**Transcript  
Cheryl Ndunguru:**  Good afternoon, everybody. We are going to go ahead and get started. Welcome to OPM. My name is Cheryl Ndunguru. I am sure most of you got that email from me inviting you to our learning transfer session today. Dr. Steve Frieman is going to introduce you to a new paradigm of transfer that is going to knock your socks off, I promise. OK? So, {inaudible 00:27} . The field of leadership development has long assumed that the key to increasing leader effectiveness on the job lies primarily in the classroom, where there is a controlled environment for the learning of new leadership competencies. Based on over 25 years of experience as a facilitator, trainer, and a coach, Dr. Steve Frieman proposes that for sustained transfer to occur, it requires both the learning of behavioral competencies, through training, education and other types of leadership development or what Steve refers to as packing-in. And an equally critical decision process called unpacking to use what you have learned and are presumably capable of doing back on the job. You are going to do an unpacking exercise today.

Today Steve will make the case that for dramatically higher levels of sustained transfer to occur, it will require the explicit use of unpacking procedures and techniques. Dr. Steve Frieman is a program director with the US Office of Personnel Management. He holds a doctorate in industrial organizational psychology and has worked for over 25 years to create sustainable, organizational, and leadership change back on the job, mostly in the role of a US government employee.

He has worked during this time in such areas as organizational development, job analysis and selection design, leadership development and executive coaching. Please help me welcome Dr. Steve Frieman.  
{applause}

**Dr. Steve Frieman**:  I am going to work this without a mic. However if I am not loud enough, let me know, and I will hold the handheld mic that I have been resisting holding, as part of that. But I think the room's small enough we'll get away with that.

So, I am a fed. I have been a fed now for 25 years. I just want you to know that what you are going to hear is really about 25 years of experience with internal, who has been kind of searching for that holy grail in the world of training around what does it take to get things back to the job. I am not very satisfied when I hear {inaudible 02:43} but it doesn't mean much to me, if they are not using it {inaudible 02:50} back on the job. That question has haunted me for most of my career. I have tried lots of different approaches to try and get things back to the job.

Anybody ever work with an IO psychologist? I'll apologize. They are very geeky people, but they do things like selection procedure. Right? So for a while I thought it was {inaudible 03:11} maybe we had to select the right people, and that'll be the answer to them {inaudible 03:15} . That helps some, but it didn't really get me the change I am looking for, so I moved into the training arena for a while. I worked at a place called Army Research Institute for the Social and Behavior Sciences {inaudible 03:27} Did some research there, and some application. Tried and get them to see, maybe through training we can get the results. I wasn't satisfied with that.

I spent about 14 years as an organizational development guy, on the ground facilitating teams, and leadership teams, and organizational groups. I did it in small groups and large groups. Groups as much as 200 people at a time, still did not see the sustainability that I was looking for. For the last seven years I have been over at the office of personnel management staff office {inaudible 03:58} center for research development, and they are playing around with training. Again, I came back to it. I came back to training and said, it is got to be smarter. They got to make a better design. They got to figure out a smarter way of doing this, and {inaudible 04:12} doing something right, I am not seeing the transfer rates I want to see.

Ultimately I finally decided that I think our paradigm may be off. I think the paradigm by which we believe transfer occurs is not complete, and we need to work on that. Really, the talk today is all about that. It is about what I have been doing in that “other duties as assigned” category for the last two or three years, as to what is that other {inaudible 04:42} variable. I'll let you know what that is today, and we can talk as a group about if you believe it or not, does it make sense to you or not, and we'll give you an experience of what our process that I use to help agencies now, to help maximize transfer of training. Just so you can have some little experience, because I am losing people already {inaudible 05:01} .

So the basic objectives of today are to explore the conditions to maximize transfer, identify what processes may allow you to accelerate transfer, and actually experience it. I should mention that when I talk about transfer back to the job, for me it doesn't count as transfer unless they sustain it for a year or more, using a hard criteria. I am not satisfied or interested when people tell me they used it once for Kirkpatrick level three, and they'll never do it again. That is not recordable transfer, in my opinion. If you don't sustain it for a year or more, it is not {inaudible 05:40} so at least we are all on the same page. So with that, before we get going too much into this, I'd like you to just talk to your table groups. In your experience...I am assuming you all have some experience in the training arena, because I don't know why you'd want to hear this talk otherwise {inaudible 05:57} you just needed a meeting to go to. {inaudible 06:00} came in the door and {inaudible 06:01} .

Assuming that, I'd like you to talk in your tables just in your experience, what you have seen over the years you have been involved in the field, what percent of training actually transfers over and is sustained for a year or more? What is your number? Just talk about that at your tables, and I'll give you a few minutes and I'll ask you what kind of numbers are coming out about how much training really is transferred and sustained for a year or more in the leadership development arena. Do that now. {crosstalk}

**Dr. Frieman:**  If I could have your attention back...So, what kind of numbers came back?

**Man 1:**  Three to six points.  
{crosstalk}

**Dr. Frieman:**  {inaudible 06:41} what? OK, {inaudible 06:43}

**Man 2:**  25 percent.

**Dr. Frieman:**  {inaudible 06:45} 25 percent? What kind of numbers came back?

**Woman 1:**  We came out with, we have no clue.

**Dr. Frieman:**  OK, and here we are in the profession. That is great.

**Woman 1:**  This is why we came to your training.  
{laughter}

**Dr. Frieman:**  Back there, what kind of numbers? OK, did anybody do the task?

**Woman 2:**  50.

**Dr. Frieman**:  15?

**Woman 2:**  50.

**Dr. Frieman**:  50? 50? Really?  
{crosstalk}

**Woman 2:**  {inaudible 07:10} I am sorry, 15.

**Dr. Frieman**:  15? That is even better. What kind of numbers came out of your table?

**Woman 3:**  We have no numbers.

**Dr. Frieman**:  No numbers?

**Man 2:**  I am afraid it was a context issue. {inaudible 79:06} So, the number wasn't as important as the context.

**Dr. Frieman**:  OK, so context is more important here?

**Man 3:**  {inaudible 07:40} said 20 to 30 percent {inaudible 07:44} .

**Dr. Frieman**:  Yeah. Yeah, I thought I presented good data.

**Man 4:**  19.71 percent.  
{laughter}

**Dr. Frieman**:  Who is on my list now?  
{crosstalk}

**Woman 4:**  We said like 15, but...

**Dr. Frieman**:  15 percent?

**Woman 4:**  But it was a recession, so {inaudible 08:09} context.

**Dr. Frieman**:  Anyone's gaining 15 percent and you publish that, you'll become a hero in the whole training field {inaudible 08:20} No one's ever shown it, established any data for that, but I am glad that you and some folks are looking at that  .

**Woman 5:**  {inaudible 08:23} .

**Dr. Frieman**:  OK. Well, so we'll go high. We'll say 25 or 30 percent, let's round to. Maybe 50, I don't know. You have to consider  your organizations. There is no good research. There is been no study in 40 years {inaudible 08:44} to show, by the way, how to do established rates of transfer, or what the  average{inaudible 08:49} rate of transfer is {inaudible 08:50} .

And the studies that have been done have been what I call bad data. They have been consultants working for companies where they have developed the training, and they are trying to please their own companies, and they come in the range when they actually have data collection around seven to 15 percent transfer rate. That is the higher rates, that is considered high end. 15 percent side That is anecdotal too, right? So the tables that said they didn’t have a number, I understand  It is kind of squishy. How do we define this, and how do we gain it? It is a problem. Here we are in the field providing a service, whether internally or at other agencies in the case of OPM, and yet none of us have a good handle... {inaudible 09:30} .

When you work with a client, whether it is an internal client or an external client, the sell is always improvement back on the job, right? Nobody sells a Kirkpatrick experience, and yet here we are as professionals, can't even come up with a number about how much is going on . When my trainers run a program, they can tell you without even knowing anyone who is coming in, their personalities, if they are a good person or bad person, disruptive or not. They can tell you, because of the design we have in the classroom, 80 percent of the people will have an 80 percent learning level regardless.

