

# Working Relationships

---

*How to Build Trust, Handle Friction and Make Yourself Easy to Work With Without Becoming Easy to Push Around*

PREPARED BY

**Manu Reynolds — Director**

Buildit Admin Solutions Pty Ltd | ABN 35 677 590 082

0406 066 652 | manu@builditadminsolutions.com.au | builditadminsolutions.com.au

REVISION 1.0 | AUGUST 2026 | DRAFT FOR CLIENT REVIEW

## Document Status and Use

### Purpose

A practical working-relationships manual for commercial construction and contract administration. It covers the recurring interfaces that determine whether information moves early, disagreement stays productive and people can work firmly together across project, client, consultant, JV and supply-chain boundaries.

### Audience

Contract administrators through commercial managers, plus engineers, supervisors and project leaders who regularly manage upward, sideways, downward and externally across clients, superintendents, designers, joint ventures and the supply chain.

### What This Manual Is — and Is Not

This is not a guide to being agreeable, avoiding difficult conversations or trading away legitimate commercial positions. It is a guide to reducing unnecessary interpersonal friction so that disagreement can occur without making the relationship itself another project problem.

It is not HR policy, legal advice, a bullying investigation procedure or a substitute for the employer's code of conduct, psychosocial risk controls, grievance process or formal management responsibilities. Serious or repeated harmful behaviour should be managed through the applicable organisational and WHS pathways.

### Evidence Position

The manual draws on established research in workplace incivility, interpersonal conflict, psychological safety, trust, organisational justice, leader-member exchange, team performance, conflict resolution and psychosocial risk management. The evidence is strongest for broad relationships and risk mechanisms; it does not support pretending that every avoided conversation or difficult interaction can be converted into a precise dollar value.

#### **CENTRAL IDEA**

Relationships are part of the operating system. Every interaction either lowers or raises the cost of the next one.

## Contents

- 1. Relationships Are Productive Infrastructure
- 2. The Interaction Tax
- 3. Trust: Be Predictable Before You Try to Be Likeable
- 4. Firm on the Issue, Low Friction With the Person
- 5. Read the Relationship Before You Act
- 6. Communicate for the Next Interaction, Not Only This One
- 7. Disagree Without Turning the Relationship Into a Contest
- 8. Manage Upward
- 9. Manage Peers and Adjacent Functions
- 10. Lead Downward Without Creating Avoidable Threat
- 11. External Parties: Client, Superintendent, Designer and Supply Chain
- 12. Repair Damage Early
- 13. Deal With Persistently Difficult People
- 14. Prevent the Adversarial Default
- 15. Boundaries, Escalation and Formal Processes
- 16. Team and Organisational Controls
- 17. Relationship Diagnostics and Practical Tools
- 18. Evidence Base and Reading List

# 1. Relationships Are Productive Infrastructure

Construction is delivered through technical systems, contracts and programmes, but those systems depend on people repeatedly exchanging incomplete information under time pressure. The quality of the relationship affects how quickly information moves, how candidly risks are raised, how much checking is required, how readily people help one another and how expensive disagreement becomes.

This is why relationship management is not separate from commercial performance. Trust within teams is positively associated with team performance, and high-quality leader-member relationships are associated with task performance and citizenship behaviour. Psychological safety matters because people must be willing to ask questions, admit uncertainty, challenge assumptions and surface bad news before it becomes expensive.

## 1.1 The Commercial Test

A useful relationship is not one in which everyone agrees. It is one in which the parties can exchange information, challenge positions, make decisions and recover from disagreement without imposing unnecessary transaction cost on the work.

### OPERATING PRINCIPLE

Do not ask only, “Did I win that interaction?” Ask, “What did this interaction make the next one cost?”

