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From the Editor

Bruce E. Winston, Ph.D.
Regent University

The third issue of Emerging Leadership Journeys (ELJ) includes five of the best research course projects submitted by students in their first, second, and third semesters of the Ph.D. in Organizational Leadership program. The Ph.D. in Organizational Leadership program has, as one of its objectives, to prepare students to conduct research and publish the findings. During the first year of the program, the focus on research is more on the conceptual, literature review and model/proposal side, thus the focus in ELJ on these types of papers. I am pleased to present these five articles for your reading and consideration.
From the Individual to the World: How the Competing Values Framework Can Help Organizations Improve Global Strategic Performance

Scott Lincoln

Handong Global University

In a competitive global economy, organizations need to be able to redefine themselves and their strategic visions. However, many change initiatives are unsuccessful due to the lack of consideration for organizational cultural variables. The Competing Values Framework, when used in conjunction with strategic planning, can increase the chances of success. Tools like the Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument and the Managerial Behavior Instrument provide concrete ways to assess where the organization is, where it should be, and realigning the organization from the individual manager to the entire organizational culture.

Confucius said in his tract known as The Great Learning that to build a great kingdom you must first tend to your own state; to build a great state, you must first tend to your own family; to build a great family, you must first cultivate yourself; and to cultivate yourself, you need to dedicate yourself to learning. This tract, written for aspiring leaders in the 5th century B.C., still holds true today. If we want our organization to become competitive on the global stage, we need to have the appropriate organizational culture to be able to execute the proper strategies. To affect this type of metamorphosis, we must first look to ourselves. Once we have developed ourselves, we may influence others around us, and thereby transform our organization. The Competing Values Framework (CVF) is an eminently practical tool to help analyze not only the individual but also the organizational culture, and to help plot a course for the organizational culture change that is a necessary part of any sweeping strategic initiatives.
The Competing Values Framework

The CVF evolved out of research to determine the key factors of organizational effectiveness. This research initially yielded a comprehensive list of 39 possible indicators to measure effectiveness. Quinn and Rohrbaugh (1983), through factor analysis, condensed this list into a more parsimonious set of two major dimensions, which defined four major quadrants representing opposite and competing assumptions (see Figure 1). The first dimension ranges from flexibility and discretion on one end, to stability and control on the other. The second dimension measures the degree to which the organization emphasizes internal focus and integration or external focus and differentiation (Cameron & Quinn, 2006). The four major quadrants defined by these two axes were originally labeled the Human Relations Model, the Open System Model, the Internal Process Model, and the Rational Goal Model (Quinn & Rohrbaugh). These respective quadrants have alternatively been labeled as the group, developmental, hierarchical, and rational cultures (Denison & Spreitzer, 1991); collaborate, create, control, and compete (Cameron, Quinn, DeGraff, & Thakor, 2006); and also clan, adhocracy, hierarchy, and market cultures (Cameron & Quinn). In this study, I will opt for the latter nomenclature.

![Figure 1. Quadrants of the Competing Values Framework.](image)

The clan culture is like an extended family. This type of organization emphasizes teamwork, employee involvement, empowerment, cohesion, participation, corporate
commitment to employees, and self-managed work teams. It is held together by loyalty and tradition. In this context, leaders are thought of as mentors or parent figures. Their main responsibilities are to empower employees, and facilitate their participation, commitment, and loyalty (Cameron & Quinn, 2006).

The adhocracy culture is a dynamic, entrepreneurial, and creative organization. This organization thrives in an uncertain, ambiguous, and turbulent environment. The common values are innovation, flexibility, adaptability, risk taking, experimentation, and taking initiative. Leaders are also expected to be visionary, innovative, and risk oriented (Cameron & Quinn, 2006).

The hierarchy culture is a formalized and structured bureaucracy. This culture values efficiency, reliability, predictability, and standardization. Fast and smooth operations are maintained by strict adherence to the numerous rules, policies, and procedures. The employees throughout the multiple hierarchical levels have almost no discretion. Leaders in this organization are expected to be good organizers and coordinators, and minimize costs.

The market culture is fiercely competitive and goal oriented. They focus on productivity, profitability, market share and penetration, and winning. Leaders in this culture are expected to be hard driving, tough, and demanding competitors (Cameron & Quinn, 2006).

One culture is not necessarily better than the others. The proper culture for each organization depends on the organization’s industry and strategy. For example, Gregory, Harris, Armenakis, and Shook (2009) found a positive relationship between clan cultures and patient satisfaction in healthcare facilities. Some early research also indicated that in a university setting, clan cultures scored higher on student educational satisfaction, student personal development, faculty and administrator employment satisfaction, and organizational health (Cameron & Freeman, 1991). However, a different study found that organizational effectiveness in institutions of higher education was highest in organizations that emphasized both the adhocracy and hierarchy cultures (Cameron, 1986).

A tool known as the Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument (or OCAI) is used to determine the organization’s dominant culture. The OCAI contains 6 to 24 items, each with four alternatives. The respondents rank each of the four alternatives using an ipsative rating scale, that is, they divide 100 points among the four alternatives. This leads to greater differentiation than using a Likert scale because it forces respondents to trade off between the alternatives, rather than allow them to rate each alternative highly (Cameron & Quinn, 2006).

Application to the Individual/Behavioral Complexity

Once the organization’s dominant culture has been established, then the individual manager needs to discover their own dominant leadership style. The most effective way to determine one’s own dominant leadership style is to use the Managerial Behavior Instrument (MBI), which has been shown to correlate to the quadrants of the CVF (Lawrence, Lenk, & Quinn, 2009). This instrument should be completed, not only by the manager in question, but also by the manager’s peers, subordinates, and supervisors. The data from the completed instruments are compiled into a single feedback report which indicates strengths and weaknesses in the manager’s ability to demonstrate leadership styles consistent with the four quadrants of the CVF. Cameron and Quinn (2006) have found that the most effective managers—those rated as most successful by their subordinates, peers, and superiors and those who tend to rise quickly in the organization—demonstrate a leadership style that matches that of their organization’s
dominant culture. However, it seems that this is a minimal measure of effectiveness, rather than an ideal.

There is a growing body of research which supports the idea that the best managers are those that can display all four managerial styles in turn, contingent on the current situation. This is known as behavioral complexity. Numerous studies confirm that leaders who can balance competing roles are evaluated more highly for their effectiveness and for other performance measures (Bullis, Boal, & Phillips, 1992; Denison, Hooijberg, & Quinn, 1995; Hart & Quinn, 1993; Hooijberg, 1996) while still maintaining a measure of behavioral integrity and credibility (Cameron et al., 2006; Denison et al., 1995). Tsui (1984) supported the idea that leaders with behavioral complexity are better able to meet multiple and competing demands of the organization, and Weick (2003) also found that these leaders have greater adaptability. Recent research also shows that behavioral complexity has a significant effect on performance of self-managed teams (Zafft, Adams, & Matkin, 2009). Therefore, it is obviously beneficial to the organization to have managers high in behavioral complexity. Lawrence et al. (2009) developed the CVF Managerial Behavior Instrument to measure behavioral complexity and predict managerial effectiveness. The need for managers who can balance leadership behaviors is especially important during periods of organizational transition (Belasen & Frank, 2008).

Leading Strategic and Cultural Change

“The 21st century may very well become known as the century of the global world” (House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman, & Gupta, 2004, p. 3). Globalization is making business more complex, and professionally demanding. There is an increase in risk and uncertainty caused by the virtual disappearance of boundaries between countries and regions on the global competitive map (Kluyver & Pearce, 2006). The strategies that worked in the past are no longer guaranteed to produce satisfactory results. Organizations need to adapt to the changing conditions globalization has created. Change is inevitable; the only uncertainty is whether this change will be random or planned. Leaders need to be change agents.

Leading change is extremely challenging and risky. Many companies have tried to implement change strategies, such as TQM initiatives, downsizing, and reengineering. However, according to various surveys, only 20% of companies achieve success with quality objectives, nearly 75% were found to be worse off in the long term after downsizing, and 85% of firms reported little or no gain from reengineering efforts (Cameron & Quinn, 2006). Many of these failures were likely caused by a failure to adequately align the organizational culture with the change effort. Schein (1985) noted that a culture which is rooted in deeply held, underlying assumptions and strategies that are incompatible with these assumptions will be resisted. Kluyver and Pearce (2006) recognized that organizational culture can inhibit or defeat a change effort. Cameron and Quinn argued that organizational culture change must occur before other initiatives can be successful. Therefore, leadership teams need to plan for organizational culture change in tandem with any major strategic realignment. The CVF is well suited for this task and fits naturally with strategic planning because, when used in culture change sessions, it gives the participants a model through which they can express their need for change, while at the same time discover why they themselves may be resistant to the very change they are planning (Hooijberg & Petrock, 1993).

Hughes and Beatty (2005) described strategy as a learning process that includes five elements: (a) assessing where you are, (b) understanding who you are and where you want to go,
(c) learning how to get there, (d) making the journey, and (e) checking your progress. Cameron and Quinn (2006) listed six steps for initiating organizational culture change. These six steps are: (a) reaching consensus on the current culture, (b) reaching consensus on the desired future culture, (c) determining what the changes will and will not mean, (d) identifying illustrative stories, (e) developing a strategic action plan, and (f) developing an implementation plan.

Clearly, a big part of the strategic steps of assessing where you are and understanding who you are should include determining the current culture by completing an OCAI. The OCAI includes two columns: one for the current culture, and one for the preferred culture. This allows the participants to clarify what cultural aspects they think should be changed going into the future. Reaching a consensus on this desired future culture is an integral part of the strategic step of deciding where you want to go. This idea of reaching a consensus is critical to get everyone on the same page. Lack of teamwork is one of the main reasons strategic leadership teams fail even though they contain many talented individuals (Hughes & Beatty). The next step in the CVF is to determine what the changes will and will not mean. This means to clarify in specific terms what the new culture should look like, and what pitfalls should be avoided. After that, illustrative stories should be presented that represent the new values that the organization hopes to achieve. Once these types of stories become widespread throughout the organization, they can introduce a strategic shift (Boje, 1991). The following steps of developing a strategic action plan and implementation plan are to nail down exactly what steps are necessary to change the culture from what it is today to what we want it to be in the timing of each of the steps. It is also important that structure, systems, processes, and people are considered to make sure that each is in alignment with the change initiative (Kluyver & Pearce, 2006). These final four steps of the CVF can be included in the strategic step of learning how to get there. The final steps in the strategic process are to make the journey, and check your progress. Simply put, these mean implementing your plans while continuously monitoring that all the changes are on track.

**Conclusion**

Globalization has changed the nature of the game for many organizations. These organizations need to consider making sweeping changes in their strategy. However, organizational culture may serve as a barrier. A strong organizational culture can be a great asset by helping to align everyone in the organization in the same direction. However, when the direction needs to be changed, management can find itself swimming against the current.

Since many change initiatives fail due to inadequate consideration of the cultural variables involved, including the CVF into the strategic planning process should greatly increase the chances of success. Through clearly defined steps, the CVF can help realign the organizational culture to match the new strategic focus, from the individual manager to the entire organization, and then on to the world.
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Jesus as Agent of Change: Leadership in John 21

John H. Wilson
Regent University

Chapter 21 in the book of John provides a snapshot of Jesus interacting with a few of his disciples, which provides insight into his leadership style and tactics. An inner-textural analysis of the chapter based on socio-rhetorical criticism and the contemporary leadership styles of leader-member exchange, servant leadership, charismatic leadership, transformational leadership, and mentorship, help demonstrate how Jesus changed their lives and guided their ministries. The model assesses the Johannine text in terms of (a) repetitive-progression, (b) opening-middle-closing, (c) narrational, (d) argumentative, and (e) sensory-aesthetic methods. These elements of texture reveal more of the author’s intention for this particular narrative, and provide a deeper understanding of how to apply Jesus’ principles in contemporary organizational leadership.

Chapter 21 in the book of John provides a snapshot of Jesus interacting with a few of his disciples, which gives insight into his leadership style and tactics. Contemporary leadership theories provide rich texture to analyze the intricacies of this seemingly simplistic dialogue. Because considering Jesus’ action in this example from the perspective of one singular leadership theory would oversimplify vast complexities, this work discuses his actions in light of an extant of contemporary theories as well as related scriptures. Examples include leader-member exchange (LMX), servant leadership, charismatic leadership, transformational leadership, and mentorship.

