

Dan Oestreich

Oestreich Associates



UNFOLDING
LEADERSHIP
THROUGH
SELF-KNOWLEDGE

Team Trust Survey



Team Trust Survey

Instructions for taking the survey	1
Scoring the survey	5
Five levels of team trust	6
Commentary on survey results	9
Intervention strategies.....	10
Where do low trust groups come from?.....	12
What facilitates trust?	13
About Dan Oestreich	14

Instructions: *Focus on a specific team of people. This may be a group that you lead, participate in, or are trying to help in some way.*

For each of the six questions, first read through all five statements (A, B, C, D, and E), carefully noting the differences between them. Rate the statement that most accurately mirrors this team's behavior as "5".

Then, for the same question, rate one of the remaining statements – the one that is next most like your team -- a "4." Similarly, rate the other statements, "3", "2" and "1" for each question, with "1" meaning the statement is least like the team in question.

When rating the five alternative statements, use each whole number only once. That is, for each question, there will be one statement rated "5," one rated "4," one rated "3," "2," and "1."

Very important: rate according to how team members actually behave, NOT how they should behave or would like to believe they behave.

Question 1: Feedback to Team Members	Question 2: Personal Openness
<p>_____A. There is a general expectation people will get along and work out their differences. However, when emotional issues, conflicts, or performance problems arise, they often end up being handled behind the scenes by the group leader, who is expected to create a positive work environment.</p> <p>_____B. In private one-on-one meetings group members are willing to give each other and the leader difficult, honest feedback and to fully work through personal/professional differences. Members can apologize to one another for problems and misunderstandings in private.</p> <p>_____C. Constructive discussion of another member's ineffective behavior or performance can be initiated <i>in team meetings</i> by anyone -- with the individual present and participating in an honest, non-defensive conversation. If appropriate, members apologize for problems publicly. People are uniformly truthful and caring in their feedback.</p> <p>_____D. Hostile, disruptive, highly emotional or retaliatory behaviors are rationalized as reasonable or necessary by group members or the leader. People do not believe the problems can be fixed without one or more individuals (perhaps the leader) leaving the group permanently.</p> <p>_____E. Criticism and blame among group members or by the leader sometimes leaks into group interactions through sarcasm, "zingers," humor with an edge, or subtle put-downs. People are confused by and uncomfortable with this behavior.</p>	<p>_____A. The team is on a journey toward greater openness. Members, including the leader, are willing to ask for personal feedback in a group setting (e.g., about communication style or personal mistakes they've made in their work) and others are willing to give feedback in a supportive, accurate manner. This may be part of a formal or facilitated process.</p> <p>_____B. Group members walk out of meetings or simply refuse to meet because conflicts have become destructive and "too personal."</p> <p>_____C. Group members maintain positive professional decorum and rapport. Meetings primarily stay task-focused. Personal growth or team relationships are rarely topics for group discussion and may be considered too "touchy-feely" or unrelated to the work to warrant the group's time or attention.</p> <p>_____D. Various background alliances seem to be operating so that some members, including the leader, may be undermined, ganged up on, or otherwise subject to conscious or unconscious power plays. People tend to be closed and careful in team meetings.</p> <p>_____E. As a natural, normal part of the everyday flow of interactions, members (including the leader) share their personal leadership and professional development challenges in an open, vulnerable way, and receive concrete assistance, ideas, guidance, and support from other team members.</p>

