

Impact of a Leadership Development Program on
Interpersonal Conflict Management
within a Coast Guard Staff Command

by
Peter A. Stinson

*A Proposal as a part of an Applied Dissertation
Submitted to the Fischler School of Education and Human Services
at Nova Southeastern University
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Doctor of Education*

Nova Southeastern University
3 July 2009

Table of Contents

	Page
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Statement of the Organizational Problem and Purpose	1
Description of the Organization.....	2
Description of the Program that Addresses the Problem.....	2
Evaluation Design to Determine Program Effectiveness	4
Research Questions to be Examined.....	4
Formative Evaluation.....	5
Summative Evaluation.....	5
Quantitative Data to be Examined	6
Methodology Weaknesses	9
Organizational Role of the Principal Investigator	10
Threats to Validity within the Program Evaluation.....	10
Anticipated Outcomes.....	11
 Chapter 2: Review of Relevant Literature	 12
Models of Conflict.....	13
Competency-Based Leadership Development.....	16
Relationship Between Leadership Development and Conflict Management	27
 Chapter 3: Methodology	 41
Study Title.....	41
Evaluation to Determine Program Effectiveness.....	41
Research Questions to Examined	41
Variables in the Program Evaluation.....	42
Evaluation Design.....	42
Evaluation Procedures to Determine Program Effectiveness	48
Participants in the Program Evaluation	49
Research Protocol for Program Evaluation	49
Timeline	51
 References.....	 52

Chapter 1: Introduction

The purpose of this proposed program evaluation is to appraise the effectiveness of the Unit Leadership Development Program, a service-wide program in the United States Coast Guard, in terms of conflict management. The Unit Leadership Development Program was introduced in January 2005 and became mandatory for use by all Coast Guard units in June 2005 (U.S. Coast Guard, 2005a). Outcome data for various indicators of leadership effectiveness have been collected for a number of years as a normal part of the Coast Guard's ongoing performance evaluation initiatives. In addition, qualitative data will be gathered and evaluated as a part of this program evaluation. The retrieval, analysis, and interpretation of this data for the purposes as outlined within this proposed program evaluation will be new for this initiative.

Statement of the Organizational Problem and Purpose

Coast Guard Maintenance and Logistics Command Atlantic, a staff command located in Norfolk, Virginia, has identified interpersonal conflict between staff members as a key problem. This problem was first identified by a mixed methods assessment conducted during the initial implementation of a leadership assessment (Stinson, 2005).

Interpersonal conflict can be defined in a number of different ways. Lulofs and Cahn (2000) note that interpersonal conflict situations include four distinct characteristics (p. 5). They note that people involved in an interpersonal conflict situation are interdependent, that they “perceive that they seek different outcomes or they favor different means to the same ends,” that “the conflict has the potential to negatively affect the relationship if not addressed,” and there is “a sense of urgency about the need to resolve the issue.” Wilmont and Hocker (2001) believe that interpersonal conflict is “an expressed struggle between at least two interdependent parties who perceive incompatible

goals, scarce resources, and interference from others in achieving their goals” (p. 41).

Description of the Organization

The Maintenance and Logistics Command staff is located in downtown Norfolk in a commercial office building. The staff consists of approximately 450 employees; about half the staff is military. The other half of the staff is civilian employees and civilian contract employees. The staff provides program management and direct support to other Coast Guard units in the fields of naval engineering, civil engineering, electronic engineering, personnel services, health and safety services, and legal services. Some divisions – such as the civil engineering staff – are fairly small; the civil engineering staff has a dozen employees. Other divisions, such as the naval and electronic engineering staffs, are fairly large as they provide a variety of direct services to Coast Guard units east of the Rockies. The naval engineering staff, responsible for boat and cutter repairs and maintenance, has approximately 150 staff members. The Maintenance and Logistics Command is headed by a rear admiral – a one-star flag officer – and a deputy commander who is a senior captain.

Description of the Program that Addresses the Problem

The Unit Leadership Development Program is a service-wide program and was introduced in January 2005; all Coast Guard units – including operational units, support units, and staff commands – were required to have implemented the program by July 2005. The program mandates three specific actions by all Coast Guard units. Units are required to conduct an assessment to determine the perceived implementation of the Coast Guard defined leadership competencies at the unit; units are required to analyze the data; units are to prepare an action plan to close the gap.

Beyond these mandated activities, the Unit Leadership Development Program

consists of a number of supporting components designed to assist the unit in assessing perceived leadership competency maturity. Many of these supporting components are Internet-based and found at the program's website, <http://learning.uscg.mil/uldp>. The program includes the ability for the unit to arrange for a web-based assessment delivered to each member of the unit. The assessment is a survey of 36-questions which reflect the respondents' perceptions of leadership implementation and maturity at the unit (U.S. Coast Guard, 2004a). The assessment's results are provided to the unit point-of-contact as an aggregate; the results are presented according to the leadership competencies. At the present time, only the first 21 competencies, those related to leading self, leading others, and leading performance and change, are reflected in the assessment results. The competencies related to leading the Coast Guard have not yet been incorporated in the assessment tool or the program.

Beyond the assessment tool, the Unit Leadership Development Program's website provides suggestions of specific interventions for each leadership competency. For instance, for the leadership competency of conflict management, 12 interventions are listed as recommended interventions for increasing unit personnel's competency of conflict management. If a unit wanted to close a perceived or actual gap in this competency, they would implement one or more of the recommended interventions. Another component to the Unit Leadership Development Program is the availability of trained coaches to assist units in developing their implementation plan of the program, in analyzing the assessment data, in choosing appropriate interventions, and in implementing the interventions. While the use of a coach is not required, the personal assistance a coach provides can help ensure the unit follows the program as designed.

While the Unit Leadership Development Program was designed to develop overall

leadership within the Coast Guard across all defined leadership competencies, this program evaluation will look only at the leadership competency of conflict management:

Coast Guard leaders facilitate open communication of controversial issues while maintaining relationships and teamwork. They effectively use collaboration as a style of managing contention; confront conflict positively and constructively to minimize impact to self, others and the organization; and reduce conflict and build relationships and teams by specifying clear goals, roles and processes. (U.S. Coast Guard, 2004b, p. 4)

Evaluation Design to Determine Program Effectiveness

The Unit Leadership Development Program at the Maintenance and Logistics Command Atlantic staff will be evaluated both formatively and summatively using a mixed methods approach. The formative evaluation will examine if the program has been implemented appropriately at the staff command. The summative evaluation will examine specific outcomes which are related to leadership and the leadership competency of conflict management. In addition, the summative evaluation will examine staff perceptions about conflict management through a survey assessment.

Research Questions to be Examined

This evaluation looks to answer five research questions:

1. What measures or indicators does the literature indicate serve as a barometer of interpersonal conflict.
2. Has the Maintenance and Logistics Command Atlantic staff implemented the Unit Leadership Development Program according to the standards required by the program and in accordance with the mandate from the Commandant?
3. Does the Unit Leadership Development Program impact conflict management at a staff command?

4. What impact, anecdotally, has the Unit Leadership Development Program had on individual members of a staff?

5. What Unit Leadership Development Program interventions were, according to staff members, most helpful in their own development?

The first two research questions look at formative issues; the next three research questions addresses a summative evaluation. The second and third questions are quantitative in nature; the other research questions are qualitative.

Formative Evaluation

The formative evaluation will examine if and how the staff is completing the mandatory activities; the evaluation will also examine to what extent and how the staff used the other, non-mandatory components, of the program. The mandatory components consist of three activities: assessment, analysis, and action plan. Did the unit use the 36-question assessment provided with the program, or did the unit use another assessment tool or survey? How was the assessment delivered? Did the unit use the data from the survey – whether quantitative, qualitative, or mixed – for an analysis of the current state? Was the analysis completed using the leadership competencies as a filter? Was an action plan developed that appears to address the gaps or chosen leadership competencies? Was the action plan completed? For each of these questions, the formative evaluation would show the program has been implemented as mandated if an assessment was made and the analysis of the assessment data was built around the leadership competencies. In addition, the program mandates the action plan be developed; the Commandant's mandate does not actually specify, however, that the action plan needs to be carried out.

Summative Evaluation

The summative evaluation is quasi-experimental in nature and is an interrupted

time series design. The summative evaluation will look at outcome or result measures which serve as indicators to the success or failure – or maturity – of conflict management behaviors at the unit. The measures that will be examined are all currently collected by various program managers at the Maintenance and Logistics Command or higher authority as indicators of program activity or success. They have, to this point, not been analyzed as indicators of conflict management or leadership.

In addition, the summative evaluation will have a qualitative component, using interviews to determine senior staff members' thoughts and perceptions about the leadership development program and interpersonal conflict within the staff.

Quantitative Data to be Examined

Sutterfield, Friday-Stroud, and Shivers-Blackwell (2007, p. 219) note that “interpersonal conflict deals with relationship tension” between people within an organizational context. Indeed, this notion that interpersonal conflict happens within organizations is paramount to the assertions of Knapp, Putnam, and Davis (1988, p. 420) who suggest that common conflict instruments measure intent or attitude rather than actual conflict; the instruments measure “abstractions of verbal styles – not actual verbalizations.” They (p. 417) further suggest that more appropriate measures must reflect “behavioral decisions in specific situations, characteristics of organizational conflicts, and models of fit between persons and environments.” Knapp et al. (p. 425) suggest appropriate measures will “examine person-context interaction” and may use “time series measures to examine cross-situational changes and consistencies in preference for conflict strategies.”

Conflict, and the inappropriate or unhealthy resolution of conflict, is reflected in various outcomes or results. When the interpersonal conflict is not resolved either quickly

or appropriately, the quality of the relationship between the people changes, as does the climate of the organization (Lulofs and Cahn, 2000, p. 14). These indicators include civil rights and equal opportunity complaints, employee churn rates, and disciplinary events. For each of these indicators, an increase in conflict would drive the metrics upward.

Three types of data will be examined in the course of this evaluation: civil rights data, employee retention data, and disciplinary data. Many civil rights and equal employment issues have, at their very root, conflict and conflict management as a cause. Research by Gallop has shown that leadership behaviors, specifically conflicts between employees and managers which are not managed appropriately, are a root cause for people leaving an organization (Buckingham and Coffman, 1999). Likewise, many incidents which become disciplinary in nature begin as conflicts between employees or conflict between an employee and some accepted norm, rule, or policy. The only measures which will be used in this proposed evaluation will be those that have at least three years of data before Fiscal Year (FY) 2005. Data, specific to the Maintenance and Logistics Command staff, must be available from at least FY 2002 and forward in order to be used for this interrupted time series evaluation. Data from FY 2005 and 2006 will also be used; the program intervention occurred during FY 2005. Results would be expected for FY 2006 and following. To determine if the effect of the Unit Leadership Development Program is long-term and does not diminish with several years, result measures would ideally be tracked for several years.

Civil Rights Data. The civil rights data will come from two sets of metrics. The Coast Guard tracks the number of informal complaints and formal complaints made with the Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) domain. EEO complaints, whether actually based on valid discrimination or not, nearly always have some sort of conflict at the root,

and usually that conflict has been managed poorly or at least the aggrieved party believes the conflict management has been less than satisfactory. The EEO realm becomes the forum of last resort for many conflicts. A second set of metrics for the civil rights data comes from triennial comprehensive civil rights unit assessments. These assessments include a survey along with qualitative data obtained through interviews and focus groups.

Employment retention data. Employee retention data is available for three important populations. The Coast Guard places great importance, because they have been found to be strong indicators of leadership amiss, on: (a) re-enlistment rates for first term enlisted member, (b) retention rates of junior officers after their initial six-year obligation is over, and (c) civil servant retention or “churn.”