We know it. We have been through the drill, and you know, and from your training probably the same thing. You know with precision, and yet we have no such predictability with transfer time. We should be able to say at some point, an exhibition of max training for the R and D {inaudible 10:23} . That 80 percent of the participants will have an 80 percent sustained transfer rate after our training, and know it. That is the vision I am at. That is where we are going {inaudible 10:32} That the same level of predictability for transfer that we have for what happens in a learning side of the classroom.

So what I need to do now, and I apologize if it gets a little bit dry, some of you may find it exciting. But I am trying to {inaudible 10:50} .What I need to step you through now is where the field is now in my opinion, and where I think we need to go as a paradigm if we want to get transfer. So just bear with me as I start to step you through. The paradigm of leadership development right now...{pause}  
**Dr. Frieman**:  ...That is all we got. All of leadership developing is based on this paradigm, capability leads to use. Is that the camera? So what does that mean? That means the only relevant variable for getting a transfer is increasing the behavioral competency strength of people, right. Isn't that what we do as trainers when we design? We design training to increase the behavioral competency {inaudible 11:49}. We make them better.

I run a conflict skills course and a coaching and mentoring course. We know, because we test them out, just like you probably do in your designs, at the end we have role-plays and other things going on. We know that they are more capable than when they came in, right. The presumption of the field is that if we make it more capable they should use it back on the job. The question is, is that a reasonable assumption to make in the field. Even though we do it every day, by the way, this is probably my sense of humor {inaudible 12:26} . We know it because when we really hammer a trainer and say "I am not seeing the transfer you are promising," they only have one of two reactions as far as I have ever seen.

The first one is blaming, right. "I did my part. It must be their environment, their supervisor, their culture, because I made them capable. The formula says if I made them capable, they should use it." You don't let them get away with that. You hammer them and say, "Look, we are going to stop this unless you do something good right now.

The only tool they have is to redesign your training to be, what? Increase even more deeper and authentic learning. Increase behavioral competency strength even more, because the formula says if you do that you should get transfer. Are you with me? We have been working with this paradigm for 40 years. I am telling you the paradigm isn't working.  
The paradigm is saying capability by itself should lead to use on the job. So, I'll give you an example. Dieting. There is probably nobody in this room capable of having a regimen of exercise and eating to be at the perfect weight. How many people feel they are at their perfect weight right now?

I can't raise my hand on that one. And yet, sending you to classes to build up your capability probably is not going to change the equation. Are you with me? It is not a capability issue, there is something else going on. That other something else is also determining whether you get transfer back on the job {inaudible 13:59} . I’ll step you through the logic as we go through it. Let me give you a different formula. That capability x choice leads to sustained use. Now I am using choice in a very specific way. I haven't told you yet. Consider it a placeholder term for now. But, you see where I am going. It is not sufficient to simply make people capable and think they are going to do things in life, and you know that from your own living in life.

You know that. There is something else we need. We need to make a choice about what to do. And if we can start to influence choice, I would suggest we'll start to influence transfer rates. And so the interesting question, really, is...is how do you do that? What is going on with that? Note also that in my formula, there is a multiplication sign here. You need both components, right? If either is zero, your transfer rate dies. We do a really good job working this side of the equation for the last 40 years. We don't really do much on this side right now. And we'll talk more about that and why that is.

I want to show you the iceberg model. The iceberg model of leadership … leadership actions. It is the model I put together to try and explain the dynamism of what is occurring inside of a person that leads to an action you actually take. So imagine it is an iceberg. You have a little water level here. At the very top is what people do, what they did.  
It is behavioral. It is the domain of behavioral competencies, right? It is where 99.5 percent of training hangs out, at the behavioral level, right? When you are training, you have to do competency analysis or think about the competencies you are having, right? Everything revolves around competencies. That is the mantra of training because capability leads to use, right? That is what is driving it.

That is at the very top of the iceberg. About halfway down below the water is how you do it, your style of expression. That is the domain of personality. Right? I am not referring to Myers Briggs or DISC {inaudible 17:07} by the way, those are not true personality instruments. True personality does not shift over time. It is how you know you are the person you are and other people know it whether you are glad, sad, mad, happy, sick, or healthy. Right? No matter what your mood, they still know it is you. It never changes. That is what true personality is defined as.

There is a very good instrument, by the way, by Hogan Assessments Systems called the HDS. If you haven't seen that, it is worth seeing a sample report. It is very nice. They have two reports, one is the HDS, the survey that tells you which parts of your personality are hardwired that under stress will tend to derail you as a leader.They have what they call the HPI, the high performance inventory, which are which parts of your personality under normal conditions will be your friends and allies as a leader. So the very bottom of the iceberg is why, why you do it.It is your cognitive meaning making system. It is how you make sense out of the world 24/7. Now you may not realize that you are making sense out of the world, and a fish may not realize they are surrounded by water until all of a sudden they aren't. But trust me, you are. I have a mother now that is 87 with severe dementia. Until you see someone who cannot get meaning out of the world, you do not realize how often we do it, every second, every moment we are living. We are always making sense out of the world.

That area is the belief systems you hold. Belief systems are particularly important for choice. Down in the why level are the factors that affect choice. Your belief systems are important because belief systems are how you encode the world for your truth. Right? Whatever you believe, this is constructive now, not given by another source. Whatever you believe is true, you'll encode into your belief system. It is your summary so you know from day to day, this is my truth. I live my life by my truth and your belief system. The belief system is something very, very interesting they give you the permission to do or not do things in life, depending upon context. Think about that. They give you permission to do or not do things in life.  
Doesn't that sound like transfer? Isn't that what we are after? Somebody says, I can't do that back on the job. But the controlling variable is not what you taught them in leadership development training. The controlling variable is right here.

That is why I have the arrows. The way it actually works with people, first you make sense out of the world. Then you decide with your cognitive meaning making system what you want to do. Then you filter that through your style of expression, at the “how” level.

Then finally, you choose an actual behavioral action that someone can see, going  on. So note behavioral actions are two levels removed from the initial impulse to do something at the “why” level. Two levels removed, how is it for you and your organizations when, I don't know what to say here. Have you ever tried to interrupt a decision made two levels up from you? Then had very elaborate stories about what the heck were they thinking? Anybody? Just me. Or even two levels below and say, why did they do that? So we are kind of in the same boat here. Unless we are aware of what’s going down at the cognitive meaning-making level. It is very difficult to interpret from a behavior what is really going on. Why did they actually do that? That is why we have all the miscommunications all the time. People are filling in the blanks with what? Their own cognitive meaning making system when they see the behavior not that person's, it is theirs and that’s where the miscommunications come.

I want to point out just a couple other things around this capability and choice equation. We'll see where that takes us. Then it may be a good time for… we are already late as a group, I think. Yes.

**Man 1:**  We had the conversation to come back from training when there is resistance in the community after we push back {inaudible 21:54} . How do the rank and file...What is the cognitive...The construct of that leadership, so that when people are selected {inaudible 22:06} people say, well, you know, there is {inaudible 22:15} that is not really OK, just like I would get the {inaudible 22:24} certain level. We get that kind of sarcasm from {inaudible 22:29} . Do you have any thoughts on that?

**Dr. Frieman**:  So {inaudible 22:35} .

**Man 1:**  Well, let's just say you have got a {inaudible 22:40} section {inaudible 22:42} program. And people, however they stand there selectively {inaudible 22:47} workplace, you can {inaudible 22:51} implements them through {inaudible 23:01} .

**Dr. Frieman**:  Right, if I’m reading between what you’re saying is that sometimes those people are blocking the person from implementing those {inaudible 23:06} .

