steepstep.

EXAMPLE REPORT

Alex Morgan

How you work

A clear look at working preferences, with familiar examples and small ideas to try.

FIVE PARTS OF A WORKING LIFE



A Working with people

C Planning and finishing

E Contact, voice and pace

O Exploring ideas and change

P Responding under pressure

Your profile at a glance

This report summarizes responses to work-preference questions. Its descriptions have not been scientifically validated.

Compare each description with your own examples. Context matters, and you do not need to agree with every sentence.

This profile covers 5 areas of work and 15 topics. Read one topic at a time to see your result and what it could mean at work.

A VISUAL INDEX

3 answer positions, plus one pace comparison

The markers show where Alex’s answers sit between the descriptions. They are not percentiles or comparisons with other people. The pace chapter shows four stated choices without a marker.

01 Working with people

Considering the people affected

Keeping attention mainly on the task and its requirements

Considering how choices and communication affect other people



02 Planning and finishing

Planning the next steps

Beginning with less advance structure or relying on memory

Making steps, priorities or commitments visible before work begins



03 Contact, voice and pace

Pace across work situations

Four stated pace choices across the situations.

04 Exploring ideas and change

Finding out more

Focusing on what is already known or immediately needed

Seeking explanations and exploring ideas beyond the familiar



CHAPTER 01 · A

WORKING WITH PEOPLE

These questions cover how you describe considering other people, working toward a shared answer, and deciding what to check when starting a working relationship.

Consideration · Cooperative approach · Initial trust

Considering the people affected

Where your answers sit · 75.00 / 100

Keeping attention mainly on the task and its requirements

Considering how choices and communication affect other people

BASED ON YOUR ANSWERS

Your result on this topic

Your answers suggest you keep the people affected in view while working through a task.

You describe checking how a decision may land, trying to understand a colleague’s view, and noticing when your words make someone uncomfortable. That attention can help surface impact early, though it does not tell you what another person feels without asking.

What supports this account

Effects and task focus

- You consider how your choices may affect the people involved.
- You disagree that focusing on the task more than on how people feel about it describes you.

Perspective in disagreement

- You try to understand another person’s perspective before responding.
- You disagree that finding it hard to see a disagreement from the other person’s perspective describes you.

Tone and communication impact

- You describe noticing when the way you communicate makes someone uncomfortable.
- You disagree that paying little attention to how your tone affects others describes you.

What this could mean at work

When a change affects a colleague, ask what it changes for their work, then make the task constraint and any available options explicit.

May help when

The distinction matters most when both the practical requirement and another person's day-to-day work are affected.

May take more effort when

It is easy to mistake a polite exchange for an adequate check, or to keep discussing impact after the decision constraint is already clear.

Example only: how this could look at work. Imagine a team must choose between a quick fix and a change that affects a colleague’s workload. The colleague has not yet been asked what the change would mean for their work.

> **One idea to try**
>
> **Situation:** A decision with one fixed requirement and one affected colleague
>
> **Small change:** Before deciding, write the requirement and ask the colleague one open question about the change.
>
> **Time frame:** Use one real decision this week.
>
> **Notice:** Note what the person raised, what remained fixed and how long the exchange took.
>
> **Review:** Which part of the conversation improved the decision, and which part could be shorter next time?

> **Another explanation:** The items may capture how you see your own social skill, not only what you prefer to do. They do not measure another person's feelings or your accuracy in reading them.

Making a shared decision



BASED ON YOUR ANSWERS

Your result on this topic

Frustration with other people’s preferences is not part of how you describe joint work. Your answer does not indicate whether you are willing to adjust your approach to make joint work easier. For a shared decision, separate the requirement that must stay fixed from the method that could change.

What supports this account

Shared answer and own approach

- You did not lean either way on looking for a solution that people with different views can support.
- You did not lean either way on preferring to defend your own approach rather than reach a compromise.

Adjustment and frustration

- You did not lean either way on being willing to adjust your approach to make joint work easier.
- You disagree that finding it frustrating to work around other people’s preferences describes you.

Resolving together and contest

- You did not lean either way on preferring to resolve a disagreement together rather than win the argument.
- You did not lean either way on tending to treat a disagreement as a contest between positions.