Staff Disciplinary Data. The final set of behavior data concerns conduct and disciplinary actions. The Coast Guard tracks the number of infractions to the Uniform Code of Military Justice, including instances of “Captain's Mast” , known as Non-Judicial Punishment (NJP) and Courts Martials, which are actual, legal trials similar to civil or criminal courts outside of the military. Most instances of NJP are caused by conflict or poor conflict management, often conflict between the subordinate and the supervisor. Captain's Masts and Courts Martials are actions under the Uniform Code of Military Justices and apply only to military members of the Coast Guard. Civilian employees, who are federal civil servants, receive disciplinary action through other means which is, most often, informal hearings and some punishment levied by an appropriate commissioned officer.

Other quantitative data from surveys. In addition to the behavior data measuring outcomes, the summative evaluation will look at staff member's perceptions about

conflict management at the unit. The Coast Guard has used a number of survey instruments over the last ten years and continues to use assessments such as the Unit Leadership Development Program 36 question assessment. The data from each entire assessment will not be examined; rather, the questions relating to conflict management, as defined by the Coast Guard leadership competency, will be analyzed.

The Coast Guard has used many assessment tools in the last ten years which may yield data related to conflict management. The Workforce Cultural Audit was a Coast Guard-wide survey examining cultural issues including civil rights, leadership, and discrimination. The Workforce Cultural Audit was completed once nearly a decade ago. The Coast Guard has completed two service-wide assessments using the Organizational Assessment Survey, an assessment developed by the Office of Management and Budget. The Coast Guard intends to conduct this survey biennially. In addition, the Maintenance and Logistics Command staff has conducted several assessments during the last seven years which may yield appropriate data. One assessment tool used was the Q-12, a survey based on the work of Gallup as published by Buckingham and Coffman (1999). Another tool used more recently is the Unit Leadership Development Program is a 36 question assessment tool. Each of these assessment tools has specific questions about conflict management, and each assessment tool's results data can be analyzed at the staff level.

Methodology Weaknesses

One weakness with this methodology is that the behavior metrics are actions or results which are merely indicators of conflict management; they do not measure, for instance, the number of conflicts reported or noted. They are only indicators, and as such other things will impact these metrics. For instance, some reported civil rights incidents are exactly that: civil rights incidents; they are not indicators or interpersonal conflict.

The Coast Guard does still have members and employees who do not treat people equally and fairly because of their race, color, gender, or other protected classification. Another impact on civil rights complaints is complaints which are resolved in the aggrieved party's favor and result in a large monetary award for the complainant. Nothing breeds formal and informal complaints through the civil rights and EEO system like rumors of employee success for complaints lodged earlier and just resolved. There is a sense of “I’ll get mine, too” for some complainants. Other factors could also move the civil rights metrics. And, the same is true for the other two sets of measures, also. For instance, the Coast Guard's well documented response to Hurricanes Katrina and Rita (Arnold, 2005; Barr, 2005, Knight Ridder Newspapers, 2005) will certainly have some impact on various performance and program measures; but, we will be unable to determine what actually had an impact on the various measures. Was it Katrina or the Unit Leadership Development Program or something else altogether?

Organizational Role of the Principal Investigator

The principal investigator for this program evaluation is a civilian employee with the U.S. Coast Guard who serves as an organizational performance consultant. In his role as an organizational performance consultant, he has served as a consultant and coach to the program manager who implemented and coordinates the leadership development program at the Coast Guard Maintenance and Logistics Command Atlantic.

Threats to Validity within the Program Evaluation

As noted above in discussing the weaknesses of this proposed program evaluation, a key weakness is the threat to internal validity through history or events. As constructed, the program evaluation does not isolate cause and effect. A number of forces or events – including or not including the Unit Leadership Development Program – could impact the

various measures. While this threat cannot be removed entirely, perhaps it can be minimized, at least in the analysis of the data, with qualitative information. Staff members' perceptions of what caused any changes could be polled during focus groups and interviews. While this would not remove the threat, it would – perhaps – provide data which can be analyzed and shown to minimize the threat.

A second threat to the validity of the proposed program evaluation is also discussed in the weaknesses: the measures do not actually measure conflict management. They may not provide a valid assessment or indication of conflict management. Additional review of the literature needs to be conducted to ensure an accurate representation of conflict is created.

Anticipated Outcomes

The Coast Guard staff that created the Unit Leadership Development Program certainly hoped that the use of the program would have a positive impact on leadership development and the use of leadership competencies throughout the Coast Guard. This program evaluation seeks to identify impact for a single leadership competency at a single organization. As to the formative research question, it is anticipated that the evaluation will show the Maintenance and Logistics Command Atlantic staff has implemented the program according to the required standards of the program. As to whether or not the program impacts conflict management at a staff command, it is anticipated the data will show a reduction of civil rights cases, increased employee retention, and reduced disciplinary actions. From these anticipated data sets, it is hoped to show the implementation of the Unit Leadership Development Program has a positive relationship with regard to conflict management.

Chapter 2: Review of Relevant Literature

Organizations face an ever-changing, and ever-quicker-changing, world. We and our organizations will be buffeted about like a tiny sailboat along the Grand Banks during a nor'easter. As Covey (1989) notes, the only constant is change. And within organizations which are changing and being changed, conflict is prevalent. Interpersonal conflict is, according to Barki and Hartwick (2004, p. 234), “a dynamic process that occurs between interdependent parties as they experience negative emotional reactions to perceived disagreements and interference with the attainment of their goals.”

Interpersonal conflict is present in organizations often as a result of change: shifting demands and priorities, a grasping toward a non-existent status quo, and culture and society crashing together. The role of leaders is to create systems which allow conflict to be managed rather than abandoned (Scholtes, 1998, p. 44-46). Under a competency model of leadership, managing conflict is often a primary or secondary competency. Managing conflict is different from resolving conflict. From a resolving mindset, conflict is inherently bad. We must manage it, keep it at bay, and ensure when it appears in an organization it is made to disappear. From a managing conflict perspective, conflict can be bad as above, but good in bringing about the best of an organization and creating an environment of open dialog where dissent and disagreement is valued and used for the good of the organization. Good or bad, but this dichotomy is not what is important. What is important is how that conflict is handled or managed; what is important are the end results. Martin and Bergmann (1996, p. 377) note,

Over the last few decades on-the-job conflict has come to be viewed as a normal element of living within a complex work environment and actually may result in positive outcomes for the organization.

They are not alone in the ability for conflict to bring about positive outcomes. Conflict might spur the development of innovative ideas, point at a need to re-organize, and lead to improved processes and systems (Ohbuchi and Suzuki, 2003; Kolb and Putnam, 1992; Walton, Cutcher-Gershenfeld, and McKersie, 1995, 2000). How do we know success at managing conflict? In order to measure success, we must look at measures of behavior in addition to measures of people's perceptions.

This review of relevant literature will focus on three distinct areas. The review will examine models of conflict and what these models say about capturing quantitative data about conflict; the review will examine leadership development and the notion of competency-based development; finally, the review will examine the relationship between leadership development and conflict management.

Models of Conflict

When Blake and Mouton (1964) published *The Managerial Grid*, they created a two-dimensional view of management which balanced "concern for people" against "concern for production" (p. 10). This 2x2 matrix formed the basis for a number of models to examine and explain conflict including Thomas and Killman (1978), who look at assertiveness and cooperativeness, and Covey (1989, p 218), who considers courage and consideration. Lowy and Hood (2004, p. 10) note the 2x2 matrix is a powerful tool which "brings richness, depth, and a uniquely transformational power to the form." While the tool is extremely powerful and can provide insight to a person looking to solve a problem or understand a situation, the form of a 2x2 matrix is not complete in providing all the variables or all the criteria which are fully relevant.

Knapp et al. (1988) suggest that while the 2x2 models have unique elements, they are fundamentally flawed in that they don't take into consideration anything beyond the

two dimensions, don't take individuality and organizational culture into consideration, and don't measure conflict, per se, but rather conflict styles. They note,

A common method of data collection was the use of questionnaires to obtain individual differences in predispositions, attributes, and attitudes. If we are seeking an individual's attitude about conflict situations, this approach still has merit. But if we are aiming to predict behavior and to uncover the nature of conflict interaction between individuals in organizations, we must expand our purview... (p. 415)

Knapp et al. (1988) note that a more ideal method of examining interpersonal conflict in organizations would "incorporate measures that examine person-context interaction" (p. 425). What is this "person-context interaction" and how can it be measured? A person-context interaction is an interaction between people which is examined in the context of the situation and environment. By examining conflict within the sterile environmental lens of a two-dimensional model, we are missing much of the meaning and action behind the conflict. As King and Miles (1990) state, "the interplay of the individual and the context is a critically important interaction to account for when assessing either (conflict) styles or strategies." Knapp, Putnam, and Davis suggest there are at least four additional variables and conceptual frameworks which need to be considered while researching conflict management. Key among them is to identify "the organization as the center stage of conflict activity."

At the center of a conflict activity is a struggle. Wilmot and Hocker (2001, p. 41) define conflict as "an expressed struggle between at least two interdependent parties who perceive incompatible goals, scarce rewards, and interference from the other party in achieving their goals." Lulofs and Cahn (2000, p. 5) note that interpersonal conflict

includes at least four characteristics; conflict is multi-dimensional (Barki and Hartwick, 2004). Like Wilmot and Hocker, Lulofs and Cahn state the parties involved must be interdependent. In addition, Lulofs and Cahn note the people involved “perceive they seek different outcomes or they favor different means to the same ends” and that the “conflict has the potential to negatively affect the relationship if not addressed.” They also note there is generally “a sense of urgency about the need to resolve the issue.”

Researchers generally agree that conflict is a part of our everyday lives (Lulofs and Cahn, 2000; Wilmot and Hocker, 2001; Rothman, 1997; Waite, 2004; Lewicki, Weiss, and Lewin, 1992; Gross and Guerrero, 2000; Thomas, 2006). Many of these same researchers have generally agreed that the dual-concerns model, made popular through the work of Thomas and Killman (1974) and others, measures differences in how people respond to conflict. This two-dimensional model is generally used through self reporting instruments, such as the Thomas Killman Instrument and the Rahim Organizational Conflict Inventory (ROCI-II) (Rahim, 1983); they are snapshots of self-reporting and do not take into consideration the person-context interaction of real and everyday life. There is a difference in measuring conflict styles and conflict strategies with measuring the results of actual conflict and conflict management.

Managing conflict, then, is a competency, a personal competency which, no matter the philosophical undergirding or model of conflict adopted, can be taught and learned.

Knapp et al. (1988) have asked, “Where do we go from here?” in terms of measuring interpersonal conflict in organizations. Barnes-Slater and Ford (n.d.) indicate there are “several commonly tracked employee metrics” which can provide “a wealth of data to analyze and track the true cost of conflict.” These measures include absenteeism, turnover, and grievance filing as indicators of workplace conflict. These are, perhaps,

indicators of conflict. Certainly, not all absenteeism is related to conflict, but just as assuredly, some is. The same is true with the other measures. Thomas (2006) states that conflict management has become important to managers and leaders because of the impact conflict has on productivity, decision making, and turnover/retention.