**Man 1:**  Correct. Or through subtle {inaudible23:08} .

**Dr. Frieman**:  Yeah. That is fine, and my response is, I don't know if that person who was trying to implement something did the work they need to do. The work is not just at the behavioral competency level. If that is where you stop, you are almost always cut short, and that is why our transfer rates are so bad. You have to also do the work and understand at a personality level, 'am I doing something through the personality?'' Am I managing myself right at that level in terms of how I am coming across?' But most importantly, you have to do the work at the cognitive meaning making  level at that choice level.

And what does that mean? That means that whenever we are in an environment, in a real context, we have a perspective. Right? We hold a perspective on how well things are going to work. We size it up, and we try to figure out what is going to happen.If you are finding that your perspective is keeping you from doing what you wanted to do, i.e I believe those people are sabotaging me, they are stopping me or not cooperating, the first work is not to ask those people to change. The first work is to see if you can do what I call an adaptive perspective shift at this level.

In fact, that is what the Max Trans Project really operationally is turning  into. How the help people do adaptive perspective shifting at the “why” level, so they can find a perspective that will allow them to do what they need to do.  
And since we are talking about that, what is the formula for choice? This is the choice equation. This is what is going on at the subconscious level where belief systems reside. How can I use what I am capable of doing in this specific situation-context, that means both situation and people, and specific people, so I can both be successful and not become a casualty?  
You have to solve that equation in order to do something. If you can't solve the equation, if the casualty equation stays too high, you simply won't do it. There?

**Woman 1:**  Can you say that again?

**Dr. Frieman**:  Yeah, OK. how can I use  what I am capable of doing in a specific situation or context, so I can both be successful and not become a casualty. In leadership development, we are really comfortable helping on the success side of that equation. We really do almost nothing on the casualty side. So, how do you know you are going to become a casualty? What does that mean? You know your sense of becoming a casualty by your level of anxiety. It is that simple. The more anxiety you are feeling over having to have that difficult conversation with an employee, telling your boss the project is going south, realizing something may not work the way he had planned on it. You know what I am talking about? That you can feel anxious over those things?

The more anxiety you are feeling, that is how you know your sense of becoming a casualty is going up. That is not so bad. But if you have been trying to do something, to use what I call your playbook, and that is not working at reducing your level of anxiety, now you are in a situation where the perspective you are holding is telling you that you are in danger. You know that. You know it because things pop up, right? By the way, people always come to me, and {inaudible 26:42} the area of belief systems, which means what? It is cognitive. It is a cognitive process. That is why there was a blind spot in the field. We wanted everything to be behavioral. We wanted it that way.

It fit our formula, that capability leads to use. We missed the fact there was a significant cognitive component controlling transfer. We just missed it, it was a blind spot. We thought we could manage it through behavior. The subconscious mind is the controlling factor here. You know that if you believe {inaudible 27:28}. Because of the diagram, right? This is where the subconscious is, down here. The conscious mind is up here, less observable, and you can see.

But you also know it, anyone had the experience where you had a really important conversation the next day, and your casualty equation was rising because you didn't know how it was going to go, and you are not sure you have the playbook to do it?And your conscious mind was saying, sleep, and your subconscious, which controls the conscious when it wants to, it can take it over {inaudible 27:58} when it needs to, says, I don't think so. No one is going to sleep until we have a plan of action.

Anyone have that experience? Some of you? OK. That shows you the power of what is going on here. When it needs to, it takes it over. By the way, this is just a side note, that process I just mentioned is called the Zeigarnik effect. Zeigarnik was a researcher in Poland, and she went into restaurants, she found out that waiters and waitresses could remember everything she ordered until she paid the bill Then they couldn't tell her anything. Did a lot of research on this. So the Zeigarnik effect, if there is something you really care about, it is immediate in its consequences and it is incomplete, then you are going to care {inaudible 28:48} is in there. You care about it. Your subconscious will require you to keep thinking about it, whether you want to or not. It will not be enough.

Why? Because the subconscious is so much trying to fill that equation, it is running out of room. It is taking over the conscious mind. Everyone is going to participate in it, whether they want to or not. The day after you bought your house, you sleep at night. You signed the papers already, right? Because the critical variable is you went from, did you have a playbook, whatever it was {inaudible 29:19} and now we have gone from incomplete to complete. When that happens, your motivation to process thing goes to zero. I am going to give you one last piece, and then I am going to give you a chance to talk, {inaudible 29:47} .

Unpacking and packing in, all right? We are going to talk about these processes. You can think of them as a bipolar scale, like hot cold. The more you maximize the one, the more you minimize the other. OK? Hot cold, right? It is all cold, there can't be any hot. Are you with me? Packing in and unpacking are like that. I will propose to you the procedures and techniques that we have developed in our classrooms for modern adult learning, that definitely increase learnings more than we have done in the past, right? Relative to like PowerPoint, actually block transfer. They block transfer. They don't help transfer, because you are down here. So, let me give you some examples.

The Zeigarnik effect. At the end of a training, what do we do? We hold up a certificate. We give completion and closure to everybody in class. We basically minimize their every motivation they have for transfer at that moment. We minimize it. If you really want to take advantage of Zeigarnik, you would hold up the certificate and say, you will get this after you sustain anything from this class for a year, and you can prove it to us.

Now, I don't want to be there when you utter those words. But you hear what I am saying, and you can see in your mind. Your casualty equation just went up, just thinking about doing that. But it would raise the energy level, not lower it. So, motivation is being controlled by Zeigarnik, if we are creating an effect {inaudible 31:26} . Let me give you a couple of other examples. All, I am going to give {inaudible 31:31} extreme statement {inaudible 31:34}. All leadership development training uses the expert model. It works with the expert model, right? We never put somebody out there, some guy named Ed and say "He knows nothing about strategic planning, but he is going to lead this room for the next two days." Right?

We always have an expert whether they are a facilitator or expert or whoever, we do that. Why? Because we are smart. We have learned that if you have a teacher who is an expert and you like the teacher you want to please the teacher. We use that dynamic in leadership development training. We want them to please the teacher in what they are doing. Right? That is part of it, and that is OK. The problem comes that once the person learns what they are doing, like in my conflict skills class, they go back and in their context at their work.

And they’re looking at this person who has filed an EEO suit  against every supervisor that has talked to them. They are saying "Do I have the level of expertise that I need for this person? I know the instructor could do this conversation great, but can I do it?" It creates doubt. In the interest of creating learnings through the expert model, we are creating doubt about the job. Another thing we routinely do, we have a forgiving environment. Right? We encourage people to make mistakes. You get feedback and quickly try it out a different way right? All the time.

You tell me back in your work environment, how many times are you allowed to fail repeatedly before you get it right? You can see where the doubt comes in. The very processes that dramatically increase learnings cause doubt. This is probably why in 40 years there has not been one study, not one, to show that modern adult learning techniques have any more transfer than a week of PowerPoint. Not one study. Why? I mean, that should just make you feel bad. Right?  
Why? Because PowerPoint doesn't interfere with this. You may create more learnings in the way that we do it, but you are interfering with transfer also. That is the price you pay by being more down here in your leadership development design.

**Man 1:**  I am sorry, could you say that again please? The part about no studies have shown that...

**Dr. Frieman**:  No studies have shown that a week of PowerPoint is getting you any more sustained transferred for a year or more versus modern adult training. It is true we create more learnings. We increase their behavioral competency strength.

**Woman 1:**  You mean in the classroom?

**Dr. Frieman**:  I would mean that back on the job.

**Woman 1:**  OK.

**Dr. Frieman**:  I am sorry, in the classroom we increase the learnings. But when they go back and actually use it for a year or more, we are not seeing any more transfer rates. We are still in that seven to 15 percent of what is going on. But note what I am saying too. That is not knocking what we are doing in the classroom. I want to be very careful about that. It is just realizing we are missing part of the equation. If we combine what we are doing with modern adult training, and combine it with working on this side of the fence too, it will be a powerful picture. Because now we have a much more increased competency strength being processed down here at the why level to figure out how they can use it on the job. How, so I can both be successful and not become a casualty. Yes?