What this could mean at work

These statements cover shared methods, compromise, and defending an approach. The items cover resolving disagreement, adjusting an approach, and frustration with preferences. They do not establish that agreement is always the best outcome. A useful hypothetical distinction is this: Holding a line can protect a clear requirement and avoid negotiating details that do not affect the outcome. The work is to separate that requirement from choices another person can own, or

disagreement can continue after the important constraint is settled. Changing a method can make a handoff easier when the other person owns a real dependency. A joint answer is useful only if the decision is shared; adapting around a fixed constraint can be more effective than seeking agreement on every preference.

May help when

Distinguishing fixed constraints from negotiable methods is useful whenever two people must coordinate but have different preferences.

May take more effort when

Trying to find consensus on a decision with one accountable owner can waste time; deciding alone on a shared dependency can create rework.

Example only: how this could look at work. Imagine two people disagree about a handover. The delivery date is fixed, but they can still adjust who documents the steps and how they coordinate.

> **One idea to try**
>
> **Situation:** A decision with both a fixed constraint and a choice of method
>
> **Small change:** Ask each person to name the constraint first, then offer one reversible option they would accept.
>
> **Time frame:** Try this once on a task disagreement.
>
> **Notice:** Note whether the actual constraint was shared and whether an option emerged without pressure to agree on everything.
>
> **Review:** What needed agreement, and what could remain a difference of view?

> **Another explanation:** Whether a joint answer is useful depends on the issue, authority and fixed constraints. The answers do not show that compromise is always better.

Giving people a chance



BASED ON YOUR ANSWERS

Your result on this topic

You do not describe usually assuming people intend to keep their commitments, while you expect them to put their own interests first when pressure increases. This is an expectation, not proof of how someone will act. In shared work, make responsibilities and follow-through visible.

You do not describe beginning a new working relationship expecting fair treatment, while you need evidence before trusting another person’s explanation. This does not mean you expect unfair treatment; it describes a threshold for accepting an explanation. Ask for the information that would resolve the question.

What supports this account

Commitments and self-interest

- You disagree that usually assuming that people intend to keep their commitments describes you.
- You expect people to put their own interests first when pressure increases.

Benefit of doubt and motives

- You did not lean either way on giving people the benefit of the doubt when their intentions are unclear.
- You did not lean either way on tending to question the motives behind an offer of help.

Fair treatment and evidence

- You disagree that beginning a new working relationship expecting fair treatment describes you.
- You need evidence before trusting another person’s explanation.

What this could mean at work

These statements cover expectations, commitments, motives, and evidence checks. Fair treatment, keeping commitments, explanations, motives, and evidence are not interchangeable. The questions do not identify which influenced a particular decision. A useful hypothetical distinction is this: A

check can protect a task when an incorrect detail has a real cost. The useful question is what evidence the task requires; checking a number or deadline does not establish what you believe about a person's intentions. Starting from a fair expectation can leave room for people to work without proving every intention. The task still needs an agreed check when an error matters; trust alone cannot supply missing evidence about a payment, safety step or deadline.

May help when

Separating relationship expectations from task controls is useful when a new colleague shares work with financial, safety or access consequences.

May take more effort when

A personal trust question can distract from a necessary process check, while a process check can be misread as a judgment of someone's character.

Example only: how this could look at work. Imagine a new project partner offers to take over a task. The next step depends on the agreed responsibilities and what has actually been confirmed.

One idea to try

Situation: One low-consequence and one high-consequence commitment

Small change: For each, state what the task requires you to verify before deciding how much checking is enough.

Time frame: Compare two examples over the next week.

Notice: Record the consequence, the check used and whether either person treated it as a personal judgment.

Review: What changed with the task risk, and what did not depend on how well you knew the person?

Another explanation: These items mix expectations about people, checking explanations and suspicions about motives. They must not turn careful verification into a claim of mistrust.

CHAPTER 02 · C

PLANNING AND FINISHING



These questions cover how you describe planning steps, returning to commitments, and comparing consequences before a decision.

Organisation · Follow-through · Deliberation

Planning the next steps



Where your answers sit · 83.33 / 100

Beginning with less advance structure or relying on memory

Making steps, priorities or commitments visible before work begins

BASED ON YOUR ANSWERS

Your result on this topic

Your answers suggest you prefer to organize work before you begin.

You describe arranging steps and keeping a consistent record of commitments. This can make dependencies visible; a plan still needs room for new information and changing priorities.

What supports this account

Ordering and the day unfolding

- You put tasks into an order before you begin.
- You disagree that usually deciding what to work on as the day unfolds describes you.