An inner-textural analysis of the chapter based on Robbins’ (1996) model helps to demonstrate the relationship that Jesus had with his followers and how he changed their lives and guided their ministries. This model assesses the text in terms of (a) repetitive-progression, (b) opening-middle-closing, (c) narrational, (d) argumentative, and (e) sensory-aesthetic. These elements of texture reveal more of the author’s intention for this particular narrative, and provide a deeper understanding of how to apply Jesus’ principles in contemporary organizational leadership.
Background: Narrative Agents

Table 1 shows the narrative agents of the passage following the example that Robbins (1996, p. 50) provided. Based on the textual analysis, Jesus is the character in the narrative at the beginning and the end of the chapter and Peter is the other prominent character; “there is a... steady focus on Jesus as the one who confronts Peter at every stage in the narrative, upsetting his equilibrium and challenging him to make decisions and take new action” (Wiarda, 1992, p. 53). Early on the descriptive focus was on all the disciples present, “Simon Peter, Thomas called the Twin, Nathanael of Cana in Galilee, the sons of Zebedee [which would include John (Matt 4:21)] and two others of his disciples” (John 21:1-2, New Revised Standard Version). O’Brien (2005) pointed out the fact “that readers identify with characters is one of narratives’ most powerful..."
tools. Readers generally identify with characters with whom they have something in common” (p. 292). The table illustrates how as the narrative progressed, the focus shifted to Simon Peter. Finally, the closing verses focused on John, even though he did not name himself directly by referring to himself as one of the Sons of Zebedee, the “disciple whom Jesus loved” (John 21:20) or “the disciple who is testifying to these things” (John 21:24). Belsterling (2006) observed, “One also sees Jesus and Peter engaging in heartfelt dialogue, not minding that the others were present. John and Peter were two of three with whom Jesus spent the most time” (p. 84). While the stronger focus in this passage is on the dyad linkage between Jesus and Peter, the corresponding dyad between Jesus and John is evident in the table as well.

Repetitive-Progression

Robbins (1996) suggested analysis of repetitive-progressive texture in terms of the following questions:

1. What patterns emerge from the repetition of certain topics in the text?
2. What topics replace other topics in the progression of the text?
3. Is there a continual repetition of the same word throughout the unit, or is there a slight modification at almost every progressive stage?
4. Does the progression bring certain kinds of words together but not others?
5. Is there repetition that occurs in steps that create a context for a new word in the progression? (p. 50)

The six most used words in this passage of verses are: (a) you, (b) said, (c) Jesus, (d) him, (e) them, and (f) Peter. These highly used words affirm the narrative approach that John the author chose.

Patterns from the Repetition

In terms of narrative agents described in the previous section, Jesus is only absent in six of the 25 verses (see Table 1). This is significant since the likely first impression for the reader is that the disciples or even Simon Peter are the focal point of this particular passage. Further, John made more prominent reference to himself than is initially apparent largely given that he did not identify himself directly. Both of these relationships demonstrate different LMX dyads between Jesus and each of the disciples. “[Jesus] realized that He would multiply God’s message of love most clearly by making Himself entirely available to a select few disciples” (Belsterling, 2006, p. 87). According to Harris, Wheeler, and Kacmar (2009), “The LMX model suggests that supervisors form differential relationships with their subordinates. These relationships range in quality from high to low” (p. 372). This is also in alignment with transformational leadership as Bass and Steidlmeier (1999) suggested, “The transformational leader treats each follower as an individual and provides coaching, mentoring and growth opportunities” (p. 189). John suggested that he was uniquely “loved” by Jesus, yet he did not swim to shore. “John recognizes [Jesus] immediately while still a hundred yards from the shore. Then Peter, in characteristic Peter fashion, makes a big splash, noisily advertising his recognition by swimming to greet Jesus” (Peterson, 2002, p. 15). Peter having receded in his exchange level seemed eager to return to his previous standing. Jesus facilitated this redemption out of love, but as a leader, Jesus established a development path for Peter. These instructions from Jesus to Peter concluded in verse 22,
“Follow Me!” Peter had to decide if he was willing to accept the new LMX level that Jesus proposed; “the conversation begs the question of whether Peter can accept a new relationship with Jesus” (Wells, 2007, p. 25). There was almost a sibling rivalry between Peter and the beloved disciple. Wells noted, “Peter is still anxious that the role of the so-called Beloved Disciple will somehow get in the way” (p. 28). “As soon as Peter is recommissioned by the lakeshore, he is immediately anxious about his status in relation to another disciple” (p. 28). Jesus carefully balanced these two distinct LMX linkages, validating and empowering both.

Another pattern that emerges is the many references to food, specifically fish and bread (see Table 2). The parallels with the story of feeding the 5,000 and the last supper are set aside for this analysis but require acknowledgement. The pattern moves from no fish in early verses resulting from only human effort, to an abundance of fish provided by God alongside human effort, and finally the provision of bread absent any effort on their part.

Table 2: Fish/Bread References in John 21:1-25

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>No fish</th>
<th>Fish</th>
<th>Bread</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>No fish (caught)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>No fish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fish</td>
<td>Bread</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fish</td>
<td>Bread</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These parallels are set aside for this analysis but require acknowledgement.

Topics that Replace Other Topics in Progression

Jesus used food in the form of fish and bread to remind the disciples that they were to look to him to provide sustenance and success. It also offers a reminder of service and sacrifice; “deeply embedded in the common meal, is the experience of sacrifice. One life is given so that
another may live” (Peterson, 2002, p. 17). As the narrative continues, the use of lambs/sheep replaces food as the focus shifts onto redemption and guidance for the ministry ahead. The belt aids the transition of the discussion to prophecy about Peter’s death and demonstrates that such end will glorify God. Verses 20-24 take on the form of a prologue launched from the discussion about Peter’s death and demonstrate that the focus of each member should be on their particular relationship with the leader and not the dyad linkage between the leader and another member; “no comparisons are to be made with others who seem to receive an easier assignment” (Wiarda, 1992, p. 69).

Table 3: Peter’s Redemption in John 21:15-17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Love</th>
<th>Lambs</th>
<th>Sheep</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Love</td>
<td>Lambs (feed)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Love</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sheep (tend)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Love</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sheep (feed)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Certain Kinds of Words Are Together—Not Others

There are only two verses where both Peter and the disciples are referenced together, verses 2 and 3 (see Table 1). In all other cases, the narrator separated discussion about Peter from that of the group of disciples. Further, John only mentioned Peter once without Jesus, which is in verse 11. As is evident in Table 2, the reference to bread coincides with the reference to fish in both cases. In the progression analyzed in Table 3, the words “love” and “lambs/sheep” were always connected.

Repetition in Steps

John emphasized the disciples’ failure to catch fish in verses 3 and 5 (see Table 2): “they caught nothing” (John 21:3) and “Children, you have no fish, have you?” (John 21:5). The progression advances after the disciples follow Jesus’ instruction to cast the nets on the other side of the boat: “you will find some” (John 21:6). In verse 8, the disciples were “dragging the net full of fish” (John 21:8).

A second repetition is the use of Peter’s full name all three times during the redemption sequence in verses 15, 16, and 17 respectively: “Simon, son of John” (John 21:15-17). In relation to this sequence, Oladipo (2007) commented, “In Nigeria, especially among the Yoruba people, the use of a full title of an individual implies that an important message is to follow” (p. 65).

A third repetition occurs in steps in verses 15-17 when Jesus redeemed Peter for the three times Peter denied Christ after his arrest (John 18:15-18, 25-27). Jesus pressed Peter to affirm his love three times and each time he gave progressive instructions to feed or tend his lambs/sheep (see Table 3). The metaphor starts with lambs, perhaps representing young Christians. Oladipo
(2007) provided insight into the verb in this case, “The Greek word used here is a very specific word *boske*, meaning to graze or feed on growing grasses” (p. 66). After the second and third affirmation by Peter, Jesus shifted the instruction to “tend” his sheep, perhaps representing discipleship towards mature Christians. Oladipo explained this distinction, “The Greek word used here . . . is *poimaine*, which has broader implications than the term *boske*” (p. 66). In the final charge, he reverts to “feed,” yet maintained the reference to adult sheep, perhaps indicating the mentorship of mature Christians in leadership roles in the church. “Jesus communicated to His disciples an expectation of mutual commitment. Peter was told he could not be part of the mission if he would not submit to the authority of the One who made the plan” (Belsterling, 2006, p. 84). Further, “Jesus did not mind that the disciples had questions. He mentored the disciples through teaching that responded to their questions and confusions” (p. 86). In this sense, Jesus demonstrated mentorship to Peter as he charged him to be a mentor.

Love is another prominent word in this segment. In Jesus’ first challenge, he asked Peter of his love in a relative sense, “Simon son of John, do you love me more than these?” (John 21:15). In the second and third case, the question is more emphatic and uses the same phrase, “Simon son of John, do you love me?” (John 21:16-17). Peter’s response however progressed in the opposite way. His first two responses were, “Yes, Lord; you know that I love you” (John 21:15-16). Peter progressed his response in the third, however, “Lord, you know everything; you know that I love you” (John 21:17). However, according to Oladipo, the form of the word love changes in the Greek, “In verses 15 and 16, Jesus used the word *agape* when he asked Peter, ‘Do you love me?’ But now in verse 17 he used *phileō* when he asked the same question” (p. 66). Wells (2007) suggested, “Peter and Jesus simply seem to have different understandings of love. Peter assumes that the love of a friend is all that is required. . . . Jesus is using the language of utter selfless love, the intimate and self-giving *agape* love” (p. 25). Even after all that happened, Peter was reluctant to accept a higher level of LMX exchange with Jesus.

In this redemption, we see unrestrained forgiveness demonstrated, a direct contrast with contemporary theory, which generally values justice, retribution, or even revenge. “Unlike revenge, the concept of forgiveness has been almost totally ignored in the organizational literature” (Murray & Karl, 1999, p. 610). Murray and Karl further cited four processes for dealing with trespasses, “Peachey (1989) and Gadaez (1986) argued that restorative justice is a distinct justice construct, represented by four different, but not mutually exclusive, processes. These processes are retribution or revenge, forgiveness, restitution, and compensation” (p. 608). Wells (2007) noted, “[This] is a discussion, first of all, of whether Jesus can still love Peter, given what he knows” (p. 24). After all, “it is a feature of reconciliation that the person offering forgiveness cannot expect the other party fully to understand the depths of their offense” (p. 24).

**Opening-Middle-Closing**

Table 1 provides insight about the transition from the opening to the middle. In verse 4, the center of attention shifts from the disciples to Jesus. The reference to Jesus in the first verse only helps to set the stage, however it is not a reference to Jesus as part of the story yet. This is consistent with Wiarda’s (1992) findings, “Vv. 1-3 may be viewed as providing background significant for our understanding of all the action which follows in vv. 4-22” (p. 57).

It appears that the middle begins at verse 4. Here the narrator began to focus on Jesus and the lessons that he had for the disciples. This includes providing food which demonstrates
servant leadership. “As appealing and refreshing as [Robert] Greenleaf’s conceptualization of servant leadership is, Greenleaf is not the individual who first introduced the notion of servant leadership. . . . It was Christianity’s founder, Jesus Christ, who first taught the concept of servant leadership” (Sendjaya & Sarros, 2002, p. 58). Examples of this include Jesus washing of his followers’ feet (John 13:13-15), or his direct statements such as the following:

But Jesus called them to him and said, “You know that the rulers of the Gentiles lord it over them, and their great ones are tyrants over them. It will not be so among you; but whoever wishes to be great among you must be your servant, and whoever wishes to be first among you must be your slave; just as the Son of Man came not to be served but to serve, and to give his life a ransom for many.” (Matt 20:25-28)

In both his ideology and his action, Jesus served those he encountered. “Serving others is the means by which the servant leader facilitates the accomplishing of their desired goals. Merely serving is not the means by which to get results, but the behavior of serving is the result” (Farling, Stone, & Winston, 1999, p. 53).

Jesus also used this to illustrate the ministry he was setting before them as described previously. Peter’s redemption is also part of the middle, as well as the use of the belt in verse 18 as a bookend between Peter’s youth and his old age when he will be martyred. The middle begins the transition to the closing as Jesus reminds Peter that God’s plan is unique and different for each follower alone.

There is overlap between the narrator’s discussion of Peter and John (referenced indirectly) for several verses (see Table 4). Starting with verse 23, there is no longer any reference to Peter and the focus shifts exclusively to the narrator and Jesus. This shift suggests the transition from the middle to the closing. This is also consistent with Wiarda’s (1992) findings stated earlier in this article.

