



# ***Crisis Leadership***

By: Dr Jeff Fox

## Module 1

### Defining and Understanding Crises

#### **Control the situation. Do not let the situation control you.**

You may or may not be familiar with the National Response Framework (NRF), the National Incident Management System (NIMS), and the Incident Command System (ICS). These are all great guidelines and tools for handling pretty much any incident or event. However, none of these great tools offer a particular leadership style to use. This is all left to chance.

I am a fan of three leadership styles in general—servant leadership, transformational leadership, and situational leadership. I would argue that these are all still applicable during a crisis, but in different ways and to varying degrees. I would put a heavy dose of situational leadership into the mix of a crisis, with a dose of servant leadership and then a little transformational leadership as well. I would add one more style that runs along with transformational, and that is transactional. During a crisis, we do not often have time to take a poll or do a lot of voting. We should collaborate in a unified command when determining priorities and goals. The one style I never want to put into my leadership stew is laissez-faire leadership.

#### **Understanding Emergency and Incident Management**

Kemp (2004) stated that there are four phases of emergency management, which are mitigation, preparedness, response, and recovery. The NIMS is applicable across all four stages. The ICS is mainly found to function within the response-and-recovery stages. Kemp went on to state that ICS should not be confused with mutual aid agreements. The ICS provides a structure or framework within which to work. Mutual-aid agreements cannot take the place of ICS or NIMS in general. All emergencies are local in nature.

Kemp went on to state that local agencies who use the ICS have a functional chain of command, reduce the possibility of duplication of services, and are overall more effective in the response-and-

recovery phases. Lastly, an all-hazards approach must be adopted by all agencies, both public and private (Bullock et al. 2006; Lindell et al. 2007; Walsh et al. 2005; Wise and Nader 2002).

Command, control, coordination, cooperation, and communications are considered key elements to effective incident management (Brunacini 1985; Molino 2006; Rosenthal 2003;

---

*I am a fan of three leadership styles in general—servant leadership, transformational leadership, and situational leadership. I would argue that these are all still applicable during a crisis, but in different ways and to varying degrees.*

---

Wise and Nader 2002). Molino (2006) described the emergency response priorities, which are life safety, incident stabilization, and property conservation (Brown 2005; Brunacini 1985; Reardon 2005). According to Molino (2006), and Flin (1996), in a small incident, there may be one officer, one fire chief and several firefighters, one transportation supervisor and workers, and one wrecker driver. Incident command could change several times throughout the incident. Yet there can be disagreements about who does what and when. Individual personalities may play a role, along with missions, organizational cultures, past experiences with one another or one another's discipline, levels of experience, and leadership styles, among many other factors (Allred 2004).

What was described here is the simplest of incidents. Extrapolate this into a Washington, DC, sniper-style attack or Pentagon attack by terrorists or even a larger-scale crisis event such as Hurricane Katrina, and the aforementioned issues increase exponentially. Unified command may be within a single discipline, such as a county police force, a state police force, or a federal law enforcement agency (Allred 2004; Boin et al. 2005; Brunacini 1985; Lester and Krejci 2007; Smits and Ally 2003).

Governmental agency personnel respond to incidents, emergencies, and disasters daily in the United States (Boin et al. 2005; Bourne 2005). While the dynamics of each incident may differ, there is one common thread: it will take decisive and appropriate leadership to resolve the situation (Bitto 2007; Bourne 2005; Howitt 2004; Mitroff 2004). Lester (2007) stated that it will take transformational leadership, coupled with NIMS, to achieve success during all phases of a disaster. Guidelines have been provided regarding how to prepare for and respond to incidents in a uniform manner throughout the country (Bourne 2005; Hanneman 2007; Perry 2003). What appear to be lacking are guidelines on how to lead during such incidents. Team or group leadership has been the subject of much research (Avolio et al. 2003). What remains to be examined in detail is individual, group, and/or team leadership during an actual incident. Even in the limited number of studies completed regarding team or group leadership, the focus has been on groups who have been established and function in a less-than-hazardous environment (Avolio et al. 2003; Jung and Sosik 2002; Kearney and Gebert 2009; King 2002).

---

*The incident commander must manage incident resources and coordinate overall emergency activities.*

---

Phillips (1999) stated that the incident commander is responsible for establishing command, ensuring responder safety, and assessing incident priorities. Furthermore, the incident commander is responsible for developing and implementing the incident action plan, developing an organizational structure as necessary, and maintaining a manageable span of control. Finally, the incident commander must manage incident resources and coordinate overall emergency activities. According to Hanneman (2007), most incident commanders initially see a problem from their own areas of expertise. Incident commanders can easily become fixated on their own perspective and bound by the biases of their discipline. However, visionary or progressive incident commanders can look beyond the paradigms of their discipline and

incorporate or understand the views of commanders from other disciplines (Lester and Krejci 2007; Yukl 2006).

Klann (2003) declared that a leader's influencing skills are critical during a crisis. Murgallis (2005) argued that team confidence begins with those who lead the team. Klann stated that leaders should concentrate on three key influencing skills during a crisis: communication, clarity of vision and values, and caring for others. These influencing skills fit the definition of transformational leadership. When considering crisis, emergency, or incident response, the team leader is actually the agency commander on the scene. Hence, UC and Incident Command (IC) need more examination in the context of NIMS and ICS (Lennartsson 2006; Lester and Krejci 2007; Moran, Perrin, and Blauth 2005).

Lindell et al. (2007) set forth the seven basic principles of ICS, which are standardization, functional specificity, manageable span of control, unit integrity, unified command, management by objectives, and comprehensive resource management (Anelli 2006; Cardwell and Cooney 2000; Herron 2004; Jamieson 2005).

Canton (2007) and Connor (1997) stated that ICS developed out of the need to manage the

response of participating agencies. The fire service was the first to implement and use ICS. It remained solely in use of the fire service for many years. It was only in the 1990s when other disciplines such as some agencies adopted ICS. Only since 9/11 has a mandate come down that all agencies must use ICS. This mandate is tied to federal funding (Brown 2005; Buntin 2001; Molino 2006).

According to Canton (2007), in 1971, Firefighting Resources of Southern California Organized for Potential Emergencies (FIRESCOPE) identified six major problem areas found while fighting California wildfires. These six areas were "lack of common organization, poor on-scene and interagency communications, inadequate joint planning, lack of valid and timely intelligence, inadequate resource management, and limited prediction capability" (286; Buntin 2001; Cardwell and Cooney 2000). While commanders are to be guided by the concepts of ICS, how they carry out these functions will likely vary (Comfort 2002; Connor 1997). Furthermore, it is acknowledged that some will carry out the concepts of ICS rather reluctantly (McCeight and

---

*Firefighting Resources of Southern California Organized for Potential Emergencies (FIRESCOPE) identified six major problem areas found while fighting California wildfires.*

*These six areas were "lack of common organization, poor on-scene and interagency communications, inadequate joint planning, lack of valid and timely intelligence, inadequate resource management, and limited prediction capability."*

---

Hagen 2007). According to Buck (2004), using a UC under NIMS should take into account the missions of all responding agencies.

