

**STYBEL
PEABODY &
ASSOCIATES, INC.**



Maryanne Peabody and Dr. Larry Stybel are co-founders of Stybel Peabody Associates, Inc. Its mission is to partner with clients to insert “success” into successful C-Suite careers. For more information, contact peabody@stybelpeabody.com

HOW TO IMPROVE YOUR IN-PERSON AND VIRTUAL TEAM PRODUCTIVITY.

The Open-Forum Paradox

Open forums or brainstorming are open in name only. The first problem is that some people try to understand what the highest-ranking person in the room thinks. They then skew their ideas to agree with that authority.

In our consulting practice, we have seen dramatic examples of how authority figures within the room deliberately skew the team into

a false consensus by using nonverbal gestures: fidgeting in the seat, crossing legs and moving one foot up and down rapidly, vigorously nodding and smiling, etc.

Without saying a word, the leader can now claim the team thoroughly discussed the idea.

A second problem is that some people prefer to keep quiet until they have read the room. They then voice agreement with the consensus.

A third problem is that some people in the room tend to dominate discussions. Introverted participants are reluctant to interrupt. When silence-presumes-consent is the unstated group norm, you get an illusion of agreement.

Nominal Technique

The nominal group technique (NGT) is a structured method of discussion that gets contributions from everyone and facilitates quick agreement on the relative importance of issues. The superiority of NGT over open

forums has been well-researched. For example, Harvey & Holmes (2012), McPhail (2001), Horton, (1980), Mullen et al, (1991).

The national CEO peer support forum Vistage uses NGT as its structure for meetings. We run a monthly Zoom program for board directors and another monthly Zoom program for chief HR officers. We use NGT as the structure for discussion with both forums.

An Example of NGT

In a recent Zoom forum for HR officers, one member raised a work-related dilemma and asked for peer recommendations. The moderator organized the meeting into four structured segments: questions, recommendations, ranking, and follow-up.

During the questions phase, the moderator went around the room and allowed each participant to ask questions. No recommendations were

permitted. This format permitted all participants to have a say.

During the recommendations phase, the moderator went around the room and allowed each participant to make recommendations. The presenter was not permitted to verbally respond. The idea was to focus on the ideas and not defend oneself. The presenter was asked to write down every idea presented.

During the ranking phase, the moderator asked the presenter to rank recommendations in terms of "most likely to implement." The presenter discussed what made these recommendations stand out as viable. The focus was on the ideas and not who presented the ideas.

Thirty days later the Zoom forum meets again. The moderator will ask the presenter what has transpired. In other words, the presenter is held accountable for acting upon the recommendation chosen by the presenter.

Summary and Conclusions

“Open” forums are open in name only. In our group facilitation, we use a well-researched tool called nominal group technique (NGT) that helps solve problems. Try it out with your team or board. Let us know the results.

References

Harvey, H. and Holmes, C.A. (2012) “Nominal Group Technique: an effective method for obtaining group consensus.” *International Journal of Nursing Practice*, 18 (2) pp. 188-194.
https://researchonline.jcu.edu.au/22604/4/JCU_22604_Harvey_and_Holmes_2012_accepted.pdf

MacPhail, A. (2001) “Nominal Group Technique: a useful method for working with young people.” *British Educational Research Journal*, 27,2, pp.161-170.
<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/01411920120037117>

Horton, J.N. (1980) “Nominal Group Technique: a method of decision-making by committee.”

Anesthesia, 35, pp.811-814.

<https://associationofanaesthetists-publications.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/epdf/10.1111/j.1365-2044.1980.tb03924>.

Mullen, B, Johnson, C. & Salas, E. (1991)

“Productivity Loss in Brainstorming Groups: a meta-analytic integration.” *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 12, 1, pp. 3-23.

https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/epdf/10.1207/s15324834basp1201_1?needAccess=true

Stybel Peabody Associates, Inc. partners with companies to insert “success” into successful C-Suite careers.

Core services revolve around retained search limited to Board Directors, CEOs, CFOs, and

COOs; relationship management coaching at this level; and C-Suite Outplacement.

The firm runs two monthly podcasts: (1) “Seat at the Table,” a case-oriented forum limited to invited Board Directors, and (2) “CHRO Forum,” a case-oriented forum limited to invited Chief Human Resource Officers.

Since 2011, Psychology Today has published Stybel Peabody’s perspectives on leadership and career management. There are nearly 700,000 downloads. Copy and paste the link below into your web browser:

<https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/platform-success>

Business leaders wishing a free 30-minute consult can contact:

Maryanne Peabody

Stybel Peabody Associates, Inc.

peabody@stybelpeabody.com

stybelpeabody.com

boardoptions.com