Question 3: Leadership and Decision-Making	Question 4: Collaboration
<p>_____A. The group is very effective “leading itself” with members taking full, shared responsibility for performance and trust levels. The group effectively manages its internal conflicts, as well as conflicts with other teams, while the formal leader typically takes only a strategic guidance role.</p> <p>_____B. Background criticism of the leader for his/her actions or inaction is common and sometimes unsparring. Decisions take too long, go unsupported, or are undermined by members after group meetings.</p> <p>_____C. The group’s leader exerts normal control, authority, decision-making and coaching skills to assist the group stay on track, accomplish its goals, and create an environment in which each person can contribute.</p> <p>_____D. The group’s leader actively serves as a facilitator and coach, helping the group stay open, resolve internal conflicts, make good decisions, and get the most from its work together as it continues to grow and develop.</p> <p>_____E. One or more individuals in the group (including the leader) are scapegoats for deep-set problems that involve almost everyone in the group. Decisions are largely impossible because of side-taking and self-serving arguments.</p>	<p>_____A. Members habitually compete with one another and/or the leader to “be right” or to protect their interests and resources. Members frequently see others as having “hidden agendas.”</p> <p>_____B. Members work to coordinate their actions to efficiently reach common, project-based objectives and solutions. They put energy into searching out and sharing in win/win opportunities for mutual improvement while maintaining their distinctive roles.</p> <p>_____C. People, including the leader, retreat to embattled positions and are unable to compromise. Discussion itself is considered a win/lose proposition. People focus on survival, stockpiling or concealing resources.</p> <p>_____D. Members innovatively collaborate by breaking down role boundaries and actively pooling their resources (time, money, people, personal energies, equipment) in service to broad, shared goals and implementation of exciting changes. Members form lasting, indelible partnerships as colleagues.</p> <p>_____E. Group members do their part to cooperate with one another in order to fulfill their defined responsibilities. They focus on customer service and task completion while avoiding stepping on others’ toes in ways that might create conflict or disagreement.</p>

Question 5: Dealing with Tough Issues	Question 6: Appreciation and Affirmation
<p>_____A. All members of the group, not just the leader, are willing to bring up difficult, emotionally painful, or complex perceptions in a group meeting (including, for example, perceptions of betrayal or retaliation by anyone in the room), and to help constructively sort out the problems, including those he/she may have personally caused.</p> <p>_____B. When difficult issues involving relationships surface or leak into group discussion, group members including the leader settle them obliquely, indirectly, or through compromise and tend to do this quickly in order to avoid awkwardness or tension.</p> <p>_____C. Although it may create tension and frustration, group members are willing to work through difficult issues once someone has had the courage to place them on the table. The leader is the person who most often brings up such issues and calls them out as opportunities for improvement, but others may occasionally do this as well.</p> <p>_____D. Open, unresolved conflicts, mistrusts, and blaming overtake the group's ability to deal with the issues that demand its attention, even everyday ones that aren't very sensitive or interpersonally demanding.</p> <p>_____E. Group members do not consider the environment safe because of their background doubts about other members' motives and/or competence. People talk about many "undiscussables"* in the background but don't bring them up in meetings because they fear it will result in negative repercussions from other team members or the leader, or that it will simply do no good.</p>	<p>_____A. Members feel ignored, abused, or intimidated; the environment is focused on public punishment for mistakes, with the leader's own performance deeply tied to the perceived incompetence of team members.</p> <p>_____B. Members (including the leader) are committed to sharing in and helping each person best use their special talents and gifts <i>as a unique life path</i>. Supportive, gracious behavior includes actively complimenting and reminding one another of these "gifts" and personally intervening with support for any team member who slips into a stressed or self-protective mode.</p> <p>_____C. Members, including the leader, tend to focus more on what each other does <i>not</i> have or does <i>not</i> do than on their positive attributes. People attempt to use job titles, office amenities (such as a window seat), slight increases in pay or other perks to compensate for perceptions of low recognition or stature.</p> <p>_____D. All members take responsibility for knowing and expressing their own best talents and for showing respect for the special capabilities of others. Team members and the leader look out for one another and express pride in their team mates' accomplishments as well as their own.</p> <p>_____E. Members share in a feeling of general respect for the team, and especially those who are considered highly competent by virtue of their technical knowledge and/or time in place. Formal recognition for work performance is considered the province of the leader; recognition for social occasions, such as birthdays, baby showers, etc. are more a matter for the group.</p>

*An "undiscussable" is an issue that someone is hesitant to talk about with those who can do something about the problem.

Scoring: First transfer your scores to the *columns* for all questions. Be sure to correctly match your number scores to the letters in each column shown below. Then total each row, left to right.

