

COLLEGIATE LEADERSHIP COMPETITION

THE 2024-2025 TERMS AND CONCEPTS
E-GUIDE FOR PARTICIPANTS



THE 2024-2025 CURRICULUM COMMITTEE:

CURT BECK, BRANDON CHARPIED, JENNIFER EURY, LACEY GREY HUNTER, DAN
JENKINS, LISA KURON (CHAIR), TODD WIGGEN

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CLC TERMS & CONCEPTS AT A GLANCE	4
INTRODUCTION	5
LEADERSHIP DEFINED	9
LEADERSHIP	10
SOLVE	14
(LEADERSHIP) STYLES	17
FOLLOW	19
TEAMS	22
STRESSORS	25
CONFLICT	29
CONFRONT	32
INFLUENCE	35
ETHICS	38
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	40
CLC COMPETITION: MISSION CONTROL	42

**“A final chronic problem
with teaching and training
about leadership
is that there’s doing it,
and then there’s talking about it.
No amount of talking about it
seems to result in people
becoming better at doing it.”**

– Peter Vaill, Management Scholar

CLC TERMS & CONCEPTS AT A GLANCE

AN OVERVIEW OF THE CURRICULUM

LEADERSHIP

Likable personality
Exciting vision
Always thinking about process
Delivers/Defines results
Emotional intelligence
Raises the heat
Shows integrity
Has clear expectations
Intervenes skillfully
Prioritizes relationships

STRESSORS

Serious time limitations
Tough working conditions
Rapid change
Extreme lack of control
Strained relationships—issue
Strained relationships—interpersonal
Organizational bureaucracy
Role uncertainty
Shame or fear

CONFLICT

Compromising
Obviating
Nothing (Avoiding)
Forcing
Listening
Indulging
Collaborating
Talking/Gossip

SOLVE

Set roles and clarify goals
Outline the problems
List multiple strategies
Veer toward consensus
Evaluate results

TEAMS

Trust matters
Equity, diversity, and inclusion matters
Accountability matters
Member norms matter
Small wins matter

CONFRONT

Communicate the behavior
Own your statement
Name the impact
Fully listen
Reflect & respond
Options moving forward
Negotiate solution
Thank you

INFLUENCE

Involve others
Need logic
Focus on relationships
Lead a coalition
Use formal authority
Emphasize win-win
Negotiate
Create positive energy
Empathy is the key

(LEADERSHIP) STYLES

Share your vision (Authoritative)
Teach & Coach (Coaching)
Yell, tell & the hard sell (Coercive)
Listen & engage others (Democratic)
Energize & push (Pacesetter)
Simply delegate

FOLLOW

Fully engaged
Opposed & open
Lazy and disengaged (sheep)
Lone Wolf
Opposed & underground
Whatever you say

ETHICS

Ensure problem definition
Trade positions (empathize)
How do loyalties affect you?
Intentions & perceptions
Clarify the downsides
Society says...

INTRODUCTION

As epitomized by the opening quote from Peter Vaill, talking about leadership theories, frameworks, and concepts is an important part of leadership learning and training, though it is insufficient by itself. If the goal of training is to become better at *doing* leadership, then we must create time and space to *practice doing* leadership.

Established in 2015¹, CLC creates a practice field where learners are challenged to safely, methodically, and deliberately put their knowledge into practice. CLC bridges the gap between the academic study of leadership and applied leadership that occurs in teams, organizations, and society by developing and delivering:

1. **an integrated curriculum** (this document) that summarizes foundational leadership theories and concepts in a user-friendly way (i.e., acronyms). For example, SOLVE is a foundational term in the CLC curriculum; each letter in SOLVE represents a critical stage in the problem-solving process.
2. **a library of practice activities** that align with the curriculum and critical leadership learning outcomes, while also challenging teams to overcome stressors in an [intentional](#) and collaborative way. Reflection questions and links to external content offer opportunities for continued deliberate practice.
3. **In-person and virtual competitions** to bring communities of learners together, challenging them to put their knowledge to the test, and create meaningful teaching, learning, and leadership experiences.

You can learn more about the competitions by talking to your coach and visiting the [last page of this document](#). For now, it is important to know that the goal of this E-Guide is to share knowledge, encourage reflection, and provide resources to enhance your CLC experience.

Framing the CLC Curriculum

Two foundational principles have guided how we have created and presented the CLC Curriculum. More specifically:

1) Theoretically Sound and User-Friendly: The CLC Curriculum is rooted in the academic study of leadership and aims to summarize *some* core themes from theories and frameworks. It is *not* designed to be exhaustive or focus on one set of theories— rather than elevate specific models, the curriculum is intentionally integrative (Boyer, 1990). The CLC curriculum covers attributes of influential leaders, stress, conflict management, difficult conversations, effective team characteristics, problem-solving, followership, leadership styles, and ethical decision-making.

Key themes are organized into acronyms (e.g., SOLVE, LEADERSHIP, STRESSORS) where each letter refers to a different concept (e.g., the S in SOLVE stands for “set roles and clarify goals”). In each section, there’s a description of the CLC term and the concepts within each acronym. Throughout the E-Guide, links provide more detail if you want additional information. If you encounter a broken link, use your favorite search engine to search for the article or author, and you will likely find it.

¹ Co-founded by Dr. Scott Allen and Dr. Arthur Schwartz, CLC is now an asset of the Management and Organizational Behaviour Teaching Society, an organization dedicated to creating meaningful teaching and learning experiences. Visit <https://mobts.org/> to learn more.

Your team's first challenge? Memorize the acronyms and what each letter stands for so that you can more readily integrate them into your practice.

Your team's second challenge? Think in an integrative way – make time and space to explore how the CLC Terms and Concepts connect. We have highlighted some connections within the descriptions and reflection questions and left a number for you to identify and discuss with your team. Recognizing the connections between concepts will allow you and your team to take your leadership and team to the next level.

The curriculum can sometimes feel like an assortment of topics, but it is essential to step back and think about the work of leaders and teams. Think of the curriculum from a [Hero's Journey](#) perspective (e.g., any Disney film, Star Wars, Lord of the Rings, The Avengers, Harry Potter). For example, imagine a novice assumes an informal or a formal LEADERSHIP role. She must navigate STRESSORS and CONFLICT with foes to achieve her goals. She will have to INFLUENCE others to join the cause and build a TEAM. As interpersonal issues arise, the team will experience CONFLICT and may have to CONFRONT one another and work through conceptual blocks as they are creatively problem SOLVE to achieve their objectives. Along the way, the leader and FOLLOWERS will use certain STYLES that help and hinder progress. All involved will face dilemmas that test her ETHICS and require attention and thoughtful consideration. The perspective herein is that the Hero's Journey can unfold more effectively and perhaps efficiently if done so intentionally, deliberately, and thoughtfully.

2) The Know, See, Plan, Do Model of Leadership Development: The CLC curriculum is rooted in the Know, See, Plan, Do model (KSPD) of leadership learning (Allen, Miguel, & Martin, 2014; Martin & Allen, 2016). Ultimately, leadership learning and education aims to develop leaders (and followers) who are ready, willing, and able to **skillfully intervene** to help the group move forward. Consider how skillful interventions apply in many contexts, from your favorite athlete (who executes an important play) to a physician (who speaks up when they notice an anomaly) or a professor (who recognizes students are struggling and takes another approach rather than move on).

The KSPD model of leader development asserts that you must have a strong command of the literature (KNOW) to understand what is happening in real time. Once you can diagnose what's going on (SEE), you can effectively develop an intervention (PLAN), and, ultimately, intervene (DO) to help the group move forward. Physicians, pilots, and chefs use this same process. For instance, a cardiac surgeon KNOWs the heart, and after some diagnostic tests, she will SEE what is happening with her patient. She sets a PLAN of care and can DO surgery if needed. As her plan unfolds, she may SEE new information she KNOWs is important and adjust her PLAN as needed. Notice that the KSPD cycle is a continuous and iterative process - a good reminder to reflect throughout activities and the practice season.

Thus, your team must KNOW the CLC Terms & Concepts. Summarizing academic theory into acronyms is meant to help you with the KNOW stage, which helps you move through the rest of KSPD. You and your team need to have the content committed to memory. Otherwise, you cannot work from a place of intentionality. Your team will have trouble SEEing, PLANning, and DOing if they do not KNOW the content. It's like asking a pilot to fly without understanding the fundamentals.

After you KNOW the content, you will begin to SEE the CLC Terms & Concepts in your family, social circles, athletic teams, associations, groups, and at work. You can intentionally PLAN a course of action based on what you SEE and KNOW. As the team begins DOing, they may

come to KNOW new information and/or SEE new problems – and will have to rely on what they KNOW to determine if the PLAN needs to change. The goal is to use the entire model to help your team move toward accomplishing the goal. This approach to leadership learning and education is rooted in the work of K. Anders Ericsson, who co-authored the book [Peak](#).

How will your coach or the judges KNOW you and your team have learned the curriculum? [The Leader and Team Effectiveness Skill Sheet](#) (L&TESS) is a rubric designed to help judges SEE your learning in real-time. As such, the L&TESS also represents the behaviors that your team should PLAN to DO, in practice activities and the competition. Understanding the [L&TESS](#), how it relates to CLC's terms and concepts, and leveraging it during your practice and feedback sessions will help prepare you for success when competing.

Overall, the goal of the CLC curriculum is to improve the level of intentionality behind your team members' behaviors. That is, making a conscious choice on how to act (PLAN, DO) based on what you KNOW and SEE. Consider how often we “stick” to our defaults – often relying on the leadership or conflict management style we find comfortable, rather than deliberately choosing one. You'll know you are making progress when team members pause before DOing to leverage what they KNOW and SEE and then make a PLAN.

Additional Information on the CLC Curriculum

Common Sense vs. Common Practice: It is important to note that much of this curriculum is common sense. In other words, it is not difficult to understand or grasp. You may have already heard some of these concepts in different leadership experiences. That's good. The challenge is making the CLC terms and concepts common *practice*. CLC creates a practice field for leadership – the goal is to have you engage in [deliberate practice](#). As you practice, we encourage you to slow down and verbalize the terms and concepts you KNOW, SEE, and want to incorporate into your PLAN. When you start seeing these concepts in real-time and adjusting your behavior on the fly, you will know you have internalized the content, moved through the KSPD model, and will be ready for the competition!

CLC & Accessibility: Our participants bring many differences to our shared experience – a strength of the CLC. Creating a practice field for leadership also requires practicing working with people who are different from you, building a sense of team, and creating a space where everyone is safely and developmentally stretched beyond their comfort zone. Differences may include skills, areas of expertise, personality, language, sexual orientation, gender, thinking style, and more. As an organization, the CLC aims to foster inclusivity and accessibility throughout the practice season and in the competition, though we recognize that we are a work in progress. We have ensured the representation of multiple perspectives throughout the curriculum and design competition and practice activities with care and inclusion in mind. We also recognize that one size rarely fits all, and we encourage coaches and team members to understand one another's differences throughout the practice season. Acknowledging differences, developing strategies to recognize the unique qualities each team member brings, *and* finding complementary ways to support each other when barriers inevitably arise (because they will!) will help your team adapt and succeed in various situations.

