

Transcript – Cathy Fromme Webinar
Trust Is Like The Air We Breathe. We Don't Notice It Until It Is Gone

MARSHALL: Hi, I'm Marshall Peter, Director of CADRE, the National Center on Dispute Resolution in Special Education, which is funded by the Office of Special Education Programs at the United States Department of Education. The title for today's webinar, one in a continuing series being offered by CADRE, is: *Trust is like the air we breathe. We don't notice it until it is gone.* Today's presenter is Dr. Cathy Fromme, the principal at TrustWorks. Dr. Fromme has held district, regional and state department positions in Washington. While at the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction she developed Washington's statewide Special Education Mediation System and chaired the statewide Commission on Student Learning Accommodations and Alternate Assessment Committees. Cathy was also the Diversity Manager for the Washington Department of Natural Resources where she facilitated positive/inclusive working relationships and diversity in the workplace for thirteen hundred DNR employees. She has consulted, written and presented extensively in the areas of trust, change management and workforce diversity in schools and organizations. She received her doctorate in Educational Leadership and Policy from the University of Washington.

Cathy, thank you so much for joining us. CATHY: Great. Thanks, Marshall, it's a pleasure to be here as always and to be a part of the work, the great work that CADRE is doing. So for today my efforts are about helping you, helping the audience and our listeners have a better understanding of some trust types and how they impact the work we do as educators. So I'll talk a little about this thing called a trust typology and then after that a little bit about really what is trust and then share a bit about maybe a concrete kind of strategy for everyone to go away with and start first thing tomorrow. So, let's get started then. Thanks for the opportunity to be here. So, I'm of the belief before we even get started that our job is to make success irresistible, whether that's teachers making success for students irresistible or state ed office folks helping districts and schools be successful and/or parents with their students. I got this little notion from Rick Stiggins in Portland, though, that's what today is about. So we're going to talk about the importance of trust. I'm not here to debate or argue the importance of trust there's plenty of literature to support that whether it's from philosophy with Locke talking about the bond of society or as, trust being as fundamental as getting up in the morning for lots of folks. Basically trust in the literature is being seen as this kind of all-purpose social glue that keeps people together and helps us do the things that we do. So this is an education webinar with educators and parents and parent advocate groups but this information in general is great info for life. The organizational literature relates trust to cost controls and profit maximizations. So businesses are looking to improve trust within their corporations and businesses for profit. When you look at sociology there's trust in society it's as a social basis and the social consequences around trust or distrust and then there is a lot of literature on democracy and trust, that is for representation. So the way that works is for instance, in our wonderful United States, we have that great opportunity to resist and to argue and to have alternative forms somewhat, of government and yet still have the same freedoms that our democracy allows for us. So, what do we know? We know based on the literature across the board, whether it's organizational or educational or from sociology, that there's a strong correlation

between the quality of the relationships between the adults in the system and student achievement. That's from Bryk and Schneider, Hoy and Taschannen. So given that then let's talk about what those relationships look like and the impact of trust in those relationships. Before we kind of get into that let me talk a little bit about capital. Capital is really, it's about wealth and whether its wealth in terms of money, or wealth in terms of as you see here, physical capital, human capital, social capital, the more you have, the more you make. So, pretty much. But physical capital are, if you are in a school or an organization it's the tables, the chairs, the books, the computers, the things that you have. Human capital is all about the people that you have. Human capital isn't just the number of people in an organization or how large the organization is. Human capital really is all about the skills, the knowledge, and the dispositions those people bring to you. So you could actually have a school district with three or four district office staff that has more human capital because of the skills, the knowledge, and the disposition then you potentially would have in another district with ten district office staff. So human capital is all about the skills, the knowledge and the disposition and when I talk about making success irresistible that's about building capacity in those staff. So, here's the other part of human capital, having just lots of people doesn't necessarily get you where you want and isn't necessarily a demonstration of trust. The last capital is social capital. Social capital is really all about who people know. It's the ties between those people that are in an organization. Social capital is all about the inclinations from these networks who people know and the inclinations or motivations for people to do things for each other. Social capital has everything to do with norms of reciprocity – that is why do I do for you? Networks, norms and social trust facilitate coordination and cooperation for mutual benefit. Strong social