balance? Will it make your life more pleasant and less stressful? Yes!

You have little to lose by trying. Trust has to start somewhere. Why not with you? Why not today? Why not right now?

You create your own environment by the choices you make. You have the power to create your own trust-rich environment. You have the power to create your own trust contagion.

As one of the participants in the "trust project" put it,

"You cannot do without trust or you would be become paranoid."

∞◌∞◌∞◌∞◌∞

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

You, as an organization.

The most impactful for organizations is typically to invest in the tribal and local relationships. For example, research proves the obvious: that trust in the supervisor is associated with better individual performance, and that if employees have little trust in their immediate manager, they are unlikely to view the company itself as trustworthy.

Some organizations might take the opportunity to revise their "annual performance management cycle".

Imagine if you said that there is no use having a process if the underlying mindset does not exist. Imagine if you said that annual mandatory discussions with performance codes are not mandatory, but that monthly performance discussions where comments only need to be recorded are mandatory. Imagine if you said that trust is the most critical enabler of performance, as well as feedback about it. Imagine if you said that there is no point in making performance-enhancing plans before trust issues are resolved.

You could then have a quite simple "annual performance management process", and a monthly "comments-based "discussion concerning performance facts, and feedback regarding how you are perceived by your boss and by stakeholders in terms of trust, while the annual discussion would focus on salary and career topics.

Other organizations might focus only on increasing the ability to build trust amongst its employees and leave processes as they are. The idea is that even imperfect process become perfect is there is an underlying mindset and interpersonal skills.

Also, other organizations might start investing in building the trust ability amongst populations that need it the most, such as those people in sales and leadership populations.

Any of these tactics could have a huge impact.

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

∞∞∞∞∞∞∞

∞∞◌∞◌∞◌◌

References.

Dirks, Kurt T., Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol 85(6), December, 2000. pp. 1004-1012.

Jones, Del, Gannett News Service, 2001.

Meyer, R.C., Davis, J. H., and Schoorman, F. S., Academy of Management Review, 20(3), 1995.

Tway, Duane C., A Construct of Trust, Dissertation, 1993.

Tway, Duane C., Unpublished Paper, Leadership and Trust: An Imperative for the Transition Decade and Beyond, 1995.

Coase, Ronald H., The Nature of the Firm. Economica, 4(n.s.), 1937, pp. 386-405. Reprinted in Coase, Ronald H., 1988 "The Firm, the Market, and the Law". Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 33-55

Liu, Wendy and Gal, David, Bringing Us Together or Driving Us Apart: The Effect of Soliciting Consumer Input on Consumers' Propensity to Transact with an Organization. Journal of Consumer Research, August, 2011. Further information: http://ejcr.org

Howard, D.J., and Kerin, R.A., The effects of name similarity on message processing and persuasion, Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 47(1) 2011, pp. 63-71

Aristotle, "Rhetoric", Book 1, Chapter 11

Cialdini, R.B. (1994) "Influence: The Psychology of Persuasion", New York: Quill

Nichols, R. G., and Stevens, L.A. 1957 "Are you listening?" New York: McGraw-Hill

Robertson, Arthur 1994 "Listen for Success". Place? Irwin

Barker, Larry, and Watson, Kittie, 2000 "Listen Up: How to Improve Relationships, Reduce Stress, and Be More Productive by Using the Power of Listening". Place? St. Martin's Press

Dirks, Kurt T., Title of article? Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol 85(6), December, 2000. pp. 1004-1012.

Jones, Del, Gannett News Service, 2001.

Meyer, R.C., Davis, J. H., and Schoorman, F. S., Title of article? Academy of Management Review, 20(3), 1995.

Tway, Duane C., A Construct of Trust, Dissertation, 1993.

Tway, Duane C., Unpublished Paper, Leadership and Trust: An Imperative for the Transition Decade and Beyond, 1995.

Costigan, Robert D, Ilter, Selim S., and Berman, J. Jason, A Multi-dimensional study of trust in organizations. Journal of Managerial Issues, 10(3), 1998 pp. 303-317. Retrieved August 9, 2011, from Alumni – ProQuest Psychology Journals (Document ID: 35697706).

Tan, Hoon, and Tan, Christy S. F., (2000). Toward the differentiation of trust in supervisor and trust in organization. Genetic, Social, and General Psychology Monographs, 126(2), 241-60. Retrieved August 9, 2011, from Alumni – ProQuest Psychology Journals (Document ID: 54565698).

Perry, W., and Mankin, Lawrence D., (2004). Understanding Employee Trust in Management: Conceptual Clarification and Correlates. Public Personnel Management, 33(3), 277-290. Retrieved August 9, 2011, from Alumni – ProQuest Psychology Journals (Document ID: 715087061).