According to Flin (1996) and Molino (2006), fire/EMS, police, and transportation agencies have various roles, objectives, and/or missions to play in many incidents. However, transportation agencies are sometimes not considered as being on the same response level as fire/EMS and police. Helman (2004) stated that the other participants, labeled secondary responders, consisted of transportation agencies, towing and recovery service providers, and hazardous material contractors (Corbin et al. 2007; Erdfelder, Faul, and Buchner 1996; Hopkins 2007). Typically, in highway incidents, fire/EMS personnel may arrive and set up command before the police arrive. Transportation agencies have a significant stake in highway incident management but usually have no direct control over when to open the highway, since statutory authority usually rests with the police or fire agencies (Allred 2004; Miller 2007). Canton (2007) added an opposing view regarding the utility of ICS, based on Dr. Russell Dyne's comments concerning community emergency planning. Canton stated that the military model assumes that pre-emergency social organizations will collapse, and commanders will be incapable of useful personal action. Canton argued that ICS is based on a military model. Canton's argument relies on the assumption that responding agencies had a pre-emergency social relationship to begin with. As was illustrated previously, such a prosocial relationship did not exist between the New York City police and fire agencies on 9/11 (Nicholson 2003). Canton discussed Botterell's laws of emergency management: stress creates an opportunity for unintelligent decisions; the problem is at the starting point; regardless of who one trains, other untrained people will respond; and expectation is reality. Canton's argument has some merit, but overall, I do not agree with his premise.

## Module 2

### What Is Crisis Management?

According to Canton (2007) and Lindell, Prater, and Perry (2007), acts of terrorism continue to grow more ominous with the possible use of chemical, biological, and nuclear devices. Add catastrophic natural weather events that occur every year and the need for a well-orchestrated response to all hazards to our threat matrix. The leaders of first responders during an incident must practice command, communication, cooperation, collaboration, control, and coordination to maximize the effectiveness and efficiency of any given response (Carlson 1999).

According to Bullock, Haddow, Coppola, Ergin, Westerman, and Yeletaysi (2006), between 1976 and 2004, there were 1,069 major disaster declarations in the United States. In 1999, there were 50 major disasters declared in thirty-eight states. There is a substantial list of known and potential types of man-made and natural disasters. Bridge collapses, pandemics, major traffic crashes, wildfires, floods, ice storms, earthquakes, hurricanes, tornadoes, chemical spills, school shootings, and any kind of terrorist attack provide a partial list of the types of incidents those in the

---

*The Leaders of first responders during an incident must practice command, communication, cooperation, collaboration, control, and coordination to maximize the effectiveness and efficiency of any given response.*

---

emergency response community respond to every day. Failing to properly lead the response and recovery efforts to any one of these events can cause cascading effects that result in more loss of life, more injuries, more loss of property, and economic loss (Bitto 2007; Corbin, Vasconez, and Helman 2007; Howitt 2004; Sapriel 2003; Mitroff 2004; Waugh and Streib 2006; Weiss 2002).

Public servants respond to incidents, emergencies, and disasters daily in the United States (Boin, Hart, Stern, and Sundelius 2005; Bourne 2005). While the dynamics of each incident may differ, there is one common thread: it takes decisive and appropriate leadership to resolve the situation (Bitto 2007; Bourne 2005; Howitt 2004; Mitroff 2004). Lester (2007) stated that it will take transformational leadership, coupled with NIMS, to achieve success during all phases of an emergency. Guidelines have been provided regarding how to prepare for and respond to incidents in a uniform manner throughout the country (Bourne 2005; Hanneman 2007; Perry 2003).

What appear to be lacking are guidelines on how to lead during such incidents. Team or group leadership has been the subject of much research (Avolio, Sivasubramaniam, Murray, Jung, and Garger 2003). What remains to be examined in detail is individual, group, and/or team leadership during a real-world incident. Even in the limited number of studies completed regarding team or group leadership, the focus has been on groups that have been established and function in a less-than-hazardous environment (Avolio et al. 2003; Jung and Sosik 2002; Kearney and Gebert 2009; King 2002).

Canton (2007) stated that prior to 9/11, the New York City fire and police departments did not communicate with each other due to mutual animosity. Technology played a role with internal communications for each agency as well (US Government Printing Office 2004). Nicholson

(2003) buttresses Canton's assertions. According to Nicholson, a police helicopter hovering near the Twin Towers warned police personnel that the second tower was going to collapse very soon. The warning included a call to evacuate the second building. This warning was clearly captured on the police radio tapes twenty-one minutes before the second tower collapsed. The firefighters in the second tower were never given this warning. The two agencies' radio systems were not

---

*Transportation agency personnel have typically found themselves on the periphery of emergency response and normally in an assist mode.*

---

linked. The police and fire commanders never talked during the crisis. Each barely coordinated activities or shared information. Each agency set up its own command post, and neither provided a representative to the other's command post for coordination purposes. The NIMS offers no guidance as to what type of leadership model should be followed (US Government Printing Office 2004).

According to Buck, Trainor, and Aguirre (2006), the ICS, as set out in the NIMS, will not likely work as intended (Lester 2007). The ICS provides a universal response model to all incidents; however, it is recognized that ICS works best with firefighting organizations and has been less successful with police, public health, and public work-style agencies. Hopefully, this is changing. The fire service actually created ICS and has used the system the longest. The fire service has long worked in a team environment, as opposed to police, who typically work and handle calls for service alone. Transportation agency personnel have typically found themselves on the periphery of emergency response and normally in an assist mode (Allred 2004; Buck 2004; Buck et al. 2006; Cardwell and Cooney 2000; Helman 2004; Reardon 2005; Ruff 2000; Walsh, Christen, Miller, Callsen, Cilluffo, and Maniscalco 2005; Weiss 2002). Social relationships are essential to the success of ICS (Hanneman 2006; Walsh et al. 2005). Along with social relationships come the styles and attributes of leadership (Avolio et al. 2003; Boin and Hart 2003).

Responses to incidents often have political elements. Hurricane Katrina is cited as a prime example of the wrong combination of ICS preparedness, leadership differences, and politics, which created inadequate decision-making and a poor response (Cooper and Block 2006; Dixon 2006; Fisher 2005; Garcia 2006; Lester 2007; Martin 2007; Weiss 2002).

As noted by Cooper and Block (2006), the response to the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina provided little evidence that significant improvement had occurred. It is surmised that leadership style plays a key role in the level of success of any endeavor, especially activities involving emergency response (Lester 2007; Lester and Krejci 2007; Murgallis 2005). McCreight and Hagen (2007) stated that there is a dearth of information regarding exactly how the Unified Command (UC)/ICS structure will drastically improve coordination and communication problems without jeopardizing effective crisis management.

Molino (2006) stated that law enforcement and other responders' disciplines have aggressively competed for priorities and resources during the management of emergency incidents. Klann (2003) declared that a leader's influencing skills are critical during a crisis. Murgallis (2005) argued that team confidence begins with those who lead the team. Klann stated that leaders should concentrate on three key influencing skills during a crisis: communication, clarity of vision and values, and caring for others. According to Hunter (2006), transformational leaders can transform emergencies into developmental challenges by presenting a crisis as intellectual

stimulus to encourage followers to seek thoughtful, creative, adaptive solutions to stressful conditions instead of hasty, defensive, or maladaptive ones.



## Module 3

### Leadership Examined

Leadership has been one of the most studied areas in business and is still one of the most perplexing areas of inquiry (Phills 2005). Leaders and followers carry out the tasks of organizations. There is little doubt that leaders or those who hold leadership positions affect followers. This impact can be positive, negative, or possibly neutral. While often overlooked, followers can have the same impacts on leaders. In fact, leaders are beholden to followers. Likewise, the organizational culture can have the same impact on both followers and leaders. Followers can also be leaders, just as leaders can be followers. Relationships, or the lack thereof, play a key role in the success or failure of leaders, followers, and organizations. Phills (2005) pondered the question of if leadership really does matter. Phills said that for leadership to matter, the leader must be able to influence the performance of an organization. This means increasing public welfare and social value. This influence should be intentional and rational instead of accidental (Bass 1990; Dessler 2001; Northouse 2001).

According to McLean (2005), there is much debate as to whether management and leadership are the same. Staveley (2002)

stated that there are over five hundred definitions of leadership.

