Cultivating Partnerships to Advance Your Implementation Projects

Presenter:
Dr. Julia E. Moore

Sponsored by AIR's Center on Knowledge Translation
Disability and Rehabilitation Research (KTDRR)
https://ktdrr.org/training/webcasts/webcast84/

Transcript for audio/video file on YouTube:
https://youtu.be/OIhpRahILvY

KATHLEEN MURPHY: Welcome, everyone. My name is Kathleen Murphy. I'm a white woman with shoulder-length blonde hair. And I'm wearing a black-and-white patterned dress and silver hoop earrings. And there are also two silver hoops in the neckline of the dress. And I have a pair of reading glasses around my neck.

I'm opening this in my role as the Director of the Center on Knowledge Translation for Disability and Rehabilitation Research, which is housed at the American Institutes for Research. We're thrilled you're here. Today's webcast is cultivating partnerships to advance your implementation projects. It wouldn't have happened without the tech support from whom you just heard from, Shoshana Rabinovsky, and our training and technical assistance lead, Ashley Clark-Purnell. We're very grateful to her.

I think we have a great presentation here. Dr. Julia Moore is going to be-- she's going to be kicking off pretty soon. And she's joining us from the Center for Implementation. We're thrilled to have you, Julia, and I'll pass it to you.

JULIA MOORE: Wonderful. Thank you so much. I am super excited to be here. I was just looking at names in the chat, and I see some people I recognize-- so hello to those of you that I already know-- and lots of new names, so people I don't know already.

I am really excited because we are here to talk about a topic that I am really excited about and really love talking about and thinking about, which is, How can we cultivate partnerships to advance implementation work? So I'm going to try to have a style where I present some stuff, we do a little bit of interactivity, then present some more stuff. If you have questions throughout, please type them in the chat. We will monitor those. Sometimes I answer them as I go. Sometimes we save them to the end. And then we'll have Q&A at the end as well.

So really quickly, if you don't know about me or about me, so first, actually, my name is Julia Moore. And I currently live in Canada. And I want to acknowledge the land and the waters that I live on and I'm located on today, which are part of the Williams Treaty First Nations.

I am a white woman with long, brown hair. I have blue eyes. I am wearing a patterned shirt and a gray sweater. And it falsely looks like I'm in a very sunny room, but it is not my real background. It is Canada, and so it is snowy where I am. I mean, it's sunny but snowy.

And I am from the Center for Implementation. And what I do and we do is we try to take this thing that is the science of implementation, which I'm sure many of you already know about. And we try to synthesize it and translate it and make it super, super, super practical and relevant for the people who are on the ground trying to implement things, spread things, scale things to have an impact in the work that they're doing.

And so in order to do this, we do lots of different stuff like providing implementation support, working on partnerships and workshops, and doing talks exactly like this, and lots of tool development. And we'll share some tools today.

So you can learn official things about me on this slide or on the website. But essentially, I'm kind of like a rogue scientist. So I was trained as an academic but now spend all of my time trying to make academic research-based things in implementation and adjacent fields super, super practical and relevant for people on the ground.

So today, we're going to talk about relationships and partnerships in the work that we're doing. And so one of the things that's kind of interesting is-- so for many years in doing implementation, I was spending a lot of time focusing on theories and frameworks and pulling in all these different frameworks and how can we use them.

And a couple of years ago, people started saying, Julia, these frameworks are great, but I'm having relationship problems, problems partnering with other people, collaboration problems. Can you help figure out how we are going to deal with those parts of implementation?

And so we spent a whole bunch of time really delving into the research and the literature to understand how can we support people to better understand how to handle different aspects of relationships and collaboration and partnership building, which are really essential to all implementation work.

Because at the end of the day, when we are trying to implement anything in the entire world, we need to bring people together and start thinking about, How are we working together? So one of the ways we like to organize our thinking around this is to think about the relational pathway.

This highlights five key things that you're probably already actively doing. And so it's just a way to organize stuff that we're doing.

One, we often convene people, like bring people together, to do the work of implementation. Two, we're often partnering with people and really defining what are people's roles. How are we working together? Three, we should be thinking about what is the governance. For example, how are decisions made? Four, we can be thinking about how we work together as a team. And depending on the nature of your work, if you are working across multiple organizations or multiple regions or states, you might be thinking about how you can work across a system.

And so when thinking about all of these different actions and activities that we all do on an everyday basis when working on implementation, it's really helpful to think about how we are collaboratively working with other people. And so one of our favorite spectrums or ways to think about this spectrum of collaboration from the Tamarack Institute. And so if you don't know them, we've had great experiences working with lots of different stuff that they've done. And they really, really get into how we collaborate with others.

There are lots of spectrums of collaboration. And so if you're using one, and you like it, keep using it. Keep going with the one that fits your work. The reason we really like this one is because it also includes this component of compete, because-- I don't know about you, but a lot of times, we're in situations where we might be working collaboratively with another group and, at the same time, competing against them as well.

