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Questions to Recognize and Move Out of Reactivity

Reflect: Recognize and move out of reactivity

- Recognize reactivity.
  - How am I/are others in reactivity? (Consider thoughts, feelings, behaviors.)
  - What are the triggers?
  - How have I and they leapt to assumptions, judgment, blame, or interpretations?
  - Where am I holding on to certainty about my views?
  - How am I contributing to the problem(s)?

- Clarify your intentions for results and relationships.
  - What are my business/quality vision and goals?
    - For the situation.
    - For my next conversation in this situation.
  - What kind of relationship(s) am I trying to build?
    - For the situation.
    - For my next conversation in this situation.

- Get in their shoes.
  - Why would well-intentioned, reasonable people act this way?

- Prepare.
  - Think through the questions for Dialogue.
  - Am I ready to let go of certainty that there is one way of looking at things?
  - Am I ready to both state my perceptions AND be curious about and seek out what others have to say?
  - Have I reviewed how roles and power differentials may impact dialogue and decision making?
  - Have I reframed my goals and intentions in a way that can promote dialogue?
Ladder of Inference

As humans, we are hard-wired to leap to assumptions in ways which create tension with others, especially under the pressure of stress and complex problems.

This hard-wiring derives from ancient parts of the brain which evolved early on to generate automatic survival reactions—flight, fight, or freeze.

Difficulties in modern social situations can activate these pathways and drive us in nanoseconds, outside of our awareness, to faulty interpretations not infrequently accompanied by strong emotions.

This happens to everyone. We cannot stop our brains from this quick process. But, we can modify it. One way is through stopping, even for a few seconds, to observe the mind.

The Ladder of Inference (1, 2) is a tool to make visual these rapid movements of the mind and help us pause for reflection before we take action. The bottom rung of the ladder represents all the observable data in a situation. Our hard-wiring leads to rapid selection of part of the data, then "up the ladder" to judgments or assumptions, and finally to conclusions and action at the highest rung. Such actions are at risk for being unproductive or counterproductive for work relationships and problem solving.

The Ladder can be divided into as many as 7 or more steps to represent schematically the brain's information processing. There is not one right number of steps. I use four because that is all I can remember in the midst of conflict which is when I use the tool to mentally orient myself. In the example shown above, my brain causes me to get very negative about a colleague, Chris.

- **At the bottom rung is all observable data** I could consider from my working relationship with Chris or even just for this one day.
- **At the next higher rung, the brain selects data out of this pool.** This day, Chris is late to a meeting and does not apologize. Because this has happened before and/or because I am particularly sensitive that day, my brain immediately focuses on that one piece of data.
- **From selected data, the brain moves to judgments, assumptions, and opinions**—i.e. making meaning out of the selected data. In this case, I assume Chris is totally disengaged and not committed to the team.
- **At the highest point of the ladder are conclusions and actions.** I am gripped by my interpretations to the point that I don't think I can work with Chris. Or, I might withdraw...
from him, disrupting the flow of work between us. Or I might publicly attack him for his "bad attitude" (an interpretation which has not been checked out).

If we keep the ladder in mind in the midst of conversations, we can step back to observe our own thinking. We can shift to asking ourselves questions which move our thinking back to data and experience opening us to more choices for communication and action. We can ask:

- What am I thinking?
- What interpretations and judgments have I made?
- On what data am I basing these conclusions?
- What is my reasoning?
- What other data am I not considering?
- What else could be going on?
- What other interpretations are possible here?

I can then use these same questions with others if I sense they have moved up the ladder. Research from Gervase Bushe (3) suggests that about 80% of conflicts at work occur because people have not checked out their experiences with each other--i.e. moving down the ladder with each other to share observed data and experience. When such sharing does occur, the conflict often either goes away or the issues are entirely different from what was expected.

Though simple in concept, asking questions and sharing experience in this way can be demanding because we may be gripped by strong emotion or the stakes may feel high or we might have a strong need to be "right" at that moment. Then it can be hard to own our contribution to the tension. Slowing down to reflect can require a good deal of self-regulation of emotion and thought.

The Ladder of Inference reminds us to treat our strongest conclusions as just theories to be tested. Our first conclusions are all too likely to put us at risk for becoming part of the problem.