Table 4: Jesus, Peter, and John in John 21:1-25

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Jesus</th>
<th>Simon Peter</th>
<th>John (beloved disciple/author)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>You</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>He</td>
<td>Him</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Jesus/Lord</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Disciple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Jesus/Lord</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Jesus</td>
<td>You</td>
<td>He</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Jesus</td>
<td>Disciple</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>Disciple/hi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Jesus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
That John is the narrator of this passage and a direct participant in the discourse seems to cause some ambiguity. In particular, John’s refusal to identify himself directly seems in need of some analysis from a narrational perspective. Robbins (1996) explained that “narrational texture . . . distinguish[es] between real author, implied author, narrator, characters, narratee, implied reader and real reader” (p. 54). Robbins went on to caution readers of “the narrator’s seduction of the interpreter” (p. 55). Since John was likely the real author, certainly the implied author, assumedly the narrator and also one of the characters in the narration deprives the narratee of this distinction.

Based on the literature, John’s authorship does not appear to be in dispute. Belsterling (2006) reported, “Internal and external evidence seems to clearly confirm that John did write the Gospel of John” (p. 79). Therefore, John serves as the real and implied author for purposes of this analysis. “John 21:24 asserts that the Fourth Gospel is itself a testimony” (O’Brien, 2005, p. 292). It would seem that John was taking the tone of a neutral narrator, however, he did make specific reference to himself as the author and narrator in verse 24. The characters are all identified in the first two verses.

Understanding the reader, both the implied reader and the actual expected reader, makes it possible to learn more from the text than initially appears on the surface: Instead of using a method that explores the distinctive nature of the text in its Mediterranean context, many interpreters use a method that stays within the confines of the discourse and the approach to the world that the interpreter presupposes for the text as the interpretation begins. (Robbins, 1996, p. 56)

O’Brien (2005) argued, “[John] is not simply a report of others’ experience, but it provides the possibility of a substitute experience for the reader . . . that is certainly not the same as being there but can be significant nonetheless” (p. 285). The implied audience was likely 1st or 2nd-century Christians. “Evidence in the Fourth Gospel, however, points to the intended audience as Christian, quite possibly belonging to the Johannine community” (p. 289). Belsterling (2006) specified further detail of John’s intended audience, “While John's original audience seems to have consisted primarily of Diaspora Jews and proselytes . . . the book appeals as a treatise to unbelievers” (p. 79). However, the real reader can take many forms over many centuries, in many languages and in many cultures. “Like the characters in the Gospel, readers must learn from their mistakes and reevaluate both Jesus and the world” (O’Brein, p. 288).

This particular “chreia . . . the anecdote in which a narrator attributes speech and/or action to a specific personage” (Robbins, 1996, p. 61), depends heavily on the reader being familiar with the cultural context of power distance in the “Mediterranean society and culture” (p. 64) that would contrast to such norms. This illustrates an element of argumentation that Robbins defined as logical argumentation: “the function of unstated premise in the discourse” (p. 59). Some possible examples in this passage include (a) Jesus was serving food to the disciples and taking care of details that would have been left to the most lowly follower in traditional Jewish culture; (b) human leaders would likely be reluctant to restore Peter after his disloyalty; (c) most of the disciples present in the scene are silent and don’t have a role in the discourse; and
(d) Jesus revealed information about Peter’s future, particular his martyrdom, a disclosure that
could dissuade him from the mission.

Further, there is an implicit modus ponens pattern or “if . . . then” (Robbins, 1996, p. 59)
condition in the dialog between Jesus and Peter. Robbins called this an “enthymeme” based on
the definition provided by Kennedy: “a statement with a supporting reason introduced by for,
because or since or an if . . . then statement” (p. 59). Wiada (1992) stated emphatically, “It is
undeniable that the writer intends to portray a cause and effect relationship between the
prediction of v. 18 and the dialogue of vv. 21-22” (p. 66). Jesus asked, “Simon son of John, do
you love me more than these?” (John 21:15) to which Peter replied in the affirmative. The
statement that follows, “Feed my lambs” (John 21:15), implies the former should lead to the
latter: if you love me, then feed my lambs. Jesus reveals transformational leadership qualities in
this approach. “Jesus cast vision to His disciples to give them direction for how they ought to
live their lives” (Belsterling, 2006, p. 89). “In communicating His vision, Jesus also made clear
to His disciples that He expected the same type of relational commitment from them” (p. 89).
Even though Peter was the object of Jesus guidance, the setting allowed the other disciples to
learn from the lesson as well. Further, through John’s account of the event, the message is
revealed to Christian leaders for centuries to come. In this, Jesus was demonstrating charismatic
leadership defined by a “focus on a future-oriented timeframe—a focus that is most often
evidenced by their use of an emotionally evocative, future oriented vision” (Bendall-Avers,

One final element that seems unaddressed in this text is why Peter and the others were
engaged in a commercial fishing operation. “For reasons we are not told, seven of the original
eleven are back at their old fishing grounds, the Sea of Galilee, not doing what they had so
recently been told to do” (Peterson, 2002, p. 13). Had they been fishing to produce their
breakfast, the effort required would have been a lot less than taking a boat out all night with large
nets. It seems perhaps that they were starting to settle back into their lives prior to Jesus ministry.
Wiarda (1992) observed, “Peter is engaging in an occupation—one not lightly undertaken, but
requiring both experience and equipment—different from that which he had been doing during
the period he was with Jesus as a disciple” (p. 58). Perhaps the entire scene depicts an exercise in
transactional leadership since it “involves contingent reinforcement. Followers are motivated by
the leaders’ promises, praise, and rewards, or they are corrected by negative feedback, reproof,
threats, or disciplinary actions” (Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999, p. 184). According to Bass and
Steidlmeier (1999), “When leaders engage in active management by-exception, [a form of
transactional leadership], they monitor follower performance and correct followers’ mistakes” (p.
184). Jesus reminded them that he would provide for them just as he did for their breakfast, and
that it was time to get to work spreading the gospel: “Feed my lambs. . . . Tend my sheep. . . .
Feed my sheep. . . . Follow me. . . . Follow me!” (John 21:15-22). In this Jesus progresses further
to transformational leadership by “inducing [the disciples] to transcend their own self-interest for
the sake of the [his vision, spread of the gospel]” (Yukl, 2006, p. 262).

Sensory-Aesthetic

Robbins (1996) described sensory-aesthetic texture as “the images in this passage, [that]
concern people’s imagination” (p. 65). To analyze this, Robbins suggested the following
questions: “How do humans imagine new possibilities for their lives? How do they imagine the
present concrete realities of their lives? How do they imagine the past and link their imagination of the past with their imagination of the present?” (p. 65). For the disciples, out on the boat, they were still limited in their imagination regarding the possibilities for their lives. They were still fishing for fish rather than “fish[ing] for people” (Matt 5:19). Jesus reminded the disciples that the possibilities were endless for them if they would follow him. Peter and the others still had not let go of their imagined “present concrete reality” (p. 65). Jesus was helping them to link their lost and hopeless past as sinners with their empty nets, so that they could let go their own efforts and trust in him for all things. In this, he was unlocking their imagination of the future that he had planned for them.

This text deals also with the physical senses throughout. The experience of fishing and coming up empty evokes the feeling of helplessness and disappointment in the early verses. Daybreak revealed the beach and implied calmness as Jesus called to them. The declaration, “It is the Lord!” (John 21:7), illustrates elation and excitement over the unexpected catch. That Peter was naked suggests that during the night the air was hot and humid and that they were working hard such that heavy clothes were uncomfortable. The leap into the lake suggests a cool refreshing end to the futile rigor of the previous night and the excitement of an unexpected reunion with Jesus face-to-face. Once ashore, the reader’s nostrils are filled with the scent of charcoal and cooked fish as if they too had crossed onto the beachhead alongside the disciples. These aromas likely dissipated a bit as they dragged 153 recently caught fish ashore. The NRSV uses the term “breakfast” (John 21:12, 15) as their overnight fast, along with their empty nets abruptly came to a satisfying end. “Jesus prepares and eats breakfast with seven of his disciples on a Galilee beach. The positioning is emphatic, attention-getting” (Peterson, 2002, p. 13). The narrator shifts the sensory tone of the text away from images of basic sustenance to that of emotional healing. Each time Jesus asked Peter to affirm his love, the reader feels Peter reduced from pride to humbleness and shame as his heart breaks. All the while, Jesus is building Peter up during this redemptive dialog.

Leadership Applications

As described in this article, multiple contemporary leadership theories together only begin to reveal the divine model of leadership personified by Jesus. The attributes revealed in the Johannine text include (a) the careful balance of distinct relationships between Jesus and each of the disciples characterizing LMX (Belsterling, 2006); (b) the redemption that comes from true forgiveness and redemption that seems to be so counter-intuitive in human terms that it falls outside contemporary leadership theory altogether (Murray & Karl, 1999); (c) the development path that Jesus laid before Peter in a fashion consistent with active management-by-exception and clear directives consistent with contingent reinforcement, forms of transactional leadership (Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999); (d) the humble service to followers basic needs illustrative of servant leadership (Sendjaya & Sarros); (e) the expectation of mutual commitment from followers towards the vision of the future, illustrative of charismatic leadership; (f) the inducement that followers set aside their own interests and follow him, the nature of transformational leadership; and finally (g) the demonstration of mentorship in a model that the disciples could easily follow. Any contemporary leader might spend years or an entire career thoroughly developing just one of these attributes. However, Jesus demonstrated that there is tremendous value in synthesizing characteristics from multiple models and theories. For
instance, Goldman (2000) suggested, “Leaders who have mastered four or more [aspects of leadership] have the very best climate and business performance” (p. 87).

The challenge for a contemporary leader is to integrate a plethora of elements at once as Jesus did. A Johannine model of leadership would rely heavily on a strong individualized relationship with each follower that is unique from all others. Forgiveness for mistakes, missteps, and disloyalties would be a regular part of each relationship with redemption displayed publicly as a complete restoration. When necessary, the Johannine leader would observe behaviors and praise or correct actions of followers with clear and concise guidance. This leader would call upon followers to commit fully to the leader’s vision and set aside their own interests when they conflict with said vision. Finally, the leader would act as an effective mentor, guiding each follower along and encouraging them in turn to mentor others. Whether explicitly or implicitly, the mantra of a Johannine leader would echo Jesus: “Follow me!” (John 21:22).

**Conclusion**

The preceding inner-textual analysis of this text depicts Jesus’ interaction with Peter as such that reveals an extant of leadership styles and tactics. Jesus demonstrated LMX given the varying levels of relationship with each individual follower based on their willingness to commit to his mission. Jesus personified servant leadership as he prepared and served a meal to the group even though their actions seem to deviate from the course he directed. Jesus is transformational in the way he inspired each individual to follow him and to spread the gospel based on the unique relationship that he had with each using Peter as a prominent example. Finally, Jesus both demonstrated mentorship while he directed Peter and the other disciples to be mentors.

Based on the assumption that Jesus is God in human form, the methods of leadership he deployed are not flawed shadows of an ideal, but rather the ideal itself. Therefore, contemporary leadership theory constructed by flawed humanity can merely illuminate some perceptible elements of leadership in its perfect form. However, such illumination informs our understanding of Jesus, while validating and calibrating our instruments of understanding leadership in human terms. Studying Jesus’ example provides contemporary leaders with a model that can transform authentic relationships into meaningful change in the lives of their followers.
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This paper investigates shared leadership and seeks to determine if more organizations should consider adopting a shared leadership model. Leadership affects the success and failure of every type of organization, and the complexity of today’s business environment makes leadership increasingly more challenging. It is becoming more difficult for any single individual to possess all of the skills and abilities required to competently lead an organization today. A review of the literature indicates that while shared leadership has been practiced in some form for centuries, research on the subject is still in its infancy. An abundance of shared leadership studies fall in the domains of healthcare and education, two industries especially open to the concept. Studies outside these two industries are scarce, but include a diverse collection of organization types and groups. While research indicates that shared leadership has its challenges and can be difficult to implement, overall the benefits of shared leadership hold promise. Organizations of all types should take notice and consider implementing a shared leadership approach.