A Work in Progress: We view the CLC experience, from curriculum to competition, to be a continual work in progress. Would you please help by sharing scholars, authors, stories of leaders, examples, videos and resources that highlight critical perspectives or experiences not currently included? We are particularly interested in resources that reflect our values of (1)

diversity, equity, & inclusion; (2) health & wellness; and (3) sustainability. Our goal is to integrate these values into the curriculum. Please share your suggestions with Lisa Kuron, chair of the Curriculum Committee: lkuron@wlu.ca.

References

- Allen, S. J., Miguel, R., Martin, B. A. (2014). Know, see, plan, do: A model for curriculum design in leadership development. *SAM Advanced Management Journal*, 72(2), 26-38.
- Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Princeton University Press, 3175 Princeton Pike, Lawrenceville, NJ 08648.
- Kellerman, B. (2018). *Professionalizing leadership*. Oxford University Press.
- Martin, B. A., & Allen, S. J. (2016). Empirical Test of the Know, See, Plan, Do Model for Curriculum Design in Leadership Education. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 15(4), 132-143.

LEADERSHIP DEFINED

OUR DEFINITION OF LEADERSHIP

“Leadership is the process of influencing others toward a common vision” (Middlebrooks et al., 2019). While this definition seems simple, key elements need exploration.

- Leadership is about helping a group, movement, organization, etc., move from Point A to Point B. Thus, leadership is about the process *and* the results.
- Likewise, leadership requires a [growth mindset](#) and resilience because there will be many obstacles along the way.
- Another critical element is influence, how leaders inspire, partner with, energize, and mobilize others to engage with the vision. Influence is different from authority, which involves formal power; while many with power have influence, the opposite may not be true.
- The word “others” is crucial because if you look behind you – and no one is there – you are not leading anything! Do you have a base of folks (i.e., followers) who view themselves as partners in the work?
- More than that, as [Barbara Kellerman \(2018\)](#) suggests, the literature over-emphasizes the role of the “leader.” Leadership is a relationship between the leaders, the followers, and the context(s). The CLC Curriculum underscores the importance of leaders and followers co-creating a better future as a team. Teams work together to improve the organization, cause, or vision. While “leadership” is often the focus, we encourage you to focus on your ability to “team” with and “follow” others to create a better world.
- Finally, the phrase toward a common vision suggests a collective movement toward a goal or a better future state.

It is also useful to explore what is *not* included in our definition of leadership.

- The definition does not include title, position, or role. Thus, leadership is available to all, even in the smallest ways – a mother influencing their family, a non-profit volunteer working to mobilize their community, or a statement that influences the group to change direction.
- Further, leadership is fluid – it can happen in brief moments and in big moments.
- Finally, the definition does not include the word person (which could start an interesting debate about whether it needs to be a person who is leading). The definition could apply to a person (e.g., Margaret Thatcher, [Dr. Dorothy I. Height](#)), a team (e.g., the international team of scientists working at [CERN](#)), an organization ([Rotary's](#) goal of eliminating malaria), a news outlet (the media's efforts to expose corrupt politicians or business leaders), or a country (e.g., [Denmark ranks highest on the Climate Change Performance Index](#)).

We challenge you, and your team, to think intentionally about what leadership is, what it can be, and how we can leverage the ideas of a growth mindset, to KNOW, SEE, PLAN and DO leadership more effectively.

References:

- Middlebrooks, T., Allen, S. J., McNutt, M., Morrison, J. (2023). [Discovering leadership: Designing your success](#). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

LEADERSHIP

ATTRIBUTES OF EFFECTIVE LEADERS

If leadership is about moving a group from its current state to a desired future state, there needs to be an **exciting vision** for a better future – the group needs to know where it is going.

Defining results is a necessary step to **delivering results**, as is having the leader that sets **clear expectations**, **shows integrity**, **prioritizes relationships** and displays **emotional intelligence** and a **likable personality** to mobilize the group toward the vision. As the group continues their efforts, the leaders should **always be thinking about process**, and pay attention to when they need to **intervene skillfully** to shift the group toward a different path, or **raise the heat** to influence the group to work above and beyond what they thought they could accomplish.

Note: This acronym is not an exhaustive list of attributes. This guide is a starting point – a springboard into leadership. You will likely hear about other attributes if you speak with educators, experts, and practitioners. That is the wonderful thing about leadership – there is so much to learn, and each person you encounter will have a new perspective or insight. Ultimately, you can determine what makes the most sense for *you*.

In many ways, LEADERSHIP is like the idea of love – it's in the eye of the beholder. Some view the President, King/Queen, or Prime Minister as having emotional intelligence, integrity, and an exciting vision. Others looked at [Charles de Gaulle](#) and could not disagree more! Each person experiences leadership differently, given factors such as upbringing, cultural context, values, goals, religion, personality type, and socioeconomic status. That is why you must intentionally determine what LEADERSHIP attributes you need to rely on most, given the situation and the people involved.

Likable personality – Research suggests that people are likely to be influenced by individuals they like (Cialdini, 2001). [Mr. Talkbox](#), best known for his opening in a Bruno Mars song, [shares in a TEDx Talk](#) how his joyous attitude and positivity have built better relationships with bands he collaborates with than any other skills or talents. Likability is important and generally means that you are pleasant to be with and are able to breathe life and energy into the team. However, this does not mean you overlook accountability and avoid difficult conversations (see CONFRONT/CONFLICT).

Exciting vision – An exciting vision is an ideal future state (e.g., a little league softball coach energizing her team to take their skills to the next level). Companies like [Patagonia](#) and [Unilever](#) have compelling visions that elicit enthusiasm and energy and lead employees to action. As a leader, your job is to have an end goal in mind, and communicate your enthusiasm and excitement for the task and how it fits into the bigger picture (e.g., [Emma Watson's speech on gender equality at the UN](#)).

Always thinking about process – Leaders balance two major tasks – managing relationships and accomplishing goals. Once teams define their objective, they need effective processes to deliver the results. Designing such a strategy is no small task. How will you collaborate? How will you

make decisions? How will you evaluate your results and determine what to do next? Likewise, leaders and teams must recognize that relationship-building is also a process. The **SOLVE** acronym represents a foundational process for problem-solving, as does **CONFRONT** for managing difficult conversations. KNOWing where the team is in their process, where they should be, and how to get there, are key skills for leaders. Leaders (and teams) *can* exert control over the process they use to collaborate, though they may not always be able to control the results they achieve. Remember, that during practice and competitions, your coaches, and judges, will use the [L&TESS](#) to assess the team's **process**; use it as a guide to intentionally work through the problem-solving process.

Delivers/Defines results – As mentioned above, teams need to define their “win” – the results they want to achieve. Defining results sets the direction for the team, and delivering results means the goal has been accomplished. Leaders and followers should identify a shared definition of success. The key is to help the team and others frame results – knowing where the team is going helps them work toward getting there. For instance, a failing basketball team in a rebuilding phase may define success as three wins in the coming season or to improve the percentage of three-pointers. Either way, the goal gives the team a shared sense of “success.” Many believe that accomplishing goals is the hallmark of leadership; in other words, some argue that individuals do not lead if they do not achieve results. How does this perspective relate to the need for leaders and teams to have a [growth mindset](#) as they evaluate results?

Emootional intelligence – Leaders assume heightened stress levels and are emotionally triggered consistently. Leaders must be aware of their emotional state and regulate as appropriate. Intuitive leaders pay close attention to the feelings of individual group members and the team's emotional state. Are members having fun and enjoying the process, or are emotional levels low and de-energizing? [Emotional intelligence](#) is the awareness and regulation of emotions in self and others (Goleman, 2000). Emotional intelligence *does not* mean team members ignore their feelings; it's the opposite – they are acutely aware of their feelings and how they impact others. Therefore, the leader understands how to adjust and regulate emotions as necessary. Note: what constitutes appropriate emotional regulation varies across people, contexts, and cultures. Consider how advocates express their opposition openly when inequities and injustices exist, **raising the heat** on others through their emotions and actions (e.g., [Rosa Parks](#), [Viola Desmond](#)). Some perspectives would see this as *not emotionally intelligent*; others might suggest advocates engage in open opposition because they know how it impacts others' emotions and, hopefully, actions. As always, the key is intentionality.

Raises the heat – Leaders can help individuals and teams accomplish more than they thought possible by **raising the heat**, challenging others to work at their edge, and push beyond the assumed boundaries. In almost every sports show or movie, a coach pushes the team past their normal state (e.g., Friday Night Lights, Cheer, The Last Dance, Remember the Titans, and Any Given Sunday). As the [Kansas Leadership Center](#) suggests, raising the heat often involves putting pressure on others, which may involve being intentional in what the leader says, how the task is structured, or which norms need to be disrupted. In this way, **raising the heat** should be an intentional choice the leader makes to challenge the team's process, norms, or current behaviors, with the goal of changing the group's trajectory. As such, knowing when to raise (or lower) the heat often requires **emotional intelligence**; the leader must take care not to push the team too far. Just as you may need to push the team to excel beyond its current capabilities, you may also need to raise the heat on yourself and experiment with different **LEADERSHIP** or

FOLLOWER STYLES to meet the needs of people and the situation (e.g., you may have to hold yourself accountable to be more authoritarian under serious time limitations, even if it is uncomfortable).

Shows integrity – Showing integrity is straightforward in concept but complex in practice.

Displaying integrity and modeling the way requires self-awareness and consistent reflection. It also requires that you are open to feedback so others can share their thoughts and perspectives when they think you are off course. Leadership requires a strong moral compass and courage to stand up for your beliefs – even in the face of criticism. The [ETHICS](#) acronym may help leaders choose a path that shows integrity, and [STRESSORS](#) may impede a leader's ability to do so if they are not well managed.

Has clear expectations – Great teams have clear expectations and understand that transparency and consistency foster trust and commitment. Expectations that need to be clarified may include the team's goals, individual roles, group norms, etc. When teams clearly communicate their expectations for themselves and one another, everyone understands their role and can articulate how they fit into the team's objectives. The key is that clear expectations often reduce confusion, increase efficiency, and fosters team synergy. As [Brene Brown \(2018\)](#) says, "clear is kind, unclear is unkind." Certainly, leaders have a responsibility to facilitate clear expectations regarding roles and goals within a team, which may beg the question -- what responsibilities might followers have?

Intervenes skillfully – According to the [Kansas Leadership Center](#), intervening skillfully means that the leader (and sometimes a team member) is engaged in "intentional acts of leadership that are carefully and collaboratively designed to impact an issue positively." In other words, leaders recognize the need to act to improve the team's processes or ability to **deliver results** and make the intentional choice to act accordingly. This may include **raising** (or lowering) **the heat** or addressing a conflict stifling team performance. The leader (or a team member) intervenes to improve things, set a course forward, and skillfully navigate the many challenges associated with the role. Indicators of success include goal achievement and team member engagement.