capital builds that mutual benefit and the more social capital you have the more cooperation and coordination you have. So, Putnam in a lot of his work, excuse me, around social capital he equates social capital with social trust. So he says that in complex modern settings, the social capital or this social trust arises from two related sources: one, norms of reciprocity, why we do things for each other, and networks of civic engagement. Let me talk a little bit about both of those. Norms of reciprocity are, again, why we do things for each other, are we doing things I scratch your back, you scratch my back if I scratch your back? It's a balanced reciprocity or do you, are your norms of reciprocity unbalanced reciprocity? That is I do for you in the unknown future that potentially if I needed something you would do for me. Strong communities with strong social capital have lots of unbalanced reciprocity. That is we do for each other because it's for the good of the whole. Putnam also talked about this whole notion of networks of civic engagement and in all of his research he came up with that notion that the more we are engaged with each other, whether it's a community, and volunteerism and/or work together or actually soccer moms and soccer parents, the stronger you have social capital. So, those networks of civic engagement are really very important. So here's where we get into some of the, start to get into the trust. There are a number of types of trust in the literature and basically leaders of any organization whether you're at a state level or school district or a school principal or even a teacher or parents, need to recognize the type and level of trust that characterize each of their relationships. So a number of years ago I developed this whole notion of an interdisciplinary trust typology. Really a typology is just a classification system, it's a way to organize different types of trust and in this case some very complicated kinds of

definitions about trust. Interdisciplinary in that it came from sociology, psychology, organizational management, economics, philosophy, education, theology, and even the sciences. So this typology has a number of different types of trust that need to exist in every organization and we'll talk about each one of those here right now. So let's start with this whole notion of particularized trust. Particularized trust is this trust that says I trust you because you look like me, you believe in the same things I believe in, we behave in the same ways. Particularized trust is a trust that is all about group bonds and solidarity. Particularized trust brings this wonderful notion of I'm one of you. Examples of particularized trust that you might know of or see are, and we'll talk a little bit about each of these here as we break them out. Particularized trust is about group bonds. So examples of those group bonds and some particularized trust groups are gangs, you look like me, you dress like me, you believe in the same things I believe in, religious groups, one that most people know about are the Amish or Ahmish, however you might want to pronounce that, again you can visibly tell a person who is part of that religious group based on their dress, their beliefs are well known to others outside of the organization. So these bonds, these bonds of solidarity say I belong, which is very important. The other, another example would be sports groups. You go to any kind of football game, baseball game; you'll see people dressed in their favorite player's uniform with the number, people rooting on for their team. So another form of particularized groups. Particularized trust is so important because of this solidarity and belongingness notion. It also has this kind of dark side to it. And the dark side comes out in that in particularized trust it's a trust that says I believe you because you are one of us and you're not one of them. It has an exclusionary nature to it. So, we trust each other and we'll help each other because we're of the same group but you can't trust anyone else. So the notion that we don't look outside of our group for information and/or help or resources is somewhat of a limiting notion. The way particularized trust and that dark side of particularized trust rears its head in organizations and in education, particularly what we're talking about, is in a form of what we call clicks. And clicks mean again, they're a trust that says I trust you because you're one of us. So again, particularized trust out of all of these trust types has been the one I've probably struggled with the most but it's important because of its solidarity and belongingness. Before I go on to the next type of trust though, and each one of these I'll talk about, a little bit about the sanctions for breaking trust. So in particularized trust, because it's about group bonds and solidarity. When you break trust in particularized trust there are social sanctions. So for instance, if you're a gang member and you break trust and you narc on someone or don't follow the rules that your higher ups gave you, you could be beaten up, you could be shot, you could be killed, you could be any number of things. There's social sanctions. In a school click, what do we do, what do kids do when another student breaks trust? You're ostracized from the group. So particularized trust is all about social sanctions when you break trust. Jump over to the next trust type, that's institutional system trust. Institutional system trust is a trust that says I trust the institution or the systems. And the reason we trust the institution or systems is because there are roles or structures or certain conditions, institutional conditions that say I should trust. Those, those structures look like rules, regulations, policies, licensures. I trust people in institutions because the structures say those people have certain expertise, certain education, certain learnings that allow them to be in the positions that

