

**A TOOLKIT
FOR MANAGING
YOUR EMOTIONS FOR
SUCCESSFUL
RESULTS**

EXPERT IN PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT
DR. M. PAULA DAOUST

Conflict at Work

Dr. M. Paula Daoust

Excerpt: Chapter 11

The CLEAN/N Model



Chapter 11

The CLEAN/N Model

The CLEAN/N conversation

Sue burst into my office, obviously distraught. “I need your help. I think I’m going to get fired and it just isn’t fair.”

“Tell me what’s going on,” I said.

“My boss used to have my job and she thinks she knows what it takes to do the work but there have been so many changes in the rules and regulations that even the simplest of tasks take twice as long as when I first started working here. On top of that, the consulting firm HR hired has put a performance evaluation system in place that requires every statement to be documented with three supporting observations. I have eight direct-reports and each evaluation is taking thirty hours and I am way behind in my work.”

“Have you talked with Beth about your workload?” I asked.

“I tried. Last week I missed letting Beth know about an important meeting and she was really angry. When I explained about my workload, Beth said that she didn’t have time for excuses and things falling off the radar. She said she was going to work with me over the next week because missing deadlines is not an option. I think the only reason she is working with me is so that she can get more evidence to fire me. I’m working until 7 p.m. every night but I never seem to catch up.”

Has anything like this ever happened to you? You are in a situation in which it feels like the harder you try to do the right thing, the worse things seem to get? Many conversations on the conflict continuum can be avoided, minimized, or easily resolved by using the tools we have discussed so far: improving our mindset, using a kindness approach, avoiding triggers and sprinkling in sparks, attending to body language, make conditioning work for us instead of against us, using self-hypnosis, storytelling and finally, considering principles that influence behavior.

All these tools can be used at the lower end of the conflict continuum. However, when a conflict has reached the level of discord or dispute, a systematic strategy for holding a conversation needs to be added to the conflict management plan. The CLEAN/N conversation provides that vehicle and this is what I advised Sue to use. The acronym stands for: Can we talk; List the facts; Explain your meaning; Ask for their meaning; Neutralize or Next Steps.

“This is a tough spot to be in, Sue. You might be right about Beth’s intentions or there might be something else going on,” I commented.

“No, there’s nothing else going on. She’s out to get me!”

When we are in a difficult situation like this, it’s hard to let go of our first interpretation of the situation. We are meaning-makers and we are wired to protect ourselves, which means we are going to go to the “dark side” first. Our meaning makes sense to us and it is hard to let it go but, if we want to truly move to a good result, we need to be open to the possibility that there could be another meaning that also fits the facts. If you are like me, there have been situations when you were sure you knew what was going on and you took action based on that knowledge, only to discover that there was more to the story. More than once I said or did something that I had to apologize for once the rest of the story emerged. This is a good prescription for damaging relationships.

I asked Sue, “What do you want? Do you want Beth to just leave you alone or do you want a better working relationship with Beth?”

“I want Beth to understand what I am up against and to help me. I can’t keep working these extra hours, but I really need this job. When I first started here, I really loved the work. I still do, but now there’s just too much of it!”

“OK then, you’re going to have to talk with Beth. Let’s walk through the steps of a CLEAN/N conversation.”

Step 1: Can we talk

“First, you are going to have to set up the conversation. A critical first step is asking permission. These kinds of conversations always feel a little threatening to both parties. By asking permission, it gives Beth some feeling of control. A basic human drive is to maintain control because with control comes predictability. When we can anticipate what is about to happen, we can take proactive steps to protect ourselves. This reduces our sense of vulnerability and most importantly, the sense of threat. The conversation is going to be much more productive if threat levels for both of you are at a minimum.

Another reason why asking for permission is important is because it might truly not be a good time to have the discussion. If Beth has a meeting in five minutes, feels the location for the discussion is not right for any reason, or is in the middle of meeting a critical deadline, the conversation will be resented, rushed or given very little attention. Feeling pressured by the clock, uncomfortable with the location or busy dealing with other demands is not a good prescription for positive results.

Finally, asking permission to have the conversation is a good tool for gauging Beth's emotional temperature. If you get permission, you are free to move on to the next step. If, instead, you get a no; a hesitant, deer-in-the-headlights response; or a yes, that really sounds more like a no; then, you need to hit the pause button and create safety.

