

**Trust and Distrust in Organizations reaction**

Trust and conflict resolution, do they require each other, do they support each other, are they even needed for attainment? That is the essential question asked here. But why in this class? When we reflect on the course purpose to “review traditional and nontraditional views of conflict from a variety of theorists,” it becomes more evident. “The effectiveness and limitations of conflict resolution will be explored, and students will explore what can and should be changed about prior conflicts, and how these changes can be effectively implemented in terms alternatives to conflict.” These course purposes demand that we infuse trust in as an understanding essential to resolving conflict.

The author of *Trust and Distrust in Organizations*, Roderick Kramer, beautifully and simply defines trust as “anticipated cooperation.” I appreciate his consolidation of extraneous terminologies when formulating his definition. Albeit, I would like to dissect his simplistic reference even further and look at the verbiage in isolation to further support my acceptance of his minimalistic formulation of trust.

Anticipated. Alone it can be a sentence, or it can be used to create a sense of wonder. It evokes a certain expectation unto itself, as it even suggests a level of anticipation within the word itself. Dictionary.com defines it as “to expect; look forward to; be sure of” while Merriam-Webster defines it as “to give advance thought, discussion, or treatment to.” In both cases the word explicitly offers an understanding of future events that conjure a certain level of expectation. The development of and understanding of things to come or expectation offers some comfort by eliminating the partial unknown. Whether it is of positive or negative experience, knowledge is powerful.

Cooperation is one of the critical attributes of success in 21<sup>st</sup> century learners. It requires collaboration with understanding of goal orientation. Although the goal may not be explicitly known, it is common to the participants. Cooperation is more specifically defined as “the actions [towards] a

common effort” according to Merriam-Webster, while dictionary.com defines it as “an act or instance of working or acting together for a common purpose or benefit; joint action.”

The consolidation of these two terms yields the following, “acting or working together with advance thought.” It is here that I look to the idea that Roderick Kramer defined trust as anticipated cooperation is suited for most situations, but flawed in the unpinning’s of developing one’s “trust.”

For the purpose of this course and conflict resolution, trust is negotiating through working together with clear and explicit advance thought. As well defined as trust is for negotiators and conflict resolution, a deeper agreement of trust needs to be fundamentally established for the existence of mutually agreed upon commitment and confidentiality concurrently. I feel only with the inclusion of commitment and confidentiality, can anticipated trust be achieved from individuals or groups. In conclusion, Isaac Watts summarized trust as” Learning to trust is one of life's most difficult tasks.” Lastly,

A little girl and her father were crossing a bridge.

The father was kind of scared so he asked his little daughter:

"Sweetheart, please hold my hand so that you don't fall into the river." The little girl said:

"No, Dad. You hold my hand."

"What's the difference?" Asked the puzzled father.

"There's a big difference," replied the little girl.

"If I hold your hand and something happens to me, chances are that I may let your hand go. But if you hold my hand, I know for sure that no matter what happens, you will never let my hand go."

In any relationship, the essence of trust is not in its bind, but in its bond. So hold the hand of the person whom you love rather than expecting them to hold yours...