they're in. So for instance, let me give you a couple of examples here, I go to the bank and deposit my, you know, my one thousand dollars cash with an unknown bank teller. So institutional system trust says you trust the situation not necessarily the person, or you trust the structure. I deposit my one thousand dollars to an unknown bank teller because there are structures in place that tell me that bank teller will put that money in my account and it will be my money and so I'll hand it over. If for some odd reason that bank teller breaks trust, I know that there are legal sanctions in this instance to deal with that broken trust. In an example in terms of the work we do in education is that we have parents sending their children to our schools, many times to unknown teachers. We have parents who have in some instances never met their child's teacher, their child's principal or other educators in the school system. They send their children to our schools because they believe that there are rules and regulations around educating children. Teachers are licensed and have gone through the appropriate educational process and that there are systems in place so that their child can get the appropriate education. In special education especially, we know that there are systems in place and we have those systems and parents know that. So the difference between institutional system trust is - and particularized trust is particularized trust says I trust you because I know you're one of us. Institutional system trust says I trust because I know that there are structures in place, rules and regulations that tell me things will be in proper order. So let's then jump over to generalized social trust. Generalized social trust is the kind of trust that just allows you to get up in the morning and get out of bed and go out and do the things that you do. It's a voluntary trust, if you will. It's a trust in people that goes beyond your particular group or your community. Generalized trust is a trust - it's a willingness to trust strangers. So in particularized trust I only trust those in my group, it's us versus them and you have to look like me and I have to know that you're one of us to trust. In generalized social trust you to trust beyond your group or beyond your community. Generalized social trust is the closest trust of these trust types that comes to this whole notion that Putnam was talking about in terms of social capital. In generalized trust the best interest of the community is - is at stake and the reason why people trust. So now we're going to start to get into why this is a Venn diagram and these trust types overlap. Generalized trust, an example of generalized social trust might be that I got into my car this morning to drive down to Eugene to do this presentation for CADRE and I drove on the right side of the road, driving the speed limit, believing that all of my fellow citizens were doing the same thing, following the speed limit, not drinking while they were driving. So there's a little bit of institutional system trust there, following the rules of the road. There's a little bit of particularized trust there in that I'm another driver on the road like everyone else and we're expecting everyone else to follow the rules of the road and were acknowledging that and there's this generalized social trust that I even get on the freeway, trusting and believing that people are going to follow the rules and regulations of the road. Do people always do that? No. We have DUIs. We have drunk drivers. We have speeders. And then system institutional trust is supposed to take care of that with tickets and highway patrol, in fact the highway patrol were out in good order this morning as I drove down. So, that's generalized social trust. These next types of trust are actually some of my favorite types of trust. There's three types of trust here - fiduciary trust, altruistic trust, dispositional trust and these trust types are grouped together because they have this moral

component to them, if you will. They're not, they can't be named moral trust, but they have a moral component to them. So let's start with this whole notion of fiduciary trust. Many of you might have heard of fiduciary trust in terms of a financial social kind of way where there are trust, you have trusts for your kids or your grandkids or of someone you know, a financial kind of situation if you will. Really this whole notion of fiduciary trust in the literature really started to come about in a, at a time where the United States was actually taking on trust territories. At that time the United Nations actually wrote up a charter that recognized the interest of those trust territories and the responsibilities of the United States as they took on those trust territories. And actually in the United Nations charter, the UN spoke to, this is how they described that trust that the US had: It was a sacred trust to which the trustee is obligated to promote the utmost of their well-being. So what does all that mean? Fiduciary trust is a trust that says if you have more power, if you have more resources, if you have more knowledge or skills you have a moral obligation and responsibility to care for those in your stead. A moral obligation. Fiduciary trust is an obligatory trust. Particularized trust is somewhat obligatory in that you belong to a group and you can't, you can't get out of that group and you have to follow the rules and regs. Generalized trust is, is voluntary, fiduciary trust is a moral obligation because you have more power, more resources, more knowledge or skill to care for those in your stead. Parents have a fiduciary trust responsibility for their children. Coaches have a fiduciary responsibility