If you proceed without getting safety, nothing good is going to happen. You cannot hold a productive, rational conversation when either party is in fight or flight mode. When the amygdala sounds the alarm and the stress response has been activated, the quality of thinking is eroded and automatic and habitual responses are in full swing. We are literally 'dumbed' down in this condition and getting to a creative solution to a problem becomes highly unlikely."

Creating safety to de-escalate the conflict

"If Beth appears to be stressed, how do I create safety?"

"The good news for you is that you have choices. You can show that you care, you can apologize if there is something to apologize for, you can establish mutual purpose, or you can use a contrast tool."

Showing you care:

The most effective way to create safety is to express genuine caring for the other party. Notice the word genuine. If you don't really care about the other person and you suggest that you do, your body language will give you away. There are many "tells" in your body language that you cannot consciously control and which the other party will read at a subconscious level. Without being able to say exactly why, the other party will know if your words don't match your heart. That disconnect between your words and your body language will create mistrust and further increase the other party's sense of threat.

Expressing genuine caring for another person can be as simple as telling them that you respect them or the work they do. Or, you might say something like, "I like working with you and I want us to get back to being comfortable with each other again." If you feel it, find a way to say it. Knowing someone likes you, is almost irresistible. If I understand that you care about me, my need to defend myself against you dissipates. Friends look out for each other; that's what friends do! On a physical level, expressing caring for the other person stimulates a surge of oxytocin in both parties which results in a feeling of connection and well-being. Expressing caring may not be enough to make the conversation easy, but it will certainly improve the likelihood of being able to have a rational discussion.

Apologize if an apology is warranted.

Apologizing for something over which you had no control is empty, disingenuous, and counterproductive. Your body language will give you away if you don't really mean the apology. However, if you recognize that there was something you did that caused harm or hurt, then an apology is in order. A good apology will specify exactly what you are apologizing for. A simple "I'm sorry" or "I apologize" doesn't work because the other party is left guessing what you are apologizing for. The lack of effort involved in throwing out two words truly undermines the effect. Finish the sentence with the specifics and then add some commitment regarding future behavior. For example, "I'm sorry I was so abrupt this morning. When you have a concern, you deserve my full attention."

If you make an excuse for your behavior when you apologize, it doesn't sound like you really meant the apology. The word "but" is going to negate anything that came before it! There are times when an explanation feels important and, if you add the commitment for changed behavior, the excuse will not have the same negative effect on the apology. Using the previous example, you might say, "I'm sorry I was abrupt this morning. I was working with a deadline, but you deserve my full attention and I will do better the next time." As the listener, I now understand what the context was. I also understand that you are not letting yourself off the hook and you intend to behave differently in the future.

Shared purpose:

When we are in the middle of a dispute or open discord, we tend to see the other party as the "enemy"; they are not part of our tribe. This separateness can be mitigated by reminding ourselves and the other party that we have a shared goal, a mutual purpose. Saying something like, "We both want this project to succeed" or "I know you care as much about the organization as I do" helps to change the perspective. It's difficult to have a meaningful conversation when you are separated by a wall. Clarifying our shared purpose helps to move both parties to the same side of the wall. This is a better starting point for a healthy conversation.

Using a contrast statement:

This is a tool that comes from Crucial Conversations and is based on the premise that it isn't what you are saying that causes resistance. It's what the other person thinks you are saying. For example, Marie and Bob have scheduled a meeting to discuss a project and how to fund it. Bob's history with budget discussions with others has been contentious. When Marie schedules the meeting, Bob believes she intends to pressure him into giving up budget dollars for the project. This suspicion about her intention is in the room and whether it is openly discussed or not, it will affect his responses to anything Marie has to say. However, if Marie uses a contrast statement, "I'm not here to talk about your budget; I just want to talk through ideas you might

have about how a project like this could be funded” she can create a different base for their discussion.

A contrast statement has two parts: firstly, what your intention is not and secondly, what your intention is. The contrast statement eliminates the guess work. It allows the other party to release any fears and to refocus their attention on what needs to be resolved. To construct a contrast statement, you need to make an educated guess about what the other person might be assuming your intention is and then clearly deny it. You then follow up with a clear statement of what you do intend to achieve.

A statement such as: “I don’t want you to think I don’t appreciate your efforts; although we do need to talk about some of the details in this report,” can be made even stronger by slipping in an assurance between the first half and the second half of the statement. It might be worded this way: “I don’t want you to think I don’t appreciate your efforts because I have seen the extra hours you have put in and I know you really care about this project. We do need to talk about some of the details in this report.” Contrast statements take a little practice but once you have them mastered, they are a very effective tool for increasing the other person’s sense of safety.

