

1



TRUST AND THE INTERNAL LANDSCAPE

A WHITEPAPER TO GET DEEPER UNDERSTANDING ON TRUST

AUTHOR: RICHARD KLEIJNEN

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Why do we need trust?

Trust is fundamental in inter human relations and interactions. It is necessary if we want to talk, work and play with others. Think of playing a game of monopoly: we trust that we all play by the rules set out in the instructions of the game. If someone doesn't play by the rules, the game is no fun. Trust is always relevant when humans meet.

Do we always need trust?

Yes and no. Even in simple daily live, when you do your shopping, you are trusting the supermarket and the suppliers that the food you buy is healthy for you. If you do a simple research on what ingredients are in a product, you will find that of some of these ingredients you have no clue what they mean. Let alone know what effect they have on your system. Same if you would grow your own food, with biological seeds. You still would not know what chemicals enter your food through the rain. Something seems trustworthy if it has proven itself over time. Like the beef coming from the neighbourhood farm. It has always been good, so it is probably good next year and we will buy it again. In this way, trust is something we can see and perceive by our thinking. It is almost a causal thing. If you look at the etymology of the word trust, trust is confidence, reliability. But these words are almost synonyms. By labelling something with another label we do not get real understanding of what trust is.

2

Digging deeper into the subject trust, we can also say there is an emotional perspective to it. Or there should be. Human beings have both feelings and thought, and I suspect trust is going deeper than just rationality. Feelings about trust go side by side with the rational thought about trust. Rationality, our thinking, is limited and not always able to analyse all information needed to make a decision. From an emotional perspective trust would have to imply things like safety, security, hope, intention and so.

Another aspect is the measure of trust. I would theorize and probably decide for real that I would trust someone to do my shopping, but not to take care of my children or vice versa. This simple example would imply that trust has different levels to it.

So to understand we need to look at three things: thinking , feeling and the level or measure of trust. Musing over this, there is one thing missing: the connection humans are able to establish between them, which is related to being.

Trust in doing	I trust you to do this, because you have done successfully before.
Trust in feeling	I trust you because I feel safe with you and can be myself when we meet.
Trust in thinking	I trust you because you are saying the right things.
Trust in being	I trust you because of who you are....we are connected.

And of course you need someone to give trust to or receive trust from. It takes at least two to party and two to trust.

Looking at human behaviour the big question is: can you define trust. At least more specifically than what is usually done. In an attempt to answer this question I will use as a basis for this analysis the inner landscape, a way of looking at the inner world of human beings. The Internal Landscape is a map with signposts that can be used at the drivers of human behaviour in a particular moment and situation. For this exercise we are only going to use a simplified version of the Internal Landscape:

3

Internal Landscape

Usually I use The Four Levels of Perception in analysing behaviour but in the case of trust, the Internal Landscape is more suitable as this deals with the inner workings of people. Trust is something that goes deep. The Internal Landscape is a map that can help understand the drivers behind human behaviour in a specific situation and moment. It deals like The Four Levels of Perception with the measure and ability to connect with yourself and others. For understanding trust we are using only a much simplified version of the Internal Landscape.

According to the Internal Landscape; behaviour (doing) is influenced by the following:

- Temper
- Attitude
- Instinct
- Convictions
- And ultimately the core or centre of a human being. Let's call it the intrinsic motivation of a person.

I usually do not feel obliged to follow the exact definition of these words as available in dictionaries, so I took the liberty to establish my own to make the Internal Landscape work and be a coherent whole.

Temper

Temper can be defined as an uncontrolled emotional response. Although being called temper, this can be good or bad, or even neutral. Spontaneous laughter would fall in the category temper for example. Other tempers could be crying, aggression, feeling shocked, inspired and so on.

Attitude

With attitude we mean formal behaviour, think of wearing a suit, shirt and tie to work, speaking in a certain way. Put enough beer into a banker and his formal behaviour will slowly disintegrate into temper.

4 Instinct

Instinct is a controllable emotional response. Your instinct would develop from your DNA, upbringing, conditioning, choices you made, training you have received. So instinct is constantly developing and one of the most powerful aspects of being human. Instinct is faster than any thought and more powerful. Unlike temper, it is controllable by mind and discipline.