References: “Ladder of Inference”

1. Attributed to Chris Argyris and Donald Schon. See a brief history of the development of the Ladder of Inference in Smith, Diana Mclain The Elephant in the Room 2011, pgs. 275 - 276
2. Thanks to the American Academy on Communication in Healthcare for the Ladder of Inference image.
3. Bushe, Gervase Clear Leadership, Davies-Black, Nicholas Brealey Publishing 2010
Questions for Dialogue

Dialogue: Sustain two-way conversations

- So far, have we used the principles of dialogue in our conversations?
- Who will I talk with next?
- What will be my goals for the immediate task/issue and for the relationship in my next conversation?
- How will I incorporate the principles of dialogue in our next conversation?

Principles\(^1\)

- State intentions.
  - Explicitly set aside decision making in order to explore all viewpoints and assure mutual understanding without debating.
  - Explain what you hope for with the issue/tasks at hand and for the quality of work relationships you would like to build.
- Build understanding of each participant’s aims and challenges.
- Seek to clarify mutual aims/interests (vs. debating positions).
- Generate multiple options for action.
- Throughout, use cycles of active listening, active telling, and checking understanding.

\(^1\)Based on Fisher et al *Getting to Yes: Negotiating Agreement Without Giving In* 2014
Don’t wait. Apply practices for dialogue in every conversation.

Eliciting and managing different perspectives is very important.

In complex systems, no one person or group has sufficient information and perspective to accurately define problems or to design the most creative and effective solutions.

One right answer rarely exists. Different perspectives must be brought together through high quality communication.

Also, the best results arise when people decide to do work out of desire and interest, or intrinsic motivation, as opposed to compliance. Intrinsic motivation arises not through being convinced but through being able to talk about the work and its rationale and contribute to solutions.

But, such open and widely distributed talk about different viewpoints and concerns is very hard to do.

The complexity, pressures, and high stakes of daily life in organizations result in a strong drive to quickly come up with answers to problems. This can shut off adequate communication and cause misdirection, errors, conflict, and passive compliance all of which can hurt results.

Dialogue is a method to elicit different perspectives and manage them skillfully.

**Definition of dialogue**
Open, honest conversation which **elicits** commonalities and differences and manages them skillfully to:

- discover what is important to each participant;
- find mutual definitions of problems, mutual goals, creative solutions, and shared commitment for action;
- maintain feedback about what is working and not working in order to sustain progress.

**Key practices for dialogue:***(see additional resource below)*

- Explicitly keep separate the times for dialogue and for decision making.
- Make explicit the intentions of dialogue (see above).
- Elicit different viewpoints and explore them. Avoid debates.
- Suspend certainty that there is one right perspective or solution.
Explore the underlying data and observations on which views are based.
Assure wide, balanced participation.
Avoid judgments and blame. Assume mutual contributions to problems.
Use cycles of active listening, active telling, and checking understanding.*

You can start to use these practices right now. Every conversation is an opportunity to advance mutual understanding and problem solving. The most important enabling factor for dialogue is the first practice—setting aside, on a temporary basis, the push to get to solutions in order to really listen to people.

Example 1: In complex systems, slowing down simply to ask questions is likely to progressively lead to more accurate definitions of problems, better solutions, and higher motivation. It is helpful to think of one dialogue about one issue as potentially spreading out over multiple interactions including even a 5 minute hallway conversation.

In your next hallway conversation or in a meeting with an individual or team, consider these questions:

- How are things going? What is working and not working?
- What do you care most about at work? What makes you most enthusiastic?
- How does this [e.g. change, project, problem] impact what you care most about?
- What are your biggest concerns right now?
- Do you have ideas about how we can mitigate those concerns?

Example 2: If you are in the middle of a conflict, ask if others could set aside the attempt to resolve it just to explore what each person is observing and experiencing. Being able to elicit and explore disagreements rather than debate them not infrequently leads to a whole new understanding of an issue entirely different from what was originally expected.

Make every conversation count toward involving people in identifying and solving problems that they care about.

*Additional Resource
Obtain more tools and references for dialogue in In-the-Moment Reminders for Dialogue available to subscribers only. Subscribe for free monthly articles and blogs by clicking on Subscribe.
Active Telling: the art of assuring people listen to you

The worst mistakes I made over 24 years as an organizational leader were how I told things to people.

I know excellent leadership depends on great listening—I was a natural with that. Each moment of listening is a step forward in building commitment.

But, early in my career, my way of telling too often led to pushback or withdrawal into silence—it was like three steps backwards with commitment.

A recipe for people not really listening
At that time, my strong need for success led to a need to convince people of my ideas. So, I worked hard to present ideas in a powerful and inspirational way, minimizing weaknesses and flaws. I was well-prepared to quickly counter any perceived limitations or risks.