We see this a lot in research projects and implementation projects, where people might have to compete in some aspects of their world but simultaneously collaborate at the same time. And so we kind of like it because it highlights that the nature of that aspect of relationships.

But if we move down the spectrum, we can see that you might also coexist where there's no official relationship going on between different people. Sometimes you might have an exchange of knowledge. So you're just sharing information, networking. You know what happening in the other organization.

Sometimes you're doing what we call as-needed joint work. Like, you have a really specific project or reason that you might collaboratively work with someone else. So I was just on a call with someone. And they said, hey, let's write this one paper together. Let's write a white paper and release it out with people. So this is kind of an as-needed joint work conversation.

Sometimes we're doing things where they say, hey, let's do ongoing joint work. How could we work together long term and figure out what that might look like? Then you might have even longer term interactions and collaborations that might be more based on shared missions,

shared goals, shared values that you have. And sometimes, not often, you might literally say, Hey, how can we merge the work that we're doing together or our organizations or our labs or our groups or whatever it is that you are doing?

And so I wanted to start here because I think that what I'm going to talk about today is actually relevant no matter where you are on the spectrum, maybe with the exception of coexist, because it's about how, in order to do any of these kinds of collaborations, you need to have relationships with people.

And so when people started asking us all these questions, we started delving into the science of trust. And what does the science tell us about how to build trusting relationships? So we started looking through the science and pulling together everything we could find. And because we have a tendency to make pathways and visuals, we started out by building this visual that we like to call Cultiv8. And it highlights that you kind of have these three phases when thinking about building trusting relationships.

First, we want to assess the context. Like, what's currently happening? What's going on right now before we take any action? Then we really deeply reflect, What is my own contribution to what is going on? And then we want to select actions for ourselves and/or for the situation. And all of these are set up so that we can actually build those trusting relationships.

So in this first phase, when we're assessing the context, we're thinking about, OK, well, what is the thing we're trying to address? What are we trying to do? Why are we even showing up to this work? Why are we having this conversation? Why are we thinking about this relationship?

And here, it's helpful to think about, What is the current stage of the relationship? Do you have no relationship at all? Is this brand new? Because you might approach that differently than if you already have a pretty good working relationship. And you might approach that differently than if you have maybe tension that exists in the relationship, either because of actual interactions between you and another organization or community, or maybe historical tensions between you and another organization or community. And then we like to rate that relationship based on trust and power.

Once we do those things, then we get into this deeply, deeply reflective phase. And I'm going to be honest, when I first started this work, I was so excited to learn about trust. I was super, super pumped. I was like, OK, I love thinking about how people interact and why we change. And so trust just felt like a natural extension of that work.

But the more we dug into it, the more my colleague Sobia was realizing that trust and power are very, very linked, that we can't really think about trust without also thinking about the power

dynamics that are at play. And while that made me feel kind of uncomfortable at the beginning, the further down the pathway I went of exploring trust and power and how those are connected, I think it really helped me think very differently about relationships.

So we like to start by thinking about identifying what is impacting trust. And I'm going to talk first about that. But now we're going to get into what contributes to power and the different dimensions of power that exists. As we reflect on these, then we start reflecting on what are the goals that we want to take to move forward. So what do we want to achieve out of this relationship? Why do we want to work together? Why do we want to collaborate with someone? And we start to explore.

So we only have, like, an hour together. So I'm really going to focus on these two pieces up here, identifying what impacts trust, identifying what impacts power, and then talking about some actions you can take.

So what does the science of trust tell us? So first, I think this is super fascinating, but people talk about four different types of trust. Strategic trust is like, Do you trust the initiative, say, you're working on? So say you're implementing a program. Do you actually believe this is going to work and have an impact? That's strategic trust.

Second, we can think about trust among organizations or groups, so between a group and a community or two different organizations. So what's the trust between people or groups? We can have personal trust. Do I trust someone else? And does that person trust me? And now we have trust within organizations or within groups.

I'm going to focus here more on especially the last two and little bit with organizations. And I'm not going to focus so much on strategic trust. I'm going to focus on trust between actual people or organizations.

And so if you can't tell, we super love analogies when we're thinking about trust. And so when I started trying to understand, well, what does the science of trust tell us-- we kind of clung on and liked this idea of thinking about trust as a tower of trust. And every single time we have an interaction with someone, we have the possibility of being able to build on our tower of trust. We have the possibility of adding a block or two to the tower of trust. Every time we talk to someone, every time we email them, every time we see them, we have the option an opportunity to build trust.