Tracking and memory

- You keep track of commitments in a consistent way.
- You disagree that relying on memory rather than a system to track tasks describes you.

Clear plan and starting without steps

- You like having a clear plan for the next steps.

- You disagree that being comfortable beginning a task without organising the steps describes you.

What this could mean at work

Before starting a complex task, write the next few steps and mark which assumption would require you to revise them.

May help when

The difference matters when one task contains both a known handoff and an uncertain part that needs exploration.

May take more effort when

Planning every step too early can freeze assumptions; waiting until later can leave a colleague unable to start.

Example only: how this could look at work. Imagine preparing a handover while a new requirement may still arrive. Some steps can be listed now; one decision may need to remain open until the requirement is clear.

> **One idea to try**
>
> **Situation:** A task with one known handoff and one uncertain step
>
> **Small change:** Write the handoff owner and date, then leave the uncertain step as a question with a review point.
>
> **Time frame:** Test this structure on one task this week.
>
> **Notice:** Note whether the handoff started on time and whether the open step changed after new information.
>
> **Review:** Which detail needed a plan up front, and which was better left open?

> **Another explanation:** The items mix advance planning, changing priorities and ways of tracking work. Tools, autonomy and task clarity can shape each answer.

Following through



BASED ON YOUR ANSWERS

Your result on this topic

You did not lean either way on continuing important tasks after interest fades. You disagree that continuing becomes difficult when enthusiasm drops. This does not tell us how long you persist. When a task feels less engaging, check whether its next step is still worth doing now.

You usually finish tasks you have committed to. You disagree that you often leave repetitive tasks unfinished; whether repetition slows you down remains unclear. For recurring work, set a clear finish point so progress is easy to see.

You did not indicate whether you return to unfinished work when something more interesting appears. You disagree that you tend to move on before finishing. The answers do not show whether you revisit unfinished work later. When interrupted, note where to resume before responding to the new task.

What supports this account

Important work and fading enthusiasm

- You did not lean either way on continuing an important task after the initial interest fades.
- You disagree that finding it difficult to continue a task once your enthusiasm drops describes you.

Finishing and repetition

- You usually finish the tasks you have committed to.
- You disagree that often leaving tasks unfinished when they become repetitive describes you.

Returning and moving to new work

- You did not lean either way on returning to unfinished work when something more interesting appears.
- You disagree that tending to move to a new task before finishing the previous one describes you.

What this could mean at work

These statements cover completion, returning to work, interest, and repetition. Finishing, returning after interruption, and continuing after interest fades are related but different situations. The answers do not identify which one explains a particular outcome. A useful hypothetical distinction is this: A change of attention may be a response to new priorities, interruptions or the task losing value. The useful distinction is whether the original commitment still matters and whether someone needs an update before work moves elsewhere. A clear finish condition can help a routine task reach completion after novelty passes. It is still worth checking whether the commitment remains useful; persistence on work that no longer matters consumes time that could go elsewhere.

May help when

Separating blocked work from work that no longer matters helps teams decide whether to resume, renegotiate or close a task.

May take more effort when

Treating every unfinished task as a personal persistence problem can hide changing priorities or missing authority.

Example only: how this could look at work. Imagine a task has become repetitive, while its deadline still matters. A check-in could clarify whether to continue, change the approach or renegotiate the commitment.

> **One idea to try**
>
> **Situation:** One task that was paused, interrupted or changed
>
> **Small change:** Write the original finish condition and ask whether it still matters before scheduling more work.
>
> **Time frame:** Review the task once this week.
>
> **Notice:** Record whether it was blocked, changed in value or still needed a visible next step.
>
> **Review:** What support or decision would have changed the outcome more than a reminder?

> **Another explanation:** Interruptions, changing priorities and the value of the task affect follow-through. Self-report does not establish delivery quality.

Thinking decisions through



BASED ON YOUR ANSWERS

Your result on this topic

You describe considering likely consequences before deciding. Your other answer leaves open whether you also sometimes commit before thinking through what follows. For a costly decision, put the consequence check before the point where changing course becomes difficult.

You compare available options before choosing. You disagree that you prefer a quick choice to examining several alternatives. This does not say how extensive your comparison is. Before a high-impact choice, set a limit on what you need to compare.

What supports this account

Consequences

- You consider likely consequences before making a decision.
- You did not lean either way on sometimes committing before thinking through what follows.

Detail checks and first ideas

- You did not lean either way on checking important details before committing to an action.
- You did not lean either way on tending to act on your first idea.