Competency-Based Leadership Development

In one sense, leadership is one of those things we know when we see it. For some of us, it is a warm and fuzzy notion that is difficult to define, but we know it, like we know pornography, when we see it (Maltby, 2004, Haas, 2004, Silver, 2003). Gladwell (2005, p. 88) suggests most of us “associate leadership ability with physical stature. We have a sense of what a leader is supposed to look like.” A number of academics and business pundits have helped define leadership; they’ve taken the subjectiveness out of our notion of leadership. Yukl (2009, p. 7) defines leadership as “the process of influencing others to understand and agree about what needs to be done and how it can be done effectively, and the process of individual and collective efforts to accomplish the shared objectives.” For Kouzes and Posner (2002, p. 20)), leadership is not so much about personality as it is about practice. They write, “Leadership is an identifiable set of skills and practices that are available to all of us... leadership is a relationship between those who aspire to lead and those who choose to follow.” Bennis and Goldsmith (2003, p. 3) suggest leadership is generating “shared values, goals, visions, or objectives” and then creating a situation whereby the followers can accomplish those goals and create the defined future.

Another working definition of leadership combines the Coast Guard’s basic definition of leadership – getting subordinates to do what you want them to do – with Covey’s (1989, p. 54) definition of effectiveness – the balance between “production of

desired results” and “production capability, or the ability or asset that produces.” This new definition of leadership is “getting someone to do something, something they might not want to do, in a way in which you can get them to do it over and over again.” Covey (2004, p. 98) defines leadership as “communicating to people their worth and potential so clearly that they come to see it in themselves.” However defined, leadership is a key and critical part of the Coast Guard culture (Phillips, 2003; U.S. Coast Guard, 2009)

Most of these definitions have a common core: getting people, usually within a formal or informal organization, to see a shared vision and getting them to work toward that shared vision. Covey (2004, p. 99) suggests “an organization is made up of individuals who have a relationship and a shared purpose” and may be as simple in structure as “a simple business partnership or a marriage.” Further, he suggests leadership is not a “formal position,” but “rather a choice to deal with people in a way that will communicate to them their worth and potential so clearly they come to see it in themselves.” For Covey, the leadership challenge is to set up organizations – including families – “in a way that enables each person to inwardly sense his or her innate worth and potential for greatness and to contribute his or her unique talents and passion ... to accomplish the organization’s purpose and highest priorities.” At first blush, Covey appears to just have the leader suss out the other person’s worth and potential; in truth, he asks that the worth and potential be committed to a shared vision. We have moved beyond Gladwell’s (2005) fuzzy notion.

“*Self Evident*” *Notions on Leadership*. Gladwell (2005) is not, however, that far off the mark: we do know leadership when we see it. This is, perhaps, the fundamental self-evident truth about leadership. Certainly, sometimes we can be taken-in and deceived – as McIntosh and Rima (1997), The Arbinger Institute (2002), and Lipman-Blumen

(2005) all note – but, more often than not, Gladwell’s “thin slicing” takes place. Gladwell (p. 23) suggests thin slicing is “the ability of our unconscious to find patterns in situations and behavior based on very narrow slices of experience” and, from those patterns to make “rapid cognition” and “sophisticated judgments.” For the most part, we are able to thin slice: we know leadership, and we know leadership when we see it. Much of “knowing it when we see it” is based on a view of practices, practices which for most of us are not clearly defined. In the passageways of Coast Guard cutters and halls of Coast Guard offices, one often hears rumblings of “walk the talk,” or more likely “not walking the talk,” or taking care of subordinates, or, again, not taking care of subordinates while being concerned only for self. The practices can be, however, defined. Kouzes and Posner’s (2002, p. 22) five practices seem to nail most of what for many of us are known but somewhat unclear. Kouzes and Posner list the five leadership practices as “modeling the way, inspiring a shared vision, challenging the process, enabling others to act, and encouraging the heart.” When we “thin slice,” we are making judgments and assessments on these, defined, basic practices.

Is a Theory of Leadership Necessary? In the same way we are able to “thin slice” to identify leadership, some people are able to “thin slice” the act of leadership. That is to say, some leaders just seem to know how to do it. And, they may not even be able to put to words what they do or why they do it. For most of us, however, thinking about leadership and having a theory of leadership is necessary. This act of leadership does not come naturally. Bennis and Goldsmith (2003, p. xiv) believe all of us “are capable of becoming effective leaders. The challenge is to confront the barriers that stand in the way of our becoming better leaders.” If each of us is capable of becoming an effective leader, and not all of us are born effective leaders, we need, as Bennis and Goldsmith propose, to

assess our character and become accomplished at certain core competencies. We assess our character so that we are doing what we do for the right reason; we grow our competencies so we can do the right thing.

We need a theory of leadership so we can grow into the role (Gracey, 2004). We also need a theory of leadership so we can grow those around us (Covey, 2004). Without a consistent theory of leadership, without a shared paradigm, one person's leadership will stop with their departure from the organization. Leadership will die on the vine.

Organizations define leadership and the competencies required for leadership. (See, for example, U. S. Coast Guard, 2004c). But they do more than define; organizations teach people within the organization. The Arbinger Institute (2002) tells the tale of the Zagrum Company and a long-standing, senior management ritual: a day-long meeting with a particular senior vice president where leadership insights are shared and taught. And part of Zagrum's process is this ritual which has been passed down and is kept alive even though the original leader has been long gone. To be an effective leader, the leader must create systems which will carry on after she is gone.

This is a most important concept to understand. A variety of practices combine to form this notion of leadership. Practices can be learned; practices can be taught. Later, we will discuss the notion of conflict management as a component practice in leadership. What follows then is pure logic: conflict management is a leadership competency which can be taught.

Leadership and Management: People and Things. The maintenance of these systems is, oddly, a function of management (Mintzberg, 1975; Zelenznik, 1977; Kotter, 1990; Nohria and Berkley, 1994; Teal, 1996). Leadership is about people; management is about things, process, and systems. Bennis and Goldsmith (2003) suggest management is

about efficiency and leadership is about effectiveness. Covey (1989, p. 169-170) echoes this when he states, “You think effectiveness with people and efficiency with thing.” Covey (2004) – drawing on 12 leadership theorists including Bennis, Gardner, Kouzes and Posner, Drucker, and Peters – notes leadership is about people, management is about things; leadership is about principles, management is about technique; leadership is about transformation, management is about transaction; it is doing the right things versus doing things right; and it’s working on the systems (for the leader) and working in the systems (for the manager). However sliced, organizations, and the people within organizations, demand both leadership and management.

In order for effective leadership to survive within an organization – whether it is a complex and large organization like the Coast Guard, a small business, a religious organization such as a parish church, or a family – good leadership must be taught to each successive generation. Creating that system is a function of leadership; continuing that system is a function of management. We need both.

Rational and Emotional Aspects of Leadership. As both management and leadership are needed within organizations, so also are rational and emotional aspects needed within leadership. If we look to Kouzes and Posner’s (2002) five practices and the associated ten commitments, we see both the rational and emotional components of an individual are challenged. The ten commitments are behaviors, and within them are both behaviors fundamentally founded on rational behavior and behaviors fundamentally founded on emotional behavior. For instance, the fourth commitment is to “enlist others in a common vision by appealing to shared aspirations” (p. 141ff). This commitment is built on various actions, actions which swing to both sides of the rational/emotional spectrum. Kouzes and Posner (p. 181) tell us to “find the common ground”, a process

which is more rational than emotional. And they also tell us to “breathe life into your vision” (p. 185) and “speak from the heart” (p. 186), two actions which are more emotional than rational.

What we see here is an understanding that leadership is about people; it is about relationships. Relationships exist between people, and they are fundamentally both rational and emotional. A relationship that is solely one or the other is doomed to fail, or worse, explode. Effective leadership hinges on both the emotional and the rational, on both the right side and the left side of the brain. When Dr. King spoke on the steps of the Lincoln Memorial more than 40 years ago, he painted a word picture that presented in no uncertain terms a common vision for all Americans (King, 1963). It was, and remains today, a heartfelt call. But Dr. King did more than evoke an emotional response; Dr. King used his words to paint a clear, rational picture. And he did it in a studied manner, built upon more than 15 years of preaching in front of gatherings, large and small.

The Learning of Leadership: Art or Science? For King, preaching, which is really what he was doing that hot August day in Washington, was both an art and a science. For most of us, when we refer to art in this sense, we mean it is something which is, while perhaps learned, is something for which we have an innate talent. A science, while we might have a talent for it, is something which is learned. Art happens; science is planned. Art comes from the heart; science comes from the head. Leadership, like King’s preaching, is both an art and a science.

While, as noted earlier, some people just “have it” where leadership is concerned, others of us don’t have it. But, as Bennis and Goldsmith (2003), Covey (2004), Hacker and Wilson (1999), and the contributors to Bennis, Spreitzer, and Cummings (2001) all suggest, leadership can be learned. What each of these authors suggests is that leadership

can be learned through a process. For each of them, the process invariably involves learning about self before moving forward. While their processes are different, each involves introspection, a determination of one's own mission and vision, and a clarification of one's own values and preferences. We see this even in the Coast Guard's (2004) own leadership competencies. Leading self is the building-block category; all else builds on the competencies of accountability and responsibility, followership, self-awareness and learning, aligning values, health and well-being, personal conduct, and technical proficiency (p. 2-3). These are the competencies of leading self. These competencies are consistent with the leading authorities' processes for learning leadership.

Through the process of learning about one's self and aligning personal mission with organizational vision, the leader becomes a person of character, a trait fundamental to the work of Bennis and Goldsmith (2003) and Covey (1989). Character, as defined by Covey, is based on three things. Integrity, or "making and keeping meaningful promises and commitments" (p. 217), is at the core. Next is "maturity," which Covey (p. 217) defines as the balance between the courage to stand up for self and the consideration one has of others. The final building block of character is what Covey (p. 219) calls "the abundance mentality" or the belief "that there is plenty out there for everybody." Integrity, maturity, and the abundance mentality can only come through substantial self-knowledge and self-understanding. Leaders must know themselves.

A strong key, however, is that leadership is not about the leader. Certainly, a leader must know one's self, but leadership is about the shared vision, the shared goal, the shared mission of the members of the organization, be it a formal organization or an informal, ad-hoc organization. Leadership is not about greatness, in the sense that

greatness is ego and self; leadership is servant-based. Greatness, as M. L. King, Jr., once suggested, is about being a servant to others (King, 2008, p. 17). Gardner, Csikszentmihayli, and Damon (2001) suggest that excellence really only takes place when high ethical standards are met; excellence in leadership is not about being “selfish and ambitious,” but rather about being concerned with the common good (p. viii). They propose three foundations to bring about excellence: development of the individual, which they distinguish along two routes: competence and character; democratic processes; and education as key (p. 242-247). Even with Gardner et al., the outward look becomes foundational. This is the link between greatness and servant-attitude that King was referring to. And, it reflects the link between leadership and a servant-attitude. Again, leadership is not about the leader; it is about those who follow the leader.

While leadership might be innate and developed through some Gladwell-ian “thin slicing” process, for most of us, a combination of art and science tends to build good leadership. And within the art of leadership, and within the science of leadership, good leaders know themselves, but focus on those around them.

Leadership Development and Competency-Based Initiatives. Onyett (2004) describes the work environment as a swamp and also as a system. As a swamp, one needs to keep their wits about them; as a system, one needs to understand “there are sub-systems embedded within wider systems” (p.36) and systems are “non-linear” in nature: “small actions can have big effect while large actions can have small effect” (p.38). Onyett offers-up for debate fourteen “markers of an effective leadership service improvement programme.” These markers fall clearly into the camp of people who believe that leadership can be taught and learned; for them, leadership development is not about “talent-spotting” but is rather about creating “whole-systems interventions” that

focus on “real issues” (p. 40). Three of these criteria are germane to the current discussion. A high quality and effective leadership development program does three distinct things.

It involves learning by doing, trying to bring about service improvement is central to the role of participants.

It develops knowledge, skills and experience by working with people's day-to-day challenges and opportunities. . .