And when we build a tower of trust that is really strong and has a great foundation, it means that when unexpected or challenging things happen, we've built a strong enough foundation that we're good to go, and we can ride that wave. But sometimes, when we go and build a tower of

trust, we don't have a strong enough foundation. And it kind of starts off as one of these, ooh-- one of the blocks in the bottom. And it means that when challenging things happen, it is a lot harder to work through them.

One of the things you might notice is that there are three different colored blocks in these towers of trust. And so those actually correspond to the three different factors that affect trust. And so essentially, we trust other people and other people trust us when three things are happening, first, when we feel a sense of connection.

So if we feel connected to them, like we have shared values. We don't believe they're being judgmental. We believe that they have generosity of intention. So kind of assume the best is the way I like to think of that one. And it's easier to trust people when they're more empathetic. So if they offer us empathy, it's easier to build connection.

We trust other people and they trust us if we believe that competence goes both ways. So we trust other people more if we believe they are competent. So if you think someone else is competent, so has the ability to do things, is reliable, accountable, kind of the stuff we think about related to competence. But in order to trust someone, we actually also want to believe that they think we are competent.

And third, this one is often the one that's more surprising to people. We trust other people and they trust us more when we think they are showing up authentically. That means they don't have ulterior motives. They don't have some other agenda that they're trying to push. And that's something that makes us feel really uncomfortable and trust them less. We also trust people more when they have really good boundaries, when they respect confidentiality, and we believe they have integrity.

So I just talked for a long time. So I'm excited that we are going to shift into an activity. So I am going to show you how to annotate, if you have not done it already-- perfect. And Carrie just put the instructions in the chat.

Note, if you cannot annotate or are having problems, please just type things in the chat. And you could chat directly to Carrie, and she can add your annotation to the board if you want to stay anonymous. Or you can just put in the chat. So do not let technology be an issue.

But if you would like to try annotating, you can literally do it on this screen, OK? So you should be able to go. Some people see this, and some people see this second option. So either go to the top, and it says, View Options, Annotate, and then a bar should show up. And I like to pick the Stamp tool. Or you might have this, the bar over on the side or down here.

6

So perfect, I will give people a couple of moments to see if you can annotate. Getting stars. Pick whichever stamp you like most. Just don't use the Spotlight tool because it only lets one person spotlight at a time. So use a stamp is best.

Excellent. And again, if you're having any problems, just message Carrie, and she will stamp for you. All right, so I'm going to clear all of these. And I'm going to take you to our first activity.

So imagine you are at the start of a team meeting. And a new collaborator shares her personal story about why she is committed to this work. Do you think this is an example of her trying to show up authentically, build connection, or show that she is competent? And you are welcome to do one or more of that. And as you can see, they all show up anonymously. So no one will know which one you added.

Fabulous. So yeah, this is exactly what I would say. I think this is a great example of showing up authentically, saying like, this is why I'm here. This is why I'm committed to this work, right? Like, that's saying, this is my motives for being here. And because shared values is really a great way to connect with people, sharing a personal story and showing those shared values is a great way to build connection. So I would go with authenticity and connection are exactly where I would put that.

Now, second example-- imagine you have a team member who continuously delivers work that is not up to your standards. What do you think this is an example of? Showing up authentically or not, building connection, or competence?

Yeah, so we see lots and lots of things sitting in competence here, and that's exactly where I would put this as well, where this is an example of someone maybe you don't trust them that much because you don't feel like they are building high-quality stuff. And so you question their competence.

Now imagine you overhear a conversation between a community partner and a project lead. And the community partner has great, relevant questions. And the project lead dismisses their concerns with a judgmental tone of voice. Do you think that this is an example of a trust issue related to authenticity, connection, or competence?

Excellent. So yeah, so the first, first place I would go is definitely, definitely in connection, right? When someone is showing up judgmentally, it immediately breaks that connection. It does not foster connection. But I've used this example several times. And lots of people highlight how this could also be a competence issue. If someone is that judgmental, especially in the type of work that they're doing, that potentially is a competence issue as well.

So super amazing job, everyone. Now I have two more. But instead of thinking of an outside situation, I want you to stop and think about a person that you don't really trust that much and who doesn't really trust you. Do not say their name. Don't tell anyone. Don't type it in the chat. But think of someone that you don't really trust, and they don't really trust you.

What makes it that you don't really trust that person? Is it that you think they're not showing up authentically? Do you have a lack of connection? Or is it not believing that they are competent or questioning if they think you're incompetent?

But I see lots of people putting theirs right in the middle here, all three things happening at the same time. All right, so nicely distributed. And it looks like people could clearly think of some examples.

Now think about the same person. Why do you think they don't trust you? Awesome. So lots and lots of examples here.

And one thing I just want to flag and highlight that we have noticed because I've asked this question a lot of different times over the past two years is, one of the things we see really often is that we might question other people's authenticity. But we rarely question whether people wonder if we are showing up authentically.