Meese and Ortmeier (2004) provided three overarching theories of leadership, each of which has a number of independent theories within the larger theory. Leader-centered theories include trait theories, behavior theories, personal-situational theory, and interaction-expectation theory. Follower and context-centered theories include situational theory, contingency theory, and path-goal theory.

Leader-follower interactions—centered theories include leader-follower exchange theory, transformational theory, and the psychodynamic approach (Yukl, Gordon, and Taber 2002). For the purpose of this research, the terms leader and manager were used synonymously.

There are hundreds of definitions of leadership, leader, follower, and manager. Leadership involves the assumption that one person exerts intentional influence over another, wherein the leader guides, provides structure, and facilitates activities and relationships within a group (Yukl 2006). Yukl (2006) stated that leadership is more of a social process than a specialized role. Yukl added that an individual is likely to be both a leader and follower at the same time (Bass 1990; Northouse 2001).

Yukl (2006) stated that leadership is the process of influencing others to understand and agree about what needs to be accomplished and how to do it and the process of facilitating individual and collective efforts to achieve shared goals. Northouse (2001) expanded the definition of leadership by stating that leadership is a process, involves influence, occurs in a group context,

---

*Likewise, the organizational culture can have the same impact on both followers and leaders. Followers can also be leaders, just as leaders can be followers. Relationships, or the lack thereof, play a key role in the success or failure of leaders, followers, and organizations.*

---

and involves goal attainment. Leadership has been defined as “the art of influencing, directing, guiding, and controlling others in such a way as to obtain their willing obedience, confidence, respect, and total cooperation in the accomplishment of an objective” (Iannone 1987, 34). Iannone also stated that there is considerable resistance to leadership training. Blanchard and Hersey (1996) discussed situational leadership. Blanchard and Hersey stated that effective leaders must be able to identify the demands of their situation and adjust their leadership style to fit. Alternatively, the leader must change some or all of the variables. These variables include the leader’s organization, supervisors, peers, and the job demands (Hersey, Blanchard, and Johnson 1997).

Keeping with this analysis of the forms of leadership influence, Fyfe et al. (1997) illustrated eleven forms of leadership influence: legitimate request, instrumental compliance, coercion, rational persuasion, rational faith, inspirational appeal, indoctrination, information distortion, situational engineering, personal identification, and decision identification. Fyfe et al. went on to examine factors that affect leadership styles. Individual factors include self-esteem, perceived stress, managerial potential, and interpersonal skills. Work-group factors include leader-member relations, work group norms, and work group skills. Environmental factors include task clarity, goal clarity, and power position. Task factors include nature of the task, task complexity, time constraints, and criticality of task. Organizational factors include organizational goals, interdependence of units, degree of autonomy, and locus of authority (Mitroff 2005).

There are many models, theories, and types of leadership. Some of these models, theories, and types or styles lend themselves more toward success and influence than others. According to Choi (2006), charismatic leadership has three core competencies: vision, empathy, and empowerment. It is argued that charismatic leadership is a powerful model for influencing followers. Yet even this style can have a negative influence if the leader’s motives are exploitative, nonegalitarian, and self-aggrandizing (Bass 1990; Northouse 2001). Two types of leadership styles often described are transactional and transformational. Tucker and Russell (2004) stated that

transformational leaders are innovative in nature and are more concerned with the quality of life of their followers. Transformational leaders provide energy-producing characteristics. On the other hand, transactional leaders use power and authority that already exist. Transformational leaders motivate followers to create new and greater change (Bass 1990; Dessler 1995; Northouse 2001; Stone, Russell, and Patterson 2004).

---

*There are many models, theories, and types of leadership. Some of these models, theories, and types or styles lend themselves more toward success and influence than others.*

---

Fyfe et al. (1997) discussed several other leadership theories or styles. The well-known leadership grid provides seven styles, which include country club management, impoverished management, middle of the road management, team management, authority compliance management, paternalism/materialism management, and opportunism management. Lastly, path-goal theories of leadership function on the premise that an employee will do what leaders want them to do if the employee understands what to do and the employee sees the attainment of his or her own personal goals in attaining the organization’s goal. Four types of leadership were created from path-goal theory: directed leadership, supportive leadership, participative leadership, and achievement-oriented leadership. The leadership styles discussed are in no

way limited to policing. Unlike some other fields or professions, public service organizations follow a much more militaristic model. This resemblance is both symbolic and functional in nature. Add to this the bureaucratic nature often found in many public agencies, and the organizational style of most agencies can be seen (Hansen 1991).

Hansen (1991) stated that team management is the most effective style from the offerings in Blake and Mouton's managerial grid. According to Hansen, those who practice team leadership are able to build effective teams, resolve problems and conflicts, and promote employee development. Yukl (2006) listed the determinants of team performance, which included commitment of shared objectives, member skills and role clarity, internal organization and coordination, and external coordination. Yukl also included resources and political support, mutual trust and cooperation, and collective efficacy and potency. The leader influences team performance by increasing these processes in a positive way (Yukl, Gordon, and Taber 2002).

Flin (1996) discussed the leadership traits of incident commanders. Flin stated that the military, along with the police and fire service, look for leadership potential when selecting employees. Flin went on to say that Field Marshall Montgomery considered the ability to make decisions and remain calm as the two most important attributes of a leader. Flin listed personality characteristics of the incident commanders. These characteristics included a willingness to take a leadership role, emotional stability, stress resistance, and decisiveness. Other characteristics included controlled risk-taking, self-confidence, and self-awareness (Smallwood and Seemann 2003). Howard (2005) stated that leadership involves verbal and nonverbal communication that involves coaching, motivating or inspiring, directing or guiding, and supporting or counseling.

According to Densten (2003), transformational leadership incorporates three other types of leadership, which are transactional, transformational, and nonleadership (laissez-faire) behaviors. Those who use transactional leadership pursue a cost-benefit or economic exchange to meet the current material and needs of their employees in return for expected effort. Three types of transactional leadership have been identified. Contingent reward, which represents proactive leadership

---

*Those who practice team leadership are able to build effective teams, resolve problems and conflicts, and promote employee development.*

---

behaviors that link reward and effort through negotiation, is one type. The others are management by exception (active) and management by exception (passive), which represents a passive leadership style that is used only when the status quo is rejected or is not functioning (Palmer, Walls, Burgess, and Stough 2001).

According to Boin et al. (2003), Canton (2007), and Reardon (2005), leadership style may vary due to individual preference, agency preference, or cultural paradigms, and because of the situation itself. Recognition of incident command principles may be affected by an individual leader's familiarity with and understanding of the ICS. Transformational leadership, according to Densten (2003), occurs when leaders seek to raise the consciousness of their employees by appealing to higher ideals and values. Transformational leadership has five types of behavior, which are idealized influence (attribute), idealized influence (behavior), individualized consideration, intellectual stimulation, and inspirational motivation. Idealized influence includes leadership behaviors that instill pride, faith, respect, and a sense of mission (Bass 1990; Fyfe et al. 1997; Kearney and Gebert 2009; Tucker and Russell 2004). Morreale and Ortmeier (2004)

added that transformational leaders set high standards. Transformation requires change (Lester 2007).

According to Ahn, Adamson, and Dornbusch (2004), 50 to 70 percent of change fails to take hold. According to Densten (2003), several studies have shown that agencies and their leaders in general do not practice transformational leadership. Instead, they practice transactional leadership and rational influencing behaviors, and the dominant leadership style of organizations has been management by exception. This includes relational influencing behaviors. According to Hunter (2006), transformational leaders can transform emergencies into developmental challenges by presenting a crisis as intellectual stimulus to encourage followers to seek thoughtful, creative, adaptive solutions to stressful conditions instead of hasty, defensive, or maladaptive ones.

