High Trust - Low Accountability

---

1. Situation

The leadership culture was strong on trust and collaboration.

Executives communicated openly, supported one another, and created a psychologically safe environment.

On the surface, this looked healthy.

But performance was inconsistent.

Issues persisted longer than they should. Underperformance was discussed — but not corrected.

And accountability was often diluted in the name of empathy.

---

2. What Was Actually Wrong

This wasn’t a culture problem.

It was an accountability gap.

Empathy had been developed — but not balanced with clarity.

Feedback was framed as collaboration: “Let’s solve this together.”

But without clear ownership, timelines, or consequences, it didn’t land.

Executives learned to explain problems instead of owning them.

Psychological safety without consequence is not safety — it's avoidance.

---

3. Intervention

The shift was to operationalize accountability — without breaking trust.

We introduced:

• Clear, co-owned goals

• Defined ownership and expectations

• Time-bound follow-ups and checkpoints

Feedback changed in tone:

From supportive and open —
to supportive and direct.

We made performance visible, explicit, and measurable.

---

4. Hard Decisions

• Confronting underperformance directly at the executive level

• Removing the safety of vague feedback

• Accepting discomfort in leadership conversations

• Enforcing consequences after repeated misses

This required redefining empathy — from understanding to clarity.

---

5. Outcome

• Clear ownership across leadership

• Faster correction of performance issues

• Improved execution consistency

• Higher standards across the organization

Trust remained — but it became aligned with performance.

---

6. Key Insight

Empathy without accountability creates excuses.

Accountability without empathy creates fear.

High-performing organizations require both — in sequence.

Kindness is clarity.