So I want to say a huge shout out to all of the people who actually put a button or a stamp here for authenticity because I think that that's a really big thing that people tell us over and over. I wonder if someone is really showing up authentically. And so if we can question whether we are showing up authentically enough or whether people believe we are, I think that that's really, really a powerful way to build trust.

So we're going to pause on activities. I promise we'll come back to activities. But pause on annotating for a couple of moments because I'm going to jump into power dynamics. So as I mentioned, we started on trust. And I was super excited to talk about trust. And then we started talking about power. And it kind of made me feel really uncomfortable. And I wasn't sure where this was going to go. But I'm actually super happy because understanding power has literally transformed the way that I approach my work, and even my actual daily life, in pretty powerful and fundamental ways.

So when we think about power-- so we had the Trust Trifecta. So there's these three things, and it was kind of simple. But there's three different dimensions of power I'm going to talk about. I'm going to do it at a pretty high level. So it's a lot of information.

But I want to flag you have access to these slides. You can look at all of this information. It like publicly available. I'll show you how you can see it. So do not worry about writing all these

things down frantically. But I want to make sure that people can see and understand the different dimensions of power.

So the first dimension of power we talk about is types of power because that's what people often think about when they think about power. In fact, we often think specifically of power over other people. So when I first thought about power, and we started going to this place, I think I felt like, ooh, power is this bad thing where we're thinking about someone else having power over me or over other people. And that is one type of power, but it is only one type of power.

We can also think of situations where we might have power with other people, where we are lending each other power to move work forward. And so hopefully, you can think about people or situations where people are collectively working together to have power with each other in order to make something happen.

Connected to that idea is the idea of power to. This is where we might lend power to others in order to move work forward. So it's not just saying, ooh, let's work collaboratively. But let's say, Hey, how can we give power or lend power to other people so that they can move this agenda forward?

Then I think, for me, the most transformative understanding of power came from better understanding the idea of power within. This is the idea that everyone has a source of power. And understanding and knowing and highlighting your own source of power, especially when you feel powerless, is an incredible way to build and foster power within.

So I'm going to use another analogy to talk about power within. And this is the idea of jewels of power. And so the idea behind jewels of power is that everyone has different things that make them super amazing and unique and special and that they bring to the table.

So I am born in May. So sometimes I like to think of my jewels of power as being emeralds. And I might have a variety of different jewels of power. Like, I know a whole bunch about how to use implementation science in practice. Or I'm pretty good at being empathetic. Like, naturally, that comes to me as one of my jewels of power.

And what's super interesting is I can be in situations where I am in a scenario or a room or a group or a table where people really respect my jewels of power. And what I bring to the table is really valued and appreciated. And so my jewels of power are appreciated.

But I could literally leave that situation or, say, leave a meeting and walk into another meeting or another virtual meeting where people do not respect my jewels of power. They don't value them. They don't appreciate them. And it is very easy in those situations to start feeling a sense of powerlessness.

But when we understand that our jewels of power are our jewels of power-- we have them always forever. No one takes them away, even when we walk into a room where people do not value them-- it can really change the way we show up to meetings. And it can change the way we highlight and value the jewels of power of other people. And to me, that has been one of the most transformative things about learning more about power.

So we also want to jump into understanding the different forms that power takes. So three forms of power-- first, we have visible power. Again, this is what we often think about. This is like, Who has decision-making authority? Who is the boss? Who is leading the work, right? Like, who is in a position of power?

But have you ever been in a situation where there's someone who does not have a position of power but they seem to be able to have a lot of influence over what's happening? This is someone who might have hidden power. But they don't have formal decision-making power. But they actually can help set the agenda and the tone and what's happening in the work.

And we also experience invisible power. This is power that is not seen, but it is felt and experienced by people. So we often think of things like gender, race, disability status, which might provide different levels of invisible power or powerlessness for people in situations.

Finally, we have spaces of power. So there are three spaces of power we can think about-- closed spaces, where decisions are not transparent, made by a small group of people. We can have invited spaces, which are much more open, where people are asking for different opinions, sharing power. And so it can be open or invited. Both of those fit in this middle one.

And when people feel a sense of powerlessness or feel that their work is not being valued, sometimes they choose to create a claimed space. So this is a new space where they get to take the work and move it forward in a space that didn't already exist because they feel, for example, like the spaces are too closed.

So as promised, we have another little quick activity, where I'd like to ask you two different questions about power. So first, pulling out your annotation again, what types of power have you maybe not considered that much? So have you thought about power over? Have you thought about power with? Have you thought about power to? And have you thought about power within in the past? And just take your little annotation tool and say which one have you not considered that much. And again, if you're having problems, just directly message Carrie.

Ooh, so it looks like lots of people on here are very similar to me, where maybe you thought a bit about power over and power with. Those are the two I had thought of the most before. Power

to seems new to quite a few people, and power within seems like a new concept to lots of people. So I'm glad I went into the jewels of power on that one.