I explained to Sue, “If you were to use a contrast statement with Beth, you might say something like, “I don’t want you to think that I don’t want your help [not your intention]. The work has changed since you had this job and I could really use your insight as to how to manage the workload [expressing respect and assurance – not an essential part of the contrast statement but it helps]. I would like an opportunity to share with you just how much the work has changed because I’m not sure just what I am dealing with. Can we talk about [my intention]?”

“Let me write that down so I can remember it,” Sue responded.

Step 2: List the facts.

“The next step is to list your facts for Beth,” I explained. “Remember, a fact is something that is true. It is consistent with objective reality and it can be verified. When you list the facts for Beth, you create an objective base of agreement. For example, ‘Your workday starts at 8 am; you arrived after 8 am three times last week.’ Either you were here on time or you were not!”

Listing the facts does not mean listing every fact. There are going to be many facts in any dispute. You pick out the most relevant facts and you share them with the other party. If you are upset about something, just taking the time to step back and think about what the actual facts are can change your perspective and your feelings about the situation. It takes work to sift through a situation and to identify the most relevant facts. When you do, you can paint a

concise picture of the situation for yourself and for the other party.

Most difficult conversations miss this step of listing facts and move directly to the next step: explain your meaning, which is the subjective interpretation of the event. Your interpretation may or may not be accurate but, regardless, it is unlikely that the other party shares the same interpretation. It is these differences in understanding or interpretation that can cause major mistrust and misunderstanding. Start with the facts because they did or didn't happen. The objectivity of facts allows you to set a base of common understanding. The other party may have some additional facts to add to the mix but once again, it's a fact or it isn't. Sharing your facts is the first step towards understanding and agreement.

"What are the facts of this situation, Sue?" I prompted.

Counting them off on her fingers, she said "One, Beth once had my job. Two, new regulations and process changes have made the work more complicated. Three, the HR performance evaluations have been taking up most of my time for the last few weeks. Four, I missed telling Beth about an important meeting. Five, I am behind on several projects and in danger of missing some deadlines." Sue moves to her other hand, "Six, Beth wants to work with me next week, and seven, Beth is collecting evidence to fire me."

"You did great until you got to number seven, Sue. Is that really a fact?" I commented.

"Maybe not but it sure feels like a fact!" Sue emphasized.

"Yeah, meanings you attach to facts usually do," I reminded her.

Step 3: Explain your meaning.

"After you have listed these facts, it's time to explain to Beth what you are thinking. This is where your seventh point comes in to play. It fits here, in this step."

"You mean, I just tell her I think she is trying to fire me?" Sue asked.

"If you share your facts first, Beth can now see why you came to your conclusion. She can see the logic even though it isn't comfortable for either of you. Whether you say it or not, Beth can figure out what you're thinking. By putting it out there and just saying it, you can both deal with it."

As a species, we are meaning-makers. Something happens and our minds immediately scan for a similar pattern from the past and attach the new event onto that pattern. Our mind is constantly judging: good/bad; safe/dangerous; like/dislike. If Adele comes to a meeting without

the right file, you attach a label to the event: disorganized or doesn't care about doing a good job. If Ronnie surprises you by bringing you a cup of coffee, you might label that event: kind, thoughtful, cares about me. We are always judging, and it happens so fast that the meaning we attach to an event – the label – gets mixed in with the facts. We easily lose sight of what the facts are and the additional meaning which we have attached to the facts. They become one in our memory and that's what sets off the downward spiral in many difficult conversations. Furthermore, my memory and interpretation of an event will not be the same as yours, especially if there is a point of contention. The fundamental attribution error (FAE) will severely affect the meaning each of us attaches to an event. FAE is one's natural tendency to use dispositional or personality-based explanations when interpreting another's behavior and discounting situational influences. You tend to do the opposite for your own behavior, basing your explanation on your intentions and situational factors.

Bailey didn't get her report done on time because she procrastinates and is not motivated to do good work. Your report was late because Henry didn't provide you with the data you needed when it was due. This is the fundamental attribution error in action. You are keenly aware of your own internal dialogue, intentions, motivations and external environmental constraints. You don't have access to all this information to explain other's behavior, so you rely on character or personality judgements.