**Woman 2:**  Steve, the more you talk about this, the more I see analog {inaudible 35:00} executive coaches training, and in people you do have {inaudible 35:05} anecdotal evidence that there is more transfer {inaudible 35:11} executive coaches. But I think you are doing what {inaudible 35:16} talk about {inaudible 35:18} and I wonder whether that isn't a place for you to be exploring to {inaudible 35:26}

**Dr. Frieman**:  Yeah, so the point made...you know, it is a good point made that executive coaching, is that an unpacking technique? Of course that is an unpacking technique. Right?

**Woman 2:**  It is costly {inaudible 35:33}

**Dr. Frieman**:  It is costly, but it is something people work down here. Like, you all know coaching. Coaching is...I rarely see coaches work at this level sometimes, but they rely on the classroom or something else for that.  
They are working down here though, right? It is just a very clinical process, and it is expensive. You have to match them up, and all this kind of stuff. The premise of Max Trans  is that, hey, guess what? I think the everyday supervisor and manager in the right structure to do it themselves, probably 60 percent of what executive coaching {inaudible 36:00} .

**Woman 2:**  But I think that if you have been looking to bolster your own research, you might look at some research that is being done on the transfer of {inaudible 36:09} executive coaches. Because I think your technique is more cost effective, and able to {inaudible 36:13} do without investing in coaches, so {inaudible 36:18} .

**Dr. Frieman**:  {inaudible 36:20} Make sure I am looking also that any studies about how executive coaches help transfer and use that as part of the {inaudible 36:26} process .

**Woman 3:**  Are you taking questions?

**Dr. Frieman**:  I guess so.

**Woman 3:**  In the unpacking, is it also a logical linear process? Or is it {inaudible 36:38} .

**Dr. Frieman**:  It is. Unpacking is usually a transformational process. Really what they mean by that {inaudible 36:52} really what we are looking for, but it is not linear. If it was linear, the person would probably get to it themselves.

**Man 1:**  So it is kind of guiding them through the process of moving through the affected domain versus the cognitive domain, or a combination thereof?

**Dr. Frieman**:  Would you say...I couldn't hear {inaudible 37:52} .

**Man 1:**  What it sounds like you are saying is, and I wrote a term on my paper, WIIFM. What is in it for me? From the learner's perspective, getting in to not only look at the cognitive domain, the what do I need to know...

**Dr. Frieman**:  You mean the behavioral domain?

**Man 1:**  The behavioral. But also the affected domain,affecting those...Why? Yes, the values. Getting them to value what they are learning so that they have more drive to apply it when they get back.  
**Dr. Frieman**:  Let me say it a little bit differently. Because a lot of what has to happen for}Max Trans has to occur back in the context, back on the job. Not in the classroom, because they interfere with each other. But you have to be careful not to mix up the expert model with basically a peer based model, by the way. That is the other end of the spectrum.

But what we do now, what we are just starting to do in terms of working with agencies, is introducing modules at the end of the training program, at the end of succession program. It gives people this orientation of giving you now, and maybe some exposure to techniques also. So that they understand that their work is not done.

What they have done in the classroom is this, and that is great. They should get a certificate, feel good about it. But the work is not done until they work on the transfer piece, and that work is going to occur primarily in here. They have to understand it, because it is not a message we have been putting out there. I mean, they have to hear the kind of things I am saying so that they can get it. OK, this was just the first fix. Now I have to do this before I blame and stop.

Before I say, it is the supervisor or the culture or the environment, first I have to find out, can I make the adaptive perspective shift in a way I can both be successful and not become a casualty. Yes?

**Man 1:**  {inaudible 39:21} .

**Dr. Frieman**:  So, I...yes?

**Woman 1:**  This is not your presentation this is ours.

**Dr. Frieman**:  {inaudible 39:51} .

**Woman 1:**  Yeah. No, just a comment and a question. Comment is, many of us are earnestly taking notes, we are trying to capture things. We are doing the kind of the tip of the iceberg thing, the Iceberg Model just like the PowerPoints, and you never...It is the archive effect. You never get back to them.  
The things that you can remember obviously are the things that you attach personal meaning to them, them and {inaudible 40:16} . The things that we discussed, or that have some meaning for us, we don't have to look at {inaudible 40:22} We won't have to look at a PowerPoint.  
So that is my comment. I think that is why we take a lot of notes. Because I don't {inaudible 40:29} But is action learning then an example of maybe the unpacking of this kind of leadership development?

**Dr. Frieman**:  {inaudible 40:44}

**Woman 1:**  Using an action learning model, where it is not an expert model, it is a peer based model, and you are...

**Dr. Frieman**:  {inaudible 40:51} sorry.

**Woman 1:**  No, that is it. That is my question.

**Dr. Frieman**:  I would say action learning is actually a hybrid, and it actually falls in this continuum about half way, is where you'll find action learning. Because action learning is almost always a combination of an expert model, either through the facilitator in the room and or the setup in the classroom, combined with a peer based model. Well, sometimes peer based. Going back to work, doing things and coming back, reporting on it. Sometimes in a peer base, sometimes just in that solo mode. But it is a hybrid. I am going to talk more about what we are going to do here today. {inaudible 41:28} here. That'll be more of a pure form of an unpacking process. Yes?

**Woman 2:**  I get your theoretical concept fully, and I think it is very easy to believe it and agree with it. What I don't get is how you are measuring whether or not the transfer has happened. I get that we want to be telling students, you are not done. The work starts when you get back and you start applying the skills we practiced in class. I get all that, so how are you measuring it, is where I feel we get stuck as an organization.

**Dr. Frieman**:  The answer is at this point, I am just moving out of the R&D phase which was to create this and do some mini pilots in agencies just to know whether a technique would work or support, that kind of stuff. The measurements have been anecdotal through an interview program.

For example, when we run one of the pilots, we debrief the group that went through it. We spend about an hour and a half with them talking through it. Did you make any changes? What is going on? Did you actually move to action on the job?  
We are doing light data collection on some forms, on some scaling and authentic remember in doing that. It is based on this interviewing protocol right now. The phase I am moving into, just for your information, is moving into the next level of pilot implementation that is the larger groups.

I don't know how you are going to tell them but we say pilot. You'll notice the reaction. I need a lot larger groups. It is kind of like when Apple makes a phone they have 15,000 people looking at it. Then they release to 10 million people in order to sell it, right. Sometimes you need larger groups to figure out what is going on. The next phase is to move into larger groups, to try out these pilots, and the timing that the data collection receives about what we are doing. We are relying on political interviewing processing right now. To talk to people, say, what happened, did you do it and so on.

I'd like to show the tables just for a little while basically. Then I promise you we will have time to do at least add some flavor and technique. So at your tables, just talk in terms of what you are doing and points like that. What did you hear? What are your reactions to what you have heard? Do you have any further questions of understanding? Take some time to chat on that because I have throw it like a fire hose at you and I want you to have some time to talk through and digest it a little bit.  
Bring your attention back to that center of the universe that begins at a point where I happen to be standing. Any questions, any question come out of the tables that we haven't heard yet?

**Man 1:**  I just...

**Dr. Frieman**:  Speak up just a little bit.

**Man 1:**  OK. I like what you are saying, but I think it is half of the equation. A lot of research on organizational culture that will substantiate that there are rewards in the system, for example. If you are a military officer {inaudible 44:46} I don't know how you would. But if you go to take courses on collaboration or even self management and you come back and it hardens, and then {inaudible 44:56} . On the other hand, if you live in an environment that collaborative and is very supportive self management {inaudible 45:05} and you go take a course and you come back, it is easier {inaudible 45:11}. So I think a lot of this is…worth pursuing {inaudible 45:18}.

**Dr. Frieman**:  So the basic comment is that, what some cultures stop things, you know? You would think they would be collaborative, and you go in a command and control {inaudible 45:23} culture, we are going to get blogged. My response to that is over here. My response is, it is not that I disagree with that. In fact, I agree. Sometimes culture can stop things, and you don't know it until you try to do the internal work first. First you have to see if you can change your perspective. That is what this model is saying.