All right, let me clear this and then ask you another question. Which of these types of power have you experienced or seen in the past month? Can you think of examples of any of these in the past month? And obviously, you can write more than one because you might have experienced one, two, three, or four of them.

So we have things showing up across the board, lots of power over, but a lot of people also saying power with, power to, and power within. So that is wonderful to see. Oh, shall I just wrap it up?

I'm going to clear this, and then I'm going to talk about the last step in how we take this work and turn it into actions. So remember we talked about first assessing the context, then reflecting on our own contributions, and then selecting actions. So we went through. I talked about these different pieces that you do to assess the context. Then we talked a lot about what is impacting trust-- that's the Trust Trifecta-- and what contributes to power. Those are those dimensions of power.

Now I'm going to jump all the way ahead to say, OK, what actions can you actually take to develop an action plan if you are trying to build a trusting relationship and deal with the power dynamics at play? So I am going to screen share this tool that we built based exactly for this.

And so, in fact, this tool used to live inside of a course. But we recently pulled it out in the month of January and made it free and publicly available so that anyone can use it because we are hearing that so many people wanted to use it in their work. I'm going to stop sharing that and bring you over here.

So this is the Cultiv8 tool. And so I'm going to scroll down here, click to start. I want to show you how it works. And in the Cultiv8 tool, you have the option of looking at the actions you might take to build trust and actions you might take to deal with power. I'm going to just show you how it works and give you a couple of examples. And you could go and explore the tool on your own.

So imagine you're in a situation. And you're like, ooh, I would love to build trust. We were talking about authenticity earlier. But I'm struggling to imagine what authenticity looks like at an organizational level because I work in an organization, and we're trying to collaborate with another organization.

So you might click on Authenticity. And here, you have the option of thinking about actions you might take if you're trying to build trust at an individual level or at an organizational level. So imagine you want to build trust at an organizational level-- might go in here.

And it gives you some actions, not an exhaustive list. There are absolutely more things you could do, but some things we have found in the literature that you could use to express authenticity and build authenticity, like cultivating a values-based shared purpose, talking about organizational values out loud, developing confidentiality agreements, so lots of different examples of what you could do at an organizational level to build trust.

I'm just going to jump back and give you one more trust example. Imagine you want to build trust and really foster connection with someone else. You're thinking, ooh, the connection, I think, is the thing that would be really helpful. You might say, ooh, I want to do that at an individual level. What are things that I might be able to do to do that?

So you could go-- there's a big, long list here. And it has lots of things that you're probably already doing, maybe practicing active listening, acknowledging people's ideas and contributions. One of my favorites is making sure we're using a person's name when communicating orally or in writing and spelling and/or pronouncing it correctly. My colleague's name is Sobia Khan, S-O-B-I-A, and it is misspelled in emails to her in response to emails she has sent on a weekly basis.

And every time it happens, I cringe because I'm like, this person is not building a trusting relationship. It makes me question and judge them in the same way that when people misspell my name, the same thing happens. And so I think that's just such a beautiful example of a simple thing we can do that actually helps establish connection. And I'm sure if anyone has a name that is misspelled or mispronounced. You know what I'm talking about.

From there, you might also say, OK, that's great about trust, but I actually think power is the thing we really want to think about. I'm going to go think about actions related to power. And I'm going to imagine-- OK, I'm going to imagine you're like, ooh, we feel powerless. We are interested in building a claimed space. What does that look like?

So you might come in here, pick Claimed spaces, and here are some actions you might take if the goal is to create a claimed space. And so it talks about some of the different things you might do.

And I also want to flag at the bottom we've highlighted how trust and power are related. So you might click here. And it says, ooh, here's some food for thought. When you're thinking about spaces of power, here are pieces related to trust that might be important. For example, when engaging in different spaces of power, it's really important to show up authentically.

So hopefully, that was helpful in giving you a bit of an overview and preview of some of the different ways that you can think about trust and power and the actions that you can take. So

I'm going to stop sharing that and just highlight-- I'm going to leave us lots of time to have questions and discussion. Let me go back to sharing slides.

So just a really quick flag that all of the content I pulled today is from this larger course called Cultivating Trust and Navigating Power. And so it kind of goes in great depth. But you have access to these slides. You can see all of these things. And that tool is free and available for anyone.

And this is technically part of our larger certificate program. In fact, there's level 1 that's currently available. And this course and all these pieces are level 2 because it's kind of advanced knowledge on implementation for people who are interested in the level that this is at. But we know that trusting relationships is such an important part of building implementation work, building collaborations, building partnerships, that we know that a lot of people are struggling with all of those pieces.

So with that, I actually want to open it up to any questions, reflections that people have. And as was mentioned at the beginning, I think that people are allowed to come on video and off mute if they would like. Is that true, Kathleen?