## 1.2 Four Relationship Assets

| Asset          | What it looks like on a project                                                    | What destroys it                                                          |
|----------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Predictability | People know how you will respond to ordinary questions, bad news and disagreement. | Mood-dependent reactions, arbitrary escalation, inconsistent standards.   |
| Credibility    | Your statements, records and commitments can be relied upon.                       | Overclaiming, selective facts, broken commitments, bluffing.              |
| Access         | People can raise issues before they become formal problems.                        | Avoidance, intimidation, chronic unavailability, excessive formality.     |
| Reciprocity    | People help because useful cooperation is normally returned.                       | Taking without giving, credit capture, information hoarding, opportunism. |

## 2. The Interaction Tax

Every person imposes some cost on the people who must interact with them. The cost may be low: a quick call, a clear answer and a reliable follow-up. Or it may be high: defensive preparation, excessive checking, unnecessary witnesses, long emails, repeated clarification, emotional recovery and escalation.

### 2.1 The Adversarial Default

A single poor interaction can often be attributed to a bad day. Persistent hostility is different. Once people expect resistance, ridicule, accusation or escalation, they begin preparing for conflict before conflict exists. The relationship changes from an information pathway into a threat-management exercise.

This is the hidden cost of being consistently difficult. The work may still get done, but people change how they do it: they delay contact, over-document, copy managers, withhold discretionary help, avoid asking questions and stop volunteering incomplete early warnings.

### 2.2 Blast Radius and Residual Load

Harmful workplace behaviour can affect both the target and witnesses. Research on workplace incivility links exposure with stress, emotional exhaustion, poorer attitudes and behavioural consequences. The effect can continue after the interaction through rumination and anticipation. The original event ends; the cognitive and relational load can remain.

#### CONSTRUCTION ANALOGY

Temporary loading can leave permanent deformation. The pressure may be brief; the relationship can remain bent.

### 2.3 Visible and Latent Cost

| Visible cost             | Latent cost                                                |
|--------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|
| Complaint or grievance   | Time spent rehearsing, checking and recovering             |
| Absence or turnover      | Questions not asked and warnings not volunteered           |
| Formal dispute           | Defensive records created only because trust is low        |
| Missed decision date     | Slow informal cooperation before the delay becomes visible |
| Escalation to management | Management attention consumed by preventable friction      |

Do not manufacture false precision. The latent cost is real but difficult to measure directly. Use multiple indicators and patterns rather than claiming a single productivity percentage.

## 3. Trust: Be Predictable Before You Try to Be Likeable

Trust is not blind confidence and it is not friendship. In project work it is an informed expectation that another person will behave competently, honestly and reasonably within the situation. Trust reduces the need to protect against every possible interpersonal surprise.

### 3.1 Build Trust Through Small Repeated Evidence

- Do what you said you would do, especially on small commitments.
- Say what you know, what you do not know and what you are checking.
- Use the same standard when the answer favours you and when it does not.
- Give early warning when a commitment will slip rather than disappearing until the due date.
- Do not use private information opportunistically.
- Give credit accurately and correct the record when someone else contributed.
- Make escalation proportionate and predictable.

### 3.2 Reliability Beats Charm

A personable colleague who cannot be relied upon becomes expensive. A direct colleague who is fair, predictable and accurate can become highly trusted. Aim first for professional reliability; warmth is useful, but it cannot substitute for competence and consistency.

### 3.3 Fair Process Matters

People judge not only the outcome but also how the outcome was reached. Organisational-justice research distinguishes distributive, procedural and interactional fairness. In practice: explain the basis, apply the process consistently, give people a reasonable chance to provide relevant information and communicate the decision with dignity.

## 4. Firm on the Issue, Low Friction With the Person

Commercial firmness and interpersonal friction are separate variables. You can reject a claim, challenge a forecast, refuse an instruction, enforce a notice requirement or demand recovery action without making the other person personally unsafe to interact with.

### 4.1 Separate the Four Layers

| Layer          | Question                                                           |
|----------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Fact           | What happened and what evidence supports it?                       |
| Interpretation | What does the contract, programme, procedure or circumstance mean? |
| Interest       | What does each party need to protect or achieve?                   |
| Relationship   | How do we keep the pathway functional while resolving the issue?   |

Poor conflict management collapses all four layers into one personal contest. Strong operators keep them separate.

