

Safety First, Then Trust - Transcript

Earle Airey

00:00:14.480 - 00:56:03.580

Welcome to Victory Leadership, where good leadership leads to victory. Here we help emerging and established leaders win through clarity, confidence and growth. Let's get started. Welcome to the Leaders Pit Stop.

My name is Earl Airey with Victory Leadership and today's podcast title is Safety First, Then Trust. Because today we're going to go down what I believe is a very important leadership rabbit hole.

And it can go deep, but it doesn't have to go as deep as many people think.

This one really matters because it helps explain why so many organizations are struggling with things like employee engage, trust, collaboration, innovation and change, just to name a few. Organizations often say they want more trust. And this is like the leaders that are talking about.

And I'd say even people across the entire organization will, you know, will align with that sentiment in many cases.

But when you think about the leadership, because they're the guardians of the organization, they'll say that they want employees to trust their leaders. And we want teams to trust each other. We want people to trust the mission, the strategy, the process, and the future direction of the organization.

And that makes sense. I, I can understand, I can agree with that. Trust matters. But today I want to explore a deeper question. What makes trust possible in the first place?

Because maybe trust is not the foundation. Maybe trust is just a bridge. That could be the bridge over calm waters, it can be the bridge over troubled waters.

It could be the bridge over a chasm. The bridge helps us to get from one place to another more efficiently than we would have been otherwise able to do so.

And if trust is the bridge, then maybe perceived, the perceived safety is a foundation of one of the bridge bridges peers that it must stand on.

So in today's episode, we're going to explore why trust requires vulnerability, why vulnerability requires perceived safety, how fear and self preservation influence workplace behavior, why perceived organizational support modeling matters.

And how leaders can create conditions where trust, engagement, creativity, collaboration and performance, just to name a few, have a

stronger opportunity to grow. So let's pull in today's leadership pit stop. So here's today's green flag moment.

Before people fully engage, they must often need the feeling of safety, enough safety to trust. And that sounds pretty simple. And you think about it, it's like, yeah, okay, could go along with that.

But think about how many workplace challenges may connect back to this, to this one idea. If people hesitate to speak up, people avoid difficult conversations.

People do not challenge weak ideas, especially if those ideas are coming from someone with more authority. People may withhold feedback. They're not exactly sure how to give it. People stop sharing concerns. People disengage quietly.

People will resist change for. For a number of reasons. I've spoken about change in the past. When these things occur, people protect themselves.

And sometimes leaders interpret these behaviors as, as attitude problems, motivational issues, or communication problems. And sometimes they are, but sometimes they're safety problems. Sometimes people are. They're not trying to be difficult.

They're just trying to avoid harm. That harm may not be physical. It can be professional, emotional, relational, or reputational.

But to the person experiencing it, this is a very real threat.

Whether it is fully understood and acknowledged, or if it is just lingering in the subconscious, that's just kind of giving them some subtle warning signs that something is amiss. Because when people perceive a threat, they usually will protect themselves before they give any any more of themselves.

And that's at the heart of today's conversation. Trust is one of the most discussed concepts in leadership. We hear phrases like trust, the process, build trust with your team.

Trust is the foundation of leadership. Trust drives engagement. Trust improves performance. And yes, this, this largely is true. Trust is essential.

High trust environments can support better communications, stronger relationships, improve collaboration integrator, willingness to work through conflict. But here's where I think we need to slow down.

If we're about to head into a turn, we need to slow down just so that we don't spin off the track and into the wall or into, you know, into others. We want to go around the corner efficiently, and so we need to slow down and we need to kind of take a look at what's going on around us.

And if trust is so important, then why is it so difficult to build? Why do organizations talk about trust for years and still struggle with things like engagement?

Why do employees sometimes say they trust their leader but do not trust the organization? Why do some, you know, why do people, sometimes they want to engage, but they're holding back. They're. They're just not making that investment.