Leadership is a pivotal issue that affects the success and failure of every organization, country, and religious movement. The speed of change and complexity in today’s business environment make leadership increasingly exigent, placing unrealistic expectations on heroic leaders (Yukl, 2006). Ostensibly, it is becoming more difficult for any single individual to possess all of the skills and abilities required to competently lead organizations today (O’Toole, Galbraith, & Lawler, 2002). O’Toole et al. affirmed, “Frequently, organizations learn the hard way that no one individual can save a company from mediocre performance—and no one individual, no matter how gifted a leader, can be ‘right’ all the time” (p. 67). Pearce (2007) pointed out, “As organizations have steadily progressed into the knowledge economy we can no longer rely on simple notions of top–down, command-and-control leadership, based on the idea that workers are merely interchangeable drones” (p. 355). Hence, this paper investigates the case for shared leadership and seeks to determine if more organizations should consider adopting a shared leadership model.
An initial search of the phrase shared leadership in the Academic OneFile database yielded 75 articles in academic journals. The search results of similar phrases are as follows: distributed leadership (24), collective leadership (22), horizontal leadership (0), team leadership (97), and leadership team (182). An evaluation of all articles referenced took place, followed by a thorough search in ABI/Inform, Academic Search Complete, and Business Source Complete using the identical terms and phrases. Again, I examined all articles and their reference lists for relevance and applicability to the topic. When no new articles turned up, I considered the search complete.

Many of the studies on shared leadership fall in the domain of healthcare (Jackson, 2000; Konu & Viitanen, 2008; Merkens & Spencer, 1998; Spooner, Keenan, & Card, 1997; Steinert, Goebel, & Rieger, 2006) and education (Boardman, 2001; Hall, 2001; Meyers & Johnson, 2008; Prather, Hartshorn, & McCreight, 1988; Rice, 2006; Wallace, 2001). Studies outside these two domains are scarce, but include a diverse collection of organization types and groups: new ventures (Ensley, Hmieleski, & Pearce, 2006), road maintenance teams (Hiller, Day, & Vance, 2006), churches (Wood, 2005; Wood & Fields, 2007), equipment and engine manufacturing (Anderson, Anderson, & Mayo, 2008), technology (Hsu & Sharma, 2008), local government (Berman, 1996), consulting teams (Carson, Tesluk, & Marrone, 2007), sales teams (Mehra, Smith, Dixon, & Robertson, 2006; Perry, Pearce, & Sims, 1999), police departments (Steinheider & Wuestewald, 2008), and banks (Walker, Smither, & Waldman, 2008). While research indicates that shared leadership has its challenges and can be difficult to implement, overall, the benefits of shared leadership often outweigh the limitations. Organizations of all types should take notice and consider implementing a shared leadership approach.

Shared Leadership

Sally (2002) pointed out that shared leadership has existed since ancient times: “Republican Rome had a successful system of co-leadership that lasted for over four centuries. This structure of co-leadership was so effective that it extended from the lower levels of the Roman magistracy to the very top position, that of consul” (p. 84). However, over the course of history most organizations have been led by one central leader in a hierarchal fashion (Wood, 2005). Indeed, O’Toole et al. (2002) observed, “For most people, shared leadership is counterintuitive: leadership is obviously and manifestly an individual trait and activity” (p. 66). Furthermore, they added, “The identities of American corporations are often viewed as mere reflections of the personalities of their leaders: entire organizations are portrayed as shadows of the ‘Great Men’ who sit in the chief executive chairs” (p. 66). Bennis (1999) complained, “In our society leadership is too often seen as an inherently individual phenomenon” (p. 72). This viewpoint has unfortunate side effects. The common assumption that one leader (the CEO) rules everything is responsible for the singular manner in which leadership is taught in business schools and the fact that academic research literature on shared leadership is sparse (O’Toole et al.).

However, times may be changing. O’Toole (2001) suggested that leadership is not only an individual trait, but is also an institutional trait. Avolio, Walumbwa, and Weber (2009) observed that shared leadership is gaining prominence in organizations as team-based structures replace hierarchical structures. Furthermore, O’Toole et al. (2002) affirmed, “The trend over the last half-century has been away from concentration of power in one person and toward
expanding the capacity for leadership at the top levels of corporations” (p. 67). Moreover, Yukl (2006) recognized that those who subscribe to shared leadership approaches understand that “important decisions about what to do and how to do it are made through the use of an interactive process involving many different people who influence each other” (p. 4).

**Defining Shared Leadership**

The quest for developing an integrative definition of shared leadership has been elusive. Avolio et al. (2009) declared that the most widely cited definition of shared leadership comes from Conger and Pearce (2003): “A dynamic, interactive influence process among individuals in groups for which the objective is to lead one another to the achievement of group or organizational goals or both” (p. 1). Conger and Pearce added, “This influence process often involves peer, or lateral, influence and at other times involves upward or downward hierarchical influence” (p. 1).

It is important to recognize the terms often associated with shared leadership. In research literature, shared leadership, collective leadership, and distributed leadership are used interchangeably, while team leadership is commonly viewed as a slightly different stream of research (Avolio et al., 2009). However, shared leadership definitions often include the term *team*, coupled with the concept of a process, property, or phenomenon. Carson et al. (2007) examined antecedent conditions that lead to the development of shared leadership in a sample of 59 consulting teams comprised of MBA students and concluded, “Shared leadership refers to a team property whereby leadership is distributed among team members rather than focused on a single designated leader” (p. 1217). Day, Gronn, and Salas (2004) called attention to team outcomes that emanate from shared leadership. Furthermore, Bligh, Pearce, and Kohles (2006) affirmed, “Shared leadership thus offers a concept of leadership practice as a team-level phenomenon where behaviors are enacted by multiple individuals rather than solely by those at the top or by those in formal leadership roles” (p. 305). To summarize, a review of the literature reveals shared leadership as a relational, collaborative leadership process or phenomenon involving teams or groups that mutually influence one another and collectively share duties and responsibilities otherwise relegated to a single, central leader.

**Components of Shared Leadership**

There are many dimensions, components, and factors which affect shared leadership. Carson et al. (2007) proposed that “shared leadership is facilitated by an overall team environment that consists of three dimensions: shared purpose, social support, and voice” (p. 1222). Internal team environment and external coaching work in unison to drive team performance (Carson et al.). Wood (2005) studied top management teams in churches with three or more pastors and determined that shared leadership involves four distinct dimensions: “joint completion of tasks, mutual skill development, decentralized interaction among personnel, and emotional support” (p. 76). He found that while “empowering team behaviors related positively with shared leadership” (p. 64), surprisingly, team structure (horizontal) did not have a significant effect on shared leadership. In a qualitative study involving 69 individuals working at St. Joseph’s Health Care Hospital, Jackson (2000) determined that four constructs vital to the
understanding of shared leadership highlight the significance of its relational aspects: “accountability, partnership, equity, and ownership” (p. 168).

Team leadership is characterized by a variety of items that set it apart from vertical leadership. Walker et al. (2008) identified the following team leadership indicators in a three-year qualitative study of 68 regional bank branch managers: (a) the work team resolves difference to reach agreement, (b) work is distributed properly to take advantage of members’ unique skills, (c) information about the company and its strategy is shared, (d) teamwork is promoted with the team itself, and (e) the team works together to identify opportunities to improve productivity and efficiency. Chen, Kanfer, Kirkman, Allen, and Rosen (2007) sampled 445 members from 62 teams in 31 stores of a national home improvement company, and asserted that in order to empower team leadership, “team leaders should ensure they delegate enough autonomy and responsibility to all members in their team, involve the team in decision making, and encourage the team to self-manage its performance to the extent possible” (p. 343). Abiding by such principles give teams a better chance for success. McIntyre (1999) insisted that emerging leadership teams become effective only when they are characterized by “strategic goals, extensive networks, collaborative relationships, effective information processing, and focused action” (p. 40).

Shared Leadership Studies

Organizational studies investigating shared leadership expose the complexity of issues surrounding this model, the conditions which engender successful implementation and practice of shared leadership, the importance of communication, and problems associated with shared leadership. Much of the research in organizations, other than education and healthcare, actually focuses more on aspects of leadership teams and teamwork (Anderson et al., 2008; Darling & Fischer, 1998; Gorla & Lam, 2004; Hiller et al., 2006; Koivunen, 2007; Lovelace, Manz, & Alves, 2007; O’Connell, Doverspike, & Cober, 2002; Pearce & Herbik, 2004; Thamhain, 2004; Wang, Chou, & Jiang, 2005) rather than shared leadership in its purest form. Therefore, a brief review of studies and observations concerning shared leadership in education and healthcare will shed light on what is known about this topic.

Shared Leadership in Education

Harris, Leithwood, Day, Sammons, and Hopkins (2007) lamented the lack of exceptional leaders in today’s schools and thus declared, “The hope of transforming schools through the actions of individual leaders is quickly fading” (p. 345). However, research concerning several elements of shared leadership in the realm of educational institutions reveals mixed results. In a qualitative study of students in three universities, Carte, Chidambaram, and Becker (2006) examined virtual teams and suggested shared leadership behavior is positively associated with monitoring group work, but not with increasing performance. Moreover, Boardman (2001) investigated shared leadership processes in Tasmanian schools and discovered that leaders were significantly more enthusiastic about a shared leadership model than the teachers they engaged with. Furthermore, in a study of co-principalship in New Zealand primary schools, Court (2003) found the presence of power struggles and the notion of “contrived congeniality,” which refers to the manipulation teachers feel when forced to participate in decision-making without any
guarantee their ideas will be heard. Indeed, while one of the key benefits of shared leadership is the ability to draw from the diversity of thought and talent possessed by a entire team (Miles & Watson, 2007; Rice, 2006), Kezar (1998) noted that “when members of leadership teams did not fully embrace the principles of fostering differences and encouraging multiple opinions, most teams slipped into groupthink” (p. 68).

The benefits and limitations of shared leadership in educational institutions lead Wallace (2001) to say, “School leadership should ideally be extensively shared but, because school leaders do not live in an ideal world, the extent of sharing which is justifiable in practice depends on empirical factors” (p. 153). Emotions cannot be ignored, especially when a school is attempting to change or undergo a renewal process (Beatty, 2007). In addition, a collegial climate (Rice, 2006) and clear communication are both paramount in all shared leadership decision-making processes (Meyers & Johnson, 2008). Finally, for shared leadership and teamwork to be effective, it is crucial that group members understand their individual roles and do not underestimate the complexity of a shared leadership arrangement (Hall, 2001).

Shared Leadership in Healthcare

Healthcare organizations seem especially open to the introduction of shared leadership. Many hospitals have responded to the need for new forms of leadership, leading them to adopt shared governance as a means to improve outcomes (Spooner et al., 1997). Shared leadership is highly practical in this domain, as the nature of the healthcare environment requires much collaboration (Merkens & Spencer, 1998). The quality of patient care often depends on how well a diverse group of medical and administrative experts work together. Konu and Viitanen (2008) conducted a quantitative study involving 703 middle-level managers in Finnish social service and healthcare and cite shared leadership as a pathway to creating uniformity in decision-making and defining responsibilities. Scott and Caress (2005) asserted that decision-making and clinical effectiveness in a hospital can be improved through shared leadership and shared governance. They discussed the challenges of implementing a shared governance model and emphasized that “shared governance is an ongoing and fluid process, requiring continual assessment and re-evaluation in order to be flexible and responsive to an ever-changing environment” (p. 4).

An interesting finding among shared leadership research in healthcare organizations relates to the willingness of group members to accept governance changes and adopt new, more inclusive leadership models. In a study investigating the satisfaction of shared leadership at three psychiatric hospitals, Steinert et al. (2006) found that nonmedical staff members favored shared leadership more than physicians, but both groups were generally satisfied with the model. They say, “Shared leadership seems to provide nurse empowerment and good nurse–physician relationships” (p. 256). Konu and Viitanen’s (2008) study of the Finnish social service and healthcare industry found no connection between shared leadership experiences and age or work experience. However, they discovered that shared leadership was practiced most often by female managers in larger work units.

In an effort to increase understanding in the area of shared leadership development, one study (Black & Westwood, 2004) addressed the effectiveness of a group-based team leadership development program at a Canadian cancer care center. The program emphasized five objectives centering on trust, cohesiveness, communication, and conflict resolution:
1. The facilitation of team members learning how to relate to and communicate with each other on an interpersonal basis.
2. The facilitation of increased levels of trust among group members.
3. The facilitation of increased group solidarity.
4. The reduction of misunderstanding among group members.
5. The facilitation skills necessary for preventing and resolving intra-group conflict.