First you do the work yourself to see if you can do an adaptive perspective shift. Because I'll tell you what. It only takes one person who took those courses on collaboration to show they can actually do it in that culture, to tell you somebody found the adaptive perspective on how to both be successful and not become a casualty.  
So, that is what I tell people too. If you can think of one person who has ever done it, it is possible. You just haven't done the work according to perspective you need  You need to do the work first. That is not to say that some things...This is not a panacea, some things simply are not going to happen because of the way things are.

**Woman 1:**  You kind of talked about that issue which is often times the most senior leadership is really operating out of their belief systems that are incompatible with what {inaudible 46:31} leadership development {inaudible 46:33} and get exposed to, and start shifting their views, and then come back into that culture. The belief systems are at odds with each other.  
It is not necessarily, I mean it’s completely in line with your model, but it actually says that there is more need for peers to band together to {inaudible 46:53} have courage to counteract these  belief systems that are competing {inaudible 46:58} build these type of leaders.

**Dr. Frieman**:  So leaders like forming factions. So I am dealing with, you know, I’m a psychologist right? I am dealing with the inner process, right, that leads people to be willing to transfer. But a great resource on the outer strategic side is Hyde and Zielinski's work on adaptive leadership. They talk about the macro strategies needed in order to bring a change to the work in a way that you can be successful and not become a casualty at the macro level, at the organizational level. To me they are very complementary with this. I am talking about the psychological level of what is needed. Right? For the person needs to find the courage and ability to do it themselves. And there is a macro strategy too. How do you deal with multiple factions?

How do you mobilize factions them into move in the same direction and so on. That is work by Hyde and Zielinski on adaptive leadership. I'd recommend that, if you are interested in looking at the macro strategies, that is all part of that. Other questions? Yes?

**Man 1:**  I am very sorry.

**Man 2**:  No, go ahead, go ahead.

**Man 1:**  We were talking about a lot of things. I am positive that there were a lot of definitional issues here that you may not have covered because there is not enough time. But it gets into the idea of when we talked about transference that the very definition of training in a specific task which is standard, learning, education, development which is a much broader term sometimes defined as expansion of your capabilities to do these  things and your self-confidence to do them. There are a lot of issues that way that are all angels dancing on the head of pin type of issues.

**Dr. Frieman**:  So that was just a comment, but I'll say, yeah, if we had to really dive in to be able to have those kinds of dialogs. I agree with you. For example, the premise of the field you won’t like this at all {inaudible 49:18} . You understand that. My four year grandson understands this. You know, this isn't right. I haven't eaten potato chips. I am learning this behavior. So you all have a presumption when you assess your training, when you get an opportunity to do that, right? To see "Is your training working?" Three to six months after the training, you go back and you try to see is there evidence of the training being used, right? Isn't that what we are doing here? Assessing training?

**Woman 1:**  Not well.

**Dr. Frieman**:  But that is the premise.

**Woman 1:**  Right.

**Dr. Frieman**:  I am just saying. It is implied. So the interesting question: is our presumption that what we taught in the training course is what has relevancy to the person on the job, at the time, during the time period that they have been back at work after the training, right? That is our presumption, that it has relevancy.  
But what controls relevancy? Relevancy is controlled by...

**Woman 1:**  Perspective.

**Dr. Frieman**:  Perspective, but really, perspective for me is this "How can I both be successful and not become a casualty?" That is what is controlling relevancy, right? If that is true, it is possible we taught them something. They learned it, but they are not showing it because the leadership challenges they are facing, the ones that are making them feel anxious, the ones that they are processing how can I both be successful  , and not become a casualty, simply they don't need it at this moment and time {inaudible 50:45}.

But we don't see it. We take it as evidence that the training didn’t work, but that may not be true at all. You have to be much more precise about "What are we looking for back on the job and what is controlling use?" This simple assumption that just because we train it to them, we should see a frequency of increase where we can go back and measure it is a very, very simple assumption to make. It is not how the world works.  
Relevancy is controlled by the leadership challenges they are facing. How do you know that? You know that because every time you check in a week after the training, they say "I wanted to do that, what you taught me, but I had all these emails and stuff."

And you say "Shame on you. If you had used what we trained you, you would be a smarter, better leader. And now, you are just back to the same person you were. You wasted government resources" right? That is the attitude. We haven't heard anything about it. In fact, maybe they are trying to tell us something but we don't want to hear it. I’m sorting  on relevancy. When I got back, the first thing I had to do was go through my emails and decide whether I am going to be a casualty or not. And those are the things I am working on and based on that, I am drawing on the competencies, I need to deal with the leadership challenges, not your training course necessarily. Are you with me?

**Woman 1:**  Yeah.

**Dr. Frieman**:  You have to be very, very careful about that. If you really want to know my opinion, {inaudible 52:02} training evaluation We also, you have to ask the question not only do you use what is in the training, was the training relevant generally to the types of leadership challenges you are facing during this time period? Otherwise we are missing the whole relevancy issue. Are you with me?  
And the training may have worked is my point. We may be drawing the wrong conclusion when we say the training doesn't work, it may have worked. It is being parked  for the time when the right leadership challenge comes that says "Now, using what is in the training will make me successful and not become a casualty  . We need to use more complexity in what we are looking at. Not simplify a {inaudible 52:36}.

**Woman 1:**  Well, we still talked a lot about the evaluation, the measuring part of it. It is a difficult thing, and your concept is a lot like, as a former federal probation officer, working with defendants and offenders. Right? Because you are asking them to change criminal behavior. That is measurable. But again, their perspective is different from yours. We have a caseload of 40, you can deal with individuals and work with them individually. But when you are training a mass amount of people like 8,000, how do you get into each individual's why? You know? It is almost impossible.

**Dr. Frieman**:  Well, when you go through the technique of seeing we don't have to, it is about setting up the peer systems to do that. So that may be a solution, just to round this conversation, you know, {inaudible 53:23} . I no longer, in my mind, equate that leadership involvement, when it works, leads to leadership effectiveness. I bet you a lot of you would say that. You know, that leadership development should lead to mutual effectiveness. I no longer make that equation at all. It is out, as far as I am concerned. Leadership development is a separate category of activity about developing behavioral competency, strength

And I know how to go back and check when the people have competency strength change. But that doesn't translate, necessarily, to leadership effectiveness. One, because of the relevancy issue that I talked about. But mainly because leadership effectiveness, to me...You know, just to me, I am not saying you should adopt this. It is how quickly somebody can do an adaptive perspective shift. When something that is unexpected and unwanted, and there is no consequences comes in front of you.

That, to me, is the clue to how you know whether a person is a more effective leader today than they were a year ago. How fast can they make that shift? And I...well, I haven't found a client to “play” with yet to do that, I do have measures on my desk about what I would use to try and look at their ability to adapt quickly to situations, to leadership challenges, that are unexpected, unwanted, and have real consequences if they are not dealt with right and which their playbook is not working, right?

I believe we can find the clues to what I mean by a leader...An effective leader, and that is an area {inaudible 54:58} . And so I distinguish it as a separate category, measuring leadership effectiveness from measuring leadership development. Right? Leadership development is what I mentioned about capability change. Not use, all right? Leadership effectiveness is how you are able to adapt and use through perspective shifting back on the job.

So, you notice what we are saying again? In my world...Where it is leading me, I am not saying we should accept this. I am realizing more and more we have to be aware of two domains simultaneously working. The behavioral domain and the cognitive domain. We can't just collapse them down into one domain {inaudible 55:43} We miss too much.  
We need to be working with both domains at the same time, and be aware them, be conscious of them. That is what the packing and unpacking words are too, right? The packing in is the behavior domain and the unpacking is the cognitive.  
Both are existent at the same time. If you are not dealing with them...When you design a course after this session today, if you only have a design for your training program, a packing in design, and you don't have an unpacking design, then I don't think you are doing your job. {inaudible 56:15} .