And the answer may be that we are willing, you know, or we're starting, you know, the, the conversation about trust a little bit too late in the steps. A little bit. As I may have heard that, hey, we need to work on step 34, and you're talking about step number 73.

Well, there's times when I've seen things build, especially when I was in it.

If there was not a certain consideration for a later step, you may discover that you're undoing a lot of foundational work because consideration for future expansion was not considered.

So in certain cases, we want to sequence things in an appropriate way and putting the right emphasis on it so the work that we carry out will be sustainable.

When we ask people to trust, before we've examined whether they feel safe enough to be vulnerable, we, we have to look at what, what does that really mean? Because trust requires vulnerability.

It's not just a nice phrase, you know, you know, you want to have a phrase, you know, be, you know, to trust, you know, and being vulnerable is just not a nice phrase, phrase and phrase. It is a core element of how trust is often divine or, or it's foundational to that definition.

To trust means that I am willing to accept some level of risk. I am willing to believe that you will not use my vulnerability against me.

I am willing to believe that you will act with some level of ability, benevolence, integrity, or reliability. So before I trust, I'm asking, are you safe? Is this environment safe? You know, are the leaders safe? Is the team safe? Is the organization safe?

And if that answer feels uncertain, I may withhold trust, not because I'm cynical, but because I'm disengaged by nature, because I am human. This is where leadership intersects with the human condition. Human beings are wired for self preservation.

This does not disappear when somebody puts on a badge, logs into a laptop, attends a meeting, or receives a job title. We may be professionals, but we are all still people. And people scan environments for safety. Sometimes that scan is conscious, sometimes it is not.

Employees may be asking themselves, can I say what I really think? Can I ask this question without looking incompetent? Can I admit that I do not understand? Can I tell my manager this deadline is unrealistic?

Can I disagree with the group? Can I make a mistake and still be treated with dignity? Can I bring up a concern without being labeled as being negative?

Can I trust that leadership means what it says? These are safety questions.

And when the answer is no, you know, or, or we cannot get a firm yes or an agreeable to a significant level of a yes, you know, then that's when the self protection element starts to kick in. You may have heard of an amygdala hijacking.

It's this little element within our brain that acts as a gateway to direct certain stimuli towards elements that may contribute to higher reasoning functions, creativity, logical thought processes, or is going to shift it towards the classic fight or flight. And we're engaging more in what it means to partake in elements that contribute to our safety than creative, logical or rational thought.

Self preservation may look like silence. You may not hear something, you may not hear feedback you may put out there, hey, does anybody need anything?

And you get back crickets, you don't hear anything.

And sometimes you actually have to go in mine those requests because that, well, I, I asked them if they needed anything and they, and they didn't say anything. Well, that in of itself can be an indicator to do a little bit of a deeper dive because it may look like it may come up.

The lack of safety may come up as disengagement. It may look like compliance without commitment. It may look like that people are avoiding risk. It may look like people are staying quiet in meetings.

It could also manifest itself as a minimum, minimum amount of contributive effort instead of providing the very best. And here's the important part. Self protection is not always laziness. It may, it might appear that way.

People seem to be like it's stalled, like they're along for the ride, that the contribution levels are not where they're expected or where they may have been in the past.

Sometimes that self protection may even be the mind trying to intellectually determine the, the, the level of safety and how much that they can contribute. Because if I feel threatened, I gotta save a little bit in case I gotta make a run for it. Because a good run is better than a bad stand.

So if an employee has learned that speaking up leads to punishment, then the silence is not irrational. It's a, it's an adaptive behavior. If an employee has learned that the mistakes lead to embarrassment, then hiding mistakes is not surprising.

If an employee has learned that leadership does not listen, then disengagement may become a form of an emotional conservation.

This is where organizations must be careful because the behavior leaders see on the surface and this may be a symptom that the deeper issue may contribute to that fear factor. And I've talked about fear on, on this channel quite a bit before and I'm not trying to necessarily get labeled the fear Dr.

