



TRUST

Foundation of Effective Networks

June Holley – Network Weaver

Table of Contents

Culture of Trust	1
Trust in Networks	4
Trust - Breaker table	11
Network Trust Assessment Worksheet	15
Worksheet: Sharing Strengths and Challenges	17

Creating a Culture of Trust in Your Network

Creating a culture of trust in a network can have a big payoff. Why is this so? First, when trust is well-developed in a network, people are willing to get involved in high-risk projects where their reputation and resources are at stake. These kinds of projects usually have a lot of impact. Next, high levels of trust usually make decision-making easier and less time consuming. Finally, a culture of trust enables people to accept and work with people who are quite different from them, which increases the number of people working on network activities. So trust generally saves time and money and increases the effectiveness of network action.

A culture of trust needs to be intentionally developed. A culture of trust has **6 major components**, all of which need to be in place to be effective:

- ▶ Values and behaviors that support trust
- ▶ Framing and valuing trust building
- ▶ Activities that help people build trust
- ▶ Weavers that coach people in building trust and deal with misunderstandings before they become conflicts
- ▶ Systems of reporting and accountability

Network Weavers can help people in the network become more aware of these by having them take the Network Trust Assessment Worksheet. This can be taken and retaken over time (and the results aggregated) to see if the culture of trust is becoming more developed over time.

① Value and behaviors that support trust

When most of the people in a network exhibit these behaviors, people are more likely to trust each other:

- ▶ Reliability: doing what we say we will do
- ▶ Reciprocity: helping each other out and allowing ourselves to be helped
- ▶ Openness: sharing what we are doing and thinking
- ▶ Honesty: telling the truth, clearing up misunderstandings
- ▶ Acceptance: accepting others as they are
- ▶ Appreciation: noticing what others do and appreciating it

A culture of trust helps people learn these behaviors so they come naturally. Some – such as reliability and honesty – have been part of our culture for eons while others – such as reciprocity, openness and acceptance – may need more explicit attention.

Network Weavers can introduce these behaviors and their importance to network success at a large group meeting using the following discussion questions:

1. What other behaviors do you think could be added to this list?
2. Think of a time when you expressed one or more of these behaviors and that behavior helped develop a more trusting relationship. Share an example of a time when one of those behaviors was missing and it made your effort less successful.
3. Which one of these is easiest for you to express? Which is the biggest challenge?

Network Weavers can also help people become more aware of these behaviors in themselves by giving the Individual Trust Assessment Worksheet.

② Framing and valuing trust building

Whether you are a formal leader or a Network Weaver, you can begin to create a culture of trust by stating the importance of investing in time to build relationships that lead to appropriate trust and by making sure that time at every meeting is spent on trust and relationship building.

Leaders and Weavers can also express— through sound bites – the values that support trust-building:

“When we’re open and transparent with each other, it helps us build trust.”

“Sharing what you have and know with each other is a great way to build trust.”

“It’s really important to think carefully before you make a commitment to do something, because your coming through is key to building trust.”

“It’s important to get to know each other so you know each person’s strengths and challenges. Then, when you ask someone to do something, you ask them to do something that uses their strengths and, if at all possible, doesn’t require them to do something that is hard for them.”

“Part of being in a network is learning to accept people and appreciate all we can learn from our differences.”

“Appreciating others when they have done something that helps you out is the foundation of a healthy network. We need to appreciate each other more.”

③ Attention to relationships

Every meeting – whether full group gathering or meetings of committees or work groups – needs to include relationship building activities. Activities at large group meetings should help people in the network have at least a basic relationship with most, if not all, of the other participants and deeper relationships with a substantial percentage of participants. People in work groups need to know each other well enough so that they have realistic expectations of each other.

Large Group Mixers

These are activities that get people talking to people they don’t know or don’t know well. Such activities include:

- Speed Networking (Chapter 2 in Handbook)
- Two-Four-eight
Starts with a round of speed networking but then has each dyad find another twosome and do introduction with them. Then the foursome finds another foursome and people again do introductions.