The trouble was that people almost always had concerns—few organizational actions are risk-free. Too often, my quick retorts made them feel not listened to. This would provoke debate we could not resolve well or silent discontent which slowed or blocked the actions I wanted.

A paradox of skillful telling
As I sought research and advice about telling, I discovered that even the most inspirational speech is lucky if it gets even 20% of people on board! The large majority of people have to talk their way toward commitment in multiple conversations.

Paradoxically, people are more likely to pull together around an idea if they are able to freely express and explore concerns. Also, people need to be able to talk things over to figure out how an idea connects to what is important to them.

I even had to face the humbling reality that my best ideas had holes and flaws. In complex systems, no one person has the full picture and everyone has a perspective to learn from. It was very hard, but I gradually learned to link success with actually seeking out negative reactions.

A method for skillful telling
To tell effectively I first prepare myself by remembering “My best ideas are just theories to be tested and improved upon.” Then I proceed with a cycle of Ask-Tell-Ask (2):

• **Ask:** In a way appropriate to the situation, I ask permission to give my point of view. This is surprisingly powerful in facilitating openness and I have never had anyone refuse.

• **Tell:** I am careful to use "I" statements (i.e. “This is the way I am seeing things.”) as opposed to "This is the way things are."—another very simple but powerful method to convey there is not One Truth and that I will be interested in any reactions.
• **Ask**: I ask people what they heard me say through some form of summarizing or repeating back. Because this can feel awkward, I may explain how easy it is for us all to misinterpret each other. Also, I ask for reactions and summarize what I heard.

Several cycles of Ask-Tell-Ask get a lot out on the table. People are more likely to feel taken seriously. Concerns can get then converted into issues for problem solving and action.

**Risks and traps in active telling**

I call this approach *active telling* because, like active listening, it is two-way—the goal is to assure *mutual* understanding and exploration of ideas even if there is disagreement.

I have experienced first-hand several risks and traps. Watch out for the inevitable lure back into convincing others. Also, I have learned to be careful that helping others feel heard does not lead to premature abandonment or revision of my ideas. The reverse can happen—dealing with negativity can easily pull us all, at times, into getting more rigid and discounting feedback.

Human affairs are never perfect. There is no guarantee these methods mean people will really listen to you. But, the chances for getting to true commitment are much higher.

**Resources**

- The tool *In-the-Moment Reminder for Active Telling* is available for subscribers only. To obtain the link, subscribe for free monthly resources at [Subscribe](#).
- Once you subscribe, you will also receive a link to the expanded tool for dialogic leadership *In-the-Moment Reminders for Dialogue*.

**References**

(1) Baker, Neil *The Impact of a Visionary Speech*.

(2) Adapted from multiple sources including Miller, William R., Rollnick, Stephen *Motivational Interviewing* The Guilford Press 2012. See the tool on active telling for full list of references.
On Being Unconditionally Constructive

(Based on work from The Harvard Negotiation Project, especially the book by Roger Fisher and Scott Brown: Getting Together: Building Relationships as we Negotiate Penguin Books 1988)

Difficult interactions and conflict occur frequently in organizational life.

One common trap in such situations is to assume that if we act rationally, fairly, without blame, and with calm emotions, then others will or should automatically follow our lead with their behavior.

But, the stress of interpersonal difficulties causes everyone, at times, to fall into unproductive relational patterns. This can happen even when people have the best of intentions and skills. Starting with expectations that everyone will always act according to their best values puts us at substantial risk for disappointment or anger and then falling into our own problematic communication and behavior.

Even when we are able to achieve working together in a productive way, the chances are this capacity will fluctuate depending on the stress level.

*It is better to assume that, under stress, reciprocal good will and behavior usually require ongoing hard work if they do occur at all.*

**Being unconditionally constructive** is a powerful but highly demanding way to stay in a leadership role in tough interactions. It means always acting in ways that raise the chances of improving the ability to work together no matter what others do.

This practice does not guarantee agreement or shared values. It means that we try to find constructive ways to manage differences even if others are not.

**This practice is also not about how to be ‘good.’ It is about how to be effective.** (Fisher and Brown). There is not much chance for a very good outcome if all the participants in an interaction choose to fall victim to a contagion of counterproductive behavior.