towards their, their athletes. Teachers, if you want to look at it even in terms of the work that we're doing, some of you on the call. School districts, school boards have a fiduciary responsibility, a moral obligation to care for the teachers, the staff, the students in their stead. So, fiduciary trust is a trust that is a moral obligation and responsibility. If you go to altruistic trust, another moral trust, the difference between altruistic and fiduciary trust is that altruistic trust is a trust that is a gift. There's no obligation, it's a voluntary trust and it's a trust that says this is my gift to you. Altruistic trust is a trust given when there is no track record, no reason, no rational reason, sometimes to give trust. It's a gift with no intention of any reciprocity whatsoever. So fiduciary trust is a moral obligation, altruistic trust is a gift and though it's a gift for the good of the whole. So I'm trusting you. So an example in terms of the work we do – I understand there are parent organizations and state level folks and/or school districts on this call. In the work that I've done in fiduciary trust and with regard to you all as participants would be, sometimes a district and a parent giving the gift of trust to each other to mitigate some of the issues and/or to come to a resolution in terms of issues around services for, for the student or your child. Now I'm not saying that you just give in and say, 'okay, do whatever you want.' I'm saying that sometimes when we are in conflict and we are mediating, altruistic trust is this trust that says, 'okay, I'm going to believe what you are saying, I'm going to give you this gift of trust for the good of the whole so we can move on.' Altruistic trust and fiduciary trust, I believe, are very important trust types and I'll show you some examples of where most people are at with those in just a minute. Let's just go on to this last type of trust, again a moral kind of trust and that's a dispositional trust. Dispositional trust is the extent to which anyone has a consistent tendency to trust across a broad spectrum of situations or people. Someone may have a high disposition to trust and/or a low disposition to trust. People have dispositional trust for two reasons. One reason is that people assume that other people are generally trustworthy so we trust one another. I assume that my neighbors

and my fellow citizens are generally trustworthy so I will trust them. Another reason for dispositional trust is, irrespective of whether I believe that people are good or bad or generally trustworthy, I believe that trusting others is for the benefit of the whole so I'm going to trust anyway. So I have a disposition to trust because I just believe it's, it's a good thing for everyone if I, if I tend to trust folks. So what is dispositional trust? Again, its how do we get a high dispositional to trust or a low disposition to trust? Well over the course of time the easiest way for me to explain that to folks is to use an example with two people. So Marshall is here with me and so I'm going to use Marshall as an example and myself. So let's say that Marshall's life is a, is a poker game and that every hand that has been dealt to Marshall or most every hand throughout his life have been winning hands. So from the second Marshall was born he was the cutest baby in the hospital he was just adorable. Everyone loved him. Both his parents were there, both sets of grandparents. He was just, he was you know playing in kindergarten, he was just terrific. He was great in sports. Every, every interaction that he had throughout his life he was winning hands. MARSHALL: That's remarkably accurate. CATHY: [laughter] You got that, remarkably accurate. And we sit here at this table and Marshall has all of those winning chips in front of him. Now, okay maybe not every hand in Marshall's life was winning, but who cares, because he's got so many chips if he had a losing interaction it didn't, it didn't impact his ability to have another interaction. The more chips, remember, the more social capital, the more you have the more you make. The more chips he had the more willing he was to interact. The higher disposition to trust he would have and the more interactions the more chances he would come away with winning chips. Now, take for instance on the other hand – this isn't true about me but you got to have an example on this – so let's just say I sit here, Cathy and most of my interactions in life have not been positive, they've not been winning hands. You know, I don't know who my dad was, he wasn't at my birth. My mom and I, you know, were so poor we lived in the car for quite a while. I didn't, you know, necessarily have clean clothes when I went to school. Didn't have a lot of great interactions and so over the course of time because I had a low, not a lot of good interactions I tended not to have interactions, when I tend not to have interactions I don't have the opportunity to win chips. So I sit here with Marshall with very few chips in front of me. Let's further say that Marshall is a parent and I'm an SEA, a state level person, no let's say I'm a district person. And we have to have this interaction around services for his child. I'm coming to this interaction with a lower disposition to trust just in general because I have had, I have had less opportunities to, to practice interacting and to gain chips. Let me be clear about this whole chip notion too, because it has kind of not a negative, it's not about who has the most chips and it's not about well if I've got a lot of chips let me just here, here Cathy, Marshall telling me, 'here Cathy, here's a couple chips, feel good about yourself.' It's just kind of a way, a notion to help people understand people with high disposition to trust usually will trust more and are willing to trust because they feel they can lose a little in an interaction and people with low disposition to trust hold back more. And so disposition to trust can be in certain instances, actually we can build chips in others. We can make success irresistible for others by finding out what are the ways to build chips and what are the ways to make interactions safe for people to have conversations. So those are the trust types and so what this looks like often times when I'm working with groups of folks is largely teachers and/or parents and/or district office