Overall, the workshop proved to be successful and valuable in developing group-based teams, but the researchers admit that ongoing maintenance will probably be required to maintain effectiveness.

Benefits of Shared Leadership

In many ways the research on shared leadership is still in its infancy, but noteworthy benefits and limitations have emerged from the few studies that have been undertaken. Perhaps the most commonly cited benefit concerns the synergy and expertise derived from a shared leadership model. Here, the old adage two heads are better than one seems appropriate. Leaders can utilize their individual strengths (Miles & Watkins, 2007), and organizations can benefit from diversity of thought in decision making. Bligh et al. (2006) posited that influence is fluid and reciprocal, and “team members take on the leadership tasks for which they are best suited or are most motivated to accomplish” (p. 306). O’Toole et al. (2002) noted that two or more leaders are better than one when “the challenges a corporation faces are so complex that they require a set of skills too broad to be possessed by any one individual” (p. 68). Indeed, Waldersee and Eagleson (2002) argued that during times of change and reorientation in a hotel corporation, shared leadership between two leaders, one task-oriented and the other behavior-oriented, would result in greater success than leadership by one person alone.

Reduced stress levels for key leaders also make this model attractive, as a more robust, shared leadership system does not unduly burden any single leader (Pearce, 2007). Furthermore, Lee-Davies, Kakabadse, and Kakabadse (2007) extolled the virtue of shared leadership as it exploits the wealth of talent present in an organization, capturing “energy and enthusiasm” (p. 253), thereby creating a distinct competitive advantage. Flow and creativity seem to flourish in a shared leadership environment (Hooker & Csikszentmihalyi, 2003). Moreover, teams often work better when leadership is shared (Carson et al., 2007; Mehra et al., 2006). In a study involving road maintenance teams, Hiller et al. (2006) found collective leadership to be positively associated with team effectiveness. Finally, Ensley et al. (2006) suggested, “Shared leadership appears to be particularly important in the development and growth of new ventures” (p. 228).

Limitations of Shared Leadership

In spite of the many benefits derived from a shared leadership model, one must not overlook the inherent limitations found in the research. First, resistance to the model can make implementation extremely difficult. O’Toole et al. (2002) believed that resistance stems “from thousands of years of cultural conditioning” (p. 64). They said, “We are dealing with a near-universal myth: in the popular mind, leadership is always singular” (p. 64). However, Locke (2003) disagreed with this notion, instead saying, “I think the resistance stems from reality and the laws of logic. Core values must be pushed from the top down” (p. 278). Steinert et al. (2006)
agreed that implementation of shared leadership is a universal struggle, boldly stating, “All authors emphasize that the introduction of shared leadership requires extensive preparatory work to overcome traditional professional demarcations” (p. 251).

Another shared leadership issue to consider involves decision making. Since it is sometimes difficult for a group of leaders to reach consensus, decisions can take longer to make (Miles & Watkins, 2007). Jackson (2000) pointed out, “Team attitudes, turf battles, and individual career goals” are potential obstacles to efficient decision making. Locke (2003) noted that without a clear (and shared) group mission, nothing can be accomplished. The benefits of complementary leadership are negated when agreement about organizational priorities differ (Miles & Watkins) and irreconcilable differences impede decision making and forward progress. As has already been mentioned in this paper, teams that do not encourage the airing of diverse opinions often default into a mode of groupthink (Kezar, 1998).

A third major limitation of shared leadership stems from elements of apparent conflict between a single-leader structure and team structure. Katzenbach (1998) noted that creating a meaningful purpose, commitment to team performance, and team member accountability are challenges involved in shared leadership. Locke (2003) mentioned, “No successful, profit-making company that I know of has ever been run by a team” (p. 273). He further said that equal influence among team members is not only undesirable, but rarely attainable. Given all the contingencies related to group dynamics, Seibert, Sparrowe, and Liden (2003) declared, “We should expect shared leadership to benefit group performance only under certain conditions” (p. 175). Bligh et al. (2006) shared this sentiment, assuming “shared leadership is not ideal for every team environment” (p. 309). Scott and Caress (2005) emphasized, “Shared governance is an ongoing and fluid process, requiring continual assessment and re-evaluation in order to be flexible and responsive to an ever-changing environment” (p. 4). Proper planning, commitment, and adaptation to cultural change are required to successfully implement a shared leadership model (Scott & Caress).

Conclusion and Implications

Based on a review of the literature, shared leadership can be operationally defined as a dynamic, collaborative process (Conger & Pearce, 2003) whereby influence is distributed (Carson et al., 2007) amongst a plurality of networked individuals, often referred to as teams, for the purpose of achieving beneficial outcomes for the organization. Characteristics of shared leadership teams include decentralized interaction, collective task completion, reciprocal support and skill development (Wood, 2005), shared purpose, and a unified voice (Carson et al.), all enhanced via social interaction that involves mutual accountability, partnership, equity, and ownership (Jackson, 2000).

This literature review investigates the case for shared leadership and seeks to determine if more organizations should consider adopting a shared leadership model. So then, is it time for a change to a shared leadership approach? Well, the answer largely depends on the type of organization involved. Rice (2006) touted the benefits of shared leadership and affirmed, “The principles of shared leadership are thus applicable to leaders in all types of organizations, from schools and hospitals to nonprofit organizations and corporations to group homes and independent living centers” (p. 98). However, the literature seems to indicate that some
organizations and industries present a more conducive environment for shared leadership than others.

Yukl (2006) affirmed that more research is needed to examine the spectrum of issues surrounding shared leadership. Conger and Pearce (2003) agreed, pointing out that more research on the process of shared leadership needs to occur in at least five areas: (a) the roles that can be shared, (b) the events that trigger shared leadership, (c) facilitation factors, (d) the most conducive influence approaches, and (e) stages and life cycles in shared leadership settings. In addition, more studies that measure outcomes, limits, liabilities, and pervasiveness of shared leadership will aid our understanding of this leadership approach. For now, it seems clear that organizations are just beginning to capitalize on the many benefits a shared leadership approach can offer. There seems to be no doubt that shared leadership is here to stay.
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Authority in the 21st Century: Likert’s System 5 Theory

John H. Wilson
Regent University

There is a paucity of research on R. Likert’s System 5 leadership theory as evidenced by only three specific articles on the topic found among several academic databases. While the field of leadership has largely ignored this theory, evidence suggests 21st-century organizational climate in many countries may be ready for this type of approach. R. Likert and Likert (1976) explained that System 5 would resemble Likert’s System 4, but with less hierarchical authority. The following summarizes the available literature on System 5 including foundational material about earlier Likert systems. Recommendations for further study include assessment of the potential viability of this approach for collaborative organizations during the postmodern era.

The following is a review of the available literature regarding R. Likert’s System 5 theory, along with a proposal for further study to assess the potential viability of this approach in organizations during the postmodern era. There is a paucity of research on Likert’s System 5 theory as evidenced by the three articles found in the following databases limited to scholarly/peer-reviewed articles: ABI/Inform, Academic OneFile, and Google Scholar. The search included the following keyword pairings in each database: “leadership” and “System 5,” “System 5” and “Likert,” and “leadership” and “Likert.” An additional search included all three terms together, but produced very few results. Searches on “System 5” alone or paired with “leadership” were problematic as they returned results when a numbered serration ended point number four with the word “system,” followed by the number five, starting the following point. For instance, a search on “leadership” and “System 5” in the ABI/Inform database returned 23 results. However, only one was relevant to Likert’s System 5 theory of leadership. By comparison, a search of the same database using “Likert” and “System 5” returned only one article, the same article referenced in the aforementioned search. The ABI/Inform search on “leadership” and “Likert” produced 44 results, 32 of which were references to unrelated Likert work (i.e., the Likert scale). Of the remainder, only two articles specifically discussed System 5, while the others more generally related information about Likert’s entire profile (Systems 1-4) without any reference to System 5. While the field of leadership has largely ignored this particular theory, there is
evidence that 21st-century organizational culture and climate in many countries worldwide may be ready to consider this type of approach.

**Background: Systems 0-4**

R. Likert and Likert (1976) described Systems 0-4 as a continuum of management systems. The authors described System 0 as a “relatively amorphous masses . . . [with] little differentiation in function, an excessive span of control, considerable confusion about each person’s role, and, in extreme cases, chaos and anarchy” (p. 18). The subsequent systems, however, represent organizations with a definable climate. In a System 1 organization, “the motivational forces rely on punitive treatment of members of the organization” (p. 19). They posited that “in the United States, the average company is 2 or 2 ½” (p. 98) at the time of publication, described as lacking “the formal structure for cross-functional linkage and coordination except at the very top of the organization” (p. 82). System 4 is “based on supportive treatment and involvement” (p. 19), used by R. Likert and Likert to show the right end of the spectrum leading to the projected System 5. Hence, they used System 4 as the foundation for the System 5 concepts.

Buble and Pavic (2007) defined organizational culture as “essential for successfulness, development and efficiency of the modern organization” (p. 143). These authors described Likert’s four systems as: (a) System 1—exploitative–authoritative, where “the leader has a low concern for people and uses . . . threats . . . fear-based methods to achieve organizational goals”; (b) System 2—benevolent–authoritative, where “the leader adds concern for people . . . [and] uses rewards to encourage appropriate performance”; (c) System 3—consultative, where the leader makes “efforts to listen carefully to ideas”; and (d) System 4—participative, where “the leader makes maximum use of participative methods, engaging people lower down the organization in decision-making” (p. 144).

**Linking Pins**

Linking pins are a key component of R. Likert and Likert’s (1976) System 4 and take on even greater importance in System 5. Linking pins are individuals who have a prominent role in two or more groups that may interact with each other when circumstances require (J. G. Likert & Araki, 1986, p. 17). Any given member of a particular team may serve as the linking pin with other groups connecting the entire organization together.

The authors characterized linking pins as individuals who (a) exert influence in more than one direction within an organization; (b) have higher involvement in each relevant group than any other member of either group; (c) enjoy full status within each group, so they are not considered an outsider; (d) communicate effectively in both groups through use of jargon and understanding of each group’s culture and values; (e) coordinate solutions to problems in ways that satisfy the needs of both groups; and (f) instill common responsibility for implementation among members of both groups (R. Likert & Likert, 1976).

The authors indicated that these lateral linkages are a formal component of System 4 and would be present in System 5 as well (R. Likert & Likert, 1976). That these linking pins are not representatives, but rather full-fledged members of both teams involved in an interaction is the critical distinction.
System 4

R. Likert (1981) discussed System 4 in terms of improving public administration in one of his final published works. R. Likert defined a System 4 leader as (a) “supportive, approachable, friendly, easy to talk to”; (b) “builds the subordinates into a cohesive . . . team linked together by persons who hold overlapping membership”; (c) “helps subordinates with their work by seeing that they are supplied with all the necessary resources”; and (d) “has high performance, no nonsense goals” (p. 674). R. Likert found that managers “fear that employees will usurp authority and that the manager will lose control” (p. 677) if they implement a System 4 environment. However, R. Likert assured readers that studies have shown “employees respond responsibly and with increased cooperation and greater productivity when their managers move toward System 4” (p. 677). The author recommended that organizations take great care to make a slow transition to System 4 from a lower system. This caution seems equally relevant to companies considering a transitioning from System 4 to System 5.

Studies Using Likert Systems 1-4

There seem to be some correlation between System 4 and Japanese-style management, often called JSM. Hall and Leidecker (1981) presented JSM, in comparison to what they called type Z, an American equivalent that is seemingly independent from JSM yet with similar characteristics. Likert’s System 4 is one of five U.S.-based models attributable to the author’s description of type Z. The authors characterized JSM as having the following elements:

1. Bottom-up process
2. Senior manager—the facilitator
3. Middle manager—the molder
4. Openness
5. Consensual decision making
6. Holistic orientation
7. Management by walking around. (p. 15)

In comparison, Hall and Leidecker (1981) characterized Likert’s System 4 as emphasizing trust, freedom to talk to superiors about the job, rewards as incentives, group involvement, responsibility of individuals towards organizational goals, co-operative teamwork, vertical and lateral information flows, and accurate communication. Hall and Leidecker suggested however, that freedom to talk with superiors in System 4 stops short of top-level managers. Likert’s System 5 downplays hierarchy and power distance, and therefore more ubiquitous communication channels might be possible between all levels of the organization in this model.

Hall and Leidecker (1981) reported that System 4 emphasizes consensus in decision making using linking pins, which they defined as key individuals with influence within multiple groups, as central to facilitating such consensus. The authors concluded however, that Likert did not “expand on this [consensus] theme to the extent found in the holistic orientation of JSM” (p. 19). System 5 seems to have the potential to address some of the gaps found between System 4 and JSM.

Al-Jafary and Hollingsworth (1983) studied ten Arabian Gulf region organizations in terms of Likert’s system model and compared them with similar organizations in the United
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States, consequently providing some cultural reference points between the systems and cultural attitudes towards various managerial styles. To this end, the authors accounted for a number of other studies of managerial styles performed in more countries around the globe, confirming their findings across an extant of cultures. However, Al-Jafary and Hollingsworth cautioned readers that “external validity for managers differing on these variables cannot be claimed” (p. 150). As a result, they recommend longitudinal study to identify the correlation between culture and managerial style effectiveness. Instrumentation for such research “must be designed [to] have validity at lower levels of organizations in a variety of countries” (p. 151) since this study found that style could vary depending on the type of decision and on the organizational level.

Bakotic’s (2008) study of Croatian companies also explored Likert’s classifications from a nonwestern cultural perspective. Bakotic explained that “the style that individuals use will be based on a combination of their beliefs, values and preferences, as well as the organizational culture and norms which will encourage some styles and discourage others” (p. 214). The study results showed that Croatian companies fall in either System 2 or System 3 in most cases. Bakotic’s study also reviewed differences in leadership style based on gender for each of Likert’s style barriers. Further, the author accounted for variability based on company activities; “the managers of large Croatian companies engaged in commerce . . . oriented toward consultative leadership style but in the case of manufacture companies this orientation is lower” (p. 216).

Beehr (1977) performed a study that tested the effectiveness of Likert’s Profile of Organizational Characteristics. The intent of this hierarchical cluster analysis was to determine if the instrument was a viable “measure of an organization’s Likert System level” (p. 120). The seven dimensions measured by this instrument are “leadership, motivation, communication, interaction-influence process, decision making, goal-setting or ordering, and control” (p. 120). The results of the study affirmed this instrument to measure four of the factors to some degree, however, the other three “were not represented as Likert intended them to be” (p. 122). It is possible that Beehr’s study provides insight into the changes that could make the Likert Profile of Organizational Characteristics better suited as a mechanism to study System 5 along with the other Likert system levels. For instance, Beehr recommended the bifurcation of decision-making into “informed decision making and participative decision making” (p. 123).

Buble and Pavic (2007) performed a study into the correlation between leadership style and organizational culture in Croatian companies based on Likert’s Systems. Like Bakotic (2008), Buble and Pavic found that the leadership style in Croatian companies was System 2 or System 3. The results showed that managers of these companies tended towards consultative leadership, but reverted to System 2 when making big decisions. Like other studies using Likert, this study did not account for variables related to readiness for an organization to progress to a higher system level.

Burns and Schuman (1988) studied law enforcement agencies using Likert’s systems. The authors indicated that the “structure [of law enforcement agencies] encourages an authoritarian approach to leadership and would appear to be counterproductive to any movement toward a more participative model” (p. 145). However, Burns and Schuman also noted that an effective leader should adapt the leadership style to situations in order to account for “the complexities of modern organization[s]” (p. 149). They used the law enforcement agency as illustrative of this point. Their conclusion was that “the compatibility of the individuals with the organization’s structure is of greater importance than where the organization might fall on the continuum between System 1 and System 4” (p. 156).
Common Definitions

Generally, authors writing on the subject of Likert’s Systems 1-4 agree on the general description of each system. Al-Jafary and Hollingsworth (1983) described Likert’s systems as follows:

1. System 1: Exploitive authoritative
2. System 2: Benevolent authoritative
3. System 3: Consultative
4. System 4: Participative group (p. 146)

As shown in Table 1, however, authors of studies related to Systems 1-4 vary in terms of the characteristics used to establish the level of a particular organization.

Table 1: Varying Characteristics Used when Assessing Likert Systems in Organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Al-Jafary &amp; Hollingsworth</th>
<th>Bakotic</th>
<th>Boss</th>
<th>Beehr</th>
<th>Burns &amp; Schuman</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision making</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership/influence</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal setting</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical training</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns for persons</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job-based control</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee based control</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction–influence process</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The authors all agreed on communication, decision making, leadership/influence, and control as characteristics. All except for Al-Jafary and Hollingsworth (1983) also agreed on goal setting. The remaining characteristics appear to be a matter of preference on the part of the author.

System 5

Likert and Likert (1976) first introduced System 5 theory as an extension of System 4. They expressed the belief “that social science [would] help create, [for the 1980s and 1990s] an
even more effective, complex, and socially evolved management and social system” (p. 33). The authors further explained, “It appears that it will have the structuring and interaction process of System 4 but will lack the authority of hierarchy” (p. 33). The authors believed that this advanced variation of System 4 would be more collaborative, would allow groups to make decisions on a consensus basis, and would provide better tools for mitigating conflict. Further, “some early experiments already are providing a glimmer of what System 5 may be like” (p. 33). The expectation was for System 4 to allow for decreased authority and the role of individuals that they call linking pins would facilitate the organizational mission into operational practice (Likert & Likert).

In contrast to System 4, Likert and Likert (1976) explained that the leader in System 5 would be less beholden to “create an atmosphere of support throughout the organization . . . this obligation would be more widely shared” (p. 18). A team would exist that consists of executive level managers, however, they would represent the linking pins that “co-ordinate the efforts of the total organization” (p. 19). Leadership of this executive team like all teams would shift as the situation required.

**Decreased Authority**

In reference to Likert’s model, Burns and Schuman (1988) indicated that “decisions appear to be more successful if those who have to implement the decisions are given more of an opportunity to be involved and have influence in the decisions made” (p. 147). The level of authority is on a decreasing scale in terms of the System 0-4 continuum. System 0 arguably lacks any authority based on the definition provided above. R. Likert and Likert (1976) do not suggest that System 5 will be without authority as with System 0, however, they distinguish System 5 “will have the structure and interaction process of System 4 but will lack the authority of hierarchy” (emphasis added) (p. 33). With the increase of influence by linking pins, the need for hierarchy decreases assuming such individuals have the personal influence to serve the purpose of coordinating groups towards the correct goals. If the linking pins can effectively serve this purpose, then the hierarchy of authority is less imperious.

Reilly (1978) included questions about System 5 theory of leadership during an interview with Rensis Likert. During the interview, Likert summarized the characteristics of System 4 as interlocking work groups comprised of loyal participants committed to trusting one another and pursuing the goals of the organization together. Further, Likert emphasized the social system as a critical element for System 4 organizations to solve problems and to influence decisions aimed at organizational achievement. In response to Reilly, Likert indicated that System 5 “will have a structure like System 4, and it will become increasingly complex as we move toward more complex technology—for example, we’ll have more matrix organizations” (p. 21). Likert presented the idea of System 5 when System 4 was more the exception than the norm. He recognized the potential for “horizontal and vertical linkages, and sometimes horizontal ones [in] two or three dimensions rather than one dimension” (p. 21). Now that models similar to System 4 are more widespread, there seems to be potential to explore the System 5 model. Further, technological advances such as social networking applications, portable communication devices, text messaging, and Twitter could aid the advancement of this approach.

J. G. Likert and Araki (1986) produced the landmark work on the subject, presenting a more structured System 5 model built on the foundation of System 4; “the group decision-
making pattern of a System 5 organization would be similar to that of System 4. The difference would be in the leadership role” (p. 18). The authors posited two key distinctions of System 5 in comparison to System 4: decision making and leadership. The authors explained that System 4 establishes the networks of individuals in an organization empowered to make decisions based on informed knowledge of the mission and objectives of the organization (J. G. Likert & Araki). Therefore, System 5 exists when team members collectively coordinate with the total organization through linking pins both to insure the alignment of decisions with organizational policy and to gain widespread consensus for said action (J. G. Likert & Araki).

**Level 5 Leadership**

Boss’ (1980) study identified a correlation between CEO behavior and “the success or failure of an OD [Organizational Development] effort” (p. 190). Using the Likert profile, this study inferred a strong correlation between the efforts of the top executive on the effectiveness of an organizational development effort. This seems particularly poignant when considering the type of executive who might guide an organization towards a model similar to System 5. Likert pointed out that many leaders are even reluctant to implement a System 4 approach for fear of losing authority (Reilly, 1978, p. 22).

Collins (2001) introduced the concept of “Level 5 Leadership” (p. 12), which bears a relevant connection to Likert’s System 5. Where System 5 describes an organization’s structure and climate, Level 5 describes characteristics of the “type of leadership required for turning a good company into a great one” (p. 12). These characteristics seem consistent with the type of leader who would not be fearful to lose authority when there is so much to gain in terms of influence and effectiveness. In an interview, Collins described Level 5 leadership as “ambition for the cause combined with the will to make good on it” (Collins & Powell, 2004, p. 710). This ambition is not self-serving, but rather for the success of the organization blending humility and strong will to succeed (Finnie & Abraham, 2002, p. 11). Finnie and Abraham quoted Collins, saying, “Most Level 5 leaders would understand that their report card only comes in when their successor succeeds” (p. 12).

Collins (2001) indicated that a Level 5 leader focuses on (a) identifying the right people for the organization before the direction of the organization, (b) confronting difficult problems while confident that efforts will be successful, (c) isolating complexity into a single focus, (d) establishing a “cultural of discipline. . . . When you have disciplined people, you don’t need hierarchy” (p. 13), (e) transforming the organization through strategic use of technology, (f) pursuing persistent increases in momentum, and (g) looking ahead towards sustainable organizational effectiveness. Gunn (2002) suggested that humility is most likely the distinguishing characteristic between Level 5 leaders and those who score lower on Collins’ scale (p. 14). Gunn indicated that such leaders are more likely to face the facts, pursue the interests of the organization ahead of their own interests, and strive towards teamwork.

This type of leader would seem a good candidate to build a System 5 organization since a Level 5 leader is likely to surround themselves with individuals who are confident, but not self-centered (Collins & Powell, 2004, p. 712). These characteristics of Level 5 are very consistent with Likert’s System 5, and it is likely that a Level 5 leader who personifies the above might even inadvertently establish a System 5 organization. Many other cultures have embraced these ideas much more quickly than the United States, such as “Asian [cultures]—and to some extent
European cultures demonstrate less of a love affair with the heroic individual facing the universe alone” (p. 715).

**Conclusion**

While System 5 is one of R. Likert’s less prominent works, System 5 seems to have noteworthy implications in the 21st century. Many businesses have adopted a System 4-style model in some form. Examples include companies such as Fitzgerald Battery, IDS, Lake Superior Paper, and W.L. Gore and Associates (Stewart, Manz, & Sims, 1999). Likert proposed these theories before the technologies existed that could potentially support System 5 on a broad scale such as the technologies for collaboration and communications described in this paper. Such innovations might supply the infrastructure needed for decision making to happen quickly without sacrificing the value of achieving consensus. More research is needed to determine whether companies and employees are ready to make the shift from System 4 to System 5. Adaptations to Likert’s Profile of Organizational Characteristics could prove useful in identifying the readiness of an organization and of individual leaders to make this transition. Finally, social networking technologies are only in their infancy, but more research into the potential uses of these applications could shed light on the type of infrastructure that could better support a System 5 organization. The proliferation of participative organizations, technological advances, and preferences towards collaboration in 21st-century organizations may at last be conducive for Likert’s visionary theory to succeed in many countries and cultures.
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Impact of Cultural Intelligence Level on Conflict Resolution Ability: A Conceptual Model and Research Proposal

Andrea Reyes Ramirez
Regent University

Cultural intelligence and conflict resolution ability are essential for 21st-century leaders when considering the increased interaction with individuals from different cultural backgrounds that is now prevalent due to the technological advances of the internet and improved modes of mobility (Templer, Tay, & Chandrasekar, 2006). With increased frequent interactions, there is greater opportunity for cultural differences to create conflict (Kaushal & Kwantes, 2006). New global skills must be acquired to be an effective leader in the 21st century (Robinson & Harvey, 2008). In response to literature gaps, this model suggests a 2X2 factorial design to test to see if cultural intelligence levels predict the appropriate conflict resolution strategy adoption, thus the conflict resolution ability.