- **Stand Up**

The facilitator asks people to stand up in answer to each of a set of questions. This gives people a chance to see others like themselves. Examples of questions are:

“Stand up if you are on Twitter.”

“Stand up if you have ever been to Africa.”

“Stand up if you like to _____.”

Small Group Interactions

Whenever possible, it's important to have people in large gatherings work in small groups. This way they not only get to participate and contribute, but they also have chance to get to know new people and deepen their relationships with others. When the facilitator gives process instructions to small groups, he or she needs to make sure that time is spent on introductions and that the introductions provide a “hook” to capture others' interest. For example, the small group might have a go-round where each describes what they are most passionate about right now. Other topics might be sharing skills, sharing strengths or sharing about challenges.

Work groups

In work groups, the coordinator needs to have activities at every session that help people deepen their relationship and build a positive culture of collaboration. One activity is to have people take turns offering an appreciation of the person on their right. Another is to have people share in dyads then report back to the group on what their partner said.

④ Weavers who coach people in building trust

The article “Trust and Networks” offers many ways to coach people in building trust or dealing with trust-related issues.

⑤ Systems of accountability

One of the major ways to build trust is to have transparency in the network. That means that anyone in the network can access meeting notes, reports, and agendas from any small group or individual. People can easily see task lists and deadlines – both theirs and others – and notice who is and is not getting work done. This public expression of what each person is to do – and their progress on that – helps hold people accountable since everyone knows that others will see if they are not doing what they committed to doing or are not getting work done on time.

Trust and Networks:



How Can We Go Deeper?

June Holley, Network Weaver

First, let's start by admitting that trust is extremely important to effective networks and self-organizing strategies. If you trust someone, you are willing to do things with them, and if you really trust them, you'll be willing to put your reputation on the line and money on the table. More high impact action is likely to happen in an environment of trust. So trust is important.

But the thing is, if you really want to make a difference and have a significant impact, you are going to have to collaborate with a lot of people, and not just the people you usually hang around with and feel comfortable with. You are going to have to learn how to build trust with people you wouldn't normally and automatically trust.

But to trust people who aren't just like you, you have to really understand what trust is all about, how it is normally determined, and the very different ways you need to learn to build trust if you are going to work with and trust a lot of people.

My first suggestion is that we stop talking about blanket "trust." We too often talk about trust as if it were an on/off switch: either you trust someone or you don't trust them. If you trust them, you expect them to always come through, and if they disappoint you, then you don't trust them any more about anything. This rigid approach to trust limits our **network of possibility**.

In addition, the way we usually figure out who we trust limits our possibilities as well: we use **short-cuts** – simple, often unconscious rules that determine whether we will trust a particular individual. These short-cuts save us a lot of time, but at the same time, because they are based on how similar the other person is to us, they eliminate many wonderful people from our network of possibility. The hidden nature of this process makes it hard for us to realize what is going on.

The first step in expanding our trust network is to remove the veil. How do these simple trust determination **rules** work and how can we replace them with a system of determining trust based on understanding networks?

The Anatomy of Trust Formation

How do we decide to trust someone? For eons, humans have relied on short cuts to determine trustfulness. We use four main types of short-cuts:

1. Similar appearance
2. Joint Activities
3. Mutual friends
4. Shared values

When we meet someone, our brain scans their appearance, their speech, their non-verbals. If those track closely to our own, we are inclined to take the next step towards trust. If not, we tend to pull back.

Appearance shortcuts include:

- Judgments about someone's appearance: is their clothing like ours? Their hair styles? Do they have tattoos? What is their skin color?
- Judgments about language: are they from the same class or region? Do they use the same slang as us?
- Judgments about non-verbals: Do they look us in the eye? How close do they stand to us?

All too often, we are unaware that we are making decisions about trustworthiness based on these shortcuts. For example, James, from a middle class U.S. background meets Paul, from one of the Native American cultures where people feel that looking in someone's eyes is bad manners. James mistakenly and unconsciously assumes that Paul is not trustworthy because "He refuses to look me in the eye." Or, James meets Susan who has tattoos and notices he feels uncomfortable around her, not knowing what to expect. Appearance short-cuts often cause us to misinterpret cultural difference as untrustworthiness.