Convictions

Convictions are the curse and blessing of Western society. It is the rational mind dominating most of our behaviour. Cogito ergo sum (Descartes) brought to the extreme. There are people that have such powerful convictions, that feelings are ignored and/or seen as weak or unimportant.

The centre

The centre or core of a person, the heart, is about connection. A deeper connection with a fellow human is always felt in the heart. It is where the deeper motivations and intentions of people come out. Where you “feel” or perceive the rightness and wrongness of things.

The internal landscape was conceived to help people looking into their inside world as to better understand the aspects of themselves driving their behaviour. So let's now try to see what we can achieve when we use the internal landscape to look at trust.

Why would you like to have trust?

I believe there are many answers to this question. For example, (let's call him John), I need John to do some work for me. I have some money available and want someone to do it for me. I tell John here is the job, here is the money, would you like to do this for me. Sure says John, takes the money and the next day the work is done. John is a great guy, says what he does. Right? John values the relationship with me and honours his agreement. He could have taken the money and not have done the work, leaving me in an awkward position with no money, no work done and possibly some aggravation about the whole thing. This little example gives raise to some more thoughts on this. We have found a way to deal with exchanging things between humans of course, as we have laws and regulations, habits and all kinds of cultural behaviour governing transactions between people. From a transactional perspective jobs could be simple transactions where tit-for-tat is the general rule. Here is the specification, here is the wage. But is this the same as trust? Not so sure really, as I do not need trust if I have defined a transactional mechanism where every aspect is quantifiable and known. I believe trust has some element of risk to it. The measure of trust I need for a clearly defined transaction, like paying for my groceries in the supermarket, is not very high. Trust is something I need where risks are involved, so things can go wrong. And you and I would like to have a lot of trust when it comes to things like taking care of the kids, dealing with a lot of money, assets and risks in business, for example an implementation of a new CRM system or acquiring a company.

5

Definition of trust

Attempting to get a better definition of trust it would need to take care of some "perception" that the parties can trust each other, maybe some connection. Also it would need to have a risk element about a future activity and a belief that a cooperative effort would be successful. So I could define trust as follows:

Trust is the ability of one or more people to enter into a relationship for a future activity where there is a measure of uncertainty, often coincided with giving before receiving.

Internal Landscape

So trust is more than a transaction, it is about what you believe you can achieve together. Trust begs for a shared vision or intention and the idea that you can actually do it together. Even when the investments are not always at the same level from each of the involved persons.

Temper and trust

If you look at temper, people governed by temper are often perceived as erratic. So trust would be difficult to give to someone that is unpredictable all the time. At the road sign of temper, the ability to connect and form a meaningful relationship is very low: the person showing temper is unconscious and not in control of their own behaviour, not aware of the surroundings as he or she is dominated by the temper itself. Trust does not seem to have a place here i.e. **No trust**

Attitude and trust

6 Looking at attitude we get a different view. Attitude was developed by mankind when we went to live in cities. There were so many of us living together that our tempers resulted in one great big mess. People fighting and killing each other all the time. Then some wise man and woman decided that we needed some rules (Moses for example) and set out some rules for behaving towards each other in a way that no one got hurt. Hence **Attitude** was born. Attitude as in people following a set of rules or laws and sticking to them. So they behaved in a certain and predictable way. And you could kind of trust one another as going into the street didn't get you killed or injured because the (negative) tempers were controlled by attitudes, common forms of behaviour. Applying this to trust, you get transactional trust, which isn't really trust from my perspective, but it at least keeps you safe as you have some rules that need to be kept. If we meet with the people from banks, law firms, police, hospital you get the nice uniforms and nice behaviours which should represent the trustworthiness of what they do. **Transactional trust** is a first way of predicting an outcome. You see a police car in your mirror when you are speeding and you slow down to the limits by set law. Because the causality rule is clear here: break the law -> uniform gets you -> you must pay the fine.