folks who are struggling with trust is we will actually take this typology and I'll give everyone a dot, I'll give 'em, everyone a blue dot and an orange dot. This is actual data. This is ABC elementary and you don't know who they are but this was a group of elementary school teachers and we had just finished talking about these trust types. And so I said okay, put a blue dot where you think you as, as a group, your school, your teachers are strongest in your trust type and then put an orange dot where you're weakest. And sure enough because these were, this was a school where teachers where kind of struggling with clicks and just a lack of trust, there was a number of dots in particularized trust and, and people sho – here's what this, what this does – all of a sudden it maps out trust and it tells a group – whoa, yes that's us. When people see this they, they nod their heads in agreement, yes we do have particularized trust, the negative part of particularized trust. Clicks - not the strong one. We trust only because there's a system in place that says that this is what will happen if you don't do what you're supposed to do. And largely this, this you'll see in some of the others, data that I'm going to show you here in a sec. This, this data is pretty predominant in most groups I work with. Most groups say we're weak in this fiduciary altruistic dispositional trust. The trust that says, 'here's a gift for you.' the trust that says, 'I'm fulfilling my moral obligation to care for those in my stead.' So this is an elementary school. And so this is what that looks like if you were to pull the typology apart. That school had strong institutional system trust, strong particularized trust, but very, a weak, or a need to build stronger their generalized/social or fiduciary/altruistic trust. So here's another elementary, same kind of picture although a little bit more weaker in the institutional system trust. That could go kind of a number of different ways, that is people don't follow the rules and regulations that, or the processes and procedures that we've set up in our school and they're saying that we need to work harder on that and/or we do follow those rules and regulations, processes and procedure but we don't trust that the, that the institution will follow through. That is, in terms of teachers and again these are elementary teachers, that is these folks are saying we don't trust that there is an accountability for all to do that. So that's where accountability comes in, this institutional system trust. And again you can see strongly an entirely different school, an entirely different state with pretty much the same kind of data. And again, that's where this, another way of mapping that out. This is a high school, just with a high school department, a math department, and so smaller numbers of teachers, but again look how particularized trust were strong in it and again that was identified when they put their dots, only put it in terms of the, the exclusionary kind of look at that. Here's a middle school – middle school teachers – and again mapping themselves out. So what this does is, all of a sudden, teachers in schools and a principal or whichever group is going through this has this picture that 'oh this is us' and again these nodding heads. Now what we do is we start to figure out, what are we going to do with this? So now we know we can work on institutional system trust. This one's a little different because they felt very strong in terms of their fiduciary/altruistic and dispositional trust. But then you pick one of these trust types and then we go through that and work some more on that. But let's start talking about trust in terms of what trust is. So in a perfect world, the most of the blue dots, the strong dots would kind of be in the center of all of the trust types, meaning we're strong in everything. We don't live in a perfect world, unfortunately, and so mapping out trust helps people figure out where they want to start to deal with some

of the trust issues. So let's actually talk about trust and what it is. Trust is relationship based, obviously you have to, it's about individual peoples trusting each other or people trusting an institution and what that looks. Basically trust is all about the beliefs or expectations that individuals will act in a certain way. Marshall asked me to come down and do this webinar and he had a belief and an expectation that I would be prepared, that I understood my material and that I would be able to present. I came down understanding that Marshall would have all the technology ready and he had all that ready. And so that's just a small example about having beliefs and expectations. What happens is sometimes our understanding of our roles and our responsibility and our understanding of what others are expected to do and their obligations are what create distrust in people. Let me give you some examples. And largely in the work that I've done with teachers and school districts, non-profits, parents, mediators - when I'm out and about this is probably, predominantly the number one area where trust starts to fall apart. We have different notions. We have different ideas, different beliefs and understanding about what the other party is supposed to do. So, we usually kinda, what I'll do is