Next, we use joint activities to identify trustworthiness. We tend to view people who attend or are involved in the same activities as us – whether bowling leagues or civic associations or churches or certain conferences – as trustworthy. And the people we meet at these places tend to be like us in many ways.

Because many of the new people we meet in life will be introduced to us by our friends, we assume almost automatically that they are trustworthy. Friends also tell us who they think is untrustworthy, and too often their notions of untrustworthiness are based on how different the individual is from them, not on their inherent trustworthiness.

Finally, as we talk with new people, we compare values and world views. We have code phrases that we unconsciously slip out and then notice the individual's response. A liberal may make a criticism of Tea Parties; a conservative may ask if you've been saved. If people answer "correctly," we assume they are trustworthy.

Especially in the last few decades, we have used our political/religious values to create **value fortresses**: we seldom interact with those who do not have similar value sets. I remember one of the first social venture capital conferences I attended where two different value sets collided. Conferences for funds that provide venture funding to further social goals bring together liberal community development types and generally more conservative bankers and investors. At this conference, several of the speakers got up and were making critical remarks about the current conservative president (the kind of remarks that were routinely heard at community development conferences), oblivious to the presence of the large numbers of conservatives in the audience, who immediately became distrustful of the community development representatives en masse. Fortunately, several leaders apologized and were able to reframe the discussion, stressing the value of working across divides on the issues of concern to all – healthy urban communities and the need for job creation.

When value short cuts are used in situations where people from different backgrounds are gathering, they can lead to conflict and division rather than trust building. This is not to say that values should be dismissed or disregarded. In a later section I will suggest that we do need to have some values in common to trust and work together, but that generally these common values will be meta-values – values about how we interact and treat each other --

rather than the political/religious values we often use to determine trustfulness.

The problem with all of these shortcuts is that they eliminate people from our pool of those we trust solely because they are from different cultures or subcultures, different classes and background, and with different beliefs. This is all done with little or no awareness on our part. But the result is that diversity – just exactly what we need if we are going to innovate to co-create a thrivable world – is removed from our pool of potential collaborators.

It's very hard for us to see our own, very individual short-cuts. This is why **mindfulness** – the process of being very aware and in the moment – is such a critical skill to develop. Mindfulness enables us to see what is happening below the surface, without judgment, in way that makes our short-cuts transparent and thus open to change.

The next time you meet someone new, see if you can bring those almost automatic reactions to the surface. What is it about the individual that makes you feel comfortable or uncomfortable? Were you able to catch the subtle judgments you made about the person and how like or different they were from you?

Notice your conversations over the next few days. Are you identifying political/religious values of others and using their values to determine trustworthiness? Are you making value statements as a way of determining alignment? Are you using values as a way to determine who you work with and who you don't?

A Network Framework for Trust

In a world of delightful diversity, how do we craft trustful relationships? Once we become aware of the limits of short-cuts, what can do to replace them?

The first step is to create a network framework for thinking about trust. There are five parts to a new network framework for trust:

1. Trust is multi-faceted not monochromatic, an ecosystem not an on/off switch. Trust needs to be nuanced and specific.
2. We can (and need to) trust many more people than we currently are trusting, realizing we can trust everyone about something and shouldn't trust anyone about everything.
3. Trust building is most effectively accomplished by dismantling short cuts and installing a transparent system of trust-building skills and processes that we can use in our interactions with others.
4. In our networks, organizations and groups, we can explicitly develop a culture of trust enhancement.
5. A key role of Network Weavers is to help people learn more about trust formation and enable them to learn the skills and create culture they need to build trust with all kinds of people.

¹ See Jean Russell's Trivability
<http://www.slideshare.net/NurtureGirl/thrivability-a-collaborative-sketch-3406586>

² See mindfulness practice www.soundstrue.com

Individual Trust Building

Visualize trust as a sky full of stars: there are thousands of specific situations where you can trust someone (or not trust someone) -- Can you trust them to be on time? Can you trust them to do a certain task? Can you trust them to always tell you the truth? We need to explore these with each other so that we know exactly what our constellation of trust with each individual looks like.