Comparing and quick choice

- You compare the available options before choosing an approach.
- You disagree that preferring a quick choice to examining several alternatives describes you.

What this could mean at work

These statements cover option comparison, consequences, detail checks, and quick choices. The items ask about speed, first ideas, alternatives, consequences, and detail checks. They do not show that one review style fits every decision. A useful hypothetical distinction is this: A quick choice can keep a reversible task moving when waiting has a cost. The important check is whether an error would be cheap to correct; a choice that affects money, safety or many people may need a slower review. Comparing options can surface an important side effect before a difficult-to-reverse decision. The review has a cost too: once the choice is reversible and the key risks are known,

gathering more opinions may add delay without changing the plan.

May help when

A simple consequence check can help when a decision ranges from easy to undo to difficult to reverse.

May take more effort when

More analysis does not guarantee a better outcome and can delay a choice after the useful evidence is already available.

Example only: how this could look at work. Imagine choosing between two ways to correct a customer-facing error. One is easy to reverse; the other could affect several people, so the checks before acting may differ.

> **One idea to try**
>
> **Situation:** One easy-to-reverse choice and one costly-to-reverse choice
>
> **Small change:** For each, write the cost of being wrong, the cost of waiting and whether a small test is possible.
>
> **Time frame:** Compare two real decisions over the next week.
>
> **Notice:** Record what evidence changed the choice and when additional review stopped helping.
>
> **Review:** Did the decision process match the cost and reversibility of each choice?

> **Another explanation:** The items overlap with generating alternatives in another facet. A slower or faster choice does not establish decision quality.

CHAPTER 03 · E

CONTACT, VOICE AND PACE

This area groups draft self-reports about interaction, speaking up, and preferred work pace. The pace chapter shows four direct choices without combining them into a score.

Interaction preference · Assertiveness · Pace across work situations

Time with people

BASED ON YOUR ANSWERS

Your result on this topic

You do not describe enjoying idea exchange during a task, and you prefer long stretches with little interaction. That preference does not mean you avoid collaboration. Before a group task, agree on a block with little interaction and a time to regroup.

You do not describe looking for opportunities to work alongside others. When either option is available, you usually choose to work independently. This describes a usual choice, not a rejection of collaboration when needed. For a dependent task, set a check-in so coordination is still covered.

You do not describe feeling drawn to activities with regular conversation. You did not lean either way on whether you are comfortable with little social contact during a workday. The answers do not establish your preferred level of contact. If a day is mostly solo, check what coordination the work still needs.

What supports this account

Exchanging ideas and stretches with little interaction

- You disagree that enjoying exchanges of ideas during a task describes you.
- You prefer long stretches of work with little interaction.

Working alongside and independently

- You disagree that looking for opportunities to work alongside others describes you.
- You usually choose to work independently when either option is available.

Conversation and little contact

- You disagree that feeling drawn to activities with regular conversation describes you.
- You did not lean either way on being comfortable with little social contact during a working day.

What this could mean at work

These statements cover conversation, shared work, contact, and independent stretches. The items cover conversation, working alongside others, independent work, and low-contact stretches. They do not show a single preferred arrangement for every day. A useful hypothetical distinction is this: A quiet block can help when the task needs sustained attention. Shared work still needs planned exchanges at the points where a decision, question or handoff would otherwise wait. Quick conversation can reduce waiting when work changes as people exchange information. It can also fragment a task that needs a longer quiet stretch, so useful contact depends on timing and purpose rather than volume alone.

May help when

It helps to separate the amount of social contact from the timing of task-related communication.

May take more effort when

Adding check-ins to every task can interrupt concentration; relying only on occasional meetings can leave quick dependencies waiting.

Example only: how this could look at work. Imagine a short decision needs input from a colleague, followed by work that needs uninterrupted concentration. The team can agree when to exchange views and when to protect focus time.

> **One idea to try**
>
> **Situation:** One task done alone and one task requiring quick exchange
>
> **Small change:** Choose one planned contact point for each task and leave other updates asynchronous.
>
> **Time frame:** Compare both arrangements over the next week.
>
> **Notice:** Record interruptions, waiting time and whether the planned exchange answered a real question.
>
> **Review:** Did you want more contact, different timing or simply clearer task information?

> **Another explanation:** The form combines enjoyment, contact level and working arrangement. Remote work, frontline work and team norms change what those answers mean.