It is outcome-focused, particularly on those positive outcomes that are meaningful to users and their supports. (p.40)

If these are indeed indicators then the program offers lot's of real-world, hands-on knowledge, skills, and experience in order to measurably impact the bottom line and those indicators of importance to the various stakeholder constituent groups (Kaplan and Norton, 1996). These measures could be grouped together into four groups, or cornerstones: Customer focus, stakeholder return and financial, processes, and organizational and individual learning, growth, and development (Kaplan and Norton, 2003). We might today add another category: organizational and individual ethics and morals (National Institute of Standards and Technology, 2009). This Baldrige-based arrangement is merely another possibility from the same pool of specific metrics or measures which filled the "productivity, decision making, and turnover/retention" buckets described above (Thomas, 2006).

Cheng, Dainty, and Moore (2005, p. 39) remind us that “evaluating behaviors” is “an underpinning component of the project management body of knowledge.” They go on to suggest that they discovered, through an analytical study, eleven "behaviors that are generic in nature and underpin effectiveness in the project management role, with one

additional competency apparently determined by the particular job role context of the project manager" (p. 39).

Leadership Impact on the Bottom Line. The Hay Group (n.d.) completed research which indicates "a direct correlation between superior leadership and bottom line performance." Their data shows that "up to 70% of differences in climate can be attributable to effective leadership and improvements in climate can impact performance by up to 30%." Their longitudinal work with IBM from 1996 through 2003 showed that leadership competencies can be identified, that effective use of specific leadership competencies drive performance excellence for work groups and organizations, and that organizationally-needed competencies can change over time due to changing external environments, challenges, and opportunities. (Tischler, 2004)

The Impact of Culture on Organizational Performance. Rashid, Sambasivan, and Johari (2003) note that organizational culture, a set of values, beliefs, and behavior patterns that form the core identity of organizations, and help in shaping employee's behavior, has an influence on the performance of the organization. Zenger, in Madsen and Gygi (2005, p. 92), notes, organizational leadership is "ultimately all about results. If leaders do not produce good results for organizations, then they really aren't good leaders. They may be a wonderful human being, very ethical and honest... I don't think you could say they were very good leaders." For Zenger, a positive impact on the organization's results is paramount and an outcome of excellent leadership. Likewise, Reid and Hubbell (2005) write that organizational excellence is driven by a performance culture which is shaped by organizational leaders.

Strategy and Organizational Performance. Bonomo and Pasternak (2005, p. 11) note that senior leaders must "establish and communicate their strategic priorities" in

order to deliver high performance in complex organizations. Blazey (1997, p. 63) goes so far as to specify that a significant portion of senior leader's time, as much as 60% to 80%, should be spent "in visible... (certain) leadership activities, such as goal setting, planning, reviewing performance, recognizing and rewarding high performance, and spending time understanding and communicating with customers and suppliers." Wongrassamee, Gardiner, and Simmons (2003, p. 15) also suggest that performance must be measured by a set of "balanced" measures which are tied to an organization's "strategy and long-term vision." Schermerhorn and McCarthy (2004, p. 46) suggest "individual behaviour that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in the aggregate promotes effective functioning of the organization," impacts performance excellence.

Leadership and Organizational Performance. Blazey (1997, p. 61) states, "High-performing organizations outrun their competition by delivering increasing value to stakeholders and improving organizational capabilities." He also notes that good leaders "convey a sense of urgency to reduce the resistance to change that prevents the organization from taking the steps that these values demand. They serve as role models by reinforcing and communicating the core values by their words and actions; words alone are not enough." Along the same vein, Banco (2005) notes the Coast Guard's response to the Katrina "proved its leaders and rank and file were committed to the agency's mission, vision and values." He also notes the Coast Guard provides a "case study in how to manage change in an ever-changing world." Scott (2003, p. 26) notes, "organizational performance is the result of a complex set of interactions among people; the methods, materials, and equipment they use; and the environment and culture in which they exist."

Relationship Between Leadership Development and Conflict Management

Whether the true definition of leadership is closer to the tactical – getting someone to do something, something they might not want to do, in a way in which you can get them to do it over and over again – or to the lofty Covey (2004, p. 98) – “communicating to people their worth and potential so clearly that they come to see it in themselves” – the tie between leadership and conflict management is clear. Managing conflict is a key leadership activity.

Lipman-Blumen (2000) provides a mental model which is certainly useful in looking at both leadership development and conflict management. Lipman-Blumen’s connective leadership model lays out the behaviors and achieving styles which address what she sees as the shifting tides in the world today: a world which is more connected, more interdependent, and more diverse than the world of yesteryear; the world of today and tomorrow demands new behaviors to ensure effectiveness. Lipman-Blumen’s model provides a framework based on research and behaviors which are necessary for conflict management. Lipman-Blumen posits that as the world becomes more diverse and more connected, conflicts will be more inevitable. The leaders must be able to resolve conflicts effectively; Lipman-Blumen’s leadership behaviors achieve that end.

Lipman-Blumen’s (2000) model for connective leadership has three general sets of behaviors. Instrumental behaviors maximize interactions; direct behaviors ensure mastery of one’s own tasks; relational behaviors contribute to other’s tasks. One of the relational behaviors is collaboration. “Collaboration turns out to be an important tool for resolving conflicts,” states Lipman-Blumen (p. 112). “Collaboration incorporates two related processes for solving complex problems in an interdependent world: resolving conflicts and advancing shared visions.” Wilmot and Hocker (2001, p. 161) state, “Collaboration

demands the most constructive engagement of any of the conflict styles.” In addition, they note collaboration “provides a constructive response to the conflict” and in a variety of contexts results in “better decisions and greater satisfaction with partners.” Bolton (1979, p. 240) states, “Collaborative problem solving requires the use of listening skills, assertion skills, and the conflict resolution method.” We see, then, that collaboration, fundamental for success in today’s world according to Lipman-Blumen’s model, provides also the fundamental building block for successful conflict resolution.

Another necessary element in conflict resolution is “a special form of empathy.” Lipman-Blumen (2000, p. 207) notes that the “capacity to discern an ally within an opponent” is the same talent which helps “understand the other party’s point of view.” Covey (2004, p. 192) places empathic listening, listening “within the other’s frame of reference,” as the highest form of listening on the listening continuum. This empathic listening, vital to conflict resolution (Bolton, 1979, p. 269; Lulofs and Cahn, 2000, p. 219; Moore, 2003, p. 468), is a fundamental aspect of Lipman-Blumen’s personal achieving style, one of the three styles of the instrumental behavior set.

What does Connective Leadership tell us which can provide a foundation or input to leadership development in the U.S. Coast Guard? In many respects, the U.S. Coast Guard is an organization created and enmeshed in Lipman-Blumen’s (1998) geopolitical era and trying to pull its way out of the muck of this era and dive into the connective era. The Coast Guard is currently undergoing a radical shift along its most fundamental ideologies. For years, longer than anyone currently in the Coast Guard has served, the Coast Guard has had two divisions at the delivery of services level: operations and marine safety. These two stovepipes have provided services to the public in overlapping geographic areas, each with its own ideology and culture. Following 9/11 and the new

port-level needs demanded by new mission areas, the Coast Guard's senior leadership decided to merge these disparate entities into single port-level organizations which provide all Coast Guard services in a given area. The service is finding itself entering an era when "connections among concepts, people, and the environment are tightening" (Lipman-Blumen, 2000, pp. 8-10) and her predictions of "short-term coalitions, changing kaleidoscopically" and "flexible, fast-moving organizations" in a world in which connections and networks "take on new importance as major discontinuities sever the links" to traditions seem to be on the threshold.

The Coast Guard's 28 leadership competencies (U.S. Coast Guard, 2004b) provide Coast Guard personnel with a set of competencies which the service believes will ensure successful leadership during and beyond this time of change and uncertainty. The 28 competencies are divided into four broad categories: leading self, leading others, leading performance and change, and leading the Coast Guard. While these are not exactly similar to Lipman-Blumen's (2000) model, there is substantial overlap.

Communication as leadership competency supporting conflict management. A key element in disputes and effective dispute resolution is communication. The transmission of message--or the non or incomplete transmission of message--is involved in every stage of dispute. All human interaction--including disputes--is based on communication. Communication is fundamental in interpersonal relationships, corporate relationships, and community relationships. To successfully communicate, barriers which block effective message transmission must be torn down. Effective communication is also predicated on all parties seeking common understanding and limiting action based on emotion as much as possible. Communication plays a role in both the escalation of conflict and the resolution of conflict. Effective practitioners of conflict resolution

understand communication and seek to increase the desire for common understanding and reduce the emotional action of the communication cycle.

As Schwarz (1994, p. 25) puts it, “Essentially communication involves exchanging information in a way that conveys meaning.” Communication requires four components: the sender, the receiver, the medium, and the message. Undergirding this quartet is the need to encode and decode the message. The sender is the person who is sending the message. They create the message, encode the message – perhaps into words – and then convey the message. The receiver is on the receiving end. They must receive the message and decode the message to ascertain the meaning of the message. The medium is what is used to transmit the message. For instance, I am using words, written English, to transmit a message to you, the reader. The medium is the written word. Tonight, when my soon-to-be wife returns from babysitting the neighbor’s child we will use the spoken word as the medium. We’ll also trade messages through non-verbals or body language: a look, a touch, a posture. Spoken words are a medium as are various non-verbals. Other mediums could be art, such as paintings or statues. The message is the fourth component of the quartet. The message is the information which the sender is attempting to transmit.

Covey (1989, p. 237) suggests there are four forms of communication: writing, reading, speaking, and listening. For him, the action by the sender or the receiver is the form of communication; it takes both appropriate forms to have successful communication.

In order for the sender to successfully communicate with the receiver, the message must be appropriately encoded, sent using the chosen medium, and decoded by the receiver. If, at any point, there’s a breakdown, the communication will not occur. Perhaps a different message will be seemingly received by the receiver (mis-communication) or

no message will be received (non-communication). As Carkhuff (1983, p. 47) notes, decoding the message uses observation that goes beyond the words the sender uses. “We must focus not only upon the words but also upon the tone of voice and the manner of presentation.”

Communication occurs at various levels of human interaction. The focus here is on interpersonal communication – communication (generally face-to-face) between two people or a small group of people. There are, of course, other types of communication including mass communication – communication using messages distributed to many people at one time, such as television and newspapers, in generally a one-way communication mode – and intrapersonal communication, our own self-talk and reflective communication. Bolton (1979, p. 4) tells us, “Although interpersonal communication is humanity’s greatest accomplishment, the average person does not communicate well.” He goes on to say, “One of the ironies of modern civilization is that, though mechanical means of communication have been developed beyond the wildest flight of imagination, people often find it difficult to communicate face-to-face... we find it difficult to relate to those we love.” For a multitude of reasons, true communication – sending out a real and true message which speaks to our inner self – is most difficult with those who we care about. And, often, even if we send out such a message, it is not received. Barriers to communication seem to abound.

Barriers to communication. Gordon (as cited in Bolton, 1979, p. 15) developed a “comprehensive list that he calls the ‘dirty dozen’ of communication spoilers.” These barriers to communication can be divided into three major categories: judging, sending solutions, and avoiding the other’s concerns. Rogers (as cited in Bolton, 1979, p. 17) claimed the major barrier to interpersonal communication is judging – approving or

disapproving what the other person says. Carkhuff (1983) places suspending judgment as a key in listening. Rees (2001, p. 60) defines an important characteristic of a facilitative leader as someone who “reserves judgment and keeps an open mind.” Covey (1997), who purports a key habit of effective people is to “seek first to understand, then to be understood,” notes, “When you understand, you don’t judge.” Patterson, Grenny, McMillan, and Switzler (2002, p. 69) suggest that effective communication has mutual purpose. They define mutual purpose as “working toward a common outcome in the conversation” and that all participants care about the other’s “goals, interests, and values.” Mutual purpose, as they define it, cannot occur with judgment impeding the communication.