Added to this, the reticular activating system (RAS) will ensure that there will always be a difference between your description of an event and the other person's memory for that same event. This happens even if the FAE doesn't come into play, which it always does! Your RAS is continuously filtering all stimuli so what reaches your conscious brain for processing is not likely to be the same set of data that reaches the other party's prefrontal cortex. We are naturally set up to interpret the same event differently.

If we have not learned to start with the facts, when we enter a conversation, we will immediately go to the meaning which we have attached to the event. While frustrated with your teenage son, you might say something like: "I'm tired of you not listening to me. I asked you to take out the trash and once again, you just kept on playing your video games. You just don't care about this family." Your son has another version of the same event: "Once again, you expect me to just drop everything and do whatever it is you want me to do. I fully intended to take out the trash, but I was in the middle of an intense game. If you had just given me a chance, I would have taken out the trash when the game was over." The difference between your version of the event and your son's version sets the two of you up for conflict.

Start with the facts and you have an objective starting point. Dad asked son to take out trash. Son was playing a video game when Dad made the request. Thirty minutes later the trash has not been taken out. Both father and son agree on the facts. Good start but it isn't enough. Facts are facts but they don't really explain the feelings associated with the event. Our ele-

phant, the emotional brain, is not satisfied with just the facts. More importantly, feelings are a part of the whole sequence and cannot be ignored any more than the objective facts can be denied. In this step of explaining your meaning, you are going to share what the facts add up to in your mind.

Returning to our young man and the trash, it might sound something like this: “I asked you to take out the trash half an hour ago and the trash is still here. I feel like you aren’t listening to me and that you don’t care about helping out around here.” Notice that this message had the same content as the first version, “I’m tired of you not listening to me...” You deliver the same message but because you started with the facts, it is now clear what led up to the meaning you attached to the situation. By stating the facts first, it is now clearer to the other party how you arrived at your meaning or the story which you have attached to the event. They don’t have to agree with your meaning, and they probably won’t, but they can now see why you are thinking or feeling what you are thinking or feeling.

One thing I have noticed when I teach people to list their facts is that they then skip sharing the meaning which they attached to the facts. Before training, they started with their meaning and skipped the facts. After training, the situation is reversed, and they skip the meaning. I believe that they do this because they have the same concern which Sue had, that it might make things worse. Sharing your meaning is uncomfortable but skipping this step is just as problematic as the original pattern of skipping the facts.

The meaning is in your head and if it isn’t shared, it’s still in the room. Even if you don’t verbalize your meaning, the other party can feel it and the result is that they don’t trust the conversation. In addition, you feel like you haven’t really been honest. The facts are only part of the story. You must share what those facts mean to you.

You could get a negative response to sharing your meaning and for this there are some important tools for neutralizing emotions. These are discussed in detail in step 6.

There are a couple of things to keep in mind when sharing your meaning: First, own your meaning. Say “I feel like...” or “I’m beginning to think...” Start with an “I” statement, and not, “You make me feel like...” Take responsibility for your thoughts and feelings but share them. Second, share your meaning as a thought or a feeling, and not as a fact. Use phrases like, “I’m beginning to think...” or, “I’m wondering” or, “It feels like...” or, “I might be...” By using tentative phrases, you are signaling that you are open to seeing or hearing something different. The combination of owning your meaning and being tentative in your statements will lessen the feeling of threat in the other person and encourage them to share their meaning, which is the next step.

Step 4: Ask for their meaning.

“Once you have shared your meaning, it’s time to hear Beth’s perspective. There is always more than one meaning that can be attached to any set of facts. What meanings might Beth attach to the set of facts you shared with her?”

“I don’t know what you mean?”

“If you were Beth, how might you explain her suggestion that she would work with you?”

“Oh, now I see. Beth might say that she is feeling some pressure from her boss and feels like she needs to get things in order so that she can ease this pressure. Is that what you mean?”

“Exactly. What other meaning could be attached to your facts?”

“That’s hard. Let me think. Maybe she realized that things have changed and wants to understand how the work gets done under these new conditions.”

“Right, if you had to, you could probably come up with many more explanations.”

Sue frowned and then said, “Aren’t I just making excuses for Beth?”

“No,” I responded, “What you are doing is opening yourself to the possibility there is another valid explanation. You may be right in the first meaning you attached to the facts but there may be more to the story. How would you know?”

“I guess I would have to ask.”