### 4.2 Match Heat to Materiality

Not every error deserves the same emotional or organisational response. Escalate the issue because of consequence, urgency, recurrence or integrity risk — not because irritation is high.

#### OPERATING PRINCIPLE

Apply the pressure required to solve the problem. Do not create additional pressure that becomes another problem.

## 5. Read the Relationship Before You Act

The same message lands differently depending on authority, history, dependency, culture, workload and previous conflict. Relationship management starts with diagnosis, not a script.

### 5.1 Map the Relationship

| Question                      | What to establish                                                             |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| What do they own?             | Decision rights, deliverables, risk and constraints.                          |
| What do I need from them?     | Information, approval, action, access, cooperation or challenge.              |
| What do they need from me?    | Clarity, evidence, timing, reliability, respect or protection from surprises. |
| Where is the friction?        | Substance, process, style, history, role ambiguity or competing incentives.   |
| What is the power balance?    | Formal authority, expertise, information, relationships and alternatives.     |
| What is the next interaction? | Design today's behaviour so tomorrow's pathway remains usable.                |

### 5.2 Do Not Mind-Read

Distinguish observed behaviour from inferred motive. “They did not respond for three days” is evidence. “They are deliberately undermining me” is an interpretation. Test interpretations before building strategy around them.

## 6. Communicate for the Next Interaction, Not Only This One

Communication has two outputs: the immediate message and the condition of the relationship afterward. Good communication protects both where possible.

### 6.1 Use the Lowest-Cost Channel That Can Safely Carry the Issue

- Quick ambiguity: call or speak directly.
- Complex technical issue: short discussion, then controlled written record.
- Sensitive disagreement: private conversation before a broad email.
- Material decision: clear written basis, owner, action and date.
- Repeated failure or formal entitlement: proportionate escalation and contemporaneous record.

### 6.2 Pre-Brief Before You Surprise

People react badly when consequential information first appears in a large meeting or formal record. Where governance allows, pre-brief the person who will be affected, challenged or expected to act. This does not mean seeking permission to raise the issue. It means removing avoidable status threat and giving the conversation a chance to be productive.

### 6.3 Close Loops

Unclosed commitments damage trust disproportionately because they create uncertainty. If you promise an answer Friday, answer Friday or advise before Friday that the date has moved and why.

## 7. Disagree Without Turning the Relationship Into a Contest

Task disagreement is unavoidable and can be useful. Relationship conflict is different: it makes the person, status or history part of the dispute. Meta-analytic research has consistently found relationship conflict harmful to team performance and satisfaction; task conflict is more context-dependent and is easily contaminated by relationship conflict.

### 7.1 A Practical Disagreement Sequence

- State the point of agreement first where one genuinely exists.
- Define the decision or issue being contested.
- State the evidence and your interpretation separately.
- Explain the consequence if your interpretation is right.
- Invite the strongest contrary evidence.
- Identify what would change your view.
- Agree the decision owner and next step.
- Record the decision without transferring the emotional residue into the record.

### 7.2 Do Not Force a Win Where You Need a Relationship

A humiliating win can be commercially expensive if you need the same person tomorrow. Preserve face where doing so does not compromise truth, governance or accountability. Correct privately when possible; escalate publicly only when the issue genuinely requires it.

### 7.3 Never Weaponise Process

Do not copy senior people merely to create pressure, issue formal correspondence to punish tone, withhold information to gain leverage, or exploit a procedural error when a proportionate correction would protect the business equally well. Process is a control system, not an emotional weapon.

## 8. Manage Upward

Managing upward means making it easier for your manager to understand the issue, trust your judgement and act. It is not flattery and it does not require agreement.

### 8.1 Reduce Manager Load

- Bring the issue with the evidence, consequence and recommendation.
- Escalate early enough that the manager still has options.
- Do not make your manager rediscover context you already know.
- Distinguish “I need a decision” from “I am keeping you informed.”
- Disagree privately and clearly; implement authorised decisions professionally unless they cross legal, ethical or safety boundaries.
- Do not use senior access to bypass the person who owns the work without a reason.