Flin (1996) and Molino (2006) stated that NIMS and its IC/UC elements, along with most of its program elements, are not typical of how police have dealt with incidents in the past. To confound the matter further, this model was adopted from the fire service. Police and fire departments have typically had their friendly differences, as do the branches of the military. Furthermore, NIMS offers no guidance as to what type of leadership model should be followed. It was surmised based on prior literature research findings (Bass 1990; Northouse 2001; Wren 1995; Yukl 2006) that most leaders practice transactional, directing, or authority-compliance-style leadership traits during a crisis. This is because of the urgency of the incident. Clements and Washbush (1999) discussed the dark side of leadership. Good leadership can create good for the social or organizational order, but bad leadership can equally create social disorder. Negative leadership can create or result in bad decision-making, frustration, dysfunctional organizations, and unintended results. Such negative consequences may result from a leader's failure to look inside, mirroring or acting as they believe followers think they should act, narcissistic behavior, emotional illiteracy, and what is called the edifice complex, wherein they fear their legacy will be destroyed (Bass 1990; Northouse 2001). Buhler (1993) argued that win-lose situations should be avoided. This is an important task for leaders.

Perkel (2005) explained that when we think of leaders, such terms or traits as integrity, honesty, wisdom, ethics, and vision come to mind. More likely, we hope they come to mind as well as fruition. However, bad leadership can also occur and do great harm. Bad leadership can be

---

*A leader can influence many things. A leader can influence the interpretation of external events for followers, choice of objectives and strategies to pursue, and motivation of followers to achieve objectives. In addition, the leader can influence mutual trust and cooperation, the organization and coordination of work, and allocation of resources. The leader can influence the development of followers' skills and confidence, learning and sharing of knowledge, and support and cooperation from external sources.*

---

seen as a continuum of behavior from plain incompetent, intemperate, callous, and corrupt, to pure evil.

According to Yukl (2006), a leader can influence many things. A leader can influence the interpretation of external events for followers, choice of objectives and strategies to pursue, and motivation of followers to achieve objectives. In addition, the leader can influence mutual trust and cooperation, the organization and coordination of work, and allocation of resources. The leader can influence the development of followers' skills and confidence, learning and sharing of knowledge, and support and cooperation from external sources. Finally, the leader can influence the design of formal structure, programs, and systems, and of critical importance, he or she can influence the shared beliefs and values of followers (Bass 1990; Northouse 2001).

Yukl (2006) stated that power and influence are distinct concepts. A leader will have some form of power, be it personal or positional or both. However, the outcome of leader-influenced behavior on a follower may result in commitment, compliance, or resistance. It is a commitment that leaders should strive to attain. Phills (2005) stated that leadership is or should be linked to the organizational culture, vision, strategy, innovation, and learning. Leadership is important to any organization, but followership is equally important. Many companies are relying less on leaders and more on individual employees or teams (Bass 1990; Buhler 1993; Hughes, Ginnett, and Curphy 1995; Northouse 2001).

---

*Transformational leaders have idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. Servant leadership is very similar to transformational leadership. However, servant leadership does not rely on charisma.*

---

Bolman and Deal (2003) illustrated various sources of power. First is position power or authority. Information and expertise are sources of power. Another source involves control of rewards. Coercive power is another source. Alliances and networks also provide a source of power. Along these same lines, access and control of agendas are a source as well. Finally, framing control of meaning and symbols is a source of power. As can be seen, followers can often have many sources of power (Bass 1990).

Tucker and Russell (2004) stated that leaders influence the internal mind-set of their followers, the culture of the organization, and the external culture. Transformational leaders help followers recognize and achieve their own leadership potential. Likewise, transformational leadership increases productivity and innovation (Bass 1990; Dessler 1995; Northouse 2001). Stephan and Pace (1991) provided five effective keys to leadership: Leaders should treat others as friends. Leaders should create a positive force. Leaders should invite others to follow. Leaders should empower others to act. Lastly, leaders should strengthen themselves.

Stone et al. (2004) offered four primary behaviors of transformational leaders. Transformational leaders have idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. Servant leadership is very similar to transformational leadership. However, servant leadership does not rely on charisma. According to Dessler (1995), charismatic leadership behavior fosters envisioning, energizing, and enabling. Envisioning involves articulating a compelling vision, setting high expectations, and modeling consistent

behavior. Energizing involves demonstrating personal excitement, expressing personal confidence, and seeking, finding, and using success. Enabling involves expressing personal support, empathizing, and expressing confidence in people. Mirsalimi and Hunter (2006) described influential leadership as leadership that relies on leadership, not coercion. The influential leadership model consists of core values of authenticity, humility, service, and integrity. Core skills include listening, reflecting, modeling, dialogue, and use of self. From core values and core skills comes presence. Trust is then developed, followed by influence and ultimately results.

One must be able to exert influence over organizational performance to be a leader (Phills 2005). Maxwell (1998) stated that leadership is nothing more than influence. It has often been thought that leaders are active and followers are passive ("In Praise of Followers" 1992). Such thoughts are a misconception about the abilities of and relationships between leaders and followers.

## Module 4

### Theory Examination

**Path-goal theory.** Path-goal theory appeared to offer much promise in operationalizing the research questions. The theory sets forth four leadership behaviors, which allow for broad inclusion of the various styles and which might be seen. According to Bass (1990), Northouse (2001), and Yukl (1989, 2006), path-goal theory is supported by comprehensive research dealing with what motivates employees. Path-goal theory examines how leaders motivate employees to achieve goals. The

goal of this theory is to improve employee performance and satisfaction by focusing on employee motivation. Path-goal theory emphasizes the relationship between the leader's style and the characteristics of the employees and the work setting. This theory is measured by using the pathgoal

leadership questionnaire (Butler and Reese 1991; Jermier 1996; Podasakoff, MacKenzie, Ahearne, and Bommer 1995; Wofford and Liska 1993; Yukl et al. 2002). Bass (1990), Northouse (2001), and Yukl (1989, 2006), all stated that path-goal theory provides four leadership styles: directive, supportive, participative, and achievement-oriented. The causal variable for the path-goal theory of leadership is leader behavior. The intervening variables are employee expectations and valences. Situational moderator variables include characteristics of task and environment and the characteristics of employees. Causal relationships of effects of supportive leadership on employees are reducing boredom and making the job more tolerable; increasing the intrinsic valence of work; increasing self-confidence and lowering anxiety; and increasing effort-performance expectancy, which all result in increased effort. Causal relationships for effects of directive leadership on employees include reduced role ambiguity and increased effort-performance expectancy, increased size of incentive followed by increasing outcome valences for task success, and strengthening required contingencies followed by increasing performance-reward expectancies with all three avenues, resulting in increased employee effort. As with most of the other theories, arguments are made that the theory has conceptual weaknesses, though it has been well tested (Butler and Reese 1991; Jermier 1996; Podasakoff et al. 1995; Wofford and Liska 1993; Yukl et al. 2002).

---

*Situational moderator variables include characteristics of task and environment and the characteristics of employees.*

---

Of interest with path-goal theory are the situational moderator variables. In the study at hand, the situational variables involved emergency conditions. According to Yukl (2006), when the task is stressful, boring, tedious, or dangerous, supportive leadership is best used. When the task is unstructured and complex, when employees lack experience, and when the rules are unclear, directive leadership is best used. The task for participative or directive leadership is not as well-developed. Participative leadership increases role clarity. Achievement-oriented leadership increases employee effort and satisfaction (Greene 1979; Wofford and Liska 1993).