do a little activity and I'll ask, so let's just say we're, we're in a room full of teachers, I could say the same thing in room full of mediators or in a room full of parents or if we if you were all here I would ask you all, 'Do you all have the same understanding of your role as a parent or do you think everyone in this room has the same understanding of the role of a parent advocacy group?' In this case I was asking teachers, 'Do you have the same understanding of your role as a teacher?' And in this group it was small group, twelve of them said, yes we all understand what our role of a teacher is and six said no. So the next thing I did was ask, 'Okay so on a post-it write the most important role of the teacher in the classroom.' And out of those eighteen folks this is what they said - be a leader of a classroom all the way down to be prepared. The number one role of a teacher is to keep a child safe. So if you've got eighteen teachers working together and/or even thirty teachers working together and we're not on the same page about the roles and responsibility, about the expectations of those folks, trust starts to diminish. Take that same example to the example of all of you in terms of your roles and responsibility as participants whether you're a mediator, district administrator, parent, SEA level personnel. Here's the quick and dirty example I always give. When my youngest son was sixteen, I, and if you have teenagers you've said this before, 'Son would you please go up and clean your room?' 'Yea, mom.' And half hour later I'm upstairs and walk in his room and it's like, 'Uh, son I thought I asked you to clean your room?' and his answer is 'I did mom.' Well we clearly had very different expectations about what a clean room looks like. So can you imagine in education with performance expectations, with standards, that teachers, that parents, that principals, that SEA staff would have very different understandings about the expectations and obligations of teachers, principals, parents and SEA staff. And we'd have different expectations and understandings about the standards to which we were getting those students to. So largely it comes down to having the same understanding of one's roles and responsibilities and the expectation and obligations of the other party. Trust also involves some risk and vulnerability. Risk just means that you're exposed. It means that you do something that has a possibility of a negative, usually, sometimes, and I added or a positive outcome. Most people think of risk with a negative outcome. You understand that potential for that outcome and you move towards it. Risk is voluntary.

So when we trust it's a voluntary trust – I'm trusting you and I'm going to risk in this case, sometimes altruistic trust is a risk, I'm giving you the gift of trust and it's a voluntary trust. It's not a gamble where there's a stronger chance that things won't go well. Trust is about risk and vulnerability. So again when breaking trust down and working with a group in trying to help folks understand where are we at with trust in terms of we go through the whole notion of expectations and obligations and after we've worked through that, then I'll ask folks on a scale of one to ten, ten being you're very comfortable with risk and vulnerability. You are comfortable making a mistake with this person. You are comfortable messing up or telling your inner secrets to this person. Ten being that. To a one, I don't, I'm not comfortable with this person at all. I don't trust that if I were to mess up everything would be okay. On a scale of one to ten where are you? And so again, using education examples I'd say where are you on a scale of one to ten in terms of a team meeting or your department meeting? On an average day in your classroom or your office or your district where are you on a scale of one to ten on a supervisor observation or evaluation? Where are you on a scale of one to ten if you're a parent in a negotiation meeting? Where are you if you're the mediator in that scale? Where are you on a scale of one to ten with your best friend? Here are some data from some groups that I've done this with and this is just to show where people are at in terms of risk and vulnerability. This is pretty standard data from it looks like this predominantly in most places I go. When I ask people where are you on a scale of one to ten with your best friend. Most people are pretty comfortable with their best friend. They tell them their inner secrets, they know they can mess up, they can do something stupid and their best friend still loves them and that's what best friends are about. You can see though there are a lot of tens but there's also some eights and nines, and in this group, someone, this is all anonymous, by the way, we do this with post-its, no one knows who is who on this. Someone said with my best friend I'm a three. There's a person with a low disposition to trust. This isn't good or bad. We don't do this to hang people out to dry. But in this group I would say something like, 'So know that in your group most of you pretty much have a strong disposition to trust in general because you trust your best friend and you do have a couple people or at least one person who has a low disposition to trust.' What that means is we make conversations; we make the work safe for people. Here's another one asking folks - so notice the difference – where are you on scale of one to ten when it comes to risk and vulnerability in a staff meeting? That whole chart just went straight down the middle where most people were going neutral. Well, I'm not really comfortable and I'm not really uncomfortable, same group of people and their seeing this data live. We just, we do this, and they're saying, 'Yep, that's us.' No wonder we're not talking in a staff meeting about the important things that we need to be talking about in terms of student achievement, common assessments, processes and procedures for discipline. And so this is what happens, this is low, we start to go down in terms of low social capital. We aren't going to do things for each other because in this setting we don't trust each other as well. Same group, average day in your classroom again. More of the teachers felt really comfortable in their classroom in front of their students. If I made a mistake in front of my students, I'm okay with that. I trust my kids. Couple of people were not as comfortable. And actually in this group those two people identified themselves, they were brand new teachers and so have less of a, of a willingness to feel vulnerable in front of their class. So again, just