However, I just see this as being such a huge contributing factor to so many things that organizational leaders point to as, as recognizing a need to improve in the organization. And I'm not saying that those elements are, that that assessment is not spot on.

However, when you in a sense peel back the onion and start to get through a couple of layers and then you start to recognize that there's a few more fundamental elements that should be addressed. Otherwise the initial request may not be as productive as, as decided.

How many times has some sort of training effort that's focused on behavioral over functional in an organization and it just does not Yield the desired benefit. And that may be because there are certain underlying elements that would support it that just are not, are not available.

You know, they're just not there. And we can do our engagement surveys and our assessments and determine where things are at.

However, if we don't take appropriate actions on them, then these, these psychometric tools are not going to help very much. Of course, knowledge is power and having understanding of what those metrics are. But action is necessary to move forward in a meaningful way.

And this is where perceived organizational support becomes useful.

Perceived organizational supporter, also known by its acronym pos, asks whether employees believe the organization values their contribution and cares about their well being. That question matters because it's deeply connected to safety.

When employee feels, when they, when they feel that the organization cares about them, they are more likely to express workplace support.

They'll experience that workplace support and, and in turn, if they're in a position of leadership, whether that's formal or informal, they may even be, you know, contributors of that within their own circles of influence.

When they trust they're going to be more willing to engage because they believe that being vulnerable is not as risky because the level of safety

is there. And when the organization supports their needs, safety and the elements leading up to it contributes to that.

So think of this as maybe a sequence of events. So if we have perceived organization support, the elements are in place that leads to psychological safety.

Then the psychological safety helps to feel, helps the person to feel a little bit more at ease with their vulnerability, which helps them more likely to trust. That then strengthens trust as it continues to mature, it increases engagement, and then that engagement supports performance.

So let me say that again. Support, safety, trust, engage, perform. That sequence matters because many organizations start at performance and then work backwards.

They may ask, how do we improve results? How do we increase productivity? How do we retrain people? How do we drive engagement?

Those are important questions, but maybe we also need to ask, do people feel supported? Do they feel safe? Do they feel trusted?

Because if those conditions are weak, performance improvement efforts may feel like pressure rather than partnership. And pressure without support often creates concern at best, fear at most.

This becomes especially important during change change management efforts because change often creates uncertainty and uncertainty creates anxiety. Anxiety can activate self protection and self protection can look like resistance.

Leaders may say people are resisting change in some way, shape or form. But employees may really be thinking, I don't know what this means for me. I don't know whether my job is safe.

I don't know whether leadership is telling us everything. I don't know whether I'll be blamed if this fails. I do not know whether I have the skills to succeed in this new direction.

I don't know whether anyone understands the impact this change has on my work. These are just not operational questions. They're safety questions.

They may seem like operational questions or performance, you know, elements on the surface, but when you dig down, people are concerned because it affects them in a very foundational and fundamental way. When leaders answer these questions with clarity, consistency, empathy and support, then trust has some room to grow.

When leaders ignore these questions, fear fills in the gaps.

We don't like missing pieces of information and we will try to ease the anxiety by filling it in with some information that may even cause more anxiety. But these are the risks that occur when there's not enough communications.

And that helps to contribute to a feeling of psychological safety, especially in times of uncertainty. Because fear is a powerful storyteller.

You know, think about a horror movie and if a change management as an example is manifesting itself with horrifying results, then it's, you know, just as bad as any psycho thriller. Fear will create explanations when the communication is absent. Fear will assign motives when transparency is missing.

Fear will protect the employee, even if it limits the organization. And this is why trust during change cannot be demanded. It must be earned through repeated safety signals. So what does this look like in practice?

What's the practicality of working on something that helps to send clear signals across the board? And it's not just with change. It can be, which is normal operations or any campaign to improve certain metrics within the organization.

Because how can a leader create safety without lowering standards?