Speaking up



BASED ON YOUR ANSWERS

Your result on this topic

You describe stating your view while a group makes a decision. You disagree that you tend to keep your opinion to yourself in group discussion. These are self-descriptions of those situations, not a statement about every group. When a decision matters, make your main reason clear.

You are willing to start a difficult conversation. Your answer does not show whether you usually wait for someone else to lead a discussion. If an issue needs raising, suggest a time and purpose.

You take the initiative to explain your position when views differ, and difficulty voicing disagreement with a group is not part of how you describe yourself. In a meeting, make the reason behind your position clear and invite the group to test it.

What supports this account

Stating a group view

- You state your view when a group is deciding what to do.
- You disagree that tending to keep your opinion to yourself in a group discussion describes you.

Starting and waiting for a lead

- You are willing to start a difficult conversation.
- You did not lean either way on usually waiting for someone else to lead a discussion.

Explaining differing views

- You take the initiative to explain your position when views differ.
- You disagree that finding it difficult to voice disagreement with a group describes you.

What this could mean at work

These statements cover stating views, explaining disagreement, initiating a conversation, and discussion leadership. The items cover stating a view, starting a difficult conversation, taking initiative, waiting, and holding back. They do not identify why someone spoke or stayed quiet. A

useful hypothetical distinction is this: Waiting can give a group time to surface its options before you respond. A concern that arrives after the decision is closed may be harder to use, especially when you hold information the group needs. Speaking up can make missing information visible before a group commits. Its usefulness depends on whether the point names evidence or a concern the group can act on, and whether others have a chance to respond.

May help when

Comparing a decision meeting with an information-sharing meeting can reveal whether the situation changes what contribution is needed.

May take more effort when

Counting how often you speak can miss whether a concise point arrived at the useful moment or whether the discussion lacked a safe opening.

Example only: how this could look at work. Imagine a meeting is about to settle a decision and one person has a concern. The chair can invite that view, while making clear who owns the final call.

One idea to try

Situation: Two group settings with different decision needs

Small change: In one, ask a question before the choice; in the other, offer a short view after hearing the options.

Time frame: Try each once this week.

Notice: Record what the group needed, when you spoke and what happened next.

Review: Did your timing fit the group's task, or did the setting itself make contribution difficult?

Another explanation: These answers concern your own report of speaking up. They do not show whether a point is right or how another person hears it.

Pace across work situations



These are your stated pace preferences in four situations. Each choice is about one familiar or learning task, worked on your own or alongside one other person.

A difference between scenes describes the choices you gave to these prompts. It does not explain why you chose a pace or show what you would prefer elsewhere.

Pace you chose in each situation

Working arrangement	Familiar task	Task you are learning
On your own	**Somewhat prefer a brisk pace**	**Somewhat prefer a measured pace**
Alongside one other person	**Strongly prefer a brisk pace**	**No preference between these paces**

> **One idea to try**
>
> **Situation:** Agreeing how to begin a shared task
>
> **Small change:** Before starting, ask what pace works for each person while still meeting the task's requirements.
>
> **Time frame:** Try it in one shared task.
>
> **Notice:** Notice whether everyone understands the pace they agreed to.
>
> **Review:** Would a different pace have changed how the task felt, while still meeting its requirements?

CHAPTER 04 · O

EXPLORING IDEAS AND CHANGE

These questions cover how you describe following questions, considering another way to solve a problem, and adjusting a method when circumstances change.

Intellectual curiosity · Originality preference · Approach flexibility

Finding out more

Where your answers sit · 83.33 / 100

Focusing on what is already known or immediately needed

Seeking explanations and exploring ideas beyond the familiar

BASED ON YOUR ANSWERS

Your result on this topic

Your answers suggest you enjoy investigating unfamiliar ideas and asking why they work.

You describe being drawn to questions that challenge what you know and explanations outside your usual field. That curiosity can open useful paths; it still helps to connect exploration back to the task at hand.

What supports this account

Unfamiliar and familiar concepts

- You enjoy understanding why an unfamiliar idea works.
- You disagree that preferring what you already know to exploring unfamiliar concepts describes you.

Challenging questions and task boundary

- You look into questions that challenge what you already know.
- You disagree that rarely investigating beyond what the current task requires describes you.

Outside knowledge and practical use

- You are interested in explanations outside your usual area of knowledge.
- You disagree that losing interest in ideas without immediate practical use describes you.

What this could mean at work

Give an open question a bounded slot, then note what practical decision or next experiment the answer could inform.