“Exactly! Before you can begin problem-solving, you need to understand Beth’s meaning or you might be solving the wrong problem. If you don’t give Beth a chance to challenge your meaning, it’s like telling her you that you know your meaning is the truth. That, my friend, is guaranteed to make the conflict much worse.”

How you ask for the other person’s meaning is important. Choose from any of the following phrases to get the additional information which might change how you proceed and avoid moving on to problem-solving too early.

- What’s your perspective on this?
- How do you see it?
- Is there something I’m missing?
- What are your thoughts on this?
- Help me understand...

The simpler the question, the better. You want to steer clear of the word “why” because it will trigger defensiveness and you absolutely want to avoid asking for a solution just yet.

When Sue had her talk with Beth, she listed off her facts and shared with Beth that she felt she was going to get fired. Beth was clearly surprised by Sue’s concern, “Sue, given how upset I was the other day, I can see now how you might be thinking that. But it’s very far from the truth. I’ve seen you working late every night for the last two months and I am concerned. We are about to take on a new project and I’m worried that you are worn out now. If I don’t figure out some way to get you some help, there is no way you can handle this project and you are the only one who has the right expertise.”

Beth’s response was an eye-opener for Sue!

These conversations don’t always work out the way it did for Sue. When approached properly, however, they always result in a good outcome. In Sue’s case, mistrust quickly shifted to feeling valued and as a result of Beth’s response the focus of the conversation took a very different turn. When you ask for the other party’s meaning, it frequently does change the direction of the conversation. Sometimes you get additional information, sometimes you get a different perspective, and sometimes you get validation that the meaning you attached was correct. When you take the time to ask for the other person’s meaning, it demonstrates that you respect their experience and it gives you an opportunity to re-think your meaning.

Step 5: Neutralize / Next Steps

Sometimes, as was the case for Beth and Sue, you can go directly to next steps which focuses on planning. More often, steps 3 and 4 have created emotions that must be calmed before you can engage in rational problem solving.

Neutralize emotions:

One reason why people often avoid sharing their meaning is because the meaning they attached to the facts is rarely positive. When they share it, the other party can become defensive, aggressive, accusatory, or simply withdraw from the conversation. None of that feels good. We may be anxious to get the difficult conversation behind us, but if we move too fast to the next step of solving the problem, we will not be able to negotiate a result that works well for both parties. Instead, we will be right back where we started. Sharing your meaning has triggered the other party’s stress response and their response has prompted some level of alarm in your brain.

When you observe a negative response after you shared your meaning, you need to stop and use any of the safety tools discussed earlier. Listening can be difficult because what the other person says to us often feels like an attack. If you can listen without responding defensively, this

burst of negativity will usually wear itself out in 3-5 minutes. Those few minutes of listening to what are often harsh words will feel like an eternity but, like a balloon losing its air, it will fizzle out. When you don't respond with anything but listening, the other party's energy has nothing to fuel it and then it often loses power until there is almost nothing. Once this happens, the principle of reciprocity comes into effect. Since you showed them the respect of listening, there is a greater probability that they will be willing to listen to you. The key is to be disciplined and to truly listen.

Listening does not mean you say nothing. Good listening is active. Listening with CARE is going to help you to truly understand and help the other person feel that they are being heard. CARE is an acronym for Clarity, Assure, Rephrase, and Encourage.

Get **clarity** by asking open-ended questions to make sure that you understand what is being said. "Why" questions will provoke defensiveness but what, when, where, how questions are fine. I often use questions like, "When you said ____, did you mean ____?" or, "What does the word ____ mean to you?" or, "How does ____ feel to you?"

Assuring involves verbalizing your feelings for the other person, "I care about you," "I really want for us to be able to trust each other," or "I respect your knowledge on this issue." Obviously, don't say it if you don't believe it. Verbalizing positive regard is going to stimulate the release of DOSE neurotransmitters - dopamine, oxytocin, serotonin, and endorphins, in both your own and the other person's brain. Looking for something positive you can say with honesty will tone down the intensity of the interaction. Assuring can also include validating the other person's perspective. Validating doesn't mean you agree, it just means that you can see the logic of the thought or feeling. For example, "If those were the facts I had, I would have come to the same conclusion" or "If I had experienced what you did, I might have felt the same way."

Rephrasing helps the other person recognize that you are really listening and that you understand what they have said. When I tell someone something and they say that they understand, I don't believe them. In fact, in my mind I am answering, "No you don't!" On the other hand, if they can put what I have just said into their own words, I feel like they do understand. Rephrasing takes focus but, when you succeed, you get a "two-for-one" reward. First, the other person feels respected and understood which contributes to a sense of connectedness. Second, the rephrase can work in the same way as a clarifying question. If you missed the point, it will be obvious, and the meaning can be corrected immediately.

Encouraging gives the other person the courage to share their meaning. Simple nods and filler words like "and" can encourage the speaker to continue and to explain more fully. While encouragement is always useful, it is critical when the other person has withdrawn from the conversation. After you have shared your meaning and you ask for their meaning, it is not

unusual for the other party to respond with silence or make movements to leave, or just say something like: “I have nothing to say” or “If that’s how you feel, then there’s no point in my talking.” When that happens, a comment from you like, “I really want to hear your perspective” or “Please, I really want to listen,” can make a big difference in getting the other person to share what they are thinking and feeling.

Next Steps:

Once you have worked your way through the first five steps and, if necessary, neutralized any negative emotions that may have been aroused, you can now problem-solve. This is the easiest part of the CLEAN/N process. Both you and the other person can think clearly, you have built an honest understanding of each other’s perspectives and, as a result, you are now focused on the right problem and are motivated to find a solution. The bonus is that when you solve the right problem, the solution tends to hold. Today’s solution is less likely to become tomorrow’s problem.

I like to use the following formula to pose the problem that needs to be solved. How do we [accomplish my objective] while also [accomplishing your objective]. The formula works just as well if you reverse the order by first stating the other person’s objective and then your own. When I put the problem statement front and center in this way, it sets the framework for finding a both/and instead of an either/or solution.

CLEAN/N Worksheet

1. Can we talk?

How will I ask permission to have the conversation about the conflict?

Which safety tools will I use?

[Using more than one tool is always more effective.]

- _____ Show that I care
- _____ Apology
- _____ Highlight a shared purpose
- _____ Contrast statements

How will I show that I care?

How might I use CARE to listen? (*Clarity, Assuring, Rephrasing and Encouraging*).

Using CARE to listen is a good strategy for further demonstrating that you care.

If appropriate, how will I apologize?

What might be our shared purpose?

What contrast statements might I use?

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

2. List your facts.

[Begin by brainstorming all the facts in the scenario and then place a check mark beside the facts that you will present in the conversation with the other party. There are always more facts than you will use but listing them all out will help you to identify the most important facts.]

☐

☐

☐

☐

☐

☐

☐

☐

☐

☐

3. Explain your meaning?

[Describe what the facts mean to you? What conclusions have you drawn? What is your interpretation of the facts?]

4. Ask for the other party’s meaning?

[How will you ask for their perspective or meaning. Make your ask simple and be careful to avoid problem-solving here.]

5. Neutralize emotions

*[Sharing your meaning and hearing the other party’s meaning often heightens emotions, you will usually need to be ready to reinstate safety at this point.]*Which safety tools will I use?

[Using more than one tool is always more effective.]

- ☐ Show that I care
- ☐ Apology
- ☐ Highlight a shared purpose
- ☐ Contrast statements

How will I show that I care?

How might I use CARE to listen? (*Clarity, Assuring, Rephrasing and Encouraging*).
Using CARE to listen is a good strategy for further demonstrating that you care.

If appropriate, how will I apologize?

What might be our shared purpose?

Next Steps:

What next steps might I propose?

[Be careful to be open to other ideas that might surface later when you have the conversation. This is just some preliminary thinking.]

Conflict at Work

The Companion Workbook

Written by a leading expert in performance management with over 40 years of experience



Dr. M. Paula Daoust has a doctorate in Behavior Psychology and is an expert in helping people find and maintain their peak performance. She is also a certified hypnotherapist and seamlessly blends these tools into her coaching to help people easily achieve lasting change. Over a period of 25 years, she has taught hundreds of master-level students how to be more persuasive and influential, and how to successfully manage conflict.

Dr. M. Paula Daoust is the expert other leaders look to for help in finding their peak performance. She has taught workshops and spoken at events all over North America on subjects such as conflict, change management, storytelling, influence and power, anxiety and stress at work and peak performance.

Do you have a group that would benefit from better conflict management skills? Dr. Daoust is available for keynote presentations or workshops tailored specifically to your needs.

Contact Dr. Daoust at:

Dr.Paula@behaviortransitions.com
785-633-6078

Other books by Dr. M. Paula Daoust