Identifying what I called “the shoals of mistrust” is a critical first step. The list below includes a number of them, with space for you to add more. For each of us, some of these are bigger “trust-busters” than others. Check those that are the most critical to you.

Shoals of Mistrust

- When someone is different so you don't feel you know what they mean
- When someone has political views or values different from yours
- When someone is unpredictable, their behavior changes, you can't count on them being a certain way
- When someone is constantly late
- When someone says they will do something and they don't
- When someone criticizes you
- When someone lies to you
- When someone does something that hurts you: they talk behind your back, they say lies about you
- When someone shares something told in confidence:
- When someone takes more than they give
- When someone is dishonest: they charge you too much, they lie to you about something

As in Scenario 1 below, you can see that many of the issues that lead to mistrust are actually **personal style or cultural differences**. Once we acknowledge that the emerging economy and society need enormous amounts of innovations and creativity, we start to realize just how important it is that people have space to be their own quirky self. It's going to be the tension that occurs when difference engages that will generate the innovation and breakthroughs the future needs so badly.

Scenario 1

Jean was sitting in the empty meeting room, anxiously looking at her watch. Jon was 20 minutes late, and she was steaming. She grabbed up her books, muttering, "I just can't trust him. I'm never going to work with him again."

Scenario 2

Clarissa was sitting in a cozy booth in the coffee house, engrossed in a new book on networks, taking a few notes and now and then looking up to greet and talk to people who came in. Clarissa was waiting for Jon, who was – as he often was – 20 minutes late. Because she was a natural Network Weaver, she had spent a good bit of time getting to know Jon, and it was very apparent to her that he was often "up in the clouds," concocting fabulous new approaches to things, and so had little awareness about time. She, for her part, enjoyed hanging out at the coffee house, so she hadn't bothered to remind him. (She had, however, discussed the importance of being on time when they were going to meet someone new, and had worked out several systems to help him remember.) Sure enough, a few minutes later in he stormed, beaming, eager to explain that he had run into Stan, the town planner, who had loved their idea about the Art Park and had agreed to join the design group.

Clarissa went through a simple **trust crafting process**:

1. She identified the possible "shoal of mistrust" and got a clear understanding of how it was part of Jon's personality.
2. She determined her sensitivity to the issue and identified the situations when she could work with the issue by adjusting her behavior and reaction.
3. She worked with him to develop strategies so that he could become more trustworthy in situations where it was critical.

Modeling & Coaching

Network Weavers play a critical role in helping individuals develop trust in each other. The two methods they employ are **modeling trust building behaviors** and **trust coaching** between two individuals.

First, Network Weavers can model trust building micro-processes and skills as they build trust relationships with others. We know from recent research on the brain that when someone sees another person modeling a new behavior, certain areas of the brain actually ignite as if it were doing the behavior, thus making it easier for that individual to actually try out the behavior himself or herself later. This is one reason people learn so well by watching others. Learning can occur even more quickly when the Network Weaver points out the trust building micro-processes as they engage in them. This increases other people's awareness of trust building and gives them some new concepts and language to help them grapple with the gnarly issues around trust.

This is what good counselors or coaches (and also Network Weavers) do: they build a sense of safety by modeling **trust foundation behavior** that lays the groundwork for building trust.

Trust foundation behaviors include:

- being very attentive and respectful, listening well and carefully
- maintaining eye contact, and leaning slightly toward the other person
- asking questions and clarifying assumptions
- showing acceptance of the other, just as they are
- being appreciative of the other person

These basic behaviors, initiated by the Network Weaver, catalyze a peer partnership. The other person is encouraged to behave in this same open and accepting manner. In that context, the two can begin a transparent trust building process.

In addition, a Network Weaver can help people get a deeper understanding of trust through coaching. They can help people, either as individuals or as duos exploring trust building:

1. Identify short-cuts.
2. Analyze the seemingly trust-breaking behavior in light of the individual's personality, background and culture.
3. Analyze their own reactions.
4. Negotiate and generate solutions so the issue doesn't destroy trust.
5. Set up a number of small collaborative projects that will help the individuals get to know each other and test out their trust ecosystem.