Cole, N. D. (2004). Gender Differences in Perceived Disciplinary Fairness. Gender, Work & Organization, 11(3), 254-279. doi:10.1111/j.1468-0432.2004.00231.x

Holtz, B. C., and Harold, C. M. (2008). When your boss says no! The effects of leadership style and trust on employee reactions to managerial explanations. Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology, 81(4), 777-802. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.

Hui, C., Chiu, W. K., Yu, P. H., Cheng, K., and Tse, H. M. (2007). The effects of service climate and the effective leadership behavior of supervisors on frontline employee service quality: A multi-level analysis. Journal of Occupational & Organizational Psychology, 80(1), 151-172. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.

Tepper, B. J., Moss, S. E., & Duffy, M. K. Predictors of Abusive Supervision: Supervisor Perceptions of Deep-Level Dissimilarity, Relationship Conflict, and Subordinate Performance. Academy of Management Journal, 54(2), 2011. pp. 279-294. doi:10.5465/AMJ.2011.60263085

Hodgetts, R. M. A conversation with Warren Bennis on leadership in the midst of downsizing. Organizational Dynamics, 25(1) 1996. pp. 72-78.

Konovsky, M. A., and Pugh, S. Citizenship behavior and social exchange. Academy of Management Journal, 37(3) 1994. pp. 656-669.

Kreitner, R., and Kinicki, A. (2001) "Organizational Behavior" (5th ed). New York: Irwin McGraw-Hill.

Leana, C. R. & Van Buren III, H. J., Organizational social capital and employment practices. Academy of Management Review, 24(3) 1999. pp. 538-555.

MacKenzie, S. B., Podsakoff, P. M., and Rich, G. A. Transformational and transactional leadership and salesperson performance. Academy of Marketing Science, 29(2) 2001. pp. 115-134.

Robbins, S. P. (2001) "Organizational Behavior" (9th ed). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Baier, A. C., "Trust and Antitrust" Ethics, 96 1986. pp. 231–260.

1991. "Trust and Its Vulnerabilities" and "Sustaining Trust", Tanner Lectures on Human Values, Volume 13, Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press.

Baker, J., Trust and Rationality, Pacific Philosophical Quarterly, 68 1987. pp. 1–13.

Becker, L. C., "Trust as Noncognitive Security about Motives", Ethics, 107(1) 1996. pp. 43–61.

Blackburn, S. (1998) "Ruling Passion: A Theory of Practical Reasoning" Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Calhoun, C. (ed), 1984. Cognitive Emotions? in "What is an Emotion?" Calhoun, C., and Solomon, R.C. (eds), New York: Oxford University Press.

Coady, C.A.J., (1992) "Testimony: A Philosophical Study". Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Cook, K. R., Hardin, R., and Levi, M. (2005) "Cooperation Without Trust?" New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Dasgupta, P., 1988. "Trust as a Commodity" in Gambetta (ed.) 1988.

Daukas, N., Epistemic Trust and Social Location. Episteme, 3(1–2) 2006. pp. 109–124.

de Sousa, R. (1987) "The Rationality of Emotion". Cambridge: MIT Press.

Faulkner, P. A Genealogy of Trust. Episteme, 4(3) 2007. pp. 305–321.

Foley, R. (2001) "Intellectual Trust in Oneself and Others". Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fricker, E., Telling and Trusting: Reductionism and Anti-Reductionism in the Epistemology of Testimony. Mind, 104 (414) 1995. pp. 393–411.

Friedman, M., 2004. "Diversity, Trust, and Moral Understanding", in Calhoun (ed.) 2004.

Fukuyama, F. (1995) "Trust: The Social Virtues and the Creation of Prosperity". New York, NY: The Free Press.

Gambetta, D. (ed) (1988) "Trust: Making and Breaking Cooperative Relations". New York: Basil Blackwell.

1988b. "Can We Trust Trust?" in Gambetta (ed.) 1988.

Goering, S. Postnatal Reproductive Autonomy: Promoting Relational Autonomy and Self-Trust in New Parents. Bioethics, 23(1) 2009. pp. 9–19.

Goldman, A. I. (1992) "Liaisons: Philosophy Meets the Cognitive and Social Sciences". Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

2001. "Experts: Which Ones Should You Trust? Philosophy and Phenomenological Research, LXIII (1): 85–110.

Govier, T. Self-Trust, Autonomy, and Self-Esteem. Hypatia, 8(1) 1993. pp. 99-120.

Author? 1997. Social Trust and Human Communities, Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Author? 1998. Dilemmas of Trust, Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Hardin, R. Trustworthiness, Ethics, 107 1996. pp. 26–42.

Author? 2002. Trust and Trustworthiness, New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

Hardwig, J. The Role of Trust in Knowledge. The Journal of Philosophy, 88(12) 1991. pp. 693–708.

Herman, J. L. (1991) "Trauma and Recovery". New York: Basic Books.

Hertzberg, L. On the Attitude of Trust. Inquiry, 31 1988. pp. 307–322.