Yukl (2006) stated that, thus far, studies on path-goal theory have resulted in mixed results. In one review, 120 studies were analyzed in a meta-analysis. Not enough studies have been done to truly test the situational moderators of directive leadership. Methodological limitations make it difficult to interpret the results of the research involving this theory. The majority of studies involving path-goal theory use employee questionnaires to measure leader behavior. A static

correlational design is used. Another problem with these studies is that they do not examine the entire theory, such as examining intervening motivational processes. With path-goal theory, each type of leadership behavior is considered separately. However, this could be said about most of the theories. Northouse (2001) described several of the strengths of path-goal theory. The theory provides an explanation for understanding how different leadership behaviors affect employee satisfaction and performance. The theory helps leaders decide which leadership style to use based on the demands of the situation and type of employee handling the task. Expectancy theory is made a part of path-goal theory. Expectancy theory is of practical use. Conversely, path-goal theory is very complex and can be confusing. The breadth, scope, and complexity involved in the theory make its use in explaining the leadership process in a particular organizational context difficult. Empirical studies have only provided partial support for the theory. The theory fails to fully explain the relationship between leader behavior and employee motivation. A final criticism is that most of the responsibility for success between the leader and employee is placed squarely on the leader. On a final note, Wren (1995) stated that path-goal research has examined the effects of the LBDQ categories of consideration and structuring. Wren also stated that path-goal theory is difficult to blend with other more general theories. Likewise, the theory has variable support (Bass 1990; Wofford and Liska 1993; Yukl et al. 2002).

---

*Situational leadership model fails to provide a clear explanation of the process by which leader behavior affects employee performance.*

---

**Situational leadership theory.** According to Bass (1990), Northouse (2001), and Yukl (1989, 2006), the style approach was considered by using Blake and Mouton's managerial (leadership) grid. Along with situational leadership style, this is one of the most well-known models of leadership. The results of this model are based on how leaders answered a series of questions about management assumptions and beliefs. Concern for people and concern for production create the scale. High concern for people and low concern for production create the style called country club management. Low concern for people and for production creates an impoverished management style. A midrange of concern for both people and production create organization management. High concern for people and production creates team management. Finally, low concern for people and high concern for production create authority-obedience management. As with nearly all studies involving leadership theories, there are criticisms of this approach. These criticisms include the lack of congruency between leaders' styles and how they are associated with performance outcomes; the failure to find a universal style to fit all situations; and the assumption that a high-high style is best. Yukl (2006) stated that the situational leadership model fails to provide a clear explanation of the process by which leader behavior affects employee performance. Goodson, McGee, and Cashman (1989) disagree with the situational leadership approach in that it does not allow for the necessary interaction needed, considering the role the individual employee plays in any given situation. In other words, situational leadership does not allow for consideration of employee readiness at all levels (Blank, Weitzel, and Green 1990; Butler and Reese 1991). Yet, in general, the theory has strength (Chen and Silverthorne 2005; Ensby 2005; Goodson et al. 1989; Van Auken 1992; Yukl et al. 2002).

Northouse (2001) described several of the strengths of situational leadership. Situational leadership appears to function well in the workplace. It provides a credible training model for



leaders. Over four hundred of the Fortune 500 companies use this model. Situational leadership is practical and prescriptive. It provides for leadership flexibility. Effective leaders can modify their style to fit the situation (Van Auken 1992). Northouse (2001) went on to state conversely that only a few studies have been conducted that justify the assumptions and propositions mentioned. Situational leadership lacks a strong body of research. Situational leadership offers ambiguous conceptualization regarding employees' development levels. Furthermore, situational leadership provides for a one-on-one relationship but not group leadership or relationships. The questionnaires used directly guide the answers to one of four specific choices, which include directing, coaching, supporting, and delegating (Beck and Yeager 1996; Blanchard and Hersey 1996; Chen and Silverthorne 2005; Ensby 2005; Goodson et al. 1989). Atwater and Bass (1994) argued that most leaders do not display a single leadership style at all times. Most leaders display different styles, such as directive or participative, task-oriented or relations oriented, transformational or transactional. Different situations may call for different styles. Blank et al. (1990) stated that situational leadership focuses only on employee maturity as a moderator of two leader behaviors; one behavior is task and relationship, and the other leader behavior is leader effectiveness. Blank et al. stated that the theory has complex relationships between variables and the theory contains ambiguities and contradictions. Blank et al. stated that in order to test the theory's underlying assumptions, psychological and job maturity must be addressed. Situational leadership is very applicable to the study of incident management (Ensby 2005; Schoenberg 2005).

**Contingency theory.** According to Yukl (2006), least preferred coworker (LPC) contingency model describes how the situation moderates the relationship between leadership effectiveness and a trait measure called LPC score. To determine the LPC, a leader is asked to think of the person he or she likes least and then rate this person on a bipolar adjective scale using such terms as friendly-unfriendly. The LPC is supposed to determine the leader's motive hierarchy. Along with the motive hierarchy, the pattern of leadership behavior varies, depending on the situation.

An examination of twenty-five years' worth of LPC score testing was undertaken. The conclusion was that the scores better reflected a value-attitude interpretation than the motive hierarchy. Low LPC leaders are supposed to value task success. High LPC leaders are supposed to value interpersonal success. The LPC score and effectiveness is dependent on a complex situational variable called favorability or situational control. The elements considered are leader-member relations, position power, and task structure. The best scenario for the leader and the level of success achieved is when the relationship with the employee is good, the leader has substantial power, and the task is highly structured (Yukl et al. 2002).

---

*Over four hundred of the Fortune 500 companies use this model. Situational leadership is practical and prescriptive. It provides for leadership flexibility. Effective leaders can modify their style to fit the situation.*

---

Yukl (2006) stated that a large number of studies tended to offer support to the model. The major criticism of research based on this model is that the model failed to achieve statistical

significance. Another criticism of the model is that its definition lacks meaning. LPC contingency is a model and not a theory because it does not explain how a leader's LPC affects group performance. LPC does not help leaders change and grow. It does help pick particular leaders for particular situations (Yukl et al. 2002).

Northouse (2001) described several of the strengths of contingency theory. Contingency theory is supported by a great deal of empirical research. The situations leaders face are considered a key element of the theory. Contingency theory is predictive, thus providing guidance for leaders as to how to deal with certain situations. Contingency theory allows leaders not to be successful in all situations. Data for leadership profiles can be built through use of the LPC.

Conversely, many studies have shown weaknesses in contingency theory. Contingency theory fails to explain why one leadership style may be better than another in a given situation. The LPC scale has been criticized because it does not correlate well with other leadership measures. The idea of measuring one's own style of leadership through what they think about another style seems illogical to some. Other criticisms of the theory include that the testing mechanism is somewhat cumbersome, the instructions are less than clear, and it does not offer a solid explanation as to what an organization should do to remedy a mismatch between the leader and the task (Yukl et al. 2002). Finally, Wren (1995) stated that the LPC scale has remained a point of contention. There are questions as to the appropriateness of situational variables and the predictive validity of the theory.

**Transformational leadership theory.** According to Bass (1990), Kearney and Gebert (2009), and Yukl (2006), transformational leadership increases follower motivation and performance. Transactional and transformational leadership are not and should not be mutually exclusive. Transformational behaviors include idealized influence (attributed), idealized influence (behavior), individualized considerations, inspirational motivation, and intellectual stimulation.