some more data in a team meeting. Team meetings meaning a third grade meeting and/or a fifth grade team meeting. Again, stronger trust types, smaller group, more particularized, feeling strong about where they're at. But again, not quite as high as with best friends. So again, just some data to show you how mapping out trust can, can help us learn where we might, specific areas where we might work harder on those areas to improve trust and areas that we want to continue to work hard on. "Progress always involves risk; you can't steal second base and keep your foot on first." So that means a little risk and vulnerability is necessary for trust. Trust is embedded in what we call referents or parties. And so the participants of trust and their relationships to each other has everything to do with, with trust. Bryk and Schneider, when they did their research in the Chicago public schools in 2002, and they're actually the only ones that I've been able to find that actually have any kind of empirical evidence around trust in education. You can find empirical evidence outside of education but in terms of evidence Bryk and Schneider were the first ones with their work that they did in the Chicago public schools. And so they're saying the referents in schools are principal to teacher, teacher to teacher relationships, school professional – meaning teacher, principal, sped teachers, other staff and student relationships and then school professionals with parent/community partnerships. I would extend this and say that it could be, also mediator to parent relationships, SEA relationship to parent organization, school district staff to teachers and/or parent organization. So the referent is the party who is that relationship. And also some of those relationships are equal teacher to teacher, are equal relationships, principal to parent or principal to teacher are relationships that have a notion of power in there. So power does impact trust as well. So, so now what? How do you turn this knowledge, this little bit of information in this short time that we have that I've shared with you? How do we hold ourselves accountable to each other when we talk about these trust types? And in my mind, without creating some albatross of a system with pointless paperwork and untold paths to nowhere - what I love about this work and this whole notion of trust is that you don't have to write some big strategic plan that's going to sit on the shelf, when we do this work or when I do this work with teachers, they have immediate feedback and then they start to talk about what are the behaviors and how are we going to start to deal with those specific issues? So here's how, how to get there. Well you can't achieve trust simply through some workshop or retreat or a sensitivity training. So you can't say you were on this webinar with Cathy Fromme and all of a sudden I sprinkled trust dust on you and your trust worthy. Trust is built in day to day social exchanges. Right back to where we started at the beginning, this whole notion of norms of reciprocity. What are we doing for each other? What are inclinations to do for the other and to build trust in our day to day social exchanges. Actions are very important in terms of trust. Actions or behaviors if you will. On a daily basis, here we are back to this again, trust is raised or diminished depending on whether the way we act – and why – is consistent with the expectations –there's that word again – we have agreed to. In other words, through our own words and reactions we show our sense of obligations towards others and then people discern their intentions. We don't have time to talk about these at all, but this is usually the next part of what we would go through. So, so you know about these trust types so what, how, how do I behave in a way, what are those actions and words that tell people I'm trust worthy as an individual or my organization is trustworthy. Well in the literature and I'm

not going to go through all of these because we don't have time, but just to give you this notion that this is research based and that there is a strong literature base around this. Actually there are these attributes or dimensions of trust or elements of trust that, that when demonstrated show that people are trust worthy individuals. The literature actually speaks to fourteen different attributes though largely I've centered on the five that keep coming up at the top of the list. And it really started way back with this guy Mishra in 1992 and '96 when he was studying, he was looking at trust and he was mostly working with CEOs in the auto industry or in private industry and he came up with these elements of trust that were competence, openness, concern and reliability for those CEOs. Then these other folks, McKnight and Chervany, around the same time '96 and a little later 2001 did an extensive meta-analysis of trust and they were actually examining trust via the internet and mostly eBay. Why do people go on eBay and spend thousands of dollars? How do they, how do they trust others and make these, these, these