**Key practices of being unconditionally constructive include:**

- Always look beyond the taking of fixed positions to find common interests.
- Always consider consulting with others before making any decisions.
- Always listen actively to others. Make sure they know you understand their views even if you disagree and even if they are critical of you.
• Always try to understand the observations and data on which others’ conclusions are based.
• Always sustain respect and accept others as worthy of consideration. Stay engaged.
• Always check your own stories and assumptions against observable facts and data.
• Always avoid attributing bad intentions to others even if their impact on you is negative.
• Always avoid blaming, judging, labeling, and expressing intense emotion.

Being unconditionally constructive does not mean abandoning what we care most about or giving in to placate or to be nice. In fact, a very important practice is to sustain clarity about our own goals, values, needs and concerns and also to communicate them clearly.

Being too quick to abandon or revise our best interests in reaction to the other party’s unconstructive behavior without careful reflection ends up being harmful to the partnership in the long run due to regret, frustration, or feelings of being coerced.

All difficult interactions present us with a choice. We can choose leadership through being unconditionally constructive and raise the chances for success as well as improving relationships. Or, we can abandon the leadership position and raise the chances of acting in destructive ways, making relationships more dysfunctional, and failing.
Having trouble motivating others?—a quick diagnostic

First reflect:

(1) **Check your theory of motivation.** "Having trouble motivating others?" is a trick question. You can't motivate others—at least if you want *intrinsic motivation* (defined as when people are fully willing and embrace a change out of interest and commitment).

   Adults make their own choices. Trying to coax or arm-twist is likely to cause them to withdraw or just comply which leads to poor outcomes in complex tasks. Intrinsic motivation arises through partnership and collaboration. People have to "talk their way" toward taking on a change. The leader's task is to create the environment for collaborative relationships which can support robust conversations about change.

(2) **Check your state of reactivity.** If you are impatient or frustrated, you are likely to be in a reactive state and at risk for coaxing and arm-twisting. Find a way to get curious about others—use the five factors listed below to guide your questions. Find your way to trusting and respecting different decision-making processes.

(3) **Check the context and state of relationships.** For example, if you have previously fallen into pressuring others to change, it will take time to build trust as you shift to a collaborative approach. What other factors in the environment are influencing consideration of a particular change?

After reflection:

(4) **Ask others questions to explore five factors for engagement with intrinsic motivation.**

**Understanding:**
- What is your understanding of the change?
- How would you describe it to someone else?

**Importance:**
- What is most important/meaningful for you at work? What makes you most enthusiastic about your work? (Ask "why" five times.)
- How could the change we are working on benefit what is most important to you?
- What is at risk for you if it does not go well? What are your concerns?

**Choice:**
- Is there a specific action which would be a good place for you to start?
- How do you want to participate in design and implementation?
Confidence:
- How confident are you that we can mitigate the risks of this change for you?
- How could we do that? What might you do?
- How confident are you that you can be successful?
- What are barriers?
- Is there a barrier that is most important to work on right now?
- What action might you test right now?
- What actions might help from me?
- What help and support do you need (e.g. coaching, consultation, training)?

Ongoing support:
- How will we know if things are going well or not?
- When will we meet next to check how things have gone?

When considering a change, motivation does not usually happen overnight. Even with the most charismatic, inspirational speech, you are lucky if you inspire no more than about 20% of people to action. Most people need ongoing conversations, individual consideration, and collaboration to take new directions.
Are flaws in decision-making processes causing conflict and poor alignment?—a quick diagnostic

Barriers to progress like lack of alignment or conflict that are difficult to resolve are fairly common. One seemingly quite logical interpretation is that the primary cause of such barriers is the way people are communicating.

But, problematic communication could be secondary to—a result of—flaws in decision-making processes. Such flaws may not be recognized as an important source of relational problems. When people then dive into discussions, they are at risk for having unexpressed concerns, differing views, and assumptions about how decisions will be made.

As a result, it is more difficult to sustain dialogue—a process of eliciting and assuring mutual understanding of differing ideas, opinions, and perceptions. Instead, due to the prevailing uncertainties, people are more likely to fall into debates, arm-twisting, coaxing, and pressuring which disrupt efforts to achieve alignment.

Identifying flaws in decision making and doing something about them can help significantly to shift a murky, entangled debate into a clear, effective process of dialogue.

Common decision-making errors include lack of clarity about: who has the authority to make the call; the type of decision being used; whether there will be input before and after decisions are made in order to address concerns; or if those impacted will be involved in the design of the implementation plan.