Transactional behaviors include contingent reward, management by exception (active), and management by exception (passive). The aforementioned taxonomy was identified mainly by factor analysis of a behavior description questionnaire called the MLQ 5X-short (Antonakis, Avolio, and Sivasubramaniam 2003; Avolio and Bass 1994; Bass 1998; Howell and Avolio 1993; Riggio, Bass, and Orr 2004). Bass (1990)

---

*Transformational leadership increases follower motivation and performance. Transactional and transformational leadership are not and should not be mutually exclusive.*

---

and Yukl (2006) stated that laissez-faire leadership has been added as a third category. The MLQ 5X-short also measures three outcome factors: extra effort, effectiveness, and satisfaction (Avolio, Bass, and Jung 1999; Bass 1990, 1998; Riggio et al. 2004). Several studies have been undertaken using the factor analysis to determine the construct validity of the MLQ 5X-short. Support was seen showing the difference between transformational and transactional leadership. Yet, as with other theories, weaknesses were found. The MLQ 5X-short has been refined several times in an attempt to strengthen its validity. Transformational leadership is considered effective in any situation. While universally relevant, it does not mean that transformational leadership is effective in all situations. Situational variables may increase or decrease the success of transformational leadership. Transformational leadership is closely akin to charismatic leadership (Lievens, Geit, and Coetsier 1997; Howell and Avolio 1993; Riggio et

al. 2004; Smith, Montagno, and Kuzmenko 2004; Torpman 2004; Tucker and Russell 2004; Yukl et al. 2002). Bass Riggio et al. (2006) stated that transformational leaders may do better in an emergency because, unlike transactional leaders, who focus on short-term outcomes and may be more likely to make rushed and poorly thought-out decisions, transformational leaders are more likely to defer from making premature decisions (Kearney and Gebert 2009).

Avolio and Bass (1994) stated that much of the research done involving this theory has focused on one element, that being either transformational or charismatic leadership. Field studies have been the most prevalent method of examining this theory. A meta-analysis was conducted involving thirty-nine studies using the MLQ 5X-short. Transformational leadership behavior correlated more strongly and consistently with leadership effectiveness than did transactional leadership (Bass 1990, 1997; Palmer et al. 2001; Riggio et al. 2004; Smith et al. 2004; Yukl et al. 2002).

Avolio and Bass (2004) and Rowold (2005) offered descriptions for each leadership style and factor, as well as outcome. Idealized influence (attributed and behavior)-type leaders are individuals who display conviction, trust, and values. These types of leaders emphasize the importance of purpose, commitment, and ethics. Inspirational motivation-type leaders inspire and motivate by appealing to a vision of the future, inspire high standards, speak optimistically, and provide encouragement and meaning regarding what needs to be accomplished. Intellectual stimulation-type leaders question assumptions, traditions, and beliefs, and encourage new ways of doing things, as well as expressing ideas. Individualized consideration-type leaders deal with individuals by considering their needs, abilities and aspirations, and they listen attentively, as well as advise and coach. Contingent reward-type leaders engage in a constructive path-goal transaction of reward for performance. The leader clarifies expectations and arranges mutually satisfactory agreements in exchange for assistance and successful performance. Management by exception (active) leaders monitor performance and take corrective action if deviation from standards occurs. This type of leader enforces rules to avoid mistakes. Management by exception (passive) leaders wait for mistakes to be brought to their attention. Laissez-faire leaders are actually non-leaders. This type of leader avoids responsibility, is absent, fails to follow up, and resists sharing views on important issues (Bono 2006; Change Dynamics 2003; Gibson et al. 2003; Podsakoff et al. 1995; Roger and Agarwala, Rogers 1976; Robbins 1996; Yagil 2002).

Avolio and Bass (2004) and Rowold (2005) offered descriptors of outcome as well. Extra effort is illustrated by getting others to try harder, heightens others to succeed, and gets others to do more than expected. Effectiveness is illustrated by effectively meeting others' job-related needs, effectively representing their group to higher authority, and leading a group that is effective. Satisfaction is illustrated by using methods of leadership that are satisfying and working with others in a satisfactory way.

Jones, (2001), Northouse (2001), Tucker and Russell (2004) described several strengths of the transformational approach. The transformational approach has been well researched using many methodologies, including a number of qualitative studies. Over two hundred theses, dissertations, and research projects have been done utilizing this approach. The approach makes sense and treats leadership as a process. The approach augments other leadership models. Finally, the approach focuses on the employees' needs. Conversely, transformational leadership lacks conceptual clarity. The approach can be seen as too simplistic in some respects. Arguments have been made that the approach relies too much on

personality and qualitative analysis. The charismatic element of transformational leadership lends itself to abuse (Bass 1990; Ohman 2000; Riggio et al 2004.; Orr 2004; Smith et al. 2004; Yukl et al. 2002). There have been a voluminous number of studies conducted to test and

replicate the results of the MLQ 5X-short and the leadership styles of transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leaders. Yet there exists a dearth of studies that address the variables of leadership style, emergency/incident management/response, and a unified or team concept in a commingled analysis (Avolio et al. 2003; House and Aditya 1997; Yukl et al. 2002). Jung and Sosik (2002) stated that most research regarding transformational leadership has evolved around followers' individual performance, as opposed to the goals found in the collective mission. Collective mission success would depend on outcomes such as empowerment, group cohesion, collective confidence, and group's effectiveness. Antonakis et al. (2003) discussed environmental risk and leadership hierarchy as each pertains to transformational leadership.

Expectations of leaders may be different between stable and crisis situations. Active management by exception may be called for in a high-risk situation. Likewise, first-line supervisors may be more prone to exhibit individualized consideration as compared to high-level leaders. First-line supervisors may also be more task oriented due to the very nature of their jobs, as opposed to high-level leaders, who are supposed to focus at a more conceptual level (Kearney and Gebert 2009; Lester and Krejci 2007; Riggio et al. 2004).

**Leader-member exchange theory.** According to Yukl (2006), leader member exchange (LMX) theory postulates that leaders

develop different exchange relationships with different employees as the two parties mutually agree. This relationship evolves based on personal compatibility and employee competence. With time, a leader will develop either a high- or low-exchange relationship with each employee. Normally, most leaders will develop high-exchange relationships with a small number of

---

*LMX is a strong descriptive theory and makes common sense. LMX theory is the only theory that considers a dyadic relationship as the centerpiece of the leadership process.*

---

employees. The employees will receive more desirable tasks, be privy to more information, and be allowed to participate more and at a higher level. This theory was modified to include a life-cycle model. LMX theory entails the growth or decline of relationships. LMX research has been examined as it relates to other variables. Research has taken the form of field studies, some laboratory experiments, and a few studies have used observation and analysis. Ambiguity about the nature of the exchange relationship has been a consistent problem. The theory needs much more work and structure. Attribution processes need to be enhanced. Vertical dyadic relationships have been the primary focus of LMX theory. Most of the reliance on LMX has been based on static field studies with questionnaires. More needs to be done with longitudinal research and the use of other methodologies, such as observation, interviews, and analysis of communication (Epitropaki and Martin 2005; House and Aditya 1997; Yukl et al. 2002).

Northouse (2001) described several of the strengths of LMX theory. LMX is a strong descriptive theory and makes common sense. LMX theory is the only theory that considers a dyadic relationship as the centerpiece of the leadership process. There is much research that supports this theory. The theory has been validated by linking LMX theory to real outcomes (Epitropaki and Martin 2005). Conversely, stated Northouse, the major criticism of the theory is that it goes against the idea of fairness. Discrimination against the out-group is of concern. LMX did not

create such discrimination; it only recognizes its existence. Strategies to stop such discrimination of out-group members are not offered. Another criticism of LMX theory is that it is not fully developed. Measurement of exchanges has been questioned, since the results were not always comparable. Questions surround the standard scale used to measure exchanges, as to whether it is unidimensional or multidimensional (Yukl et al. 2002).

**Multiple-linkage theory.** Bass (1990) and Yukl (2006) discussed multiple-linkage theory. For analyzing leadership behavior or traits during an incident, multiple-linkage theory appears to be an excellent choice. While it is more complex, it is much more comprehensive than other theories. Multiple-linkage theory includes more relevant intervening variables, a wider range of leader behaviors, and more situational variables. The multiple-linkage model is more of a general conceptual framework than a definitive theory. Likewise, it is difficult to test in a single study. The limited number of studies completed on this model thus far have resulted in inconsistent findings. However, while the model is congruent with the spirit of this exploration, it does not offer specific leadership traits that can be classified and categorized, thus fitting into the typical labeling process such as autocratic, democratic, transactional, transformational, and so forth (Yukl et al. 2002).