A Network Weaver knows that you can trust everyone about some things, and shouldn't trust anyone about everything. The trick is to take the time to get to know people, and find out enough about them so you trust them appropriately, and don't have expectations of them that are out of character.

For example, A Network Weaver can point out that if someone spends a lot of time in their head (as is the case for Jon in Scenario 1), it doesn't make sense to trust them to always be on time. In this situation, a Network Weaver can coach individuals see their choices: If someone's being late does not bother you and you are prepared to fill the waiting time productively, great. If it does bother you, the two of you can discuss how to deal with the behavior – you can send email reminders, help the person develop systems such as computer reminders, etc – so that you increase the likelihood of them being on time. In time, exactly what you can trust them about will be very specific: for example, "I can trust them to be on time for an important meeting if I send them a reminder, but they will only be on time about half the time if I don't send a reminder and the meeting is not super important."

This **situated trust** is best developed by doing a number of small acts together and checking out how the other is in partnership, using the trust busting items in the list on page 5: Are they timely? Do they do what they say they would do? Are they honest? Do they communicate when something changes or when they have concerns?

Coaching is most powerful done with a duo. When behavior occurs that is disturbing to either party, a Network Weaver can help the duo learn the skills and build the commitment they need to discuss the difference.

Sometimes the potential trust-buster is simply a class or cultural difference: in some cultures or subcultures, being late for a meeting is normal; in others, being honest -- if it means saying anything in any way critical -- is verboten (see example below). In such cases, the Network Weaver needs to help the duo identify the cultural element and be creative in figuring out how to deal with it.

Dealing with Cultural Differences

Network Weaver: I wonder if each of you could describe to the other your approach to saying something negative to another person.

Person 1: I was brought up to have a lot of respect for older people. My parents would have been very ashamed of me if I ever said anything critical to an older person. I have to tell third person my criticisms and hope that my issues are taken back to the person. I'm have difficulties with

Person 2: Oh, I had no idea. I have always tried to be very honest and upfront with others. To me, when someone talked about me behind my back it meant I couldn't trust them. I would really like to work with you on this project but I would always be wondering if I'm doing something to offend you. Gosh, how are we going to work this out?

Person1: Maybe Lin could be the person I go to if I have a problem. You're old friends with him and I think you would be able to hear what he had to say. And I could try to take some risks saying what I feel.

A simple duo coaching process might have the following steps:

1. Have one or both identify the difference or issue.
2. Have each respond, explaining how they saw their behavior and the historical or cultural aspects of the behavior.
3. Generate a number of possible solutions.
4. Check in with each person in the duo several weeks later.

Some questions that a Network Weaver can ask to help individuals or duos check out trust issues are listed below.

Trust – Breaker	What questions can a Network Weaver coach an individual to ask about the other person?
When someone says they will do something and they don't	<p>Are they too busy right now? What makes it hard for them to let others know they are too busy?</p> <p>Do they need help with organizational systems?</p>
When someone does something that hurts you: they talk behind your back, they say lies about you	<p>Are they too shy or embarrassed to talk to the person directly? Has that person done something that needs to be addressed?</p>
When someone criticizes you	<p>Do they need help or encouragement to expressing criticism and concerns directly? DO they have cultural norms that make direct criticism difficult? Is there an issue that need to be addressed?</p>
When someone shares something told in confidence	<p>Are they aware of how this affected you? Did you explicitly say it was not to be shared?</p>
When someone takes more than they give	<p>Are they aware that others feel they are doing this? What is their understanding of their behavior? What are extenuating circumstances others need to know about?</p>
When someone is dishonest: they charge you too much, they lie to you about something	<p>What is their attitude about money? About lying? Are they aware of the repercussions?</p>
When someone is different so you don't feel you know what they mean	<p>How can you learn more about this person's culture or subculture?</p>
When someone has political views or values different from yours	<p>Can you identify areas that you both care about?</p>

Bad Habits

Sometimes an individual has bad habits. For example, perhaps they were brought up in a home where people continually criticized each other and they don't realize how this same behavior makes people in the group not trust them.