Prioritizes relationships – While leaders should **always think about the process**, they must also focus on people. In other words, they focus on process *and* people. They build relationships with individual team members, external stakeholders, or others in the sphere of influence. In other words, leaders prioritize relationships within, and sometimes beyond, the team. Doing so builds trust and allows leaders and teams to attend to diversity and inclusion. Great leaders build strong teams that will work above and beyond for the whole.

Reflection Questions

1. Think of a leader with whom you work closely. How successful are they at managing both **relationships** and **processes**? What are the ramifications of this?
2. When it comes to leadership, what does **intervening skillfully** look like? How does a leader know when it is appropriate to intervene? When shouldn't they?

3. What happens when a leader lacks **clear expectations**? How does it impact the team?
4. Why is **raising the heat** such an important concept? What happens when a leader who does not **prioritize relationships** tries to **raise the heat**?
5. What is your opinion on **defines/delivers results**? Has someone effectively led if they did not deliver results? Or did so from an unhealthy place or in an unhealthy way?

References That Have Helped Inform LEADERSHIP

- Avolio, B. (1999). *Full Leadership Development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Avolio, B. J., & Gardner, W. L. (2005). Authentic leadership development: Getting to the root of positive forms of leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, 16, 315-338.
- Bass, B. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Cialdini, R. B. (2001). Influence: Science and practice. *Boston: Allyn & Bacon*.
- Ericsson, K.A., Prietula, M.J., & Cokely, E.T. (2007). The making of an expert- response. *Harvard Business Review*, 85, 146-147.
- Goleman, D. (2000) Leadership that gets results. *Harvard Business Review*, March-April, 78-90.
- Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R. & McKee, A. (2002). *Primal leadership: Realizing the power of emotional intelligence*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- HERI (1996). *A social change model of leadership development: Guidebook version III*. Los Angeles: University of California Los Angeles Higher Education Research Institute.
- Judge, T. A., Bono, J. E., Ilies, R., & Gerhardt, M. W. (2002). Personality and leadership: a qualitative and quantitative review. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 765.
- Komives, S. R., Lucas, N., & McMahon, T. R. (2009). *Exploring leadership: For college students who want to make a difference*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Kouzes J. & Posner B. (1995). *The leadership challenge: How to keep getting extraordinary things done in organizations* (3rd Ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Meissen, G. (2010). Leadership lexicon. *The Journal of Kansas Civic Leadership Development*, 2(1), 78-81.
- Shankman M., Allen, S. J., & Haber-Curran, P. (2015). *Emotionally intelligent leadership: A guide for students*, 2nd edition. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

SOLVE

A SIMPLE PROBLEM-SOLVING MODEL

A core activity of leadership is problem-solving. The term SOLVE provides a simple model to help the leader and team systematically navigate the challenges ahead. First, it's critical to **set roles and clarify goals** – who will lead (i.e., facilitate the problem-solving process)? Who will follow (i.e., contribute to the problem-solving process)? How will your team define success (e.g., task completion, building skills, satisfaction)? The next step is to **outline the problem**. This means that the group clearly understands the task and context they find themselves in. Asking questions, testing assumptions, and thinking critically and carefully help ensure the team recognizes the challenges ahead before moving on to step three: **list multiple strategies** that may facilitate task and goal completion. After exploring several possible paths forward, the team can **veer toward consensus** on which strategy they will implement. Frequently, the team will have to re-adjust if the chosen approach is not working - in other words, they must **evaluate results**. As a plan unfolds, new problems must be outlined and solved to achieve success. In other words, SOLVE is not a one-time process, nor is it always linear; teams should expect to revisit steps as the process unfolds.

Consider SOLVE to be a [mental representation](#) of how the problem-solving process *may* work. A skilled leader will aim to move the team efficiently through the process while having an acute awareness when the team (or certain members) has skipped a step or has not given a step enough time and attention. Sometimes, all steps may not make sense, be unnecessary, or come in a different order. The overall goal is to identify a breakthrough strategy that efficiently and elegantly helps the team achieve its objective. Critically, this includes actively evaluating the strategy and re-visiting steps as needed. Each problem-solving step requires diverse perspectives, an inclusive tone, improvisation, and a leader who intentionally moves the team to the next step when the time is right.

During the practice season and the competition, your team will work together to SOLVE problems. On this basis, we intentionally designed the [L&TESS](#) rubric (i.e., the rubric coaches and judges will use to assess your team's process scores) to mirror the SOLVE process.

Set roles and clarify goals (Step 1) – At the beginning of the task, it is helpful to establish foundational roles and goals to guide the team. Who will lead/facilitate the process? Who will follow? Who will hold the team accountable (e.g., timekeeper), and who will take notes? Along with setting roles, the leader ensures that everyone understands the team's shared purpose – a core differentiator between a team and a group. Remember, effective leaders **define results** – knowing where the team is going is critical in determining how the team will get there. This step fosters a shared “big-picture” perspective of what the team strives to accomplish.

At the outset of problem-solving, roles and goals may be “fuzzy.” This is normal. Preliminary roles and general goals may be defined based on team norms or leveraging frameworks such as [Benne and Sheat's seminal work on group roles](#). As the team works through the task, new roles may emerge, and goals may shift as new information or problems present themselves. Great leaders and followers see this need and, because they are **always thinking about process**, can adapt – returning to this step to assign new roles, tasks, and/or goals as the activity progresses. Less prepared leaders will forget to assign roles and goals in the first place

or assign them but forget to follow up. A lack of role and goal clarity will be a source of stress, cause confusion, and may cause the team to be less efficient and effective.

Outline the problems (Step 2) – The goal of this stage is that everyone on the team *truly* understands the problem(s) at hand. As such, a hallmark of this step is that the team is asking questions. Lots of questions. **Outlining the problem** involves exploring the many nooks and crannies of the task and context at hand. Questions signify that members are trying to understand the objective and context while searching for conceptual blocks that may help or hinder the group's problem-solving process. **Conceptual blocks** are mental barriers that impede an individual's ability to define or solve a problem; they are rules that humans construct in their minds that are simply not there! For example, we tend to favor solutions we have used in the past, even when the context has changed. Think about organizational policies that continue because "that's how they've always been done before!" A preference for constancy can be a conceptual block that impedes creative problem-solving.

Careful reading and questioning the task directions will clarify what the team must, can, or cannot do. In addition, this step may protect the team from conceptual blocks. Testing and questioning assumptions are critical at this stage and may include questions such as "What is meant by this?" or "How did we determine that?" Contextual problems must also be outlined. For example, some STRESSORS may impact the team's ability to accomplish the task (e.g., lack of expertise, limited time, or too much organizational bureaucracy). Some of these STRESSORS may be problems that can be solved; others may not be.

One of the biggest problems that teams must outline is knowing whether they should keep outlining problems (i.e., PLAN), or if they should begin to act (i.e., DO) so they can collect information that is useful in outlining more problems. On one hand, the team may need to ask questions of one another and/or any authority figures (e.g., a coach in practice or the Lead Judge in competition) before proceeding to idea generation and taking action; otherwise, *the group may brainstorm all the wrong options* because of this. On the other hand, the team may need to begin acting so they have a better understanding of the problems they are facing. Afterall, how can you solve a problem when you do not fully know what you are faced with?

Effective leaders are aware of **action bias** and are able to assess what they know and what they do not know to keep the group in this step for the right time – not too long (analysis paralysis) and not too short (jumping immediately to brainstorming).

List multiple strategies (Step 3) – Even teams that have given the previous step some time will stumble during this step. Humans have an instinctual response to act on the first viable path forward (Nutt, 1999). As soon as that first idea is introduced, the group's collective processing shuts down, and the group begins to think of the idea as *the* solution moving forward. While, in theory, that idea could be the best, it is essential to acknowledge that great idea and then push the group to identify 5-6 other paths forward. Remember the phrase "first is the worst" – the first idea is often the most obvious solution everyone else has identified. It is also likely not the most *effective or efficient* path forward. Remember, the goal of this step is to generate *many* potential solutions, not choose THE solution (that comes next!).

Veer toward consensus (Step 4) – Once the group has many potential paths forward, the leader should move the group toward agreement on a chosen strategy. Intentionality is critical at this step. It may be helpful to ask questions about each strategy. For example, what **problems can we outline** with each strategy? Can we **obviate** any of those problems? Ideally, the group will determine a strategy by consensus. However, the group may sometimes need to vote if a few factions have differing viewpoints on how to proceed. While differences can be uncomfortable, it's a normal part of the process, so encourage others to openly share different opinions and engage in healthy conflict, where appropriate, rather than remain **underground**.

Evaluate results (Step 5) – It is important for the leader to continually check in throughout strategy implementation to evaluate whether the team is on the right track. Does the chosen strategy seem to be working? Are any new **roles** needed? Has our **goal** changed? What **problems** are we facing that must be further outlined? Unfortunately, many teams (including well-practiced CLC teams!) often proceed with a flawed strategy, even though everyone thinks it is not working. Many strategies fail. Rather than feel **shame or fear**, consider this step an opportunity for the team to learn as new information emerges, outline the problem, and adjust their strategy. Skilled leaders and followers must **evaluate results**, and **intervene skillfully** as needed, so teams need members willing to model the **opposed and open** followership style. Notably, while we advocate for teams to evaluate results *during* the process, doing so after task completion (or once time runs out) is also an important debriefing strategy to help teams maintain their growth mindset and be more intentional in the future.

Discussion and Reflection Questions

1. Why do humans often move forward with their first idea – even when they know it's likely not the most effective or efficient? What happens in the brain?
2. "Perfect can be the enemy of good." How does this statement apply to SOLVE?
3. Does evaluating results have to occur at the end? Why do leaders often struggle with this step during a project or task?
4. A professor at Yale once said, "If I had only one hour to solve a problem, I would spend up to two-thirds of that hour attempting to define what the problem is." Do you agree? Why?
5. How can your team use SOLVE to outline some common problems teams face when working together? Can you veer toward consensus (e.g., develop member norms) to help the team collaborate and solve problems more effectively?
6. What step of SOLVE do you believe is the most important? Why?

References That Have Helped Inform SOLVE

- Beyth-Marom, R., Fischhoff, B., Quadrel, M. J., & Furby, L. (1991). Teaching decision making to adolescents: A critical review. *Teaching decision making to adolescents*, 19-59.
- Guo, K. L. (2008). DECIDE: A decision-making model for more effective decision-making by health care managers. *The Health Care Manager*, 27(2), 118-127.
- Hammond, J., Keeney, R., & Raiffa, H. (2002). *Smart choices: A practical guide to making better decisions*. New York, NY: Broadway Press.
- Nutt, P. C. (1999) Surprising but true: Half the decisions in organizations fail. *Academy of Management Executive*, 13(4), 75-90.
- Seemiller, C., & Whitney, R. (2020). Creating a Taxonomy of Leadership Competency Development. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 19(1).