Multiple-linkage model may have the soundest framework for the study of leaders interacting with employees and other leaders during an incident. Bass (1990), Northouse (2001), and Yukl (1989, 2006) stated that this model was built on earlier models of leadership and group effectiveness. The model described the interacting variables that determine the performance of a work unit. Situational variables in the model exert influence at three points. They constrain managerial behavior and moderate its effects. They directly influence intervening variables. In addition, they determine the relative importance of the intervening variables.

---

*Based on team leadership, the intervening variables are task commitment, ability, role clarity, organization of the work, cooperation and mutual trust, resources and support, and external coordination.*

---

The casual relationships among types of variables are as follows: leader behavior is coupled with situational variables otherwise known as neutralizers and substitutes, as described in leadership substitute theory. Intervening variables include employee effort, role clarity and task skills, organization of work, cohesiveness and cooperation, resources and support services, and external coordination. Likewise, other situational variables may come into play, the result being criteria of unit effectiveness. Put another way, based on team leadership, the intervening variables are task commitment, ability, role clarity, organization of the work, cooperation and mutual trust, resources and support, and external coordination. The multiple-linkage model is one of the first contingency theories to emphasize leadership processes at the group level instead of the dyadic level (Yukl et al. 2002).

According to Yukl (1989), multiple-linkage theory lacks a large volume of research. The most glaring conceptual weakness is the absence of specific propositions regarding leader behaviors' influence with intervening variables in which situations. It is more of a general framework than a formal theory. However, the model fits well with other leadership theories (Yukl et al. 2002).

## **Implications**

Social relationships are essential to the success of ICS (Walsh et al. 2005). Along with social relationships come the styles and attributes of leadership (Avolio et al. 2003; Boin and Hart 2003). Hurricane Katrina is cited as a prime example of the wrong combination of ICS preparedness, leadership differences, and politics, which created inadequate decision-making and a poor response (Garcia 2006; Lester 2007).

## Module 5

### Team Leadership

Ijames (2005) argued that sound teams, when properly functioning, create synergy. In essence, the sum is greater than its parts. Zaccaro, Rittman, and Marks (2001) addressed team leadership through the concept of reciprocal influence, which dealt with leadership and teams influencing one another. This study came close to examining the reciprocal influence of team leaders on one another. The study involved a stable environment where leaders were not thrust together to deal with an emergency (Atwater and Bass 1994). Zaccaro et al. considered the following team processes: (a) feedback and control, (b) selecting personnel, (c) developing personnel, and (d) utilizing and monitoring personnel resources. Based on this, four outcomes were considered: (a) conflict control, (b) team emotion control norms, (c) presence/absence of emotional contagion, and (d) team emotional composition. All this leads to team effectiveness.

House and Aditya (1997) pointed out that of the three thousand studies listed by Bass in 1990, the vast majority were related to leader-and-immediate-follower relationships. The relationships between leader and organization, their leader, external stakeholders, and peers had received little to no examination up to that point. The focus on leadership remains on the leader and immediate employee, but attention has been given to other variables. Guzzo and Dickson (1996) discussed findings involving teams within organizations by way of performance and effectiveness. Variables include group composition, heterogeneity, and performance. In this context, heterogeneity consisted of personality types, genders, attitudes, and experiences. As has been the case with other studies examined, the focus was on internal teams and not divergent team leaders, which form under emergencies (Zaccaro et al. 2001).

Finally, Atwater and Bass (1994) argued that team leaders cannot be experts in every possible area of knowledge; hence, it is imperative team leaders develop personal relations with team members and motivate them.

## Module 6

### Leader-Follower Interaction

According to Yukl (2006), the term follower is used to describe one who acknowledges a leader as the main source of direction, regardless of the leader's actual authority. Followers do not have to be direct reports of the leader. Those who reject the formal leader and purposely attempt to remove the leader from his or her position are described as rebels or insurgents. As can be surmised, leadership does not always come from someone with legitimate authority. Leadership is also about power, which can be interpreted as influence. Yukl discussed different types of power. Positional power includes legitimate, reward, coercive, information, and ecological power. Personal power includes referent and expert power (Bass 1990; Hughes et al. 1995). Bass (1990) declared that there is no absolute amount of power. Bass also stated that power can and should be shared with followers (Northouse 2001). Hence comes the concept of empowerment.

---

*Leadership and followership can bring about good or bad results.*

---

According to Yukl (2006), for many years it was assumed that it was in all followers' best interest to allow themselves to be led. In other words, it was in everyone's best interest to cooperate to achieve shared objectives. However, in recent years, the concept of leadership has changed to recognize more of an emotional influence than just what seems reasonable. The concept argues that it is only through emotional value-based leadership influence that exceptional achievement is recognized. Leaders inspire followers to sacrifice what is in their own interest for a higher cause. In reality, both rational and emotional motives are likely to occur in leader follower relationships (Bass 1990; Northouse 2001). Emotional intelligence includes self-awareness, self-regulation, motivation, empathy, and social skills (Dessler 1995).

Leadership and followership can bring about good or bad results. Yukl (2006) argued that strong leadership could bring order from chaos. Strong followership can stymie productivity. What matters is what type of strong leadership or followership is involved. Choi (2006) stated that a charismatic leader's empathetic behavior creates the followers' need for affiliation in several ways. Trust will be created. The follower will believe the leader cares about him or her. The follower will be able to better identify with the leader. Such charisma can be very positive or very negative (Bass 1990; Northouse 2001; Tucker and Russell 2004).

Followers have the ability to influence as well. Clements and Washbush (1999) described follower behavior using a two dimensional taxonomy. Five styles are given. Exemplary style includes active and independent thinking, along with critical thinking. Conformist style includes active and dependent thinking, along with uncritical thinking. Passive style includes passive and dependent thinking, along with uncritical thinking. Alienated style includes passive and independent thinking, along with critical thinking. Finally, pragmatist style includes both dimensions.

Clements and Washbush (1999) went on to describe follower syndromes. The dispositions or syndromes described are pathological in nature but function on a continuum of behavioral degree. A follower may have a controlling disposition. This person has an authoritarian personality. Often this type ends up in leadership positions. Dysfunctional follower behavior,



which is considered histrionic, is another type. This type seeks attention, is overreactive, and like the controller, is submissive to the leader. This type of follower is very impressionable and extremely loyal to charismatic or transformational leaders. The passive-aggressive follower can appear acquiescent. Their pessimism, resentment, and covert resistance makes for a poor follower. The dependent follower will come across as extremely intense and overpowering and will sacrifice anything for the leader. Finally, the masochistic follower encourages others to take advantage of them and accepts blame for things they have not done. As stated, this range of behaviors can go from normal to pathological (Bass 1990; Buhler 1993; Northouse 2001).

Clements and Washbush (1999) described the Machiavellian personality type. This can be found in the leader or the follower. Such types will deprive leaders of important feedback for their own self-enhancement. Knowledge is power. As was once said by Lord Acton, power corrupts, and absolute power corrupts absolutely (Yemm 2006). Clements and Washbush stated that a strong follower can do much to sabotage a leader's efforts for personal gain. Recall that a leader is also a follower to someone else. Followers and leaders can damage or affect self-esteem, self-efficacy, risk aversion, conflict avoidance, and tolerance (Bass 1990; Northouse 2001).