Hieronymi, P. The Reasons of Trust. Australasian Journal of Philosophy, 86(2) 2008. pp. 213–236.

Hinchman, E. S. Trust and Diachronic Agency. Noûs, 37(1) 2003. pp. 25–51.

Hollis, M. (1998) "Trust Within Reason". Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Holton, R. Deciding to Trust, Coming to Believe. Australasian Journal of Philosophy, 72(1) 1994. pp. 63–76.

Horsburgh, H.J.N. The Ethics of Trust. Philosophical Quarterly, 10 1960. pp.343–354.

Inglehart, R., 1999. "Trust, Well-being and Democracy." In Warren ed. 1999.

Jones, K. Trust as an Affective Attitude. Ethics, 107 1996. pp. 4–25.

Koenig, M. A., and Harris, P.L. The Basis of Epistemic Trust: Reliable Testimony or Reliable Sources? Episteme, 4(3) 2007. pp. 264–284.

Lagerspetz, O. (1998) "Trust: The Tacit Demand". Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Lahno, B. On the Emotional Character of Trust. Ethical Theory and Moral Practice, 4 2001. pp. 171–189.

Lehrer, K. (1997) "Self-Trust: A Study of Reason, Knowledge, and Autonomy". New York: Oxford University Press.

Luhmann, N. (1979) "Trust and Power". Toronto: Wiley.

Mackenzie, C., and Stoljar, N. (eds) (2000) "Relational Autonomy: Feminist Perspectives on Autonomy, Agency, and the Social Self". New York: Oxford University Press.

McGeer, V., Trust, Hope, and Empowerment. Australasian Journal of Philosophy, 86(2) 2008. pp. 237–254.

McLeod, C. (2002) "Self-Trust and Reproductive Autonomy". Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Mills, E. The Unity of Justification. Philosophy and Phenomenological Research, 58(1) 1998. pp. 27–51.

Mullin, A., Trust, Social Norms, and Motherhood. Journal of Social Philosophy, 36(3) 2005. pp. 316–330.

Nickel, P. J., Trust and Obligation-Ascription. Ethical Theory and Moral Practice, 10 2007. pp. 309–319.

O'Neill, O. (2002) "Autonomy and Trust in Bioethics". Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pellegrino, E. D., Trust and Distrust in Professional Ethics, in Pellegrino et al. (eds) 1991.

Pellegrino, E. D., Veatch, R. M., and Langan, J. P. (eds) (1991) "Ethics, Trust and the Professions: Philosophical and Cultural Aspects". Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Pettit, P., The Cunning of Trust. Philosophy and Public Affairs, 24 1995. pp. 202–225.

Potter, N. N. (2002) "How Can I be Trusted? A Virtue Theory of Trustworthiness". Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield.

Rorty, A. O. (1980) Explaining Emotions in "Explaining Emotions" Rorty, A.O. (ed). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Skyrms, B., Trust, Risk, and the Social Contract. Synthese, 160 2008. pp. 21–25.

Silvers, A., and L. Pickering Francis Justice through Trust: Disability and the 'Outlier Problem' in Social Contract Theory. Ethics, 116 2005. pp. 40–76.

Smith, M. N., Terrorism, Shared Rules and Trust. The Journal of Political Philosophy, 16(2) 2005. pp. 201–219.

Strawson, P. F. (1974) "Freedom and Resentment". London: Methuen.

Uslaner, E. M., 1999. "Democracy and Social Capital." In Warren ed. 1999.

Walker, M. U. (2006) "Moral Repair: Reconstructing Moral Relations After Wrongdoing". Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Warren, M. (ed) (1999) "Democracy and Trust". Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Zaner, R., 1991. "Trust and the Patient-Physician Relationship", in Pellegrino et al. (eds.) 1991.

Rousseau, D. M., Sitkin, S. B., Burt, R. S., and Camerer, C., Not so Different After All: A Cross-Discipline View of Trust. Academy of Management Review, 23 1998. pp. 393-404.

Lewicki, R. J., McAllister, D. J., and Bies, R. J., Trust and distrust: New relationships and realities. Academy of Management Review, 23 1998. pp. 438-458.

Stewart, J., and Thomas, M., Dialogic Listening: Sculpting Mutual Meanings in "Bridges Not Walls" John Stewart (ed), 6th edition. New York: McGraw- Hill, 1995, pp. 184-201

Mike Armour, Ph.D. Building a High-Trust, Peak-Performance Organization

Stephen M.R. Covey book, The Speed of Trust.

Ken Blanchard Companies, TrustWorks, Harper Collins

Reina Michelle and Dennis, Rebuilding Trust in the Workplace: Seven Steps to Renew Confidence, Commitment, and Energy

David Horsager, The Trust Edge: How Top Leaders Gain Faster Results, Deeper Relationships, and a Stronger Bottom Line Hardcover – October 9, 2012