KATHLEEN MURPHY: I am not sure. Shoshana, is that possible?

SHOSHANA RABINOVSKY: Yep, that's correct.

KATHLEEN MURPHY: OK.

JULIA MOORE: OK, so I'm going to stop sharing because I want to see bigger things. So wonderful. So Rosman has a question. "Can you give us an example of how you've used this in an implementation project?" Absolutely. Let me give you two examples.

So someone had reached out to me. In fact, this was part of the inspiration to make this freely available to someone. And she said, I have just joined a new organization. And there are crazy power dynamics at play that I don't totally understand what's happening. Yeah, like don't totally understand what's happening.

And she had already taken the course and had gone through all these things. And I said, well, how about you sit down, map out all the different people or departments that you're thinking about, and start thinking about, OK, well, what are the dynamics that are currently at play? What type of what types of trust already exist? And what might be the power dynamics? Like, who holds visible power? Who holds invisible power? Who holds hidden power? And are decisions being made behind closed doors or in open spaces?

And so as she started mapping this out, she started noticing different places where it felt like there were avenues or opportunities to better get in and understand and better build relationships with people within the organization. And so she used it that way.

The other place I just saw someone talk about using it is they literally are having challenges reaching out to a community organization. And they literally mapped out, OK, what do we already know about our relationship? And what actions could we take to directly reach out to that organization?

And one of the big actions they realized is they were asking the community organization to come into their space to meet instead of physically going to the community organization or finding more neutral ground. And so it was an example of where they used it to think differently about how they were engaging with and approaching the community. So I hope that is helpful, Rosman. Steve, it looks like you have a question or thought.

AUDIENCE: Yeah, thanks so much. I found your presentation very exciting and on track for me. My question, really-- I'm an advocate for injured and disabled workers and have been active for 30, 40 years, really interacting with government. But we've seen on the political side that there's really this polarization. So it's hard to even start building the relationship if someone won't talk to you and won't meet with you. And I'm wondering, in a situation like that, how do you kind of break through that ice?

JULIA MOORE: So think that's really hard. I think that a couple of different thoughts I have-- so one is sometimes I think it's important to understand-- so this is not your example, but I think it's a related example that might be helpful, and then I'll have one maybe closer to yours-- is someone was working-- I was working with someone who was working in Australia with Indigenous communities there. And she was having a lot of problems engaging.

And I brought to her the-- I highlighted that it isn't about you. It's about historical relationships that have come for hundreds of years before you that you are trying to overcome in this situation. And so I think starting with a place that recognizing like, that's not what's happening here. So that's kind of my first piece. And I think that's a little different than yours but probably related to some of the pieces.

The second part is I think that it's figuring out if it is very hard to even enter the beginnings of a relationship, to have the first conversation, there's science that shows people are more likely to believe someone who believes things that are close to their belief system. So I would look for people who seem closer to the audience you are trying to reach out to so that you can leverage people who are better able to enter different spaces that some people might not be able to

enter. And when we can do that, that's a great example of lending power to someone else to help build and foster a relationship. And so that's, I think, the place that I would go.

And then the other thought is I think that a huge challenge with the polarization is the deep sense of judgment that people are feeling and experiencing. And when people feel a sense of judgment or fear the possibility of judgment, it is very easy to close down doors. And so I think highlighting the lack of judgment as early as possible is another thing that can be helpful.

AUDIENCE: Thank you so much.

JULIA MOORE: Yep. But that's a super challenging question, Steve. I don't know if there's a good answer.

Jackie asks, "The difference between power with and power to?" So great question. So interestingly, in my experience, they've often actually happened together. They don't always happen together, but they often happen together. Power with is like saying, we, with another organization, are doing something together. Like, it's a very power with another person, another group. So it's very-- collaboratively, we are trying to build power and move things.

Power to is often very focused on an action that people are taking. So let me give you an example. So we at the Center for Implementation have just partnered with another group called the Society for Implementation Research. We have shared vision, shared mission.

So we are trying to do power with each other, but we don't actually have a literal action item we're trying to take. We're saying, hey, you guys have an audience. And you are doing a thing, or we're doing a thing, and they seem very connected. And we love the work that we're each doing.

Power to is like saying, hey, we are working on this initiative. We want to move the needle on this initiative. How about we lend power to someone else or someone else lends power to us in order to move this work forward? But as you can see, those are fairly often closely connected to each other.

Yeah, "lending each other power when collaboratively moving forward." Thank you, Kathleen. So I don't know if that helps, Jackie, because I feel like it's like they're connected but slightly different.

KATHLEEN MURPHY: Thanks, Julie. Yeah, and I just wanted to clarify, I was just going back to your presentation and putting in-- in case people didn't quite remember what that was. It's not me defining those terms for you.