A quick diagnostic for flaws in decision making process (to support high quality dialogue):

- In this situation, is it clear who (person or group) has the authority to make the decision?
- Has that person or group identified the type of decision making to be used? (see brief descriptions below)
- Is there a clear timeline for the decision?
- Do people who are impacted and those who can contribute expertise have opportunities to give input? Have they been involved in creating a mutual definition of the problem?
- Has there been high quality dialogue prior to the decision with consideration of different options and the benefits and risks of each?
• Will there be opportunity to express reactions and address concerns about a decision after it is made?
• Will people be involved in designing the implementation plan for the decision?
• Will the person or group who made the decision engage in regular review of the quality, clarity, and effectiveness of decision making processes?

Types of decision making: (1)
The following two decision types mesh best with the objective of promoting high quality dialogue.

• In **consultative** decisions, a leader with the authority to do so makes the call after obtaining input through dialogue from those who will be impacted and those who have key knowledge and expertise.

• In **consensus**, a group of people make the call together. Consensus does not mean that the decision is everyone’s first choice but that everyone can *live with* the decision and *commit fully* to its success.

Additional decision types:

• In **authoritative** decision making, a leader with authority makes the decision without input. Dialogue about the decision after it is made is crucial to promote alignment and participation in implementation.

• **Majority vote** decision making, except where required in by-laws, is not generally recommended except in decisions of low importance (e.g. “Will we have lunch during the meeting?”)

Maintaining high quality dialogue while also maintaining clarity and quality of decision making processes is an important and nuanced balancing act. It takes art, skill, and ongoing, deliberate practice by individual leaders and by teams.

Reference
An Easily Missed Ingredient for High Team Performance.

One of the worst teams I’ve been part of was comprised of experts on facilitating teams. Our meetings were chaotic and unproductive as some experts got into intense debates without really listening to each other while some fell into silence.

I am embarrassed to say I participated in the mess. When we finally stopped to actually apply our team expertise to ourselves, we transformed and had great results. We did not eliminate all problems but we managed them much better.

What helped most in turning this team of experts around?

It became clear to us that we had overlooked defining and using team norms. Norms are ground rules or guidelines for how members communicate and behave with each other—like really listening to each other, exploring ideas instead of debating them, giving feedback without blame, assuring everyone’s involvement, and being clear about how decisions will be made.

Even if, like my experts, team members bring a lot of prior experience with norms, every team has to create them yet again. Norms gain their power through development in conversation.

Why are team guidelines about communication and behavior so important?

Team which do not define and use norms are at higher risk for falling into mediocre performance or failure. In a study of 120 senior leadership teams, only 21% were high performing and the factor most strongly associated with high performance was clarity and use of team norms—not brilliance in things like strategy, quality, or efficiency. (1)

Defining and using norms leads to better communication, problem solving, and conflict resolution all of which lead to both better results and higher quality work relationships. The latter enhances sustainability and team resilience.

Why is it so easy to overlook establishing adequate team norms?

- **Norms seem so basic and simple.**
  For my team of experts, needing to create and apply norms felt like being demoted from grad school to grade school. But, impressive credentials don’t protect anyone from the way our brains are hard-wired. At times, in anyone, stress activates ancient brain pathways for survival—for flight or flight. Socially, such activation may lead to strong emotions and fixed opinions or withdrawal into silence. Norms remind us we are human and we all make mistakes.

- **Teams with problems can appear to be doing just fine.**
Not all teams are like my team of experts in which lack of sufficient norms led to “noisy” signs like difficult conflict. It is not uncommon to see teams claim in meetings that they are getting along just fine. But, there are hallway conversations outside of meetings with complaining about problems that never get adequately addressed or about people some members feel are not behaving well. Yet these concerns are not raised in meetings. This is exactly what guidelines for communication and behavior should be designed to address.

- **Developing and using team norms is like learning a new language.**
  People have less confidence and experience talking about communication and behavior compared to technical issues like strategy or quality. Developing and using norms takes practice and trial and error as a team. In particular, it takes time and practice to define norms with enough behavioral specificity so that people can check to see if they are being followed.

  For example, compare “We need to feel safe.” to “When someone offers an idea we will always check understanding to make sure they feel heard.” Or, “When we give feedback we will avoid negative labels and be specific about the situation and behaviors we have observed. We will own observations as perceptions and not The Truth and check out each other’s perceptions.”

- **Ongoing feedback is required for making progress and it is uncomfortable.**
  Some teams, like my team of experts, turn around very quickly once they define and use norms. More often it takes ongoing feedback to steadily improve alignment of communication and behavior with those norms. Naturally, this raises concerns about embarrassment--feedback is uncomfortable. But it gets less so with steady and frequent practice.