May help when

A stopping rule can help when some questions affect the work and others are interesting but optional.

May take more effort when

Research without a decision link can take time from delivery; a premature stop can leave a material assumption untouched.

Example only: how this could look at work. Imagine an unfamiliar idea appears during a project. The team can ask what decision it could change, then agree how much investigation is useful before moving on.

> **One idea to try**
>
> **Situation:** Two open questions, one decision-relevant and one optional
>
> **Small change:** Set a short time limit for the relevant question and leave the optional one on a later list.
>
> **Time frame:** Try this on one task this week.
>
> **Notice:** Record whether the answer changed the plan and whether the optional question could wait.
>
> **Review:** What was the stopping point that gave enough information to act?

> **Another explanation:** Interest in an idea does not establish intelligence, learning speed or the accuracy of a conclusion.

Imagining alternatives



BASED ON YOUR ANSWERS

Your result on this topic

You enjoy thinking of a different way to approach a familiar problem. You did not indicate whether you prefer a proven solution over creating a new one. When a change is low-risk, compare it with the proven approach.

You generate several possible approaches before settling on one. Your answer does not say whether you usually begin with an established example or invent an approach. Before choosing, check one option against a known example if one is available.

What supports this account

Different and proven approach

- You enjoy thinking of a different way to approach a familiar problem.
- You did not lean either way on preferring a proven solution to creating a new one.

Alternatives and established example

- You generate several possible approaches before settling on one.
- You did not lean either way on usually starting with an established example rather than inventing an approach.

Combining and refining ideas

- You did not lean either way on liking to combine ideas usually considered separately.
- You did not lean either way on finding unusual alternatives less appealing than refining a known method.

What this could mean at work

These statements cover new approaches, combining ideas, generating alternatives, and established methods. The items cover alternative generation, combining ideas, and using established methods. They do not measure creativity or the quality of a proposed solution. A useful hypothetical distinction is this: An established method carries useful lessons and can reduce setup when it

already meets the need. It may still contain a poor fit; the answer pattern does not show whether a familiar process works well for this task. A second approach can reveal a simpler route when the current method leaves an unmet need. An idea becomes useful only when it can be tested against the same requirements and does not add more cost than the problem it solves.

May help when

Comparing a familiar process and a small alternative against the same requirement can make the actual difference visible.

May take more effort when

Treating novelty as automatically useful can add risk; treating familiarity as proof can leave an avoidable problem in place.

Example only: how this could look at work. Imagine a familiar template stops fitting a new case. The team can generate a few alternatives, compare what each changes and keep the parts of the template that still work.

> **One idea to try**
>
> **Situation:** A familiar method that may or may not fit a changed need
>
> **Small change:** Write the requirement, compare one alternative and test it only if it changes a concrete result.
>
> **Time frame:** Run one reversible trial.
>
> **Notice:** Record the result against the requirement, not whether the method felt new.
>
> **Review:** Which method served the need better, and what evidence would make you switch back?

> **Another explanation:** The items overlap with careful comparison and decision-making. Considering an alternative does not mean preferring novelty or producing a useful idea.

Changing your approach



BASED ON YOUR ANSWERS

Your result on this topic

You reconsider your method when new information changes the situation. You disagree that you prefer to keep the original method as alternatives emerge. These answers describe how you respond to changed conditions; they do not mean you replace every method. When new information matters, note what it changes before revising your approach.

You are comfortable trying an unfamiliar approach when conditions change. Your answer does not indicate whether you need time to become comfortable with a different way of doing things. For a change in routine, set a point to review how it is working.

You describe being able to revise a plan without feeling the earlier work was wasted. Your answer does not establish whether letting go of a developed plan is difficult. When plans shift, identify which earlier work still applies.

What supports this account

Reconsidering and keeping a method

- You reconsider your method when new information changes the situation.
- You disagree that preferring the original method when alternatives emerge describes you.

Unfamiliar method and adjustment time

- You are comfortable trying an unfamiliar approach when conditions change.
- You did not lean either way on needing time to become comfortable with a different approach.

Revising and letting go of a plan

- You describe being able to revise a plan without feeling that the earlier work was wasted.
- You did not lean either way on finding it difficult to let go of a developed plan.