### 8.2 Manage the Relationship, Not the Mood

A manager may be under pressure. That explains some behaviour; it does not make chronic aggression a sound operating model. Adapt to preferences where reasonable, but do not normalise conduct that creates material psychosocial risk or prevents safe performance.

## 9. Manage Peers and Adjacent Functions

Many project failures occur at interfaces where nobody has complete authority: commercial and delivery, design and construction, planning and cost, project and corporate, JV partners, or separate packages.

### 9.1 Trade Help Before You Trade Favours

Healthy reciprocity is not political debt. Help peers solve legitimate problems, share useful context and make their work easier when the cost is reasonable. Over time this creates a network that can move information and solve cross-functional problems without constant hierarchy.

### 9.2 Protect Ownership

Do not solve a peer's problem by quietly taking permanent ownership of it. Clarify who owns the decision, who is assisting and what happens next. Helpful people become overloaded when cooperation is mistaken for transfer of accountability.

### 9.3 Give Credit Sideways

Accurate credit builds trust and reputation simultaneously. People remember colleagues who make contribution visible without performing generosity.

## 10. Lead Downward Without Creating Avoidable Threat

Authority changes the meaning of behaviour. A manager's irritation, sarcasm or public criticism carries more weight because the employee must continue working within that power relationship. The manager therefore has a greater obligation to regulate how pressure is transferred.

### 10.1 Accountability Without Humiliation

- Describe the performance gap specifically.
- Explain why it matters.
- Ask for the employee's account before deciding motive.
- Set the required standard and next action.
- Provide support where capability or role clarity is part of the problem.
- Escalate repeated or serious issues through the proper process.
- Do not add ridicule, personal labels or audience effects.

### 10.2 Make Bad News Safe to Deliver

If the first person to raise a problem is punished for bringing it, the next problem will arrive later. Separate the existence of bad news from responsibility for causing it. Investigate accountability after protecting the information pathway.

### 10.3 Your Team Watches What Happens to Other People

Witnesses learn from management behaviour. They observe who can disagree, who is humiliated, whether mistakes are recoverable and whether reporting a concern creates retaliation. Culture is partly the accumulated prediction people make from those observations.

## 11. External Parties: Client, Superintendent, Designer and Supply Chain

External relationships are commercially consequential because the parties may have competing contractual interests while remaining operationally interdependent.

### 11.1 Do Not Confuse Contractual Opposition With Personal Opposition

A subcontractor claim can be rejected while the subcontractor remains a useful project partner. A superintendent can disagree with your interpretation without becoming an enemy. Treating every issue as proof of bad faith encourages reciprocal defensiveness and increases the cost of every subsequent transaction.

### 11.2 Protect the Informal Pathway Without Losing the Formal Record

The best projects often have both: people who can call each other early and records that accurately protect the parties. Informal communication should improve speed and understanding; it should not erase material rights, approvals or decisions that require formal control.

### 11.3 Never Make the Other Party Pay for Someone Else's Pressure

Client pressure, internal forecast pressure or senior frustration does not become more legitimate when transferred down the chain. Translate the business requirement into a clear request or position; do not simply pass the emotional load onward.

## 12. Repair Damage Early

All working relationships accumulate errors. Repair capacity is therefore more important than perfection.

### 12.1 The Repair Sequence

- Address the specific interaction, not the person's entire character.
- Acknowledge your part without adding a defensive “but”.
- Correct any factual or procedural damage.
- State what will be different next time.
- Ask whether anything material remains unresolved.
- Then demonstrate the repair through subsequent behaviour.

### 12.2 Apology Is Not Surrender

You can apologise for tone, timing, audience or process while maintaining the substantive commercial position. “My position on the entitlement has not changed; the way I raised it yesterday was unnecessarily aggressive” is coherent.

### 12.3 Repair Before Positions Harden

Conflict is easier to resolve before people build identity, allies and documentation around competing stories. Current conflict-management guidance therefore emphasises early, proportionate and, where appropriate, informal resolution.

## 13. Deal With Persistently Difficult People

Some relationships remain difficult despite reasonable effort. The objective then changes from building warmth to making the interface predictable, bounded and safe.

### 13.1 Diagnose Before Labelling

| Possible cause                      | Useful response                                                                          |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Role ambiguity                      | Clarify ownership, authority and handoffs.                                               |
| Competing incentives                | Make the trade-off explicit and escalate the decision, not the personality.              |
| Communication mismatch              | Agree channel, frequency, level of detail and response expectations.                     |
| Low trust / history                 | Use evidence, small commitments and consistent follow-through.                           |
| High workload / stress              | Reduce unnecessary interaction cost; clarify priorities.                                 |
| Persistent incivility or aggression | Set boundaries, document patterns proportionately and use formal pathways when required. |

### 13.2 The Bounded Interface

- Keep requests specific and decision-oriented.
- Use neutral written summaries after material conversations.
- Do not mirror hostility.
- Limit unnecessary exposure without withholding required cooperation.
- Use witnesses or a manager where the risk or pattern justifies it.
- Escalate behaviour patterns with examples, dates, consequences and attempted controls — not labels such as “toxic”.

### 13.3 Do Not Diagnose Personality

You do not need a psychological explanation to manage observable behaviour. Focus on what happened, frequency, severity, work consequence, required standard and control. Personality labels usually create heat without improving the decision.

## 14. Prevent the Adversarial Default

The most expensive relationship pattern is often not one dramatic incident but a stable expectation that every interaction will become difficult. Once that expectation forms, both parties may contribute to maintaining it.

### 14.1 Reset the Pattern Explicitly

Where the relationship matters, name the operating problem without litigating every historical incident. For example: the current interface is consuming too much time, routine matters are becoming defensive, and both parties need a simpler way to resolve ordinary issues.

### 14.2 Agree Interface Rules

| Rule       | Example                                                                  |
|------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Channel    | Call first for ambiguity; formal email for decisions and entitlements.   |
| Response   | Acknowledge within one business day; give a realistic decision date.     |
| Escalation | Raise with direct owners before copying senior management unless urgent. |
| Meetings   | Bring evidence and decision required; avoid surprise accusations.        |
| Records    | Record facts, decisions and actions; leave personal commentary out.      |
| Behaviour  | Challenge positions directly; no ridicule, threats or personal attacks.  |

### 14.3 Watch for Reciprocal Escalation

Incivility can become self-reinforcing. One party anticipates hostility, becomes defensive, the other reads defensiveness as hostility and responds more aggressively. Break the cycle by making your own behaviour boringly predictable.

## 15. Boundaries, Escalation and Formal Processes

Relationship skill does not require tolerating unsafe, unlawful or persistently harmful behaviour. Informal resolution is appropriate only where the circumstances allow it.

### 15.1 Escalate When the Risk Changes

- Threats, violence, harassment, discrimination or serious bullying concerns.
- Repeated aggression or incivility after clear boundaries and reasonable attempts to correct the interface.
- Retaliation for raising safety, integrity, commercial or employment concerns.
- Material impairment of a person's ability to perform safely or effectively.
- Power imbalance that makes direct resolution unsafe or unrealistic.
- Conduct requiring formal investigation under company policy or law.

### 15.2 Record Behaviour, Not Conclusions

A useful record identifies date, context, observable words or actions, witnesses where relevant, work consequence, previous attempts to resolve the issue and the control requested. Avoid speculative motive and diagnostic labels.

### 15.3 Psychosocial Risk Is a Work Risk

Australian WHS guidance expressly recognises conflict, poor workplace relationships, aggression and harmful behaviours as psychosocial hazards. Risk increases with frequency, duration, severity and interaction with other hazards. Businesses should identify, assess, control and review these risks rather than treating chronic interpersonal harm as simply a personality issue.

## 16. Team and Organisational Controls

Do not rely on individual resilience to compensate for a system that rewards destructive behaviour. The strongest controls change the environment in which relationships operate.

### 16.1 Practical Controls

- Clear roles, decision rights and escalation pathways.
- Behaviour standards that apply to high performers and senior people as well as juniors.
- Managers trained to identify and resolve conflict early.
- Regular team forums where issues can be surfaced before they become personal.
- Work design that does not create unnecessary competition or incompatible accountabilities.
- Accessible reporting and support pathways.
- Review of recurring hotspots by interface, team, role and project phase.
- Consequences for repeated harmful behaviour, not merely coaching for the recipient.

### 16.2 Civility Can Be Developed

Intervention research, including Civility, Respect and Engagement in the Workplace (CREW), indicates that workplace civility can be improved through structured, participative interventions. Training alone is weaker when leadership behaviour, work design and reinforcement remain unchanged.

### 16.3 Measure the System, Not Only Complaints

Low complaint numbers do not prove a healthy environment. People may not report because they expect no action, fear blame, consider the behaviour normal or find the process costly. Use multiple signals.

| Signal               | Possible evidence                                                           |
|----------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Access               | Can people raise ordinary concerns early?                                   |
| Interaction cost     | Are routine issues becoming long, defensive or over-escalated?              |
| Psychological safety | Can people ask, challenge, admit uncertainty and report mistakes?           |
| Trust                | Are commitments and representations relied upon without excessive checking? |
| Conflict             | Are the same interfaces repeatedly consuming management attention?          |
| Retention            | Are capable people avoiding teams, managers or packages?                    |
| Cooperation          | Is discretionary help increasing or disappearing?                           |

## 17. Relationship Diagnostics and Practical Tools

### Tool 1. Relationship Health Check

| Question                      | Green                                 | Amber                     | Red                                |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Can we raise bad news early?  | Usually                               | Depends on issue/person   | People delay or hide it            |
| Can we disagree directly?     | Yes, without retaliation              | Careful wording required  | Disagreement becomes personal      |
| Are commitments reliable?     | Mostly                                | Frequent chasing          | Little reliance without escalation |
| Is the channel proportionate? | Call / meeting / record used sensibly | Too much email or copying | Routine issues are formal battles  |
| Is repair possible?           | Issues reset quickly                  | Residue remains           | Old conflicts dominate new work    |
| Is effort reciprocal?         | Both sides help                       | One-sided                 | Cooperation is withheld            |

### Tool 2. Difficult Interaction Pre-Brief

- What outcome do I actually need?
- What facts are established and what am I assuming?
- What is the other person's legitimate interest or constraint?
- What part of my message is necessary pressure and what part is emotional residue?
- What channel and audience minimise unnecessary status threat?
- What would a fair contrary argument be?
- What do I want the relationship to look like after this conversation?

### Tool 3. Interaction Tax Review

For one recurring interface, estimate the avoidable work created by the relationship: extra checking, repeated explanation, unnecessary meetings, copied managers, defensive records, delayed decisions and rework. Do not convert the estimate into false scientific precision. Use it to identify where an interface redesign may have commercial value.

### Tool 4. Repair Conversation

Use five moves: identify the interaction; own your contribution; restate the substantive issue; agree the future operating rule; demonstrate the change.

### Tool 5. Persistent Behaviour Escalation Record

| Field            | Record                                                         |
|------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------|
| Pattern          | Specific observable behaviour and frequency                    |
| Context          | Where and with whom it occurs                                  |
| Impact           | Work, safety, information flow, delay or team consequence      |
| Controls tried   | Direct conversation, boundary, channel change, manager support |
| Result           | What changed or did not change                                 |
| Requested action | Specific organisational control or decision                    |

## Tool 6. Manager Self-Check

- Do people bring me problems early, or only when they are fully defended?
- Do I make disagreement more expensive than agreement?
- Does my mood change how safe ordinary questions feel?
- Do people need witnesses for routine conversations with me?
- Do I reward people who tell me what I need to know rather than what I want to hear?
- Can I deliver a hard message without making the recipient pay an unnecessary emotional tax?
- Would my team describe me as firm and predictable, or simply difficult?