You need to have an unpacking design too. You need to at least recognize something is going on there. And your whole unpacking design may be one hour in the classroom showing them the iceberg diagram just to make them aware, we process at different levels. And perspective shifting is important. You know?

**Woman 1:**  What are some examples of other unpacking ideas?

**Dr. Frieman**:  We are going to get to those a little bit {inaudible 56:42} Other questions about {inaudible 56:44} I want to move you to doing the technique {inaudible 56:45} .

**Man 1:**  Just quickly {inaudible 56:49} doing a great job focusing on internal mechanisms and variables that are...Anything with regard to external?

**Dr. Frieman**:  Heifetz and Linsky's work. Get the book "Adaptive Leadership.” They have the strategies to deal with the external macro side of what is going on at the organizational level. Some great strategies for that.  
They talk about things like being on the balcony, reaching another perspective, the dance floor versus the balcony. There is lots of things we could talk about. They have really good material {inaudible 57:18} and they are one of the few groups I know that deal with what I call the dirty side of leadership. Where it is messy, and it is not clean. Boundaries are unknown, and how do you navigate through that ambiguity and actually mobilize people to {inaudible 57:34} .  
Man 2:  Could you give those names again please sir?

**Dr. Frieman**:  Marty Linsky, L-I-N-S-K-Y, and Ron Heifetz, H-E-I-F-I-T-Z or something like that. If you Google the book "Adaptive Leadership" it actually has title at Amazon, look within that. It is a great resource, and a good compliment to this material that is a part of that. Any other burning questions? Realize I need to get at least some time {inaudible 57:57} .

**Woman 2:**  What about any references you can give us for researching {inaudible 58:01} intrinsic motivations?

**Dr. Frieman**:  There are folks that have worked on intrinsic motivation, but I don't know their names, so I don't have their...but yes. Sure.

**Woman 3:**  I know that Deci and someone {inaudible 58:14} they have a self determination theory {inaudible 58:20} that talks about self determination {inaudible 58:26} theory. {inaudible 58:29} .

**Man 3:**  When I say, just throw a packet out to each. They are in packets of four, just throw a pack out to...

**Man 4:**  Sure.

**Woman 3**:  {inaudible58:40}from amotivation to the intrinsic motivation {inaudible 58:42} .

**Woman 4**:  Also I would suggest Daniel Pink and his book "Drive.” It is called "Drive The Surprising Truth About What Motivates Us.”

**Woman 3:**  Yeah "Drive" is based a lot on that research. {inaudible 58:54} .

**Woman 5:**  {inaudible 58:53} .

**Dr. Frieman**:  Any other burning questions?

**Woman 6:**  {inaudible 58:59} .

**Dr. Frieman**:  Don't make me become the expert. OK, so we are going to do...Yes?

**Man 5:**  Just a {inaudible 59:07} Is it possible for us to make a name for {inaudible 59:11} .

**Dr. Frieman**:  That would {inaudible 59:14} .

**Woman 7:**  Sure. I'll send around a sheet {inaudible 59:18} .

**Dr. Frieman**:  OK, I want to put you into an activity, so let's give these out...Somebody pointed out to me you are human, you have needs. You want to take a break? Yes, no?

**Woman 1:**  Yes.

**Dr. Frieman**:  Good. OK, 10 minutes. Go, go, go.  
{break}

**Dr. Frieman**:  Basic rolls are on the flip charts. We are going to give you about half an hour. That means probably only two people are going to get through it because we were talking, but we have got to give it a try. So just know that about two of you will be in the role of reflector, but it is good enough. This is supposed to be a taste, a sample, and you have this unit if you want to do more of it. So what is this? A year based technique. Right?

When we do this in the real world, assume you are sitting up here. Let's go through it. If you are in the role of the reflector, you are going to describe a leadership challenge that should be something that, for you, is immediate.  
I need something real. This works better when it is real. Don't try and make up something. That is real consequences for you, i.e. it causes you anxiety thinking about it if it is not going to get done. Right? If you are not feeling anxiety, throw it out. It is not useful.

Something where your play book is not working or you are not sure what is going to work. OK? Those are the factors you want to describe in a leadership challenge. Once you describe it, that will be, by the way, three to five minutes at most.

Once you describe it, your role is to listen. You may not respond. There is no dialog in this process. Dialog is the friend of packing in. It is the enemy of unpacking. Dialog blocks the transfer process. It does not help the transfer process.  
If we had more time we could go into that. For now, just trust me. Your role is just to listen. At the end which will be no more than 15 minutes from when you started, just because of time, answer this question. What if any of the questions that I was hearing impacted you the most?

OK? If none, that is fine. Just let people know.

That is the role of the reflector. The person with the leadership challenge. Everybody else is an ally. Allies first and foremost. Confidentiality is maintained even in this activity. I am asking people to ante up  a real leadership challenge. Please make sure it stays in this room, whatever it is. Second, you are listening to them when you are describing it. I will let you ask one or two maximum clarification questions, only if you just don't have a clue what the leadership challenge is about. OK? One or two, most. This is not to turn this into a dialogue process.

Then finally, the role of the allies primarily during the remaining time is to ask questions. Anything ending in a question mark is game. I don't care if you are covertly telling them, have you considered going to Joe and asking him this question now? As long as it ends in a question mark, it is OK. No dialogue. Most people usually ask questions that agree with a person's story, and I will tell you, most times they need questions that disagree with their story. Right? You have examples on your sheet  about which some of those questions are to challenge the story. Just be aware.

You don't have to do it here, but when we are in our groups we encourage them to spend most of their time with questions that agree with the story. i.e., let's call that problem solving through questions, right? But we ask them to save 10 percent of their questions that challenge the person's stories. It is not unusual, the issue is occurring because the person is avoiding something bigger that is even more anxiety producing, and sometimes you need questions around it. Right? So they are really focused on dealing with this employee who has a poor performance, and the question is do you really need to spend this much time and attention dealing with this employee? Or are you not dealing with the fact that there is a bigger issue like morale {inaudible 63:38} . You know, something like that.

You are going to have about 10 minutes for questions. If during that 10 minutes it goes silent, no one says anything, please hold the silence for a minute before you say it is over. Questions sometimes percolate up. Just give it one minute to be sure.  
Then just try to end at least by the 15 minute mark, so the person can answer this last question and rotate to the next person. Are there three people here, or four? Four? Four, very good. So I am going to divide you guys as a group of five because I will be doing this. Everyone else is in a group of four. Here what you need to do, I'll be roaming around. Let's start now, in this first adversity {inaudible 64:30} . Let's go now. You should be wrapping up your first round now. Wrap that up if you haven't but then say you would have had it done. Then you have a chance to do a second person if someone has a real leadership challenge they’re facing that is the back pull of real consequences in the {inaudible 64:56} . You can just drag yourself to the center of the universe, right here. Thank you, you were that close. Who was in the role of reflector who had a real legitimate leadership challenge?

**Woman 1:**  Legitimate?

**Dr. Frieman**:  I have some people who question these.

**Woman 2:**  Why is he pointing at me?

**Dr. Frieman**:  What was your experience? What was your experience with this? How was it to not speak and did you get anything useful out of this?

**Man 1:**  I felt that...

**Dr. Frieman**:  Speak up.

**Man 1:**  I need to tell you this. I felt that the questions that the guy who...It was difficult not to just respond or give a nod or indication that, yes, I do have a thought about that. It gave me some other ideas that we could try to use, I will on the next hour to not speak. It was a good thing.

**Dr. Frieman**:  Other reflectors?

**Man 2:**  I think it was really beneficial that we have other choices {inaudible 66:31} .

**Dr. Frieman**:  Did any of  the questions impact you at all?

**Man 2:**  Yeah

**Dr. Frieman**:  What about here?

**Man 3:**  It was hard not to answer. And it was also helpful, as was said, to hear other voices, different perspectives, other ways of looking at intervening. Again just having blinders on as to how you see a problem and maybe not appreciate it fully.