Often overlooked is the fact that leaders and followers influence each other (Buhler 1993). Buhler argued that some organizations and followers do not need leaders as much as others. Those with greater experience or with professional orientations are in less need for leadership. Having said this, organizations need good followers. Buhler (1993) stated that good followers should be active and independent critical thinkers (Bass 1990; Northouse 2001). Maxwell (1998) stated that a follower's capacity to achieve is decided by their leader's ability to empower. Maxwell went on to say that some leaders withhold empowerment out of fear of being dispensable (Bennis 1995). Bass (1990) stated that leaders tend to react to followers' compliance or noncompliance. These reactions can be positive, negative, or neutral. In essence, a neutral reaction would mean no reaction from the follower. Leaders do the right thing in lieu of just doing things right. Leaders work on improving the system in lieu of just working within the system. The same can be said for followers (Covey 1992).

## Module 7

### Organizational Culture

Both followers and leaders are affected by the organization they work for and the situations they find themselves in. The amount of influence a leader needs depends on the situation (Yukl 2006). Tucker and Russell (2004) stated that organizational culture could stymie a leader's ability to influence in a positive way. Transformational leaders seek to change such organizational cultures. Transactional leaders work within the existing culture (Bass 1990; Northouse 2001). Lewis, Goodman, and Fandt (1998) defined organizational culture as the system of common beliefs and values that develops within an organization. Culture affects how people act in organizations—the way they perform, view their jobs, work with others, and view things. Bass (1998) stated that organizational culture is a learned pattern of behavior passed from one generation to the next. Bolman and Deal (2003) stated that culture is a pattern of shared fundamental assumptions that a group learned as it solved its problems that have worked well enough to be considered legitimate and hence worthy to be taught to new members as the right way to deal with related problems. Given the definition offered by Bolman and Deal, it is surmised that similar disciplines would have similar shared experiences due to the nature of their mission and, to some degree, similar adaptations, with some degree of organizational variance. House and Aditya (1997) reinforced the influence group norms have over leadership style (Torpman 2004). According to Bass (1998), leadership affects organizational culture as much as organizational culture affects leadership.

Organizational culture is a situational variable that may influence the leader (King 2002; Stewart and Manz 1995; Torpman 2004). Organizational culture may be dictated by the type of discipline or industry, the specific organization, or both (Burkle and Hayden 2001). Yukl (2006) stated that cultural differences may influence the attitudes and behavior of managers in a number of ways.

Organizational values are likely to be internalized by managers who move up in a particular culture. Mitroff (2004) stated that organizations have personalities in the same way people do. Mitroff (2004) discussed system-age versus machine-age systems. Mitroff argued that too many organizations remain in a machine-age mentality. This includes the handling of emergencies. Mitroff added that crisis management is no longer adequate; what is needed is crisis leadership. Gabris (2004) added that bureaucratically designed organizations function in a system-maintenance mode. This system mode operates as a closed system and is entrenched in machine-age thinking. This philosophy creates a thing mentality and is geared toward management. Transactional leadership fits this style of leadership. Conversely, transformational leadership is more in line with system-age thinking (Bass 1998). Atwater and Bass (1994) stated that organizational culture most likely figures prominently in the effectiveness of those teams that are clearly defined as a work group. Teams typically rely on organizational culture to establish and clarify values that will guide their actions.

---

*Culture affects how people act in organizations—the way they perform, view their jobs, work with others, and view things.*

---

Phills (2005) stated that leadership has to be tailored to the specific individual, organization, place, and time. There are many factors that affect the leader's ability to influence. Phills argued that the two most significant mechanisms are psychological and emotional logic and the economic logic of an organization. Psychological and emotional logic deals with mobilizing the energy of its followers. This includes buy-in regarding a sense of purpose. The leader must work with the determinant that exists at the time, which includes follower motivation, talent, technology, creativity, capital, and other factors (Bass 1990; Northouse 2001).

Yukl (2006) stated that influence is the core foundation of leadership. Leaders and followers are beholden to one another ("In Praise of Followers" 1992). One major key to leadership is to influence through empowerment (Stephan and Pace 1991). Leadership and followership are a set of variables and complex relationships. The leader and follower, as well as the organizational culture and situation at hand, affect these relationships. Leaders and followers both have the ability to challenge, inspire, enable, model, and encourage one another. In addition, one does not have to be a formal leader with positional power to influence others as a leader who possesses dispositional power and influence. All the elements found in these relationships can and do spell either success or failure for the work group and organization as a whole if the roles are sizable enough.

## **Priorities**

Success is the progressive realization of a predetermined goal. Having the discipline to prioritize and the ability to work toward a stated goal are essential to success. The ability to juggle three to four high-priority projects successfully is a must for every leader.

## **Multitasking**

It is not only how hard you work; it is also how smart you work.

## **Priority Principle**

Efficiency is the foundation for survival. Effectiveness is the foundation of success. Under normal conditions, we are efficient. As emergencies arise, we become effective. Time deadlines and emergencies force us to set priorities. Practice this on a regular basis, and it will become part of your character.

## **Teamwork**

This is a cooperative or coordinated effort by a group of persons acting together for a common cause. Self-importance is a pitfall to this concept. There is no "I" in teamwork! Never be afraid to ask for advice or assistance. Neglecting to do so will drastically limit your ability to succeed.

## **Members of Teams with Absence of Trust**

- ✓ Conceal their weakness and mistake for one another
- ✓ Hesitate to ask for help or provide constructive feedback
- ✓ Hesitate to offer help or provide constructive feedback

- ✓ Jump to conclusions about the intentions and aptitudes of others without attempting to classify them
- ✓ Fail to recognize and tap into one another's skills and experiences
- ✓ Waste time and energy managing their behaviors for effect
- ✓ Hold grudges
- ✓ Dread meetings and find reasons to avoid spend time together

### **Members of a Trusting Team**

- ✓ Admit weakness and mistakes
- ✓ Ask for help
- ✓ Accept questions and input about their areas of responsibility
- ✓ Give one another the benefit of the doubt before arriving at a negative conclusion
- ✓ Take risks in offering feedback and assistance
- ✓ Appreciate and tap into one another's skills and experiences
- ✓ Focus time and energy on important issue, not politics
- ✓ Offer and accept apologies without hesitation
- ✓ Look forward to meetings and other opportunities to work as a group

### **Teams that Fear Conflict**

- ✓ Have boring meetings
- ✓ Create environments where back-channel politics and personal attacks thrive
- ✓ Ignore controversial topics that are critical to team success
- ✓ Fail to tap into all opinions and perspectives of team members
- ✓ Waste time and energy with posturing and interpersonal risk management

### **Teams that Engage in Conflict**

- ✓ Have lively interesting meetings
- ✓ Extract and exploit the ideas of all team members
- ✓ Solve real problems quickly
- ✓ Minimize politics
- ✓ Put critical topics on the table for discussion

### **A Team that Fails to Commit**

- ✓ Creates ambiguity among the team about direction and priorities
- ✓ Watches windows of opportunity close due to excessive analysis and unnecessary delay
- ✓ Breeds lack of confidence and fear of failure
- ✓ Encourages second-guessing among team members

### **A Team that Commits**

- ✓ Creates clarity around direction and priorities
- ✓ Aligns the entire team around common objectives
- ✓ Develops an ability to learn from mistakes
- ✓ Takes advantage of opportunities before competitors do

- ✓ Moves forward without hesitation
- ✓ Changes direction without hesitation or guilt

#### **A Team that Avoids Accountability**

- ✓ Creates resentment among team members who have different standards of performance
- ✓ Encourages mediocrity
- ✓ Misses' deadlines and key deliverables
- ✓ Places an undue burden on the team leader as the sole source of discipline

#### **A Team that Holds One Another Accountable**

- ✓ Ensures that poor performers feel pressure to improve
- ✓ Identifies potential problems quickly by questioning one another's approaches without hesitation
- ✓ Establishes respect among team members who are held to the same high standards
- ✓ Avoids excessive bureaucracy around performance management and corrective action

## Module 8

### