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DEDICATION

Once upon a time a poor pious peasant died, and arrived before the gate of heaven. At the same time a very rich, rich lord came there who also wanted to get into heaven. Then Saint Peter came with the key, and opened the door, and let the great man in, but apparently did not see the peasant, and shut the door again. And now the peasant outside, heard how the great man was received in heaven with all kinds of rejoicing, and how they were making music, and singing within. At length all became quiet again, and Saint Peter came and opened the gate of heaven, and let the peasant in. The peasant, however, expected that they would make music and sing when he went in also, but all remained quite quiet; he was received with great affection, it is true, and the angels came to meet him, but no one sang. Then the peasant asked Saint Peter how it was that they did not sing for him as they had done when the rich man went in, and said that it seemed to him that there in heaven things were done with just as much partiality as on earth. Then said Saint Peter, “By no means, you are just as dear to us as anyone else, and will enjoy every heavenly delight that the rich man enjoys, but poor fellows like you come to heaven every day, but a rich man like this does not come more than once in a hundred years!” (Grimm & Grimm, as cited in Grimm, Grimm, & Mondschein, 2011, p. 548)

Life is filled with peaks of joy and valleys of sorrow. Throughout this rollercoaster of life, the strength I needed to continue on this journey was earned through the experiences I had along the way. I realized that what is truly important is not what you know or the possessions you have, but those who have befriended you along the way. Today I am an educator and constantly sharing the stories of those friends. These stories are told with very little embellishment. My hope is that the lessons I impart will help others in their journeys to avoid the obstacles I have encountered. Though this dissertation is a study about organizational leadership and dispute resolution, this paper is really a story of Thomas Joel Gajewski and what he has learned through his many trials and tribulations.
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ABSTRACT

If a successful organization is one where internal strife is minimized, then it stands to reason that a successful leader is an individual who knows how to handle conflict. Handling conflict, though, should not be approached intuitively, as the field of mediation has developed numerous techniques to understand and address conflict. To date, though, these techniques have not been categorized by leadership styles. The purpose of this study was to develop such a framework to understand how conflict resolution relates to the disciplines of mediation, organizational behavior, and organizational leadership. To further this endeavor, four themes were developed. These themes drew upon a quadrant categorization methodology proposed by Leonard L. Riskin, which was then compared to four leadership styles: situational leadership, transformational leadership, leader-member exchange theory, and servant leadership. A phenomenological methodology was used and eight leaders were interviewed to understand how they approach conflict within their respective organizations. Utilizing a story provided by each leader about a conflict each encountered on a frequent basis, the researcher asked a series of randomized questions based on the themes mentioned. By categorizing each leader’s response, the study found that a relationship worthy of further research existed between the position of the individual within the organization and how societal norms dictated the methodology the leader used to resolve his/her stated conflict. This relationship supported the use of specific tools developed in mediation that the leader and the organization could embrace to transcend conflict, allowing the organization and hence the leader to be more efficient.
Chapter 1: Background of Study

Introduction

The study of human interactions, both within an organization and in its environment, embraces the academic disciplines of organizational behavior, change, development, and leadership. Together, these disciplines form the foundation of sociology. Exactly where one field ends and the others begin is a subject of great controversy. These disciplines do, however, have many commonalities upon which to draw and inspire comparison in dealing with social interaction and conflict.

Mediation is another discipline that deals with social interaction and conflict. Although usually associated with the legal profession, mediation can be used to help resolve unwanted social interaction or conflict. Mediators are skilled at playing a variety of roles and using different approaches to frame and resolve a conflict. The ways in which the mediator frames the conflict and the roles the mediator plays can be categorized; these categories are often referred to as mediator or mediation styles.

The study of mediation styles shares many commonalities with sociology, particularly with the field of organizational leadership. In the quest to understand the commonalities between these two fields, research conducted by Higgs and Rowland (2000, 2001, 2005) may hold the answer. This study will build upon the work of Higgs and Rowland in the hope that their work holds a critical link between mediation styles and organizational leadership. If a link is found, then organizational leaders that embrace effective mediation styles may ultimately become more successful than those that do not. This study sought to determine if such a relationship exists between organizational leadership and mediation styles.
Statement of the Problem

As the world becomes increasingly interconnected, the possibility of conflict within an organization increases. As the potential for conflict increases, productivity decreases. Therefore, tools developed to deal with conflict would seem to be in the best interest of the organization. This may seem intuitive, but little research has been published outlining a methodology or framework for leadership to address conflict within a respective organization. This study therefore proposes a framework for categorizing how leadership may address the problem of conflict within an organization. By focusing on leadership styles and the techniques utilized by leaders to address conflict, this study showcased that techniques utilized by leaders share a striking resemblance to tools developed in the field of mediation.

Purpose of the Study

The specific purpose of this study is to determine if a relationship exists between Riskin’s (1996) Framework representing mediation styles and Anderson, Herriot and Hodgkinson’s (2001) Framework and Quinn and Rohrbaugh’s (1983) Framework representing leadership styles. If a relationship exists, then the three models can all be interrelated, implying that Riskin’s Framework is related to Anderson et al.’s Framework, which in turn is related to Quinn and Rohrbaugh’s Framework. Once this relationship is established, then mediation styles can be said to be related to different leadership styles.

Research Questions

The comprehensive research question was as follows: What relationship, if any exists between organizational leadership styles and mediation styles as described by Riskin (1996)? This comprehensive question was then broken down into the following specific research components:
1. What relationship, if any, exists between the evaluative-narrow approach to mediation and situational leadership?

2. What relationship, if any, exists between the evaluative-broad approach to mediation and transformational leadership?

3. What relationship, if any, exists between the facilitative-narrow approach to mediation and Leader Member Exchange (LMX Theory) theory?

4. What relationship, if any, exists between the facilitative-broad approach to mediation and servant leadership?

**Frameworks Utilized in the Development of the Research Questions**

Of importance when reviewing the history and establishment of the research questions, several frameworks must be recognized. The foundation for this research was contained in two published papers: Higgs and Rowland’s (2005) *All Changes Great and Small: Exploring Approaches to Change and Its Leadership* and Riskin (1996) *Understanding Mediators’ Orientations, Strategies, and Techniques: A Grid for the Perplexed*. This research centered on whether or not a relationship exists between the models proposed by these two papers that emerged two very different academic disciplines. In establishing the framework for Higgs and Rowland’s research, two additional papers were recognized as crucial to the establishment of the research questions: Anderson, Herriot, and Hodgkinson’s (2001) *The Practitioner-Researcher Divide in Industrial, Work and Organizational (IWO) Psychology: Where Are We Now, and Where Do We Go from Here?”* and Quinn and Rohrbaugh’s (1983) *A Spatial Model of Effectiveness Criteria: Towards a Competing Values Approach to Organizational Analysis*. Because of the importance of these four papers to this research, the following abbreviated methodology or framework was developed to reference these works:
• Quinn and Rohrbaugh’s Framework – Abbreviation for Quinn and Rohrbaugh’s (1983) paper, which establishes a perspective of the leadership models used in this study.

• Riskin’s Framework – Abbreviation for Riskin’s (1996) paper, which establishes quadrant categorization of skills utilized by a mediator.


**Quinn and Rohrbaugh’s Framework - Perspective of the leadership models.** The research conducted by Quinn and Rohrbaugh (1983) established a relationship between the leader’s behavior and the circumstances in which the leader is found. This relationship is categorized in a quadrant chart arrangement with stable versus flexible on one axis and internally focused versus externally focused on another. For ease of reference, a map of the United States can be superimposed over the grid and the names of four major U.S. cities may then be used to represent the four quadrants (Figure 1): Seattle for the northwest quadrant, San Diego for the southwest quadrant, Boston for the northeast quadrant, and Miami for the southeast quadrant. In the Seattle Quadrant, Quinn and Rohrbaugh assert that leaders whose behaviors are internally focused and stable in nature utilize a leadership model that centers on internal processes. Behaviors that are still internally focused but flexible in nature are determined to be part of a human relations leadership pattern in the San Diego Quadrant. For the Boston Quadrant, leaders
whose behaviors are externally focused and stable in nature utilize a leadership model that centers on rational goals. Finally in the Miami Quadrant, behaviors that are externally focused and flexible showcase a leadership behavior that relates to open systems characteristics (Denison et al., 1995).

**Quinn and Rohrbaugh’s Framework with Leadership Models and Quadrant Identifiers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure Stability</th>
<th>Internal Focus</th>
<th>External Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internal Process Model</strong></td>
<td><strong>Situational Leadership</strong> (Seattle Quadrant)</td>
<td><strong>Rational Goal Model</strong> Transformational Leadership (Boston Quadrant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human Relations Model</strong></td>
<td><strong>Leader Member Exchange Theory</strong> (San Diego Quadrant)</td>
<td><strong>Open Systems Model</strong> Servant Leadership (Miami Quadrant)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 1. Quinn and Rohrbaugh’s (1983) Framework.*

Comparing the research conducted by Quinn and Rohrbaugh (1983) to Organizational Leadership Theory, an example of the Internal Process Model would be Situational Leadership, an example of Human Relations Model would be Leader-member exchange theory (LMX), an example of Rational Goals Model would be Transformational Leadership, and an example of Open Systems Model would be Servant Leadership. In the Seattle Quadrant, situational leadership takes a prescriptive approach to leadership style where the most successful leaders must have a different style to match each specific situation and the level of development of individuals in a given circumstance (Blanchard, Zigarmi, & Zigarmi, 1985; Hersey & Blanchard, 1988; Hersey, Blanchard, & Johnson, 1996). In the San Diego Quadrant, LMX treats followers
as specific individuals rather than as a group. In LMX, leaders build a relationship with each follower, progressing through three phases of relationship building: the stranger, acquaintance, and partner phases (Dansereau, Graen, & Haga, 1975; Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995; Liden, Wayne, & Stilwell, 1993). In the Boston Quadrant, the goal of transformational leadership is to change and transform the individual. The transformational leader influences the emotions, values, ethics, standards, and motives of the follower in an attempt to get the follower to accomplish more than is expected (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978; Downton, 1973). In the Miami Quadrant, servant leadership is an ethical and moral leadership model (Greenleaf, 1977; Greenleaf, Beazley, Beggs, & Spears, 2003). This leadership style builds upon a foundation of principles that guide the leader in being a moral and upstanding person. Servant leadership is about respect, service, justice, honesty, and community (Burns, 1978; Greenleaf, 1977; Greenleaf et al., 2003; Heifetz, 1994).

**Riskin’s Framework - Skills of the mediator.** Recalling Beckhard (1969), success is defined as a function of dissatisfaction. Successful leadership, then, is leadership that seeks to avoid dissatisfaction. If the word *conflict* is used instead of dissatisfaction, then the successful leader is the individual who is skilled in resolving conflict (Beckhard & Harris, 1977, 1987; Beckhard & Pritchard, 1992). One such conflict resolution tool available is mediation. Mediation traces its origin to conflict resolution during ancient Greek and Roman times (Roebuck, 2001). In short, mediation is a voluntary process where an impartial third party will assist the disputing parties in identifying the issues, options, and alternatives needed to settle a disagreement. The impartial third party has limited advisory capacity in determining which solution is best and prefers to focus on the process for arriving at resolution (Nolan-Haley, Abramson, & Chew, 2005).
You will probably be in mediation for one of two reasons. You elected to use mediation because you and your client thought that a mediator might help two sides resolve the dispute. Or, you were compelled to go into mediation. In both scenarios, you need to figure out how to benefit from this new person in the room. For you to take advantage of the mediator’s presence, you ought to be familiar with how a mediator can contribute to resolving a dispute. What a mediator might do depends on her training, her practices, and what parties can expect from her. Her various contributions can vary across cultures. (Nolan-Haley et al., 2005, p. 124)

In order to describe the relationship between different mediation styles, Leonard L. Riskin developed an instrument now known as Riskin’s Grid (Figure 2; Krivis & McAdoo, 1996; Riskin, 1994, 1996, 2003a, 2003b). Riskin proposed a quadrant arrangement to summarize the various mediation styles based on two axes. One axis classifies the mediator’s stance as narrow or broad. A narrow stance focuses on rights and obligations and a broad stance focuses on fears, values, goals, feelings, and interests driving the conflict. The other axis deals with whether the mediator takes an evaluative or facilitative approach to the issue. The evaluative mediator provides direction to the client based on the mediator’s experience, education, training, or objectivity, and the facilitative mediator provides direction in the hope that the clients solve their own dilemma (Noll, 2001). Again, for ease of reference, a map of the United States can be superimposed over Riskin’s Grid and the names of four major U.S. cities may then be used to represent the four quadrants: Seattle for the northwest quadrant, San Diego for the southwest quadrant, Boston for the northeast quadrant and Miami for the southeast quadrant. The Seattle Quadrant describes a mediator who is evaluative and the scope of whose mediation is narrow. The evaluative-narrow mediator tries to resolve a dispute by sharing an evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses of each party’s case. The San Diego Quadrant depicts a mediator who is facilitative and narrow in his/her mediation approach. This means the mediator focuses on helping the parties understand the relative merits of their positions and the ramifications (such as expense, delay and inconvenience) of not achieving an agreement. The Boston Quadrant
describes a mediator with an evaluative style and a broad scope that encompasses many dimensions of a conflict. In the evaluative-broad mediation style, the mediator’s focus is on understanding the nature of the conflict, not the position of the parties. The Boston mediator then directs those involved to an agreement that serves those interests. Lastly, the Miami Quadrant depicts a mediator who is facilitative in style and able to handle a broad situation that has many facets. The facilitative-broad mediator’s strategy lies in helping the parties understand their goals, values, and feelings, and encourages the parties to seek an agreement that encompasses their interests (Riskin, 1996).

Figure 2. Riskin’s Framework detailing mediation styles.
Anderson, Herriot, and Hodgkinson’s Framework - The relationship between leadership style, organizational change and mediation styles. Up to this point, two seemingly dissimilar models have been discussed (Figure 3). One model is based on work published by Quinn and Rohrbaugh (1983), representing Organizational Leadership, and the other based on work published by Leonard L. Riskin (1996) representing mediation. To substantiate that a relationship exists between these two models, some additional link must be found.

Figure 3. Is there a relationship between Organizational Leadership and mediation?

Several published articles may illuminate the potential relationship between leadership styles and mediation styles using models developed in organizational change (Figure 4). The first set of articles comes from Anderson et al. (2001) and Denison et al. (1995). These articles systematize the field of organizational change models into a quadrant chart. They state that organizational change theories can be grouped using a two-axis system. One axis deals with system complication and the other axis deals environment complexity. System complication implies a system with many parts where a great deal of expertise is required to understand the interactions of each component individually. Environmental complexity involves surroundings where instability exists; those who work with instability must be able to adapt quickly to the instability. From this two-axis system, Anderson et al. and Denison et al. further develop their idea by labeling the four resulting quadrants as Pedantic Science, Puerile Science, Pragmatic
Science, and Practitioner Science. Once again, for ease of reference, a map of the United States is superimposed over these quadrants and the cities of Seattle, San Diego, Boston, and Miami will be used to represent the quadrant. Pedantic Science, in the Seattle Quadrant is defined as theories within organizational change that deal with a high degree of system complication and low environmental complexity. Puerile Science, the San Diego Quadrant, deals with theories developed to address low system complication and low environmental complexity. In the Boston Quadrant, Pragmatic Science categorizes theories that address high system complication and high environmental complexity. Lastly, Practitioner Science, the Miami Quadrant, classifies theories that encompass low system complication and high environmental complexity (Figure 4).

Anderson, Herriot and Hodgkinson’s Framework with Quadrant Identifiers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System Complication</th>
<th>Environment Complexity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedantic Science</td>
<td>Pragmatic Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Complication</td>
<td>High Complication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Complexity</td>
<td>High Complexity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Seattle Quadrant)</td>
<td>(Boston Quadrant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerile Science</td>
<td>Practitioner Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Complication</td>
<td>Low Complication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Complexity</td>
<td>High Complexity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(San Diego Quadrant)</td>
<td>(Miami Quadrant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 4.* Anderson, Herriot, and Hodgkinson’s Framework displaying system complication versus environmental complexity.
Drawing upon the work of Anderson et al. (2001) and Denison et al. (1995), Higgs and Rowland (2000, 2001, 2005) provide the next set of articles that develop the sought after relationship between Anderson, Herriot, and Hodgkinson’s Framework and Quinn and Rohrbaugh’s Framework. In these series of articles, Higgs and Rowland categorized specific texts from noted authors to the quadrants defined by Anderson et al. (Figure 5).

![Anderson, Herriot, and Hodgkinson’s Framework with Authors Categorized by Higgs & Rowland](image)

Recall that the quadrant labeled Pedantic Science as characterizing the environment that is highly complicated but low in complexity. The following texts have been categorized in this quadrant: Beckhard (1969), Duck (1993), Hammer and Champy (1993, 2003), Kotter (1995), and Lewin (1951). In the Pragmatic Science quadrant, the environment is highly complicated but
also highly complex. Noted authors whose work aligns with this quadrant would include: Beer and Nohria (2000a, 2000b); Conner (1993); Hurst (1995); Nadler and Tushman (1999); and Senge, Renesch, and Allee (1999). The Puerile Science quadrant is distinguished by an environment that is low in complication and low in complexity, encompassing the following authors and texts: Beckhard (1969), Boddy and Buchanan (1992), Pascale (1990), Senge (1997), and Senge et al. (1999). Lastly, the quadrant labeled Pragmatic Science identifies an environment that is low in complication but high in complexity, including the following texts by these authors: Aldrich (1999), Blackmore (1999), Lichtenstein (1995, 1997), Shaw (1997), Weick (1995, 2001), and Wheatley (1992, 1999).

**Higgs and Rowland’s Framework – Establishment of the relationship between Anderson, Herriot, and Hodgkinson’s Framework and Quinn and Rohrbaugh’s Framework.** From this research, Higgs and Rowland (2000, 2001, 2005) have established a relationship between Quinn and Rohrbaugh’s Framework and Anderson, Herriot, and Hodgkinson’s Framework. In other words, Pedantic Science is related to the Internal Process Model, Puerile Science is related to the Human Relations Model, Pragmatic Science is related to the Rational Goal Model and Practitioner Science is related to the Open Systems Model (see Figure 6).
What was not intuitive to this point was whether or not a relationship existed between Riskin’s Framework and any of the leadership theories. This is where the work of Higgs and Rowland (2000, 2001, 2005) plays a vital role. By establishing the relationship between Quinn and Rohrbaugh’s Framework and Anderson, Herriot, and Hodgkinson’s Framework, there now appears to be some similarity between Riskin’s Framework and Anderson, Herriot, and Hodgkinson’s Framework. If a relationship established between either Riskin’s and either Anderson, Herriot, and Hodgkinson’s Framework or Quinn and Rohrbaugh’s Framework, then the three models can all be interrelated: implying that Riskin’s Framework is related to Anderson, Herriot, and Hodgkinson’s Framework, which in turn is related to Quinn and Rohrbaugh’s Framework.

Figure 6. Relationship between Quinn and Rohrbaugh’s Framework and Anderson, Herriot, and Hodgkinson’s Framework as established by Higgs and Rowland (2000, 2001, 2005).
Figure 7. The potential relationship between Higgs and Rowland’s Framework and Riskin’s Framework.
Significance of the Study

Recalling the point made by Handy (1994), Adam Smith’s writings espouse the belief that social responsibility ultimately leads to the betterment of society. From a leadership perspective, then leadership is not about the pursuit of self-interest or profit, but the pursuit of leadership skills that act in the best interest of the community. In other words, the successful leader is one who creates harmony and regard for one’s fellow human beings. If a relationship is found, this means the successful leader is one who can best adapt himself/herself to the circumstances at hand. Therefore, this study aims to provide a tool for leaders. If the leader has an appreciation of the complication of the task and the complexity of the emotions involved, then Riskin’s Framework provides a context for determining which leadership style will best help the leader navigate the conflict.

Assumptions of the Study

This study was qualitative, utilizing a phenomenological approach. The leaders were asked to share a story about how they handled a specific conflict. A series of follow-up questions were then asked of the leader in an attempt to help categorize his/her leadership style. Based on the leader’s narrative and subsequent questions, the researcher hoped hope that the leader would fall into one of four categorizations. For simplicity, these categorizations were noted as Seattle, Boston, Miami, or San Diego Quadrants.

Delimitations of the Study

The sample group consisted of eight participants with two participants each from the following sectors: (a) civil servant, (b) judicial, (c) corporate, and (d) community. The population provided a sample of diverse ethnic groups from California. Regardless of the stated ethnic makeup of the population used, bias was inherent in that all individuals live in the U.S.
and specifically the state of California. These individuals have willingly adopted certain characteristics as part of the American/California psyche, such as a high degree of individualism and respect for an American perspective on the rule of law.

**Definition of Terms**

The following terms will be used throughout this dissertation:

- **Administrative approach**: An organization’s ability to address changes in predicting future innovation and rationalization of its current structure and processes.

- **Analyzer’s Stance**: Organizations operating routinely and efficiently through the use of formalized structures and processes, but still monitoring their competitors for new ideas, which they can adopt quickly.


- **Behavioral Complexity**: A leader’s performance gauged in terms of managerial level, job function, and environment, and divided into two dimensions:
  - Behavioral repertoire: the variety of roles that managers can perform, and
  - Behavioral differentiation: managers’ ability to adapt their role to the context of the situation faced.

- **Broad Problem Definition**: This occurs when a mediator encourages parties to focus on the underlying values, goals, fears, and feelings driving the conflict and the narrow legal issues of an issue.
• Collectivism Cultural Dimension: Collectivism pertains to societies where individuals are integrated into strong, cohesive groups that continue to protect them throughout their lifetime in exchange for unquestioning loyalty.

• Congruency: Congruency occurs when the structure of an organization is in alignment with the environment of operation.

• Contingency Theory: A framework for determining an organization’s success through the alignment of its structure and environmental demands.

• Defender Stance: Organizations that seldom need to make major adjustments in their technology, structure, or methods of operation and devote primary attention to improving the efficiency of their existing operations.

• Engineering approach: An organization’s focus on its ability to address change on its market and product domains.

• Entrepreneurial approach: Centers on the organization’s ability to address change on its choice of technology for production and distribution.

• Environment (Environmental scanning): A focus on the identification of emerging issues, situations, and potential pitfalls that may affect an organization’s future. Environments can be defined on a continuum from stable and certain on one end, to turbulent and unpredictable at the other extreme.

• Evaluative Mediator: A mediator who offers the client direction based on his/her experience, education, training, or objectivity. The evaluative mediator often interjects opinions about possible solutions to the negotiations.

• Facilitative Mediator: A mediator who believes that the clients are capable of solving their own dilemmas better than anyone else. The facilitative mediator believes in
focusing on enhancing or clarifying communications between the different groups and remains impartial so as not to interfere with the decision making process.

- General Environment Issues: Those items that have an indirect impact on a business and may include human resource, financial resource, technology, legal-regulatory, political, cultural, or socio-demographical environments.


- Human Subsystem: Draws on the work of Maslow (1943; Maslow & Frager, 1987), where human development is categorized by five stages; Physiological, Safety, Belongingness, Esteem, Self-Actualization.

- In-congruency: A term used to describe when the structure of an organization is not in alignment with or is mixed with the environment in which it is operating.

- Leader-member exchange theory (LMX): A leadership theory based on the interactions between leader and follower. Rather that treating followers as a group, LMX leaders treat followers as specific individuals.

- Leadership Success: The measure of how successful humans are at directing the interactions between the organization and the environment in which the organization operates.

- Managerial Subsystem: Categorizes leadership style as Autocracy, Bureaucracy, Technocracy, Democracy or Co-Determination.
• Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs: Five levels of motivation that leads to some level of satisfaction: (a) physiological, (b) safety, (c) social, (d) esteem, and (e) self-actualization (Maslow, 1943; Maslow & Frager, 1987).

• Mediation: A voluntary process in which an impartial individual(s) helps disputing parties identify his/her (their) issues, options, and alternatives in the hope that the parties will reach a settlement for their dispute. The impartial individual(s) has limited advisory capacity in determining which solution is best and prefers to focus on the process for arriving at a settlement.

• Mediator Styles: Based on Riskin’s Framework, a mediator’s style can be defined along two axes. One axis frames the issue as either narrow or broad in scope. The other axis deals with whether the mediator is evaluative or facilitative.

• Narrow Problem Definition: This occurs when a mediator defines conflict in a way that focuses on rights and obligations.

• Open Systems Theory: Use of biological principles as a metaphor for an organization where an organic system as entity is contained within a boundary that is transcribed to organizations (Von Bertalanffy, 1950, 1968). Open systems theory describes how an organization interacts with its environment (Boulding, 1956)

• Operational Subsystem (Technological): A focus on internal processes or influence, comprising the organization’s focus on accomplishing goals and objectives (Burrell & Morgan, 1979).

• Organizational Behavior: The study of human interaction with both an organization and the environment in which the organization operates.
• Organizational Change: The study of how humans can change an organization in response to the environment in which the organization operates.

• Organizational Development: The study of how humans can predict the interaction between both the organization and the environment in which the organization operates.

• Organizational Leadership: The study of how humans direct the interaction between both an organization and the environment in which the organization operates.

• Prospector Stance: Organization engaged in creating a work environment that embraces an organic structure and democratic managerial style.

• Quinn and Rohrbaugh’s Framework – Abbreviation for Quinn and Rohrbaugh’s (1983) paper, which establishes a perspective of the leadership models used in this study.

• Reactor Stance: An organization where one or more subsystems do not align with any specific region of the environment. This stance leads the organization to be unbalanced or unstable, and does not have the same potential of a congruent alignment. The organization is therefore not performing optimally and the possibility of failure is higher for an incongruent than a congruent alignment.

• Riskin’s Framework – Abbreviation for Riskin’s (1996) paper, which establishes quadrant categorization of skills utilized by a mediator.

• Riskin’s Grid: The intersection of two scales proposed by Leonard Riskin (1996) to articulate a mediator’s approach at any given moment. One axis frames the issue as either narrow or broad in scope. The other axis addresses whether the mediator is evaluative or facilitative.
• Servant leadership: Coined by Greenleaf (1977) almost 40 years ago, this term encompasses ethical and moral leadership models that focus on respect, service, justice, honesty, and community.

• Situational Leadership: A leadership theory postulating that leadership must have one of four different leadership styles—directing, coaching, supporting and delegating—to match the specific situation in which the leader is situated and the level of development of the individuals in the given situation.

• Stances: Stances gauge the alignment of the strategy to the environment and are categorized as environment, strategic, technological, human/cultural, structural and managerial.

• STAR Approach: A matrix technique developed at the Straus Institute for Dispute Resolution at Pepperdine University School of Law that comprises five stages: (a) convening, (b) opening, (c) communicating, (d) negotiating, and (e) closing.

• Task Environment Issues: Issues that have a direct impact on a business, including industry, raw materials, market, and economic and physical environments.

• Transformational leadership: A leadership theory postulating that leaders influence the emotions, values, ethics, standards, motives of the followers in an attempt to get the followers to accomplish more than is expected.
Definitions of the Quadrants

**Seattle Quadrant.** This quadrant is categorized by tasks having a high degree of complication associated with the situation, but the relationships involved are of low complexity, implying a good deal of distance between the individuals involved (Figure 8). The situation is perceived on its strengths and weaknesses, and the participants may have a good understanding of the likely options for settling the dispute. Other terms used to describe this quadrant are:

- Simple quadrant
- Directive quadrant
- Evaluative-narrow quadrant
- Pedantic quadrant

*Figure 8. Simplified representation of the Seattle Quadrant framework presented in Figure 7.*
**Miami Quadrant.** The tasks in this quadrant have a low degree of complication associated with the situation, but the nature of the relationships involved is of high complexity, implying a good deal of closeness between the individuals involved (Figure 9). The negotiating parties consider their interests rather than their positions. In this situation, the mediator helps the parties find alternative means to settle their disputes by discussing their underlying interests or developing creative solutions. Other terms used to describe this quadrant include:

- Emergence quadrant
- Facilitative-broad quadrant
- Practitioner quadrant

**Miami Quadrant**

![Diagram of Miami Quadrant](image)

*Figure 9. Simplified representation of the Miami Quadrant framework presented in Figure 7.*
**Boston Quadrant.** This quadrant is categorized by tasks having a high degree of complication associated with the situation, and the nature of the relationships involved is also of a high complexity, implying a good deal of closeness between the individuals involved (Figure 10). The mediator believes that there are many solutions to a problem, but that each side must be given direction on how to interpret the other side’s intentions. They will speculate on outcomes, form opinions by reading or studying relevant documents, and apply pressure to settle by emphasizing options that satisfy broader interests rather than narrow positions. Other terms used to describe this quadrant are:

- Sophisticated quadrant
- Evaluative-broad quadrant
- Pragmatic quadrant

![Boston Quadrant Diagram](image-url)

*Figure 10. Simplified representation of the Boston Quadrant framework presented in Figure 7.*
San Diego Quadrant. The tasks in this quadrant have a low degree of complication, and the nature of the relationships involved is of a low complexity, implying a good deal of distance between the individuals involved (Figure 11). The focused mediator has a straightforward perception of the solution, but does not try to assess or predict outcomes, form opinions by reading or studying relevant documents, or apply pressure to settle. Other terms used to describe this quadrant are:

- Self-Assembly quadrant
- DIY quadrant
- Facilitative-narrow quadrant
- Puerile quadrant

Figure 11. Simplified representation of the San Diego Quadrant framework presented in Figure 7.
Chapter 2: Review of the Literature

The study of human interaction, both within the organization and the environment in which the organization operates, encompasses the academic disciplines of Organizational Behavior, Change, Development, and Leadership. These disciplines form the foundation of sociology. Exactly where one field ends and the others begin is a subject of great controversy. These disciplines do, however, have many commonalities to draw upon and inspire comparison with other fields of study. Mediation is one such example. Although it is usually associated with the legal profession, mediation can be used to assist with any kind of social interaction or conflict. The conflict-resolution skills developed in mediation are of great importance to this study. Mediators are skilled at employing a variety of roles and approaches to frame a conflict with the hope that the parties involved will resolve their conflict. These roles and framing approaches can be categorized into different mediator styles that share many similarities with sociology, in particular Organizational Leadership. This study aimed to investigate the intersections between these two disciplines and determine if a relationship exists between them.

Higgs and Rowland (200, 2001, 2005) published several articles that may elucidate one such link between these mediation styles and organizational leadership and offer insight into what types of leader behaviors are especially effective in dealing with conflict. These authors have developed a graphical representation of this relationship, measuring methodological rigor on one axis and practical application on the other. This type of comparison results in a matrix with four quadrants, each of which represents a different style of leadership: pedantic, pragmatic, puerile, and practitioner. Higgs and Rowland’s Framework and Riskin’s Framework share many elements in common; what Higgs and Rowland call methodological rigor, Riskin refers to as facilitative versus evaluative. What Higgs and Rowland label practical application, Riskin calls
narrow versus broad. This in turn offers mediator styles a new field of theory from which to draw. Once this comparison is made, then noted authors as identified in Higgs and Rowland’s Framework will provide mediators with an additional source of research. Furthermore, those practiced in mediation will have a set of established theories to illustrate their techniques rather than intuition.

A comprehensive analysis of the intersection between mediator style and organizational leadership can be used to address many conflicts. Organizational leadership styles provide a foundation from which social conflict can be understood as “perceived divergence of interest or a belief that the parties’ current aspirations cannot be achieved simultaneously” (Rubin, Pruitt, & Kim, 1994, p. 5). If a leader understands which quadrant to use as well as the cultural dimensions of the groups involved, that leader may then select the most appropriate leadership style such as Situation Leadership, LMX Theory, Transformational Leadership, or Servant Leadership for the given set of parameters. Before this framework can be addressed, however, it is essential to develop a thorough understanding of Organizational Development (Organizational Change) first.

**Synopsis of Sociology**

As globalization continues to accelerate, organizations must adapt to an ever-changing environment. One particularly interesting and important aspect of this adaptation is how conflict is resolved within organizations; it seems logical to assert that successful organizations are governed by individuals who are skilled in resolving conflict. In the past, managerial skills seemed relatively straightforward, requiring only positive production numbers as the sole determinant of the successful leader (Becker, 1964, 1993; Huselid, Becker, & Beatty, 2005). In this new world, however, measuring the success of leadership continues to be elusive as leaders deal with issues such as cross-cultural and international disputes (Brett, Behfar, & Kern, 2006;
Majidi, 2006; Mumford, Marks, Connelly, Zaccaro, & Reiter-Palmon, 2000; Mumford, Zaccaro, Harding, Jacobs, & Fleishman, 2000; Mumford, Zaccaro, Johnson, Diana, Gilbert, & Threlfall, (2000); Yammarino, 2000).

The history of organizations is as rich as it is old. Although the existence of human organizations can be traced back many millennia, the birth of sociology is considered to have heralded the creation of modern managerial theory (Bass, Bass, & Stogdill, 2008; House & Aditya, 1997). During the latter part of the 1800s, influential sociologist Max Weber was interested in describing the relationship between industrial mechanization of industry and the proliferation of bureaucratic organizational forms (Morgan, 1997; Parkin, 2002). During the 1900s, modern management theory has taken on many different forms and has produced various schools of thought. However, the quandary of how to determine what makes a successful leader, a central issue in this field of study, was and continues to be problematic (Bartlett & Ghoshal, 1998, 2002; Pucik & Saba, 1998). Researchers have conducted numerous studies that clearly define organizational success through the environment in which the organization operates. Miles and Snow (2003) have called this relationship between organizational success and environment efficacy (Miles & Snow, 2003). Unfortunately, sociological research continues to deliver inconclusive results about what makes an organization’s leader successful, measured separately from the overall success of the organization itself (Pucik & Saba, 1998).

Organizational behavior. One branch of sociology, Organizational Behavior, focuses on the study of human behavior within an organization. Some of the well-known researchers in this field—Frederick Taylor, Henri Fayol, Mary Parker Follett, Douglas McGregor, Abraham Maslow, Frederick Herzberg, David McClelland, and Victor Vroom—built on Weber’s work, focusing on whether motivation was related directly to success. At the beginning of the 1900s,
the works of Frederick Taylor (Wrege & Greenwood, 1991) and Henri Fayol (1984) were renowned as they ushered in the period known as the era of Scientific Management. Scientific Management Theory was a rigid discipline used by industrialists that dictated carefully timed and charted assembly line techniques. The success of this discipline replaced craftsmanship as the means to determine the success of a factory worker.

As the roaring 1920s approached, Mary Parker Follett (1924, 1987) popularized the notion that successful management should be more democratic than Scientific Management Theory. This led to the development of the Human Relations Movement in sociology in the 1960s, pioneered by Douglas McGregor (1985; Heil, McGregor, Bennis, & Stephens, 2000) and Abraham Maslow (1943; Maslow & Frager, 1987). In their work they defined two theories of management: Theory X preaches coercion as a means to force a worker to perform a specific task, and Theory Y asserts that workers must be inspired to perform a specific task. This paradigm became a popular foundation to determining the success of the worker because it related an individual’s success to a human hierarchy of needs: physiological, safety, societal, esteem, or self-actualization. Frederick Herzberg furthered this work with his Dual-Structure Theory of Motivation (Two-Factor Theory). This theory describes two factors: intrinsic and extrinsic. Intrinsic factors motivate the worker to seek satisfaction; these factors are also referred to as motivators. Extrinsic factors, also referred to as hygiene factors, are factors that if absent lead to dissatisfaction (Herzberg, Mausner, & Synderman, 1993). David McClelland (1953, 1964, 1975, 1976) furthered the Two-Factor Theory with his Theory of Need, which drew upon the work of Follett, McGregor, Maslow, and Herzberg by asserting that an individual’s success relates to the need for achievement, affiliation, and power.
As the 20th century came to a close, many of the theories associated with Organizational Behavior and the success of the worker focused on extrinsic and or intrinsic gains. Unlike the ideas of his contemporaries, Victor Vroom’s (1964) Expectancy Theory dispels the notion that success requires a balance between maximizing pleasure and minimizing pain through expectancy (expectation), instrumentality (perception), and valence (value). Vroom’s theory rejects the notion that success is only gauged through measured gains in intrinsic or extrinsic wealth. This means that some factor other than motivation drives success.

**Self-interest versus community** Handy (1994) and Hoopes (2003) return to the basics of the age of modern management theory through an understanding of the oft-quoted Adam Smith. They suggest that the current perception of wealth is a paradox and that Adam Smith has been misinterpreted greatly.

We misinterpreted Adam Smith’s idea to mean that if we each looked after our own interests; some “invisible hand” would mysteriously arrange things so that it all worked out for the best for all. We therefore promulgated the rights of the individual and freedom of choice for all. But without self-restraint, without thought for one’s neighbor and one’s grandchildren, such freedom becomes license and mere selfishness. Adam Smith, who was a professor of Moral Philosophy, not of economics, built his theories on the basis of a moral community. Before he wrote *The Wealth of Nations* he wrote his definitive work, *A Theory of Moral Sentiments*, arguing that a stable society was based on “sympathy,” a moral duty to have regard for your fellow human beings. The market is a mechanism for sorting the efficient from the inefficient; it is not a substitute for responsibility. (Handy, 1994, p. 10)

From this notion, Handy suggests that, contrary to the modern belief that wealth is a pursuit of individual self-interest or profit, Adam Smith’s writings espouse the belief that social responsibility ultimately leads to the betterment of society. Handy argues that Smith would advocate for leadership that acts in the best interest of and brings harmony to the community. In other words, the successful leader is not one that focuses on profit and self-fulfillment, but one who creates harmony and regard for one’s fellow human beings and the betterment of the community.
**Organizational development.** In order to create harmony, the successful leader must therefore embrace change both for the individual and the organization being served. The field of sociology that deals with changing the environment around an individual or an organization, Organizational Development, traces its roots to Kurt Lewin, a psychologist who gained fame in the mid-1900s. His Process Model stated that organizational change is a simple three-step process of *unfreezing, changing, and re-freezing* the behaviors of individuals in an organization (Lewin, Adams, & Zener, 1935; Lewin & Gold, 1999; Lewin & Lewin, 1948, 1997).

Researchers Richard Beckhard, W. Edwards Deming, and Chris Argyris furthered the research in this field in the latter part of the 1900s. A few years after Lewin’s work, Beckhard pioneered the definition of Organizational Development to reflect efforts in overcoming resistance to change as a means to drive success. Beckhard postulated that success is a function of dissatisfaction, vision, and willingness to achieve the vision. Beckhard’s theory focused on efforts in planning, comprehensiveness, and executive accountability (Beckhard, 1969; Beckhard & Harris, 1977, 1987; Beckhard & Pritchard, 1992). Expanding on Beckhard’s theory, Deming (1950, 1960, 1985, 1986) espoused the notion that the workplace requires management to create a balance between intrinsic and extrinsic rewards. To illustrate his perspective, Deming described 14 principles of management, seven deadly diseases, and lesser category of obstacles. If adhered to, Deming argued that these concepts would lead to organizational transformation. Argyris supplemented this theory with the idea of double loop learning, in which the successful leader not only learns from mistakes, but also implements change within the organization’s culture (Argyris, 1991, 1993, 1999; Argyris & Schön, 1978).
Behavioral complexity. Building upon the work of these contemporary authors in Organizational Development and how leaders implement change within an organization, the leader’s behaviors are now thought to play a significant role in an organization’s success and has given rise to the field of behavioral complexity (Denison et al., 1995). Of central interest in behavioral complexity is how a leader’s success relates to organizational success. Behavioral complexity addresses this by monitoring a leader’s performance through managerial level, job function, and environment, through two dimensions: (a) behavioral repertoire, meaning the variety of roles that managers can perform; and (b) behavioral differentiation, or the ability of managers to adapt their role to the current context. Results of these studies indicate that higher levels of social perceptiveness and social adaptability lead to a greater amount of behavioral complexity, and leaders with a higher level of behavioral complexity tend to have a higher level of promotability (Greathouse, 2001). This does not necessarily mean that they are successful, just that they are more likely to be promoted. Further research indicates that although a relationship was found for each variable of behavioral repertoire and behavioral differentiation independently, interactions between the two variables were not substantiated. In other words, the relationship between behavioral complexity and success is more elusive than present theory can explain (Ernst, 2000).

Recalling the point made by Handy (1994), Adam Smith’s writings espouse the belief that social responsibility ultimately leads to the betterment of society. In other words, leadership success is not about the pursuit of self-interest or profit, but the pursuit of leadership skills that act in the best interest of the community. Repeated again, the successful leader is one who creates harmony and regard for one’s fellow human beings. This means that the successful leader is someone who can best adapt himself/herself to the circumstances at hand. The notion of
adaptation of the leader’s behavior to a given situation leads to research conducted by Quinn and Rohrbaugh (1983).

**Understanding the Environment and the Boundary of the Organization through Open Systems Theory**

The notion of adaptation is essential to understanding what an organization is and how its strategy relates to its environment. Open systems theory provides one way of defining this adaptation. Open systems theory traces its origins to the use of biological principles of organisms as a metaphor for an organization. Von Bertalanffy (1950, 1968) defined an organic system as an entity contained within a boundary, and Boulding (1956) applied von Bertalanffy’s principles to organizations. Open systems theory also describes how an organization interacts with its environment (Miller, 1978). Examples of these interactions are summarized in detail by Emery (1969) and categorized as either task or general environments (Kast & Rosenzweig, 1979). Task environments include industry, raw materials, market, economic, and physical environments; these kinds of environments have a direct impact on a business. General environment issues include human resources, financial, technology, legal-regulatory, political, cultural, and socio-demographic; these issues have an indirect impact on a business (Kast & Rosenzweig, 1979). Burns and Stalker (1966) present ideas about merging the task environment to the general environment. McCabe and Dutton (1993) created a model that can be used to assess the environment in which an organization is operating. Lawrence and Lorsch (1969) furthered this research by comparing the organization’s environment to how it is managed. This work is significant in that it establishes an organization as a unique entity that is defined by boundaries and interacts with its environment (Morgan, 1997). Unfortunately, however, this work does not
address the success of leadership in the organization or the environment in which the organization operates.

**Overview of Contingency Theory**

Contingency theory provides a framework for determining the success of an organization’s structure and the demands of the environment in which it operates. Burrell and Morgan (1979) define contingency theory thusly:

Contingency theory postulates that the successfulness of the organization in coping with the demands of its environment is contingent upon the elements of the various subsystems which comprise the organization being designed in accordance with the demands of the environment with which they interact as presented. (p. 176)

Applying contingency theory involves breaking down an organization into subsystems and determining whether these subsystems are aligned properly or congruent with the environment in which they operate (Figure 12). Miles and Snow (1978, 2003) define these subsystems as the administrative, engineering, and entrepreneurial approaches and are applied to an organization’s ability to address change. The administrative subsystem relates to an organization’s ability to predict future innovation and rationalize its current structure and processes. The entrepreneurial subsystem focuses on an organization’s market and product domains. Lastly, the engineering subsystem centers on the organization’s choice of technology for production and distribution. Even though behaviorists have a variety of different perspectives on these subsystems, the foundation of contingency theory is based on proper alignment.

Burrell and Morgan (1979) further the understanding of contingency theory by viewing subsystems as a means of understanding how the organization adapts to its environment. They identify three subsystems: operational, human, and managerial. The operational (sometimes referred to as technological or structural) subsystem would be defined by the limits of mechanistic/bureaucratic at one end and organic at the other. The human subsystem draws on the
work of Maslow (1943) with physiology/safety needs at one end of the spectrum and esteem/self-actualization at the other. Lastly, the managerial subsystem relates to an organization’s style, specifically addressing whether an organization is authoritarian or democratic. Morgan (1997), on the other hand, establishes the following subsystems: environmental, strategic, technological, human/cultural, structural, and managerial. Regardless of their background and emphasis, all of these authors espouse the basic notion that a congruent organization would be aligned properly in all its subsystems, whereas an in-congruent organization would be misaligned to or mixed with the environment in which it is operating.

**Environment.** The environment in which an organization operates and with which it interacts creates a baseline of operational benefits and challenges. In order to determine how the environment is likely to impact an organization’s functioning, it is important to utilize some form of environmental scanning, which:

focuses on the identification of emerging issues, situations, and potential pitfalls that may affect an organization’s future. The information gathered, including the events, trends, and relationships that are external to an organization, is provided to key managers within the organization and is used to guide management in future plans. (Albright, 2004, p. 40)

Morgan (1997) furthers the definition by including economic, technological, market, labor relations, and sociopolitical dimensions as factors that comprise an organization’s environment. Burrell and Morgan (1979) add another element to environmental scanning by creating a continuum of environmental predictability, with stable and certain on one end, and turbulent and unpredictable at the other. Once the environment has been thoroughly scanned and analyzed, the organization should be able to formulate a competitive strategy that is congruent with current environmental conditions (Beal, 2000).

**Strategy.** An organization that has scanned its environment carefully will then make key decisions based on its findings. Paramount to the organization is the decisions the leaders will make with regards to the: (a) goals and direction of the organization, (b) internal mechanisms to achieve the goals, and (c) monitoring of those mechanisms (Burrell & Morgan, 1979). Miles and Snow (1978, 2003) have defined four unique stances to gauge the alignment of the strategy with the environment: prospector, analyzer, defender, and reactor. These stances will then encompass a range of action for each of Morgan’s (1997) subsystems: environmental, strategic, technological, human/cultural, structural, and managerial.
Prospector stance. Organizations will adopt a prospector stance and employ the most successful organizational structure possible when the environment is turbulent and unpredictable. Miles and Snow (2003) assert,

Organizations that almost continually search for market opportunities, and they regularly experiment with potential responses to emerging environmental trends. Thus, these organizations often are the creators of change and uncertainty to which their competitors must respond. However, because of their strong concern for product and market innovation, these organizations usually are not completely efficient. (p. 29)

In other words, an organization that is employing a prospector stance successfully would be proactive and willing to create learning systems. Individuals would have a high level of discretion in their roles, as their roles would be complex in nature. Members who seek an environment that is self-actualizing would be most successful, which would mean that the organization should embrace an organic structure and democratic managerial style (Morgan, 1997).

Defender stance. In contrast to the prospector stance, an organization should adopt a defender stance when its environment is stable and certain. Miles and Snow (2003) state,

Organizations that have narrow product-market domains. Top managers in this stance of organization are highly expert in their organization’s limited area of operation but do not tend to search outside of their domains for new opportunities. As a result of this narrow focus, these organizations seldom need to make major adjustments in their technology, structure, or methods of operation. Instead, they devote primary attention to improving the efficiency of their existing operations. (p. 29)

Therefore, in order to be maximally successful, an organization working in a stable and certain environment would adopt a strategy that protects its market niche. This organization would focus on efficiency by providing a quality product or service in a cost-competent manner. It would employ mass-production methodologies, be structured or organized mechanistically, and have content employees working in narrowly defined roles (Morgan, 1997).
**Analyzer stance.** In order to optimize success, an organization will assume an analyzer stance when it finds itself in an environment that is somewhere between stable and turbulent.

Organizations that operate in two stances of product-market domains, one relatively stable, the other changing. In their stable areas, these organizations operate routinely and efficiently through use of formalized structures and processes. In their more turbulent areas, top managers watch their competitors closely for new ideas, and then they rapidly adopt those that appear to be the most promising. (Miles & Snow, 2003, p. 29)

In order to consider adopting this stance, an organization must be working in an environment where technological advancements are occurring at regular intervals, forcing transition in the market place. This means that the organization will need to maintain efficiency, but still be willing to update products or services as emergent trends dictate. The organization does not have to be on the cutting edge of innovation, but rather must find ways to be competitive by offering better products or services in a more cost-efficient way.

**Reactor stance.** The reactor stance is adopted when the leaders of an organization fail to articulate or adhere to a strategy; failure may also occur if the articulated strategy is incompatible with the environment. When an organization uses a reactor stance, this invariably represents a misalignment between the environment and stance. The reactor stance is also known as incongruency. If an organization has adopted a reactor stance, this means that that one or more subsystems are not aligned with any specific region of the environment. This stance leads the organization to be unbalanced or unstable, and does not have the same potential of a congruent alignment. The organization is therefore not performing optimally and the possibility of failure is much higher than in a congruent organization (Miles & Snow, 2003).

Organizations in which top managers frequently perceive change and uncertainty occurring in their organizational environments but are unable to respond successfully. Because this stance of organization lacks a consistent strategy-structure relationship, it seldom makes adjustment of any sort until forced to do so by environmental pressures. (p. 29)
Operational, human and managerial relationships to environment and strategy. A common historical reference point for Burrell and Morgan (1979), Miles and Snow (1978, 2003), and Morgan (1997) is the work conducted by Lawrence and Lorsch (1969), who emphasized the importance of contingency theory as the alignment between environment and strategy of an organization. If congruent, then all other sub-categories must also align. Instead of investigating why organizations are unsuccessful, they approached the problem from the perspective of why organizations are successful. Only when in-congruency was present were the operational, human, and managerial sub-categories of relevance. Additionally, much of the initial work performed by both Burrell and Morgan (1979) and Miles and Snow (2003) was performed concurrently and separately, so the terminology, though similar, does have some differences. Of particular importance is how each sub-category relates to Miles and Snow’s (1978, 2003) three stances—prospector, analyzer and defender—and their relationship to the extremes as defined by Burrell and Morgan.

The operational sub-category. This sub-category represents a focus on internal processes or influence, comprising the organization’s focus on accomplishing goals and objectives (Burrell & Morgan, 1979). For industrial organizations this activity would involve the transformation of inputs such as labor, raw materials, and capital into outputs in the form of material goods. Many times the term technology is used to describe this process. Care should be taken when using this term as the intended meaning of technology is actually a reference to behaviorism. This transformation process reflects the operational imperative characteristic of goal-orientated organizations (Burrell & Morgan, 1979). In later works and independent of Burrell, Morgan (1997) makes the subtle shift away from operational to technology. Miles and Snow (2003) use
the term *engineering* when referring to behaviors that belong in the operational or technological sub-category. They define the engineering sub-category thusly:

The engineering problem involves the creation of a system which puts into actual operation management’s solution to the entrepreneurial problem. The creation of such a system requires management to select an appropriate technology (input-transformation-output process) for producing and distributing the chosen products or services and to form new information, communication, and control linkages (or modify existing linkages) to ensure proper operation of the technology. (p. 21)

Another perspective on the operational sub-category is through conflict resolution within the organization. Kilmann and Thomas (1977) present the topic from two viewpoints; the first is process versus structure analysis.

Process models of behavior place the parties in a temporal sequence of events. Behavior is assumed to be directly influenced by preceding events and anticipation of subsequent events. Structural models focus upon conditions, relationships between those conditions, and their influence upon behavior. At a given moment, those conditions are viewed as exerting forces upon behavior. Whereas a process model places parties in a sequence of events, a structural model places them in a web of forces. (pp. 60-61)

The second viewpoint approaches the situation as internal versus external sources of influence.

*Internal* models emphasize events and conditions within a party that influence behavior. Parties are seen as decision-making entities confronted with alternatives and choice points. Variation in behavior is assumed to be an outcome of differences in the processes and structures of this decision-making. By contrast, *external* models focus upon events and conditions outside the party that shape behavior. The implicit assumption is that parties are fairly interchangeable in their reactions to processes and conditions in their environment - that these processes and conditions are sufficient to explain behavior. (pp. 60-61)

Again the importance of the operational sub-category is how the extremes align for congruency. Burrell and Morgan (1979) define one extreme as complex high-discretion roles, which align with the prospector stance. This type of role would be appropriate for an environment that is turbulent and unpredictable. The other extreme involves routine, low-discretion roles that align with the defender stance. This role would be appropriate for stable
environments. Between the two roles would lay a region that aligns with the analyzer stance and corresponds with the appropriate environment.

**The human sub-category.** The human sub-category reflects an organization’s core values and cultural beliefs, encompassing the kind of people and the dominant ethos within the organization. The organization’s core values and the beliefs that shape the organizational culture are key components of this sub-category (Miles & Snow, 2003). Burrell and Morgan (1979) further the definition by describing the special status human beings have within the organization. They believe that organizations need to recognize that individuals have certain needs that must be satisfied in order for them to stay with the organization and sufficiently apply themselves to their duties. Miles and Snow (1978, 2003) regard this sub-category as the entrepreneurial problem. In their eyes the organization must first center on a specific domain it wishes to dominate: a specific product or service and a target market or market segment. This acceptance becomes evident when management decides to commit resources to achieve objectives related to the domain. For many organizations this translates to the internal and external commitment the organization is willing to make in the development and projection of its image and its orientation towards that image.

Krackhardt and Hanson (1993) provide additional insight into the human sub-category with their understanding of the formal and informal networks within a company. They outline their reasoning in the following way:

Many executives invest considerable resources in restructuring their companies, drawing and redrawing organizational charts only to be disappointed by the results. That’s because much of the real work of companies happens despite the formal organization. Often what needs attention is the informal organization, the networks of relationships that employees form across functions and divisions to accomplish tasks fast. These informal networks can cut through formal reporting procedures to jump start stalled initiatives and meet extraordinary deadlines. But informal networks can just as easily sabotage companies’ best laid plans by blocking communication and fomenting opposition to
change unless managers know how to identify and direct them…If the formal organization is the skeleton of a company, the informal is the central nervous system driving the collective thought processes, actions, and reactions of its business units. Designed to facilitate standard modes of production, the formal organization is set up to handle easily anticipated problems. But when unexpected problems arise, the informal organization kicks in. Its complex webs of social ties form every time colleagues communicate and solidify over time into surprisingly stable networks. Highly adaptive, informal networks move diagonally and elliptically, skipping entire functions to get work done. (p. 104)

Burrell and Morgan (1979) simplify the human sub-category even more by narrowing the definition of the extremes. They label one end “economic / instrumental orientation to work,” (Burrell & Morgan, 1979, p. 78) which represents an alignment to the defender stance and a stable environment. They label the other end “self-actualizing / work a central life interest,” (Burrell & Morgan, 1979, p. 78) which represents an alignment to the prospector stance and a turbulent environment. Again, the region between the two aspects of the human sub-category would include the analyzer stance and corresponding environment.

**The managerial sub-category.** This sub-category reflects how the organization deals with conflict and reducing uncertainty, encompassing the internal integration and control of the organization. This sub-category is defined via two types of structure: (a) autonomy structure, as reflected in organization charts, job descriptions, and financial control systems; and (b) managerial styles, as expressed by individual managers in day-to-day interpersonal relationships. Through these expressions of structure the organization is able to satisfy the demands of its members and reconcile conflicts between them (Burrell & Morgan, 1979).

Miles and Snow (1978, 2003) identify this sub-category as the administrative problem, arguing that organizations must focus on reducing uncertainty within the organizational system. From their perspective, the organization must be capable of engaging in rationalizing and stabilizing activities that have successfully solved problems faced by the organization. This process involves more than just rationalizing the system already developed (uncertainty
reduction); the organization must also formulate and implement processes that will allow the organization to continue to evolve (innovation).

Adler (1999) breaks the issue into two types of dilemmas: technical and social. Adler argues that in organizations where routine is the primary goal, efficiency requires high levels of bureaucracy, but to deliver improved efficiency requires innovation. In an innovation environment that requires creative people, the organization must forgo or limit bureaucratization. This presents a challenge. Burrell and Morgan (1979) offer the following alignment guidelines. For a stable environment and a defender stance, bureaucracy and authority (Theory X) will prevail. For a turbulent environment and a prospector stance, organic social structure and democracy (Theory Y) will prevail. For an analyzer stance in the corresponding environment, some mix will provide the successful formula for the organization.

**Determination of success or failure.** The issues covered so far have focused on identifying the environment and how the organization is aligned to that environment. What has not been covered at length is the issue of the organization’s success. Central to contingency theory is the notion of congruency and in-congruency, congruency referring to a state of proper alignment with the environment, and in-congruency referring to a state of misalignment or lack of alignment with the environment. These concepts are vital components that lead to an organization’s success or failure, which is ultimately judged by performance. Research has shown that organizations that adopt contingency theory and hence the notion of proper alignment through congruency perform better than organizations that are incongruent.

Contingency theory suggests that a match among business-level strategy, organizational structure, and the competitive environment is necessary for high performance…This study found that the judgment policies used by CEOs of manufacturing firms in making strategy-structure-environment alignment decisions are strongly related to the realized strategy-structure-environment fit of the firm. This result indicates that top managers’ judgments do influence organization design outcomes, supporting the strategic choice
perspective of organizational adaptation. This study also found that CEOs whose judgments are more consistent with contingency theory prescriptions are associated with higher performing firms, providing support for the efficacy of normative contingency theory. Non-contingent preferences for particular strategies, structures or environments were found to be marginally negatively related to performance, while bivariate contingent preferences, individually, exhibited no reliable relationships with performance. The triple interaction in the CEOs’ judgment models exhibited the strongest and most consistent relationships with performance, strategy making processes, and realized fit. Thus, the degree to which a CEO considers simultaneous relationships among multiple variables appears to be important to realized fit and performance outcomes. (Priem, 1994, p. 443)

**Major issues and or dilemmas bearing on defining uncertainty in a rapidly evolving world.** It is extremely important for an organization to build an accurate understanding of the environment in which it operates. In a world where technology is evolving rapidly, the perception exists that all contemporary organizations are located in an uncertain and turbulent environment. This means that all where strategic, operational, human, and managerial tactics fall under the prospector stance. However this is not really the case as thoughtful and introspective examination of the results of any environmental scanning method must be made to ensure proper identification of environmental conditions (Burrell & Morgan, 1979).

**Four Successful Leadership Styles**

Four specific leadership styles will be studied in this work: (a) situational leadership, (b) LMX theory, (c) transformational leadership, and (d) servant leadership.

**Situational leadership.** Situational leadership traces its roots to Hersey and Blanchard (1979, 1996) and Reddin (1979) taking a prescriptive approach to leadership style. In situational leadership, the implication is that the most successful leaders must have a different style to match each specific situation and the level of development of the individuals in the given situation. There are four leadership styles of Situational leadership based on a three-scale axis; the first axis describes the need for directive behavior, the second measures the need for supportive behavior, and the last axis quantifies the development level of the followers. When introducing a
new member to the organization, the appropriate leadership style would be directive, since the individual would be in need of a highly directive leader who is low in supportive behavior. This type of leadership is known as **directing**. As the individual moves to the next level of development, then the leadership style would shift to a coaching function, requiring both directive and supporting leader behavior. As the individual develops further, he/she would require less direct supervision, but still require a high degree of support. The leadership style would then change from coaching to a supporting role. Lastly, when the individual is fully developed and no longer in need of directive or supportive maintenance, the leader would adopt a delegating style; since the individual would need only cursory guidance to complete his/her mission (Blanchard et al., 1985; Hersey & Blanchard, 1988; Hersey et al., 1996).

The situational leadership model offers numerous strengths. It is intuitive, easy to understand, and widely used, and can be applied easily to a given situation. The four phases are serial in implementation and may be used progressively based on employee development. This model also presents several weaknesses, foremost of which is the lack of strong theoretical research to support its claims. Furthermore, this model does not account for or explain individual development, commitment, and competence and how these phenomena relate to the four phases. Lastly, the model does not address demographical issues such as education, experience, age, and gender (Fernandez & Vecchio, 1997; Graeff, 1997; Vecchio, 1987; Vecchio & Boatwright, 2002; Yukl, 2002).

**Leader-member exchange (LMX) theory.** LMX theory is based on the interactions between the leader and followers. Rather than treat followers as a group, LMX leaders treat followers as specific individuals. To accomplish this, leaders build a relationship with each follower, progressing through three phases of relationship building: the stranger, acquaintance,
and partner phases. From the leader’s perspective the followers will then fit into two groups based on the amount of subsequent interface needed. Those who require only sporadic interface belong to the out-group. Out-group members work strictly within prescribed parameters, doing what is only required of them. Although they are treated fairly, the individuals in the out-group are not afforded any special attention. Regarding the in-group, however, the leader develops a special relationship with all members. The leader promotes opportunities for members of the in-group to take on new roles and responsibilities while building trust and respect. In-group members reciprocate with a willingness to do more work than is required of them and look for innovative ways to advance the goals of the organization (Dansereau et al., 1975; Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995; Liden et al., 1993).

As with any leadership theory, LMX has its strengths and weaknesses. One of LMX’s strengths is that it is a meritocracy where some individuals contribute and receive more than others. LMX focuses on developing and catering to the specific needs of the individual. Communication is a hallmark in developing the leader-follower trust, respect, and commitment inherent in LMX, biases such as race, sex, ethnicity, religion, or age must be overcome. Lastly, there is significant research to support the powerful influence of LMX on organizational success (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995; Scandura, 1999; Schriesheim, Castro, & Cogliser, 1999; Schriesheim, Castro, Xiaohua Zhou, & Yammarino, 2001).

**Transformational leadership.** Transformational leadership is possibly the most exciting and dangerous of the leadership styles mentioned in this study. The goal of this type of leadership is to change and transform the individual. The transformational leader influences the emotions, values, ethics, standards, and motives of the follower in an attempt to get the follower to accomplish more than is expected (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978; Downton, 1973). The severe
shortcoming of transformational leadership is that it includes behaviors of charismatic and visionary leadership: forces that can be harnessed for either good or disastrous consequences (Bass, 1998; Bass & Riggio, 2006; Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999). Mohandas Gandhi was a great transformational leader, whereas Adolph Hitler’s use of charisma and vision led to the destruction of Germany and the other Axis Powers at the conclusion of World War II (Howell & Avolio, 1992; Northouse, 2007).

Great care needs to be taken when utilizing transformational leadership because of its overlap with charismatic leadership. Transformational leaders need to monitor their personality characteristics and behaviors and their effects on followers closely and constantly (Bryman, 1992; Kuhnert & Lewis, 1987). The personality characteristics of the charismatic transformational leader include: (a) dominance, (b) desire to influence, (c) confidence, and (d) strong values. Charismatic transformational behaviors include: (a) being a strong role model, (b) competence, (c) clear articulation of goals, (d) communication of high expectations, (e) confidence, and (f) arousal of motives. The charismatic transformational leader could have the following, seemingly innocuous effects on followers: (a) trust in the leader’s ideology, (b) assimilation of the leaders mannerisms, (c) unquestioning acceptance, (d) affection towards the leader, (e) obedience, (f) identification with the leader, (g) emotional involvement, (h) heightened goals, and (i) increased confidence. If kept in check, this leadership style can have a positive impact; however, if left unmonitored, history has proven that charismatic characteristics can lead to disastrous consequences (Northouse, 2007).

It is important to distinguish between transactional and transformational leadership. Transactional leadership deals with the exchange that occurs between the leadership and follower and encompasses extrinsic contingent reward and active or passive discipline (Burns, 1978).
Contingent reward is based on receiving remuneration for accomplishing a goal. Active and passive discipline involves either proactive negative reinforcement or after-the-fact negative intervention, respectively. In contrast, transformational leadership involves positive intrinsic reward and (a) idealized influence, (b) inspirational motivation, (c) intellectual stimulation, and (d) individualized consideration. The transformational leader establishes a positive relationship with his/her followers by improving their performance and developing followers to their fullest potential, also supporting the greater good of the community (Northouse, 2007; Yukl, 1999).

**Servant leadership.** The term servant leadership was coined by Greenleaf (1977; Greenleaf et al., 2003) in the 1970s and is a key component of the ethical and moral leadership models. This leadership style builds upon a foundation of principles that guide the leader in being a moral and upstanding person. Ethical theories are divided into theories about conduct and theories about character. Teleological and deontological theories approach the theory of conduct from the perspective of the consequences and rules that govern leadership behavior. Teleological perspectives focus on the balance between concern for self and concern for others and are grouped into three types: ethical egoism, utilitarianism, and altruism. Ethical egoism focuses on how to better oneself, whereas altruism focuses on the betterment of others. In between the two extremes lies utilitarianism theory. Focusing on the character of leaders, virtue-based theories stress qualities such as courage, honesty, fairness, and fidelity, tracing their origins to the time of Plato and Aristotle. Virtue-based theories focus on the potential of the individual’s virtue, stressing moral development and training (Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999).

Taken together, ethical and moral leadership models are about respect, service, justice, honesty, and community (Burns, 1978; Greenleaf, 1977; Greenleaf et al., 2003; Heifetz, 1994). Respect means being tolerant of opposing points of view and being able to listen to many
perspectives. Altruism, placing concern for the welfare of others above concern for oneself, forms the basis of service. Justice involves creating a workplace where decisions are based on fairness and promote the common interest of the community. A good leader must be honest, presenting information in a truthful and straightforward fashion. Lastly and most importantly, ethical and moral leadership is about community and building a society (Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999; Komives, Lucas, & McMahon, 1998).

Renewed emphasis has been placed on ethical and moral leadership, which leads to its current strength as a leadership model. Since the public is now demanding higher levels of moral responsibility, approaches such as servant leadership provide direction regarding how to achieve this quality. Ethical and moral leadership are processes that build upon each successful step. It requires practice to be a servant leader, continually revisiting one’s principles over the course of each day (Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999; Rost, 1991).

Mediation

Up to this point the literature review has focused on theoretical applications of organizational behavior and leadership style, but practical application is seriously lacking in this academic exploration. Although mediation is usually associated with the law profession, it can be used to address any form of conflict or problematic social interaction.

Mediation is an extension of the negotiation process in which a third party intervenes to help resolve disputes or manage conflicts. There are numerous definitions of mediation. The domestic concept of mediation contemplates and informal, consensual process in which a neutral third party, without power to impose a settlement, “assist the disputing parties in reaching a mutually satisfactory resin with resolution. “Lon Fuller’s classic formulation reminds us of mediations “capacity to reorient the parties Ford’s each other, not by imposing rules on them, but by helping them to achieve a new and shared perception of the relationship, a perception that will redirect their attitudes and dispositions towards each other.” In the international context, Bercovitch defines mediation as “a process of conflict management, related two but distinct from the party’s own negotiation, where those in conflict seat at the assistance, or accept an offer of help from an outsider (who may be an individual, an organization, a group, or a state), to
change their perceptions of behavior, and to do so without resorting to physical force for
invoking the authority of law.” (Nolan-Haley et al., 2005, p. 31).

Based on this quote, this study will then define mediation as a voluntary process in which an
impartial individual(s) helps disputing parties identify their issues, options and alternatives in the
hope that the parties will reach a settlement for their dispute. The impartial individual(s) has
limited advisory capacity in determining which solution is. There is ample substantiation to
support the effectiveness of mediation in resolving conflict. Indeed, humans have been using
forms of mediation for this purpose for thousands of years. Research indicates that the ancient
Mesopotamians practiced some form of mediation as early as the 18th and 19th centuries B.C.E.
and maybe even as early as 3,000 B.C.E. Present-day mediation can trace its origins to ancient
Greek and Roman times, around 700 B.C.E. (Roebuck, 2001).

**Five modes of the Kilmann and Thomas Scale (Dual Concerns Model).** As mentioned
previously, mediation is a consensual process; both parties are able to control the process used
and the agreement settled upon. Private confidential communications are allowed, and both
parties can discuss the situation freely with the mediator independent of the other party.
Disputants are autonomous; therefore, settlements may be creative and unconventional.
However, the possibility exists that either party could simply overwhelm the tactics of the other
party, rendering a solution that favors a particular disputant.

Kilmann and Thomas have conducted a thorough study of conflict approaches,
developing a tool known as the Kilmann and Thomas Scale (Kilmann & Thomas, 1977) or the
Dual Concerns Model (Rubin, Pruitt, & Kim, 2004). The scales are based on the concern one
party has for itself versus the concern the party has for the other. This framework is based on
work initially developed by Blake and Mouton (1964) and a two-dimensional model of conflict
resolution created by Kenneth Thomas (1992). These works led to the currently adapted two-
dimensional scale, which outlines five types of conflict resolution: accommodation, avoidance, competition, collaboration, and compromise.

**Accommodation.** In this type of conflict resolution, the individual yields to the desires of the other person with little to no concern for his/her personal interest in the situation. This entails self-sacrifice and may take the form of selfless generosity, charity, or servitude (Kilmann & Thomas, 1977).

**Avoidance.** This type of conflict resolution is engaged when the individual has little or no concern for the other party and the issue at hand is of little to no importance to him/her. This response may take the form of sidestepping an issue, postponement, or simply withdrawing from a threatening position (Kilmann & Thomas, 1977).

**Competition.** When competing, the individual is self-focused and has little to no concern for the opposing party. This individual will use whatever tools are available in order to be declared the victor. This may include arguing, pulling rank, or imposing sanctions (Kilmann & Thomas, 1977).

**Collaboration.** This type of conflict resolution skill is used when the individual’s concern for his/her self-interest is weighed equally against the needs of the opposing party. Collaboration involves understanding and finding a solution that addresses both parties’ objectives fully. Collaboration may involve exploring one another’s disagreements, resolving a conflicting issue, or finding some creative solution that satisfies each party (Kilmann & Thomas, 1977).

**Compromise.** This type of conflict resolution differs from collaboration in that although a solution is reached; neither party is fully satisfied with the solution. In other words, each party is required to concede, split, or seek middle ground on some major issue. Although compromise
might seem to be an egalitarian way to settle a dispute, neither side is fully satisfied (Kilmann & Thomas, 1977).

**Why the Kilmann and Thomas Scale is undesirable in this study.** The Kilmann and Thomas (1977) Scale provides a useful vehicle for understanding various means of settling conflicts. For this study, however, the Kilmann and Thomas Scale is lacking in that the framework consists of five modes. This handicaps the researcher’s ability to compare their framework with Higgs and Rowland’s Framework. Additionally, comparison between the different regions is difficult at best, making Riskin’s Framework a better alternative for the purposes of this study.

**Riskin’s Framework.** Of key interest in this study, is the use of various mediation styles summarized by Leonard L. Riskin (1994, 1996, 2003a, 2003b) and specifically a tool called Riskin’s Framework (Riskin, 1994, 1996). As previously mentioned, Riskin devised two ways of describing how a mediator addresses a conflict. One descriptor classified the mediator’s stance in terms of the narrowness or breadth of its scope. A narrow stance entails defining the conflict in a way that focuses on rights and obligations, whereas a mediator with a broad stance encourages the disputing parties to see beyond a rights-based focus and look at the underlying fears, values, goals, feelings, and interests driving the conflict.

One continuum concerns the goals of the mediation. In other words, it measures the scope of the problem or problems that the mediation seeks to address or resolve. At one end of this continuum sit narrow problems, such as how much one party should pay the other. At the other end lie very broad problems, such as how to improve the conditions in a given community or industry. (Riskin, 1996, p. 17)

The other descriptor deals with whether the mediator takes an evaluative or facilitative approach to the issue. The evaluative mediator often provides direction to the client; this direction may be based on the mediator’s experience, education, training or objectivity. The evaluative mediator may even provide opinions about possible solutions to the conflict. In contrast, the facilitative
mediator believes the clients are capable of solving their own dilemma better than anybody else. Their focus is on enhancing communications and negotiations between the different groups and not interfering by remaining impartial (Noll, 2001).

The second continuum describes the strategies and techniques that the mediator employs to achieve her goal of helping the parties address and resolve the problems at issue. At one end of the continuum are strategies and techniques that evaluate issues important to the dispute or transaction. At the extreme of this evaluative end of the continuum fall behaviors intended to two direct some or all of the outcomes of the mediation. At the other end of the continuum are beliefs and behaviors that facilitate the parties’ negotiation. At the extreme of this facilitative end his conduct intended simply to allow the parties to communicate with and understand one another. (Riskin, 1996, pp. 23-24)

**Evaluative-narrow (Seattle) mediator.** The evaluative-narrow mediator tries to resolve the dispute by evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of each party’s case. To judge the merits of these positions, the evaluative-narrow mediator stresses the superior level of his/her education or experience of the situation. The evaluative-narrow mediator encourages the opposing parties to (a) consider the strengths and weaknesses of their positions, (b) predict the potential outcomes if the dispute were decided by an authority figure, (c) encourage compromise agreements, and (d) endorse a particular settlement proposal (Riskin, 1996).

A principal strategy of the evaluated-narrow approach is to help the parties understand the strengths and weaknesses of their positions and the likely outcomes of litigation or whatever other process they would use if they do not reach a resolution in mediation. But the evaluative-narrow mediator stresses her own education at least as much as that of the other parties. Before the mediation starts, the evaluative-narrow mediator will study relevant documents, such as pleadings, dispositions, reports, and mediation briefs. At the outset of the mediation, such a mediator typically will ask the parties to present their cases, which normally means arguing their positions, in a joint session. Subsequently, most mediation activities take place in private caucuses in which the mediator will gather additional information and deploy evaluated techniques, such as the following which are listed below from police to the most evaluated a). Assess the strengths and weaknesses of each side’s case...b). Predict the outcome of court or other processes...c). Propose position-based compromised agreements...d). Urge or push the parties to settle or to accept a particular settlement proposal or range. (Riskin, 1996, pp. 26-28)
Facilitative-narrow (San Diego) mediator. The facilitative-narrow mediator takes on the role of educator, helping the parties understand the merits of their positions and the ramifications of not reaching an agreement, such as added expenses, delays, and inconvenience. The facilitative-narrow mediator often focuses on helping the parties develop narrow proposals, which can be achieved by asking the parties questions about their positions in the hope that they will develop their own solutions. The goal of this strategy is that the parties will evaluate one another’s proposals in a constructive fashion, leading to a mutually agreeable settlement (Riskin, 1996).

The facilitative-narrow mediator shares the evaluated-narrow mediator’s general strategy—to educate the parties about the strengths and weaknesses of their claims and the likely consequences of failing to settle. But he employs different techniques to carry out the strategy. He does not use his own assessments, predictions, or proposals. Nor does he apply pressure. He is less likely than the evaluative-narrow mediator to request or to study relevant documents. Instead, believing that the burden of decision making should rest with the parties, the facilitative-narrow mediator might engage any of the following activities: a.) Ask questions… b.) Help the parties develop their own narrow proposals… c.) Help the parties exchange proposals… d.) Help the parties evaluate proposals.

The facilitative nature of this mediation approach might also produce a degree of education or transformation. The process itself, which encourages the party to develop their own understandings and outcomes, might educate the parties, or “empower” them by helping them to develop a sense of their own ability to deal with the problems and the choices of life. The parties also might acknowledge or empathize with each other’s situation. However, in a narrowly focused mediation, even a facilitative one, the subject matter normally produces fewer opportunities for such developments than does a facilitative-broad mediation. (Riskin, 1996, pp. 28-29)

Evaluative-broad (Boston) mediator. In the evaluative-broad mediation style, the mediator’s focus is on understanding the nature of the conflict, not the position of the parties. The evaluative-broad mediator directs those involved in a negotiation to understand the ramifications of not reaching an agreement and will encourage the parties to seek broad interest based settlements. The evaluative-broad mediator may even urge parties to accept the mediator’s perspective on a settlement (Riskin, 1996).
It is even more difficult to describe the strategies and techniques of the evaluative-broad mediator. Mediations conducted with such an orientation vary tremendously in scope, often including many narrow, distributed issues, as the previous discussion of the problem definition continuum illustrates. In addition evaluative-broad mediators can be more-or-less evaluated with the evaluative moves touching all or only some of the issues.

The evaluative-broad mediator’s principles strategy is to learn about the circumstances and the underlying interests of the parties and other effective individuals or groups, and then use that knowledge to direct the parties toward an outcome that responds to such interest. To carry out the strategy, the evaluative-broad mediator will play various techniques, including the following (list of from least to most evaluated); a) Educate herself about underlying interests… b) Predict impact (on the interest) of not settling… c) Develop an offer broader (interest based) proposals… d) Urge parties to accept a mediator’s or another proposal. (Riskin, 1996, p. 29-32)

Facilitative-broad (Miami) mediator. Lastly, the facilitative-broad mediator’s strategy lies in helping the parties understand their goals, values, and feelings and reach an agreement that encompasses both their own interests and those of the opposing party. The facilitative-broad mediator encourages both parties to develop mutually beneficial proposals and then helps the parties evaluate the merits of the different proposals. This process allows the parties to recognize one another in the hope of building better a relationship between them (Riskin, 1996).

The facilitative-broad a mediator’s principles strategy is to help the participants the find the subject matter of the mediation in terms of underlying interests and to help them develop and choose their own solutions that respond to such interests. In addition, many facilitative-broad mediators will help participants find opportunities to educate or change themselves, their institutions, or their communities. To carry out some strategies, the facilitative-broad mediator may use the techniques such as the following: a) help parties understand the underlying interests…b) help parties develop and propose broad, interest based options are for settlement…c) help parties evaluate proposal. (Riskin, 1996, pp. 32-35)

Later works of Leonard Riskin and the rationale for focusing on the earlier work. In 2003, Riskin (2003a, 2003b) published an article printed in two journals outlining his concerns about the way his grid was being interpreted. His first concern was that his term evaluative was being interpreted as judgmental. A mediator does not sit in judgment of a conflict; this would be arbitration. This leads to Riskin’s second area of concern; if the term evaluative was being used
interchangeably with judgmental, it could imply that an evaluative mediator is adversarial in his/her approach to conflict resolution in that being judgmental or adversarial stands in stark contrast to the role of the mediator. Furthermore, mediators are supposed to help the disputing parties determine the solution for themselves. Once the mediator takes on the role of judge or adversary, all hopes for a settlement based on self-determination are dashed. To offset the misuse of this terminology, Riskin proposed that the term *evaluative* be replaced with *directive*, and *facilitative* with the term *elicited*. His hope for this new terminology is that the axis of evaluative versus facilitative will be interpreted either as mediator-influenced or party-influenced negotiations. For the purpose of this study, the issue is rendered moot as the original grid is the more widely used of the two and the structure of the long interviews took this subtle meaning into account.

**Using the Research Sciences to Compare Riskin’s Mediation Style Grid through Riskin’s Model against the Leadership Models in Organizational Change**

Organizational change through evolutionary theory offers a similar paradigm by which to frame the issues. For the purposes of this study, it is vital to delineate the difference between complicated systems and complex systems. A complicated system, such as a thesaurus, is rich in detail. In contrast, a complex system, such as a multinational organization, is rich in structure (Sammut-Bonnici & Wensley, 2002).

The complexity of a problem describes whether the stance is narrow or broad. To address complex problems successfully, the approach needs to have simple rules and goals because the environment keeps shifting and the organization needs to be able to adapt to the ensuing chaos. A complicated system is one that has many parts, and a leader must have a great deal of expertise in order to address the separate components competently. The evaluative stance is the best
approach to working with a complicated system, since a leader who wants to manage this type of system successfully must have experience, education, training, or objectivity (Higgs & Rowland, 2005; Lichtenstein, 1995; Sammut-Bonnici & Wensley, 2002).

Shaw (1997) offers some important advice about the challenges that may be encountered in addressing a highly complex situation. Complexity is turbulent and as such borders on instability. If an organization is to regain stability, the organization must adapt, co-evolving with its environment in an unrestricted fashion. This evolutionary process will generate tension between stability and instability, but this is healthy. As anxieties rise from lack of agreement, patience is required as a guard against using any form of control, since the process requires complex learning and the future is uncertain. Intervention is only allowed to assist, stimulate, and provoke communications, as feedback loops are required to legitimize the evolving solution. All parties should be aware and anxieties should be contained, to understand that the successful leader may amplify existing sources of difference, friction and contention so that complex learning might occur.

A complex environment is highly turbulent, meaning that products and technologies are changing rapidly and may have a short lifespan. In order to survive this turbulence, an organization must think outside the box and search for new ways of solving the issues at hand; therefore, innovation is Key. The people involved in this arena must make a massive commitment and be highly motivated. They are best managed in an organic fashion. The participants balance each other’s strengths against their weaknesses both internally and externally with the environment (Morgan, 1997).
Seattle Quadrant: Understanding how Pedantic Science, evaluative-narrow mediation, and situational leadership relate to each other. A problem that is highly complicated but not very complex falls within a region referred to as the Pedantic Science Quadrant. Higgs and Rowland (2000, 2001, 2005) also call this the directive or simple quadrant. Problem-solving strategies related to this quadrant are characterized by the following qualities: (a) an executive or a small group initiating, driving and or managing the change; (b) a small range of interventions, only some targets, tightly controlled communications; and (c) a set of explicit project management directives that give little or no attention to capability development. Kotter (1995) notes that urgency and anchoring to organizational culture can also help solve the problem. Duck (1993) describes eight primary leadership responsibilities unique to the pedantic quadrant. In order to successfully navigate a pedantic problem, a leader must: (a) establish a context for change and provide guidance; (b) stimulate conversation; (c) provide appropriate resources; (d) coordinate and align projects; (e) ensure congruence of messages, activities, policies, and behaviors; (f) provide opportunities for joint creation; (g) anticipate, identify, and address people problems; and (h) prepare the critical mass for the ensuing decision.

The organization is secure in its methodology, administers services in a cost-efficient manner, and runs efficiently and routinely. The employees are mechanistic in their approach to problems and define their positions narrowly. The management style most successful in this environment is an authoritarian approach (Morgan, 1997).

Many similarities exist between Pedantic Science and evaluative-narrow mediation. The evaluative-narrow mediator reviews the facts and documentation associated with a case, assessing the case on its strengths and weaknesses; this kind of mediator possesses a good understanding of the likely settlements or judgments to ensue. During the mediation, this
mediator employs evaluative techniques such as: (a) urging parties to settle or accept a settlement proposal; (b) using position-based compromise agreements; (c) forecasting court outcomes; (d) persuading parties to accept mediator assessments; and or (e) assessing the strengths and weaknesses of each side (Noll, 2001).

Based on this analysis, situational leadership shows the most promise in the Pedantic Science quadrant. The situational leadership model is intuitive, easy to understand, and widely used, and can be used easily as a recipe to resolve a given situation. The evaluative-narrow leader would most likely: (a) be mechanistic in his/her approach to problems, (b) define his/her positions narrowly, and (c) run the organization efficiently and routinely. The management style most successful in this environment is an authoritarian approach where the leaders can pick from the following limited leadership techniques: (a) directing, (b) coaching, (c) supporting, and (d) delegating.

**Miami Quadrant: Understanding how Practitioner Science, facilitative-broad mediation, and servant leadership relate to each other.** Problems that are characterized by a low degree of complication and a high degree of complexity fall into a region known as the Practitioner Science Quadrant, which Higgs and Rowland (2000, 2001, 2005) also call the emergent quadrant. The quadrant has few rules and a loose set of directions. Communications are wide-ranging and constant, as is the sharing of information and ideas. Expertise outside of the area of concern and novel mixes of people help an organization find alternative solutions to this type of problem. An organization facing a problem in this quadrant places an emphasis on innovation and experimentation.

To address problems in the Practitioner Quadrant, a mediator should adopt a facilitative-broad perspective, encouraging the negotiating parties to consider their broad ranging interests
rather than their rights. The facilitative-broad mediator helps the parties find alternative means to settle their disputes by discussing their underlying interests and developing creative solutions. The legal position takes a back seat as the substantive issues are addressed. Facilitative-broad mediators need only to keep the parties focused on the realistic aspects of their proposals; they must be careful not to provide predictions, assessments, or recommendations, as this would take away from the holistic nature of the arrived-upon solution (Noll, 2001).

Servant leadership fits nicely into this arena. Wheatley (2004a), a pioneer in this area, suggests five components of a successful servant leader: (a) do no harm, (b) have faith in people, (c) move from the leader as hero to the leader as host, (d) do not try to control events, and (e) lead the conversation. Wheatley (2004b) notes several core principles of servant leadership that are crucial to developing relationships: (a) nourishing a clear identity; (b) focusing on the bigger picture; (c) demanding honest, forthright communication; (d) preparing for the unknown; (e) keeping meaning at the forefront; (f) using rituals and symbols; and (g) paying attention to individuals.

**San Diego Quadrant: Understanding how Puerile Science, facilitative-narrow mediation, and LMX Leadership relate to each other.** The Puerile Science Quadrant shares some of the attributes of both the Pedantic and Practitioner Quadrants. The facilitative-narrow focused mediator (Puerile Quadrant) has a straightforward definition of the solution like the evaluative-narrow mediator, but does not try to assess or predict outcomes, form opinions by reading or studying relevant documents, or apply pressure to reach consensus. This mediator will, however, use caucuses to help each side gain an appreciation of the opponent’s position and the consequences of not settling (Noll, 2001).
Situations characterized by a low degree of complexity and complication fall into the Puerile Science quadrant, a region that Higgs and Rowland (2000, 2001, 2005) refer as the self-assembly or DIY (do it yourself) quadrant. In this quadrant, the decision process is pushed down in the ranks to the lower levels, but control is maintained as only a narrow range exists for allowable solutions. Leaders in this arena commonly respond to problems by using one size fits all solution matrices or templates, leaving minimal opportunities for personalization. Innovation is allowed, but limited to established boundaries. Training programs are an important aspect of this quadrant, as development is dispersed through a narrow top-down approach of institutional learning.

Senge’s (1997) work, Communities of Leaders and Learners, focuses on the Puerile and Pragmatic Quadrants. He describes the self-assembly aspect of the Puerile Quadrant, as local participants work with direction from experts to solve their own problems. Obviously this implies that local leaders have significant sine qua non responsibility. Top-level expert managers still keep their eye on the organization by mentoring local leaders and becoming their thinking partners. If the organization encounters an undefined situation, then these top-level expert managers are prepared to become stewards of the mediation and push institutional change if needed.

Pascale (1990; Pascale et al., 1997) discusses the Puerile Quadrant from the perspective of how corporate culture can impact change within the organization. For him, four traits define this quadrant: (a) power, (b) identity, (c) conflict, and (d) learning. To measure the success of these traits he has developed an after-action review process that includes seven disciplines: (a) building an intricate understanding of the business, (b) encouraging uncompromising straight talk, (c) managing for the future, (d) harnessing setbacks, (e) promoting inventive accountability,
(f) understanding the quid pro quo, and (g) creating relentless discomfort with the status quo (Pascale et al., 1997).

As mentioned previously, LMX theory is based on the philosophy that leaders should treat followers as specific individuals rather than as a group. The leader promotes opportunities for the individuals to take on new roles and responsibilities while building trust and respect. The expectation is that the followers will then reciprocate with a willingness to do more than is required of them and look for innovative ways to advance the goals of the organization (Northouse, 2007).

**Boston Quadrant: Understanding how Pragmatic Science, evaluative-broad mediation, and transformational leadership, relate to each other.** Situations that are characterized by a high degree of both complication and complexity fall within the Pragmatic Science Quadrant, which Higgs and Rowland (2000, 2001, 2005) also call the *master* quadrant. The Pragmatic Quadrant is diametrically opposed to the Puerile Quadrant; unlike the Puerile Quadrant, change in the Pragmatic Quadrant is driven directly by the expert or top group. The leadership oversees the organization, but the process is responsive and adaptable to new ideas and innovations. If training is needed it is developed as the solution to the problem at hand takes shape.

The pragmatic mediator believes that there are many solutions to a problem, and that each side must be given direction on how to interpret the other side’s intent. Pragmatic mediators will speculate on outcomes, form opinions by reading or studying relevant documents, and apply pressure to settle by emphasizing options that satisfy broader interests rather than narrow positions (Noll, 2001).
To ensure success in addressing problems that reside in this quadrant, Nadler and Tushman (1999) propose a strategic architecture, which includes the general concepts of maintaining flexibility and focusing on speed. Nadler and Tushman identify eight core competencies related to strategic architecture: (a) increased organizational clock speed, (b) design structural divergence, (c) organizational modularity, (d) hybrid distribution channels, (e) asymmetrical research and development, (f) mediator processes, (g) organizational coherence, and (h) team management.

Beer and Nohria (2000a, 2000b) offer a wonderful review of directive and emergence stances with their E and O theories. Using these two theories, these authors offer guidelines for dealing with the particularities of the pragmatic quadrant. For theory E they present six points: (a) maximize shareholder value, (b) manage change from the top down, (c) emphasize structure and systems, (d) plan and establish programs, (d) motivate through financial incentive, and (f) have consultants analyze problems and shape solutions. For theory O, they present another six points: (a) develop organizational capabilities, (b) encourage participation from the bottom up, (c) build up corporate culture (employees’ behavior and attitudes), (d) experiment and evolve, (e) motivate through commitment—use pay as fair exchange, and (f) ensure that consultants support management in shaping their own solutions. Combining the two theories together, they present several guidelines for the pragmatic quadrant. First, they emphasize the need to understand and embrace the paradox that exists between economic value and organizational capability. Secondly, although expert participants provide the bulk of direction, the non-experts must also be embraced. Finding consensus is never easy; in their third point, they mention that structures and systems, also known as the hard structure, need to be considered simultaneously along with the corporate culture, also called the soft structure. To accomplish this, their fourth
point entails planning for spontaneity. The remaining fifth and sixth points are: to reinforce change while not driving it, and to use resources to empower the participants.

Transformational leaders mirror this assessment as they influence the followers’ emotions, values, ethics, standards, and motives in an attempt to get followers to accomplish more than is expected of them. Based on this analysis, this leadership style shows the most promise in the pragmatic quadrant since transformational leaders focus on positive intrinsic reward and provide: (a) idealized influence, (b) inspirational motivation, (c) intellectual stimulation, and (d) individualized consideration. Transformational leaders establish a positive relationship with their followers by improving their performance and developing the followers to their fullest potential, which supports the greater good of the community (Northouse, 2007).

Mixing quadrants. When strategy is misaligned with the environment, the organization is inherently unstable. Miles and Snow (2003) refer to this misalignment as the reactor stance. Morgan (1997) notes that organizations adopting a reactor stance tend to be bureaucratized excessively and more inclined to defend their current position rather than search out innovative solutions. He also adds that this instability leads to frustration among the participants because they desire more open and demanding jobs than the strategy, technology, organization, or managerial style allows. This implies that the mediator should operate out of only one quadrant at a time (Riskin, 1996). Mixing quadrants, or employing a cross-border strategy, often leads to a period of organizational instability. If this strategy is not corrected to align with the environment using only one quadrant, it is highly unlikely that the leader will be able to guide the organization through its problem successfully. Additionally if the meditation style changes from one quadrant to another, then the period of transition will be a time of instability. Therefore, the quadrant change must be handled as expeditiously as possible.
Strategy Implementation Based on Framework Similarities

One of the interesting problems facing the field of organizational change is the lack of methodology with which to determine in which quadrant the organization needs to operate. Higgs and Rowland (2000, 2001, 2005) do not address this issue; they merely provide a cross-reference index. In mediation, the parties and mediator must decide on a quadrant from which to operate, but few guidelines exist about how the group should proceed. In building an understanding of their respective approaches, a great deal of overlap between the fields of organizational change and mediation becomes evident. To address the aforementioned problem, mediation can benefit from the literature on Organization Behavior, Development, Change, and Leadership because it can offer perspectives on how to manage in the different quadrants.

Tyler’s Basic Principles and the Relationship between a Leader and Mediator using the STAR Approach to facilitate Conflict Resolution

In his Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction (1949) Tyler states, “if we are to study an educational program systematically and intelligently we must first be sure as to the educational objectives aimed at” (p. 1). The pioneer in the application of objectives to curriculum, Tyler defined four basic objective-centered principles:

1. What educational purposes should the school seek to attain? (objectives)
2. What educational experiences that can be provided are likely to attain these purposes? (experiences)
3. How can these educational experiences be effectively organized? (organization)
4. How can we determine whether these purposes are being attained?
   (evaluation; p. 1)
Tyler (1949) did not attempt to answer these questions. His purpose was to provide “a rational by which to examine problems of curriculum and instruction” (p. 3). Tyler recommended this rationale be used by curriculum/course developers based on the needs of their particular institution and curriculum. These principles are used as a component of the framework for the *STAR Approach to Facilitate Conflict Resolution*. Though the STAR acronym stands for Situation, Task, Action, and Result, the *STAR Approach to Facilitate Conflict Resolution* has come to represent five stages: (a) convening, (b) opening, (c) communicating, (d) negotiating, and (e) closing. In each stage the participants must ask the following questions: (a) what task is being accomplished, (b) how to act on the task, and (c) what results are needed (Straus Institute for Dispute Resolution, 2005).

**Convening phase.** Convening is the most difficult phase in both organizational change and mediation. In both fields of study, the parties involved in the situation must come to terms with their environment and their strategy in the environment. The mediator and the leader of the organization share common roles and must make common observations and decisions. First, the leader must assess the environment and determine whether it is: stable and certain (straightforward), turbulent (complex), or somewhere in between. Next, the leader must determine what strategy will best suit the environment. He/she must decide whether the organization’s posture should be: defensive and focused on goal setting (evaluative), proactive and focused on creating a learning system (facilitative) or somewhere in between. In contingency theory, this process is similar to making an initial assessment about whether the situation calls for a defender, prospector, or analyzer stance. In relation to Riskin’s Framework, this would be similar to determining in which quadrant the situation belongs. If there is a misalignment, then the mediator must realize that the situation is inherently unstable. Before the mediator can
continue, he/she must make structural realignments to the meditation by moving as quickly as possible to a specific quadrant. From Riskin’s Framework, this is the same as saying that one party is in the Seattle Quadrant and the other party is in the Miami Quadrant: an incompatible situation. Before the mediation can begin, the parties must agree on which quadrant they need to be in before the process can start. Once the environment and strategy are determined, the task, action, and result may be determined (Straus Institute for Dispute Resolution, 2005).

**Opening phase.** As stated previously, in the convening phase the mediator determines the quadrant in which the process needs to start. Based on this quadrant, the mediator establishes guidelines for the mediation. If the process starts in the Boston Quadrant, then the mediator directs those involved in a negotiation to understand the ramifications of not reaching an agreement and encourages the parties to seek broad interest-based settlements. The mediator may even urge parties to accept the mediator’s perspective on a settlement (Riskin, 1996). Similar to the mediator, if the leader finds himself/herself in the Boston Quadrant, then the technology employed will encompass complex and highly discretionary roles. The leader will be expected to be self-actualizing and completely focused on the situation at hand. Rewards will be organic in nature and the structure will be democratic.

**Communication phase.** In the first two phases, the leader or mediator has developed the structure of the process and explained the roles that will be involved. As the name suggests, the communication phase involves the lines of communication both within the group and external to the group. If the leader finds himself/herself in the Seattle Quadrant, communications will be formal and structured and he/she will use a top-down approach, giving explicit instructions about what is expected. Communications between the different participants will be controlled or strictly monitored. If the approach aligns with the Miami Quadrant, then communication is free
flowing and informal, with the leader searching continuously for new meaning. Leadership will feed ideas after idea in a bottom-up approach and consensus will reign supreme (Higgs & Rowland, 2000, 2001, 2005)

**Negotiation phase.** Now that the leaders and mediators have formed the structure, defined the roles involved, and established lines of communication, the leaders and mediators must decide how to resolve the issues at hand. A key component of the negotiation stage involves understanding and respecting the boundaries of the chosen quadrant. As long as the process stays within the selected quadrant, contingency theory maintains that the process will remain stable. If the process deviates from the chosen quadrant, then the process becomes unstable. It is perfectly acceptable to change quadrants, as there may be a natural progression if the view of the environment and strategy change. However, it is essential that the transition from one quadrant to the next occurs as rapidly as possible (Miles & Snow, 2003).

**Closing phase.** Coming full circle in the closing phase, open systems theory establishes a memorable idea; mediation and organizations are living, changing entities. They have boundaries and interact with the environment around them. As with any other living entity, their lives are finite. There must be some form of closure or celebration to signal the transcending from one presence to another presence (Morgan, 1997).

**Conclusion**

Higgs and Rowland’s Framework provides a rubric for determining whether or not a relationship exists between mediation and leadership styles, demonstrating that the STAR mediation matrix can be used as a framework for establishing how leadership of an organization may set up and monitor a change process. The STAR approach has five stages: (a) convening, (b) opening, (c) communicating, (d) negotiating, and (e) closing. In each stage the participants
must ask the following questions: (a) what task is being accomplished, (b) how to act on the task, and (c) what results are needed (Straus Institute for Dispute Resolution, 2005). Additionally, Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) may also draw upon the field of organizational change in its development of mediation tools associated with Riskin’s Framework. The Pragmatic Quadrant optimizes the process, defines the environment as being stable and certain, and defines the strategy as being defensive in nature. For the Practitioner Quadrant, the prospector stance optimizes the process, but in this quadrant the environment is highly turbulent, which means that products and technologies are rapidly changing and may have a short life span. Therefore the strategy must be proactive and fluid to maximize the organization’s potential. Both the Puerile and Pragmatic Quadrants would fall into the analyzer stance of contingency theory. In these stances the organization is dealing with a moderate amount of environmental change. Technical developments are not extreme and considered regular in pace; therefore, the strategy is neither excessively defensive nor excessively proactive. Although still a work in progress, by understanding the nature of where each party stands in relationship to the Dual Concerns Model, the hope is that the peacemaker will be able to determine the motivating factors of the parties involved. The researcher believes that by studying Higgs and Rowland’s Framework and Riskin’s Framework, a potential relationship may be discovered between mediation and leadership styles.
Chapter 3: Methodology

This study aimed to determine whether relationships exist between organizational leadership and mediation styles by conducting a phenomenological study, which offered the opportunity to understand perceptions, perspectives, and situations through lengthy interviews comprising topic-centered questions. These interviews were conducted with carefully selected participants whose experiences were interpreted through the lenses of both organizational leadership and dispute resolution. Participants were knowledgeable about the intent of the research and were free to help guide the research in terms of determining whether a relationship exists or not. By looking at the same situations from multiple perspectives, the researcher found that Higgs and Rowland’s Framework and Riskin’s Framework held the key to determining whether a potential relationship exists between mediation and leadership style.

Restatement of Problem and Purpose

As previously stated, the purpose of this study was to determine whether a relationship exists between organizational leadership and mediation styles. The comprehensive research question was as follows: What relationship, if any exists between organizational leadership styles and mediation styles as described by Riskin (1996)? This comprehensive question was then broken down into the following specific research components:

1. What relationship, if any, exists between the evaluative-narrow approach to mediation and situational leadership?
2. What relationship, if any, exists between the evaluative-broad approach to mediation and transformational leadership?
3. What relationship, if any, exists between the facilitative-narrow approach to mediation and Leader Member Exchange (LMX) theory?
4. What relationship, if any, exists between the facilitative-broad approach to mediation and servant leadership?

If a relationship was found to exist, then many of the techniques developed for mediators could be applied to various leadership development tools used to train managers in the art of conflict resolution. These techniques could then be applied to the various realms of disputes, providing a methodology for making local and global leadership more successful.

Research Design

The research design entailed a 2 x 2 phenomenological qualitative study. This type of study was used to determine whether or not comparisons could be drawn between two variables as described in Higgs and Rowland’s Framework and another set of two variables as described in Riskin’s Framework. The researcher hoped that this study would provide a foundation for comparing the fields of organizational leadership and mediation.

The researcher decided to use a qualitative design for this study. Creswell (1998) describes qualitative research thusly:

Qualitative research is an inquiry process of understanding based on distinct methodological traditions of inquiry that explore a social or human problem. The research builds a complex, holistic picture, analyzes words, reports detailed views of informants, and conducts the study in a natural setting. (Creswell, 1998, p. 15)

The researcher selected a qualitative design for several reasons. First, in qualitative research, the outcome is secondary in importance to the process. In other words, this study was interested in discovering the meanings people associate with making sense of a specific individual or events. One of the strengths of qualitative research is that it focuses on obtaining descriptive data, where understanding is gained through participants’ descriptions. Finally, qualitative research is inductive; by asking a few simple questions, the researcher hoped to build abstractions, concepts, hypotheses, and theories (Creswell, 1994).
This study employed a sub-type of qualitative research called a phenomenological study. The strength of a phenomenological study is in its ability to explore the essence of the human conscience through experiences, where individuals describe the meaning of their lived experience from the perspective of a specific concept or phenomenon. The researcher in turn set aside all preconceptions, framed participant perceptions based on the concept or phenomenon being investigated, and developed a mental picture of the experience through intuition and imagination in order to:

- determine what an experience means for the persons who have had the experience and are able to provide a comprehensive description of it. From the individual descriptions, general or universal meanings are derived, in other words, the essences of structures of the experience. (Moustakas, 1994, p. 13)

Simply put, a phenomenological study focuses on an individual’s perceptions, perspectives, and understanding of a specific situation or event, rather than on how others view the individual’s reaction. The researcher is not detached from the process since he/she may have a personal experience of the specific situation or event. Through an unbiased exchange with the individual, the researcher seeks to understand how others handled a similar situation in the hope of drawing generalizations about their shared situation or event (Leedy & Ormrod, 2005).

From the Moustakas (1994) quote, Creswell (1994) extrapolates five key elements to be addressed in a phenomenological study:

1. The researcher needs to understand the philosophical perspective behind the approach, especially the concept of studying how people experience a phenomenon.
2. The investigator writes research questions that explore the meaning of that experience for individuals and asks individuals to describe their everyday lived experiences.
3. The investigator then collects data from individuals who have experienced the phenomenon under investigation.
4. The phenomenological data analysis steps are generally similar for all psychological phenomenologists who discuss the methods.

5. The phenomenological report ends with the reader understanding better the essential, invariant structure (or essence) of the experience, recognizing that a single unifying meaning of the experience exists. (pp. 54-55)

In spite of these guidelines, Creswell notes that a phenomenological study may still be difficult to perform, basing this perspective on several factors. First, the researcher needs to have a thorough understanding of the phenomenon. Second, the researcher needs to select participants who have firsthand experience with the phenomenon under investigation. Next, the researcher needs to consider carefully how he/she introduces his/her own personal experiences into the study. Lastly, the researcher may have difficulty bracketing personal experiences.

Through this concern about bracketing, this phenomenological research was structured as a 2 x 2 study, also commonly known as a two-factor designed experiment. As stated previously, this structure was chosen because the research centers around two variables: task complication and relationship complexity. Drew and Hardman (1985) state that the number of experimental variables is an essential determinant of design configuration. The experimental variable, of course, is that factor or question that is under study…Frequently, the researcher is interested in investigating two experimental variables in the same study. This may be conveniently accomplished by using what is known as a two-factor design. (pp. 87-88)

Each variable has two levels (low and high) and the variables exist independently of each. As mentioned previously, Riskin (1996) has created a grid describing the intersection of these variables, giving rise to four unique quadrants: Seattle, Boston, San Diego, and Miami. The Seattle Quadrant describes issues that are highly complicated, but with low complexity relationships; the Boston Quadrant describes issues that are highly complicated and characterized by highly complex relationships; the San Diego Quadrant describes issues that are low in
complication and have low complexity relationships; and the Miami Quadrant describes issues that are low in complication, but with highly complex relationships.

Creswell (1994) emphasizes the importance of researchers maintaining a “philosophy without presuppositions” (p. 52). This researcher aimed to suspend any prejudgments by creating a design with four independent test groups and asking those test groups a battery of questions. By addressing these elements and heeding Creswell’s concerns, the phenomenological study allowed the researcher to explore a potential relationship between Higgs and Rowland’s Framework and Riskin’s Framework.

**Population and Participant Sample**

The sample size in phenomenological studies typically ranges from five to 25 participants and is limited to only those who have experience with the phenomenon in question (Creswell, 1994). Although random sampling would be the preferred sampling method, this study focused specifically on leadership qualities, meaning that some level of researcher bias is inherent in the selection of analysis units. Therefore this study employed purposive sampling to select participants, as certain individuals were selected *on purpose* to participate in this survey (McCall, 2000). The researcher sorted these individuals into two specific strata, or artificial groupings. First, they had to be leaders within their organizations, and second, they had to deal directly with disputes on a daily basis. This study used Northouse’s (2007) definition of leadership: “a process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal” (p. 3).

Given the strata, the researcher surveyed eight leaders in four unique organizational structures/sectors: (a) civil servant, (b) judicial, (c) corporate, and (d) community. These leaders were only to have a cursory relationship with the researcher; the researcher may have known the
individuals, but would not have had detailed interaction with them. Additionally, the number of people to be interviewed reflected the fact that phenomenological studies utilize lengthy interviews; the sample of eight participants was an acceptable size for the time and effort required to administer the interviews (Figure 13; Easterby-Smith, Thorpe, & Lowe, 2002).

**Quinn and Rohbaugh’s Framework with Leadership Models, Participants and Quadrant Identifiers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Flexibility</th>
<th>Internal Process Model</th>
<th>Rational Goal Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stability</td>
<td></td>
<td>Situational Leadership (Seattle Quadrant)</td>
<td>Transformational Leadership (Boston Quadrant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Participants from the Judicial Sector</td>
<td>Participants from the Corporate Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Relations Model</td>
<td>Open Systems Model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader Member Exchange Theory (San Diego Quadrant)</td>
<td>Servant Leadership (Miami Quadrant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants from the Civil Servant Sector</td>
<td>Participants from the Community Sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 13.* Two-factor phenomenological designed study used to determine the relationships between organizational and mediation style.

The list of candidates was compiled from several sources: a review of the literature; the researcher’s list of personal contacts; and referrals from trusted, knowledgeable individuals. The list of candidates included individuals representing each the four organization types. The researcher sent invitations to participate in the study sequentially based on closest geographic proximity to the researcher until two individuals from each group volunteered. The initial contact was made in one of the following ways: via an in-person invitation, telephone call, letter, e-mail, or third party.

The participants shared some common characteristics in that they were leaders in their respective organizations and dealt directly with disputes on a daily basis. Also because of the
uniqueness of phenomenological studies, these individuals were expected to have at least a casual understanding of the survey and subject matter being investigated.

**Data Collection**

**Role of the researcher.** When collecting data in a research study, the researcher’s role is to maintain an environment that is objective as possible. Leedy and Ormrod (2005) assert that in order for the researcher to remain objective, he/she must understand that research does not involve: (a) merely gathering information, (b) transporting facts from one location to another, or (c) rummaging for information. Also, according to Leedy and Ormrod, objective research may not be used simply to embellish an issue. Rather, the authors define research as “a systemic process of collecting, analyzing, and interpreting information (data) in order to increase our understanding of the phenomenon about which we are interested or concerned” (p. 2). From the researcher’s perspective, this study’s use of a qualitative interview was paramount since the topic of interest was undeveloped in the academic field and, as of this writing, did not lend itself well to the artificiality of experimental design or the superficiality of surveys in quantitative research. This study strove to find generalizations based on the “real life context in which events occur and the manner in which the many complex variables interact, with a minimum of intrusion and an absence of any attempt to control or manipulate variable” (Isaac & Michael, 1995, p. 219).

**The long, focused interview.** The long interview is an indispensable tool for phenomenological studies. This data collection method involves an in-depth interview with a small number of participants who have firsthand knowledge about the phenomenon being investigated. For this specific study, each interview lasted up to 2 hours. In addition to the interviews, the researcher gathered additional data by engaging in self-reflection and consulting respected sources regarding the phenomenon being studied (Creswell, 1994; McCracken, 1988;
Moustakas, 1994). This required the interviewer to continuously monitor and maintain close control of the interviews’ (a) range, (b) specificity, (c) depth, and (d) personal context. The interviewer was therefore responsible for encouraging the range of responses to be as broad as possible in order to allow for evocative elements and patterns to emerge. However, the interviewer also ensured that the participant focused his/her responses specifically on the topic at hand. These highly specific responses allowed the participant to provide enough depth to elicit the affective, cognitive, and evaluative significance of his/her experience. This depth in turn brought out the innermost attributes, affording the researcher an understanding of the participant’s context of the phenomenon (Merton, Lowenthal, & Kendall, 1990).

As is generally recognized, one of the principle reasons for the use of interviews rather than questionnaires is to uncover a diversity of relevant responses, whether or not these have been anticipated by the inquirer. There would be little point in using the interview as all, if it simply resolved itself into a fixed list of stock questions put by the interviewer. For this would abandon a distinctive merit of the interview in comparison with the questionnaire: the give-and-take which helps the interviewee decode and report the meanings which a situation held for him. It would mean the loss of that collaboration which encourages the interviewee to continue his self-exploration of an experience until some measure of clarity is attained. (Merton et al., 1990, pp. 12-13)

The interviews were focused, meaning that participants being interviewed had experienced the situation under investigation. The researcher had also conducted an analysis of potentially significant elements via the literature review. This analysis informs the interview development process, which will be discussed in detail in the coming sections. The following interview guide outlines the strategy by which the interviewer delved into the participants’ subjective experiences in an effort to understand their definition of the phenomenon (Merton et al., 1990).

**Interview guide.** This guide is divided into several different sections, all of which play an important part in conducting a long, focused interview. When conducting an interview, the researcher needed to focus on the following key elements: (a) non-verbal communication, (b)
listening, (c) questioning, and (d) capturing. Adhering to this format allowed the researcher to maintain a data-gathering environment that was as objective as possible.

**Non-verbal communication.** Non-verbal communication contributes 55% of the overall information gleaned from a conversation. An additional 38% is further garnered from vocal tone and inflection. As a result, only seven percent of the information from a conversation is gleaned from the meaning of the words that are spoken (Alfini, Press, Sternlight, & Stulberg, 2001). Therefore, the researcher paid close attention to the participants’ non-verbal language, since it was a valuable source of information. However, the researcher was cautious, recognizing that non-verbal communication serves only as a guidepost or indicator. As Alfini et al. (2001) note,

Traditionally, body language experts identified standing with one’s arms crossed in front as a “closed posture” that indicates that individual unwillingness to participate or hostility to the person or issue being discussed. Today, we understand that there might be many different reasons for assuming such a posture – e.g., one is cold, one is comfortable like that, one is missing a button and trying to cover it up, and on and on. Experts now say that we should look at the total package of behaviors that an individual exhibits and, more importantly, at changes in behaviors. (p. 124)

It is also important for researchers to note that non-verbal communication is bi-directional, since the participant will be observing the researcher’s non-verbal messages as well. Therefore, the researcher tried to maintain as neutral a position and tone of voice as possible while interviewing, but still observing the participant’s non-verbal communication.

**Listening.** According to Ury (1991), listening is the “opportunity to interrupt the chorus of monologues” (p. 55). Along these lines, Ury asserts that active listeners need to “tune into their [participants’] wavelengths” (p. 65) Researchers are encouraged to observe the participant’s sensory language and adapt his/her communication style to match the participant’s. Alfini et al. (2001) present a list of sensory language skills that communicate to the participant that the researcher is listening carefully:
1. Successful and appropriate eye contact;

2. Appropriate facial gestures;

3. Appropriate affirmative head nods (Remember that the nod of the head can be interpreted as agreement or acknowledge. A mediator should try to be consistent with any nods to avoid concern regarding lack of impartiality);

4. Avoidance of actions or gestures that suggest boredom (such as yawning and leaning on your hand);

5. Asking clarifying questions;

6. Paraphrasing using neutral words;

7. Not interrupting the speaker;

8. Not talking too much; and

9. Acknowledging and validating feelings and thoughts (having empathy). (pp. 122-123)

**Questions.** Interview questions fall into three basic categories: (a) unstructured, (b) semi-structured and (c) structured (Merton et al., 1990). Unstructured questions, also commonly referred to as open questions, are designed to allow the participant to respond freely. Examples may include, What do you think about this issue? or Can you please elaborate on that further? These questions garner a wealth of information for the researcher while providing a stimulus-free environment for the participant. Once the participant broached a topic of interest, the researcher drew out the details of the specific issue by using semi-structured questions. Clarifying questions are one type of semi-structured question; they involve a pointed inquiry from the researcher that provides a deeper understanding of a piece of information. Can you explain that issue in greater detail? or How do you think the issue could have been resolved? are examples of clarifying questions. However, clarifying questions by definition are still somewhat general in nature. To
understand the participant’s specific reaction, another form of semi-structured question called a justification question may be useful. The researcher used justification questions carefully, as they could inadvertently cause the participant to become defensive. For example, instead of asking, Why did you act that way? a more tactful question would be, Can you explain the different options that were available and how you felt about the use of each one? The researcher must be also aware that a tactful justification question could easily become a compound question, which is a question that implies a multitude of meanings. For example, Do you think the individual was drinking and driving or having an adverse reaction to medication? Due to their complex nature, compound questions should be avoided. The last type of question is the structured or closed question. This question may be answered with a yes or no response, or may be answered using a set of optional responses; Based on what you saw the individual do, do you think the individual was drunk? Although this type of question may extract a specific piece of information, the perception may not be complete, meaning that the participant could have provided additional information on the given topic. Closed questions should be used infrequently and are an excellent way to conclude a line of questioning (Alfini et al., 2001).

Capturing. Capturing is the last area covered in the interview guide. Before the interview started, the participant was asked to sign a release statement. This statement offered the participant an opportunity to remain confidential or allow his/her name to be published as part of this research. If the individual chose to remain anonymous, then the researcher protected his/her identity and removed any identifying information such as his/her real name and place of employment. The main body of the research focused on the researcher asking each participant an unstructured question. After posing this unstructured question, the researcher followed up with a mixture of semi-structured and structured questions. These interviews were conducted in person
and the researcher informed the participants about the questions in advance. The interviews were audio recorded following all applicable requirements established by the Pepperdine University’s IRB process (discussed in the section entitled “IRB Requirements”). After the interviews were completed, the researcher provided transcripts to the participants for their review and feedback.

**Timeline**

The researcher commenced the interviews in July of 2009, and the entire process lasted 3 years. With permission secured from the Pepperdine University’s IRB process (discussed in the section entitled “IRB Requirements”), invitations were extended to potential research participants. Once a participant accepted the invitation, the researcher scheduled the interview and gave the participant a consent form to sign (Appendix A). The researcher then conducted the interview, created a transcript of the interview, and sent a copy of the transcript to the participant for review and feedback. The researcher analyzed the transcripts and provided an analysis of each response as it pertained to the research topic.

**Ethical Concerns**

Phenomenological studies offer a unique realm where the researcher can greatly influence the outcome of the results.

The challenge facing the human science researcher is to describe things in themselves, to permit what is before one to enter consciousness and to be understood in its meaning and essences in the light of intuition and self-reflection. The process involves a blending of what is really present with what is imagined as present from the vantage point of possible meanings; thus a unity of the real and the ideal. (Moustakas, 1994, p. 27)

To address the concern that the researcher may have assumed too much control over the outcome, the participants had the opportunity to comment on the transcript of their interviews, as mentioned previously. However, this safety measure was not enough to ensure that there would be no bias from the researcher, because, regardless of the safeguards that were incorporated, the researcher ultimately conducted the final data analysis. The implications of this quandary were
clear; the researcher needed to use the most stringent ethical safeguards possible in order to produce honest results. To this end, Gellerman, Frankel, and Ladenson (1990) offer an excellent framework of ethical guidelines for researchers. In this work, the authors helped leading practitioners of organizational and human research development develop a statement regarding ethics for the profession. This process resulted in the establishment of five major areas of responsibility to which a researcher should be beholden:

1. Responsibility to self;
2. Responsibilities for professional development and competence;
3. Responsibilities to client and significant others;
4. Responsibilities to the profession; and
5. Social responsibilities.

In spite of the fact that it is still impossible to guarantee that there will be no researcher bias, it is important to note that the focus of this research was to build a greater understanding about how Higgs and Rowland’s Framework may relate to Riskin’s Framework.

**Informed Consent**

Before the researcher could conduct an interview, the participant signed an informed consent form (Appendix A) in adherence with Pepperdine University’s IRB process (discussed in the section entitled “IRB Requirements”). The form discussed the nature of the research and what participation entailed. It clearly stated the title of this research project, the researcher’s name and contact information, and the institute with which the researcher is affiliated. The form then provided a brief statement regarding the purpose of the research and an overview of the interview process, stating clearly that participating in the interview was completely voluntary. If the participant elected not to participate, the researcher simply sought another participant. The
next part of the form was a confidentiality statement, asking for the participant’s permission to audio record the interview. If the participant was unwilling to allow the researcher to audio record the interview, the researcher sought another participant. The form then asked whether or not the researcher could use and publish the participant’s name in conjunction with the research project. If the participant was unwilling to allow the researcher to use the participant’s name, the researcher concealed the participant’s name, organization, and situation. Lastly, the form notified the participant that upon completion of the interview he/she would be able to review the transcript of the interview and offer feedback regarding its accuracy. The researcher then asked the participant for his/her signature verifying the accuracy of the transcript.

**Pilot Study**

Before the interview process commenced, the researcher conducted a pilot test of the research procedures. A participant was selected based on his/her knowledge of the research process and the topic being researched. The researcher then conducted a mock interview with the pilot test participant using the informed consent form, following the interview guide, audio recording the interview, and following the guiding principles of the long, focused interview. After the interview, the researcher discussed the process with the pilot test participant to understand where improvements could be made. From this pilot study, the researcher felt the participant was trying to predetermine the quadrant he/she wanted to align with. The researcher determined that the questions needed to be randomized as a means to impede the participant from doing this.

**Reliability and Validity**

Quantitative research involves internal and external validity as well as reliability and objectivity. Qualitative research has the respective counterparts of credibility, transferability,
dependability, and conformability. Internal variability relates to the independent variable’s ability to impact the dependent variable, whereas credibility rests on the findings being both believable and convincing. External validity focuses on the generalizability of the results, and transferability extends the application of the results to other contextually similar settings. Reliability is a measure of the results’ consistency, repeatability, and predictability from one setting to another; the qualitative term dependability can be defined the same way, with the added caveat of within reasonable limits. Lastly objectivity refers to differences within the quantitative community regarding the results, whereas confirmability describes whether the results are auditable in the qualitative community (Isaac & Michael, 1995).

Data Analysis

For this phenomenological study, data analysis involved the transcription of the interviews, followed by analysis of the content in a search for themes regarding organizational leadership and mediation styles. The data analysis phase of a phenomenological study consists of four phases: (a) identifying statements that relate to the topic, (b) grouping statements into meaningful units, (c) seeking divergent perspectives, and (c) constructing a composite. To identify statements that related to the topic, the researcher focused on what the researcher perceived to be relevant statements or ambiguities. This researcher categorized the statements into groups based on whether they pertained to establishing a relationship between Higgs and Rowland’s Framework and Riskin’s Framework. The researcher then scrutinized the data again, searching for divergent perspectives by categorizing the data into groups and eliminating the components that were not part of Higgs and Rowland’s Framework or Riskin’s Framework. Based on these two ways of breaking down the data, the researcher constructed a composite that provided an overall description of the phenomenon as the interviewees experienced it. As
mentioned previously, this phenomenological study sought to determine if a relationship, if any, exists between Higgs and Rowland’s Framework and Riskin’s Framework. If a relationship were to be found, then techniques developed for negotiation in mediation could be applied to various leadership development tools in the training of managers in conflict resolution. These techniques could then be applied to various realms of disputes, providing a methodology for making local and global leadership more successful.

IRB Requirements

All research was conducted in accordance with Pepperdine University’s policies and procedures as stated in the *Pepperdine University Protection of Human Participants in Research: Policies and Procedures Manual*. As stated in the introduction of the manual, the primary objective in any type of survey is to protect the dignity and welfare of the individual participants. Once approval was granted, the researcher contacted the participants and scheduled a meeting time. During the interview, the researcher reviewed the required consent documents with the participants and had the participants sign the forms. The researcher reiterated that the participant’s identity was to be kept anonymous, if he/she so desired, and that the participant had the right to stop the survey at any time in the process. Once the interview was completed and a transcription was made, the participant was allowed to review the transcript to verify accuracy of the statements made during the interview. All data will be held by the researcher for a period not to exceed 5 years.

Limitations/Delimitations of the Study

General limitations of the study revolve around those items specific to the phenomenological study method employed, as well as limitations inherent in the variables being measured. The phenomenological method does not necessarily allow the researcher to identify
the specific presence, nature, or extent of the relationship between Higgs and Rowland’s Framework and Riskin’s Framework, only that the potential for a relationship exists. Since this study used a non-experimental approach, the researcher had less control over the independent variables than would be possible with an experimental design. This lack of control could have resulted in the identification of patterns or elements that may have had little to no reliability or validity, or that may have been arbitrary or ambiguous. Since phenomenological studies are used mainly as a preliminary or exploratory tool, it is entirely possible that the results obtained might lack useful interpretation at best, or, at worst, be meaningless. Of specific concern are those variables that may be construed as cross-cultural issues. Frederiksen (1977) and van der Flier (1977) argue that the hypothesis being tested depends on whether or not the instrument’s interpretation is the same from one culture to another. Additionally, when two different cultures coexist in the same environment, some level of assimilation is likely to occur between the two cultures, biasing the results of the study. Regardless of these shortcomings, it is important to note that this study represented the first steps in bridging the fields of Organizational Leadership theory and mediation. As such, this research should be considered preliminary or exploratory in nature; its results, though not definitive, form a foundation upon which to build future research in this area.
Chapter 4: Results

This study sought to develop an understanding of whether a relationship exists between mediation and Organizational Leadership. Four questions formed the basis of this study:

1. What relationship, if any, exists between the evaluative-narrow approach to mediation and situational leadership?

2. What relationship, if any, exists between the evaluative-broad approach to mediation and transformational leadership?

3. What relationship, if any, exists between the facilitative-narrow approach to mediation and Leader Member Exchange (LMX Theory) theory?

4. What relationship, if any, exists between the facilitative-broad approach to mediation and servant leadership?

To address these four questions a qualitative research project utilizing a phenomenological study approach was employed. Eight participants were interviewed using a long interview format. As this is the first study of its type, the researcher determined that two participants for each category or quadrant would meet the objectives of this study. The participants were selected based on their job title and position of leadership within the organization. Participants included two presiding judges, two executives in a for-profit organization, two leaders in a non-profit organization, and two leaders in a firefighting organization. The long interview format and phenomenological study approach were deemed appropriate by the researcher because this structure provided the researcher latitude to analyze not only what was said, but also how the participant reacted to the questions,

In Phenomenological Reduction, the task is that of describing in textural language just what one sees, not only in terms of the external object but also the internal act of consciousness, the experience as such, the rhythm and relationship between phenomenon and self. The qualities of the experience become the focus; the filling in or completion of
the nature and the meaning of the experience becomes the challenge. The task requires
that I look in describe; look again and describe; look again and describe; look again and
describe; always with reference to detect textual qualities - rough and smooth; small and
large; quiet and noisy; colorful and bland; hot and cold; stationary and moving; low and
high; squeezed in and expansive; fearful and courageous; angry and calm - descriptions
that prevent varying intensities; ranges of shapes, sizes, and spatial qualities; time
references; and colors all within an experiential context. So, “to the things themselves,”
an open field, where everything and anything is available as given in experience! Each
angle a perception adds something to one’s a knowing of the horizons of the
phenomenon. The process involves pre-reflective description of things just as they appear
and a reduction to what is horizontal and thematic. Such an approach to elucidating once
knowledge is known as Transcendental Phenomenological Reduction. (Moustakas, 1994,
pp. 90-91)

Structure of the Study

Recalling Higgs and Rowland’s Framework, a relationship between Quinn and
Rohrbaugh’s Framework and Anderson, Herriot, and Hodgkinson’s Framework was established.
This means that the quadrants of each model are related such that A is related to B, as depicted in
Figure 14. The next step was to study if a relationship exists between Riskin’s Framework and
Higgs and Rowland’s Framework. In other words, is A or B related to C, as depicted in
Figure 14.
To accomplish this task, the researcher hypothesized that leadership style might play a significant role in establishing whether or not a relationship exists between Higgs and Rowland’s Framework and Riskin’s Framework. The leadership style chosen was based on the unique traits of four leadership styles: transformational leadership, servant leadership, LMX theory, and situational leadership. These leadership styles were selected because the researcher believed their traits were comparable to the quadrants depicted in the two groupings in this study: (a) Quinn and Rohrbaugh’s Framework and Anderson, Herriot, and Hodgkinson’s Framework, and (b) Riskin’s Framework. Additionally, the researcher was also compelled to include an additional tool in this study: contingency analysis.

As stated earlier, contingency theory provides a framework for determining the success of an organization’s structure and the demands of the environment in which it operates (see Figure 15). Contingency theory accomplishes this goal by determining the congruency or incongruency of an organization with three stances: defender, analyzer, or prospector. Contingency
analysis theorizes that congruent organizations align closely to one of the three aforementioned stances. If an organization is congruent and hence aligned with one of the three stances, contingency theory postulates that the organization is being run well and possesses effective leadership. Organizations not aligning with one of the three stances are labeled as in-congruent and are reactive to the environment in which they operate. Contingency theory postulates that in-congruent organizations are poorly run and possess ineffective leadership.


**Understanding effective leadership through contingency theory.** Contingency theory was vital in the development of the data gleaned from this study. Subsequent to Riskin’s Framework, Leonard Riskin developed additional models in his understanding of mediation. The
researcher believes that these later developments were made to offset the perception that a mediator should only operate in one quadrant of Riskin’s Framework. The researcher interprets this as the notion that the successful mediator will be able to switch from quadrant to quadrant based on the particular mediation situation. Given a specific situation, the skilled mediator will lock in on those traits that have been identified as being effective in that specific situation. Through contingency theory, a good leader will align an organization with the environment in which the organization is operating: defender, analyzer or prospector. This is not to say that a good leader uses only the traits limited to the quadrant in which his/her organization is operating, as defined by Higgs and Rowland’s Framework, but that the traits dictated by the environment will drive the traits of the leader that are most effective for the environment in which the organization is operating.

An example of this would be an organization operating in a defender stance, such as the military in a combat situation. If an army unit is ordered to take an objective such as a hilltop, the successful leader will embrace a command and control leadership style, as defined by the defender stance in contingency analysis. Granted, the leader may seek opinions from the troops in his/her command, but the ultimate decision resides with the commander of the unit. In short, the leader does not drive the organization; the environment in which the leader is operating drives the traits the leader should embrace to allow the organization to be effective.

**Liberties the researcher may take with the ineffective leader.** This study pre-supposes that the leader selected to participate in this study is operating in an effective organization. If the organization is teetering on bankruptcy, then a statement professing the leader’s effectiveness will only add an additional level of complication to this study. Contingency theory again helps eliminate this scenario through an understanding of the reactor stance. As mentioned before, an
effective organization is one that closely aligns with the defender, analyzer, or prospector stance. If the organization is grossly out of alignment, as depicted in Figure 15 by the reactor curve, then the organization is not as effective as it could be.

**Long interview format.** At the heart of this study is the use of the long interview format. Remembering that the interview is about not only what is said, but also what the researcher observes, the long interview format allows the researcher broad latitude with interpreting the interview results. However, this does not give the researcher a license to modify the results uncontested. Contingency analysis provides the researcher a warrant to redirect answers if the participant’s responses are in-congruent. Several factors could be responsible for in-congruency. One factor might be that the participant does not understand the meaning of the questions. Another factor might be that the participant is answering the question so as to appease the researcher. Still another reason might be that the participant is trying to lead or second-guess the quadrant in which he/she feels he/she should be categorized. Regardless of the reason, an in-congruent alignment in the contingency chart provides the researcher with a foundation from which to modify responses as he sees fit.

**The Interview Questions**

In setting up this study, 146 questions were identified. These 146 questions were divided and categorized into four major subsets, (a) administrative questions, (b) demographic questions, (c) an unstructured question, and (d) semi-structured questions.

**Administrative questions.** The administrative questions referenced specific facts about each interview. These questions included the name of the individual, the date of the interview, the time of the interview, the location of the interview, and a statement regarding whether or not the confidentiality agreement was signed.
**Demographic questions.** Demographic questions provided a means to categorize the participants of this study. One question was about the age of the individual. The minimum age was 43 years old and the maximum age was 65. Further analysis showed a mean of 55.1, a median of 56, a mode of 56, and a range of 22 years for the participants. The participants included six males and two females. The religious makeup of the participants consisted of one Christian, one southern Baptist, and six Catholics. Special consideration should be given to one of the Catholics who also identified with his/her ethnic Mayan heritage and more specifically his/her spiritual belief in Inlakech. Seven of the eight were American citizens and stated that English was their primary language. One was a Mexican national and stated that he/she was bilingual in both English and Spanish. For education, one of the participants stated that he/she had a doctorate degree, two had jurist doctorate degrees, three stated that they have master’s degrees, and two of the participants had bachelor’s degrees. All the participants live and work in Southern California. The size of the organizations for which the participants worked ranged in size from 15 to 20,000 individuals with the mean size of the organization being 3,859 and the median being 700 people. The participants further stated that their organizations have been existence anywhere from 35-162 years, with the mean being 101.5 years and median being 114 years. The participants stated that they have been with their respective organizations anywhere from 12 to 45 years with a mean being 19.8 years and a median of 14 years. They have been in their specific positions anywhere from 1 month to 35 years, with the mean being 9.2 years and the median being 6 years. The participants stated that their organizations have anywhere from three to over 5,000 people with the mean being 914 people. Employees they manage range anywhere from three to 20 individuals with the mean being 11.5. The participants stated that they work between 44-60 hours a week with an average mean of 58 hours per week. Lastly, the
numbers of planned changes the participants have been through ranged from a total of three changes to a maximum of roughly 100 changes in their organization, with the mean being three planned.

**Contingency analysis.** The next section deals with the barometer of the study, contingency theory analysis. These seven questions, as detailed, provide insight into the effectiveness of the organization in the environment in which it operates. The first question gave the researcher a feeling for how the participant perceived his/her role within his/her respective organization. The specific question asked was, “Please describe your organization and your leadership role within the organization.”

Once the participant answered the question, the researcher was able to categorize the stance of the organization as defender, analyzer, or prospector. The next six questions further fine-tuned the analysis and provided an additional dimension of congruency or in-congruency to organizational structure. If the answers aligned to one of the stances—defender, analyzer or prospector—the organization was deemed congruent. From contingency analysis this means that organization is managed effectively for the environment in which the organization is operating. If the answers did not align to one of the stances—defender, analyzer, or prospector—the organization was deemed in-congruent and not managed effectively for the environment in which the organization is operating. The latter situation is described in contingency theory as a reactive organization. As the name suggests, a reactive organization allows the environment to drive the administration of the organization; thus, the organization is not as effective as it could be.
**An unstructured question.** The unstructured question formed the foundation of this study. This open-ended question allowed the participant to share a story he/she has encountered in her/his life. The answer could be as short or long as the participant liked; however, the researcher had the option to ask clarifying questions if he felt the participant’s response lacks specificity. For this study, the unstructured question to each participant was:

Please share with us a specific story about a typical conflict in a normal day that you personally encountered repeatedly in your organization and your leadership style used to address the conflict.

**Special Note**

Please be cognizant that though extreme or emergency situations may come to mind in relating an experience, the focus of this study is to better understand the day-to-day interactions of the participants, your methods for handling conflict that may happen on a daily basis and the most common leadership style you may employ.

**Structured questions.** Once the participant was comfortable with her/his story answering the unstructured question, a series of structured questions were then asked. These structured questions were organized into four groups: Seattle, Boston, Miami, and San Diego. Before all the participants were interviewed, a pilot study was first performed. The participant in this pilot study was an expert in the field of academic research in leadership. During this pilot study, the researcher determined that the expert was manipulating his responses to force his alignment to a quadrant he felt he should be aligned with. Whether unconscious or deliberate, this second guessing would skew the results. To guard against future incursions, the researcher randomized the structured questions to correct this bias.

Upon conclusion of the question and answer session, the interview was transcribed. Still in its randomized format, a Likert scale rating was applied to the answers. The Likert scale ranged from 1 to 5 with 3 being a neutral response, 5 being a strong affirmation, and a 1 being a strong repudiation. The questions were then sorted back to their original order and analyzed. A
simple ratio was used to determine which quadrant the participant favored. The data were further parsed segregating Riskin’s Framework components from Quinn and Rohrbaugh’s Framework and Anderson, Herriot, and Hodgkinson’s Framework. Success was determined based on whether or not the quadrants in Higgs and Rowland’s Framework and Riskin’s Framework aligned (see Figure 16).

Figure 16. To show the relationship between Higgs and Rowland’s Framework and Riskin’s Framework, the quadrants should align.

Seattle Quadrant Results

The first grouping of interviews addressed the Seattle Quadrant of this study (Figure 17). These participants were the presiding judges. The Seattle Quadrant also refers to the Pedantic Quadrant and focuses on tasks that have a high degree of complication and relationships of low complexity. Situations are perceived in terms of strengths and weaknesses and the participants were expected to have a good understanding of the options for settling a dispute. In mediation this is also known as the directive quadrant or evaluative-narrow quadrant. As this quadrant involves individuals who are highly directive, this quadrant presented significant challenges for the researcher to find individuals who were willing to submit to research interviews; this could be because of their directive nature and their inability to control the interview process.
Figure 17. Is there a relationship between the Seattle Quadrant of Higgs and Rowland’s Framework and the Seattle Quadrant of Riskin’s Framework?

**Seattle Elizabeth’s responses.** The first participant for this section will be referred to as Seattle Elizabeth. Seattle Elizabeth is a presiding judge responsible for a large organization and was nominated to her position by a political process. Although Seattle Elizabeth has a large staff, her main focus is specifically on supervising judges in the organization and administering the staff to ensure that the court system maintains its functionality.

**Contingency analysis.** As summarized in figure 18, the majority of Seattle Elizabeth’s responses were captured in the analyzer/prospector stance. When asked what was the nature of her organization’s environment she responded,

> it’s turbulent and unpredictable largely because we’re State Court funded, and our budget has been slashed to the bone and beyond over the course of the last four years. So, much of my time right now is spent trying to figure out how we’re going to live within a substantially reduced budget.

For the type of strategy being utilized, her response was,

> I’m not sure what proactive creative of learning systems means, but if I had to identify our strategy in terms of responding to the situation we’ve been dealt in terms of the budget, which is really much of my time right now, I would say proactive. We are trying to plan how we’re going to survive for the next 3 to 5 years.

The next question that was asked is framed by the technology (mechanical and non-mechanical) being used by the organization. Seattle Elizabeth believed the technology was complex, dynamic, and with high discretion. She acknowledged that she did not manage the judges as the
judges are elected officials. For the staff, however, she defers to the Court Executive Officer regarding staffing issues. When asked about the dominant culture or ethos within the organization, Seattle Elizabeth firmly stated that the staff was “intrinsically driven. We have people who have been employed in a court system for many years and are acquainted with the organization and are driven by a desire for excellence.”

For the next two questions, Seattle Elizabeth’s responses were aligned with the defender/analyzer stance. When asked how the organization was structured, Seattle Elizabeth responded that with the number of years that court system has been in existence, she cannot help but think that the system is bureaucratic is structure. Lastly, when Seattle Elizabeth was asked about the dominant management structure, she responded that her origination favored a structure between Theory X and Theory Y, implying that her organization is aligned with a technocracy.

Semi structured questions. Upon review of the answers Seattle Elizabeth provided to the semi-structured questions of the interview (Figure 19), a few of her answers stand out as noteworthy. An example of this is question number 34 and 35 asking whether she established context for change, provide guidance, and stimulate conversation; her response was an enthusiastic, “I hope so!” Similarly, with question number 40 where the question asks, “Do you anticipate, identify, and address people’s problems?” the judge gave an enthusiastic affirmation. When asked in question 41 about preparing the critical mass for the ensuing decision [in this case layoffs], her response was,

I think it’s important to share as much information as you possibly can, but again, you’re very often, just to use your hypothetical about layoffs, we’re governed by a set of rules with the unions. And so, you’ve got to follow certain steps and do things within the right timing based on the negotiations and agreements that have been reached. And so, does everybody understand everything? Maybe not. If you’re following the rules and that you’re not at the point where you’ve been able to disclose all the information you need to disclose. I mean, I just think as much information as you can possibly give is a good thing.
In question 42, Seattle Elizabeth was asked whether the organization was secure in its methodology. She stated,

I never say everybody knows everything. I can’t speak for everybody else, but I think, again, because we’re an organization driven by sets of rules, most of those are laid out or we try to lay them out and try to make sure that they’re understood.

In response to questions 43 and 45 about the cost effectiveness of the organization and whether or not the organization runs efficiently and routinely, the judge again gave an enthusiastic affirmation. Lastly when asked whether she urged parties to settle or accept a settlement proposal by forecasting court outcomes (question 50) and by assessing the strengths and weaknesses of each, she confirmed that this was definitely something she would consider.
Seattle Elizabeth’s Responses

Seattle Elizabeth is the second participant for the Seattle Quadrant. Seattle Elizabeth held the position of presiding judge several years ago where he was responsible for a large court system in California. During the interview, Seattle Elizabeth stated that the organization is stable and certain. The individual activities within the judges at any given time may feel somewhat turbulent only because there are issues that are important to judges, but from the outside, it’s probably one of the most stable institutions around.

Contingency analysis. When asked about the nature of the organizational environment (Figure 20), Seattle Clive responded,

Well, it’s really—the organization is stable and certain. The individual activities within the judges at any given time may feel somewhat turbulent only because there are issues that are important to judges, but from the outside, it’s probably one of the most stable institutions around.

Next Seattle Clive was asked about the strategy being employed by the organization. To this, Seattle Clive responded that he felt his organization aligned with the region entitled proactive/creation of learning systems categorization of this question. When asked about the
technology being utilized, Seattle Clive felt that the individuals within the organization were given a high degree of discretion. Seattle Clive further felt that those employed by his organization were driven more by intrinsic rewards than extrinsic rewards, but that the organizational structure was still bureaucratic. Lastly, Seattle Clive described the dominant management structure as follows; “…the presiding judge of the Superior Court is really first among equals. We have very little power other than two or three things: we can make assignments, and the rest we have to do by persuasion.”

**Semi structured questions.** Seattle Clive, as with Seattle Elizabeth, also showed alignment with the Seattle Quadrants in both Higgs and Rowland’s Framework and Riskin’s Framework, as seen in Figure 21. Some examples of Seattle Clive’s responses are provided. When asked question 33 regarding whether Seattle Clive approached conflict systematically by stating that urgency and anchoring to organizational culture are part of the solution, his response was a strong affirmation. When asked if he stimulated conversation and provided appropriate resources (questions 35 and 36), Seattle Clive stated, “Yeah, one really involved resources per se, it involved people getting along. But to the extent that it’s a yes or no, the answer would be yes.” Question 39 asked Seattle Clive whether he provided opportunities for joint creation, Seattle Clive responded, “Yes. Yeah, to the extent that people were listening and could see the direction that I was trying to take it.” Lastly, when Seattle Clive was asked about whether the court system ran efficiently and routinely, he said, “absolutely; the court, yes.”

**Seattle Clive’s Responses**

*Figure 21. Quadrant preference for Seattle Clive’s response to Riskin’s Framework, Quinn and Rohrbaugh’s Framework, and Anderson, Herriot, and Hodgkinson’s Framework.*
**Miami Quadrant Results**

The next group of interviews deals with the Miami Quadrant (Figure 22). This quadrant is known for low task complication and high complexity relationships. The mediation style associated with this quadrant would be a facilitative broad style and the open systems model for leadership roles, which is also known as servant leadership. Participants in this quadrant should display a high deal of closeness between the individuals with whom they are engaged and entering into negotiations. Negotiating parties should be focused on trying to learn each other’s interests versus their positions. Participants in this quadrant should be skilled in finding alternative means to settle disputes by discussing underlying interests and developing creative solutions. The participants in this quadrant may deal with non-profit organizations or community groups.

![Figure 22. Is there a relationship between the Miami Quadrant of Higgs and Rowland’s Framework and the Miami Quadrant of Riskin’s Framework?](image)

**Miami David’s responses.** Miami David is the leader of a non-profit charitable, educational, cultural arts organization. Although the organization focuses on the Latino community, the organization is open to people of all ethnic backgrounds. This organization teaches instrumental music and dance routines and inspires youths via self-confidence and achievement. The organization holds its primary meetings after school where the children participate and develop communal shows for their own benefit as well as for the community.
Contingency analysis. When asked the contingency theory questions, Miami David’s responses were generally aligned with the prospector stance as seen in Figure 23; however, there were exceptions. The first question regarded the nature of the organizational environment. To this question, Miami David responded that his organization was very stable and certain. When asked what type of strategy is being employed, Miami David responded, “I think we’re more of a very proactive, creative of learning systems.” Miami David responded to the next question about the technology (mechanical and non-mechanical) being used with a lengthy answer:

Well, I would say it’s routine but yet at the same time, you know, learning as they progress to the higher levels of, like in the music program, you know, the difficulty of learning particular music style is very complex, but yet, you know. I adhere to knowledge that sometimes it’s not cognitive but rather in the effective domain where the individual can learn and demonstrates a certain level of intelligence that complex things become very obtainable. And I’ve seen it happen over and over in my dance program where parents say my son can’t read, can’t write, he’s slow. But yet, they’re demonstrating that they’re doing complex dance routines or they’re playing an instrument, you know, very complex manner that even they’re baffled how their child has learned or mastered that skill.

And so, alternative learning styles is what I try to adhere to. So, on the other question, I mean, I do routine low, but at the same time we have the second part, which is the complex.

For the kinds of people being employed and dominant culture or ethos within the organization, Miami David stated that he these individuals are intrinsically driven and self-actualizing. Asked whether he believed the organization was mechanistic or organic, Miami David responded that the organization is very organic and only he does all the bureaucratic paperwork. Lastly Miami David described the dominant management structure thusly; “I would say I try to make it as democratic as possible. Democratic as possible.”

**Semi-structured question analysis.** With his strongest showing in the Miami Quadrant in both Higgs and Rowland’s Framework and Riskin’s Framework, Miami David shows a preference towards dealing with issues that are characterized by a low degree of complication and a high degree of complexity (Figure 24). Some of Miami David’s responses were quite lengthy and provided a treasure trove of rich information. When asked whether he considered novel mixes of people, Miami David responded,

Oh, yeah. Definitely. Yeah. I think it’s important to try to bring in different people. Obviously, because of the degree of individuals within the Center, who they are ethnically, you know, that sometimes keeps others out because they think it’s only a Mexican thing. But to me, a Mexican thing is really a human thing, and when I taught in junior high, I had in the things that I do with my junior high school students, you know, I
had a mix of Black and Filipino and Mexican and Anglo, Sudans involved in same, similar things, you know. I directed a play called, it was called The Diary of Anne Frank, where Mr. Frank was a Black Dominican student playing Mr. Frank, Mr. Van Daan was a Mexican person. Mrs. Van Daan was – you know, so we had this extremely multi-ethnic production, but the kids didn’t see that. They just saw that we were all playing a part, you know, the roles. So, it’s very important, and that’s why I love the theater and I love what we do, that we try to do that. And I try to involve other people, who come into our Center, but you know, because of what we are and what we focus in, you know, people stay away because they don’t feel that they’re a part of it, you know. But I always try to in bring them into the mix.

Along the thread for traits in the Miami Quadrant, Miami David responded with similar vigor when asked about his feeling for amplifying difference, stating that friction and contention would help the parties learn about each other and encourage complex learning.

With that one, you know, it’s the same. I think that there’s a cooling off period to resolve that because, like in my classroom, with my kids when they explode in the classroom, I know that one of the things that I would tell them is, “That’s okay if you explode, you know. If you slam the door, I’ve got to write it down on the referral, I’ve got to send you to the office. You need some time to cool off, you know. That’s fine, go to the office. When you come back tomorrow, you’ll finally be a different person and I still love you,” you know. And if it escalates, you’ve got to give them a time, you know, to cool off, to be able to then resolve the conflict. I think that’s one of the reasons why in our junior high school right away we send both the kids home regardless of whether or not they’re both at fault, you know, or one is at fault, or the other one is at fault. So, to allow them time to cool off so that they can resolve, you know.

For the question about the importance of doing no harm, Miami David stated,

Definitely it’s important to not do any harm to anyone, you know, to encourage them to, you know, be part of what you are. And the example would be my dad, you know, how I had to finally stand up to my dad and tell him what his role was, for him to understand that, as a parent, he must demonstrate, be the guiding light.

For his concluding remark about his feeling towards keeping meaning at the forefront, Miami David responded,

Oh, yeah. Oh, definitely. We have to keep the mission in the forefront of everything that we do, you know, which is to me, that’s why I’m always preaching the idea of [Specific Cultural Tradition], of what important role the kids play not only as the learners, but also as when we go in the public what important role they serve as the example of hope
Miami David’s Responses

Figure 24. Quadrant preference for Miami David’s response to Riskin’s Framework, Quinn and Rohrbaugh’s Framework, and Anderson, Herriot, and Hodgkinson’s Framework.

Miami Pierre responses. Miami Pierre is an executive of a nonprofit community services organization that helps children. He has been with the organization for almost 13 years and this organization has been in existence for 4 decades. Unlike the last community-based organization that was a sole proprietorship, Miami Pierre’s organization encompasses several hundred individuals.

Contingency analysis. When reviewing the contingency theory analysis, Miami Pierre’s responses generally align on the analyzer stance (see Figure 25). When asked the nature of his organization’s environment and whether it might be stable and certain at one end of the spectrum or turbulent and unpredictable at the other end of the spectrum, Miami Pierre responded that his organization was aligned in the middle of the spectrum. When asked about the kind of strategy being employed by his organization, with the spectrum being comprised of defensive, operational, and goal setting at one end and proactive creative of learning systems at the other end, again Miami Pierre stated that his organization is somewhat equally between the two ends.
of the spectrum. For the kind of technology (mechanical and non-mechanical) being used, Miami Pierre asked the researcher to clarify this question. The researcher responded,

Essentially, this is where everyone makes a mistake with this one. It’s more the organizational structure – mechanic, almost automaton, or do the individuals within the organization have a great deal of freedom and pretty much can do whatever they desire with minimum oversight?

Regarding this definition, Miami Pierre again responded that he believes his organization is equally separated from the two ends of the spectrum. Being a non-profit and hence unable to pay hefty salaries, Miami Pierre stated that the people employed are intrinsically driven for their reward. Regarding organizational structure, Miami Pierre stated that his organization is heavily regulated and as such is bureaucratic in organizational structure as well as its dominant management style.
Semi structured question analysis. Based on Miami Pierre’s answers, he favors the Miami Quadrant where issues are characterized by a low degree of complication and a high degree of complexity (Figure 26). When asked about times when he felt that the future outcome might be uncertain, Miami Pierre responded,

Yes. …. The tendency has been just we seem to get close sometimes and then it gets opened up again. So I’m wondering where we’re going to end up with this. I mean, we’re told that we have to do it, but it just seems that sometimes it’s not.

Miami Pierre was also asked about his feeling regarding the importance of demanding honest, forthright communication. Miami Pierre responded,
Yes. In fact, we started off this group by saying that we wanted it really to set a tone that people could speak frankly and honestly about things. So, I think, yes, you need to have that or else nothing works.

Lastly, Miami Pierre’s was asked if he felt it was important to pay attention to individuals. He responded,

Most certainly. I mean, people are unique. Their experience is unique. And putting together a team like we did, I didn’t know everybody there and their story, and so people’s stories come up every once in a while. So, definitely you’ve got to pay attention to people’s stories, to people talking, not speaking, not participating and make sure you’re inclusive.

**Miami Pierre’s Responses**

![Quadrant preference for Miami Pierre’s response to Riskin’s Framework, Quinn and Rohrbaugh’s Framework, and Anderson, Herriot, and Hodgkinson’s Framework.](image)

*Figure 26. Quadrant preference for Miami Pierre’s response to Riskin’s Framework, Quinn and Rohrbaugh’s Framework, and Anderson, Herriot, and Hodgkinson’s Framework.*

**Boston Quadrant Results**

The Boston Quadrant deals with tasks that are high in complication and relationships that are high in complexity. Referring to Riskin’s Framework, this quadrant relates to the evaluative-broad mediation style. Denoting leadership styles, this quadrant relates to the rational goals model. In this quadrant, high complication and high complexity imply a good deal of closeness between individuals. One would expect to find many solutions to a problem, but each side must be given direction. They will speculate on outcomes, form opinions by reading or studying
relevant documents, and apply pressure to settle by emphasizing options that satisfy broader interests rather than narrow positions to the conflict (Figure 27).

**Higgs and Rowland’s Framework**

![Diagram of Higgs and Rowland’s Framework]

**Riskin’s Framework**

![Diagram of Riskin’s Framework]

*Figure 27. Is there a relationship between the Boston Quadrant of Higgs and Rowland’s Framework and the Boston Quadrant of Riskin’s Framework?*

**Boston Richard’s responses.** Boston Richard was selected as a participant for the Boston Quadrant. He is an executive in a for-profit organization in the education field. This specific organization encompasses approximately 140 staff and faculty members and roughly 900 students.

**Contingency analysis.** From the contingency theory analysis, Boston Richard’s responses generally align his organization with the analyzer stance (Figure 28). For the nature of the organizational environment, Boston Richard explained that his organization struggles with issues that span the entire range. In his assessment, Boston Richard stated that the environment in which his organization operates can become turbulent if new regulation is enacted for which the for-profit industry is unprepared to handle or to which it is unprepared to adapt. He mentioned this because he witnessed this process firsthand several years ago when new regulations were passed and several competitors simply closed their doors. He also stated that, by the very nature of the education offered, many students will remain committed to their educational goals for several years. This in turn provides stability and certainty to the industry as students will generally stay with one school through their study for a degree. When asked what kind of
strategy is being employed, again Boston Richard could see an argument that the entire spectrum is embraced. The extremes would tend to balance out such that he believes the comprehension strategy is equal distance between defensive, operational, goal setting at one end of the spectrum and proactive creative of learning systems at the other end of the spectrum. Boston Richard responded to the question about what kind of technology (mechanical and non-mechanical) is being used as follows:

Well, I guess this gets into whole thing, organizational theory, right? I mean, as I said, I’ve been with [Organization] for [over 10] years, so I’ve been through that kind of, you know, startup mentality to where it’s very entrepreneurial and you’re just doing what you need to get things done. And then [Organization] moved into kind of the home, you know, the second phase of where people start to know that, oh, you could always go to Bob for the answer, Bob knows what to do and kind of go from there, to where [Organization] moved to a third area which is really you’re large enough to either have to have policies and procedures in place so that you act consistently. I think this really became stronger for [Organization] when, quite a few years ago, well, probably about four or five years ago, we are considering going to regional accreditation. And when we did that, we’re in actually a credit college system, the [Organization] campuses are, and when we decided to go to regional, we decided to do it as a system of schools. You have an option of doing it campus by campus or a system of schools, and we thought it best to go as a system of schools so that we could then again, once again, strengthen our processes across the board. And so, I would say we’re in between because I think we definitely took that next step to where we tried to have a lot of our policies be consistent from campus to campus. But I think there still is some flexibility and it’s still seen at a local level to where there is some, you have the options of the process on how you get what needs to be done.

Boston Richard again stated that he believed his organization is somewhat equidistant between routine with low discretion at one end and complex, dynamic, and with high discretion at the other end of the spectrum. When asked about the kinds of people are being employed and what is the dominant culture or ethos within the organization, Boston Richard stated,

But I think most of the staff, you hope it’s intrinsic, you hope we get value in what we do knowing that you’re doing a good job, and you’re taking pride in what you do. So, if you had to say there’s a dominant culture, I would think it’s intrinsic, that you work in an educational environment, and you believe in what you’re doing.
For the last two questions about how the organization is structured and the dominant management structure, Boston Richard offered insight about being a for-profit entity in the field of education. On the one hand, education is heavy regulated by both the government and accreditation bodies, which drives bureaucracy within the organization. On the other hand, his organization falls under the for-profit model, which forces the organization to have a prospector stance to the environment in which the organization is operating. So again Boston Richard believes the organization’s structure is somewhere between mechanistic and or bureaucratic at one of the spectrum and organic at the other end of the spectrum. For the dominant management structure, Boston Richard’s explanation characterizes the organization as a technocracy.

**Semi-structured questions.** Boston Richard’s results from the survey display favorability towards the Boston Quadrant in both Higgs and Rowland’s Framework and Riskin’s Framework (Figure 29). When asked his feeling about managing change from the top down, Boston Richard stated,

I would say yes. Depending on how much the change impacts the organization. I think if it’s something that impacts the entire organization, that’s important that it comes from the top so people know how much importance that has on the organization. This specific project, it was only impacting the educational department as far as the college environment was concerned. The only guidance I really gave is that the project was going to be divested in the program chairs. Aside from that, I didn’t need to get involved in that change.

Maintaining the thread to this topic, Boston Richard further elaborated on his perspective when asked whether there is a paradox between economic value and organizational capability and whether this this paradox needs to be embraced:

Absolutely. I think it’s sometimes referred to as an—I’ll give you a great example—it’s called the agency factor. When it comes to scheduling, you have program chairs that are going to schedule courses for their students, and from an operational perspective, a [Organization] perspective, we want that to be efficient. Say I have 30 students, and my average class size should be 10, I would hope that I have three core classes and I put 10 students in each of those classes. That’s efficient. Now the agency factor and the paradox that they would sometimes run into with this specific instance, is a program chair who understands that well, I’ve got two full-time faculty, and to keep them full-time, each of them have to have two classes. So, what I’m going to do is I’m going to create four classes, and I’m going to put seven or eight students in each of those four classes so that my full-time faculty have enough courses. That’s the paradox, that’s the agency factor. They’re doing what’s in their,…I don’t want to say best interest, but they’re doing to best support their faculty to make sure they have full-time status, and they do that. But that’s something that yeah, we definitely have to oversee. It’s a paradox.

Lastly, when asked whether he believed positive intrinsic rewards provide individualized consideration, Boston Richard stated,

Yes. And the reason I do is because people enjoy working with people who are, I don’t want to say yes people, people who are always willing to look at options to make things successful. And people have an intrinsic worth and it’s a positive intrinsic reward that they get from what they do. You tend to see those individuals get more opportunities, they’re going to get projects and people enjoy working with them. So, I think, yeah, there is some individual consideration for people who have that type of attitude.
**Boston Katelynn’s responses.** Boston Katelynn is a television executive for a show that airs nationally on a major network. She works with the creative end of the organization as the employees in her department are employed for their creative skills.

**Contingency analysis.** Boston Katelynn’s responses to the contingency theory analysis were short and to the point (Figure 30). When asked the nature of her organizational environment, Boston Katelynn stated simply that her organization was somewhere in between stable and certain at one end of the spectrum and turbulent and unpredictable at the other end of the spectrum. Regarding the kind of strategy being employed, again Boston Katelynn simply stated that she believed the strategy was between defensive, operational, and goal setting at one end of the spectrum and proactive creative of learning systems at the other end of the spectrum. For the next question, considering that Boston Katelynn works with the creative end of the organization, her response to the kind of technology being used was, “Yeah, I would say complex dynamic with high discretion.” When answering the next question about the kinds of people being employed and the dominant culture or ethos within the organization, her response...
was not surprising as she stated that the employees were intrinsically driven and had a self-
actualizing orientation to work. Not surprising again, Boston Katelynn stated that her
organization was structured organically and that the dominant management structure was
democratic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stance</th>
<th>Defender</th>
<th>Analyzer</th>
<th>Prospector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What is the nature of the organization’s environment?</td>
<td>Stable And Certain</td>
<td>Turbulent And Unpredictable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What kind of strategy is being employed?</td>
<td>Defensive Operational Goal Setting</td>
<td>Proactive creation of learning system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. What kind of technology (mechanical and non-mechanical) is being used?</td>
<td>Routine Low Discretion</td>
<td>Complex/dynamic High Discretion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. What kinds of people are employed, and what is the dominant &quot;culture&quot; or ethos within the organization?</td>
<td>Economic/Instrumental orientation to work</td>
<td>Self-actualizing orientation to work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. How is the organization structured?</td>
<td>Mechanistic/Bureaucratic</td>
<td>Organic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. What is the dominant management style?</td>
<td>Autocracy</td>
<td>Bureaucracy</td>
<td>Technocracy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


_Semi-structured questions._ Boston Katelynn has a strong favorability towards the Boston Quadrant as seen in Figure 31. When asked if she took on the role of educator where her emphasis was placed on educating the parties about the situation they were in and the ramifications of not achieving an agreement, Boston Katelynn agreed emphatically. Regarding whether she felt it was important for followers to reciprocate with a willingness to do more than
required and look for innovative ways to advance the goals of the organization, Boston Katelynn again emphatically agreed. When Boston Katelynn was asked if she thought it was important to build up corporate culture, employees’ behaviors and attitudes, she stated,

Yes, I would say, to resolve this one, I did have to build up their – what I had to do is to point out of the positives and to understand both sides of the story. I had just understood that with that kind of talent comes a different personality, [salary employee]’s kind of personality. That kind of real artistic talent, there’s other things that come with that. There’s assets and there’s negatives. So I tried to build that part of her, and then with the others, I had to tell them, “Look, you’re as important as she is. I need you as much.” So I was trying to build everybody up so we all worked at our best level.

Lastly when asked if she believed settlements involve developing a positive relationship between followers where improving the performance and development of the followers to their fullest potential supported the greater good of the community, Boston Katelynn stated, “Yes, everybody was in this boat together. Definitely.”

**Boston Katelynn’s Responses**

**Higgs and Rowland’s Framework**

- Seattle: 22.08%
- San Diego: 26.60%
- Miami: 27.89%
- Boston: 23.42%

**Riskin’s Framework**

- Seattle: 23.10%
- San Diego: 27.72%
- Miami: 28.28%
- Boston: 20.90%

*Figure 31. Quadrant preference for Boston Katelynn’s response to Riskin’s Framework, Quinn and Rohrbaugh’s Framework, and Anderson, Herriot, and Hodgkinson’s Framework.*
San Diego Quadrant Results

The last major section for interviews was the San Diego Quadrant (Figure 32). In this quadrant the leaders deal with tasks that are low in complication and relationships that are low in complexity. The San Diego Quadrant corresponds to the human relations model as the structure is flexible and the focus is internal. The specific leadership style that corresponds to this quadrant is LMX theory. For the leader, the decision process is pushed down in the ranks to the lower levels, but control is maintained as only a narrow range exists for allowable solutions. Leaders in this quadrant commonly respond to problems by using one size fits all solution matrices or templates, leaving minimal opportunities for personalization. Innovation is allowed, but is limited to established boundaries. Training programs are an important aspect of this quadrant, as development is dispersed through a narrow top-down approach to institutional learning. Additionally, the leader forms opinions by studying relevant documents and applies pressure to settle disputes. As mentioned previously, LMX theory is based on the philosophy that leaders should treat followers as specific individuals rather than as a group. The leader promotes opportunities for individuals to take on new roles and responsibilities while building trust and respect. The expectation is that the followers will then reciprocate with a willingness to do more than is required of them and look for innovative ways to advance the goals of the organization (Northouse, 2007).
Figure 32. Is there a relationship between the San Diego Quadrant of Higgs and Rowland’s Framework and the San Diego Quadrant of Riskin’s Framework?

**San Diego Edmund responses.** San Diego Edmund is an assistant fire chief at a major southern California fire department. At the time of the interview, a good deal of training conducted in the fire department was focused on individual behavior within the respective fire stations.

**Contingency analysis.** San Diego Edmund works for a government organization that is heavily bureaucratic; as such, the contingency theory analysis (Figure 33) for his responses reflects a defender stance indicative of large government organizations. When asked about the nature of the organizational environment, San Diego Edmund responded that the organization environment was stable and certain. For the kind of strategy being employed, San Diego Edmund responded,

> We’re a – I would say we are an operational-based organization. I mean, that’s what we – you know, basically management through objectives, and that’s kind of our – the way we – so I would say we’re more of an operational.

When asked about non-emergency related technology utilized, San Diego Edmund stated that the technology utilized was routine with low discretion. For the kinds of people being employed and the dominant culture or ethos within the organization, San Diego Edmund stated, “I think – I think, you know, rather – I didn’t want to generalize, but I can probably guarantee you that most of these folks would do this job for free.” When asked how the organization is structured,
bureaucracy was the term San Diego Edmund used. Lastly, when asked about the dominant management structure, San Diego Edmund stated,

We are – when it comes to – we’re a bureaucracy. I mean, it’s – here is where I would say that we could probably break out of that mold but, yeah, we’re a bureaucracy with some democracy and Theory Y that we have really good people. But if I pick and give an answer, I pick “b” bureaucracy.


Semi-structured question analysis. San Diego Edmund has a strong favorability towards the San Diego Quadrant as seen in Figure 34. One particularly noteworthy response was San Diego Edmund’s affirmation of the following question, “Do you push the decision process down in the ranks to the lower levels, but maintain control as there was only a narrow range for
allowable solutions?” When asked whether he felt that a solution to this conflict needed direction from experts, San Diego Edmund stated,

Yes. Yes, I think otherwise, a lot of times, you know, our own biases – or sometimes we don’t know what we don’t know, and so when we’re making a decision, we’re really – and in this scenario, yes, we did get some expert advice to assist. And then – actually, then realized is that, hey, you know what, this isn’t that hard to achieve after all once we talked to other folks. So, I mean, it’s important. I think the term “expert” is the one that you need to provide clarity to. You know, what is an expert? But forget it for that question.

Lastly, when asked if he felt it was important for followers to reciprocate with a willingness to do more than required and look for innovative ways to advance the goals of the organization, San Diego Edmund said,

I think it’s important to have the willingness to do more than required. I think it’s important, but – and I think it’s important to look for innovative ways to advance goals, and I think that’s very important. But, I’m also mindful that there’s a sense of peer accountability. I mean, I – this is a great – I think it’s important, but a peer is – from a labor management perspective, may say that you can’t do that. That you can’t expect people to do more – just because you do more, you can’t expect it, but – so – but from the practical standpoint, I think it’s important.

San Diego Edmund’s Responses

Higgs and Rowland’s Framework

Riskin’s Framework

Figure 34. Quadrant preference for San Diego Edmund’s response to Riskin’s Framework, Quinn and Rohrbaugh’s Framework, and Anderson, Herriot, and Hodgkinson’s Framework.
San Diego Ian responses. San Diego Ian is a regional fire chief for a major Southern California fire department. As a 30-year veteran, San Diego Ian had a wealth of experience to share in his interview.

Contingency analysis. For the contingency analysis (Figure 35), San Diego Ian’s direct responses did not favor a particular stance. When asked about the nature of the organizational environment being either stable and certain at one end of the spectrum or turbulent and unpredictable at the other end of the spectrum, San Diego Ian responded,

Somewhere in between. So when it comes to stable and certainty, when someone dials 911, we gonna show up. So that is stable and that’s certain, and so our level of service hasn’t changed. The turbulence is an area of human resource management. You know, what I say now is like, you know, this department has had a long history of dealing with diversity, either recognizing it as a strength, which we did not in the past, and getting diversity, which was not the department’s choice, it was through the leadership efforts of the black firefighters. And now that we have diversity, the turbulence to an extent, I believe, exists, and so how do you lead it? And so – and the unpredictable part centers in – like the biggest thing for us is like this whole budget issue that we’re dealing with and the uncertainty with regard to how long is this going to last? How is it going to continue to affect me personally because of my – because my economic means has diminished as a result of over time not being as available as it was in the past? Very uncertain for a lot of members and a lot of heartache and pain for a lot of families. Unpredictable because we – as an organization, we don’t do well at marketing what we do and so not marketing well what we do can kind of give us more of the same even when the budget process levels itself out. If there is another term in the budget in a negative way, how do we stay ahead of it as an organization? How do we, as an organization, create change based on our future forecast of what we see is coming to minimize the unpredictability of how the social environment impacts us so we can be ahead of it as opposed to constantly reacting to it. Yeah, but it’s – it’s great. I love it. This is good times.

In response to the question about kind of strategy being employed, San Diego Ian responded, “I see it as proactive and also creating a learning environment or learning systems.” For the kind of technology (mechanical and non-mechanical) being used, San Diego Ian responded that in non-emergency situations he believed it was closer to routine and with low discretion. For the question regarding what kinds of people are being employed and the dominant culture or ethos within the organization, San Diego Ian gave the following rich and detailed response:
Absolutely intrinsically. Absolutely, no doubt about it. Now, that’s an interesting question because when I got hired, it was for extrinsic – external reasons because I didn’t know a lot about the fire department, and I knew that they were hiring, and I knew they had a great schedule and great benefits. And, you know, as a young 22-year-old coming from New York to [City in California]. I mean, I – that sounded good to me. But what – what begins to happen, and I think this is the case now with the people that we hire, they know much more about the job before they get hired, and they are not only driven by all of the benefits, but the excitement. The – the thing about helping others, you know, now becomes – how do you say – like toxic, but in a positive way. You know, almost as if the adrenaline now drives us to the point where – you know, most of us are extreme Type A personalities, or somewhere along that spectrum, and so, you know, the idea of helping, and then the completion of that and what that does is just, you know, it is just constant adrenaline that you are getting each time the bell rings. And it goes on for – throughout your career. We do have some folks that have become complacent and mediocrity has set in. However, the organization – the structure of the organization easily flushes those individuals out. And so it’s hard to hide. And – and we generally will, as an organization as a whole, will do the best we can when tasked with some type of an emergency, without a doubt. Rarely have I seen someone who at an emergency incident slacks. Now distinctly different when it’s a nonemergency incident. So when it’s a nonemergency incident, you will find that if someone is slacking or becoming laid back or lazy, that they can get away with it because that’s the culture of that firehouse or that leader on that shift. Or if they are at a busy firehouse and a high-performing team, it will easily get flushed out that they are not really doing as much as they can and more interested in what the job has to offer, like this new language we have now with this drop program. And so some folks have – you know, use language such as, hey, well, listen, I just got 2 years left in the drop program. So it’s almost as if they’ve checked out even though they at work. And that’s part of what they’re thinking is because they’re looking now at the end result of leaving; however, while they’re here, they’re still expected to perform, and there’s systems in place that will hold them accountable.

When asked about the organizational structure, San Diego Ian related that the organization is highly bureaucratic based on a command and control structure. Lastly, the dominant management structure is again bureaucratic.

**Semi-structured question analysis.** San Diego Ian’s responses favor the San Diego Quadrant as seen in Figure 36. When asked if he had a straightforward perception of the solution where he did not try to assess or predict outcomes, form opinions by reading or study relevant documents, or apply pressure to settle, San Diego Ian stated,

The perception of the solution, you know, pretty much centered around the importance of, you know, folks getting along, and that was pretty straightforward. I wasn’t quite sure what the outcomes were going to be because there was resistance, and the importance of, you know, studying other relevant documents and, you know, looking at other behavioral information, absolutely. That was a definite resource for me. And with regard to applying pressure to settle, not really applying pressure, you know, just – you know, just the coaching aspect of being able to subtly provide options or help the person get led to different options, which is what they oftentimes can’t see. So the notion about applied
pressure to settle, we weren’t there – we were not there, and I thought we are, but no, I never applied any pressure to settle, but I did talk about what the expectations are.

San Diego Ian was asked whether or not he used caucuses to help each side gain an appreciation of the other’s position and the consequences of not settling. In response, he said,

Yeah, to an extent. That caucus would have been my supervisor, other people that know this individual who I’ve called and say, look, I need – I need you to help me with a situation. You know, I’m dealing with captain so-and-so. Oh, gosh, oh, man, and I said, whoa, whoa, whoa, don’t give me your bias about him. Let me just tell you what I’m dealing with and what I’m trying to achieve and give me some feedback on it. So yeah, absolutely. That’s a big part of this organization is to be able to use our network of support to help us with our situations.

Lastly, when asked if he took on the role of educator where his emphasis was placed on educating the parties about the situation they were in and the ramifications of not achieving an agreement, San Diego Ian stated,

Absolutely. Absolutely. Constantly upfront about what I was up to, what the outcomes, you know, could and should be; provided, you know, other resource material to help, you know, for him to see the distinctions in terms of different leadership styles and when this one style is appropriate versus this one – and absolutely. I think it’s really important because it’s what we suffer from today as an organization, and that -- that issue wasn't even dealing with race or gender; it was just dealing with power. So absolutely.

**San Diego Ian’s Responses**

![Pie chart](image)

*Figure 36. Quadrant preference for San Diego Ian’s response to Riskin’s Framework, Quinn and Rohrbaugh’s Framework, and Anderson, Herriot, and Hodgkinson’s Framework.*
Chapter 5: Conclusions

Summary

Forming the foundations of sociology are the academic disciplines of Organizational Behavior, Change, Development, and Leadership. These academic disciplines study human interactions, both within an organization and in its environment. Exactly where one field ends and the others begin is a subject of great controversy. These disciplines do, however, have many commonalities upon which to draw and inspire comparison in dealing with social interaction and conflict.

Mediation is another discipline that deals with social interaction and conflict. Although usually associated with the legal profession, mediation can be used to help resolve unwanted social interaction or conflict. Mediators are skilled at playing a variety of roles and using different approaches to frame and resolve conflicts. The ways in which the mediator frames the conflict and the roles the mediator plays can be categorized; these categories are often referred to as mediation styles.

The study of mediation styles shares many commonalities with sociology, particularly with the field of Organizational Leadership. In the quest to understand the commonalities between these two fields, research conducted by Higgs and Rowland (2000, 2001, 2005) holds the answer. This study built upon the work of Higgs and Rowland and proposes that their work holds a critical link between mediation styles and organizational leadership. From this link, then, organizational leaders that embrace effective mediation styles may ultimately become more successful than those that do not. This study therefore proposes that a relationship exists between organizational leadership and mediation styles as represented in Figure 37.
Figure 37. Results indicate that a relationship exists between Higgs and Rowland’s Framework and Riskin’s Framework.

**Overview of the Problem**

To date, though, these techniques have not been categorized by leadership styles. This study proposes a framework to understand how conflict resolution relates to the disciplines of mediation, Organizational Behavior, and Organizational Leadership. Towards this endeavor, four themes were developed that drew upon a quadrant categorization methodology proposed by Leonard L. Riskin (1996), which was then compared, to four leadership styles: situational leadership, transformational leadership, LMX leadership theory, and servant leadership. A phenomenological research methodology was used and eight leaders were interviewed to understand how they approach conflict within their respective organizations. Utilizing a story provided by each leader about a conflict each encountered on a frequent basis, the researcher asked a series of randomized questions based on the themes mentioned. By categorizing each leader’s response, the study showed that a relationship worthy of further research existed between the positions of the individuals within the organization and how societal norms dictated the methodology the leader used to resolve his/her stated conflict. This relationship supported the use of specific tools developed in mediation that the leader and the organization could embrace to transcend conflict, allowing the organization and hence the leader to be more efficient.
**Purpose statement and research questions.** The purpose of this study was to determine what relationship, if any, exists between Riskin’s Framework representing mediation styles and both Anderson, Herriot, and Hodgkinson’s Framework and Quinn and Rohrbaugh’s Framework representing leadership styles. To accomplish this, a phenomenological study utilizing the long interview format was undertaken. Four research questions were proposed in linking the three models together. These research questions were:

1. What relationship, if any, exists between the evaluative-narrow approach to mediation and situational leadership?
2. What relationship, if any, exists between the evaluative-broad approach to mediation and transformational leadership?
3. What relationship, if any, exists between the facilitative-narrow approach to mediation and Leader Member Exchange (LMX Theory) theory?
4. What relationship, if any, exists between the facilitative-broad approach to mediation and servant leadership?

**Brief review of the methodology.** Based on the results of this phenomenological study, the researcher determined that a relationship worthy of further research exists between Organizational Leadership and mediation styles. The use of a phenomenological study offers the opportunity to understand perceptions, perspectives, and situations through lengthy interviews comprised of topic-centered questions. These interviews were conducted with carefully selected participants whose experiences were interpreted through the lenses of both organizational leadership and dispute resolution. Participants were knowledgeable about the intent of the research and were free to help guide the research in terms of determining whether a relationship exists or not.
The research design entailed a 2 x 2 phenomenological qualitative study. This type of study is used to determine whether or not comparisons can be drawn between two variables (in this case, issue complication and relationship complexity) and their relationship to another set of two variables (in this case, leadership styles and dispute resolution). The researcher selected a qualitative design for several reasons. First, in qualitative research, the outcome is secondary in importance to the process. In other words, the researcher was interested in discovering the meanings people associate with a specific individual or events. One of the strengths of qualitative research is that it focuses on obtaining descriptive data, where understanding is gained through participants’ descriptions.

The sample size in phenomenological studies typically ranges from five to 25 participants and is limited to only those who have experience with the phenomenon in question (Creswell, 1994). Although random sampling would be the preferred sampling method, this study focused specifically on leadership qualities, meaning that some level of researcher bias was inherent in the selection of analysis units. This study employed purposive sampling to select participants, as certain individuals were selected on purpose to participate in this survey (McCall, 2000). The researcher sorted these individuals into two specific strata, or artificial groupings. First, the participants were leaders within their organizations, and secondly, they dealt directly with disputes on a daily basis.

Given the strata, the researcher surveyed eight leaders in four unique organizational structures/sectors: (a) civil servant, (b) judicial, (c) corporate, and (d) community. These leaders had only a cursory relationship with the researcher; the researcher may have known of the individuals, but did not have in-depth interactions with them. Additionally, the number of people interviewed reflects the fact that phenomenological studies utilize lengthy interviews; the sample
of eight participants was an acceptable size for the time and effort required to administrate the interviews (Easterby-Smith et al., 2002). The participants shared some common characteristics in that they are leaders in their respective organizations and deal with disputes directly on a daily basis. Also, because of the uniqueness of phenomenological studies, these individuals were expected to have at least a casual understanding of the survey and subject matter being investigated.

Importance of the Reactor stance in Contingency Theory

An organization that has scanned its environment carefully will make key decisions based on its findings. Paramount to the organization is the decisions the leaders make with regards to the: (a) goals and direction of the organization, (b) internal mechanisms to achieve the goals, and (c) monitoring of those mechanisms (Burrell & Morgan, 1979). In contingency theory, Miles and Snow (1978, 2003) define four unique stances to gauge the alignment of the strategy with the environment: prospector, analyzer, defender, and reactor. These stances then encompass a range of action for each of Morgan’s (1997) subsystems: environmental, strategic, technological, human/cultural, structural, and managerial. Although the prospector, analyzer, and defender stances give insight into how an organization responds to its environment, the reactor stance signals to the researcher the degree of presuppositions or liberties he/she may take when analyzing the transcriptions from the interviews. The reactor stance is adopted when the leader of an organization fails to articulate or adhere to a strategy; failure may also occur if the articulated strategy is incompatible with the environment. When an organization uses a reactor stance, this invariably represents a misalignment between the environment and stance. If an organization has adopted a reactor stance, this means that that one or more subsystems are not aligned with any specific region of the environment. This stance leads the organization to be unbalanced or
unstable, and does not have the same potential of a congruent alignment. The organization is therefore not performing optimally and the possibility of failure is much higher than in a congruent organization (Miles & Snow, 2003).

**Seattle Quadrant Analysis of Findings**

The first grouping of interviews will address the Seattle Quadrant of this study (Figure 38). These participants are the presiding judges. The Seattle Quadrant also refers to the Pedantic Quadrant and focuses on tasks that have a high degree of complication and relationships of low complexity. Situations are perceived in terms of strengths and weaknesses, and the participants were expected to have a good understanding of the options for settling a dispute. In mediation this is also known as the directive quadrant or evaluative-narrow quadrant. As this quadrant involves individuals who are highly directive, this quadrant presented significant challenges for the researcher to find individuals who were willing to submit to research interviews; this could be because of their directive nature and their inability to control the interview process.

![Diagram](Figure 38. Is there a relationship between the Seattle Quadrant of Higgs and Rowland’s Framework and the Seattle Quadrant of Riskin’s Framework?)

**Seattle Elizabeth’s analysis of findings.** The first participant for this section, Seattle Elizabeth, is a presiding judge responsible for a large organization and was nominated to her position by a political process. Although Seattle Elizabeth has a large staff, her main focus is specifically on supervising judges in the organization and administering the staff to ensure that
the court system maintains its functionality. By the nature of her background and as documented in the interview transcripts, Seattle Elizabeth is not well versed in many common business and academic terms/nomenclature. This could account for Seattle Elizabeth’s personal story not being very detailed. However, by the nature of a phenomenological study, the researcher was able to glean much about Seattle Elizabeth’s management style, not so much by what was said but by what was observed.

**Contingency analysis.** A good example of the observations made during the interview process can be related easily through the contingency analysis performed on Seattle Elizabeth’s interview. As Seattle Elizabeth is responsible for a large court system, it became evident through the interview that this organization is very bureaucratic. When asked about the nature of the organization’s environment, the judge clearly thought that she was operating in a turbulent and unpredictable environment, possibly due in part to severe budget cuts and realignment of staff based on those budget cuts in recent months. However, the work of the court system would still have to get done and would still have to adhere strictly to policies and procedures. Although the judge indicated that the court system falls somewhere between analyzer and prospector stance, it was noted that the court system must also operate from a stable and certain perspective; placing it in the defender stance. This dichotomy in perspective was seen in response to other questions regarding the utilization of strategy and whether the policies and procedures being used within the court system are (a) mechanical in nature and routine, utilizing low discretion in implementation; or (b) organic in nature where the very essence of administering law is a new and undocumented process.

The judge was also very passionate in that she believed that her staff and volunteers were working in the court system for intrinsic or fulfillment of self-actualizing needs; for the joy of the
work in itself. The remaining two questions were about organization structure and dominant management style. The judge freely admitted that hers was a large bureaucratic organization that was trying to embrace change; however, by the very nature of the bureaucracy, there was no evidence of significant change taking place (Figure 39).


**Semi structured questions.** Upon analysis of the semi-structured questions for Seattle Elizabeth’s interview, the data clearly identify the judge as favoring the Seattle Quadrant in both Higgs and Rowland’s Framework and Riskin’s Framework as seen in Figure 40. These results suggest that Seattle Elizabeth favors urgency and anchoring of organizational culture; a small group initiating, driving and or managing the change; tightly controlled communications; and an
explicit set of directives that give little or no attention to capability development. Seattle Elizabeth’s responses favor establishing a context for change and providing guidance. She tends towards ensuring congruence of messages, activities, policies, and behaviors where the opportunity for joint creation is possible so long as the critical mass is prepared for the ensuing outcome. Based on her responses, Seattle Elizabeth would most likely administer services in a cost-efficient manner, ensuring the organization runs efficiently and routinely. She is most likely mechanistic in her approach to problems and defines positions narrowly. Seattle Elizabeth most likely views a situation based on facts and documentation associated with a situation assessing the case on its strengths and weaknesses. Seattle Elizabeth may have a predisposition to forecasting likely outcomes, may be mechanistic in her approach to the problems, and may favor persuading parties to accept predetermined outcomes as these recipes have a proven track record for success. Her approach to management would be authoritarian, picking from the following limited leadership techniques: (a) directing, (b) coaching, (c) supporting, and (d) delegating.

Seattle Elizabeth’s Responses

![Quadrant preference for Seattle Elizabeth’s response to Riskin’s Framework, Quinn and Rohrbaugh’s Framework, and Anderson, Herriot, and Hodgkinson’s Framework.](image)

*Figure 40.* Quadrant preference for Seattle Elizabeth’s response to Riskin’s Framework, Quinn and Rohrbaugh’s Framework, and Anderson, Herriot, and Hodgkinson’s Framework.
Seattle Clive analysis of findings. Seattle Clive, the second participant for the Seattle Quadrant, held the position of presiding judge several years ago where he was responsible for a large court system in California. Seattle Clive’s interview posed a unique challenge for the researcher. It was clear from the outset that Seattle Clive had some level of knowledge regarding the concepts encompassed by this research, which was similar to the situation the researcher encountered in the pilot study. To offset the impact of this familiarity, the researcher randomized the questions asked. As can be seen from the transcription, the researcher felt that the participant was making an effort to second-guess his answers and deliberately place himself in a quadrant of his choosing. By choosing the long interview format, the researcher was able to thwart this effort as the participant eventually realized that several questions were redundant in nature. Based on the results, the researcher feels this interview was tainted to some level, but nevertheless offers valuable insight into this research effort.

Contingency analysis. Based on the contingency analysis model, Seattle Clive related a model that is highly ineffective: a reactor stance. What led to this finding is Seattle Clive’s notion that the organization should be proactive / creative of learning systems, staffed by complex dynamic high discretion individuals who possess self-actualization in their orientation to work. He also related that the dominant management style should be more along the lines of a democracy even though he sees the organization as being bureaucratically structured. This finding resulted in a gross misalignment between the organization’s environment and the management style that he believes would be effective in this organization. This perception runs contrary to contingency theory analysis as seen in Figure 41.
Semi structured questions. Seattle Clive, as with Seattle Elizabeth, also showed favorability towards the Seattle Quadrants in both Higgs and Rowland’s Framework and Riskin’s Framework as seen in Figure 42. Favorability towards this quadrant implies that when faced with the need to solve a problem, Seattle Clive would favor characteristics underscoring a small executive group initiating and driving change, tightly controlling communications, and providing directives that give little attention to capability of the organization. Fundamental in this approach, Seattle Clive would stress the urgency of anchoring change to the organizational culture as a means of helping solve the problem. Some of the leadership qualities that Seattle Clive might employ would be establishing the context for change, stimulating conversation,
providing adequate resources, coordinating congruence of messages, anticipating problems, and preparing the participants for the ensuing decision.

Seattle Clive’s Responses

Figure 42. Quadrant preference for Seattle Clive’s response to Riskin’s Framework, Quinn and Rohrbaugh’s Framework, and Anderson, Herriot, and Hodgkinson’s Framework.

The management style most successful in this environment is an authoritarian approach where the organization would need to be secure in its methodology, administering services in a cost-efficient manner to ensure the organization runs efficiently and routinely. Seattle Clive would most likely be successful with employees who are mechanistic in their approach to problems and define their positions narrowly.

Reviewing Seattle Clive’s style along the lines of a mediator, he would most likely favor an evaluative-narrow mediation style, which reviews the facts and documentation associated with a case, assessing the case on its strengths and weaknesses. Seattle Clive would most likely possess a good understanding of the likely outcomes, urging settlement either through compromise agreements or persuasion.

Based on this analysis, Seattle Clive would favor a leadership style that has the characteristics of situational leadership, as it is authoritarian in its approach.
leadership is intuitive, easy to understand, and widely used, and can be applied easily to a given situation. The four phases are serial in implementation and may be used progressively based on employee development. Also this model presents Seattle Clive with a leadership style that does not predispose individual development, commitment, or competence, nor does it elicit education, experience, age, and gender as required parameters.

**Acknowledgement of relationships in Seattle Quadrant.** For the Seattle Quadrant and acknowledging the interviews with a Seattle Elizabeth and Seattle Clive, strong relationships can be seen in the Seattle Quadrant for the participants involved in this study (Figure 43). The implication of this finding is that for the Seattle Quadrant, a relationship can be witnessed between Riskin’s Framework, Anderson, Herriot, and Hodgkinson’s Framework, and Quinn and Rohrbaugh’s Framework. The findings specifically suggest a relationship between the evaluative-narrow style of mediating, high complication, low complexity and stability, and internal focus within the structure of the individual’s leadership style. This study suggests that because a relationship exists, further investigation is warranted in developing this relationship.

![Figure 43. Acknowledgment for the relations in the Seattle Quadrant witnessed between Riskin’s Framework, Quinn and Rohrbaugh’s Framework, and Anderson, Herriot, and Hodgkinson’s Framework.](image-url)
**Miami Quadrant Analysis of Findings**

The next group of interviews deals with the Miami Quadrant (Figure 44). This quadrant is known for low task complication and high complexity relationships. The mediation style associated with this quadrant would be a facilitative broad style and the open systems model for leadership roles, also known as servant leadership. Participants in this quadrant should display a high deal of closeness between the individuals with whom they are engaged and entering into negotiations.

Negotiating parties should be focused on trying to learn each other’s interests versus their positions. Participants in this quadrant should be skilled in finding alternative means to settle disputes by discussing underlying interests and developing creative solutions. The participants in this quadrant may deal with non-profit organizations or community groups.