**Dr. Frieman**:  Any other comments from the reflectors?

**Woman 1:**  It felt a little exposed. With some of the questions really has me really ask myself, what do I realize. There are

the things that were like that.

**Dr. Frieman**:  How many reflectors feel incomplete and unsatisfied? What we did, was we evoked the Zagarnick Effect  . Good stuff, right, because by not having dialogue, generally the reflectors feel incomplete. They didn't really have a way to say, is this really the solution or not? They only had one place to go now to do it. To the bottom of the iceberg for theirown reflective thinking. We want that as an effect and because it is incomplete, tied to a problem that is immediate, has consequences, your playbook isn't working, guess what? They don't even have a choice. Their subconscious is going to require them to process later today.

Now it doesn't mean they are going keep themselves up at night. That would be a consequence that could occur. But it means that the subconscious is process is cracking, right? At the cognitive even-making level, trying to figure out if there is a clue there to the perspective they need in order to both be successful and not become a casualty. That is why we don't allow any dialog. We want that motivation to be around to move into reflective proper thinking, not artificially closing it out by saying 'Oh, I know that. That won't work here. The culture won't allow it' and all that kind of stuff, because that artificially shuts down the reflective thought process. And we are trying to maximize the thought process. Allies, who was an ally and what was your experience just asking the question? Was it, you know...

**Woman 1:**  Can I make a comment as a reflector, please?

**Dr. Frieman**:  Yeah. Of course you can.

**Woman 1:**  I found the listening fascinating. I mean, because when you are doing role-plays and you are the instructor walking around, you are listening to people do role-plays, they are always responding back. They are not really listening. And so I think that listening is, like you were saying...That he said, it was just hard not to respond. I like that listening piece, because it really made me think about the things he was saying. I didn't feel like I wanted to respond. Jane did. How do you keep them from not responding, or do you just let them do as however way they are doing it, or do you try to control the environment at all as you are walking?  
You saw us talking when we weren't supposed to be, and you...You dogged us a bit, and I just wonder how you really do that?

**Dr. Frieman**:  So you really want to know if I am a controlling person?

**Woman 1:**  Right. Exactly. No, no, I just want to know how you control that for your lab?

**Dr. Frieman**:  And the answer is you don't need to. When I work with groups, sometimes I'll be in groups of executives, SESers. Doing this class or GS15s. That is one kind of environment. In another environment we work with succession programs where there are 60 people in the room, just like here. Right? We are dividing and conquering. If you give them the instructions and they are willing to listen to my instructions and follow them, they are actually fine. Why are they fine? Because they are starved for this conversation. Do you know how shameful it is to go down the halls and say "I am not sure exactly what you do as a leader" People don't know where to turn to decide. This process allows them to do it. They don't skip a beat. They get right into it.

They really like it. It is real to them. It is tough the first couple of rounds they do it, but once they have been through the reflector role, most people say "Wow, I am so glad I went through this." One, they are open and they are listening. Right? They realize if they were dialoging, it is just like being at work. They are not going to speak, just listening to them. So it is awkward at first, but once they go through they are in. In fact, it is interesting. I was working with one agency, and we did it with their succession program, this process. They had internal coaches. I would train the internal coaches in this process. The coaches pushed back at me at the end of this and said "We need dialog. This is crazy. This is a stupid new program." I said, "Fine." So the next year we are going to do a tough one. We trained the coaches.

It turned out two of the coaches from the first year came to the second, and I had them go through the dialogue process, and they stopped the process. One of them said "We can't do this. We have got to go to silence. We have got to not respond."  
They could immediately see the difference between the value gained from just listening and not having to defend or prepare yourself for what the person might say. Just to be in that space of listening is so powerful. They said "We have to do it that way" and we pulled it all back to the way it was. So it is a powerful place to be. Yes?

**Woman 2:**  I have two questions, two different questions. One is, must you explain all of this in order to do this? In order to get the reflectiveness?

**Dr. Frieman**:  You have to do at least what I have on the charts.

**Woman 2:**  No, I meant the whole explaining...

**Dr. Frieman**:  No, no, no, when we run groups, we don't do that. If you do that that puts me back in the role of the expert, right?

**Woman 2:**  Yes.

**Dr. Frieman**:  Now it sounds like the packing in process and you can see it there. You want to keep it as unpacking. Unpacking relies on peer processing where the peers come to process. Packing-in relies on expert processing to get to the end stage.

**Woman 2:**  So you do this to just explain why this is happening. You rely on the expert to...

**Dr. Frieman**:  For you?

**Woman 2:**  Yes.

**Dr. Frieman**:  For you as people in the field.

**Woman 2:**  My second question is, so what do we do afterward to give them some structure for their reflections?

**Dr. Frieman**:  The question is, what are you doing to help people have structure for their reflections? I assuming the presumption is, how to structure time to reflect?

**Woman 2:**  Do you do anything to say, I have been approved?

**Dr. Frieman**:  Not even. This is the subconscious what they think of as relevancy will do it on its own. You don't actually have to write that. I know every time I do this, almost every one writes down the question that somebody had on that. What is that? That is the conscious mind liking that it is in control. Not just it wants to have it.  
The truth is, everything we hear your subconscious registers and if it is relevant it will take it in. Whether or not you remember it, it is there and it is processing it 24/7. That is how reflective thought works and why it is different than analytical thought which requires conscious attention through the thought process.  
Reflective thought does not require conscious attention, its subconscious by recognition. It is occurring all the time. It is doing it all the time, you don't have to manage it or control it, it just happens.

**Woman 1:**  The process question that is a follow up, based on what you just said Steve. I can see that, if the inevitable did take over this after you leave this room, and just, I liked what you said and I have been thinking about it. That could actually undo or maybe interfere with what we want to actually occur, right? So maybe some advice would be to the group, let this lie. Leave here. That is as far as we want you to take it. Really try to leave it alone, with your peers.

**Dr. Frieman**:  I think so. Kathy raised an interesting point as it better not to be going around the world in a coffee mug and getting dialogue over it and I don't know. I think it is an R&D question, it is a research question. The reason I say that is, we run these groups. I run these groups, I do these tests and we have a break and they go to the mall and first thing they do is a dialog because they couldn't do it in the room. I tell them, that is OK. Let me just tell you what I tell them. I am not sure of the smart what I’m saying..

I tell them that is OK. I think people can compartmentalize it and they can understand what goes on in this environment. It is OK to have a different dialogue outside of this environment because we have set the conditions and we are going to meet those. The problem that leaders have when they are stuck is they know their playbook isn't working. They intuitively know the only place to go is reflective thought, going at the behavioral competencies and analytical processes of change in a certain way. They know they need to go to reflective thought, but they have to find a {inaudible 75:22} .

The problem is under the tension and pressure of those consequences, all they can do is cycle through what is already in their subconscious. It is already been put in there. They need new perspectives to be in there. And that is what this process is intended to do. You are putting into the hopper, you know, the hopper, the bin, a whole bunch of new perspectives {inaudible 75:43} for 10 or 15 minute the questions are going on So now when they go back they have new material to see it from, new perspectives, new angles. And that seems to be the secret. It is not that they are not seeing what is relevant in the workplace. It is they are filtering it out. Most people have seen that video they’re passing the basketball {inaudible 76:03} .

**Woman 1:**  We all have.

**Dr. Frieman**:  OK. Who hasn't seen that? {inaudible 76:12} Let' s just say it is an effect that you would think most people would see. And yet when you decode it afterwards, most people don't see it. The reason they don't see it is that we give them a task. They focus on the task and the other things that occur in the video neither will make them successful or make them a casualty {inaudible 76:39} .

**Woman 1:**  Yeah.

**Dr. Frieman**:  You know what I am talking about. It is not that they don't see that event, that is my point. They see it. They Photoshop it out and that is the problem. That is the problem here. It is not that the leader isn't seeing the relevant material they need to solve this problem. They are Photoshopping it out because in the past it hasn't been relevant to them.  
Their problem is how do you see something you are actively removing from the picture? That is the dilemma that the leader has. The answer is, we are finding, a peer network. They need to now be willing to examine new perspectives that are not Photoshopping out.

What is the source of this new perspective? Generally they will not listen to an expert. They will listen to the expert, but not {inaudible 77:25} . They'll listen to their peers. They will accept perspectives from peers and be willing to hear them. That is what this process is intended to do, fill up the hopper with new perspectives, from people whom they consider their peers and they are willing to accept this from them.

Where did we first learn this? Somewhere in our teen years some event occurred that was fairly dramatic to you, not so much for your parents, but for you. But you made a decision, from that moment, to solve your problem, your social dilemma, to not go to the experts  which you’re your parents. We said "I am going to go to peers" who you know are less experienced. You know that and yet you were willing to accept the perspectives from peers. We learned this in life. Peers do two things for us. They both have a way of providing us perspectives we may not want to hear, but we are willing to listen to in the process, and they do something that experts are incapable of doing. They provide us the courage to take that first stepIt is absolutely critical. And so, we learn to develop peers. We have been doing some R and D with the execs at an  agency, and we interview them because we were designing a program for them. This was the interview question that was asked, because we were designing a program to move {inaudible 78:40} .

The question was 'What happened in your first year as an executive, that if you didn’t succeed in it  your career would be over? {inaudible 78:50} to the anxiety {inaudible 78:52} didn't ask it to be.' One of the things they told us, at the executive level, if you don't have a peer network, you are screwed. You are not going to survive. You are too isolated at the executive level. You have to have a peer network, because you are going to miss some.

We have done the same process here with 15s also. Every time you debrief it executives say, this is a critical process for us to use, we need to keep it at this level {inaudible 79:19} 15s always say, this is nice. But not critical. There is a difference going on in there about where your peer networks become more and more important. {inaudible 79:30} We are seeing that, and this is a peer process. All the non-standard procedures is pretty much like peer type processes {inaudible 79:36} .  
Other questions or reactions?

**Man 1:**  Is the Zeigarnik effect sufficiently validated such that truly willing to rest all of this on that?

**Dr. Frieman**:  I don't know if we are resting all of it on it, but it is a real effect, yeah. Yeah, you can Google it. You can...

**Man 1:**  I have, which is why I asked the question.

**Dr. Frieman**:  Yeah, yeah, yeah. They have research papers happening on that.

**Man 1:**  Yeah. Then there are times when it is not as effective? Including if you are not motivated to do it, or if you think you are not going to do it well, the Zeigarnik effect {inaudible 80:19} .

**Dr. Frieman**:  It has to be {inaudible 80:21} you really care about it. How much is it really important to you, is the absolute critical thing. And how are the consequences? If you don't care about it, there is no Zeigarnik effect. You have to {inaudible

80:31} .

**Woman 1:**  {inaudible 80:32}

**Dr. Frieman**:  Let me mention...I have a little bit more to cover. But if you can't wait, then you just can't. My contact information's up there, if you want it. We are looking to see how this {inaudible 80:43} . So if you think your agency has a interest, feel free to contact me. We can talk more about that means  And if you want to be part of the pilot process, let me know, as far as that. Any other final comments from the people here? Anything? Any even reactions to today? Was this useful? Not useful? Whatever. Yes?

**Woman 2:**  I think she had her hand up first.

**Woman 3:**  I think this is {inaudible 81:14} process. Not just the leadership, {inaudible} I met my through the {inaudible 81:18} at the time. And I gave her my best advice that I could {inaudible 81:20} . There was a dialogue, and I liked very much. It is just questioning, and she {inaudible 81:35} happy to say, OK mom, I'll go along with it. And I like this idea of just throwing them questions, and then she can think about it later, because she is already dying about it now. So, give her the opportunity to {inaudible 81:50} I think it is wonderful {inaudible 81:53} .

**Dr. Frieman**:  Any other comments? Yes?

**Woman 4:**  I have a need to provide a new supervisor support group {inaudible 81:58} 40 hours of mandatory training {inaudible 82:04} year. But we found that we need to also provide a supervisor support group, and what we were doing I don't think really is kind of getting to...You know, I was thinking it is {inaudible 82:19} would be extremely valuable to supervisors {inaudible 82:24} .

**Dr. Frieman**:  As long as they fit the conditions. Right? You know, of {inaudible 82:27} As long as they fit the conditions, and it is a real challenge. It is immediate, there are real consequences if it is not done right, and they are not sure what their playbook is. This works for any problem in that category. I should mention we had other  techniques by the way also, where you could do {inaudible 82:50} . There is no time to go into those today, but I want you to know this isn't the only process {inaudible 82:53}.

**Woman 4:**  So, if they were having to come to the Census Bureau, where the training officer...What would that look like? I mean, hire you? Or what are {inaudible 83:06} that relationship?

**Dr. Frieman**:  Well, I am at a reimbursable shop at OPM {inaudible 83:09} so if it is just like a talk...

**Woman** 4:  A training {inaudible 83:15} assistant's office in May?

**Dr. Frieman**:  I am sorry? Center for Leadership Development. You know the Shepherdstown  Center, {inaudible 83:21} Denver Center, we are part of that group. And so we contract with agencies all the time. We enter agency agreements to do work. You know, if we are just talking this kind of awareness talk, where we just need to come in for a couple of hours, let me know, when I am in DC I can just drop by and do some {inaudible 83:35} .  
If it is a real event, for instance, one thing we are doing besides this is we have developed models {inaudible 83:42} grounded in why this is important, and have some experience with business and other techniques also. You know, if we are actually in the classroom doing something, or for helping you to launch a pilot, there is going to be some sort of reimbursable cost as part of that.

**Woman 5:**  You wouldn't have a problem if my facilitators were to try to use your classes?

**Dr. Frieman**:  Oh, no, no, no. In this particular process, I'll mention the vision we have for that is that we should get to the point. We should train enough leaders, supervisors and managers and execs in this  process, and give them enough experience to get confident and secure with it, that they will spontaneously call these sessions on their own without telling you or me or anybody else.

All they need is a door and five chairs. It is so cost effective, and I am telling you, every time we have run this, they have solved their leadership challenges, mostly. Most people solve their leadership challenges within three sessions, just going through this kind of peer process. There are some subtleties we have to talk about. You know, but, think about it. If we can get this growing in the governmen, this is a viral procedure, right? It is just in the DNA, and it doesn't require professionals, experts to lead the process.

You know, it is going to take time just to establish a tipping poing. But think about the goal of it. It is just a routine technique that people use. That is what lab is intended to be. It was intended and designed by me to be a technique that we could get out there to be viral, that doesn't need to be managed, and people can just do it, to solve their own leadership challenges as they are occurring. I actually hope that part of the way they'll do it is when they have a leadership challenge, they'll do a social system event where they'll put up four peers they already have, right, that they already have trust in and say 'Will you meet with me two hours a month for one or two or three months? We'll decide to when to end it. And the deal is, we'll all have to ante up a real leadership challenge. We will have to help each other. Are you willing to do that?' And it just takes off.

**Woman 1:**  Would you oppose if I hired a vendor to do this, to help me conduct these sessions, like, if I can't find the in-house resources?

**Dr. Frieman**:  Yeah. Yeah, I mean, there are subtleties there. You might want to use our services first to make sure your people doing it are grounded in what they have you do and not just mechanically following the rote procedure without understanding the subtleties of it. I would encourage you to at least let us do a train the trainer. But I am encouraging you. It is out there. I have just given it to you. Use it as you want.

**Woman 1:**  Do you have a card?

**Dr. Frieman**:  I don't...

**Woman 1:**  Just the email.

**Dr. Frieman**:  Sorry. It is up there, and I do have cards, if anyone wants them, you know, please let me know after class, and I'll put those out {inaudible 86:22} . Any other final comments? Thank you.

**Woman 1:**  Thank you.  
{applause}  
{end}