Question 1	Question 2	Question 3	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6	Row Total
C:	E:	A:	D:	A:	B:	_____ = +2
B:	A:	D:	B:	C:	D:	_____ = +1
A:	C:	C:	E:	B:	E:	_____ = 0
E:	D:	B:	A:	E:	C:	_____ = -1
D:	B:	E:	C:	D:	A:	_____ = -2

Next transfer your Row Totals to the score boxes on the left side of the following pages. Once you have done this, *circle the box with the highest score*. The highest score shows the trust level at which your team typically operates: +2, +1, 0, -1, or -2. Based on “match strength” you can also decide whether your team operates very consistently at this level or operates on more than one trust level. The table above can help you look for categories where the team operates with a lower or higher trust level. (“Feedback to Team Members,” “Personal Openness,” etc., based on the number of the question.) Teams whose highest scores span more than one level often do so based on circumstance, the nature of the issues that are being handled, physical proximity of members, and many other issues.

Perceived Match Strength:

27-30: Strong Match	21-26: Good Match	15-20: So-so Match	9-14: Marginal Match	5-8: Not a Match
---------------------	-------------------	--------------------	----------------------	------------------

Team Trust Levels

Level +2

Score

Ideal: As a natural, normal part of the everyday flow of interactions, members (including the leader) share their personal, leadership, and professional development challenges in an open, vulnerable way and receive concrete assistance, ideas, guidance and support from their teammates. Members innovatively collaborate by breaking down role boundaries and actively pooling their resources (time, money, people, personal energies, equipment) in service to broad, shared goals and implementation of exciting changes. The group is very effective “leading itself” with members taking full, shared responsibility for performance and trust levels while the leader typically takes only a strategic guidance role. The group effectively manages its internal conflicts, as well as conflicts with other teams. Everyone is committed to sharing in and helping each person best use his or her special talents and gifts as a unique life path. Supportive, gracious behavior includes actively complimenting and reminding one another of these “gifts” and personally intervening with support for any team member who slips into a stressed or self-protective mode. Group trust is high enough that any member is willing to bring up difficult, emotionally painful, or complex perceptions in a group meeting, including perceptions of betrayal or retaliation by another in the room, and to help constructively sort out the problems, including those he/she may have personally caused. Constructive discussion of another member’s ineffective behavior or performance can be initiated in the group with the individual present and participating in an honest, non-defensive conversation. If appropriate, members apologize for problems and misunderstandings to the whole team publicly. Teammates form lasting, indelible partnerships with one another as colleagues.

Level +1

Score

High Functioning: The group is on a journey toward a higher level of openness. Group members are willing to give each other and the leader difficult feedback and to fully work through differences in private, one-on-one meetings, apologizing to one another for problems and misunderstandings if appropriate. In a group setting, although it may create tension and some frustration, once someone has had the courage to throw a difficult issue on the table, the group will do its best to work through it effectively. The leader may be the primary one to do this, but others may do this occasionally as well. Members are willing to ask for personal feedback in a group setting (such as communication style or about personal mistakes in their work) and others are willing to give feedback in a supportive, accurate manner. The team’s leader is largely a facilitator and coach, helping the group stay open, address conflicts, and get the most from its decisions and work together. Members work to coordinate their actions to efficiently reach common project-based objectives and actively search for mutually beneficial opportunities for improvement while maintaining their distinctive roles. All members take responsibility for knowing and expressing their own best talents and for showing respect for the special capabilities of others. Team members and the leader look out for one another and express pride in their team mates’ accomplishments as well as their own.

Level 0

Score

Traditional Practice: Group members maintain positive professional decorum and rapport with one another. Meetings primarily stay task-focused. Personal growth and team relationships are rarely topics for group discussion and may be considered too “touchy-feely” or unrelated to the work to warrant the group’s time and attention. There is a general expectation people will get along and work out their differences. However, when emotional issues, conflicts, or performance problems arise, they often end up being handled behind the scenes by the group leader, who is expected to create a positive work environment. If difficult relationship issues do come up in group discussion, they are usually handled obliquely, indirectly, or through compromise. Often this is done quickly to avoid too much awkwardness or tension from arising. Members are cooperative with one another in order to fulfill defined responsibilities. They focus on customer service and task completion while being careful not to step on one another’s toes in ways that might create conflict or disagreement. The leader exerts normal control, authority, decision-making and coaching skills to assist the group stay on track and accomplish its goals. Members share in the feeling of general respect for the team and especially those who are considered highly competent by virtue of their technical knowledge and/or time in place. Formal recognition for work performance is considered the province of the leader; recognition for social occasions, such as birthdays, baby showers, etc. are more a matter for the group.

Level -1

Score

Low Functioning: Group members do not consider the environment safe enough to share their real concerns in a group setting, often because these concerns include doubts about other members’ motives and/or competence. People talk about many “undiscussables” in the background but don’t bring them up in meetings because they fear it will result in negative repercussions from other team members or the leader, or that it will simply do no good. As a consequence, criticism, blame, or tension among group members sometimes leaks into group interactions through sarcasm, “zingers,” humor with an edge, or subtle put-downs. Various background alliances seem to be operating so some members, including the leader, may be undermined, ganged up on, or otherwise subject to conscious or unconscious power plays. People tend to be closed and careful in group meetings. They may habitually compete with one another to “be right” and protect or expand their turf. Members view one another as having “hidden agendas.” The leader may be frequently criticized for not remedying the situation but these criticisms, which can be unsparing, remain largely in the background. Decisions take too long, go unsupported, or are undermined by members after meetings. People tend to focus more on what each does *not* have or does *not* do than on their positive attributes. Members may attempt to use job titles, office amenities (such as a window seat), slight increases in pay or other perks to compensate for perceptions of low recognition or stature.

Level -2

Score

Disintegrating: The team is collapsing. Open, unresolved conflicts, mistrusts, and blaming exist in the group, with hostile, disruptive, extremely emotional or retaliatory behaviors rationalized as reasonable or necessary by group members or the leader. Members do not believe the problems can be fixed without one or more people leaving the group, including potentially the leader. Decisions by the group are largely impossible, with virtually every decision mired in side-taking and self-serving arguments. People retreat to embattled positions and are unable to compromise. Discussion itself becomes a win/lose proposition, with people focusing on survival and hoarding or concealing their resources. Even everyday matters that demand the group's attention are too sensitive for the group to handle. One or more members (including the leader) are scapegoats for deep-set problems that involve almost everyone in the group. Group members walk out of meetings or otherwise refuse to meet because conflicts have become destructive and "too personal." Members feel ignored, abused, or intimidated; the environment is focused on public punishment for mistakes, with the leader's own performance deeply tied to the perceived incompetence of team members.

Commentary on Survey Results

Ratings of teams are based on an overall bell curve. Within any given organization a majority of teams are typically at Level 0, fewer are at -1 and +1, and an even smaller proportion are at -2 and +2. However, for a variety of reasons, some referenced below, teams do tend to initially rate themselves higher than objective observations of day-to-day behavior would warrant.

The survey can be answered in two key ways. Team members can individually score the survey based on their personal perceptions, then share results, examining discrepancies and similarities in their scores. Or, a whole group can score the survey together, consensing on the ratings for each question, one at a time. Either way, the survey is primarily a discussion tool, sparking a deeper conversation about the culture of the team. ***The goal of such discussions is to develop a shared perspective of where the team actually is and what development is needed and desired.*** A team that cannot come to agreement about the ratings may be acting out the stressed interactions of lower trust ratings while arguing over higher ones that some members want to believe in. A team that too quickly comes to agreement may need to check itself to see if this agreement covers up sensitive issues that members, in an unspoken way, have decided not to address. In other words, the goal is to foster an honest and reflective dialogue, especially as such an exchange leads to a shared, *accurate* perspective on the team's true behavior, higher levels of interpersonal openness within the group, and a plan for how the group can grow and develop.

Such conversations can be an innately threatening activity for some teams and for some individuals, especially when the ratings are 0, -1 and especially -2. People who value examining and improving their relationships at work may like the tool and welcome an open discussion, even when the ratings are lower. However, people may also fill out the survey with a falsely positive rating, in order to:

- deny or cover up sensitive problems or conflicts within the group in which they are involved
- protect themselves from personal frustration or from retaliation by team members or the team leader
- seek to avoid emotional, relationship-oriented subjects of any kind at work (too 'touchy-feely')
- score the survey from a cynical perspective ("This won't do any good anyway, so why should I stand out?")
- pretend to oneself the group operates at a higher level than it actually does in order to protect image
- confuse "would like to behave" with "actually behaves."

For example, an instance of the last two points is the leader of a team rating the team +2 while the other team members rate it -1 or -2. Individuals may sometimes also challenge the descriptions for the +2 level, arguing that teams should not be as open as what is described, saying such things as "Not every team member needs to be involved in every performance issue." This of course is not the intent of +2, but can be a distraction from more genuine discussion of where relationships and performance by the group actually stands.

If artifacts like these surface, the best course of action is to let group members work together to define their own +2 and then examine score discrepancies and similarities among members question by question, letting members talk about their experiences in the team

and citing real examples to support their ratings. Be aware that some of the issues that surface could have been previously undiscussable and are emotional, so this sharing among team members may require some skilled facilitation and strong ground rules.

Intervention Strategies:

Each team situation has unique elements, so the following advice is only a general guide. If your team is -2, -1, or 0, focus your efforts on helping the team move toward the most positive aspects *two* levels up.

- Level -2 Action needs to be immediate and fully committed. The group probably cannot be saved without significant changes in personnel, roles, or leadership methods, basically reinventing the group along the lines of “Standard Practice,” a traditional work-group model with clear structures and responsibilities. As a starting point, restructuring may appear as the most compelling option (e.g., breaking up the group, appointment of a deputy, etc.) as sometimes even small amounts of reorganization can lead to a turnaround. In any event, members and the team leader may need much supportive individual coaching, mediation, or facilitation to vent negative emotions, discern real needs, and develop solutions to individual and group problems. Some people may be asked to leave or leave on their own out of frustration with the group. The leader ideally needs to play a strong, forthright, and calming role. The solutions are less likely to be achieved through group consensus than through participation by all members and visible, rational decision-making by the leader. Pairs or trios in conflict may need significant attention to reach agreements on how best they can work together. The group will need clear ground rules for day-to-day courtesy and cooperative behavior as well as frequent checks on progress. The goal is to get people refocused on tasks, responsibilities, and customers as soon as feasible, while swiftly resolving the large emotions and conflicts that clamor to be addressed.
- Level -1 The ship can be righted but this will require time, persistence, and patience. Dealing with “undiscussables” and creating and reinforcing new group norms for respectful behavior will be paramount. The leader and team members probably all need feedback about their contribution to the problems, and often the best way for this to happen is through third-party facilitation and coaching, fostering an environment in which people increasingly work through their differences on their own. Underlying systemic issues (e.g., the budget or pay or IT system, or some other workflow) need to be separated out from the interpersonal mistrusts woven around these systems. For example, a performance appraisal system that is associated with past organizational “baggage” and terminations could be co-redesigned with members to become more open, consistent, and rational. Skills training in conflict management, assertiveness, meeting management, or similar topics may also be helpful, all of which need to help people move from a “victim” stance to higher levels of responsibility for personal and team dynamics. For example, training or individual coaching should aim to show how members can ask one another for personal feedback safely. The leader will mostly likely need to solicit his/her own personal feedback from the team and act on it in visible, constructive ways -- essentially serving as a core model for Level +1.

- Level 0** The leader can begin to set a goal for the group to become more self-managing (the +2 level). The group will need time to discuss the merits of this direction and their fears about it. The leader may need to share the nature of the concerns that he/she is handling in the background that the members are actually capable of addressing themselves along with a positive vision that builds team confidence and a sense of safety. Exercises that focus on helping each member see his/her “gift” and “shadow” behaviors in the context of everyday group dynamics may also be useful, especially if these become part of individual development plans that are shared with the group as whole and supported by the group. Training on group process and development can also be introduced, including tools, such as multi-voting and STP (Situation-Target-Proposal). Work projects that demand more open relationships and members frequently asking for feedback to achieve “big, hairy, audacious” goals based on business realities can be an excellent jumping off place for groups moving toward openness. Developing a group charter can be used to define what and how decisions should be made by the group, and establish criteria for group effectiveness. In this way a charter can drive training and the steps needed in order to turn over specific decisions to the group when they are ready.
- Level +1** Group practice, experience, and individual interpersonal risk-taking are primarily what separates +1 from +2. Regular sessions to help members give and receive feedback about their performance from their peers and talk about their personal development can now be built into a group’s meeting schedule. Higher level training in even more sophisticated skills, such as facilitation skills and “systems thinking,” can be brought into the team, with members trying on new behaviors that guide and teach the group as a whole. A major movement from +1 to +2 is in the area of collaboration, where work and resources begin to be significantly co-managed and pooled, rather than separated into siloed areas of responsibility. The group can also be challenged to take on higher level group leadership tasks, such as getting feedback and other data from the team’s external and internal customers, developing and deploying a strategic plan or vision, auditing the culture of the teams reporting to the group, and so on. At the +1 level teams take over some of the visioning from the leader, developing their own shared and preferred ideal for the kind of team members want it to be.
- Level +2** The group can be challenged to identify its own course of study and learning for the future. The appraisal/pay system can be adjusted to mirror the sense of accountability team members have to one another. A major part of feedback to individual members can come from the group itself (both systemically and informally) rather than being passed through the leader. The leader may need to move from being a facilitator to more of a group mentor, with day-to-day leadership within the group being handled according to the talents of members rather than their formally assigned areas of responsibility. Groups at this level are likely to spend a significant amount of time in purposeful innovation and in self-initiating strong inter-team collaborations to meet the strategic goals of the organization and its customers.

Where do low-trust groups come from?

Trust levels are part of the complexity of human interaction. Individual relationships, teams, and organizations all have their own cultures based on shared assumptions about reality. From small events, perceptions, and interpretations of behavior, mistrust can spiral. As groups begin to move downward toward -1 and -2, people bring more and more self-protective and hostile behaviors to interactions, basing this conduct on increasingly negative, often unverified beliefs about others' motives. There are many factors that seem to push groups toward self-fulfilling -1 and -2 spirals, including the previous experiences of individual team members, performance pressures, conflicts, integrity issues, broken promises, or other "betrayals," poorly handled or avoided performance problems, abrasive or ambiguous behavior of leaders and peers, unresolved complaints, and many other factors. Here are a few examples:

- Ambiguous behavior in a relationship between a female manager and male assistant manager of a work unit led to questions in employees' minds about the propriety of the relationship. Frustrated by the manager's apparent insensitivity to the assistant manager's intimidating and patronizing behavior toward them, team members took their concerns to the HR department. The head of HR and a consultant then attempted to counsel the manager. However, the manager had become deeply and permanently incensed by the employees' concerns, denied all impropriety, and appeared to take a hostile stand, eventually pushing people out of the work unit before eventually resigning herself. (-2)
- Members of a City Council often leaked their values conflicts and assumptions about one another's self interests during public meetings. Increasingly these comments became unfair and were not grounded in the facts but generally amounted to petty sniping and alliance building with the effect of undermining one another's credibility. Fortunately, the group agreed to reduce these behaviors and develop a shared vision. This work and the development of ground rules for conduct helped improve the group's internal communications and overall functioning. (-1)
- A superficially "self-managing" middle-management team had great difficulty making decisions regarding the priority and completion of key projects. Behind the scenes comments by some members reflected a strong sense of frustration and criticism of other members. Background questions about one another's competence, agendas, and motivations were not being addressed either by the formal leader or by individuals. Instead, the group played out its differences by arguing "rationally" -- and interminably -- about the projects. The leader tended to skip group meetings, rationalizing that this was a "learning process" for the team. Things began to change when members became publicly critical of the leader's "abandonment" of the group and people began to see and acknowledge how their own, rather than their colleagues' behaviors, contributed to the group's overall stuckness. (-1)

What facilitates trust?

Trust levels begin to improve as people become more aware of their personal behaviors and more responsible for them. Commitment to a positive “relational field” of trust emerges when individuals develop a shared sense of accomplishment for interpersonal changes they can see one another striving for. Triggers to improvement often lie deep within the potentials of people for authenticity, self-knowledge, and personal meaning. This means that high trust levels cannot be forced. They are always a matter of choice, invitation, and inspiration. Individuals lead toward higher trust levels by modeling their self-awareness with vulnerability and disclosure, and by actively and unselfishly helping others gain appreciation, and understanding. This in turn leads to further reductions of self-protective and defensive behavior, allowing openness and respectful exchanges to flourish, even with sensitive topics. Some examples:

- A leadership team for a probation department found themselves in a deep argument over the wording of their mission statement. Trust in the group was so low that there were grave questions on the table about its ability to even meet to discuss the matter. Some members preferred a mission focused on “rehabilitation;” others on “punishment for wrong-doing.” In the heat of the argument one of the members shared his private experiences from some years previous when he had attempted suicide and found himself going through the department as a probationer. “If this place had been about punishment, I’d be dead now,” he said. This dramatic disclosure triggered others to share their own moving stories of why they had come to work for the department. As they did this, the team reached a new level of understanding and the mission statement was resolved. A desire for collaboration around newly defined department directions suddenly began to emerge. (-2 moving toward 0)
- The executive team for a hospital reached the breaking point over a minor policy decision, resulting in a number of angry outbursts and members in tears. Not sure exactly what to do, the group examined how the angry disagreements had come about. This revealed a number of incorrect assumptions about one another’s intentions and faulty norms for dialogue that emphasized confusing, “depersonalized” messages that were ambiguous in both meaning and tone. The group re-wrote its formal norms for communication, members offered apologies to one another and spontaneously asked for feedback. A group practice of checking one another’s intentions quickly developed. (-1 moving toward +1)
- A management team for a phone company faced new and rapid changes in technologies and resource demands after years of a stable, “institutional” type environment. Under the guidance of the team’s leader, a visionary vice president, the team learned to resolve two-person conflicts within the group openly and with the assistance of other team members who were not directly involved but who were affected by the conflicts. The vice president himself modeled deep disclosure of his motives, successes, and failings, so that all could participate in co-management of the organization, moving the team from a siloed past toward a trust-based, skilled and adaptive future. (0 moving toward +2)



Dan Oestreich
Oestreich Associates
2100 Lake Washington Blvd N #E-101
Renton WA 98056
425-207-8034 (office/fax)
425-922-2859 (cell)
dan@unfoldingleadership.com
www.unfoldingleadership.com
www.unfoldingleadership.com/blog



I am a consultant, coach, and trainer. My work is always focused on the possibilities for a person and for an organization. I offer a broad range of customized services that are most valuable in two situations: as a leader you have a vision and want to find a way to turn it into action; or you are concerned about a team that needs special assistance to realize its potentials. Either way, you want to help people be more than they may believe they can be.

I am co-author of **Driving Fear Out of the Workplace** and **The Courageous Messenger**. These books are about creating high performance workplaces by overcoming the “undiscussable” issues that erode productivity. **Driving Fear Out of the Workplace** won the 1992 national book award from the Society of Human Resource Management and was republished in a revised and expanded form in 1998. I have also authored chapters on conflict management and employee development for **Advanced Supervisory Practices**, a text for public sector managers published by the International City Management Association.

My clients are in all types of industry: manufacturing, professional services, health care, utilities, government, schools, non-profits, and research. Some of my past and present clients are Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center, Springs Window Fashions, PEMCO Insurance, Con-Force Structures, PTI Communications, the National Park Service, Meriter Hospital, Cellular One, and many other organizations.

Prior to embarking on my consulting career I spent ten years providing professional HR services for the City of Bellevue, Washington.

I graduated from Yale University in 1973 and hold a Master’s Degree in Guidance and Counseling from the University of Colorado at Boulder.

Please see my website and blog, listed above, for more information, or contact me directly via email or phone.