![Diagram](image)

*Figure 44. Is there a relationship between the Miami Quadrant of Higgs and Rowland’s Framework and the Miami Quadrant of Riskin’s Framework?*

**Miami David’s analysis of findings.** Miami David’s organization teaches instrumental music and dance routines and inspires youths via self-confidence and achievement. In this position, he is the leader of a non-profit charitable, educational, cultural arts organization. His organization, though focused on the Latino community, is open to people of all ethnic backgrounds. The organization holds its primary meetings after school where the children participate and develop communal shows for their own benefit as well as for the community.
**Contingency analysis.** Miami David has been running this organization for over 35 years. This is an important fact in understanding the contingency analysis for this organization. The projected stance for this organization should be prospector as this organization is a community volunteer organization. This is important when reviewing question number 26 in the interview because, when asked about the nature of the organization’s environment, Miami David stated that the organization was stable and certain. Yet given the lack of evidence of succession plans in an organization that is heavily dependent upon one person, the organization more closely aligns with the prospector stance. The reason for this is that this is a volunteer organization and the members have many opportunities to engage in a variety of different community projects. Whether or not the members support Miami David is a choice they must make individually. As the organization also deals with diverse members of the community, the organization operates in a complex, dynamic and high discretion environment. Moreover, because it is a volunteer organization, the participants are self-actualizing and have an orientation to this type of an organization. The organization is clearly organic and uses codetermination as the dominant management style, locating the organization in the prospector stance of the contingency analysis (see Figure 45).
Semi-structured question analysis. With his strongest showing in the Miami Quadrant in both Higgs and Rowland’s Framework and Riskin’s Framework, Miami David shows a preference towards dealing with issues that are characterized by a low degree of complication and a high degree of complexity (Figure 46). These issues tend to have few rules and a loose set of directions. Communications are wide-ranging and constant, as is the sharing of information and ideas. Miami David most likely favors utilizing expertise developed outside of the area of concern and embraces novel mixes of people in helping to find alternative solutions. Additionally, Miami David has a tendency to place an emphasis on innovation and experimentation.
From a mediator’s perspective, Miami David would feel most comfortable adopting a facilitative-broad perspective to solving issues. Miami David would encourage individuals to consider broad ranging interests rather than their rights. He would find merit in helping parties find alternative means to settle their disputes by discussing their underlying interests and developing creative solutions. To Miami David, the legal aspect of an issue takes a back seat as the substantive issues are addressed. Additionally, substantive issues would be more of a concern than providing predictions, assessments, or recommendations. Miami David would direct his attention toward keeping the parties focused and would find reward in achieving a holistic resolution.

Servant leadership fits nicely with Miami David’s style, as servant leadership stresses doing no harm, having faith in people, not trying to control events, playing the host, and leading the conversation. Furthermore, Miami David’s characteristics would favor establishing a clear identity and respecting all parties, keeping sight of the big picture, not being intimidated by the unknown, demanding honest and forthright exchanges, and respecting rituals and symbols.

*Figure 46. Quadrant preference for Miami David’s response to Riskin’s Framework, Quinn and Rohrbaugh’s Framework, and Anderson, Herriot, and Hodgkinson’s Framework.*
Miami Pierre’s analysis of findings. Miami Pierre is an executive of a nonprofit community services organization that helps children. He has been with the organization for almost 13 years and this organization has been in existence for 4 decades. Unlike the last community-based organization that was a sole proprietorship, Miami Pierre’s organization encompasses several hundred individuals.

Contingency analysis. Miami Pierre’s organization also has to deal with a great deal of local, state, and federal regulations. This means that the projected contingency theory stance would be slated to align more with analyzer versus a prospector stance. When asked what type of environment in which Miami Pierre’s organization is working, he stated that it was somewhere between stable and certain versus turbulent and unpredictable, or the analyzer stance. Based on Miami Pierre’s responses, the strategy employed by his organization is between proactive creation of learning systems and defensive operational goal setting. By virtue of the organization being non-profit, the technology involved cannot be low discretion routine, but rather more focused towards complex and high dynamic, which means it is essentially between the two. When asked what type of people are employed and what is the dominant culture of ethos within the organization, Miami Pierre related that many of the individuals that work in the organization find a great deal of intrinsic reward in their work. This implies that the organization is more aligned to self-actualizing with an orientation to work than economic instrumental orientation to work. This finding is based more on the economic realities of the nonprofit organization in that the pay is not very good for the employees, so Miami Pierre feels that they stay because they love working with the children. When asked about how the organization is structured and the dominant management style, Miami Pierre admitted that his organization is highly bureaucratic because of the regulatory environment in which his nonprofit operates. This creates a reactor
stance within the contingency analysis, which signifies that the organization is unstable and additionally not as efficient as it could be (see Figure 47).


**Semi structured question analysis.** Based on the survey results Miami Pierre favors the Miami Quadrant where issues are characterized by a low degree of complication and a high degree of complexity (Figure 48). Higgs and Rowland’s Framework also calls this region the Practitioner Science quadrant or the emergent quadrant. This region is governed by few rules and a loose set of directions. Communications are wide-ranging and constant, as is the sharing of information and ideas. Expertise outside of the area of concern and novel mixes of people help
an organization find alternative solutions to this type of problem. An organization facing a problem in the Miami Quadrant emphasizes innovation and experimentation.

Miami Pierre most likely adopts a facilitative-broad perspective when dealing with conflict, encouraging the negotiating parties to consider their broad ranging interests rather than their rights. Miami Pierre is probably interested in finding alternative means to settle disputes by focusing on underlying interests and developing creative solutions. To Miami Pierre, the legal position takes a back seat to the substantive issues being addressed, as he only needs to keep the parties focused on the realistic aspects of their proposals. Miami Pierre will mainly emphasize the holistic nature of an agreement, but must be cognizant about providing predictions, assessments, or recommendations.

Lastly, Miami Pierre is in tune with leadership traits related to the servant leadership model. As a servant leader, Miami Pierre most likely believes in several if not all of the traits in servant leadership. These traits focus on not doing harm as well as having faith in people. Miami Pierre most likely would prefer not to control events, but rather keep the parties engaged. He may lead the conversation, nourish identity, focus on the bigger picture, encourage honest and forthright opinions, and most importantly demand respect among participants.
Acknowledgement of relationships in Miami Quadrant. For of the Miami Quadrant and the resulting interviews with Miami David and Miami Pierre, strong relationships can be seen between the Miami Quadrants of Riskin’s Framework and Higgs and Rowland’s Framework (Figure 49). Based on these results, one can infer that Miami David and Miami Pierre prefer relationships characteristic of the facilitative-broad mediator stance. Additionally, Miami David and Miami Pierre show favorability towards low complication and high complexity situations. They also demonstrate favorability to an open systems model for leadership such as servant leadership, implying a flexible and externally focused leadership stance. Again these interviews show a relationship between these quadrants, suggesting that further research is warranted.
Figure 49. Acknowledgment for the relations in the Miami Quadrant witnessed between Riskin’s Framework, Quinn and Rohrbaugh’s Framework, and Anderson, Herriot, and Hodgkinson’s Framework.

**Boston Quadrant Analysis of Findings**

The Boston Quadrant deals with tasks that are high in complication and relationships that are high in complexity. Referring to Riskin’s Framework, this quadrant relates to the evaluative-broad mediation style. Denoting leadership styles, this quadrant relates to the rational goals model. In this quadrant, high complication and high complexity imply a good deal of closeness between the individuals. One would expect to find many solutions to a problem, but each side must be given direction. They will speculate on outcomes, form opinions by reading or studying relevant documents, and apply pressure to settle by emphasizing options that satisfy broader interests rather than narrow positions to the conflict (Figure 50).

Figure 50. Is there a relationship between the Boston Quadrant of Higgs and Rowland’s Framework and the Boston Quadrant of Riskin’s Framework?
**Boston Richard’s analysis of findings.** Boston Richard was selected as a participant for the Boston Quadrant. He is an executive in a for-profit organization in the education field. This specific organization includes approximately 140 staff and faculty members and roughly 900 students.

**Contingency analysis.** Reviewing the contingency analysis, Boston Richard’s organization aligns very closely with the analyzer stance. When asked about the organization’s environment, Boston Richard explained that it is somewhere between stable and certain versus turbulent and unpredictable. The management strategy being employed in this organization is somewhere between defensive operational goal setting and proactive creative of learning systems. The type of technology being used within this organization is somewhere between routine low discretion versus complex dynamic high discretion. When asked what types of individuals are employed in the organization, Boston Richard asserted that his employees are more aligned towards self-actualizing with an orientation to their work. When asked about the dominant management style and the organizational structure, Boston Richard described it as a technocracy that balances between mechanistic bureaucratic and organic. This organization closely aligns with the analyzer stance in the contingency analysis (see Figure 51).
Semi-structured questions. Boston Richard’s results for the survey display favorability towards the Boston Quadrant in both Higgs and Rowland’s Framework and Riskin’s Framework (Figure 52). This favorability towards the Boston Quadrant suggests that Boston Richard is driven directly by the expert or top group that leads an organization. Unlike the Seattle Quadrant, though, individuals favoring the Boston Quadrant are responsive and adaptable to new ideas and innovations. If training is needed it is developed as the solution to the problem takes shape.
Boston Richard’s Responses

Higgs and Rowland’s Framework  Riskin’s Framework

Seattle  Boston  Seattle  Boston
San Diego  Miami  San Diego  Miami
23.50%  27.11%  23.19%  28.82%
25.18%  24.21%  23.65%  24.35%

Figure 52. Quadrant preference for Boston Richard’s response to Riskin’s Framework, Quinn and Rohrbaugh’s Framework, and Anderson, Herriot, and Hodgkinson’s Framework.

**Boston Katelynn’s analysis of findings.** The employees who work for Boston Katelynn are extremely artistic as she is a television executive for a show that airs nationally on a major network and her organization works with the creative end of the organization. It should be noted that, from the researcher’s perspective, the entertainment industry is very much an old guard defender stance industry when one considers the contingency analysis. This conflict creates an interesting paradox for creative individuals who develop content for the entertainment industry as these individuals would thrive in prospector stance environment.

**Contingency analysis.** Boston Katelynn appears to be an individual who is able to operate effectively and efficiently in this industry in spite of the paradoxical nature of the environment in which she works. This is seen quite clearly in her contingency analysis. For the organization in which she is a manager, her environment is somewhere between analyzer and prospector. The initial assumption correlated with this is that she deals with many administrative issues but that her staff members are highly creative in their job skills. When asked about the nature of her organization’s environment, Boston Katelynn’s response was clearly in the
analyzer stance; this means that the environment is somewhere between stable and certain versus turbulent and unpredictable. Boston Katelynn’s managerial style is somewhere between defensive operational goal setting versus proactive creative of learning systems. In terms of individuals employed within this organization, Boston Katelynn feels that her staff is highly self-actualizing with an orientation to work and that their nature is very organic. The way she is able to accommodate both the bureaucratic nature of the corporation and the highly creative employees has Boston Katelynn adopting a predominantly democratic management style (see Figure 53).

![Figure 53. Assessment of the contingency analysis for Boston Katelynn’s organization. Note. Adapted from Images of Organization (2nd ed.; p. 58), by G. Morgan, 1997, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. Copyright 1997 by Sage.](image-url)
**Semi-structured questions.** Regardless of the paradox that Boston Katelynn is facing based on the contingency analysis, Boston Katelynn has a strong favorability towards the Boston Quadrant (Figure 54). This implies that Boston Katelynn’s leadership oversees the organization, but that she is responsive and adaptable to new ideas and innovations. If training is needed it is developed as the solution to the problem takes shape. Boston Katelynn most likely believes there are many solutions to a problem, and that each side must be given direction on how to interpret the other side’s intent. Boston Katelynn may also be prone to speculate on outcomes, form opinions by reading or studying relevant documents, and apply pressure to settle by emphasizing options that satisfy broader interests rather than narrow positions.

**Boston Katelynn’s Responses**

![Pie charts](image)

*Figure 54.* Quadrant preference for Boston Katelynn’s response to Riskin’s Framework, Quinn and Rohrbaugh’s Framework, and Anderson, Herriot, and Hodgkinson’s Framework.

To ensure success in the organization, Boston Katelynn’s management style emphasizes increasing organizational clock speed, designing structural divergence, and ensuring organizational modularity and hybrid distribution channels. Additionally, Boston Katelynn’s management style embraces asymmetrical research and supports organizational coherence and team management.
Boston Katelynn emphasizes the need to understand and embrace the paradox that exists between economic value and organizational capability. She also subscribes to the notion that although expert participants provide the bulk of direction, non-experts must also be embraced. Boston Katelynn is probably aware that finding consensus is never easy, but she understands that structures and systems, known as the hard structure, need to be considered simultaneously along with the corporate culture, also called the soft structure. To accomplish this, Boston Katelynn supports planning for spontaneity so long as this drive for reinforcing change does not deny resources to the greater society to which the change is beholden.

**Acknowledgement of relationships in Boston Quadrant.** From the analysis of the interviews with Boston Richard and Boston Katelynn, a relationship appears to exist between their leadership styles and that of the evaluative-broad quadrant in Riskin’s Framework and the Pragmatic Science quadrant of Anderson, Herriot, and Hodgkinson’s Framework, in that they embrace both a high complication and high complexity environment, and the Rational Goals Model presented by Quinn and Rohrbaugh’s Framework. These results support the relationships as defined, suggesting that further research would be beneficial (Figure 55).

*Figure 55.* Acknowledgment for the relations in the Boston Quadrant as witnessed between Riskin’s Framework, Quinn and Rohrbaugh’s Framework, and Anderson, Herriot, and Hodgkinson’s Framework.
San Diego Quadrant Analysis of Findings

The last major section for interviews is the San Diego Quadrant (Figure 56). In this quadrant the leaders deal with tasks that are low in complication and relationships that are low in complexity. The San Diego Quadrant corresponds to the human relations model as the structure is flexible and the focus is internal. The specific leadership style that corresponds to this quadrant is LMX theory. For the leader, the decision process is pushed down in the ranks to the lower levels, but control is maintained as only a narrow range exists for allowable solutions. Leaders in this quadrant commonly respond to problems by using one size fits all solution matrices or templates, leaving minimal opportunities for personalization. Innovation is allowed, but is limited to established boundaries. Training programs are an important aspect of this quadrant, as development is dispersed through a narrow top-down approach of institutional learning. Additionally, the leader forms opinions by studying relevant documents and applies pressure to settle disputes. As mentioned previously, LMX theory is based on the philosophy that leaders should treat followers as specific individuals rather than as a group. The leader promotes opportunities for the individuals to take on new roles and responsibilities while building trust and respect. The expectation is that the followers will then reciprocate with a willingness to do more than is required of them and look for innovative ways to advance the goals of the organization (Northouse, 2007).
Figure 56. Is there a relationship between the San Diego Quadrant of Higgs and Rowland’s Framework and the San Diego Quadrant of Riskin’s Framework?

San Diego Edmund’s analysis of findings. San Diego Edmund is an assistant fire chief at a major southern California fire department. At the time of the interview, a good deal of training conducted in the fire department was focused on individual behavior within the respective fire stations.

Contingency analysis. Utilizing contingency analysis theory, San Diego Edmund works for a government organization that is heavily bureaucratic. As a government agency, the environment in which the organization operates is stable and certain. A special note needs to be made that at the time of this interview, the fire department was dealing with significant budgetary shortfalls for the city in which the fire department operates. The budgetary concerns may have skewed the level of unpredictability the leaders of the organization may have felt. However, as this department is the only fire department for a specific region, there are no competitors. Therefore, the struggles the fire department was facing are internal in nature, and unless something dire happens, the fire department will continue to exist: hence, the reason why it is operating in a stable and certain environment. Again, the mission of the fire department is to fight fires and save people’s lives. Regardless of any budgetary concerns there will always be a fire department, and this is the reason why the kind of strategy being employed is defensive operational and goal setting. Life in the fire department is routine, as the organization must
follow policies and procedures; hence, the technology used is routine and low discretion. This
does not mean that there is no room for improvement; it just means that the fire department’s
policies and procedures are well defined and followed.

San Diego Edmund claims that there is a good deal of intrinsic reward for people to stay
in the fire department versus only showing up to receive a paycheck. For this reason, the type of
people who are employed and the dominant culture of ethos within the organization is
somewhere between economic instrumental orientation to work and self-actualizing orientation
to work. The question for people who claim they are only intrinsically driven with their job is,
“If you were not being paid for the job would you still come to work every day?” As employees
in the fire department are fairly compensated for their work, this is the reason why the motives
for the employees in the fire department are not purely intrinsic. The last two questions of the
contingency analysis regard the organization structure and the dominant management style.
Again, working in a large government organization, San Diego Edmund correctly identifies the
fire department as being a bureaucracy (see Figure 57).

*Semi-structured question analysis.* San Diego Edmund’s response favors the San Diego Quadrant as seen in Figure 58. The San Diego Quadrant’s characteristics favor a decision process that is pushed down in the ranks to the lower levels, but control is maintained as only a narrow range exists for allowable solutions. San Diego Edmund will most likely respond to a situation with a preprogrammed response, matrix, or template, leaving minimal opportunities for personalization. Innovation is allowed, but limited to established boundaries. Training programs are an important aspect of San Diego Edmund’s psychic as development is dispersed through a narrow top-down approach of institutional learning.
San Diego Edmund’s Responses

Higgs and Rowland’s Framework

Riskin’s Framework

Seattle 23.47% 25.23%
Boston 24.35% 20.54%
San Diego 26.57% 30.27%
Miami 25.62% 23.96%

Figure 58. Quadrant preference for San Diego Edmund’s response to Riskin’s Framework, Quinn and Rohrbaugh’s Framework, and Anderson, Herriot, and Hodgkinson’s Framework.

San Diego Edmund is not averse to significant sine qua non responsibility, owing to the perspective that he adheres to direction from experts and uses it to solve problems. San Diego Edmund would therefore support top-level expert managers keeping their eyes on the organization via mentoring local leaders and becoming their thinking partners. If the organization encountered a situation it was not trained to handle, then San Diego Edmund would expect top-level expert managers to prepare and push institutional change as needed.

San Diego Edmund would most likely be an acolyte to power, identity, conflict, and learning. He would also be skilled in an after-action review process that embraces building an intricate understanding of the organization, encouraging straight talk, managing for the future, harnessing setbacks, promoting inventive accountability, understanding the quid pro quo, and creating relentless discomfort with the status quo.

LMX theory would form a base for San Diego Edmund’s philosophy of a leader, as he would treat subordinates as specific individuals rather than as a group. He would encourage and promote opportunities for the participants in his organization to take on new roles and
responsibilities while building trust and respect. Lastly, San Diego Edmund would place a high expectation on individuals reciprocating with willingness to do more than is required of them and look for innovative ways to advance the goals of the organization.

**San Diego Ian’s analysis of findings.** San Diego Ian is a regional fire chief for a major Southern California fire department. As a 30-year veteran, San Diego Ian had a wealth of experience to share in his interview. This being the case, San Diego Ian’s interview was also one of the most difficult to interpret because his responses were quite lengthy and intricate. In addition, San Diego Ian is a highly enthusiastic individual. This required interpretation and some toning down of his responses to several of the interview questions.

Contingency analysis. The contingency analysis is a good case in point. From San Diego Ian’s responses (Figure 38), the nature of the organization’s environment is understandably stable and certain in that there are few competitors for the fire department. When asked what kind of strategy is being employed, defensive operational goal setting or proactive creative of learning systems, San Diego Ian championed a proactive learning environment. San Diego Ian’s next response regarding what kind of technology is being used indicated that the organization did have a good deal of routine and low discretion, but noted that it was always looking for new and better ways to understand its current policies and procedure. When asked about the kind of people who are employed in his organization and about the dominant culture or ethos within the organization, San Diego Ian’s enthusiastic response was that the average firefighter does this job because of his/her passion for helping the common good. Therefore the environment is highly self-actualizing with an orientation to work. The purposes of the study, this was interpreted as falling between instrumental orientation to work and self-actualizing. For the next two categories in the contingency analysis San Diego Ian was forthright in stating that the organization is
bureaucratic in nature, therefore the organizational structure and dominant management style is bureaucratic (see Figure 59).

Semi-structured question analysis. San Diego Ian’s responses to the study favor the San Diego Quadrant as seen in Figure 60. This implies that, unlike the Seattle Quadrant, where an individual would seek a straightforward definition of the solution, San Diego Ian will most likely seek a decision process that is pushed down in the ranks to the lower levels, but controlled, as only a narrow range exists for allowable solutions. San Diego Ian’s likely response to a situation would embrace a one size fits all solution of matrices or templates, leaving minimal opportunities for personalization. San Diego Ian accepts innovation as long as it is limited to established boundaries. Training programs are an important aspect of this quadrant, as development is dispersed through a narrow top-down approach of institutional learning.
San Diego Ian’s approach to leadership would embrace working with direction from experts to solve problems. Obviously this implies that San Diego Ian will have significant sine qua non responsibility, as top-level expert managers would keep their eye on the organization by mentoring local leaders and becoming their thinking partners. If the organization encountered an undefined situation, then San Diego Ian would yield until top-level expert managers became involved, but would then push to adopt an institutional change if needed.

San Diego Ian would be comfortable with the perspective of corporate culture change within the organization so long as this change was directed through power, identity, conflict, and learning. To measure the success of these traits, San Diego Ian has most likely developed an
after-action review process that includes: (a) building an intricate understanding of the business, (b) encouraging uncompromising straight talk, (c) managing for the future, (d) harnessing setbacks, (e) promoting inventive accountability, (f) understanding the quid pro quo, and (g) creating relentless discomfort with the status quo.

The traits of San Diego’s leadership adhere closely with LMX theory, which is based on the philosophy that leaders should treat followers as specific individuals rather than as a group. The leader promotes opportunities for individuals to take on new roles and responsibilities while building trust and respect. The expectation is that the followers will then reciprocate with a willingness to do more than is required of them and look for innovative ways to advance the goals of the organization.

**San Diego Ian’s Responses**

**Higgs and Rowland’s Framework**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>22.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>24.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>26.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>25.58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Riskin’s Framework**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>19.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>18.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>32.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>29.75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 60.* Quadrant preference for San Diego Ian’s response to Riskin’s Framework, Quinn and Rohrbaugh’s Framework, and Anderson, Herriot, and Hodgkinson’s Framework.

**Acknowledgement of relationships in San Diego Quadrant.** For the San Diego Quadrant and from the analysis of the interviews with San Diego Edmund and San Diego Ian, strong relationships can be seen in the San Diego Quadrant for the participants involved in this study, implying that for the San Diego Quadrant a relationship can be observed between Riskin’s
Framework, Anderson, Herriot, and Hodgkinson’s Framework, and Quinn and Rohrbaugh’s Framework. The findings specifically suggest a relationship between the evaluative-narrow style of mediating, high complication, low complexity and stability, and internal focus within the structure of the individual’s leadership style. This study suggests that because a relationship exists, further investigation is warranted in developing this relationship. These findings highlight the relationships between the facilitative-narrow quadrant of Riskin’s Framework, the low complication and low complexity quadrant in Anderson, Herriot, and Hodgkinson’s Framework, and the human relations model in Quinn and Rohrbaugh’s Framework (Figure 61). These findings indicate that further research would be beneficial.

Figure 61. Acknowledgment for the relations in the San Diego Quadrant as witnessed between Riskin’s Framework, Quinn and Rohrbaugh’s Framework, and Anderson, Herriot, and Hodgkinson’s Framework.
Acknowledging the potentials for relationships between the quadrants and the research questions

This study is entitled Exploring Leadership Styles from a Mediator’s Perspective: A Phenomenological Study examining Four Specific Organizational Leadership Styles and their relationship to Four Mediation Styles as summarized by Leonard L. Riskin. This research encompassed four research questions:

1. What relationship, if any, exists between the evaluative-narrow approach to mediation and situational leadership?
2. What relationship, if any, exists between the evaluative-broad approach to mediation and transformational leadership?
3. What relationship, if any, exists between the facilitative-narrow approach to mediation and Leader Member Exchange (LMX Theory) theory?
4. What relationship, if any, exists between the facilitative-broad approach to mediation and servant leadership?

As the title and research questions imply, this study is qualitative research and seeks to explore whether or not relationships can be derived from a specific phenomenon; in this case how leaders approach conflict in their organizations. These results are not quantitative, but the outcomes arrived at in this study do not preclude the potential for relationships, such that

1. There were no findings in this study that would preclude a relationship existing between the evaluative-narrow approach to mediation and situational leadership.
2. There were no findings in this study that would preclude a relationship existing between the evaluative-broad approach to mediation and transformational leadership.
3. There were no findings in this study that would preclude a relationship existing between the facilitative-narrow approach to mediation and Leader Member Exchange (LMX Theory) theory.

4. There were no findings in this study that would preclude a relationship existing between the facilitative-broad approach to mediation and servant leadership.

While there was no clearly defined relationship identified in this study between the respective quadrants in both Higgs and Rowland’s framework and Riskin’s Framework, there may have been indicators of indirect associations embedded in the interview data. Given these findings and the potentials of their meaning, the results of the study indicate that a potential relationship exists between Riskin’s Framework representing mediation styles and both Anderson, Herriot, and Hodgkinson’s Framework and Quinn and Rohrbaugh’s Framework representing leadership (Figure 62).
Figure 62. Results of the study indicate that a potential relationship exists between Riskin’s Framework representing mediation styles and both Anderson, Herriot, and Hodgkinson’s Framework and Quinn and Rohrbaugh’s Framework representing leadership.
Limitations of the study

Impact of the timeframe on the study. The timeframe for this study was excessive and may have impacted the results. Finding participants who were willing to participate was by far the biggest challenge. Surprisingly, the researcher believed that finding a participating fire department would be the biggest hurdle, when in fact they were the first to volunteer. The hardest participants to find were presiding judges. This challenge even necessitated the researcher to fly to a participant’s office to conduct an interview.

Interview protocol’s length may have contributed to a perception of complexity for the participants. The interview was comprised of 142 questions and may have taken up to three hours to complete. Given that the participants in this study were leaders within their organizations, the time commitment to complete the interview may have been excessive. Additionally several of the participants were not comfortable with the terminology used in this study. More specifically the structures of the questions were explicitly derided from academic disciplines and nomenclature.

Participants’ self-ranked responses did not always align with the results of their interview. A key component of this study was the use of Contingency Analysis. This tool was indispensable in identifying a participant’s understanding of the environment their organizations operated in. The results derived from the tool thought may lead to speculation regarding the outcomes as the researcher is given a good deal of latitude to interpret the results.

Participant may not be forthright with their answers. A parameter for this study focused on leaders within an organization. By the very nature of these individuals holding this position within the organization implies that these individuals possess certain attributes which allowed them to become leaders. In short these individuals have most likely developed a certain
level of political savvy. This political savvy may have impacted the answers these individual provided to the researcher and may not represent the true feelings of the participant.

**Significances of Job Title and Adaptation to the Environment**

This study employed purposive sampling to select participants. These individuals were selected because they were leaders within their organizations, they dealt directly with disputes on a daily basis, and lastly because their position related closely to a chosen quadrant in this study. The results from this study indicate that the participants displayed qualities from their categorized quadrant more so than qualities from the other quadrants. This study would seem to indicate that job title has a significant impact on the manner in which an individual approaches conflict. From the Seattle Quadrant, presiding judges were interviewed. Their answers aligned more with those qualities that were highlighted in the Seattle Quadrant. This means that the judges favored situational leadership and evaluative-narrow mediation over the other leadership and mediation styles. The same can be said for community leaders aligning with the Miami Quadrant who showed a preference for servant leadership and facilitative-broad mediation, for-profit business leaders aligning with the Boston Quadrant and showing a preference for transformational leadership and evaluative-broad mediation styles, and firefighters aligning with the San Diego Quadrant and showing a preference for LMX theory and facilitative-narrow mediation. Although, investigating the reasons for this favorability is beyond the scope of this study, this comparison does raise the questions about why these associations exist. Could the job title of a position have an impact on the traits an individual embraces? Is there an inherent trait within the individual that has inspired him/her to excel in their chosen occupation? Is the participant’s displayed characteristic a result of a lifetime of training in this specific leadership field or is society dictating how an individual should conduct himself/herself in a specific job?
Regardless of the reason, these questions are outside the scope of the current research and are worthy of extensive consideration.

**Recommendations for Further Research**

To narrow the options for future research, the researcher recommends two limited areas that merit further immediate research: the establishment of a training framework for leadership to understand how environment drives leadership style, and a tool for leaders to self-assess their current leadership style and a means by which a leader can understand the need to change his/her leadership style. As this study showcases, a potential training framework would need to address the environment in which a leader is working. Additionally, leaders must understand that different environments require different leadership skills. These leadership styles must be taught to the leader and it is important for leaders to understand that one leadership style does not fit all situations.

Lastly, the foundation of this study lends itself to a self-assessment format, along the lines of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. Leadership style based on environment can be quantified. Once quantified, a leader has a cookbook, so to speak, for dealing with different scenarios to improve the efficiency of the organization.

**Concluding Remarks**

Is leadership an art, skill, or science? Is mediation an art, skill, or science? Numerous of books have been written about the art and skill of successful leadership and mediation. Where research is lacking, though, is in the ability to quantify both leadership and mediation: the focus of the present study. By taking a conflict and applying Higgs and Rowland’s Framework and Riskin’s Framework through a phenomenological study format, the research shows that the potential for a relationship exists between the two fields of study as seen in Figure 62. If a
relationship exists in qualitative format, then perhaps a relationship exists in a quantitative
format as well. If the latter is true, then a whole new potential may exist for quantifying both
leadership and mediation. Maybe even the potential for forecasting or programming leadership
and mediation styles exists. First, though, one step at a time!
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APPENDIX A

INFORMED CONSENT FORM FOR PARTICIPATION IN RESEARCH ACTIVITIES

Participant: _____________________________________________

Principal Investigator: Thomas J. Gajewski

Title of Project: Exploring Leadership Styles from a Mediator’s Perspective: Phenomenological Study Examining Four Specific Organizational Leadership Styles and their Relationship to Four Mediation Styles as Summarized by Leonard L. Riskin

I, __________________________, agree to participate in the research study being conducted by Tom Gajewski under the direction of Dr. Elizabeth C. Reilly.

The overall purpose of this research is to bring greater understanding of the relationship between various mediation styles and leadership success.

My participation will involve the following:

One face-to-face individual interview that will last up to two hours in length. The interview will be at the participant’s convenience, and will take place at their work site or other site of their choice. A copy of the letter of informed consent, interview protocol, and questions will be provided.

One survey that will take approximately one hour to complete.

My participation in the study will take approximately three hours. The study shall be conducted in your place of work or at a place of your choosing.

I understand that the possible benefits to myself or society from this research are that this information might be useful to other organizations interested in understanding how mediation relates to leadership.

I understand that there are certain risks and discomforts that might be associated with this research. These risks include: the physical risk of fatigue, the psychological risk of boredom and anxiety, and the social risk of embarrassment. The researcher will provide breaks as needed. You may choose to not answer any question.

I understand that my estimated expected recovery time after the experiment will be either immediate or within thirty minutes.

I understand that I may choose not to participate in this research.
I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I may refuse to participate and or withdraw my consent and discontinue participation in the project or activity at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which I am otherwise entitled.

I understand that the investigator will take all reasonable measures to protect the confidentiality of my records and my identity will not be revealed in any publication that may result from this project unless I agree to have my name used. The confidentiality of my records will be maintained in accordance with applicable state and federal laws. Under California law, there are exceptions to confidentiality, including suspicion that a child, elder, or dependent adult is being abused, or if an individual discloses an intent to harm him/herself or others. I understand there is a possibility that my medical record, including identifying information, may be inspected and or photocopied by officials of the Food and Drug Administration or other federal or state government agencies during the ordinary course of carrying out their functions. If I participate in a sponsored research project, a representative of the sponsor may inspect my research records.

I understand that the investigator is willing to answer any inquiries I may have concerning the research herein described. I understand that I may contact Dr. Elizabeth C. Reilly at ereilly@pepperdine.edu if I have other questions or concerns about this research. If I have questions about my rights as a research participant, I understand that I can contact Dr. Doug Leigh, Chairperson of the Graduate School of Education and Psychology IRB, Pepperdine University, at dleigh@pepperdine.edu, if I have any further questions.