As the 21st century presents a deepened global experience through internet resources and more accessible modes of mobility, a greater number of individuals have the opportunity to interact with persons from different cultural backgrounds (Templer et al., 2006). With these increased frequent interactions, there is greater opportunity for cultural differences to create conflict (Kaushal & Kwantes, 2006). Although conflict itself and resolving conflict is a part of every culture, “the way it is expressed, perceived, and dealt with varies from culture to culture” (Miyahara, Kim, Shin, & Yoon, 1998, p. 506). Therefore, new global skills must be acquired to be an effective leader in the 21st century (Robinson & Harvey, 2008).

As a result, increasing interest continues to focus on issues surrounding cultural diversity and the conflict it produces (Kaushal & Kwantes, 2006). Much could be at risk if businesses and leaders do not understand the issues that arise and how to effectively overcome them. Cultural intelligence is a proven tool to increase an individual’s ability to connect with others outside their own culture, thus cultural diversity (Ang, Van Dyne, Koh, Yee Ng, Tay, & Chandrasekar, 2007; Brislin, Worthley, & MacNab, 2006; Earley & Ang, 2003) For example, Americans doing business in Japan who adapt to the cultural norm of exchanging business cards will be better received by Japanese businessmen than those who ignore this cultural expectation (Brislin et al.,
Conflict resolution strategies can be helpful in resolving conflict (Blake & Mouton, 1964; Holt & DeVore, 2005; Thomas & Kilmann, 2007; Wood & Bell, 2008). Global teams and individuals that do not know how to effectively communicate, identify with, and resolve conflicts across cultures are likely to be in danger of pitfalls such as losing cross-cultural business opportunities, encountering reluctance to share valuable ideas occurring when culture is not understood, and potentially losing revenue (Janssens & Brett, 2006). Adversely, businesses and individuals who do know how to effectively use cultural intelligence and conflict resolution strategies have the opportunity to create a path for others to follow.

In light of the importance of utilizing cultural intelligence and appropriate conflict resolution strategies to effectively overcome conflict related to cultural differences, this study builds on previous literature to present a model examining how levels of cultural intelligence might potentially impact conflict resolution ability. Selecting an appropriate conflict resolution strategy that is fitting for the situation has been found to be one of the key factors for determining the quality of the outcome resolving the conflict (Deutsch, 1973; Lawrence & Lorsch, 1969; Wood & Bell, 2008). Conflict resolution ability is the skill to affectively resolve conflict by determining which conflict resolution strategy is most appropriate for a given situation (Koza & Dant, 2007; Lawrence & Lorsch; Van de Vliert, Euwema, & Huismans, 1995). Some studies have found that certain conflict resolution strategies are more culturally acceptable to those involved in the conflict (Ting-Toomey & Kurogi, 1998; Ting-Toomey, Yee-Jung, Shapiro, Garcia, Wright, & Oetzel, 2000). Therefore, this model presents that a higher level of cultural intelligence positively affects and predicts whether an individual will select an appropriate conflict resolution strategy fitting for the cultural backgrounds of those involved in the conflict.

The Gap in Current Studies

Since conflict resolution strategies are essential to resolving conflict, much focus has been on variables that influence or predict an individual’s preferences regarding which conflict resolution strategy is selected (Baron, 1989; Sternberg & Soriano, 1984; Wood & Bell, 2008). Studies examining hindrances to resolving conflict have identified such variables as being driven and determined found to be characteristics of Type A individuals, having low self-monitoring skills, and indicating a low level of marital satisfaction (Baron; Bell & Blakeney, 1977; Geist & Gilbert, 1996; Holt & DeVore, 2005). Although determining which factors hinder certain conflict strategy preferences is of interest, there seems to be a larger number of studies attempting to identify factors that instead predict conflict resolution strategy preferences (Geist & Gilbert; Rizkalla, Wertheim, & Hodgson, 2008; Sternberg & Soriano; Wood & Bell). These studies have reviewed predictor variables such as forgiveness, the Big Five personality traits, bilingualism, and gender, and found them to positively predict which conflict resolution strategy an individual prefers (Costa, Hernandez, Costa-Faidella, & Sebastian-Galles, 2009; Rizkall et al.; Sternberg & Soriano; Wood & Bell). For example, as pointed out by Costa et al., bilingual individuals were found to have a stronger ability to ignore distractions and solve problems faster than monolinguals when dealing with assignments involving conflict resolution. Additional studies have examined interventions that might prove productive in helping children select appropriate conflict resolution strategies with training such as the use of social stories and peer
mediation training (Kalyva & Agaliotis, 2009; Trunuklu, Kacmaz, Turk, Kalender, Sevkin, & Zengin, 2009).

Although these studies are valuable and aid in determining which variables might influence or predict the conflict resolution strategy that will be selected, three significant gaps seem to exist. First, there seems to be a gap in identifying variables that will predict which conflict resolution strategy an individual will adopt when selecting based on what is most culturally appropriate given the cultural background of the parties involved in the conflict. Second, there seems to be an absence of studies examining if the other parties involved in the conflict are in agreement with the conflict resolution strategy selected by the individual and determining if the strategy selected is the most ideal for their cultural backgrounds and understandings. Third, the impact of cultural intelligence levels, including variables such as versatility and confusion acceptance, which could aid in selecting a culturally appropriate strategy have not yet been tested to see if they serve as predictors for increased or decreased conflict resolution ability (Brislin et al., 2006).

These gaps are evidenced when considering Wood and Bell’s (2008) study where the findings show individuals with the personality traits of agreeableness (A) and extraversion (E) are likely to prefer and adopt the conflict resolution strategies of competing and accommodating. However, it is unknown if these strategies were also preferred by the other parties involved in the conflict. Furthermore, were these preferred strategies the most culturally appropriate? How would cultural intelligence levels impact the conflict resolution strategy adopted? Current literature has focused on a model as seen in Figure 1 where the variable is tested to see if it predicts which conflict resolution strategy will be most preferred by the individual tested.

![Figure 1. Current model illustrating how literature has tested variables such as personality traits to predict which conflict resolution strategies will be preferred.](image)

The focus of the current literature is the preferred conflict resolution strategy of an individual based on certain variables instead of on the variables that will predict the most
appropriate conflict resolution strategy suited for the situation (Holt & DeVore, 2005; Kaushal & Kwantes, 2006; Wachter, 1999; Wood & Bell, 2008). By examining the preferences of one individual instead of those of the whole group, the literature seems to be individual focused instead of group focused.

**Explanation of the Variables in the Proposed Model**

This gap of determining appropriateness and testing a potential variable that might increase an appropriate conflict resolution strategy being adopted is what this proposed model seeks to address. The proposed testing will see if cultural intelligence levels predict the appropriate conflict resolution strategy adoption, thus the conflict resolution ability. In order to adequately present this model as seen in Figure 2, the definitions of the variables must be clearly defined. Following the graphic of the proposed model presented is an explanation of each variable.

![Figure 2. Proposed model illustrating how cultural intelligence levels predict conflict resolution ability with cultural intelligence characteristics serving as mediating variables.](image)

**Cultural Intelligence Level**

The study of culture and multiple intelligences has gained traction since the 1990s (Crawford-Mathis, 2009; Hofstede, 2006). Four major cross-cultural studies paved the way for cultural intelligence to develop including (a) House’s GLOBE study which aimed at describing the relationships between social culture, organizational processes, and leadership; (b) the World Values Survey which was conducted on respondents from market research agencies across various countries; (c) Schwartz’s Survey of Values covering students and teachers in over 50 countries; and (d) a study of event management including managers from 47 countries (Hofstede; House, Javidan, Hanges, & Dorfman, 2002; Inglehart, Basanez, & Moreno, 1998; Schwartz & Bardi, 2001; Smith, Peterson, & Swartz, 2002; Yukl, 2006). Another noteworthy study was performed by Den Hartog et al. (1999) which explored universal leadership traits. By building on
these studies and others to determine why some individuals “are more effective than others in culturally diverse situations” (Ang et al., 2007, p. 336), Earley (2002) theorized that cultural intelligence impacts several key aspects of intercultural interactions.

Plainly stated, the definition used in this model for cultural intelligence is “an individual’s capability to function and manage effectively in culturally diverse settings... a specific form of intelligence focused on capabilities to grasp, reason, and behave effectively in situations characterized by cultural diversity” (Ang et al., 2007, p. 337). Early and Ang (2003) also asserted that this ability adapts regardless of culture (Ng & Earley, 2006). There are four components of cultural intelligence which include (a) cognitive, (b) metacognitive, (c) motivational, and (d) behavioral.

Cognitive cultural intelligence “reflects knowledge of the norms, practices and conventions in different cultures acquired from education and personal experiences... those with high cognitive CQ understand similarities and differences across cultures” (Ang et al., 2007, p. 338). Whereas, metacognitive cultural intelligence “reflects mental processes that individuals use to acquire and understand cultural knowledge... those with high metacognitive CQ are consciously aware of others’ cultural preferences before and during interactions... they also... adjust their mental models during and after interactions” (Ang et al., p. 338). Motivational cultural intelligence refers to the “capability to direct attention and energy toward learning about and functioning in situations characterized by cultural differences” (p. 338). Finally, behavioral intelligence is the “capability to exhibit appropriate verbal and nonverbal actions when interacting with people from different cultures... this includes having a wide and flexible repertoire of behaviors... exhibit situationally appropriate behaviors” (Ang et al., p. 338).

To measure cultural intelligence, the cultural intelligence scale (CQS), a 20-item scale developed by Ang et al. (2007), can be used which the following breakdown of positively worded question items: “four metacognitive CQ, six cognitive CQ, five motivational CQ, and five behavior CQ” (p. 344). High and low levels of cultural intelligence are determined by the results of this measurement tool. As seen in Figure 3, high levels of cultural intelligence produce versatility with appropriate actions when interacting with people from different cultures, energy toward learning how to function in different cultural situations, an awareness of cultural norms, and an adaptability to adjust mental modes to effectively interact (Ang et al.; Brislin et al., 2006). Whereas, low levels of cultural intelligence are evidenced by individuals who have difficulty adjusting to those from different cultural backgrounds, a low tolerance with not understanding cultural norms, also known as confusion acceptance, and a lack of placing energy on focused learning to reach cultural awareness (Brislin et al.).

As levels of cultural intelligence are manipulated, the knowledge base to select a culturally appropriate strategy—the conflict resolution ability—is increased or decreased. Therefore, cultural intelligence level serves as the independent variable on the dependent variable of conflict resolution ability.
Blake and Mouton (1964) popularized the study of conflict resolution with their typology concept which explains that individuals have dual concerns, “the desire to obtain one’s own goals (concern for production) versus the desire to retain interpersonal relationship (concern for people)” (Holt & DeVore, 2005, p. 167). These concerns formed a managerial grid with “five discrete styles for resolving conflict . . . smoothing (high concern for people and low concern for production); withdrawing (low concern for both people and production); compromising (medium concern for production and people); problem-solving (high concern for production and people); and forcing (high concern for production versus low concern for people)” (Holt & Devore, p. 167). Significant contributors expanded and attempted to simplify this typology such as Thomas-Kilmann (1975, 2007), Hall (1969), Rahim (1983), and Renwick (1975; Holt & DeVore; Wood & Bell, 2008). Since the Thomas-Kilmann model “has been shown to have better internal consistency reliability than previous instruments” (Lawrence & Lorsch, 1969; Wood & Bell, 2008, p. 127), for the purposes of this model the Thomas-Kilmann’s (2007) 2X2 matrix is used. This 2X2 matrix builds upon assertiveness and cooperativeness dimensions (Wood & Bell).

Initially, the thought was that problem solving with a high concern for both production and people was the ideal strategy, however after further study by Killman and Thomas (1978), it was concluded that no one strategy is better than another and that certain strategies will be more...
ideal in different situations and cultures (Blake & Mouton, 1964; Fisher & Ury, 1981; Holt & Devore, 2005; Ting-Toomey et al., 2000). Thomas and Killman (2007) defined assertiveness as “the extent to which the individual attempts to satisfy his or her own concerns” (p. 7) and cooperativeness as “the extent to which the individual attempts to satisfy the other person’s concerns” (p. 7). According to their model, “conflict resolution behavior can be simultaneously classified according to whether the behavior is cooperative or uncooperative, and whether it is assertive or unassertive . . . for example . . . behavior that is uncooperative and assertive is labeled as ‘competing’ behavior” (Wood & Bell, 2008, p. 127).

Figure 4. Overlay of Thomas-Killman’s (2007) conflict resolution strategies (in bold and underlined) and Blake and Mouton’s (1964) strategies (highlighted with italics).

Conflict resolution ability is the skill to affectively resolve conflict by determining which of these conflict resolution strategies is most appropriate for a given situation (Koza & Dant, 2007; Lawrence & Lorsch, 1969; Van de Vliert et al., 1995). Strong conflict resolution ability will be measured by determining if the conflict resolution strategy selected is preferred by the majority of those individuals involved in the conflict. With the opposite anticipated result, weak conflict resolution ability will be determined if the conflict resolution strategy selected is not preferred by the majority of those individuals involved in the conflict. Ting-Toomey et al. (2000) presented findings that certain cultures have a preferred conflict interaction style, or conflict resolution strategy, that “is learned within the primary socialization process of one’s cultural or ethnic group. Individuals learn the norms and scripts of appropriate conflict conduct and effective conflict behavior in their ethnic and cultural environment” (p. 48). For example, the study findings discovered that “Latino(a) Americans and Asian Americans use avoiding and third party conflict styles more than African Americans, and, Asian Americans use avoiding
conflict style more than European Americans” (p. 47). Therefore, the ability to decipher which conflict resolution strategy is most appropriate for the situation while considering cultural norms of those involved in the conflict is considered conflict resolution ability in this model (Deutsch, 1973; Lawrence & Lorsch; Wood & Bell, 2008).

**Mediating Variables of Versatility and Confusion Acceptance**

Cultural intelligence encompasses the ability to discern appropriate interactions and not merely a cognizant awareness of emotions or social occurrences (Thomas & Inkson, 2004). Earley and Peterson (2004) explained that cultural intelligence reflects an individual’s capability to adjust to new situations and thus producing novel behavior. The ability to discern, adjust, and behave effectively in this manner is called versatility in this proposed model. As stated above, Killman and Thomas’ (1978) study concluded that no one strategy is better than another and that certain strategies will be more ideal in different situations and cultures (Blake & Mouton, 1964; Fisher & Ury, 1981; Holt & Devore, 2005; Ting-Toomey & Kurogi, 1998). Therefore, versatility to adjust from strategy to strategy depending on the situation is needed for ideal selection. If an individual is limited to only the conflict resolution strategies they are most comfortable with and cannot be versatile to use all the forms, then the success of potentially solving the conflict is impacted (Lawrence & Lorsch, 1969; Ting-Toomey et al., 2000; Wood & Bell, 2008). Versatility helps to explain how culturally intelligent individuals are able to adjust from one cultural situation to another by utilizing cultural awareness and selecting the most appropriate behavior as well as how someone with a strong conflict resolution ability is able to select the most appropriate strategy based on what is needed for the individuals involved in the conflict (Brislin et al., 2006; Wood & Bell).

Confusion acceptance also serves as a mediating variable in this model. Brislin et al. (2006) introduced two concepts that seem to be needed in order to be successful at adapting to new cultural contexts. First, disconfirmed expectancy which is the result of an individual strong in emotional intelligence in their own culture expecting that they will have the same level of understanding in a different culture only to find that the expectation is not met (Brislin et al.). The second is confusion acceptance where an individual is comfortable with not understanding cultural interactions. Brislin et al. explained:

One important and critical skill of people who are culturally intelligent is the expectation for misunderstanding . . . the sojourner who is culturally intelligent begins to expect that she or he will encounter specific events and behaviors in the new cultural context that will not immediately be understood . . . slightly different, from what Triandis (2005) calls “suspending judgment.” In this manner, people who are culturally intelligent not only delay judging the situation (e.g., as right or wrong) until more understanding is gained but also allow themselves the normally uncomfortable state of not knowing. Confusion acceptance, accommodating the not knowing . . . thus reduces levels of stress during cross-cultural interactions . . . lowering levels of stress during the interaction can allow one to calmly and more fully take in and evaluate the situation to help move toward . . . reconciliation. (pp. 48-49)
Therefore, culturally intelligent individuals have high levels of confusion acceptance which offers more time for the conflict to be resolved and by reducing stress and working out a greater level of patience allows for consideration of which conflict resolution strategy is most suited for the situation (Brislin et al., 2006). Therefore, as cultural intelligence levels increase so does versatility and confusion acceptance which in turn could positively impact and predict a stronger conflict resolution ability which is selecting the most appropriate strategy based on the cultural backgrounds of the individuals involved in the conflict.

**Future Testing**

In order to test this model, a Solomon four-group design will be used which is a “special case of a 2X2 factorial design, this procedure involves the random assignment of participant to four groups. Pre-tests and treatments are varied for the four groups. All groups receive a post-text” (Creswell, 2009, p. 161). The 2X2 factorial test measures high/low cultural intelligence and strong/weak conflict resolution ability. Descriptive statistics and Factorial AVOVA tests will be run to measure the hypotheses statements.

The hypotheses statements that will be tested include:

- **H1**: High levels of cultural intelligence will predict stronger conflict resolution ability.
- **H2**: Higher levels of versatility will be found in individuals with high levels of cultural intelligence and that have strong conflict resolution ability.
- **H3**: Higher levels of confusion acceptance will be found in individuals with high levels of cultural intelligence and that have strong conflict resolution ability.
- **H4**: Low levels of cultural intelligence will predict weaker conflict resolution ability.
- **H5**: Lower levels of versatility will be found in individuals with high levels of cultural intelligence and that have strong conflict resolution ability.
- **H6**: Lower levels of confusion acceptance will be found in individuals with high levels of cultural intelligence and that have strong conflict resolution ability.

**Participants**

Four groups of church staff members will be used to test this model. The groups will be representative of predominantly African American, Anglo American, Hispanic American, and Asian American Baptist congregations in the Dallas Metroplex. To avoid an extraneous variable of cultural differences within the church staff groups, only church staff where all of the staff members are of the same cultural background under these four categories will be selected for testing this model (Kerlinger & Lee, 2000). Another extraneous variable that might construe the results is variance of the church staff size. Therefore, the selected church staffs will be a size of three to eight full-time staff members to ensure a small staff and consistency among the size of the groups. A random sampling of 16 college professors will be invited to participate in serving as a consultant to the church staff to help solve a conflict for this test. In order to reduce internal validity threats—“experiences of the participants that threaten the researcher’s ability to draw correct inferences from the data about the population in an experiment” (Creswell, 2009, p. 162)—the professor will be of a different cultural background than the designated church staff.
Materials

To test cultural intelligence levels of the professors serving as consultants, the 20-item cultural intelligence scale will be used (Ang et al., 2007). A Likert scale survey will be created to test what the church staff members feel is the conflict resolution strategy most appropriate for their subcultural norms. Since all of the individuals will also most likely be influenced by the American culture, the church staff members will be asked to specifically consider the cultural norms of African American, Anglo American, Hispanic American, and Asian American subcultures. A Likert scale exit survey will also be used for the professors to determine which conflict resolution strategy they select, how many of the Thomas-Kilmann (2007) strategies they feel comfortable using so as to test versatility, how comfortable they will be with working with a different cultural group which is to test confusion acceptance, and which strategy they believe will be most commonly used in the cultural group of the assigned church staff.

Procedure

First, four church staff groups representing African American, Anglo American, Hispanic American, and Asian American congregations will be located using the permission of a church association representative. The four church staff groups will be invited to participate in the experiment. As previously stated, to reduce validity threats, the church staff groups will be selected based on a size of three to eight full-time church staff members. Then, a random sampling will be used from a list of university faculty within the Dallas Metroplex. The random sampling will produce 16 professors. Four professors will be assigned to individually work with each church staff group on a conflict they have not resolved in the last year. The church staff group will be asked to identify four conflicts they have not resolved in the last year so as to have a separate conflict to share with each professor assigned to their church staff group.

To ensure reliability, a pre-test will be administered to the 16 professors to determine their cultural intelligence levels using the cultural intelligence 20-item scale (Ang et al., 2007). After the pre-test results are recorded, the professors will be assigned to the church staff groups by cultural diversity. The professors will not be paired with a church staff group that is of the same subculture as the professor. The researcher will explain the Thomas-Kilmann (2007) conflict resolution strategies to the professors and explain that the professors will need to pick which strategy they deem most appropriate for the church staff conflict. Each professor will meet with the assigned church staff group and discuss one of the conflicts that has remained unresolved in the last year. Then, a Likert scale survey that will be created by the researcher using the Survey Monkey tool will be printed and administered to the church staff members to determine which conflict resolution strategy they feel is most appropriate for their subcultural norms. The results will be recorded and analyzed using the Survey Monkey tool to determine which is the majority choice for the most culturally appropriate strategy. This is the purpose of limiting church staffs to three to eight full-time staff members. Only three staffed churches or more will be able to get a majority choice. A Likert scale exit survey will also be created using the Survey Monkey tool also administered electronically for the professors to (a) report which conflict resolution strategy they selected, (b) how many of the Thomas-Kilmann strategies they felt comfortable using so as to test versatility, (c) how comfortable they were with working with
a different cultural group which would test confusion acceptance, and (d) which strategy did they believe was most commonly used in the cultural group of the assigned church staff. The results will be recorded and entered into SPSS where initial descriptive statistics will be run to measure for standard deviation, mean, and standard error mean. In order to test H1 and H4, factorial 2X2 ANOVA will be run since there are two factors of the independent variables being the two levels of cultural intelligence (high/low) and then two categories of the dependent variable which will be the strong and weak conflict resolution ability.

The test of the between-subject factors such as degrees of freedom ($df$), mean square, $F$, and sig. will also be run to determine the value of $p$. If $p$ is less than .05, these hypotheses statements are true, however if they are greater than, a null hypotheses statement will have to be used in that there will be no relationship between the variables. This test will be repeated using the results of the Likert scale given to the professors regarding validity and confusion acceptance and will be compared to both cultural intelligence levels (high/low) and then again to compare to conflict resolution ability (strong/weak). These repeated tests will be run for the purpose of testing H2, H3, H5, H6.

Limitations include the geographic concentration of individuals found in the Metroplex might not be indicative of individuals found all throughout the United States. Future study would need to confirm if these same results are found in other regions in the United States and a more comprehensive study would need to be conducted to determine if these results remain true outside of the United States. Another limitation is individuals being tested on cultural intelligence and conflict resolution ability are professors who deal with students from various cultures daily. This might cause the results to be skewed toward higher levels of cultural intelligence than pulling a random sampling from the general public.

**Conclusion**

Cultural intelligence and conflict resolution ability are essential for the 21st-century leaders when considering the increased interaction with individuals from different cultural backgrounds that is prevalent due to the technological advances of the internet and improved modes of mobility (Templer et al., 2006). With increased frequent interactions, there is greater opportunity for cultural differences to create conflict (Kaushal & Kwantes, 2006). New global skills must be acquired to be an effective leader in the 21st century (Robinson & Harvey, 2008).

Much of the literature surrounding conflict resolution strategies have been focused on hindrances and predictors of an individual’s conflict resolution strategy preference (Baron, 1989; Bell & Blakeney, 1977; Geist & Gilbert, 1996; Holt & DeVore, 2005; Rizkalla et al., 2008; Sternberg & Soriano, 1984; Wood & Bell, 2008). The presented model attempts to address the three significant gaps that are found in the current literature. These gaps include (a) identifying variables that will predict which conflict resolution strategy an individual will adopt when selecting based on what is most culturally appropriate given the cultural background of the parties involved in the conflict; (b) examining if the other parties involved in the conflict are in agreement with the conflict resolution strategy selected by the individual and determining if the strategy selected is the most ideal for their cultural backgrounds and understandings; and (c) testing the impact of cultural intelligence levels, including variables such as versatility and confusion acceptance, which could aid in selecting a culturally appropriate strategy have not yet
been tested to see if they serve as predictors for increased or decreased conflict resolution ability (Brislin et al., 2006). In response to these gaps, the model suggests a 2X2 factorial design to test to see if cultural intelligence levels predict the appropriate conflict resolution strategy adoption, thus the conflict resolution ability. The test will include the examination of the other parties involved in the conflict are in agreement with the conflict resolution strategy selected.

An area for future research might be the exploration of how Christianity impacts conflict resolution strategy and cultural intelligence. Many concepts in the Bible support resolving differences and having sensitivity for individuals from different cultural backgrounds (Ephes 4; John 4; Psalms 133). Does being a Christian increase the levels of either cultural intelligence or strengthen conflict resolution ability? More studies could also concentrate on the group’s conflict resolution preferences such as Ting-Toomey and Kurogi’s (1998) study on the impact of the cultural norm of saving face on a cultural group’s conflict resolution strategy preference.
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