JULIA MOORE: Yeah, perfect. Thank you, yeah. Yeah, and exactly, Jackie. They seem close. I think that there are-- it's like one of those things where we're trying to pull from the actual literature. And so this is based on research from Powercube that uses those distinct terms. But in practice, a lot of the things might overlap, especially depending on the nature of the work that you might be doing. Any other thoughts, questions, reflections?

KATHLEEN MURPHY: Let me see if anybody has their hands raised. We did have some questions from registrants--

JULIA MOORE: Yeah.

KATHLEEN MURPHY: --we could turn to. So one of them is-- a lot of questions, but I wanted to focus-- you've talked about the importance of power, and that can play out in different ways, right? There can be power imbalances for different reasons. So someone is interested specifically when the imbalance is related to academic researchers and nonacademics. So, "As a researcher, how do you handle power hierarchies and imbalances? What can you do to create a safe space for nonacademic partners to voice for their contributions?"

JULIA MOORE: Such a good question. OK, so the first thought I have is I think that lots of times-- so in that situation, people often don't realize the power that we hold. We all have a tendency to actually believe we have a lot less power than we typically have. I think it's the reason that the idea of power within is often the one that is newest to people because most people think that others hold and wield power over us. Sometimes I jokingly say that the only people who might not feel that way are extreme narcissists because, otherwise, we all have someone who feels like they hold some kind of power over us.

And so when we step back and realize-- say you are an academic researcher, and you're working with nonacademics or community partners. You actually, in other people's eyes, might hold a large amount of perceived power. And the first thing is the act of recognizing and acknowledging that, I think, is really important because we don't often think that way. And we aren't trained to think that way.

And if you have more perceived, power more visible power, or hidden power, it actually gives us the opportunity to do things like show up authentically first. So it is easiest for the person with the most power to show up authentically first because a person with less power is often much more fearful.

So if you even think about a boss and their employee dynamic, if the boss shows up more authentically first, it then becomes easier for the employee to do that. But the flip is very, very difficult. Similarly, showing up and saying, ooh, I'm not going to be judgmental, and showing and

expressing and doing actions that convey that can be really, really powerful, for example, in that space.

The other thing I think that's helpful in building trust in that kind of dynamic is to really understand, Well, what is it that might make people hesitant to show up and believe and-- that other people are to have that trusting relationship? And so I think that that's why we have all of this deep-reflection part before we get to the actions. And I'll admit, lots of people just want to jump to the actions.

But it's like, you have to do the deep reflection and understand where people are coming from and which things might be challenging for them in trusting people or in not being worried that power is going to be wielded over them in a situation. So I think that's really hard, Kathleen, but that's my first thought.

KATHLEEN MURPHY: Absolutely, yeah. And so we have-- I mean, you did a great job of addressing interpersonal power dynamics and interorganizational power dynamics. And Marie Tyler is pointing out that-- well, kind of implicit in her question is those organizational ties are forged by people, right? And so when there are people transitions, which are inherent in organizations and groups, do you have any suggestions about how to anticipate that they might-- maybe there is going to be staff turnover early on in relationships and partnerships to promote the sustainability of that trust and relationship at the organizational level?

JULIA MOORE: Yeah, so I think that's really important, especially right now, where it feels like a lot of organizations are having a lot of transitions. I don't know if everyone's experiencing that, but we've been seeing a lot of that. So I think a couple of things are, one, recognizing if the-- we trust people even if it is interorganizationally at a personal level. Like, that is the reality of how humans interact.

So if there is change, then you're going to have to spend time to rebuild that personal relationship between people. Hopefully, the personal relationship has created enough of an organizational or interorganizational relationship that that becomes easier because the groundwork is there, right? Like, if you think of the tower of trust, there's-- this foundational piece is like, ooh, this organization typically isn't going to do terrible things. So probably the new person they're hiring isn't going to be terrible either.

But think that really explicitly building that out and making time and doing actions that help build that-- my colleague Sobia has this great example of people working in schools, where someone wouldn't let her-- she was in a school district. She was trying to get into the school, but she was at the district level. And the school literally was like, nope, nope, nope, nope, nope.

And one day, they had an event. And they said, sure, fine. Show up to the event. But we're doing the event. We won't talk to you, but you can come if you want. And she came and shredded chicken for tacos for the entire afternoon, just sat there shredding chicken, helping serve shredded chicken to people. And the next day, they emailed her and said, OK, fine, now we're ready to talk, because they wanted to know she was genuinely going to show up bidirectionally here. And so I think that it's building time and factoring that in, which we often don't do sometimes in our work.

KATHLEEN MURPHY: But I guess I'm also wondering, What do you see as the pros and cons, particularly if we're talking about interorganizational relationship, of having formal memoranda of understanding or written-down meeting norms? Do you think that that helps to build trust? Or does it come across as too formal and confining?