Instinct and trust

When your feelings tell you it is safe, you can trust someone. I honestly don't believe this is entirely true. Instinct, as defined in the Internal Landscape, is the sum of all things, DNA, experience, choices you have made and so. It is your body telling you something about the situation at hand. The

development of our instincts is closely related to how we grew up. If we are of the same family, village, town or province we share more at the instinct level than with people from other cultures, religions or countries. The greater the similarity of instincts, the easier it is to trust. This is because of these similarities, it gives you a greater idea of predictability and that goes beyond the transactional trust at the attitude level. **Instinctive trust** relies on the common factors. This type of trust is easy if you are the same “kind” of the person as the other, but hard if you are from a completely different culture, religion and upbringing. In case you cannot achieve instinctive trust, an option would be to implement transactional trust by setting up a contract. But do not think that a contract will always solve the problem: they do not have the same validity and respect in all the different cultures in the world. What is more important you could ask yourself: respecting yourself, your culture or respecting a contract? Long term contracts suffer from this, as modern people are ever changing and often cannot see into the future more than 1 or 2 years at best. I wonder: if I have changed and wish to live a different life, would or should that make a contract prohibiting this void?

7 **Convictions and trust**

The western world is getting more and more individualistic and convictions rule the world. Everyone to his or hers own! We have opinions about everything, even if we do not have the qualifications and experience to form a comprehensive view on things. We even stopped listening towards each other, as our own convictions and self-importance are in the way of truly hearing what another has to say. They are a curse and a blessing, two sides of the same coin. To have a personal view enables us to become truly human and fulfil our destinies. The problem with strong convictions is that these result in very judgemental behaviour and we so lose the trust of the instinct as we grow in life. Where temper and instinct are part of the world of feelings, attitude and convictions belong the world of thoughts. How would trust work if we have the same convictions. In the case they are well developed, say in the area of religion, we then have much to share as the thought principle driving us is the same: then we can trust and work together, even if we are of a different culture. **Doctrinal trust** supersedes instinctive trust hence and it is very powerful. The world’s religions have a huge influence on bringing people together from different places all over the world. The doctrine, often with lots of dogma, binds people together. Some still swear on the bible in a court of law to tell the truth. Because you swear on the doctrine, you can be fully trusted. Breaching that trust is a serious offense. Companies and governments have codes of ethics and values you have to comply to. It is an attempt to go beyond the doctrines from childhood and have people commit and follow

something different for the time they are employed and working. For a start-up business it would seem a good thing to think about this. But it is still an umbrella that might conflict with the individual ambitions of the person working for you. Hence you might lose your best employees because they just get bored and fed up with what you stand for. Especially if you don't revisit such values and visions regularly. Doctrinal trust is a super version of transactional trust as it tries to capture a whole group of transactions over time. It works for those who share the same values, it doesn't for everybody else.

Beyond convictions

As we are now moving to the end of the development of our convictions, many are leaving the churches and replacing it for a non-affiliated, more loose, belief system. We also recognize each of us is entitled to his own choices to lead the life he or she wishes. So how do we trust when we cannot predict what the other might do? I believe discovering the intrinsic motivation of someone might be the key to this. In the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, article one, two and three state:

8

Article 1.

"All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood."

Article 2.

"Everyone is entitled to all the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration, without distinction of any kind, such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status. Furthermore, no distinction shall be made on the basis of the political, jurisdictional or international status of the country or territory to which a person belongs, whether it be independent, trust, non-self-governing or under any other limitation of sovereignty."

Article 3.

"Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of person."

In modern society people are changing, growing rapidly thus developing their strengths and qualities quicker than ever before in the history of mankind. To build a relationship, work together, invest and take risks together we need a great kind of trust. It should be greater than transactional trust: as we want to allow for the other to change. It needs to be bigger than instinctive trust, as we want to work with people who have completely different backgrounds than we do. It should allow for a different conviction and doctrine. Trust is given first and the belief in reciprocity of some kind is the basis for that gift. And that could be some form of reward to someone or something not you. Ask yourself: “why do people donate so much to charities?” Because they trust something good for someone, somewhere will come out of it. **Reciprocal trust** is essential for businesses and governments to keep the staff involved, motivated and inspired to go that extra mile for you when the business needs it. Use contracts, processes, procedures and all that other paperwork as a shield, not as a sword.

9