A Network Weaver can sit down with an individual whose bad habit is getting in the way of a group's progress and talk about that specific trust-breaking behavior (see box below).

Working with Bad Habits

Suzie had agreed to take notes for the group three different times and each time she had come to the meeting with no notes and excuses about why they hadn't been completed. The Network Weaver sat down with her, told her she had noticed the lack of notes and pointed out that it was making it hard for people in the group to trust that she would come through for them. Suzie cried, then started to talk about how much she always wanted to be helpful, but how frequently she did not come through because her life was chaos. She really wanted to figure this out. The Network Weaver then asked her more questions, and together they discovered that Suzie had no system for keeping track of tasks to which she had committed. When she expressed interest in learning a system for keeping track of "to dos," the Network Weaver showed her several options. She decided to use the Post-It notes on her Mac. A week later the Network Weaver checked in with her and she expressed her delight in her new system, which was really helping her stay on top of her obligations.

The process for dealing with bad habits:

1. Affirm the person and their importance to the group or network.
2. Describe the behavior and its impact on the group or network.
3. Give the person space to respond (they will often be defensive and feel criticized). Just listen with empathy.
4. Ask questions to help you and the individual better understand the context and history underlying the behavior.
5. See if they will commit to working on this behavior. Appreciate their willingness to try.
6. Explore options for behavior change or modification. Pick one or two to try.
7. Check-in and give support during the following weeks.
8. Make sure people in the group or network notice and appreciate any changes.

Sometimes, an individual is unwilling or unable to change, even given support. In such cases, it's best to move away from that person. Do not invite them to be part of future collaborations that require trust. Of course, sometimes these individuals are major players and ignoring them can jeopardize access to resources. Usually they can be part of small chunks of the project where their behavior will have fewer negative repercussions.

Using Networks for Building Trust

Earlier in this paper, we discussed how networks are often used to reinforce the limiting qualities of short-cuts, as friends introduce us mainly to people like ourselves, and tend to label people not like us as untrustworthy. However, when we become aware of this, we can explicitly develop network strategies that expand our network of possibility. We need a strategy for identifying people who can help bridge divides and difference and one to help us make more nuanced trust recommendations to others in our networks.

The Role of Connectors

First, we need to identify Connectors (also called bridge people or brokers) who have relationships with other clusters. These clusters may represent people in other cultures or sub-cultures, different geographies, or different types of organizations or issues.

One characteristic of Connectors is that they are aware of the culture, jargon, behaviors etc of each cluster and have a sense of the ways that each cluster tends to misunderstand (and thus often mistrust) the other. Such Connectors can act as guides and interpreters for both clusters, helping them understand the differences so that they don't get in the way of trust.

They also help individuals in each cluster become Connectors as well. This is done by bringing together a open-minded person from each cluster who have some common interest of passion, then helping them do something together that will enable them to build understanding of each other and situated trust. These two often move to the next step, which is organizing a small collaborative project with more individuals from each cluster. This usually creates a sufficient base of relationships such that the two clusters are usually able to collaborate in an ongoing fashion.

However, the Network Weaver needs to make sure people are reflecting on what's happening. They need to bring up any issues that come up and process them so that they do not get in the way of building trust.

The Connector Role in Trust Building

Seven counties were mandated to work together to create a workforce development system that would ensure that people were being trained for the new green jobs being created by innovative companies in the region. This required educational institutions (technical schools, high schools, and universities) to work with these entrepreneurial businesses and with the Latino community (since the majority of young people in the region were now Latino). Marcos was seen as an ideal Connector. He worked in the HR department of one of the businesses after coming from a position in the technical college, and was highly respected in the Latino community.

He immediately identified a major issue. The businesses felt that they were being left out of the planning process, as meetings were set up in the afternoon when they could not get away from work. The technical college, which was leading the process, was miffed that the businesses were not engaging in the process. Marcos brought together (at a early morning meeting) a small group from both camps to determine times and formats for meetings. He used this group to raise awareness of some of the cultural different between the two types of organizations and had made sure plenty of time was given to helping people get to know each other so the two clusters were now well overlapped.