interactions and purchases with unknown others. So they did this extensive research in '96 and again in 2001 with this meta-analysis and came up with – sure enough there it is – competence, and instead of concern they call it benevolence and caring and instead of reliability they use the word predictability though really when you get down to it that's semantics. And then they talked about honesty and integrity. Hoy and Taschannen-Mora were educators and so in '99 they were looking at trust in terms of education and they actually came up with a little trust questionnaire. They largely took from these others and said the trust dimensions are competence, openness, benevolence, reliability and honesty. Bryk and Schneider, when they did their work in Chicago public schools, talked about competence. Instead of openness they used the word respect, personal regard and personal integrity. Really, I pretty much, competence, openness, benevolence, reliability and honesty when demonstrated and we could break all of these out with some research base about what that behavior actually looks like on a daily basis demonstrating these, you are demonstrating your trust worthiness. So we don't have much more time to talk about those but those are the trust attributes. So again, actions are important. Trust grows through exchanges through those kinds of behaviors, benevolence and caring, honesty and integrity, openness, reliability and competence. Even simple interactions if successful can enhance complex capacities for more subsequent actions. So, every day little tiny actions make a difference. People have to behave their way into new ideas and skills, not just think them. And behavior are those trust attributes. So no one said it would be easy necessarily, so let me give you this, let me kind of start to end with this, kind of story about trust. This is true. A true story and it came from Brazil. This is about the ministry of the interior in Brazil. A number of years ago, a number truly, of years ago, Brazil had a pretty grizzly history with regard to its settler colonies getting established. What had happened was, in an effort to establish those settler colonies the government was pushing back its indigenous peoples further into the interior and it did so by murdering, poisoning, and putting some of those indigenous folks in concentration camps. Over the course of time, rightly so, the indigenous people did not have a strong trust for their government in Brazil. For whatever reason a more benevolent government came into being in the 1960's and said we can't continue to do this. We have to stop treating our indigenous people this way. And so they made every great effort to reach out to those indigenous people that were far into the interior. And every effort came with a negative,

a futile, a non-response and those people going even further into the interior. They kept trying and actually happened to have on their team a person who said, 'Let's, let's, let's try this, let's' I believe it was an archeologist. This person said, 'Let's put up a clothesline in the last place, the last field we saw these folks.' And in fact they did that. They went to the last field that they had seen any of the indigenous peoples and they put up a clothesline. And on that clothesline they put matches, they put pen knives, they put ropes, they put things and items that they thought the indigenous folks could use and they left. A number of weeks later they came back and found those items gone and in their place beads, woven cloth, and items that the people had made and left there for them. So a very tentative exchange. Over the course of time, a long time, these exchanges continued so that soon enough they had those exchanges with each other across the field, the government officials or whoever and indigenous people in sight of each other and finally over time making those exchanges hand to hand. What started as a very tentative, sensitive, tender kind of trust, built over the course of exchange and over the course of time. So that clothesline is kind of what I would usually ask people, it's what will you add to your clothesline? Now, remember in this case they weren't large things, they were things that were important to those people. What are you going to add to your clothesline to build trust? Malcom Gladwell in his book *The Tipping Point*, has identified context as a key tipping point. And he says that the power of context what really matters are the little things. And I can't give you any more example than the one that I just gave you that the little things, everyday little tiny examples, demonstrations of your trustworthiness are what builds trust in others. So I ask you, what will you add to your clothesline? And this is kind of I guess a reason to trust if you will and I'll leave you with this as we, as we close and one more slide. This came from a great book *The Penguin and the Leviathan*, and he's talking about cooperative behavior and trusting and Benkler said, 'Always aiming to constrain the bad man might be the safer option (when you're looking at trust and cooperation). It might even be perfectly rationale (to constrain the bad man). But it also makes us miss out on what would happen if we did trust. In life, we take chances on one another. We trust, and we behave in trustworthy ways. Not always; not with everyone. But more often than the cynical, unflattering views of human nature and interaction would predict. And when we do, it turns out that we thrive; at the least we do better than when we do not trust people.' So let me leave you with this – it's a journey. Building those chips in others, building capacity in others, building strong social capital - it's a journey. And I wish you well on that journey and thank you Marshall and CADRE and everyone for the opportunity to be here. So be well.