## Tool 7. The 24-Hour Rule for Heat

Where there is no immediate safety, legal or operational urgency, avoid sending emotionally loaded correspondence at peak arousal. Draft the facts, consequence and required action; then remove the material that exists mainly to punish, signal status or transfer frustration. Urgency is not a licence to be vague, personal or theatrical.

## 18. Evidence Base and Reading List

The following sources provide the principal evidence base for this manual. They should be read as a body: no single study proves every mechanism described here.

- Magley, V. J. et al. (2026). Workplace Incivility. Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior. Review of prevalence, mechanisms, context and intervention.
- Chris, A. C. et al. (2022). A meta-analysis of experienced incivility and its correlates. Journal of Occupational Health Psychology. k = 246; N = 145,008; supports stress and social-exchange pathways.
- Yao, J. et al. (2022). Experienced incivility in the workplace: A meta-analytical review of its construct validity and nomological network. Journal of Applied Psychology.
- De Dreu, C. K. W. & Weingart, L. R. (2003). Task versus relationship conflict, team performance, and team member satisfaction: A meta-analysis. Journal of Applied Psychology.
- Edmondson, A. C. & Bransby, D. P. (2023). Psychological Safety Comes of Age. Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior.
- de Jong, B. A., Dirks, K. T. & Gillespie, N. (2016). Trust and team performance: A meta-analysis. Journal of Applied Psychology. 112 independent studies; 7,763 teams.
- Martin, R. et al. (2016). Leader-Member Exchange and Performance: A Meta-Analytic Review. Personnel Psychology. Relationship quality associated with task and citizenship performance; trust was an important mediator.
- Cohen-Charash, Y. & Spector, P. E. (2001). The Role of Justice in Organizations: A Meta-Analysis. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes.
- Peng, X. et al. (2023). Advancing Workplace Civility: A systematic review and meta-analysis of definitions, measurements, and associated factors.
- Sawada, U. et al. (2021). Effects of the Civility, Respect, and Engagement in the Workplace (CREW) program on social climate and work engagement.
- CIPD (2022). Bullying and incivility at work: An evidence review.
- CIPD (2024). Preventing and dealing with bullying and workplace conflict: guide for people managers.
- Acas (2025). The power of informal conflict resolution at work.
- Safe Work Australia. Model Code of Practice: Managing psychosocial hazards at work.
- Workplace Health and Safety Queensland. Managing the risk of psychosocial hazards at work Code of Practice 2022; guidance on poor workplace relationships and interpersonal conflict.
- Buildit Admin Solutions. Think Like the Approver (Manual 02), especially Part 4: Handle Pressure, Disagreement and Politics.
- Buildit Admin Solutions. The Manager Framework, including cohesion measures covering trust, peer support, psychological safety and clean handovers.

### Evidence Cautions

- Most organisational-behaviour evidence is correlational or based on self-report to some degree; causal claims should be proportionate.
- Effects vary by context, authority, task interdependence, culture, severity and frequency.
- Conflict is not inherently harmful. The objective is not zero disagreement; it is high-quality disagreement without unnecessary relationship damage.
- Do not infer that a difficult personality is the sole cause of a team problem. Work design, incentives, role ambiguity, workload and leadership systems can create or amplify the behaviour.
- Psychological safety is not freedom from accountability. High standards and interpersonal safety can coexist.

## Buildit Operating Summary

### THE RELATIONSHIP TEST

Be easy to work with, not easy to push around.

- Make yourself predictable.
- Keep pressure on the issue rather than transferring it into the person.
- Protect the informal information pathway while maintaining the formal record.
- Resolve conflict early before identity and history attach to it.
- Do not make every interaction a contest.
- Repair damage quickly.
- Bound persistent harmful behaviour and escalate patterns with evidence.
- Measure the interaction tax, not only formal complaints.
- Remember that everyone around an interaction is learning what the workplace permits.