And, and this is important because a lot of organizations may think about does this mean that I have to do this, that and or the other, and it's tied back to some expense. Possibly, but not always. And it can pay dividends. How much is going to get lost?

And as the example was a change management effort that fails to succeed, you know, how much is that going to cost? How much goodwill is going to suffer, internal and external. So psychological safety in of itself doesn't mean being comfortable all the time.

And it does not mean avoiding accountability. And it does not mean that everyone gets their way in a, from a, from a more of a, a selfish perspective.

And it does not mean that poor performance is ignored. Safety means that people can be honest, human learning oriented without the unnecessary fear, fear of humil, humiliation, retaliation or rejection.

When people understand that there are good intentions for efforts that are in their direction and that their sense of Self worth is not under threat, then it helps to set the stage for greater performance as an end goal. And there's elements that occur in between. But to get there, these elements should be in place to provide a clear path, a clear path as possible.

We know that there are ambiguity in certain events or certain elements, especially when it comes to things of change. However, people feel a little bit safer when we're all in it together and everyone feels like we're in it together. Safety in numbers.

I'm pretty sure that you've heard, you know, united we stand, divided we fall type of thing.

Well, people look at that consistently throughout life and in the workplace it's no different because leaders can create safety through behavior such as providing clear explanation, explanations, clear expectations, consistent communications, respectful feedback, owning up to mistakes, inviting questions, explaining decisions, providing follow through, protecting dignity, listening before correcting, responding to concerns without immediate defensiveness, recognizing efforts and contributions, and making it clear that people can tell the truth without being punished for it. Those are safety signals. Over time, safety signals become trust evidence and trust evidence becomes engagement fuel.

A leader cannot just simply say trust me. The leader must behave in ways that make trust reasonable. I hinted on it briefly about communications and it plays a major role.

I mean that's how we get information back and forth to one another and people a greater understanding of what's going on through communications. Now sometimes there is under communications that is going on and it can unintentionally create fear.

Things may be coming from so many different angles and we barely have enough time throughout our day to try to keep our Venn diagram overlapping schedules in check. You know, so when there is a lack of communications, it can at times of course create ambiguity. It's going to do that.

People are going to fill in missing pieces of the communications puzzle with the situation as they see it unfolding. And many times they're not seeing it correctly just because it. They're under. Under informed. Sometimes the wrong communications channel is chosen.

Marshall McLuhan wrote a very thought provoking book called the. You know, the. The medium is the message.

And you want to make certain that you're choosing the appropriate message in which to send that you know, that communication through. And also there's times when communications are avoided because they are, they're uncomfortable again.

And it goes back to, you know, if there's a lack of comfort then that signals that there can be some fear and even there's fear about fear. People don't want to admit that they're fear fear that there's fear or that they're scared because it makes them look weak.

And that just makes the fear even worse, you know, so in the, in the spirit of calling a shovel a shovel, I'm gonna, you know, fear is fear.

And while there are healthy forms of fear that make us pay attention to times when we may be in a dangerous situation and we need to be very alert to our surroundings and what's going on, there are also, of course, times when, you know, that is counterproductive. How do employees interpret this silence?

You know, they, you know, they, of course, if there's nothing happening, nothing going on, then, you know, you, you.

The longer that occurs or longer that happens, or if there's information that kind of partially gets out there, but the communications loop is not closed, then that just makes it a little bit more challenging. And the whole trust structure starts to crumble.

Because as leaders and we try to interpret the silence of when we try to have interaction with our direct reports or even peers within the organization, you know, it's similar to the employees when they're looking for communication and they're not receiving it. So everyone is feeling a certain some way about the whole lack of communications.

And it all becomes counterproductive in potentially even more so depending on what your point of, you know, what your viewpoint to how everything is transpiring is going. Because when they interpret silence, they'll also interpret tone, they'll interpret timing.

So if they're not hearing something or when they hear it, they're not necessarily picking up on the intentions of how the message was shared, how often or how seldom the message is being presented.