What this could mean at work

These statements cover new information, revising a plan, unfamiliar methods, and adjustment time. The items cover revising a method, trying an unfamiliar approach, and comfort with switching. They do not identify which factor mattered in a particular situation. A useful hypothetical distinction is

this: Keeping a method that still works avoids switching cost and gives a team a stable reference. When the conditions have changed, a short evidence check can distinguish a useful pause from continuing with a process that no longer meets the requirement. Changing course can keep a process aligned with a new requirement. A revision still needs a clear owner, a transition plan and evidence that the new method solves the problem rather than simply replacing a familiar routine.

May help when

A small test is useful when the proposed change is reversible and the current method has a specific unresolved cost.

May take more effort when

Changing too quickly may impose migration work; waiting without a review date may let a real problem continue indefinitely.

Example only: how this could look at work. Imagine new information arrives after a plan is underway. The team can identify which steps remain useful and which need revision, without treating earlier work as wasted.

> **One idea to try**
>
> **Situation:** One change you accepted or questioned
>
> **Small change:** Write the problem, the switching cost, who decides and the evidence that would change your view.
>
> **Time frame:** Review after one safe trial or a set date.
>
> **Notice:** Record which factor actually determined the decision.
>
> **Review:** Was the decision driven by evidence, timing, switching cost or authority?

> **Another explanation:** Change depends on evidence, timing, authority and switching effort. Keeping a plan is not by itself resistance.

CHAPTER 05 · P

RESPONDING UNDER PRESSURE



These questions cover what you report about attention during pressure, returning to work after a setback, and waiting while an outcome is unresolved.

Composure · Recovery after setbacks · Comfort with uncertainty

Keeping steady



BASED ON YOUR ANSWERS

Your result on this topic

You describe being able to keep attention on the task when demands increase. You did not lean either way on whether concentration becomes difficult as demands build up. When several demands arrive, choose one next step before switching.

You describe staying composed during tense exchanges, without describing them as tending to disrupt your focus. This speaks to one kind of pressure, not how you handle other demands. If a discussion gets heated, recap the decision and what happens next.

You describe being able to think through the next step when several things need attention. You disagree that you feel unsettled when several people need something at once. This pair covers those situations, not every competing request. When several tasks arrive, decide which next step has the clearest deadline.

What supports this account

Rising demands

- You describe being able to keep your attention on the task when demands increase.
- You did not lean either way on finding it difficult to concentrate as demands build up.

Tense exchanges

- You usually stay composed during a tense exchange.
- You disagree that tense exchanges as tending to disrupt your focus describes you.

Simultaneous requests

- You describe being able to think through the next step when several things need attention.
- You disagree that feeling unsettled when several people need something at once describes you.

What this could mean at work

These statements cover tension, concurrent requests, rising demands, and focus. The items repeat attention and focus language. They do not establish decision quality, resilience, or capacity for a workload. A useful hypothetical distinction is this: A tense conversation and several simultaneous requests are different demands, even if both compete for attention. The answers cannot identify the cause; workload, control, support and the task's safety requirements need attention in their own right. Keeping a next step visible may help work continue during a short disruption. That report does not show that the decision is accurate, that the workload is sustainable or that stress is absent; recovery time and support still matter.

May help when	May take more effort when
Separating conflict, interruptions and workload can help identify which condition needs a practical change.	A general claim about being calm or stressed can conceal the specific condition that made the work harder or unsafe.

Example only: how this could look at work. Imagine several requests arrive during a tense exchange. The people involved can pause to name the immediate task, the next decision and what support or time is available.

> **One idea to try**
>
> **Situation:** One tense exchange and one high-volume work period
>
> **Small change:** After each, note the demand, support available and one work condition that would help.
>
> **Time frame:** Compare two recent examples or observe the next two.
>
> **Notice:** Record differences without rating your resilience or guessing at work quality.
>
> **Review:** Which condition needs to change, and who has the authority to change it?

> **Another explanation:** The items repeat focus wording. Feeling composed does not show that a workload is safe or that decisions stay accurate.

Finding a way forward



BASED ON YOUR ANSWERS

Your result on this topic

A disappointing outcome usually stops occupying your attention after you review it. You did not indicate whether you need a long time to refocus after the outcome. Choose a manageable first task after reviewing an outcome.

What supports this account

Setback and refocusing

- You did not lean either way on being able to return your attention to useful work after a setback.
- You did not lean either way on continuing to replay a setback after the immediate problem has passed.

Difficult feedback

- You did not lean either way on being able to focus on what comes next after difficult feedback.
- You did not lean either way on difficult feedback staying on your mind while you do other things.