JULIA MOORE: That's a great question. So I actually feel like it really depends. We were just talking with a group where we're like, yep, we think we want to build like a memorandum and have this formally written up because it is an official partnership. And we want to write that up and make sure that everyone understands, especially as you have transitions.

But I think sometimes that does not seem appropriate given the nature of the relationship. So I think it's really dependent on the nature of the relationship and the nature of the organizations. And often, the bureaucracy is involved in those and stuff like that. So I think it depends. But if you think about whether or not something like that will foster trust or erode trust, I think that that's what's really helpful.

And is it the group with more power that is asking for that or the group with less power? Because I think if the group with less power asks for that, then the answer is definitely yes. If the group with more power asks for it, then it feels sometimes like maybe it's a wielding-power-over situation.

KATHLEEN MURPHY: Mhm, that's a good point. Yeah.

[INTERPOSING VOICES]

JULIA MOORE: Sorry.

[INTERPOSING VOICES]

JULIA MOORE: That answered your question? Great. Another question, yeah.

AUDIENCE: Thanks, yeah. And I had to join this webinar about five minutes late. So I may have missed if you said this at the beginning. I apologize if so. I'm just curious if you could speak

about the impetus for the development of this tool, and if there were gaps that you were identifying, and how you went about making those observations.

JULIA MOORE: Yeah, so I'm trained as an implementation scientist. And so I've been doing years and years of theories, models, and frameworks, and implementation science. And people were like, that's great, Julia. But I can't even implement things because we have these relationship problems or these power dynamic problems. And how do I deal with that? So literally, it was just constant questions about that. That was the impetus.

And when we started researching, we first went to the implementation science literature, and there was nothing. There's a couple articles since then. But at the time, there was nothing, nothing, nothing. And so we had to go far afield to find these things, from things that other people think about, like Brené Brown. Her BRAVING, which is one of her trust things, informed the Trust Trifecta. Harvard Business Review had a whole bunch of stuff.

But then we started going down lots of other rabbit holes of trust and power. The Powercube is a great place. So it was just a pulling of lots of different strings, let's say, to weave together how power and trust factor in. But it was definitely not one-- there was no one field we could find that talked power and trust.

AUDIENCE: Thank you.

KATHLEEN MURPHY: Julia, do you see other-- I'm trying to see if there's any hands raised. Does anyone else-- OK.

I was wondering if you could talk more about how we're thinking about power here, because what I'm hearing is the importance of roles and individual characteristics. And did you think about and choose not to tie this tool more to theories about intersectionality and social structures, more collective identities, say, akin to when you were talking about the Native American-- not the Native Americans, the Indigenous people in Australia? Or do you find this just a more productive ...

JULIA MOORE: Sorry, can you repeat? I don't know if you froze for a moment. Sorry, Kathleen. Can you repeat? You froze for a moment for me, and so I want to make sure I got ...

KATHLEEN MURPHY: Oh, I'm so sorry. We only have a few minutes left, and this is giant question. But I'm wondering in what ways you tie the tool to broader social structures that give power.

JULIA MOORE: That's a good question. So we, our audience, the people we talk to most of the time, are people who would say-- we like to think of like, live in the middle. They're almost never

the people at the top who hold a lot of classic traditional power. And they are rarely the people feeling right at the bottom. They're often feeling in the middle, whether that is researchers, whether those are middle managers, whether those are change agents, whatever they are.

And so our focus was not on thinking about the larger structures that they're living in, but more like, How can we support people who often feel stuck in the middle to think differently about trust and power, given this kind of stuck-in-the-middle-ness of their roles that they often feel?

And because we are topic agnostic and country agnostic, because we have people from around the world, in fact, after North America, I think we have more people from Africa than-- is our second most common country. Like, huge numbers of people from Uganda and stuff using these tools. And so we want to make sure things apply across contexts, across topics.

So in my mind, everything needs to be tailored to people's own context in which they're living. That's why there's all these options, but not all those things are appropriate or relevant depending on who you are or where you're living and all those different pieces.

KATHLEEN MURPHY: That makes sense. Yeah, you can definitely map your tool to things that people tie in with discussions of intersectionality and diversity, equity.

JULIA MOORE: Exactly, exactly.

KATHLEEN MURPHY: OK. We really are going to have to end because our accommodation support people have hard stops at the top of the hour. And I just want to say, thank you, Julie. This is really fascinating, really interesting, and has such broad application to, I think, a lot of people's work and lives, whether or not they're involved in an implementation project.

JULIA MOORE: Awesome. Well, thank you so much for having me. Super exciting to meet all of you. Thank you, everyone, for your engagement today.

KATHLEEN MURPHY: And thanks to our funder NIDILRR, the National Institute on Disability, Independent Living, and Rehabilitation Research. Have great afternoons, everyone.

JULIA MOORE: Thank you.