They may interpret something that was better said face to face versus phone meeting, whether you're using some type of text platform, some type of collaboration, communicative platform, what is the appropriate method in which is appropriate for the information being shared? Because as the topics that may involve change, conflict, uncertainty, accountability, or even trust.

If from a traditional perspective of how we may look at that, leaders should be thoughtful about how the message is delivered. You know, in of itself, is it, Is it a town hall, Is it webinar type of presentation? Is it gathering people together in the same room?

And it's alive in person.

There's multiple ways and depending on the organization, its scope, and what the message and how all of those interactions occur, there may be times when you have to substitute one message, that medium that is not as potent as another. But you can explain that, you can share that information. You can say, hey, I love to meet everyone in person, however, in a timely manner.

I want to get this information to you in sooner than later. So we are meeting virtually and continue the message on in an appropriate way. You know, so again, it helps to contribute to that safety element.

That helps to reduce the vulnerability of the people that are in the environment. That helps to extend that a psychological safety so that they can contribute towards those elements that help to build trust.

There are a lot of challenges, of course, with, you know, and what is the appropriate method? How do we get that message out there?

Where are the people at in the organization as far as, you know, do we have multiple shifts that they work through? Do we have people that we need to communicate with an organization that's operating 24 7?

And so there's a lot of those elements to take into consideration.

However, when you do, when you, you put them together and it's crafted and delivered in a, in a right or in an effective way, then that goes a long ways towards helping the person to get everything that they need so that they're more likely to want to build those factors together that contributes towards the trust that then of course, improves the engagement and increases performance. Because safety is not only built by what is communicated, but it is also built by how that communication is carried.

So let's bring this back to employee engagement, because I know that's a big one, that's a big, huge hot topic. And there's so many people. What the percentage is of people who are engaged, disengage, actively disengaged.

Gallup has done a lot of studies on this, and there are a lot of metrics that are flying around and suggests that, you know, that employee engagement is low. You know, it's.

It's below 40%, it's in the 30s, and depending on how you slice it up, of actively engaged versus actively, you know, disengage, disengage. You know, there's levels of engagement, obviously, and people can be busy, but they can also be disengaged.

So you can see a flurry of activity and there's disengagement going on because it's just not merely about whether people comply, because people can be compliant, but they can be emotionally detached. Engagement involves energy, commitment, involvement, and a willingness to contribute.

The level of collaboration requires something more than just a task assignment. It requires people to believe their efforts matter. It requires people to believe that they matter.

It requires people to believe that they have a voice in this place. It requires people to believe that the organization will not punish them for trying, learning, speaking, or growing.

So those, I mean, we have a lot of times that we, you know, get defensive about things. And again that that defensive because why would we put up our defenses unless we felt we were under attack?

And I think Walt Whitman said it best be curious and not judgmental.

And when we hear these things that are, that we initially are in opposition, that it should strike a curiosity as to, I'm curious as to why this is important for someone else. Why are they so passionate about

this? I think Abraham Lincoln said it best. I don't like that person. I must get to know them better now.

So what are those things that help contribute? Because investments in the human condition will return a dividend somewhere.

Now either one will see it directly or it will ripple through the organization. But rarely does an investment in the human condition not provide some sense of return when it is invested smartly.

And this is why the safety that contributes to the trust is so important. I mean I think you could pretty much guess but just, just so that it is said that without safety, people guard themselves.

Without trust, people withhold themselves. Without engagement, organizations lose the best of what people can contribute. They may still get labor, but they're not going to get imagination.

They may still get compliance, but they may not get commitment. They may get attendance, but they may not get discretionary effort.

And in today's workplace, organizations need more people showing up in all those areas. They need people who are meaningfully engaged. So from a victory leadership perspective, this connects to the clarity, confidence and growth paradigm.

Because the clarity reduces unnecessary ambiguity.