Disappointing outcome

- A disappointing outcome usually stops occupying your attention once you have reviewed it.
- You did not lean either way on needing a long time to refocus after a disappointing outcome.

What this could mean at work

These statements cover feedback, setbacks, disappointment, and refocusing. The items overlap in how they describe attention after setbacks. They do not show how long a response lasted or what caused it. A useful hypothetical distinction is this: The next useful step depends on what happened: feedback may call for clarification, a correctable mistake may need repair, and an outcome outside your control may need acknowledgement before moving on. The answers do not measure a fixed recovery time. A short review can turn an error or difficult outcome into a next action. Moving on too

quickly may still miss a needed repair, and another person's response or an unresolved workload issue may require follow-up.

May help when	May take more effort when
Separating a correctable mistake from a disappointing result can make the next step more relevant.	Using one reset routine for every setback may skip a repair, ignore a lesson or keep revisiting something that cannot be changed.

Example only: how this could look at work. Imagine a disappointing result comes with detailed feedback. A short review can separate a change that is within the team’s control from an outcome that needs time or more information.

> **One idea to try**
>
> **Situation:** Two different setbacks, such as feedback and a delayed project
>
> **Small change:** For each, label what can be clarified, corrected or accepted before choosing a next step.
>
> **Time frame:** Compare two examples this week or from recent work.
>
> **Notice:** Record whether the useful action differed between events.
>
> **Review:** Which event needed action, which needed information and which mainly needed time or support?

> **Another explanation:** The items use overlapping pressure language. Feedback, a missed deadline and a cancelled project may have different effects; no stable recovery time is measured.

Handling uncertainty



BASED ON YOUR ANSWERS

Your result on this topic

You do not report being able to focus on the next step when the final outcome is unclear. You find it hard to settle into a task when important outcomes are uncertain. The second response describes difficulty settling into the work, not whether you can take any next step. Clarify what is known and choose a first action that fits it.

You do not describe remaining reasonably settled while waiting for information you cannot control. You did not lean either way on whether unanswered questions tend to occupy your attention. These answers do not establish what the wait is like for you. Identify when you can next check for information.

You do not report being able to work effectively without knowing exactly how a situation will turn out. You feel a strong need for clarity before you can focus on the next step. That need does not mean the outcome itself must be fully known. Before starting, identify the specific information needed for the next action.

What supports this account

Next-step focus and unclear outcome

- You disagree that being able to focus on the next step while the final outcome is unclear describes you.
- You find it hard to settle into a task when important outcomes are uncertain.

Waiting and unanswered questions

- You disagree that remaining reasonably settled while waiting for information outside your control describes you.
- You did not lean either way on unanswered questions tending to occupy your attention.

Working without certainty and need for clarity

- You disagree that being able to work effectively without knowing exactly how a situation will turn out describes you.
- You feel a strong need for clarity before focusing on the next step.

What this could mean at work

These statements cover missing information, waiting, unclear outcomes, and next steps. These items combine attention to an unclear final outcome with waiting for information outside your control. They do not identify which kind of uncertainty is present in a particular situation. A useful hypothetical distinction is this: Waiting is harder when there is no owner or update time, but some information is genuinely needed before a safe decision. A useful plan separates what can move now from what must wait for an answer. Continuing with an independent task can prevent a pending outcome from stopping all work. The boundary matters: an unresolved question that controls a safety, finance or permission decision must stay a gate rather than become background uncertainty.

May help when

Checking dependencies can help separate safe parallel work from a decision that needs a specific answer first.

May take more effort when

Calling every delay uncertainty can pressure people to proceed without a needed safeguard; treating every unknown as a blocker can stop work that is safe to do.

Example only: how this could look at work. A final approval may block a decision while preparing a draft can continue before the approval arrives.

> **One idea to try**
>
> **Situation:** One open question and the work waiting around it
>
> **Small change:** Mark what requires the answer, what can safely continue and when the owner will update you.
>
> **Time frame:** Review at the next update time.
>
> **Notice:** Record whether the waiting boundary was correct and whether safe work continued.
>
> **Review:** Which part needed certainty, and which part only needed a clear update?

> **Another explanation:** The items repeat focus wording. Wanting clarity does not show inability to cope; sometimes the missing information is necessary for a safe decision.

How to read this example

The descriptions are prompts for reflection, not a validated measure or a comparison with other people.

Alex Morgan and the answers shown in this example are fictional. This page shows the report’s format.