Another prominent barrier to communication doesn’t fit neatly into Gordon’s pantheon. This barrier has to do with a person’s attitude while listening. Bolton (1979) says, “If you are at all typical, listening takes up more of your waking hours than any other activity” (p. 30). Nichols and Stevens (as cited in Bolton, 1979, p. 30) claim listening occupies 45 percent of our waking time. And yet, as Bolton notes, “few people are good listeners” (p. 30). Covey (1989) says, “Most people do not listen with the intent to understand; they listen with the intent to reply. They’re either speaking or preparing to speak. They’re filtering everything through their own paradigms, reading their autobiography into other people’s lives.” (p. 239) Patterson, Grenny, McMillan, and Switzler (2002) suggest, “At the core of every successful conversation lies the free flow of relevant information” (p. 20). They call this “filling the pool of shared meaning.” This filling of the pool of shared knowledge seeks a common understanding. And common understanding cannot happen when the listeners are filtering the message through their own world-view.

Conversation – two people talking and listening back and forth – is not necessarily built on a desire for common understanding. Tannen (1995, p. 321) says, “Conversation is fundamentally ritual in the sense that we speak in ways our culture has conventionalized and expect certain types of responses.” Covey (1989, p. 240) notes, “We’re usually ‘listening’ at one of four levels.” He identifies those four levels as ignoring the other person, pretending to listen to the other person, only selectively listening to the other person, and attending to the other person by focusing on the words and feelings. He claims few of us practice the fifth level – empathic listening, which he defines as “listening with the intent to understand” – not to respond or run the message against our own life script. “Empathic (from empathy) listening gets inside the other person’s frame of reference.” In wearing the other’s shoes, or glasses, perhaps, a listener can begin to come to a common understanding.

Another barrier to communication is strong emotion. Often emotion enters into a communication cycle and neither the sender nor the listener is able to focus on message. Patterson et al. (2002) identify six behaviors stemming from emotion. These six behaviors form a continuum from “silence” to “violence.” Withdrawing, avoiding, and masking form silence, while attacking, labeling, and controlling form violence. Olsen and Braithwaite (2004, p. 271) note clear research shows violent communication behaviors – such as verbal aggression, anger, patronizing behavior, and destructive forms of relational control – often lead to violent relationships. These same violent communication behaviors are common behaviors of people experiencing interpersonal conflict (Tezer, 2001).

Violence can be tamed, however. Utne (2004) suggests, “If you blunder into a delicate communication, request a re-do lest you dig yourself in any deeper... let your

hackles down and listen as if for the first time” (p. 56). True listening can help conquer interpersonal conflict.

These barriers – judging, sending solutions, avoiding other’s concerns, not pursuing common understanding, and strong emotion – all play a part in communication styles.

Communication Styles. Researchers and communications experts have identified a number of communication styles. Covey (1989) provides the five levels of listening, a set of communication styles. Tannen (1995) outlines communication styles of men and women. Lulofs and Cahn (2000) list a number of communication options. Davis (2002) outlines communication styles and behaviors that help build bridges between diverse peoples. Kroeger (2002) purports that communication style is linked with personality type and outlines styles and their implications in the work setting.

Another way of looking at communication styles is to first look to the barriers to communication. Judging has to do with putting our own spin on someone else’s message or words. It is an autobiographical response that runs counter to the goal of attaining common understanding. Sending solutions falls into the same trap; when we send solutions, we are providing solutions developed from our own perspective. Again, it runs counter to a establishing a common understanding. When we avoid the other’s concerns, we are also running counter to common understanding, but we usually do it in a way of intolerable emotion, such as provided on the silence/violence continuum.

We can look to communication style as falling along two continuums. The first continuum has to do with the level of emotion in the communication, as exhibited by either the sender or the receiver. On one end of the spectrum is no emotion; on the other end is emotion generally present in the form of violence or silence. The second

continuum is the desire for common understanding within the sender or the receiver. This continuum measures “intent” or the inner desire of the person. We can match these two continuums in a 2x2 matrix, and then plot a person’s style on the axis.

The ideal communication style lies in the lower right quadrant: low emotion and a high desire for common understanding. The least helpful communication style lies in the upper left quadrant with a low desire for common understanding and high emotion. Interestingly, in this model, both ends of the silence/violence continuum lie together in the same quadrant. Both the extremes of silence and violence are highly emotional behaviors.

The communication matrix can be a useful tool in reviewing communication styles. The emotional continuum determines external behavior, what we see. The other continuum measures something inside the person: it measures intent, desire, and hope. Using the matrix, we can look at behavior and intent; and, by using the matrix we can, perhaps, change behavior and intent – or at least educate communication partners.

Role of communication in conflict escalation. Communication plays a fundamental role in conflict escalation. Wilmot and Hocker (2001) detail destructive conflict spirals, patterns of behaviors in relationships which spiral out-of-control. In each of these destructive spirals, communication between the parties sparks further development. In these spirals, the communication is negative in nature or highly emotional or stems from a misunderstanding. Davis (2002) provides examples of Israeli and Palestinian youth attending camp together in the United States. Through destructive cycles, which are fed by communication between these youth, occasional outbursts create untenable situations. It is communication, not action, which propels the motion of the cycle. Certainly, in their homeland it is action that provides a spiral of destruction; in the woods of Colorado,

however, it is not so much action as it is talking about action which sometimes creates these cycles. Emotion, misunderstanding, negativity propel the participants to conflict.

When we apply the communication matrix, we can see that generally, for a destructive spiral to occur, one or both of the participants must be living to the left of the centerline. Whether emotion is high or low, the desire for common understanding is low. Lulofs and Cahn (2000), Wilmot and Hocker (2001), Davis (2002), and Ury (1999), all suggest that strong emotion, in and of itself, does not escalate conflict. Looking at the communication model, the upper right quadrant has high levels of emotion, but also high levels of desire for common understanding. It is possible to have both. In the upper right quadrant of the communication matrix, the participant has strong emotion, but because it is tempered with the desire for common understanding, the emotion is not acted on. In the upper left quadrant, the emotion is acted on in such a way as to withdraw, avoid, or mask, or in such a way to control, label, attack. The emotion is not tempered by a desire for common understanding; as a matter of fact, when we are behaving in the upper left quadrant, our emotion can be fanned out of control like a wild fire on a dry, southern California hillside with the winds kicking off the Pacific.

Role of communication in conflict resolution. Lulofs and Cahn (2000, p. 87) describe a process model of communication that suggests five distinct phases. These phases are: prelude to conflict, a triggering event, the initiation phase, the differentiation phase, and the resolution phase. The prelude to conflict is just that: the prelude. In this phase, conflict can potentially exist because of the participants and their relationships or some environmental factor. The triggering event is generally some sort of communication; actions serve here as communication. If someone slaps you, they are using their hand and the action of the slap as the medium in delivering a message; in

order for you to receive the message, you would need to decode to translate. In this sense, the action is a mode of communication. The initiation phase starts when at least one of the participants realizes there's a conflict as initiated by a triggering event: no triggering event, no conflict. Likewise, when the parties have no realization of a triggering event, there's no conflict. It is possible for the conflict to proceed to no further stage if the participants move to avoidance. In the differentiation phase, the participants begin to share their differences, positions, and needs. The final stage is resolution. Lulofs and Cahn (p. 96) suggest, "Resolution is a probable outcome when the conflict can be resolved to the satisfaction of all concerned; management is more likely when only one or neither party can be satisfied."

What is the role of communication in these phases? Communication can trigger the conflict. Likewise, communication in the differentiation stage can help de-escalate conflict and begin to bring the conflict to resolution. Davis (2002) tells a number of stories from the camp in the mountains outside Denver with the Israeli and Palestinian youth. In each story, it is positive communication – sometimes laced with emotion – coupled with a strong desire to really understand the other person that creates situations where the conflict is resolved. As Davis (p. 201) notes, "When two people come to the table with authenticity and kindness – and a deep willingness to listen to each other – neither comes out of the interaction unchanged." She goes on to say, "But when adversaries enter into a dialogue with a basic respect for differing points of view and ground rules that make conversation possible, alliances can be built even across the most intransigent lines." Covey (1989) suggests one of those ground rules that makes conversation possible. Covey would have us present the other person's ideas and position as well as they can, or better. He suggests we do not need to agree with it; we merely

need to understand it. This is at the root of his fifth habit, “Seek first to understand, then to be understood.”

Covey’s ground rule is truly only effective when the participants both desire a common understanding. Certainly, if one participant desires common understanding, and the other does not, it is possible that the first’s actions will bring about a change in the second person. In this case there is still some effectiveness.

Role of communication in interpersonal relationships. Communication is a fundamental building block in interpersonal relationships. As Davis (2002, p. 14) notes, “Estrangements often start because we lack the communication skills to prevent them: we don’t know how to apologize, listen, or cool off and talk again tomorrow.” For her, communication skills are paramount in developing, and holding on to, deep relationships between people. Beyond the skills, however, is the attitude. The communication matrix places the horizontal axis with “desire.” It is the individual’s desire to find common understanding. Covey (1989, pp. 257-258) says, “But you can always seek first to understand. That’s something that’s within your control.” He goes on to suggest, “To touch the soul of another human being is to walk on holy ground. . . . The next time you communicate with anyone, you can put aside your own autobiography and genuinely seek to understand.”

Using the communication matrix, we see the goal is certainly to stay to the right of the matrix. When we do not intend to seek common understanding, we do not increase the pool of knowledge, nor do we seek first to understand. Living to the left of the matrix only increases the likelihood of destructive conflict cycles and a life in conflict. And, when we act in the upper left quadrant, our actions are highlighted by the extremes of silence and violence. We find ourselves withdrawing or attacking; both have no place in

conflict resolution. By withdrawing, we only create stronger emotion within ourselves that festers and spirals out of control. By attacking, even if it is only a verbal attack, we increase the likelihood of physical violence (Olsen and Braithwaite, 2004).

Communication as a tool for personal growth and conflict resolution.

Understanding the role of communication in conflict escalation, conflict resolution, and interpersonal relationships can provide a person with an opportunity for personal growth: “I can do better.” Using the communications matrix as a tool for understanding, we see the relationship between emotion – in the communication content, message, or medium – and desire for common understanding. When a person has a desire for common understanding, as demonstrated by the stories told by Davis (2002), Covey (1989, 1997), and Bolton (1977), tremendous things can happen in the relationship between the participants. Minimizing action based on emotion – the silence and violence behaviors – and increasing the desire for common understanding, can allow growth in each participant and in the relationship as a whole.

Facilitative leadership. The last twenty years have brought a shift in leadership from dictatorial and hierarchical in nature to a style more attuned to consensus, collaboration, and synergy. This second style is facilitative leadership, a style which calls for a different set of skills, tools, and knowledge. For many who grew up in hierarchical organizations which emphasized decision making solely by leaders and delegation of task from the top down, facilitative leadership requires we learn and implement these new skills and tools.

Bens (1999) states “Facilitation is a way of providing leadership without taking the reins. A facilitator’s job is to get others to assume responsibility and to take the lead” (p. 3). Bens goes beyond the common process tools (such as brainstorming, force field

analysis, and multi-voting) as discussed also by Martin and Tate (1997), Brassard and Ritter (1994), and Goal/QPC and Oriel (1995). Bens tackles new ground for the process oriented when discussing facilitating conflict. While Bens' approach is somewhat simplistic in that she often presents topics as two-sided or either/or (such as debates vs. arguments) or two-stepped (such as managing conflict by venting emotions and then resolving issues) her ying/yang approach works: it provides the basic information necessary for a person to successfully facilitate a meeting or lead a team.

Scholtes' (1998) proposes six leadership competencies which fit with the concepts of facilitative leadership. Of particular note for facilitative leaders is Scholtes' discussion about performance without appraisal. Scholtes shares a philosophical worldview with Deming (1983), the father of the total quality movement in Japan and here in the United States. Scholtes (p. 307) outlines the "case against appraisal" with what he defines as the faults common to all types of performance appraisal systems. The facilitative leader will ask, then, "What am I to do?" Scholtes suggests "debundling" the various aspects or benefits of the performance appraisal process and experience. Through debundling, the facilitative leader can still gain the benefits of a traditional performance appraisal system without the faults Scholtes identifies as catastrophic to creating a healthy, high performing organization.

Rees (2001) presents a model which delineates four goals a facilitative leader must keep in mind at all times: lead with a clear purpose, empower to participate, aim for consensus, and direct the process all of which facilitate the management of conflict.

Chapter 3: Methodology

The basic methodology for this study is a program evaluation using both qualitative and quantitative, or mixed, methods (Creswell, 2003). In addition, the study is quasi-experimental in nature (Campbell & Stanley, 1963) and of an interrupted time series design (Cook & Campbell, 1979).

Study Title

The title of this study is Impact of a Leadership Development Program on Interpersonal Conflict Management within a Coast Guard Staff Command.

Evaluation to Determine Program Effectiveness

The Unit Leadership Development Program at the Maintenance and Logistics Command Atlantic staff will be evaluated both formatively and summatively using a mixed methods approach. The formative evaluation will examine if the program has been implemented appropriately at the staff command. The summative evaluation will examine specific outcomes which are related to leadership and the leadership competency of conflict management and staff perceptions about conflict management using a survey assessment.

Research Questions to be Examined

This evaluation looks to answer five research questions:

1. What measures or indicators does the literature indicate serve as a barometer of interpersonal conflict.
2. Has the Maintenance and Logistics Command Atlantic staff implemented the Unit Leadership Development Program according to the standards required by the program and in accordance with the mandate from the Commandant?
3. Does the Unit Leadership Development Program impact conflict management at

a staff command?

4. What impact, anecdotally, has the Unit Leadership Development Program had on individual members of a staff?

5. What Unit Leadership Development Program interventions were, according to staff members, most helpful in their own development?

The first two research questions look at formative issues; the next three research questions addresses a summative evaluation. The second and third questions are quantitative in nature; the other research questions are qualitative.

Variables in the Program Evaluation

The independent variable in this evaluation is the institution or deployment of a leadership development program at a major Coast Guard staff command. The dependent variables are several. The primary dependent variable is interpersonal conflict among staff members within the organization. Other dependent variables are indicators of interpersonal conflict, albeit not direct indicators: employee retention, staff discipline, and civil rights complaints.

Evaluation Design

This program evaluation will use three primary methods of gathering information in order to address the research questions: analysis of extent data from the organization, a brief survey directed to members of the organization, and interviews of senior leaders and program managers.

Extent organizational data: leadership development program data. A variety of data which is already collected by the organization will be examined. The first set of extent data to be examined will be program documents for the leadership development program at Maintenance and Logistics Command Atlantic. These documents will include

the charter, minutes of meetings, and other archival material. These documents will primarily be reviewed to determine if the Maintenance and Logistics Command Atlantic staff implemented the Unit Leadership Development Program according to the standards required by the program and in accordance with the mandate from the Commandant. In addition, these specific additional questions will be answered through the review of this extent organizational data:

1. Did the unit use the 36-question assessment provided with the program, or did the unit use another assessment tool or survey?
2. How was the assessment delivered?
3. Did the unit use the data from the survey – whether quantitative, qualitative, or mixed – for an analysis of the current state?
4. Was the analysis completed using the leadership competencies as a filter?
5. Was an action plan developed that appears to address the gaps or chosen leadership competencies?
6. Was the action plan completed?

The documents reviewed will be used only to answer these specific questions or this evaluation's five formal research questions.

Extent Organizational Data: Indicators from key programs. The second set of extent data to be examined is program data collected by staff and headquarters' program managers. Three types of data will be examined in the course of this evaluation: civil rights data, employee retention data, and disciplinary data.

Civil Rights data. The civil rights data will come from two sets of metrics. The Coast Guard tracks the number of informal complaints and formal complaints made with the Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) domain. EEO complaints, whether actually

based on valid discrimination or not, nearly always have some sort of conflict at the root, and usually that conflict has been managed poorly or at least the aggrieved party believes the conflict management has been less than satisfactory. The EEO realm becomes the forum of last resort for many conflicts. Specifically, the analysis will examine six activity measures:

1. Number of EEO contacts made
2. Number of informal complaints initiated
3. Number of informal complaints resolved.
4. Number of informal complaints not resolved and a right to file notice issued to the aggrieved party.
5. Number of formal complaints initiated.
6. Number of open formal complaints.

The data from these measures will be whole number integers. The reporting period for each of these is by quarter, with fiscal year cumulative data released. Each of these measures is, again, an indicator of perceived grievances, often stemming from interpersonal conflict.

A second set of metrics for the civil rights data comes from triennial comprehensive civil rights unit assessments. These assessments include a survey along with qualitative data obtained through interviews and focus groups.

Employment retention data. Employee retention data is available for three important populations. The Coast Guard places great importance, because they have been found to be strong indicators of leadership amiss, on several employee retention measures.

1. Re-enlistment rates for first term enlisted member.

2. Retention rates of junior officers after their initial six-year obligation is over.
3. Civil servant retention or “churn.”

Each of these indicators will be represented as a percentage. The re-enlistment rates is the number of enlisted members eligible for re-enlisted divided by the number of members who do enlist. These rates are collected quarterly. The junior officer retention rate will be similar in nature and represented as the number of junior officers who reach six-years of service divided by the number of officers who remain with the Coast Guard. Civil service churn is slightly different and is represented by the number of billets divided by the number of billets which become vacant.

Staff Disciplinary Data. The final set of behavior data concerns conduct and disciplinary actions. The Coast Guard tracks the number of infractions to the Uniform Code of Military Justice, including instances of “Captain's Mast” , known as Non-Judicial Punishment (NJP) and Courts Martials, which are actual, legal trials similar to civil or criminal courts outside of the military. Most instances of NJP are caused by conflict or poor conflict management, often conflict between the subordinate and the supervisor. Captain's Masts and Courts Martials are actions under the Uniform Code of Military Justices and apply only to military members of the Coast Guard. Civilian employees, who are federal civil servants, receive disciplinary action through other means which is, most often, informal hearings and some punishment levied by an appropriate commissioned officer.

Extent Organizational Data: Historical survey data. The Coast Guard has used many assessment tools in the last ten years which may yield data related to conflict management. The Coast Guard continues to use assessments such as the Unit Leadership Development Program 36 question assessment. The data from each entire assessment will

not be examined; rather, the questions relating to conflict management, as defined by the Coast Guard leadership competency, will be analyzed.

The Workforce Cultural Audit was a Coast Guard-wide survey examining cultural issues including civil rights, leadership, and discrimination. The Workforce Cultural Audit was completed once nearly a decade ago. The Coast Guard has completed two service-wide assessments using the Organizational Assessment Survey, an assessment developed by the Office of Management and Budget. The Coast Guard intends to conduct this survey biennially. In addition, the Maintenance and Logistics Command staff has conducted several assessments during the last seven years which may yield appropriate data. One assessment tool used was the Q-12, a survey based on the work of Gallup as published by Buckingham and Coffman (1999). Another tool used more recently is the Unit Leadership Development Program is a 36 question assessment tool. Each of these assessment tools has specific questions about conflict management, and each assessment tool's results data can be analyzed at the staff level.

Specifically for this program evaluation, the results from five questions from the Coast Guard's Organizational Assessment Survey will be examined.

1. Question number 30: Disputes or conflicts (for example, between co-workers, management, and members/employees) are resolved fairly.
2. Question number 57: A spirit of cooperation and teamwork exists in my immediate work unit.
3. Question number 58: Different work units cooperate to get the job done.
4. Question number 71: Differences among individuals (for example, gender, race, national origin, religion, age, cultural background, disability) are respected and valued.
5. Question number 83: The people I work with cooperate to get the job done.

Original Data Collection: Survey of organizational members. In order to answer the research questions posed, particularly the last three, military members, civilian employees, and contract employees who currently work at the Coast Guard Maintenance and Logistics Command staff, will be surveyed, using an electronic survey of 16 questions, including demographic data. In addition to the questions from the Organizational Assessment Survey listed above, the survey will ask eleven other questions, as selected after evaluation according to Fitzpatrick, Sanders, and Worthen (2004, p. 249) including the following four questions.

1. Have you ever made an informal, or formal, EEO complaint while a member or employee at MLCA staff?

2. Thinking about your current work situation, how much interpersonal conflict is inherent in your workplace?

3. Thinking back to when you started working at the MLCA, how much interpersonal conflict was inherent in your workplace?

4. Thinking about your current work environment, how much interpersonal conflict do your colleagues and shipmates seem to experience?

The full survey text is included in the Appendix A.

Original data collection: Interviews. To help answer the research questions posed, interviews of senior leaders and the leadership development program manager will be conducted. The staff members serving in the following roles will be interviewed in the course of the program evaluation:

1. Program manager for the leadership development program at Maintenance and Logistics Command Atlantic, a mid-grade civil servant

2. Senior champion for the leadership development program at Maintenance and

Logistics Command Atlantic, a senior Coast Guard officer.

3. Command master chief for Maintenance and Logistics Command Atlantic, a senior Coast Guard noncommissioned officer.

Each of the interviews will be recorded using a digital voice recorder. The audio recordings of these interviews will be posted online at Internet Archive (<http://www.archive.org>) so that other researchers and interested individuals may review the interviews.

The program manager will be asked a number of questions specific to her role as the program manager. These questions include

1. How did you assess the state of leadership development at the Maintenance and Logistics staff?
2. How were the results of those assessments analyzed?
3. What was the action planning process used following the analysis of the assessment?

All interviewees will be asked general questions about the leadership development program and conflict at the Maintenance and Logistics staff, including these following several questions.

1. What impact on conflict management and interpersonal conflict have you seen as a result of the leadership development program?
2. What impact has the leadership development program had on members of the staff?

Evaluation Procedures to Determine Program Effectiveness

This program evaluation is quasi-experimental in nature and is of an interrupted time series design. The procedures of this program evaluation will provide the answers to

the stated research questions.

Participants in the Program Evaluation

Participants of this program evaluation are those targeted to participate in the survey or in the senior leader and program manager interviews. All participants are adults, employed as military members, federal civilian employees, or contract employees serving at the Coast Guard Maintenance and Logistics Command Atlantic staff in Norfolk, Virginia. Aside from their affiliation with the Coast Guard, the participants of this study are not distinct special population. The participants represent both men and women, adults with education ranging from high school equivalencies to earned doctoral degrees, and a range of racial and ethnic composition. For this evaluation, these distinctions will not be made in the analysis of any data, as the focus of this evaluation is on the larger organization as an entity itself, albeit composed of individuals.

All of the approximately 450 employees and members of the staff command currently assigned will be offered the opportunity to complete the online survey. Participants for the survey will be sought through an email campaign, as well as relying on the formal and informal networks of the leadership development program manager.

Research Protocol for Program Evaluation

This program evaluation will follow the research protocol detailed below.

Study Investigators. The principal investigator is Peter A. Stinson, 431 Crawford Street, Suite 217, Portsmouth, Virginia 23704; 757-398-7747. The principal investigator is a doctoral student at Nova Southeastern University in the Fischler School of Education and Human Services studying organizational leadership with an emphasis on conflict management. He is also a civilian employee with the Coast Guard, serving as an organizational performance consultant on the Atlantic Area staff. The principal

investigator, in his duties as an organizational performance consultant, has served the Maintenance and Logistics Command Atlantic staff and counts the program manager for the leadership development program among his clients.

The faculty adviser/dissertation chair overseeing this program evaluation is Regina Kline, a faculty member of the Fischler School of Education and Human Services.

Study funding. No external funding supports this program evaluation.

Purpose and potential benefits of the program evaluation. This program evaluation addresses both formative and summative issues. The formative evaluation component will examine if and how the staff is completing the mandatory activities; the evaluation will also examine to what extent and how the staff used the other, non-mandatory components, of the program. The summative evaluation, quasi-experimental in nature utilizing a time series design, will look at the outcome or results measures which serve as indicators to the success or failure, of maturity, of conflict management behaviors within the staff. These results are level-4 evaluation criteria as seen in Kirkpatrick's model of evaluation training (Phillips, 1991, 2000; Siniscalchi, Beale, Fortuna, 2008). These measures that will be examined are all currently collected by various program managers at Maintenance and Logistics Command Atlantic or higher authority, as indicators of program activity or success. This will be the first time these measures have been analyzed as indicators of conflict management or, even more broadly, as reflections of leadership. Providing this analysis to senior leaders on the staff will provide a benefit to the organization as it continues to use a leadership development program to teach and instill leadership competencies.

There will also be a qualitative component, using a survey and targeted interviews to determine senior staff members' thoughts and perceptions about the leadership

development program and conflict within the staff.

Proposed review by Institutional Review Board. This program review fits the criteria specified for a center level review in that aside from extent organizational data, additional data will be gathered from adult employees.

Timeline

With the bulk of the quantitative data already captured by the Coast Guard, and a supportive staff willing to participate in interviews and an online survey, progress in completing this evaluation should be fairly quick. In addition, impending organizational changes throughout the Coast Guard, the Commandant's strategic transformation initiatives, makes it imperative to complete the study before the Maintenance and Logistics Atlantic staff is thrust into a new organizational matrix.

The following benchmarks for this study -- complete with updates, actual dates, and negotiated deadlines -- are proposed:

	Actual or Projected Date
Acceptance of the concept paper	08/17/2007
Submission of the proposal.....	07/03/2009
Acceptance of the proposal.....	08/01/2009
Completion of the IRB process.....	09/01/2008
Quantitative data gathered from Coast Guard sources	09/15/2009
Survey collection of data completed.....	09/30/2009
Completion of interviews.....	09/30/2009
Submission of dissertation with results and conclusions.....	10/01/2009
Acceptance of dissertation and completion of program	10/30/2009

References

- The Arbinger Institute (2002). *Leadership and Self-Deception: Getting out of the box*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.
- Arnold, C. (September 9, 2005). Coast Guard Praised for Katrina Response. *National Public Radio, Morning Edition*. Retrieved November 18, 2005, from <http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=4838677>.
- Banko, S. (November 4, 2005). Coast Guard Shows Dedication to Changing Mission. *Federal Times*. Retrieved November 18, 2005, from <http://federaltimes.com/index2.php?S=1223122>.
- Barki, H. & Hartwick, J. (2004). Conceptualizing the Construct of Interpersonal Conflict. *The International Journal of Conflict Management*, 15(3), 216-244.
- Barnes-Slater, C., & Ford, J. (n.d.) Measuring Conflict: Both the hidden costs and the benefits of conflict management interventions. *LawMemo*. Retrieved July 2, 2009, from <http://www.lawmemo.com/articles/measuring.htm>.
- Barr, S. (September 6, 2005). Coast Guard's Response to Katrina a Silver Lining in the Storm. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved November 18, 2005 from http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2005/09/05/AR2005090501418_pf.html.
- Bennis, W., & Goldsmith, J. (2003). *Learning to Lead: A workbook on becoming a leader*. New York: Basic Books.
- Bennis, W., Spreitzer, G. M., & Cummings, T. G. (2001). *The Future of Leadership: Today's top leadership thinkers speak to tomorrow's leaders*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bens, I. (1999). *Facilitation at a Glance: A pocket guide of tools and techniques for effective meeting facilitation*. Salem, NH: Association of Quality and Participation & Goal/QPC.
- Blake, R. R. & Mouton, J. S. (1964). *The Managerial Grid: Key orientations for achieving production through people*. Houston, TX: Gulf Publishing Company.
- Blazey, M. (1997). Achieving Performance Excellence. *Quality Progress*, 30(6), 61-64.
- Bolton, R. (1979). *People Skills: How to assert yourself, listen to others, and resolve conflicts*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Bonomo, J. & Pasternak, J. (2005). Unlocking profitability in the complex company. *The Journal of Business Strategy*, 26(3), 10-11.

- Brassard, M. & Ritter, D. (1994). *The Memory Jogger II: A pocket guide of tools for continuous improvement and effective planning*. Salem, NH: Goal/QPC.
- Buckingham, M., & Coffman, C. (1999). *First, Break All the Rules: What the world's greatest managers do differently*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Campbell, D. T., & Stanley, J. C. (1963). Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research. In N. L. Gage (ed.), *Handbook on Research in Teaching* (pp. 1-76). Chicago: Rand-McNally.
- Carkhuff, R. R. (1983). *The Art of Helping*. Amherst, MA: Human Resource Development Press Inc.
- Cheng, M., Dainty, A. R. J., & Moore, D. R. (2005). Towards a multidimensional competency-based managerial performance framework: A hybrid approach. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 20(5/6), 380-396.
- Cook, T. D., & Campbell, D. T. (1979). *Quasi-Experimentation: Design and analysis issues for field settings*. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.
- Covey, S. R. (1989). *The Seven Habits of Highly Effective People: Restoring the character ethic*. New York: Free Press/Simon & Schuster.
- Covey, S. R. (1997). *The Seven Habits of Highly Effective Families*. New York: Golden Books.
- Covey, S. R. (2004). *The 8th Habit: From effectiveness to greatness*. New York: Free Press.
- Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research Design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Davis, L. (2002). *I Thought We'd Never Speak Again: The road from estrangement to reconciliation*. New York: HarperCollins Publishers.
- Deming, W. E. (1983). *Out of the Crisis*. Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Fitzpatrick, J. L., Sanders, J. R., & Worthen, B. R. (2004). *Program Evaluation: Alternative approaches and practical guidelines* (3rd ed.). New York: Pearson.
- Gardner, H., Csikszentmihalyi, M., & Damon, W. (2001). *Good Work: When excellence and ethics meet*. New York: Basic Books.
- Goal/QPC & Oriol Incorporated. (1995). *The Team Memory Jogger: A pocket guide for team members*. Salem, NH: Author.

- Gladwell, M. (2005). *Blink: The power of thinking without thinking*. New York: Little, Brown and Company.
- Gracey, J. S. (2004). *The Reminiscences of Admiral James S. Gracy, U.S. Coast Guard (Retired)*. Annapolis, MD: U.S. Naval Institute.
- Gross, M. A. & Guerrero, L. K. Managing conflict appropriately and effectively: An application of the competence model to Rahim's organizational conflict styles. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 11(3), 200-227.
- Haas, R. N. (2004). A Premium on Good Judgment. *Naval War College Review*, 57(3/4), 11-16.
- Hacker, S. K., & Wilson, M. C. (with Johnston, C. S.). (1999). *Work Miracles: Transform yourself and your organization*. Blacksburg, VA: Insight Press.
- Hay Group (n.d.). Leadership: Impact on Performance. Retrieved October 26, 2005, from http://www.haygroup.co.uk/Services_Lines/Capability/leadership_Development_effective.asp?GoTo=Expertise.
- Kaplan, R. S., & Norton, D. P. (1996). *The Balanced Scorecard: Translating strategy into action*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business School Press
- Kaplan, R. S., & Norton, D. P. (2003). *Strategy Maps: Converting intangible assets into tangible outcomes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business School Press
- King, C. S. (2008). *The Words of Martin Luther King, Jr.* New York: Newmarket Press
- King, M. L., Jr. (1963). I Have a Dream. Retrieved July 2, 2009, from <http://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/mlkihaveadream.htm>
- King, W. C., & Miles, E. W. (1990). What We Know – and Don't Know – About Measuring Conflict: An examination of the ROCI-II and the OCCI conflict instruments. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 4(2), 222-243.
- Knapp, M. L., Putnam, L. L., & Davis, L. L. (1988). Measuring Interpersonal Conflict in Organizations: Where do we go from here? *Management Communications Quarterly*, 1(3), 414-429.
- Knight Ridder Newspapers. (September 11, 2005). Government's Failures Doomed Many. *The Seattle Times*. Retrieved November 18, 2005, from http://seattletimes.nwsourc.com/html/hurricanekatrina/2002486672_katresponse11.html.
- Kolb, D. M., & Putnam, L. L. (1992). The multiple faces of conflict in organizations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 13(3), 311-324.

- Kotter, J. P. (1990). What leaders really do. In Harvard Business Review (1998), *Harvard Business Review on Leadership* (pp. 37-60). Boston: Harvard Business School Publishing.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2002). *The Leadership Challenge* (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kroeger, O., Thuesen, J. M., and Rutledge, H. (2002). *Type Talk at Work: How the 16 personality types determine your success on the job*. New York: Dell Publishing/Random House, Inc.
- Lewicki, R. J., Weiss, S. E., & Lewin, D. (1992). Models of Conflict, Negotiation and Third Party Intervention: A review and synthesis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 13(3), 209-252.
- Lipman-Blumen, J. (1998). Connective leadership: What business needs to learn from academe. *Change*, 30(1), 49-53.
- Lipman-Blumen, J. (2000). *Connective Leadership: Managing in a changing world*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lipman-Blumen, J. (2005). Toxic leadership: When grand illusions masquerade as noble visions. *Leader to Leader*, 36, 29-36
- Lowy, A. & Hood, P. (2004). *The Power of the 2 x 2 Matrix: Using 2x2 thinking to solve business problems and make better decisions*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Lulofs, R. S., & Cahn, D. D. (2000). *Conflict: From theory to action*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Madsen, S. R. & Gygi, J. (2005). A Conversation with John. H. Zenger: Leadership and Change. *Organizational Development Journal*, 23(3), 89-98.
- Maltby, V. (2004). Pornography: More complex than most people imagine. *Everyman*, 63, 10.
- Martin, G. E., & Bergman, T. J. (1996). The Dynamics of Behavioural Response to Conflict in the Workplace. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 69, 377-387.
- Martin, P. & Tate, K. (1997). *Project Management Memory Jogger: A pocket guide for project teams*. Salem, NH: Goal/QPC.
- McCarroll, J. E. (2000, January). Deployment and the probability of spousal aggression by U.S. Army soldiers. *Military Medicine*, 165(1), 41-44.

- Mintzberg, H. (1975). The Manager's Job: Folklore and fact. In Harvard Business Review (1998), *Harvard Business Review on Leadership* (pp. 1-36). Boston: Harvard Business School Publishing.
- Moore, C. W. (2003). *The Mediation Process: Practical strategies for resolving conflict* (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- National Institute of Standards and Technology. (2009). Criteria for Performance Excellence. Gaithersburg, MD: Author.
- Nohria, N., & Berkley, J. D. (1994). Whatever happened to the take-charge manager? In Harvard Business Review (1998), *Harvard Business Review on Leadership* (pp. 199-222). Boston: Harvard Business School Publishing.
- Ohbuchi, K. & Suzuki, M. (2003). Three Dimensions of Conflict Issues and Their Effects on Resolution Strategies in Organizational Settings. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 14(1), 61-74.
- Olson, L. N. and Braithwaite, D. O. (2004). If You Hit Me Again, I'll Hit You Back: Conflict management strategies of individuals experiencing aggression during conflicts. *Communication Studies*, 55(2), 271-285.
- Onyett, S. (2004). The Joy of Wading: Leadership and team working in swampy conditions. *The Mental Health Review*, 9(3), 35-41.
- Patterson, K., Grenny, J., McMillan, R., and Switzler, A. (2002). *Crucial Conversations: Tools for talking when stakes are high*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Phillips, D. T. (with Loy, J. M.). (2003). *Character in Action: The U.S. Coast Guard on leadership*. Annapolis, MD: Naval Institute Press.
- Phillips, J. J. (1991). *Handbook of Training Evaluation* (2nd ed.). Houston, TX: Gulf Publishing Company.
- Phillips, J. J. (2000). *The Consultant's Scorecard: Tracking results and bottom-line impact of consulting projects*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Pimpton, W. M. (2009). *The Quality of Leadership and Its Implication on Church Membership*. Capella University. (UMI No. 3344901)
- Rahim, M.A. (1983). *Rahim Organizational Conflict Inventories: Professional Manual*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychology Press.
- Rashid, M. D., Sambasivan, M., & Johari, J. (2003). The Influence of Corporate Culture and Organisational Commitment on Performance. *The Journal of Management Development*, 22, 708-728.

- Rees, F. (2001). *How to Lead Work Teams: Facilitation skills* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass/Pfeiffer.
- Reid, J. & Hubbel, V. (April/May, 2005). Creating a Performance Culture. *Ivey Business Journal*, 1-7.
- Rothman, J. (1997). *Resolving Identity-Based Conflict In Nations, Organizations, and Communities*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Schermerhorn Jr., J. R., & McCarthy, A. (2004). Enhancing Performance Capacity in the Workplace: A Reflection on the Significance of the Individual. *Irish Journal of Management*, 25(2), 45-60.
- Scholtes, P. R. (1998). *The Leader's Handbook: Making things happen, getting things done*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Schwarz, R. M. (1994). *The Skilled Facilitator: Practical wisdom for developing effective groups*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Scott, W. (2003). Performance Improvement Interventions: Their Similarities and Differences. *The Journal for Quality and Participation*, 26(1), 26-30.
- Silver, J. A. (2003). Movie Day at the Supreme Court or "I Know It When I See It": A history of the definition of obscenity. Retrieved February 25, 2009, from <http://library.findlaw.com/2003/May/15/132747.html>.
- Siniscalchi, J. M., Beale, E. K., & Fortuna, A. (2008). Using importance-performance analysis to evaluate training. *Performance Improvement* 47(10), 30-35.
- Stinson, P. A. (2005). Addressing the Need for Leadership Development as a Human Performance Issue in the United States Coast Guard: An intervention designed for MLC LANT. Retrieved December 2, 2005, from <http://doctorate-in-the-works.blogspot.com/2005/12/addressing-need-for-leadership.html>.
- Sutterfield, J. S., Friday-Stroud, S. S., & Shivers-Blackwell, S. L. (2007). How NOT to Manage a Project: Conflict management lessons learned from a DOD case study. *Journal of Behavioral and Applied Management*, 8(3), 218-238.
- Tannen, D. (1995). The Power of Talk: Who gets heard and why. In Lewicki, R.J., Saunders, D. M., Minton, J.W., & Barry, B. (2003). *Negotiation: Readings, exercises, and cases* (4th ed). Boston: McGraw Hill Irwin.
- Teal, T. (1996). The human side of management. In Harvard Business Review (1998), *Harvard Business Review on Leadership* (pp. 147-170). Boston: Harvard Business School Publishing.
- Tezer, E. (2001). Conflict Behaviors and Their Relationship to Popularity – Statistical

- Data Included. Retrieved February 24, 2009, from http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m2248/is_144_36/ai_84722694.
- Tischler, L. (November, 2004). IBM's Management Makeover. *Fast Company*, 88. Retrieved November 18, 2005, from <http://www.fastcompany.com/magazine/88/ibm.html>.
- Thomas, K. W., & Kilmann, R. (1974). *Thomas-Kilmann Conflict Mode Instrument*. Santa Clara, CA: Xicom.
- Thomas, K. W., & Kilmann, R. (1978). Four Perspectives on Conflict Management: An attributional framework for organizing descriptive and normative theory. *Academy of Management Review*, 3(1), 59-68.
- Thomas, K. W. (2006). Making Conflict a Strategic Advantage. Retrieved July 1, 2009, from <http://www.cppsurvey.com/resources/cpp/conflictwhitepaper.pdf>.
- Ury, W. L. (1999). *Getting to Peace: Transforming conflict at home, at work, and in the world*. New York: Viking/Penguin Putnam Inc.
- U. S. Coast Guard. (2004a). *ULDP 36: A competency-based assessment instrument for leadership development*. New London: Coast Guard Leadership Development Center.
- U. S. Coast Guard. (2004b). Leadership competencies. Retrieved October 12, 2005, from <http://learning.uscg.mil/uldp/ulpresources/28leadcompo.doc>.
- U. S. Coast Guard. (2004c). *Assessment Questions and Competencies Matrix*. Unpublished paper, Leadership Development Center, Coast Guard Academy, New London, CT.
- U. S. Coast Guard. (2005). Commandant's Priorities – People – Unit leadership Development Program Implementation. Retrieved April 9, 2005, from http://learning.uscg.mil/uldp/ulpresources/ALCOAST057_05.doc.
- U. S. Coast Guard. (2009). *U.S. Coast Guard: America's Maritime Guardian*. Coast Guard Publication 1. Washington, DC: Author.
- Utne, N. (2004). The ABCs of Intimacy: A toolkit for getting closer. *Utne*, November-December 2004, 56.
- Waite, C. (2004). *Intractable Interpersonal Conflicts*. Northwestern University. (UMI No. 3156664)
- Walton, R. E., Cutcher-Gershenfeld, J. E., & McKersie, R. B. (1995). *Pathways to Change: Case studies of strategic negotiations*. Kalamazoo, MI: W. E. Upjohn Institute.

- Walton, R. E., Cutcher-Gershenfeld, J. E., & McKersie, R. B. (2000). *Strategic Negotiations: A theory of change in labor-management relations*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Wilmot, W. W., & Hocker, J. L. (2001). *Interpersonal Conflict* (6th ed). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Wongrassamee, S. Gardiner, P. D., & Simmons, J. E. L. (2003). Performance Measurement Tools: The Balanced Scorecard and the EFQM Excellence Model. *Measuring Business Excellence*, 7(1), 14-29.
- Yukl, G. (2009). *Leadership in Organizations* (7th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Zaleznik, A. (1977). Managers and leaders: Are they different? In Harvard Business Review (1998), *Harvard Business Review on Leadership* (pp. 61-88). Boston: Harvard Business School Publishing.

Appendix A

Survey Examining the Leadership Development Program at Coast Guard MLCA

Thank you for considering to participate in this study. Peter Stinson, a doctoral candidate at Nova Southeastern University, is conducting an evaluation of the unit leadership development program at the Coast Guard Maintenance and Logistics Command Atlantic staff in Norfolk, Virginia.

Participation and input for this evaluation is solicited from all current Coast Guard employees – military, civilian, volunteer, or contract – at Main Street Tower, Norfolk, Virginia.

Your responses will remain confidential; no identifying information will associate your name or other specific identifying information, with your responses to the survey.

Some demographic information will be collected, but no data will be analyzed in demographic segments of fewer than six respondents in order to maintain confidentiality. Data will be analyzed primarily in the aggregate. The raw data will be maintained only until the evaluation, in the form of the applied dissertation, is accepted. At that time, the raw data will be deleted. Only Peter Stinson and certain faculty of the Fischler School of Education and Human Services at Nova Southeastern University will have access to the raw data.

The information gathered through this survey will be used in Peter Stinson's doctoral dissertation; the dissertation, but not the raw data of this survey, will be shared with the leadership development program manager and the senior staff of the Maintenance and Logistics Command Atlantic. The dissertation will also be available online so that anyone can review it. The URL will be provided to Dr. Kathy Nash who will provide it to the members of the training advisory panel and the unit leadership development program advisory committee. The URL is <http://dissertation.peterstinson.com>.

Aside from the satisfaction of knowing your voice will be heard, you will not receive any benefits to participating in this brief, 15 question, survey.

If you do not wish to complete this survey, please indicate this by answering Question #1 as "No" and then scrolling to the bottom of the page and hitting the "Submit" button.

We thank you for your consideration. If you would like to review the dissertation, please surf to <http://dissertation.peterstinson.com>.

If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact Peter Stinson directly at his Coast Guard email on the GAL.

Thank you for helping out with this program evaluation.

* Required

1. Consent to participate * Do you wish to complete the survey, and do you consent to your responses being used as described? If you answer no, please toggle to "No" and then scroll to the bottom of the page and hit the "Submit" button.

2. Employee Type/Demographics Considering your current role at the MLCA staff, what best describes your employee type and grade?

3. Your current education status Are you currently taking courses at a college or university?

4. Your longevity working at Main Street Tower When did you start working at the MLCA / MST?

5. Your participation in leadership development as a staff member Have you ever participated in training offered under the umbrella of the MLCA's Leadership Development Program (ULDLP) generally offered through the MLCA (p) staff -- ie, Dr. Kathy Nash -- not including mandatory, all-hands, GMT training?

6. More detail about your participation in leadership development at the MLCA If you answered YES to question #5 (directly above), did the training you participated in cover, in terms of content, the leadership competency "conflict management"? The Coast Guard defines the conflict management competency as: Coast Guard leaders facilitate open communication of controversial issues while maintaining relationships and teamwork. They effectively use collaboration as a style of managing contention; confront conflict positively and constructively to minimize impact to self, others, and the organization; and reduce conflict and build relationships and teams by specifying clear goals, roles, and processes.

7. Your experience with the EEO program Have you ever made an informal, or formal, EEO complaint while a member or employee at MLCA staff?

8. Conflict at work Thinking about your current work situation, how much interpersonal conflict is inherent in your workplace?

	1	2	3	4	5	6	
None	<input type="checkbox"/>	Overwhelming					

9. Conflict at work - In the past Thinking back to when you started working at the MLCA, how much interpersonal conflict was inherent in your workplace?

	1	2	3	4	5	6	
None	<input type="checkbox"/>	Overwhelming					

10. Conflict at work - Perceptions about other people Thinking about your current work environment, how much interpersonal conflict do your colleagues and shipmates seem to experience?

	1	2	3	4	5	6	
None	<input type="checkbox"/>	Overwhelming					

11. Fairness and treatment of others: Question from the CG OAS (#30) Disputes or conflicts (for example, between co-workers, management, and members/employees) are resolved fairly.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Strongly Agree				

12. Teamwork: Question from CG OAS (#57) A spirit of cooperations and teamwork exists in my immediate work unit.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	<input type="checkbox"/>	Strongly Agree				

13. Teamwork: Question from CG OAS (#58) Different wrok units cooperate to get the job done.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	<input type="radio"/>	Strongly Agree				

14. Diversity: Question from CG OAS (#71) Differences among individuals (for example, gender, race, national origin, religion, age, cultural background, disability) are respected and valued.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	<input type="radio"/>	Strongly Agree				

15. Cooperation: Question from CG OAS (#83) The people I work with cooperate to get the job done.

	1	2	3	4	5	
Strongly Disagree	<input type="radio"/>	Strongly Agree				