Marcos then tackled the next issue. He was the only Latino involved in the regional effort. When he showed the group a network map by racial and ethnic background, along with statistics about future workforce demographics, the group was shocked. He then recruited several people to meet with key Latino organizations and leaders and discuss their involvement in the workforce development system. This led to a set of very innovative small projects to engage the Latino community in workforce issues.

Steps for building trust across divides:

1. Determine: What are the divides, silos, clusters, differences we want to bridge?
2. Identify Connectors who are comfortable with and respected by both groups or networks.
3. Have them bring together duos or small groups that include individuals from both to do some small acts together.
4. Provide a framework to help people become aware of differences and their impact on trust building.
5. Have small group identify a number of small projects involving people from both groups/networks.
6. Support the Connector.

Network Trust Assessment Worksheet

Put a circle around the number that best expresses your response.

1. Most people in this network know most others in the network at least a little.

1

2

3

4

5

Strongly Agree

Strongly Disagree

2. Most people in this network know at least a few people very well.

1

2

3

4

5

Strongly Agree

Strongly Disagree

3. Most people feel comfortable with most of the people in this network.

1

2

3

4

5

Strongly Agree

Strongly Disagree

4. There are few or no conflicts in this network.

1

2

3

4

5

Strongly Agree

Strongly Disagree

5. People are very accepting of differences in this network.

1

2

3

4

5

Strongly Agree

Strongly Disagree

6. People in this network feel comfortable dealing with conflict.

1

2

3

4

5

Strongly Agree

Strongly Disagree

7. Most people in this network do what they say they will do.

1

2

3

4

5

Strongly Agree

Strongly Disagree

8. Most people in this network help each other out.

1

2

3

4

5

Strongly Agree

Strongly Disagree

9. Most people openly share what they are doing and thinking.

1

2

3

4

5

Strongly Agree

Strongly Disagree

10. Most people in this network take the time to clear up misunderstandings.

1

2

3

4

5

Strongly Agree

Strongly Disagree

11. Most people in this network notice what others are doing and appreciate it publicly.

1

2

3

4

5

Strongly Agree

Strongly Disagree

12. Our network has good systems for us to share what we are doing with others.

1

2

3

4

5

Strongly Agree

Strongly Disagree

13. We have people in our network who help us build trust.

1

2

3

4

5

Strongly Agree

Strongly Disagree

In what areas is the culture of trust strongest?

Where does this network most need to work on its culture of trust?

Worksheet: Sharing Strengths and Challenges

For each of the following characteristics, circle ONE number from 1 to 5 that best describes your behavior.

Reliability

A. Get my tasks done on time Seldom get tasks done on time
1 2 3 4 5

B. Participate regularly Participation uneven
1 2 3 4 5

C. I keep my commitments I have trouble keeping commitments
1 2 3 4 5

Reciprocity

C. Help others out frequently Don't tend to help out
1 2 3 4 5

D. Ask for help when I need it Hard for me to ask for help
1 2 3 4 5

Openness

E. Easily communicate what I'm doing with others Forget to communicate
1 2 3 4 5

F. Tell others what I'm thinking & feeling Hard for me to share
1 2 3 4 5

Honesty

G. Almost always honest Find myself telling white lies
1 2 3 4 5

H. Clear up bad feelings right away Let bad feelings fester
1 2 3 4 5

I. Willing to deal with conflict Afraid of conflict & avoid it
1 2 3 4 5

Acceptance

J. Very accepting of others' differences

Some people bug me

1

2

3

4

5

K. Accept others weak points

Want others to change

1

2

3

4

5

L. I check out assumptions about others

I often jump to conclusions

1

2

3

4

5

Appreciation

L. Notice & appreciate what others contribute

Don't seem to appreciate much

1

2

3

4

5

What are your 3 strengths as a network participant?

What are challenges you'd like to work on?

June Holley — Network Weaver

juneholley@gmail.com

WWW.NETWORKWEAVER.COM/