I will be informed of any significant new findings developed during the course of my participation in this research which may have a bearing on my willingness to continue in the study.

I understand that in the event of physical injury resulting from the research procedures in which I am to participate, no form of compensation is available. Medical treatment may be provided at my own expense or at the expense of my health care insurer which may or may not provide coverage. If I have questions, I should contact my insurer.
I understand to my satisfaction the information regarding participation in the research project. All my questions have been answered to my satisfaction. I have received a copy of this informed consent form which I have read and understand. I hereby consent to participate in the research described above.

Participant’s Signature: ____________________________
Date: ____________________________
Witness: ____________________________
Date: ____________________________

I have explained and defined in detail the research procedure in which the subject has consented to participate. Having explained this and answered any questions, I am cosigning this form and accepting this person’s consent.

Principle Investigator: ____________________________
Date: ____________________________
Non-verbal Communications

The researcher should be cognitive to maintain a neutral position when interviewing, but also be observant of the gestures of the participant.

Listening

The researcher is to promote the following during the interview:

- Successful and appropriate eye contact
- Appropriate facial gestures
- Appropriate affirmative head nods (Remember that the nod of the head can be interpreted as agreement or acknowledge. A mediator should try to be consistent with any nods to avoid concern regarding lack of impartiality)
- Avoidance of actions or gestures that suggest boredom (such as yawning and leaning on your hand)
- Asking clarifying questions
- Paraphrasing using neutral words
- Not interrupting the speaker
- Not talking too much
- Acknowledging and validating feelings and thoughts (having empathy)

Unstructured Questions

- These are also commonly referred to as an open question.
- Open questions are as the name suggests, a question designed to allow the participant to respond freely.
- Examples may include,
  - “Please tell me what you think about this issue” or
  - “Can you please elaborate on that further?”
- These questions garner a wealth of information for the researcher while providing an environment that is stimulus free for the participant.

Semi-structured Questions

- Once a topic of interest is broached by the participant, the research must next draw out the details of the specific issue with semi-structured questions.
- Clarifying questions are part of this category and provide a method for inquiry where a pointed response from the researcher provides a deeper understanding of a piece of information.
• Examples may include,
  o “Can you explain that issue in greater detail?” or
  o “How do you think the issue could have been resolved?”

• Clarifying questions by definition still have a generality about them. To understand the specific reaction of the participant, another form of semi-structure question called a justification question may be useful.

• Care must be used in justification questions as the researcher could inadvertently cause the participant to become defensive.

• Instead of using directness, “Why did you act that way?” where the participant is placed on the defensive, a more tactful question would be,
  o “Explain the different options that were available and how you felt about the use of each one.”

• Care must again be used by the researcher in that a tactful justification question could just as easily become a compound question which again inadvertently is a question that implies a multitude of meanings; “Why you think the individual was drinking and driving or having an adverse reaction to medication?”

• Due to their complex nature, compound questions should be avoided.

Structured Questions

• The last category of questioning is the structured or closed question.

• This question may be answered by a “yes” or “no” response or may be answered using a set of optional responses; “Based on what you saw the individual do, do you think the individual was drunk?”

• While this question may extract a specific piece of information, the perception may not be complete, meaning that there was additionally information the participant could have provided on a given topic.

• Closed questions should be used infrequently and as a means of bring a line of questioning to a close.

Capturing

• The researcher will ask each participant to share a specific story about a typical conflict repeatedly encountered in a normal day in their organization that involves their leadership style.

• The participate should be cognizant that though extreme or emergency situation may come to mind in relating an experience, the focus of this study is to better understand the day-to-day interactions of the participants, their methods for handling conflict that may happen on a daily basis and the most common leadership style they may employ.

• From these two unstructured questions a mixture of unstructured, semi-structure and structured questions will be asked by the researcher.
• These interviews will be conducted in person and the participant will be told of the initial question in advance.

• The interviews will be tape-recorded following all applicable requirements established by the Pepperdine University’s IRB process.

• Transcripts will be provided to the participants for their review and feedback for accuracy of transcription.

• If the individual elects to remain anonymous, then their identity will be protected with their real names, organizations and situations being camouflaged.
APPENDIX C

ADMINISTRATIVE AND DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONS

Administrative Questions

1. Name of Participant
2. Date of Interview
3. Time of Interview
4. Location of Interview
5. Signed Confidentiality Statement

Demographic Questions:

6. Age
7. Gender
8. Race, Ethnicity or Heritage participant identifies with
9. Religion
10. Nationality
11. Primary Language
12. Education level
13. Occupation
14. City/state of organization
15. Number of employees
16. How long has the organization been in existence?
17. What is your department?
18. What is your title?
19. How long have you been in this position?
20. How long have you been with the organization?
21. How many people do you have in your team?
22. How many people do you manage?
23. How many hours do you work in a week?
24. How many planned changes have you been through at this organization?
APPENDIX D

SEMI STRUCTURED QUESTIONS FOR DETERMINING ORGANIZATIONAL SUCCESS
BASED ON MILES & SNOW’S (1978, 2003) CONTINGENCY THEORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stance</th>
<th>Defender</th>
<th>Analyzer</th>
<th>Prospector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is the nature of the organization’s environment?</td>
<td>Stable And Certain</td>
<td>Turbulent And Unpredictable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What kind of strategy is being employed?</td>
<td>Defensive, Operational, Goal Setting</td>
<td>Proactive creation of learning system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What kind of technology (mechanical and non-mechanical) is being used?</td>
<td>Routine, Low Discretion</td>
<td>Complex, Dynamic High Discretion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What kinds of people are employed, and what is the dominant “culture” or ethos within the organization?</td>
<td>Economic, Instrumental, orientation to work</td>
<td>Self-actualizing orientation to work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is the organization structured?</td>
<td>Mechanistic, Bureaucratic</td>
<td>Organic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the dominant management style?</td>
<td>Autocracy, Theory X</td>
<td>Bureaucracy</td>
<td>Technocracy, Democracy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Un-Structured Question

25. Please describe your organization and your leadership role within the organization

Structured Question

26. What is the nature of the organizational environment?
   a. Stable and Certain
   b. Turbulent and Unpredictable
   c. Somewhere in-between

27. What kind of strategy is being employed?
   a. Defensive, Operational, Goal Setting
b. Proactive Creative of Learning Systems
c. Somewhere in-between

28. What kind of technology (mechanical and non-mechanical) is being used?
   a. Routine and with low discretion
   b. Complex, Dynamic and with high discretion
c. Somewhere in-between

29. What kinds of people are being employed and what is the dominant “culture” or ethos within the organization?
   a. Externally driven, Instrumental orientation to work
   b. Intrinsically driven, Self-actualizing orientation to work

30. How is the organization structured?
   a. Mechanistic and or Bureaucratic
   b. Organic

31. What is the dominant management structure?
   a. Autocracy and Theory X
   b. Bureaucracy
c. Technocracy
d. Democracy
e. Co-Determination and Theory Y
APPENDIX E

COMPREHENSIVE QUESTION TO ASK ALL PARTICIPANTS FOR DETERMINING
LEADERSHIP AND MEDIATION STYLE

Un-Structured Question

32. Please share with us a specific story about a typical conflict in a normal day that you personally encountered repeatedly in your organization and your leadership style used to address the conflict.

Special Note

Please be cognizant that though extreme or emergency situations may come to mind in relating an experience, the focus of this study is to better understand the day-to-day interactions of the participants, your methods for handling conflict that may happen on a daily basis and the most common leadership style you may employ.
APPENDIX F

SEMI STRUCTURED QUESTIONS FOR SEATTLE QUADRANT

Semi-Structured Question

Seattle Quadrant

- Kotter (1995)
  33. Did you approach this conflict systematically by stating that urgency and anchoring to organizational culture is part of the solution?

- Duck (1993)
  34. Did you establish context for change and provide guidance?
  35. Did you stimulate conversation?

36. Did you provide appropriate resources?
37. Did you coordinate and align projects?
38. Did you ensure congruence of messages, activities, policies, and behaviors?
39. Did you provide opportunities for joint creation?
40. Did you anticipate, identify, and address people problems?
41. Did you prepare the critical mass for the ensuing decision?

Morgan (1997)

42. Is the organization secure in its methodology?
43. Does the organization administer services in a cost-efficient manner?
44. Do the people employed a mechanistic approach to problems and define their positions narrowly?
45. Does the organization run efficiently and routinely?
46. Is the most successful management style in this environment an authoritarian approach?

Noll (2001) and Riskin (1996)

47. Do you perceive the case on its strengths and weaknesses?
48. Do you have a good understanding about the likely settlements or judgments to ensue?
49. During the conflict, did you urge parties to settle or accept a settlement proposal by using position-based compromise agreements?
50. During the conflict, did you urge parties to settle or accept a settlement proposal by forecasting court outcomes?

51. During the conflict, did you urge parties to settle or accept a settlement proposal by persuading parties to accept mediator assessments?

52. During the conflict, did you urge parties to settle or accept a settlement proposal by assessing the strengths and weaknesses of each side?

*Northouse (2007)*

53. Do you feel the most successful management style in this environment is an authoritarian approach where the leadership can pick from the following limited methods of leading:

   a. Directing?
   
   b. Coaching?
   
   c. Supporting?
   
   d. Delegating?
APPENDIX G

SEMI STRUCTURED QUESTIONS MIAMI QUADRANT

**Semi-Structured Question**

*Higgs and Rowland (2000; 2001; 2005)*

54. As you addressed this conflict, did you have few rules and a loose set of directions?

55. Were communications wide-ranging and encouraging the sharing of information and ideas?

56. Did you consider expertise outside of the area of concern?

57. Did you consider novel mixes of people?

58. Did you consider alternative solutions?

59. Did you emphasis innovation and experimentation?

*Shaw (1997)*

60. Did you consider that the solution to the conflict would involve tension between stability and instability and that this tension would be healthy?

61. As anxieties rose from lack of agreement, did you feel that patience was required?

62. Did you guard against using any form of control as the process required complex learning?

63. Where there times when you felt that the future outcome might be uncertain?

64. Did you view intervention as a means to only assist, stimulate and provoke communications, as feedback loops are required to legitimize the evolving solution?

65. Did you feel that amplifying difference, friction and contention would help the parties learn about each other and encourage complex learning?
Morgan (1997)

66. Do you feel the environment as highly turbulent where products and technologies are rapidly changing and may have a short life span?

67. Did you feel that the quest to think outside the box and search for new ways of solving the issues was key to innovation?

68. Did the people involved make a massive commitment and display high motivation?

69. Did the participant’s balance each other’s strengthens against their weaknesses both internally and externally with the environment?

Noll (2001) and Riskin (1996)

70. Do you feel that the solution to the conflict encouraged the negotiating parties to consider their interests rather than their positions?

71. Do you feel that the solution to the conflict encouraged the parties to find alternative means to settle their conflict?

72. Did the legal position take a back seat as the substantive issues are addressed?

73. Do you feel that the solution to the conflict need only keep the parties focused on realistic aspects of their proposals?

74. Were you careful not to provide predictions, assessments, or recommendations, as this would take away from the holistic-ness of the solution?

75. Did you encourage the parties to give recognition to each other in the hope of building better relationships between those opposing forces?

Wheatley (2004a)

76. In this conflict, did you feel it was important do no harm?

77. In this conflict, did you feel it was important to have faith in people?

78. In this conflict, did you feel it was important to move from the leader as hero, to the leader as host?

79. In this conflict, did you feel it was important not try to control events?

80. In this conflict, did you feel it was important lead the conversation?

Wheatley (2004b)

81. In this conflict, did you feel it was important to nourish a clear identity?

82. In this conflict, did you feel it was important to focus people on the bigger picture?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>83.</td>
<td>In this conflict, did you feel it was important to demand honest, forthright communication?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.</td>
<td>In this conflict, did you feel it was important to prepare for the unknown?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85.</td>
<td>In this conflict, did you feel it was important to keep meaning at the forefront?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86.</td>
<td>In this conflict, did you feel it was important to use rituals and symbols?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87.</td>
<td>In this conflict, did you feel it was important to pay attention to individuals?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX H

SEMI STRUCTURED QUESTIONS FOR SAN DIEGO QUADRANT

Semi-Structured Question

San Diego Quadrant

Higgs and Rowland (2000; 2001; 2005)

88. Did you push the decision process down in the ranks to the lower levels, but maintained control as there was only a narrow range for allowable solutions?

89. Did you feel that solution matrices or templates where a one size fits all mentality were a common response in this conflict with a marginal level of customization for local content?

90. Did you feel that innovation is okay, but limited to established boundaries?

91. Did you feel that training programs were an important solution to this conflict as development was dispersed through a narrow top-down approach in institutional learning?

Senge (1997)

92. Did you feel that a solution to this conflict needed direction from experts?

93. Did you feel that you had sine qua non (indispensable, essential action, condition, or ingredient) responsibility?

94. Did top-level expert managers keep their pulse on the conflict by mentoring local leaders and becoming their thinking partners?

95. If an undefined situation were encountered, could these top-level expert managers have positioned themselves to become stewards of solving the conflict and pushing for institutional change if needed?

Pascale (1990) and Pascale, Millemann, & Gioja (1997)

96. Did you feel that these four traits were used in solving this conflict:
   a. Power?
   b. Identity?
   c. Conflict?
   d. Learning?
97. To measure the success of the solution to the conflict, did you feel these seven disciplines played a role:
   a. Build an intricate understanding of the business?
   b. Encourage uncompromising straight talk?
   c. Manage for the future?
   d. Harness setbacks?
   e. Promote inventive accountability?
   f. Understand the quid pro quo?
   g. Create relentless discomfort with the status quo?

*Noll (2001) and Riskin (1996)*

98. Did you have a straightforward perception of the solution, where you did not try to assess or predict outcomes, nor forms opinions by reading or study relevant documents, nor applies pressure to settle?

99. Did you use caucuses to help each side gain an appreciation of the other’s position and the consequences of not settling?

100. Did you take on the role of educator where your emphasis was placed on educating the parties about the situation they were in and the ramifications of not achieving an agreement?

101. Did you ask the parties questions about their position in the hope the parties would develop their own solutions?

102. Did you encourage the parties to exchange their proposal and evaluative each other proposals in a constructive fashion leading to a mutually agreed settlement?

*Northouse (2007)*

103. Did you feel that the leader in this conflict treated followers as specific individuals rather than as a group?

104. Did you promote opportunities for individuals to take on new roles and responsibilities?

105. Did you believe that building trust and respect was important?

106. Did you feel that it was important for followers to reciprocate with a willingness to do more than required and look for innovative ways to advance the goals of the organization?
APPENDIX I

SEMI STRUCTURED QUESTIONS FOR BOSTON QUADRANT

Semi-Structured Question

_Higgs and Rowland (2005)_

107. Did you feel that change was driven
directly by the expert or top group?

108. Did you feel there was an explicit
overview or agenda imposed by the nature of the
organizational structure?

109. Was the process responsive and adaptable
to new ideas and innovations?

110. Do you feel that if training was needed, if
could have been developed as the solution took shape?

_Nadler and Tushman (1999)_

111. To resolve the conflict, did you believe the following eight core competencies
were needed:
   a. Increased organizational clock speed?
   b. Design structural divergence?
   c. Organizational modularity?
   d. Hybrid distribution channels?
   e. Asymmetrical research and development?
   f. Conflict management processes?
   g. Organizational coherence?
   h. Team management?

_Beer and Nohria (2000a, 2000b)_

112. To resolve the conflict, did you believe the following competency (Theory E) was
needed, “maximize shareholder value?”

113. To resolve the conflict, did you believe the following competency (Theory E) was
needed, “manage change from the top down?”

114. To resolve the conflict, did you believe the following competency (Theory E) was
needed, “emphasize structure and systems?”
115. To resolve the conflict, did you believe the following competency (Theory E) was needed, “plan and establish programs”?

116. To resolve the conflict, did you believe the following competency (Theory E) was needed, “motivate through financial incentive”?

117. To resolve the conflict, did you believe the following competency (Theory E) was needed, “entrust consultants to analyze problems and shape solutions”?

118. To resolve the conflict, did you believe the following competency (Theory O) was needed, “develop organizational capabilities”?

119. To resolve the conflict, did you believe the following competency (Theory O) was needed, “encourage participation from the bottom up”?

120. To resolve the conflict, did you believe the following competency (Theory O) was needed, “build up corporate culture: employees’ behavior and attitudes”?

121. To resolve the conflict, did you believe the following competency (Theory O) was needed, “experiment and evolve”?

122. To resolve the conflict, did you believe the following competency (Theory O) was needed, “cultivate through commitment - use pay as fair exchange”?

123. To resolve the conflict, did you believe the following competency (Theory O) was needed, “consultants support management in shaping their own solutions”?

124. Combining the two theories together (Theory E & O), did you believe there is a paradox between economic value and organizational capability and this paradox needs to be embraced?

125. Combining the two theories together (Theory E & O), did you believe direction is given from the experts, but the non-experts must also be embraced?

126. Combining the two theories together (Theory E & O), did you believe finding consensus in never easy, in that structures and systems, also known as the hard structure, need to be simultaneously considered along with the corporate culture or the soft structure?

127. Combining the two theories together (Theory E & O), did you believe spontaneity must be planned for?

128. Combining the two theories together (Theory E & O), did you believe change must be reinforced while not driving it?

129. Combining the two theories together (Theory E & O), did you believe resources were used to empower the participants?

*Noll (2001) and Riskin (1996)*

130. Did you believe there are many solutions to a problem, but that each side must be given direction on how to interpret the other side’s intent?
131. Did you believe that the sides in the conflict speculate on outcomes, form opinions by reading or study relevant documents, and they applied pressure to settle by emphasizing options that satisfy broader interests rather than narrow positions?

132. Did you believe focus was on understanding the nature of the conflict, not the position of the parties, then directing those involved to come to an agreement which serves those interests?

133. Based on your clout or reputation, did you believe it was not beyond the scope to coerce the parties through the use of manipulating strategies such as prediction of the impact on a party if an agreement is not reached?

134. Based on your clout or reputation, did you believe it was not beyond the scope to use threats?

135. Based on your clout or reputation, did you believe it was not beyond the scope to use strong-armed tactics?

136. Did you believe that the focus of a settlement was to garner an agreement which encompasses as many of interests for all the parties involved?

Northouse (2007, pp. 175-206)

137. Did you believe that in order to get the followers to accomplish more than is expected, you must influence “Emotions”?

138. Did you believe that in order to get the followers to accomplish more than is expected, you must influence “Values”?

139. Did you believe that in order to get the followers to accomplish more than is expected, you must influence “Ethics”?

140. Did you believe that in order to get the followers to accomplish more than is expected, you must influence “Standards”?

141. Did you believe that in order to get the followers to accomplish more than is expected, you must influence “Motives”?

142. Did you believe that positive intrinsic rewards provide “idealized influence”?

143. Did you believe that positive intrinsic rewards provide “inspirational motivation”?

144. Did you believe that positive intrinsic rewards provide “intellectual stimulation”?

145. Did you believe that positive intrinsic rewards provide “individualized consideration”?

146. Did you believe that settlements involved developing a positive relationship between followers where improving the performance and development the follower to their fullest potential supported the greater good of the community?
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APPROVED IRB CONSENT FORM FOR 2009 TO 2010

INFORMED CONSENT FOR PARTICIPATION IN RESEARCH ACTIVITIES

Participant: ________________________________

Principal Investigator: Thomas J. Gajewski

Title of Project: Exploring Leadership Styles from a Mediator’s Perspective: Phenomenological Study Examining Four Specific Organizational Leadership Styles and their Relationship to Four Mediation Styles as Summarized by Leonard L. Riskin

1. I, __________________________, agree to participate in the research study being conducted by Thomas J. Gajewski under the direction of Dr. Elizabeth C. Reilly.

2. The overall purpose of this research is to bring greater understanding of the relationship between various mediation styles and leadership success.

3. My participation will involve the following:
   - One face-to-face individual interview that will last up to two hours in length. The interview will be at the participant’s convenience, and will take place at their work site or other site of their choice. A copy of the letter of informed consent, interview protocol, and questions will be provided.
   - One survey that will take approximately one hour to complete.

4. My participation in the study will take approximately three hours. The study shall be conducted in your place of work or at a place of your choosing.

5. Although there are no direct benefits to myself, there may be societal benefits in that organizations might find it useful in understanding how mediation relates to leadership.

6. I understand that there are certain risks and discomforts that might be associated with this research. These risks include: the physical risk of fatigue, the psychological risk of boredom and anxiety, and the social risk of embarrassment. The researcher will provide breaks as needed. You may choose to not answer any question.

8. I understand that I may choose not to participate in this research.

9. I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I may refuse to participate and/or withdraw my consent and discontinue participation in the project or activity at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which I am otherwise entitled.

10. I understand that the investigator will take all reasonable measures to protect the confidentiality of my records and my identity will not be revealed in any publication that may result from this project unless I agree to have my name used. The confidentiality of my records will be maintained in accordance with applicable state and federal laws.

GPR IRB APPROVAL
PEPPERDINE UNIVERSITY

JUN 04 2010
VALED UNTIL DATE ABOVE
11. I understand that the investigator is willing to answer any inquiries I may have concerning the research herein described. I understand that I may contact Dr. Elizabeth C. Reilly at [Contact Information] if I have other questions or concerns about this research. If I have questions about my rights as a research participant, I understand that I can contact Dr. Doug Leigh, Chairperson of the Graduate and Professional Schools IRB, Pepperdine University, at [Contact Information], if I have any further questions.

12. I will be informed of any significant new findings developed during the course of my participation in this research which may have a bearing on my willingness to continue in the study.

13. I understand to my satisfaction the information regarding participation in the research project. All my questions have been answered to my satisfaction. I have received a copy of this informed consent form which I have read and understand. I hereby consent to participate in the research described above.

______________________________
Participant’s Signature

______________________________
Date

______________________________
Witness

______________________________
Date

I have explained and defined in detail the research procedure in which the subject has consented to participate. Having explained this and answered any questions, I am cosigning this form and accepting this person’s consent.

______________________________
Principal Investigator

______________________________
Date

GFS IRB APPROVAL
Pepperdine University

JUN 04 2010
Valid until DATE ABOVE
APPENDIX K

APPROVED IRB CONSENT FORM FOR 2010 TO 2011

INFORMED CONSENT FOR PARTICIPATION IN RESEARCH ACTIVITIES

Participant: ________________________________

Principal Investigator: Thomas J. Gajewski

Title of Project: Exploring Leadership Styles from a Mediator’s Perspective: Phenomenological Study Examining Four Specific Organizational Leadership Styles and their Relationship to Four Mediation Styles as Summarized by Leonard L. Riskin

1. I, ________________________________, agree to participate in the research study being conducted by Thomas J. Gajewski under the direction of Dr. Kent Rhodes.

2. The overall purpose of this research is to bring greater understanding of the relationship between various mediation styles and leadership success.

3. My participation will involve the following:
   - One face-to-face individual interview that will last up to two hours in length. The interview will be at the participant’s convenience, and will take place at their work site or other site of their choice. A copy of the letter of informed consent, interview protocol, and questions will be provided.
   - One survey that will take approximately one hour to complete.

4. My participation in the study will take approximately three hours. The study shall be conducted in your place of work or at a place of your choosing.

5. Although there are no direct benefits to myself, there may be societal benefits in that organizations might find it useful in understanding how mediation relates to leadership.

6. I understand that there are certain risks and discomforts that might be associated with this research. These risks include: the physical risk of fatigue, the psychological risk of boredom and anxiety, and the social risk of embarrassment. The researcher will provide breaks as needed. You may choose to not answer any question.

8. I understand that I may choose not to participate in this research.

9. I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I may refuse to participate and/or withdraw my consent and discontinue participation in the project or activity at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which I am otherwise entitled.

10. I understand that the investigator will take all reasonable measures to protect the confidentiality of my records and my identity will not be revealed in any publication that may result from this project unless I agree to have my name used. The confidentiality of my records will be maintained in accordance with applicable state and federal laws.

GSE IRB APPROVAL
Pepperdine University

MAY 07 2011
VALID UNTIL
DATE ABOVE
11. I understand that the investigator is willing to answer any inquiries I may have concerning the research herein described. I understand that I may contact Dr. Kent Rhodes at [contact information] if I have other questions or concerns about this research. If I have questions about my rights as a research participant, I understand that I can contact Dr. Doug Leigh, Chairperson of the Graduate and Professional Schools IRB, Pepperdine University, at [contact information], if I have any further questions.

12. I will be informed of any significant new findings developed during the course of my participation in this research which may have a bearing on my willingness to continue in the study.

13. I understand to my satisfaction the information regarding participation in the research project. All my questions have been answered to my satisfaction. I have received a copy of this informed consent form which I have read and understand. I hereby consent to participate in the research described above.

_________________________________________________________________________
Participant’s Signature

_________________________________________________________________________
Date

_________________________________________________________________________
Witness

_________________________________________________________________________
Date

I have explained and defined in detail the research procedure in which the subject has consented to participate. Having explained this and answered any questions, I am cosigning this form and accepting this person’s consent.

_________________________________________________________________________
Principal Investigator

_________________________________________________________________________
Date
APPENDIX L

APPROVED IRB CONSENT FORM FOR 2011 TO 2012

INFORMED CONSENT FOR PARTICIPATION IN RESEARCH ACTIVITIES

Participant: ________________________________

Principal Investigator: Thomas J. Gajewski

Title of Project: Exploring Leadership Styles from a Mediator’s Perspective: Phenomenological Study Examining Four Specific Organizational Leadership Styles and their Relationship to Four Mediation Styles as Summarized by Leonard L. Riskin

1. I, ________________________________, agree to participate in the research study being conducted by Thomas J. Gajewski under the direction of Dr. Kent Rhodes.

2. The overall purpose of this research is to bring greater understanding of the relationship between various mediation styles and leadership success.

3. My participation will involve the following:
   - One face-to-face individual interview that will last up to two hours in length. The interview will be at the participant’s convenience, and will take place at their work site or other site of their choice. A copy of the letter of informed consent, interview protocol, and questions will be provided.
   - One survey that will take approximately one hour to complete.

4. My participation in the study will take approximately three hours. The study shall be conducted in your place of work or at a place of your choosing.

5. Although there are no direct benefits to myself, there may be societal benefits in that organizations might find it useful in understanding how mediation relates to leadership

6. I understand that there are certain risks and discomforts that might be associated with this research. These risks include: the physical risk of fatigue, the psychological risk of boredom and anxiety, and the social risk of embarrassment. The researcher will provide breaks as needed. You may choose to not answer any question.

7. I understand that I may choose not to participate in this research.

8. I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I may refuse to participate and/or withdraw my consent and discontinue participation in the project or activity at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which I am otherwise entitled.

9. I understand that the investigator will take all reasonable measures to protect the confidentiality of my records and my identity will not be revealed in any publication that may result from this project unless I agree to have my name used. The confidentiality of my records will be maintained in accordance with applicable state and federal laws.
11. I understand that the investigator is willing to answer any inquiries I may have concerning the research herein described. I understand that I may contact Dr. Kent Rhodes at [Redacted] if I have other questions or concerns about this research. If I have questions about my rights as a research participant, I understand that I can contact Dr. Doug Leigh, Chairperson of the Graduate and Professional Schools IRB, Pepperdine University, at [Redacted] if I have any further questions.

12. I will be informed of any significant new findings developed during the course of my participation in this research which may have a bearing on my willingness to continue in the study.

13. I understand to my satisfaction the information regarding participation in the research project. All my questions have been answered to my satisfaction. I have received a copy of this informed consent form which I have read and understand. I hereby consent to participate in the research described above.

[Signature]

Participant’s Signature

[Date]

[Signature]

Witness

[Date]

I have explained and defined in detail the research procedure in which the subject has consented to participate. Having explained this and answered any questions, I am co-signing this form and accepting this person’s consent.

[Signature]

Principal Investigator

[Date]
APPENDIX M

APPROVED IRB CONSENT FORM FOR 2012 TO 2013

INFORMED CONSENT FOR PARTICIPATION IN RESEARCH ACTIVITIES

Participant: ____________________________

Principal Investigator: Thomas J. Gajewski

Title of Project: Exploring Leadership Styles from a Mediator’s Perspective: Phenomenological Study Examining Four Specific Organizational Leadership Styles and their Relationship to Four Mediation Styles as Summarized by Leonard L. Riskin

1. I, ____________________________, agree to participate in the research study being conducted by Thomas J. Gajewski under the direction of Dr. Kent Rhodes.

2. The overall purpose of this research is to bring greater understanding of the relationship between various mediation styles and leadership success.

3. My participation will involve the following:
   - One face-to-face individual interview that will last up to two hours in length. The interview will be at the participant’s convenience, and will take place at their work site or other site of their choice. A copy of the letter of informed consent, interview protocol, and questions will be provided.
   - One survey that will take approximately one hour to complete.

4. My participation in the study will take approximately three hours. The study shall be conducted in your place of work or at a place of your choosing.

5. Although there are no direct benefits to myself, there may be societal benefits in that organizations might find it useful in understanding how mediation relates to leadership.

6. I understand that there are certain risks and discomforts that might be associated with this research. These risks include: the physical risk of fatigue, the psychological risk of boredom and anxiety, and the social risk of embarrassment. The researcher will provide breaks as needed. You may choose to not answer any question.

8. I understand that I may choose not to participate in this research.

9. I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I may refuse to participate and/or withdraw my consent and discontinue participation in the project or activity at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which I am otherwise entitled.

10. I understand that the investigator will take all reasonable measures to protect the confidentiality of my records and my identity will not be revealed in any publication that may result from this project unless I agree to have my name used. The confidentiality of my records will be maintained in accordance with applicable state and federal laws.

GPS IRB APPROVAL
PENNSTATE UNIVERSITY
JUN 27 2013
VALID UNTIL
DATE ABOVE

E03001D10
V. 6/28/12
11. I understand that the investigator is willing to answer any inquiries I may have concerning the research herein described. I understand that I may contact Dr. Kent Rhodes at [redacted] if I have other questions or concerns about this research. If I have questions about my rights as a research participant, I understand that I can contact Dr. Doug Leigh, Chairperson of the Graduate and Professional Schools IRB, Pepperdine University, at [redacted] if I have any further questions.

12. I will be informed of any significant new findings developed during the course of my participation in this research which may have a bearing on my willingness to continue in the study.

13. I understand to my satisfaction the information regarding participation in the research project. All my questions have been answered to my satisfaction. I have received a copy of this informed consent form which I have read and understand. I hereby consent to participate in the research described above.

____________________________
Participant’s Signature

____________________________
Date

____________________________
Witness

____________________________
Date

I have explained and defined in detail the research procedure in which the subject has consented to participate. Having explained this and answered any questions, I am cosigning this form and accepting this person’s consent.

____________________________
Principal Investigator

____________________________
Date