(LEADERSHIP) STYLES

APPROACHES AN INDIVIDUAL CAN USE TO LEAD OTHERS

In golf, a person has several clubs that can be used depending on where they are on the course. STYLES highlights six basic leadership styles like metaphorical golf clubs (Goleman, 2000). Each style has benefits and drawbacks depending on the context. Skilled individuals will intentionally choose an appropriate style depending on culture, norms, and other contextual factors. Like golfers who rely on many different clubs as they navigate each hole on the course, leaders will likely need to rely on different STYLES throughout problem-solving, relationship-building, and other team-oriented activities. As always, the key is intentionality. Ultimately, each style has benefits and drawbacks that will be important to explore and experiment with.

Share your vision (Authoritative) – **Share your vision** is an authoritative approach in that the leader has the knowledge or a clear vision for how the group should proceed. In other words, the leader has a clear vision of where they *think* or *want* the group to go, and are comfortable asserting their viewpoints and thoughts, without gaining input from others. While this can feel comforting for the followers (“Phew, someone has the answer!”) – be careful. As soon as someone says, “I have done this before,” or “I know the answer,” ensure that the group stays alert and closely monitors progress. This approach can work well with a democratic style to inform or validate the vision. For example, [Jacinda Arden](#) – the former Prime Minister of New Zealand, was praised in the early days of the COVID-19 pandemic for her ability to articulate her plans clearly and openly while demonstrating care and concern for her constituents.

Teach and Coach (Coaching) – Leaders who use a teach and coach style share their expertise with others. They pause, slow down, and take the time to guide others down potential paths. This approach takes time but builds capacity and depth among team members, which in the long run, can save time. For instance, a leader who is a negotiation expert may actively coach others to improve their skills as well. The coaching style is highly personalized but can take too much time. The leader needs to pay close attention to time and resources.

Yell, tell, and the hard sell (Coercive) – Individuals using this style want their way and will do whatever it takes (yell, tell, or make [the hard sell](#)) to ensure that an individual or the group complies with their directives. A leader using this style is directive - sometimes *too* directive – and often coercive. This style is the most high-risk style of leadership because using this style can alienate others, cause hard feelings, and disengage individuals who do not feel a part of the process. However, it can be expedient in an emergency and a perfectly appropriate style under heavy time-oriented stressors. Beware: while there is a time and a place, overuse of the coercive style will likely damage relationships in the long run.

Listen and engage others (Democratic) – Leaders who listen and engage others are more democratic. They seek the group’s wisdom or knowledge and build ownership in the path forward. The adage, “people support what they help create,” comes to mind when exploring this

leadership style. A hallmark of this style is the question - “what do you think?” The democratic style fosters a feeling of belonging and can be extremely effective when the leader needs a high level of buy-in from the group. And while there are many positives, the style can be time-consuming and stall progress if the leader tries to please everyone. A skilled leader using this style must focus on the time and know when it is appropriate to vote, table the discussion, or decide to move forward.

Energize and push (Pacesetting) – Leaders sometimes need to **raise the heat** and **energize and push** their team to work above and beyond their current efforts or limits ([Elon Musk](#) is known for using this style, for example). Like other styles, this approach has a time and place. Pacesetting is often associated with **serious time limitations** and a high necessity for results. Energizing and pushing is especially useful when teams settle into a slow-moving pace and must be re-energized to meet the mission. **Raising the heat** offers a number of ways that leaders can energize and push their (e.g., naming the issue, explaining the consequences of inaction, holding others accountable for speaking too much, and displaying **emotional intelligence**; see the [Kansas Leadership Center](#) for more suggestions on how this can be accomplished). However, be careful; pacesetting leaders can create an environment that feels demanding rather than one that feels inclusive or open to differing perspectives.

Simply delegate – By delegating tasks, leaders can build team capacity, distribute the workload, and accomplish more in less time. This style challenges leaders to facilitate the distribution of tasks and provides them more time and space to **always be thinking about process**. Inexperienced leaders often take on too much themselves; if you pay close attention, you will find that they take on multiple roles rather than assign tasks to others. An indicator of emotional maturity and successful leadership happens when followers have developed to the point where they have the knowledge, skills, and attitudes to work autonomously. Consider, for example, how a conductor of an orchestra directs the group, but does not play an instrument; simply delegating facilitates **role clarity** for others and gives the leader more opportunity to **skillfully intervene** as needed.

Reflection Questions

1. How can the STYLES be combined in a skillful way? What would it look like?
2. What are the downsides of defaulting to a teaching and coaching style?
3. How would you expect each of the STYLES to move through the SOLVE process? Be specific.
4. Which of the STYLES do you most often default to when you are leading? Which do you shy away from? What are the ramifications of this for you as a leader?
5. Which of the STYLES do you most prefer when you are not leading? Which do you least prefer? How does your answer to this question compare to your answer to the question above?

References That Have Helped Inform STYLES

- Blanchard, K., Zigarmi, P., & Zigarmi, D. (1985). *Leadership and the one-minute manager*. New York, NY: Morrow.
- Goleman, D. (2000) Leadership that gets results. *Harvard Business Review*, March-April, 78-90.
- Vroom, V. H. (2000). Leadership and the decision-making process. *Organizational Dynamics*, 28(4), 82-94.

FOLLOW

APPROACHES FOLLOWERS CAN USE WHEN WORKING TOWARD A COMMON GOAL

The literature, by default, is leader-centric, limiting how we think about leadership. Dr. Ron Riggio, a seminal leadership scholar, suggests that "Leaders don't do leadership. Leadership is co-created by leaders and followers working together." Likewise, author Sharna Fabiano suggests, "If we're going to have people called leaders, then we're going to have people called the followers, and those people have to be equally valued."

Followership involves how we accept or respond to the influence of others. The behavioral patterns captured in FOLLOW represent a spectrum of ways we respond to others' influence. In that sense, STYLES and FOLLOW are closely related concepts, and the reality is that each of us often shifts between the two roles depending on the context.

Keep in mind that while we tend to default to a particular way of FOLLOWing, we can intentionally choose one that is appropriate for the context. There is an appropriate time to engage in each of the ways to FOLLOW, and each has benefits and drawbacks that will be important for you to explore. As always – the key is contextual awareness, intentionality, and not defaulting to one style in all situations. Pay close attention to the leader-follower dynamics in yourself, your team, and your organization(s). Just as golfers rely on many different clubs as they navigate each hole on the course, followers will likely need to rely on different ways to FOLLOW throughout problem-solving, relationship-building, and other team-oriented activities.

Fully engaged – This followership style is the most active and engaged. **Fully engaged** followers view themselves as partners and are invested, committed, and excited about the work. They are not trying to take over; they simply view themselves *all in* and will enthusiastically partner with the leader to achieve their mission. In this way, a **fully engaged** follower is likely adept at knowing when to use each style in FOLLOW – they will be fully engaged in whatever role they are needed. As scholar Ira Chaleff suggests, **fully engaged** followers will "stand up to and for" their leaders and feel a duty to have difficult conversations (see CONFRONT). As an example, [Ange Macphail, helped reform the penal system in Canada through speaking up](#). Overall, this is a positive form of followership, but you must pay close attention – some leaders may not want partners in their space.

Opposed and open – A follower using an **opposed and open** style is more of an individualist who openly disagrees with the leader's or team's direction. You will often notice this followership style in public service. Open opposition can be positive because there is transparency - everyone knows where the other individuals and factions stand. Advocates like [Autumn Peltier—an Indigenous water protector and advocate for clean drinking water](#)—may rely on this style to encourage others to think differently about an issue. Likewise, some people will say, "This is not working," which is essential for high-functioning teams - disagreeing without being disagreeable (consider which LEADERSHIP attributes an opposed and open follower should rely on). Remaining civil during opposition can lead to open discussion, help the team outline the problem, and list new strategies. This style usually occurs in teams and systems where people cannot be marginalized, fired, or, in extreme cases, killed for voicing their concerns and

criticism. This style is less common when there is fear in the system, and jobs and careers could be on the line.

Lazy and disengaged (Sheep) – A **lazy or disengaged** individual activates when tapped but often lacks a proactive approach to the follower role. Even when tapped, they may not contribute much to meet the team's objective. Pay close attention to the behavior of people exhibiting this style. A follower who feels left out, or overlooked, can withdraw and limit their participation on a team. It does not always mean they have nothing to contribute; instead, they have not found a path. Consider how, in the movie [Wall-E](#), humans became complacent while others (e.g., robots) began doing everything for them. The presence of lazy and disengaged followers can add value *if* the leader notices and works to include them. We tend to perceive this as a negative form of followership, so pay close attention to your assumptions about why someone may be disengaged.

Lone Wolf – No one knows where the allegiances of the *lone wolf* lie – they are active and engaged but seem to have their priorities and agenda. A hallmark of this style is an individual who works “outside” of the traditional norms of practice – this can be good (especially in the face of injustice) but may sometimes be unhealthy and solely for personal gain. Dorothy Vaughn ([Hidden Figures](#)), Steve Biko ([Cry Freedom](#)), Paikea ([Whale Rider](#)), and Carrie Mathison ([Homeland](#)) are examples of TV and film characters who display the tendencies of a lone wolf. Lone wolves often prioritize their agenda – whatever that is. In some cases, lone wolves may be working towards the team agenda without explicitly saying they're doing so. Strategically, lone wolves may be valuable to the **simply delegate** leadership style (e.g., testing a strategy or collecting information individually before bringing it to the team). As always, the key is for followers, and leaders, to leverage this style with intention.

Opposed and underground – This style is prevalent in organizational life. Because of **shame or fear**, people rarely externalize their true feelings about leaders, leaders' ideas, and the limitations of the current strategy. An indicator of this style is a “meeting after the meeting” to **talk/gossip** and discuss why the plan will not work. Another indicator is when an authority figure offers a bad idea to the group, and no one openly challenges their thinking. Perhaps the paradox here is that, due to fear and an inability to intervene, the followers enable a path prone to failure – which lowers morale and engagement (and other [negative outcomes](#)), which may limit their willingness to speak up. An **opposed and underground** follower style often undermines the group's long-term success. Importantly, in time-sensitive environments, it may be beneficial for followers to remain underground so the team can move forward in their process – as long as integrity is not compromised.

Whatever you say – A follower with a **whatever you say** (e.g., a “yes” person) approach will align with the wishes of the leader/authority figure and rarely challenge or let their feelings be known. The implementer is a dutiful follower who rarely questions the authority figure. This style is often appropriate, mainly when the leader displays integrity and works toward noble objectives. When activated, these followers know their role and can often complete many tasks quickly. However, this style can be destructive. If the leader is morally corrupt, these followers may find themselves doing the dirty work of a toxic leader. Extreme examples of toxic leaders

are Hitler and Stalin, who needed implementers to enact their tragic visions. In his own words, Adolf Eichmann noted he was “[just following orders](#)” in enacting Hitler’s vision.

Reflection Questions

1. Followers are often a part of the problem when things are not going well. How so?
2. When is it appropriate/potentially dangerous to use each of FOLLOW approaches?
3. When it comes to FOLLOW, what styles do you default to? How can this be perceived (good or bad) by authority figures?
4. What does it look like when you work with a follower who defaults to *fully engaged* and *opposed and underground*?
5. What could indicate an unhealthy or dangerous follower response?
6. Consider STYLES and FOLLOW together. What types of FOLLOWer do you think each of the STYLES would, or would not, prefer working with?

References That Have Helped Inform FOLLOW

- Chaleff, I. (2009). *The courageous follower: Standing up to & for our leaders*. Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Fabiano, S. (2021). *Lead & follow. The dance of inspired teamwork*. Koehler Books.
- Kellerman, B. (2008). *Followership: How followers are creating change and changing leaders*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Jenkins, D. M., & Spranger, A. N. (2020). Followership Education for Postsecondary Students. *New Directions for Student Leadership*, 2020(167), 47-63.
- Kelley, R. E. (1988). *In praise of followers* (pp. 1-8). Harvard Business Review Case Services.
- Uhl-Bien, M., Riggio, R. E., Lowe, K. B., & Carsten, M. K. (2014). Followership theory: A review and research agenda. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 25(1), 83-104.

TEAMS

ATTRIBUTES OF HIGH-FUNCTIONING TEAMS

As [Kellerman](#) (2018) argues, leadership is not about an individual – it is a system with three equally important parts: (1) the leader, (2) the followers, and (3) the contexts – which includes the context that the leaders and followers are operating in, *and* the context that they create as a team. Building a cohesive and high-performing team is a core activity of leaders *and* of followers – both roles have responsibilities.

The TEAMS acronym highlights some of the primary attributes of effective teams. First, an environment of **trust** is foundational to effective teams and leadership. Likewise, leaders understand that **equity, diversity, and inclusion matters**, and they are responsible for creating a positive and inclusive culture. At the same time, effective teams realize the need to hold one another **accountable** for fulfilling their roles and responsibilities. Effective teams also set **member norms** so there is a clear understanding of the expectations and behaviors required of each member. In addition, great teams understand the importance of celebrating **small wins** as members work toward their shared purpose and common goal.

T**rust Matters** – Trust is the foundation of human relationships. Generally, the higher the degree of trust, the more people feel they can bring their “full selves” to the group, so fostering trust among team members is vital. Some indicators of high levels of trust in your team include high levels of involvement from all team members, high levels of input from each team member, strong relationships among team members, a willingness to provide feedback openly, and high levels of self and group awareness. If your team does not realize these benefits, consider the benefits of **prioritizing relationships**. In many [Indigenous](#) and [collectivistic](#) cultures, relationship building must occur before collaborating on a task,

E**quity, Diversity, and Inclusion Matters** – These three concepts are values an individual, group, or organization holds. Equity ensures that “[access, resources, and opportunities are provided for all to succeed and grow](#)” and thus recognizes that different individuals may need different things from their leaders to succeed. Diversity is the presence of differences, including gender, thinking style, values, attitudes, age, race, gender, degree, sexual orientation, experience, and country of origin. Diversity is a critical consideration for team performance and helps teams and organizations thwart cognitive biases such as groupthink, blind-spot bias, and stereotyping. Diversity within a group can lead to creativity and innovation - but [leaders should take care to foster a culture of inclusion](#) – where all team members are welcomed and valued. For example, the movie [Black Panther](#) is culturally significant because it was the first big-budget superhero, including a Black superhero, director, and majority Black cast.

A**ccountability Matters** – Great teams hold one another accountable to high standards. They do not enable destructive or unhealthy behaviors and ensure everyone fulfills their role. This means high-functioning teams are willing to have tough conversations when needed and hold individual members accountable for not following team norms or standards. For example, [In Canada, many Indigenous communities, allies, and news agencies are trying to hold Prime Minister Justin Trudeau and his government accountable for breaking their promise to end water](#)

[advisories](#) (an equity issue). Conceptually, accountability makes sense but can be challenging to operationalize (See [CONFLICT](#) & [CONFRONT](#)). That said, when dysfunctional behaviors (e.g., negative attitude, not fulfilling roles, missing deadlines) are allowed to fester, the entire group suffers, reinforcing how much accountability matters.

Member Norms Matter – Most successful teams have a set of norms. Norms are agreed-upon guidelines for the group. They are behaviors that the group commits to living. For instance, a group with the norm of “always providing honest feedback” will be more likely to have authentic and critical conversations about each team member’s strengths and areas of development, without **shame or fear**. Likewise, a team with an “always follow through” norm will be better prepared to hold individual members **accountable** when they do not follow through on a task or norm. Many [military academies](#) have honor codes and established norms of behavior for those contexts. From a diversity and inclusion perspective, [the GLOBE study](#) has documented societal norms, including norms of “outstanding” leadership in countries worldwide. Leaders should increase their awareness of different societal norms and intentionally establish norms with their teams – to which every team member will be accountable.

Small Wins Matter – Most would agree that teamwork can be challenging. Naming the [small wins](#) is critical to effective group functioning. The work is often long, arduous, and challenging. Individuals who see and identify the small wins can energize the group and remind others of the good amongst the STRESSORS. Individuals who name the small wins can influence and shift the group’s emotional state. They can make the experience more enjoyable and help others see all the good that’s happening along the way. Consider how this may be a role your team sets at the initial steps of SOLVE.

Reflection Questions

1. If you had to remove one of the concepts in TEAMS, which one would it be and why?
2. Norms are critical to team success but rarely prioritized. Why is this?
3. What is the difference between a group and a team? What is an example in your life of each, and what were some key differences based on your experience?
4. Why is peer accountability so tricky to master? What’s behind the desire to avoid conflict in social systems?
5. What are some actionable ways that each of the concepts within TEAMS can be practiced to demonstrate that inclusion, diversity, and equity matter?

References That Have Helped Inform TEAMS

- Costa, A. C., Fulmer, C. A., & Anderson, N. R. (2018). Trust in work teams: An integrative review, multilevel model, and future directions. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 39(2), 169-184.
- Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Definitions (draft). University of Washington. Retrieved from <https://www.washington.edu/research/diversity-equity-and-inclusion-definitions-draft/>
- Duhigg, C. (Feb. 25, 2016). [What Google learned from its quest to build the perfect team](#). *The New York Times Magazine*.
- Hackman, J. R. (1990). *Groups that work and those that don't*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Katzenbach, J. R., & Smith, D. K. (1993). *The wisdom of teams: Creating the high-performance organization*. Harvard Business Press.

- Lencioni, P. (2002). *The five dysfunctions of a team: A leadership fable*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Owen, J. E. (2020). *We are the Leaders We've Been Waiting For: Women and Leadership Development in College*. Stylus Publishing, LLC.
- Sweeney, C., & Bothwick, F. (2016). *Inclusive Leadership: The Definitive Guide to Developing and Executing an Impactful Diversity and Inclusion Strategy: Locally and Globally*. Pearson, UK.
- Wang, J., Cheng, G. H. L., Chen, T., & Leung, K. (2019). Team creativity/innovation in culturally diverse teams: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 40(6), 693-708.

STRESSORS

TYPES OF STRESSORS THAT LEADERS, FOLLOWERS, AND TEAMS ENCOUNTER

Leadership is often associated with heightened levels of stress. The STRESSORS acronym addresses various stressors which may be encountered when solving problems and collaborating. Knowing the types of stressors can help leaders diagnose and navigate the challenges. That said, hidden stressors may impact an individual, though they may be unknown to the whole group. For example, an individual experiencing mental health concerns might be managing the additional stress of figuring out their anxieties independent of their work life. STRESSORS exist across a spectrum of identities, and it is important to consider factors beyond a single person's or team's experience.

Everyone experiences multiple stressors each day. You and your team *will* encounter multiple stressors during the practice season and at the CLC competition. The goal is to increase awareness and help identify healthy ways to navigate stress. One navigation strategy could be to view STRESSORS as a conflict (within oneself or between an individual and the external environment and others and then reflect on the appropriate way to navigate that CONFLICT. Positive forms may include **obviating** stressors through a healthy diet, meditation, exercise, spirituality (however you define that), or **collaborating** with mentors and family. "Quick fix" stress relievers may include alcohol, food, shopping, gambling, and binge-watching television shows. Like doing **nothing (avoiding)**, perhaps these quick fixes are fine in limited quantities, but each can be abused and cause additional stress. Throughout the season, you may find it helpful to name the STRESSORS you are experiencing – doing so is a way to **outline problems** and may prompt the group to **list multiple strategies** to **SOLVE** it.

Leaders must be acutely aware of the STRESSORS acting on the team and should work to minimize and eliminate as many as possible so the team can concentrate on the work versus the stress. While eliminating all STRESSORS is unrealistic, some can surely be minimized and managed in new ways. For instance, if you have a **strained relationship** with a roommate or partner because of a particular **issue** or **interpersonal** matter, you can choose to have a difficult conversation (see **CONFRONT**), try to reach a **compromise**, or **avoid** the issue altogether by moving out. Having difficult conversations may take time, introducing new STRESSORS temporarily, but seeks to eliminate stress in the long run.

Serious time limitations – Sources of this stressor include emergencies, deadlines, time-bound tasks, and a general sense of having too much to do in too little time. This concept plays out on the basketball court, your favorite cooking shows, and other programs like *Minute to Win it*, *Pyramid*, or *American Ninja Warrior*. Practice season and competition activities often make you feel like you do not have enough time – be sure to practice your **emotional intelligence** and **list multiple strategies** to manage this. For example, choosing inappropriate leadership **STYLES** of leading or following may contribute to your time limitations; choosing appropriate leadership **STYLES** may help you manage them.

Tough working conditions – For readers that have worked in health care (e.g., paramedicine), the food and beverage industry, construction, or retail, you can immediately empathize with the concept of tough working conditions – long hours, difficult people, crises, tense situations,

limited resources and more. Other examples may include collaborating virtually on a complex task, working with incomplete information, or on an unfamiliar task. Some tough working conditions are problems that can be solved, while others must be managed to the best of the team's ability. Remember, that while some tough working conditions are caused by external factors, some are internal (e.g., organizational or team culture; human capital and resource constraints; non-existent, poor, or inconsistent feedback) and each of our actions contributes to the working environment. Leaders and teams that do not emphasize the concepts in the term TEAMS, may create a non-inclusive environment that leads others to experience this stressor.

Rapid change – Changing circumstances are inevitable. Some people thrive on rapid change.

The rapid pace is an adrenaline rush, and there is a thrill when moving from one task to another (e.g., emergency room doctor, professional athlete, or law enforcement officer). For others, rapid change is stressful and associated with feeling out of control. Rapid change can be stressful for people who like to be *in* control. As circumstances change, teams may also need to rapidly change their perspective, strategy, process, and more.

Extreme lack of control – Another way of thinking about **rapid change** is having an extreme lack of control. Think about small business owners during the COVID-19 pandemic, extreme drought due to climate change, or cyber-attacks. In these instances, people navigate extreme circumstances without access to needed resources – for example, without the formal authority to take charge or make decisions. Consider how using some leadership **STYLES** may allow others to regain control (at least in some capacity).

Strained relationships-issues – There are people that you like, but you disagree with their politics, perspectives, and so on. For instance, imagine your friend is an avid sports fan who believes that the only way to learn about leadership is through sport. In contrast, you dislike sports and believe that leadership is best learned through serving others, such as in a volunteer capacity. Perhaps your friend supports superstar athletes being paid millions of dollars a year, given their ability to inspire others, and you believe that this money could be better spent elsewhere. Or perhaps you believe a democratic style is needed for a given task, and someone else believes an authoritative style is more appropriate. Whether disagreeing on a topic, or how something should be done, relationships can be negatively impacted. Consider how frequently disagreements happen in non-profits, organizations, athletic teams, and other organizations where people are passionate. For example, [Senator George Mitchell returned to Northern Ireland](#) for the 50th anniversary of Peace Talks and [described that he had to work with people who approached negotiations with differing styles](#) – forcing, avoiding, and other conflict management styles, not to mention cultural differences. Senator Mitchell's responsibility was to adapt to reach the goal so that the issue of different conflict styles did not strain the relationship, nor the team's progress toward the goal.

Strained relationships-interpersonal – There are people you simply do not connect with on an interpersonal level. Maybe it is their personality, value system, or their mindset. Repeated disagreements over issues may lead to strained interpersonal relationships. A hallmark of an interpersonal conflict is when disagreement is accompanied by negative feelings toward another (e.g., distrust, hostility, suspicion, disrespect, lack of credibility). As a leader, you must manage

strained relationships between yourself and team members, and within the team itself. There are numerous [stories](#) (whether accurate or not) about how athletes and coaches disliked each other, but had to work with one another anyway. As an example, Indigenous groups in [Australia](#) and [Canada](#) value sustainability and thus oppose the extraction of the earth's resources. In contrast, governments and for-profit organizations prioritize the financial opportunity such extraction brings. Such values differences are likely to lead to negative affect and hostility between parties, which must be managed, if it is to be resolved.

Organizational bureaucracy – Consider your last call with the cable, insurance, or phone company. When you called, you entered an automated labyrinth that was difficult to escape. This is a simple example of organizational bureaucracy. Organizational bureaucracy often involves laws, rules, regulations, and processes that could be simplified to save everyone time, frustration, and emotional well-being. In the context of CLC activities, organizational bureaucracy may be reflected in the rules, and what your team cannot do as outlined on the activity sheet. Informally, bureaucracy may also be reflected in your team's norms. Consider how bureaucracy may help, or hinder, the group.

Role uncertainty – This source of stress is much more subtle than some of the others listed in this section. However, it happens all the time in organizational life. Certain group members lack a clear objective or understanding of their role (see [SOLVE](#)). As a result, inefficiencies and re-work can become the **norm**. Consider your first internship or “big” organizational and societal goals like sustainability and inclusion. Were you unclear about what to do next? Did you speak up to SOLVE that problem?

Shame or fear – The last time you presented in public, you likely had this source of stress to one degree or another. Fear has many shades – from fear of real physical danger to the psychological danger felt when you experience public embarrassment. This stressor is often associated with the following: making mistakes, being perceived as “not good enough,” doing poorly on a project, not being accepted by a group of peers, getting rejected by someone, athletic failure, not getting a promotion, and so on. **Shame and fear** may lead some to use **avoidance** or “go underground”. Many teams will **avoid** giving each other constructive feedback, during or after activities, out of fear that it will negatively impact the team. We encourage you to remember, there are multiple strategies to address each stressor – [talking about shame and listening](#) are important steps to solving this one, as is creating team norms.

Reflection Questions

1. Which of these stressors have you experienced today?
2. Look at the sources of stress. Which did you consistently experience growing up? Which stressors were most prevalent for your parents or primary caregivers?
3. Leadership often involves heightened exposure to multiple stressors. How does your immediate supervisor react to these stressors? Your parents?
4. If leadership is about experimentation and many experiments fail, how does the stressor of *shame or fear* impact you and the work of others?
5. What types of FOLLOWers are most likely to experience *role uncertainty*? How can TEAMS work together to SOLVE this stressor – proactively and as it occurs?

References That Have Helped Inform STRESSORS

- Carver, C. S., Scheier, M. F., & Weintraub, J. K. (1989). Assessing coping strategies: A theoretically based approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psych.*, 56(2), 267.
- Ganster, D. C., & Schaubroeck, J. (1991). Work stress and employee health. *Journal of Management*, 17(2), 235-271.
- Newton, C., & Teo, S. (2014). Identification and occupational stress: A stress buffering perspective. *Human Resource Management*, 53(1), 89-113.
- Moustaka, E., & Constantinidis, T. C. (2010). Sources and effects of work-related stress in nursing. *Health Science Journal*, 4(4), 210.
- Whetten, D. A. & Cameron, K. S. (2010). *Developing management skills* (8th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

CONFLICT

APPROACHES FOR NAVIGATING CONFLICT

Like stress, conflict is often present when working in groups. The acronym CONFLICT highlights some basic approaches to navigating interpersonal and issue stressors inherent in leadership and working with others. Note: each of these has a time and a place. The key is that the leader intentionally chooses the appropriate conflict management approach for the situation, which may involve using 3-4 of these styles, at the same time, or at different phases of the conflict.

Four relatively passive approaches to working through conflict are **indulging** (e.g., giving in to others), **listening** (e.g., truly understanding the perspective of the other), **doing nothing** (e.g., avoiding the conflict or difficult conversations), and **talking/gossip** (e.g., side conversations that do not directly address the conflict).

In contrast, more active approaches include **obviating**, which means that leaders effectively avoid conflict ahead of time – they see the potential for conflict and proactively address issues before things escalate. Leaders who choose **forcing** take a hard stand and often aggressively promote their perspective. **Compromising** can be a quick fix, but each party must give something up. **Collaborating** means that the individuals find a win/win solution, so each party benefits from the new direction.

Compromising – This approach requires that each party give something up. While often viewed as a positive way to overcome the challenges of opposing sides, it is critical to remember that compromising also leaves each party feeling slightly unsatisfied with the outcome. However, this approach is common in government and other situations where both parties have more substantial needs. For example, in the U.S., this occurs between Republicans and Democrats when they compromise to avoid a government shutdown. In Canada, this occurred when the New Democratic Party agreed to support the Liberal government, which is typically their competition, [in exchange for a universal dental plan](#).

Obviating – This approach addresses potential conflict *before* it becomes an issue. The leader has played the proverbial chess match in their head, and they are 5-6 steps ahead of the game. This could be as simple as looking outside, seeing it is dark and cloudy, and bringing an umbrella to avoid getting wet if it rains. It could also be more complex, for instance, an employer may choose not to place specific individuals in a position because it does not match their skills or there is a high potential for failure for that employee. Alternatively, a manager begins documenting a negative employee's behavior *well before* there is a need for a meeting with human resources. The key is to **outline** potential **problems**, and **list** (and execute) **strategies** to avoid them through a **skillful intervention**. The key to obviating is to understand what *might* happen and take preventative steps to *avoid* it.

Nothing (Avoiding) – An individual using this approach chooses *not* to confront the behavior of another or the group; instead, they choose to avoid sharing concerns with the other party. This is sometimes entirely appropriate, but an authority figure who consistently avoids conflict may have more significant problems if negative behaviors are unaddressed. In other words, while it may be appropriate to be **opposed and underground** sometimes, it is equally critical to be

willing to be **opposed and open** at other times in order to not erode **trust** or **strain relationships**, as well as to maintain a mentality of **always thinking about the process**.

Forcing – Individuals who employ this conflict style are willing to strongly advocate for their perspective. A forcing style is a high-risk approach in many instances, but as with the others, it certainly has a time and place (within reason). This approach has a negative image because the style can be mean, aggressive, and negative. While this is true, someone can use this approach in a very calm and emotionally intelligent manner. For example, consider former British Prime Minister [Margaret Thatcher](#), who stood firm in her beliefs and was often applauded for it (though was not without criticism or negative repercussions).

Listening – Active listening can *lower the heat* and move an emotionally charged individual or situation to a different place. Simmons (2001) states that listening can make room for new thinking and that being heard (or hearing ourselves) is often enough to change our minds. Listening allows for [empathy](#) and for people to learn about an experience other than their own. Listening can be an important way to **prioritize relationships** and build **trust**.

Indulging – An individual using this style will often give in to the wants/needs of another party. Centering the voices and needs of others may be needed to foster equity and inclusion. For example, it may be inappropriate for a leader who is white, cis-gendered, and heterosexual to **share their vision** on how to increase 2SLGBTQ+ representation in the organization or how to celebrate Black History Month. Recognizing your privilege, and taking a more passive role, allows you to **listen and engage** others. Given its more passive approach, indulging can also be another way to diffuse or **lower the heat** in a situation. However, individuals who default to this approach too often may be used or taken advantage of in relationships. Because they always give in to others, their needs may go unmet for long periods, leading to **strained relationships**.

Collaborating – Often perceived as the best approach to navigating conflict, [collaborating also requires the right conditions to be effective](#). Collaborating offers the opportunity is to ask: “How can we both get our needs met in this situation?” If nothing else, framing the question in this way can help the two parties quickly brainstorm other potential paths forward. The [conceptual block](#) that one party must win and the other lose may be false. There may be opportunities for both to gain, especially if the issues at hand are multi-dimensional and there is a strong foundation of **trust** within the relationship.

Talking/Gossip – On one hand, talking is the counterpoint of listening and so can be a necessary and productive approach to conflict management. Talking through a conflict can be restorative and collaborative, as it encourages parties to be open about their opposition. On the other hand, sometimes people talk about a problem to avoid the problem. Gossiping is a less productive conceptualization of talking; a version of avoiding conflict, gossiping rarely addresses the conflict (see opposed and underground). Gossiping may feel good in the short term, but the problem(s) will likely persist until it is confronted.

Reflection Questions

1. While collaborating is generally the best approach, when is it *wrong*?
2. Which CONFLICT styles do you default to? What are the positives and negatives of this reality?
3. As a FOLLOWer, which CONFLICT styles would you prefer your leader to default to? Why?
4. If you asked five people who are close to you about your listening skills, what would they say?
5. What happens when you have a team with a leader who avoids and indulges as default approaches to conflict?
6. How can you integrate the ideas of CONFLICT with SOLVE to be intentional in managing STRESSORS?

References That Have Helped Inform CONFLICT

- Gartzke, E., Li, Q., & Boehmer, C. (2001). Investing in the peace: Economic interdependence and international conflict. *International organization*, 55(2), 391-438.
- Kass, Edward (2010). The Power of Nice: Active Listening, Procedural and Interpersonal Fairness Perceptions and Prosocial and Antisocial Negotiation Behaviors. *Organization, Leadership, and Communications*. Retrieved from <http://repository.usfca.edu/olc/6>
- Thomas, K. W. & Kilmann, R. H. (2007). *Thomas-Kilmann Conflict Mode Instrument*. Mountain View, CA: CPP, Inc.

CONFRONT

A SIMPLE PROCESS FOR NAVIGATING DIFFICULT CONVERSATIONS

Because stress and conflict are often present in teams, leaders who are skilled at having difficult conversations have a distinct advantage. The CONFRONT acronym is a simple process for navigating difficult conversations with intentionality (remember, leadership involves **always thinking about process**).

As a reminder, the goal is to provide a general framework, so you have a strong **mental representation** of how the process *can* work. Rarely are difficult conversations clean and easy. Sometimes, all steps may not make sense, be unnecessary, or come in a different order. To help you practice the model as defined (i.e., in order), we offer an example of what you might say/or do to CONFRONT a leader who is relying on the **energize and push** style, and in doing so, is causing your team to work too quickly and make mistakes.

Communicate the behavior (Step 1) – This step aims to communicate the individual's behavior in a way that does not make them feel defensive or disconfirmed. This means that you will have to regulate your emotions, which can be challenging, especially when you are feeling frustrated, angry, sad, or disappointed with the other person. You must name the specific, observable behavior (e.g., negative attitude, late work, not living up to commitments). For example, to your leader trying to energize and push the team, you might want to highlight how they “raise their voice” or “repeatedly say GO! GO! GO!” Doing so helps the other person see what they may need to change.

Own your statement (Step 2) – When having difficult conversations, it is critical to communicate in a way that does not involve anyone but you and the other individual. The conversation can get messy if you bring others who are not present into the conversation (e.g., friends, co-workers). If possible, keep discussing the two of you and *your* specific observations of the other person's behavior. If possible, avoid “you” statements that could inflame the situation during this step. Stick with “I” statements (e.g., “I have observed,” “I feel that...”). For example, to a leader trying to energize and push the team, you might want to say something like, “You are frazzling me when you tell me to GO! GO! GO!”. However, that uses “you” language and can lead them to be defensive. Instead, consider how you can **own your statement** by reframing it to, “I am getting frazzled and can't focus when I am told to: ‘GO! GO! GO!’”

Name the impact (Step 3) – The other person should clearly understand how their behavior has impacted you (e.g., lost time, hurt feelings, mistrust, a missed opportunity, increased stress). Again, if possible, you want to keep this between you. Involving others not in the room can confuse, muddy, and divert the conversation. For example, singers **Beyonce and Lizzo changed lyrics in their songs** after several advocacy groups named the impact of using derogatory language. Note: the first three steps do not need to take long. A common pitfall is that the person confronting says too much in these first three steps. For example, if your leader pushed you into a role that you did not want, you could say, “I was not comfortable being the notetaker for this activity, and my discomfort negatively impacted our process and ability to succeed.”

Fully listen (Step 4) – After you move past the first three steps, stop, and fully listen to the other person (recall the importance of **listening**, as discussed in CONFLICT). It is vital that you pause and [actively listen](#) so you can work to understand their mindset. This may involve maintaining eye contact and controlling the pace – lowering the heat as needed (the conversation can speed up when emotions are involved and make it challenging to empathize with another’s perspective). The other person may admit fault, lash out, and deny all charges. While you do not have to agree, you should not interrupt and provide the other person the space to respond. In the example with the **energize and push** leader, at this stage, you should say very little; the focus should be on listening and giving the leader a chance to explain themselves.

Reflect and respond (Step 5) – Based on how the other person responds (realistically, unrealistically, or somewhere in between), take time to regulate your emotions and consider how you want to move forward. Is it time to take the next step (e.g., is there agreement?), or do you need to go back to earlier steps (e.g., does the other person disagree with your perspective?). If the other person responds in a way you were not expecting, it is realistic to pause and ask for some time to gather your thoughts. Likewise, at some point, you may need to “agree to disagree.” For example, if your leader said, “We were facing **serious time limitations** and needed to **set roles** quickly,” you might reflect and respond by saying, “Were we intentional in setting roles? Maybe we should have revisited our roles as the plan unfolded.”

Options moving forward (Step 6) – This step involves a simple question – “How can we ensure that we are not in this situation moving forward?”. In other words, how can we **obviate** the issue in the future? Even if you and the other person cannot fully agree on the facts, you must understand and agree upon some options for a better future. It may take some time to search for a win/win solution, but that is the goal, where possible. However, remember that oftentimes, “first is the worst,” so consider brainstorming multiple options (e.g., 4-5) to move forward. For example, you and the activity leader can agree to listen to one another throughout the process, and set a group norm to pause and evaluate results, so this doesn’t become a repeated issue.

Negotiate solution (Step 7) – Through your dialogue, agree upon 2-3 options and, if possible, ensure that they are SMART – [Specific](#), [Measurable](#), [Actionable](#), [Relevant](#), and [Time-Bound](#). The specifics will help you gauge progress and set the stage for the next conversation. Remember to record the specifics, so there are *clear expectations* for both parties moving forward. For example, you and your team can create a codeword that means “we need to revisit our roles and responsibilities” so that everyone feels comfortable for the team to succeed.

Thank you (Step 8) – Thank the other individual for their time and communicate your desire for a better future. After all, this conversation could start a better future for both parties. Furthermore, doing so **prioritizes relationships** and expresses to the other individual that you care about their well-being. For example, you and your leader thank one another for addressing this conflict without taking too much time away from the activity.

Reflection Questions

1. Emotional intelligence seems critical in the CONFRONT process. What other attributes of LEADERSHIP can help you CONFRONT others more effectively?
2. Earlier, we noted that many people prefer to avoid conflicts. How might our *conceptual blocks* impact our willingness to CONFRONT others?
3. When is it appropriate NOT to use some of the steps mentioned above?
4. After you have fully listened, do you think it's appropriate to ask for some time to reflect on their answer? Why could this be your best option?
5. The first three steps of CONFRONT could be a couple of sentences. How can this help you?
6. How can you integrate the ideas from TEAMS to CONFRONT more effectively?

References That Have Helped Inform CONFRONT

- Patterson, K. (2002). *Crucial conversations: Tools for talking when stakes are high*. Tata McGraw-Hill Education.
- Scott, K. (2019). *Radical Candor: Fully Revised & Updated Edition: Be a Kick-Ass Boss Without Losing Your Humanity*. United Kingdom, St. Martin's Press.
- Whetten, D. A. & Cameron, K. S. (2015). *Developing management skills* (9th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

INFLUENCE

STRATEGIES FOR INFLUENCING OTHERS

Influencing others is at the heart of effective leadership. Recall the definition – *leadership is the process of influencing others toward a common vision*. The acronym INFLUENCE highlights several strategies for influencing others that you can choose from. Like the other content in this guide, intentionality is critical. Leaders who intentionally choose influence strategies will be better prepared to help the team accomplish its task and **deliver results**.

Note: Any influence attempt is an experiment. Like most first-time experiments, there is a high likelihood of failure. So, to influence others, you must be patient and **list multiple strategies** (sound familiar?). Likewise, you may need to combine 3-4 strategies for one situation while only one approach works in another case. Are you intentional in your plan? Have you determined the correct timing and location? In general, influence attempts work best in person – emails, texts, and phone calls are much less effective than face-to-face dialogue. Think about your last influence attempt with your parents, siblings, friends, and co-workers. If you pay close attention, you may notice that many have failed. Stay in a place of active experimentation and integration – pay attention to what works, what doesn't, and why.

Involve others – An adage suggests that “people support what they help create.” One way to influence others is to make them part of the process. By doing so, they will better understand the intricacies of the issues, can help brainstorm beyond the barriers, and will serve as a partner in the process. This influence strategy is all about voice. If individuals feel they have a voice (i.e., input), they will become more likely to champion the cause. Consider how this relates to how the various STYLES would move through the SOLVE process. A limitation of this approach is that you may lose control of your original idea or vision as the group moves in new directions. This approach can also take time. An upside of this approach is that there will be higher levels of buy-in, and the group will understand the many nuances of the topic.

Need logic – Use facts, data, and logical argument to assert your case. While this would seem simple at face value, logic alone can fail. Economists have known for decades that humans tend to act irrationally. We do NOT always do what makes logical sense. Saying to your friend who struggles with his weight to start running rarely succeeds. It may seem to make logical sense, but it ignores other variables (e.g., medical issues) that make it difficult to put into practice. So, build this strategy into your influence attempt, but do not expect it to always yield results. If statements like “follow the speed limit,” “cliff jumping is dangerous,” or “save 10% of your income” worked, the world would be a different place.

Focus on relationships – If a leader is well-liked and builds strong interpersonal relationships, she is more likely to influence others because they feel they can trust her. Plus, this can make working through CONFLICT a bit easier to manage. Notice how many CLC terms and concepts relate to this idea. If influence is at the heart of leadership, relationships are the glue that keeps the whole thing together. The more time you invest in relationships on the front end, the more influence you will have when needed.

Lead a coalition – Is it “me,” or is it “we”? Leading a coalition can have a great influence on decision-makers. Leading a coalition aligns with the adage “there is power in numbers,” but more than that, it can foster inclusion by having multiple voices at the table – an essential strategy. Numbers communicate energy and advocacy for an idea, approach, or course of action. For example, [Larry Kramer](#) led a coalition in response to the AIDS epidemic, and the United Nation’s [Net Zero Coalition](#) has an **exciting vision** to cut greenhouse gas to as close to zero as possible.

Use formal authority – If you must use your authority, do it carefully. There is a difference between authority and influence. An authority has formal power and can “make” others comply or face the consequences. Leaders using influence generally try to inspire or energize others to act. However, remember that formal authority *can be* critical, especially when you need compliance or time is of the essence.

Emphasize win-win – This strategy aligns well with the influence tactics of **focus on relationships**, and **empathy is key**. If you truly understand the needs of the person/group you are trying to influence, you can more easily identify win/win solutions. After all, if both parties gain something, everyone is happy. Leaders keep the other party’s needs in mind, identify solutions that minimize problems, save time or money, and chart a creative path forward. [Pairing retirement home residents with students](#) is an excellent example of a creative win/win solution to a housing and loneliness crisis (and how to overcome conceptual blocks!).

Negotiate – When asked at seminars why they choose *not* to negotiate, participants often use the word **fear**. Fear that the relationship will be damaged. Fear that they will be seen as greedy. Fear that they will be rejected. Negotiation is a learned skill. This reality means that you need mentors and coaches to help guide you along the way. Like win/win, this concept means that you are working to secure a resource (e.g., time, money, training, flexibility, resources) while the other party gains something. In that way, consider how negotiation is inherently related to other INFLUENCE strategies.

Create positive energy – If you are enthusiastic about a given course of action, others will likely be as well. Energizing and engaging others is a critical influence strategy. Doing so requires skill and authenticity. It also requires you to set a positive emotional tone for others. Your positive emotion influences the emotional state of others. Pretty cool! Who is your friend who makes it more enjoyable, energetic, and fun when they are with the group? Essentially, they use their optimism, charisma, and [humor](#) to influence the group’s emotional state – a phenomenon known as emotional contagion.

Empathy is the key – When you influence an individual or group, you must put yourself in their shoes. What motivates them? What pains do they experience? What are they struggling to achieve? An acute understanding of these questions can help you formulate a plan of action. Your plan needs to have two components: 1) the intentional use of multiple influence strategies

listed in this section, and 2) the content you would like to propose – innovative ideas that chart a path forward.

Reflection Questions

1. What is the primary reason(s) that so many influence attempts fail?
2. In your opinion, what are the two most essential influence tactics? Why?
3. Above, you were encouraged to combine 3-4 strategies together in your INFLUENCE attempts. Which strategies do you think would work together? Which would not work well together?
4. The concept of positive energy is an important one. When is negative energy appropriate, and what are the positives and downsides of this approach?
5. When have coalitions changed the course of world history? Why are alliances so critical to influence?
6. Which of the strategies come naturally to you? Which needs the most work?

References That Have Helped Inform INFLUENCE

1. Baldwin, D., & Grayson, C. (2006). Influence: Gaining commitment and getting results. Retrieved from <http://www.ccl.org/leadership/pdf/community/InfluentialLeadershipPresentation.pdf>
2. Bass, B. (2008). *The Bass handbook of leadership: Theory, research and managerial applications* (4th ed.). New York, NY: The Free Press.
3. Cialdini, R. B. (2001). Influence: Science and practice. *Boston: Allyn & Bacon.*
4. Kellerman, B. (2010). *Leadership: Essential selections on power, authority, and influence.* McGraw-Hill.
5. Quinn, R. E., Faerman, S. R., Thompson, M. P., & McGrath, M. R. 5th ed. (2003). *Becoming a Master Manager: A Competing Values Framework.* New York, NY: Wiley.

ETHICS

SIX QUESTIONS FOR ETHICAL DECISION-MAKING

Laura Nash outlined 12 possible questions an individual or group can ask when facing an ethical dilemma. ETHICS focuses on 6 of these questions. You are encouraged to explore her [full essay](#). To move you through the KSPD model for ETHICS, we explore an ethical dilemma you may have experienced or thought of as technology continues to evolve.

Imagine you are an undergraduate at OldPsiWash University. Faculty at the University are considering integrating generative artificial intelligence (AI) tools, like ChatGPT, GoogleBard, and ChatSonic, to enhance their students' learning experience. The AI-powered tools will provide personalized feedback on assignments, suggest additional learning resources, answer questions, and assist professors in grading, including essays and written work. Essentially, AI-powered assistants will replace teaching assistants; they will be used instead of hiring graduate students to support the course.

As a student in a class where the professor chooses to use such AI tools, you may have concerns about bias and fairness, data privacy, or the quality of your educational experience. Similarly, there may be dimensions the University should consider around academic integrity, teacher-student relationships, and allowing faculty but not students to rely on AI. There may also be advantages to leveraging AI assistants to expedite grading, lighten instructor workload, and provide consistent student feedback.

As a reminder, the goal is to provide a general framework, so you have a strong mental representation of how this process can work. Sometimes, all steps may not make sense, be unnecessary, or come in a different order. As always, the key is intentionality – take what you KNOW, SEE what may be needed for your context, and PLAN to DO accordingly.

Ensure problem definition (Step 1) – Before the team can proceed, they must come to a shared understanding of what is at stake. A hallmark of this step is that a team leader or group member asks, “Have we defined the problem/ethical dilemma accurately?” There may be different perspectives among group members, and it is essential to understand the situation clearly. For instance, a conversation about professors using AI to manage classes and grade student work will yield differing perspectives, depending on who you ask. Some group members may believe that AI is not a viable substitute for the education (and expertise) they are paying to receive. Others may believe it is unethical to “replace paid positions for humans with robots.” Others may not be bothered by taking a class where AI is used for grading and management, and others may not even register it as an ethical dilemma – after all, “everyone uses AI these days – lighten up!” Consider the overlaps of this step with the preliminary steps of SOLVE; **outlining the problem** from multiple perspectives helps us understand the core issues at hand. In the AI case, is it a problem of fairness? Labor? Services paid for that aren't fully delivered? Improper or non-transparent use of technology?

Irade positions (empathize) (Step 2) – Empathy is the key to this second question. Empathy is about putting yourself in the shoes of people that the actions may impact. Who could be impacted by the decision (e.g., the students in the class, the professor, the University, graduate

students, society)? Can you imagine what it would feel like to be from their viewpoint? So, the question is, “How would we define the problem if we stood on the other side of the fence?” For instance, what would administrators say about the risks to student data privacy? What would students say about the impacts on the relationship with their professors or the fairness of professors using AI but maybe not allowing students to use it? How would people outside of the University view professors who rely on AI for doing part of their job? What would the professors’ position be, and how could it help them to be more efficient and effective?

How do loyalties affect you? (Step 3) – An important component of ethical decision-making is recognizing how loyalties impact decisions. In many academic cases, loyalties would be to students and the University. Instructors may also have unconscious loyalties to social status (being perceived as cool). An important question is: “How is decision-making affected by friends, colleagues, and the organization?” Acknowledging your loyalties can help protect you from biases. At the same time, staying loyal to your values and ethics can help you demonstrate **moral courage** – standing up for what is right, even if nobody else is standing with you. As you read this, you may recognize that you have had opportunities to use ChatGPT to assist you with your coursework. Perhaps you used it and were penalized for academic misconduct. Maybe you have a strong moral stance on this topic already. However, in a classroom where power dynamics are at play, would you have the moral courage to share your perspective, even if the professor perceived it to be “pushing back”? Even if your perspective was different from your peers?

Intentions and perceptions (Step 4) – Understanding the intention of the actions and how others will perceive them is essential. What is gained by utilizing AI to assist faculty with grading and course management? How will others perceive the behavior? Is the intention to decrease their workload? Give better feedback to students. Help students become better writers? Spend more time on other tasks and responsibilities. Is the intention to leverage AI technology in the classroom? Or should they consider the threats to academic integrity and the institution’s code of conduct? It’s critical to explore motivations and ask, “What is the intention in making this decision?” Is it noble or self-serving? Does it serve us/them/others well (remember to take multiple perspectives), or could it negatively impact higher education? How will students be affected by integrating AI into the classroom? Notice that intentions and perceptions are not always aligned; what you/others intend to do is not always what you/others perceive.

Clarify the downsides (Step 5) – There are many potential downsides to faculty using AI in their courses. The question, “Whom could the decision or action impact?” is critical. All involved must understand the academic, legal, and social ramifications of professors using AI in and outside the classroom. On one hand, an AI chatbot may not be capable of assessing the nuanced aspects of academic writing, such as critical thinking, creativity, and originality, thereby not giving students effective feedback or appropriate grades. On the other hand, it may allow faculty to be more efficient with grading, thus freeing time for better teaching and mentoring. It may encourage timely feedback from professors and increase consistency in the kind of feedback and grading students receive – though that could also mean consistently offering biased or misinformed feedback. Does the class size make a difference (e.g., a class of 150 vs. a seminar of 15)? It’s important to go in with “eyes wide open” about the downsides of a moral dilemma.

Society says... (Step 6) – In the end, others will judge your actions. When making the decision, the question, “Could faculty disclose their decision or action(s) without qualms or hesitation to their president, the provost, the board of trustees, administrators, colleagues, or society as a whole?” Would the actions warrant a front-page story or occupy the media cycle for some time? Could the decision ruin their reputation and career? The answer to this question may help them decide how to approach the ethical dilemma.

Reflection Questions

1. Develop an original, one-sentence quote that captures the content from ETHICS.
2. The content in ETHICS is common sense. Why do humans struggle to behave ethically?
3. The term “moral courage” was used and is essential to know. Provide a definition and share a time when you lacked moral courage. What types of FOLLOWers do you think display the most moral courage? The least?
4. How has social media impacted elements of ETHICS?
5. Do positions of power and authority attract people who are more ambiguous in their morals? What do you think?

References That Have Helped Inform ETHICS

1. Nash, L. L. (1981). Ethics without the sermon. *Harvard Business Review*, 59(6), 79-90.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS*:

We are grateful for the ongoing support of our community in creating, maintaining, and sustaining a practice field for leadership. The following individuals have given countless hours to make CLC a possibility.

Year	Curriculum Committee	Competition Committee
2024-2025	Curt Beck, Brandon Charpied, Jennifer Eury, Lacey Grey Hunter, Dan Jenkins, Lisa Kuron (chair), Todd Wigger	Curt Beck (co-chair), Brandon Charpied, Dan Jenkins (co-chair), Lisa Kuron, Todd Wigger
2023-2024	Scott Allen, Brent Boles, Melissa DiLeo, Travis Greene, Jacob Herz, Lisa Kuron (chair), Valerie Lane, Elyse Pratt-Ronco, Jessica Roshak	Jess Calberry and Dan Jenkins
2022-2023	Scott Allen, Yolanda Caldwell, Lisa Kuron (chair), Dorcas Mensah	Scott Allen, Jess Calberry, Rox Chwaluk, John Edwards, Cathy Gray, Dan Jenkins, David Levy
2021-2022	Scott Allen, Melissa DiLeo, Sam Edgar, Lisa Kuron, Susan Luchey, Kennedy Rogers, Carl Sveen, Lori Throupe.	Scott Allen, Jess Calberry, Rox Chwaluk, Garrett Currie, John Edwards, Cathy Gray

***all acknowledgements in alphabetical order**

CLC COMPETITION: MISSION CONTROL

There are SIX competition dates to look forward to for the 2025 CLC Season. Talk to your coach about which events your team wants to/can participate in.

1. Virtual Scrimmage (Sunday March 1) online via Zoom

- An optional opportunity to get a “feel” for what the CLC Global Challenge will be like in a Zoom environment.
- Experience two activities and evaluate your results as a team.

2. In-person competitions – on various Saturdays in March and April:

- An opportunity to compete in person with colleagues in your geographic area.

Competition	Date	Location	Host
Canadian Invitational	Saturday, March 15	Brantford, Ontario	Wilfrid Laurier University
Southeast	Saturday, March 29	Rome, Georgia	Berry College
Southwest	Saturday, April 5	Weatherford, Oklahoma	Southwestern Oklahoma State University
The New England Cup	Saturday, April 12	Portland, Maine	University of Southern Maine

3. The CLC Global Challenge online via Zoom ([Information Sheet here](#))

- A two-day competition with teams from across North America
- Six activities in total, 3 per day with breaks in-between
 - Day 1: Thursday, April 10, in the evening (530-10pm EST); AND
 - Day 2: Saturday, April 12, during the day (10am - 2pm EST).

In the meantime, you can contact clc@mobts.org with questions or comments.