When expectations are clear and communications are honest and the, and they're complete as much as possible and the decisions are explained, people have less of a need to fill the gaps, fill in missing pieces of information. And many times if there is a fear factor involved, what they fill those potholes with is not necessarily going to be quality information.

Confidence will grow when people believe that they can contribute, speak, learn, recover and improve without being diminished. Growth becomes possible when people feel safe enough to try, honest enough to reflect, and supported enough to develop.

So the leadership pathway could look like this. Clarity helps to create safety. The safety makes trust possible. Trust builds confidence. Confidence supports engagement.

Engagement fuels the growth and the growth strengthens performance. This is not soft leadership. I, you know, say somebody says this is one of those touchy feely things or the soft skills.

I said you, when you say that, it's almost like it's being belittled and it's because you don't understand. You think that the command and control and say it and do it just because I told you to is the end all Be all of leadership.

That in of itself is a fear tactic. And we've got too much information that is too just flowing all around the place.

We get it on our computers, we get it on our mobile devices that are nearly next to being embedded in us. So we see so many different perspectives and opinions and thoughts that can help to shape how we view things more so than ever.

One of the things with command and control is that they were limited opportunities to share information in a meaningful way for people to grow.

One of the areas where you saw that growth most, you know, probably most often was like with certain trades where you had apprenticeships, so you had the master and you had the apprentice and the master would, you know, they would work together to build the skill so that individual would journey and become a professional in those areas. That had to be done due to the technical nature of the subject. Nowadays there's just so much information. And now with AI, people will use that.

And many times if they, if their time is limited, they may take information that is not complete or very, you know, or very solid and they'll run with that in a, in a totally unproductive, eventually unproductive direction. So these are not soft skills, these are power skills.

College of mine call them power skills and I love that term because if these soft, touchy feely things, because soft skills are rock hard and, and if you can manage them in an effective way, then you are exercising power. And those are power skills.

So it is not soft leadership by any means trying to appeal or connect with a person in their humanity, especially as it is associated with the workplace or things that they feel that is important, important in their life. That could be friends, family, other circles of influence that they are engaged with.

Whatever it is that makes them human, because in human leadership matters is because the organizations essentially are human systems.

So unless you got like a lights out facility where robots are doing all the work in that may happen at some point, but there's going to be someone who's going to initially build the robots. And even if you have robots building robots, you still need people. The whole idea is that this is all to serve human needs.

And so humans have to be a part of that system. Otherwise why are we doing it?

If it's not to up lift humanity, then it's only serving of a few that I won't get into the philosophies around whether they're doing something nefarious. The idea is we are here to interact, to perfect, promote who we are as a species.

And yes, we need to make considerations and grow not only inwardly but outwardly so that we can cultivate these relationships in a more optimized way to reach the goals that we want to achieve collectively. So a couple of questions, actually a few questions, a few questions for leaders, a couple of things to reflect on. So do people feel safe?

Do they feel safe telling me the truth? If I go somewhere and I ask somebody something, am I going to get the right answer?

Or is the fear factor going to cause them to put up their barriers or up their shields? And when shields go up, it's bi directional. Things don't go out as well as come in. So do they feel safe telling me the truth?

Do people bring concerns early or do I have to find out once the problem has become serious or before a deadline is going to be missed or some inappropriate timing? Do team members ask questions freely? Do. Do we have an appreciative inquiry type of consideration that's baked into our culture?

Do employees admit mistakes quickly?

One of the things I like about the aviation industry that is largely self reporting at the amount of psychological safety that had to become a part of the culture to allow that to happen so that it could flourish as a whole. You know, it had to be extended so we can follow that example in other places and see similar results. Do people challenge ideas?

Respectfully, we understand that if people have not really been provided with the resources as to how to engage in these conversations in a meaningful and fruitful way, we may have to extend some grace around the quality of some of the, I would say some of the word choices, some of the emotional expressions, how that may come out. They may not just have had the opportunity to be in positions to take the candor and incorporate the kindness as a part of it.

So those, you know, can some be.

Those can be challenging and concerning for individuals who need to share information but are frustrated and not exactly sure how to, you know, so do. As a leader, do I communicate clearly enough to reduce unnecessary fear? Again, the longer that communications go and open door policies are great.

I you with open door policies, I say you still, you have to be careful. You have to manage your time because your time as a leader is valuable as well.

You need to sequester your time aside so that you can work on certain things so that you can be more effective as a leader.

Now that's just my own personal not only I just say, not only is that my own personal reflection on that, but also there is empirical evidence out there that supports that. So you always want to make certain that you

check in with people, check in with your people purposefully, beyond just having an open door policy.

So when you respond to disagreements, you know, again, are you thinking about it with curiosity, you know, or is there a judgment involved with that so that it could, could be something that we could, we may get defensive about and that's part of the human condition.

It's understandable that things like this happen, but we do have ways to respond more productively so that we can reach the goal that we want to achieve in a more meaningfully collective and unappreciative manner. Another is, do people believe that I care about their well being or only their output?

So do I care about you as a person or I just care about what you can do for the company, which is a reflection on what you, essentially what you can do for me because that reflects on me as, as the boss. So if I can scare people into doing things, then I might look good to senior leadership. However, that's only going to last us so long.

Do my behaviors make trust reasonable?

So if trust is an extension of a person, an exercise in vulnerability that is determined around elements that contributes to their feeling of psychological safety in the foundation of what the organizations may have available from a perception of perceived organizational support, then all of those things coming together, is there a, is there a reasonable room to trust?

And these questions are not always comfortable, but they're useful because the goal is not to just appear trustworthy, but the goal is to become worthy of that trust.

So there are a lot of elements and there's a lot more that I could talk about that would provide a little bit more of a granular approach instead of trying to put all of that in this venue. It's if there is something that you see or that you're curious about than the, the LinkedIn article for Victory Leadership.

If you go to LinkedIn and you put an earl area and you look for, if you look for the newsletter that the, the print of this is attached to. So we have, so we have a LinkedIn publication. It's called the Winner Circle. So this is the leadership pit stop.

It helps you to get back into the race so that you can be in the Winner Circle. And there you'll find this article with the same title.

So Trust first and you can respond in the comments or you can go to victoryleadership.com and you can also submit questions there. If you are looking for additional information or if you even want to have a quick discussion.

I, I don't charge for just, you know, like a quick talk around certain topics and we can discover if there's any additional possibilities. So in

closing, you know that I just want to just quickly return to the main idea that organizations want more trust. There is a trust initiatives.

They'll get publications and materials and workshops and they will distribute distributed to their people. And trust is important. But trust requires vulnerability, and vulnerability requires perceived safety. So before leaders ask how do we build trust?

Maybe we should ask, what are we doing to help people feel safe enough to trust? Or you can just say, how are we making them feel safe in this turbulent times?

Or whatever the focus is, because that question moves us a little bit closer to the root. It helps us to see engagement not merely as a metric, but as a human response to conditions people experience every day.

When people feel unsupported, they protect themselves. When people feel unsafe, they withhold trust. When people withhold trust, they disengage.

But when people feel supported, they feel safe, respected, Then trust has a place to grow. And when trust grows, engagement becomes more than just an initiative. It becomes a part of the culture.

So thank you for joining me today on this episode of the Leadership Pit Stop.

If this conversation gave you something that was useful to reflect on, please share it with other leaders who want to build a stronger, healthier, more human workplace. And remember, good leadership leads to victory, and I will see you in the Winner Circle. Take care, everyone.

Thank you for joining me today on the Victory Leadership Podcast. If you found value in this episode, be sure to subscribe and share it with someone who is committed to growing as a leader.

For additional tools, resources and leadership development content, visit www.victoryleadership.com resources the content shared in this podcast is for educational and informational purposes only and is not intended as professional or organizational advice. As always, good leadership leads to victory. I'll see you in the winner's circle. Sa.