  Feedback is facilitated by making explicitly clear that it is not about “bad behavior.” Getting off track from norms can happen to anyone at any time no matter how long a team has worked together. Feedback is about helping people be at their best. Leaders help greatly by modeling feedback including inviting it about themselves.

- **Changing habits of behavior is hard.**
  Team norms are not useful unless they are used. And that requires changing habits which is usually hard no matter how simple the new behaviors seem to be. For example, in my team of experts, we had to work hard to assure time at the end of meetings to ask: “What is working and not working in our communication based on our norms?” Also, we had to work to remember to check in during meetings to ask about specific norms--e.g. “Do you feel heard?”

**Transform team problems into learning and creativity.**
Strong evidence links quality of team experience to better results, resilience, and sustainability. Norms are the rudder to maintain the desired team experience. I am humbled by how easy it is, even for experts, to neglect norms. By remembering this aspect of our humanness, I am better at helping myself and others transform team problems into learning and creativity.
In-the-Moment Reminder for Team Norms

The most effective team norms are not copied from someone else’s list but are developed by each team using its preferred language and prioritization of what is most important.

So, this "reminder" is not meant to be taken to use as is. Instead, it is intended to offer guidance to facilitate getting started on your own list of norms. It is derived from the components of high quality dialogue. More extensive information and references about dialogue can be found in the resource In-the-Moment Reminders for Dialogue available for subscribers—see link on page 1.

Two additional articles also provide useful background about norms: Teamwork as perpetual feedback; and Vulnerability, results, and leadership.

If you have questions, please contact me at neil@njbaker.net.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selected components of high quality dialogue</th>
<th>Examples of norms based on components of high quality dialogue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Explicitly keep separate the times for dialogue and for decision making.</td>
<td>• Our ideal is to develop mutual understanding of what is important to each of us, mutual definition of problems, and mutual commitment to solutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Make explicit the intentions of dialogue.</td>
<td>• We will assure that everyone feels listened to and understood even when there is disagreement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Elicit different viewpoints and explore them. Avoid debates.</td>
<td>• We will explicitly check understanding to assure people feel heard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Suspend certainty that there is one right perspective or solution.</td>
<td>• We will seek out differences in viewpoints to come to the best, most creative solutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Explore the underlying data and observations on which views are based.</td>
<td>• We will explore the underlying data and observations on which opinions or ideas are based.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assure wide, balanced participation.</td>
<td>(see next page)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Avoid judgments and blame. Assume mutual contributions to problems.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use cycles of active listening, active telling, and checking understanding.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(see next page)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selected components of high quality dialogue</th>
<th>Examples of norms based on components of high quality dialogue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- When there is conflict, we will assure each point of view is heard and explored rather than get into debates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- We will suspend certainty about our own ideas and opinions. There is no one truth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- When we give our ideas or feedback we will use “I” statements and own our statements as our perceptions and not The Truth. We will seek other viewpoints.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- We will not judge or blame. We will assume mutual contributions to problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Feedback will be given through referring to specific words, situations, and behaviors rather than using global terms (e.g. “You were late 15 minutes today.” as opposed to “You are unmotivated and disorganized.”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- At the end of meetings we will check in to see what worked well and what did not well about our interactions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- We will be explicit about when and how a decision will be made.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Selected References to Support Transformational Leadership

My current top eleven books to support transformational leadership

- Buckingham, Marcus, Coffman, Curt First Break All the Rules: What the World's Greatest Managers Do Differently Simon and Schuster, 1999
- Connor, Daryl R. Managing at the Speed of Change Villad Books, 1999
- Oakley, Ed, Krug, Doug Enlightened Leadership: Getting to the Heart of Change Key to Renewal, Inc. 1991
- Scholtes, Peter The Team Handbook Joiner Associates Consulting Group, 1989

Selected References

Leadership

1. Bushe, Gervase Clear Leadership: sustaining real partnership and collaboration at work Nicholas Brealey Publishing, 2009
8. Maurer, Rick Beyond the Wall of Resistance Bard Press, 2010


**Leadership and adult development**


**Engagement and motivation**

7. Thomas, Kenneth _Intrinsic Motivation at Work_ Berrett Koehler Publishers Inc., 2009

**Issues of power, positional authority, and decision making**


**Communication and team building**

3. Doyle, Michael, Straus, David _How to Make Meetings Work!_ Berkley Books, 1976
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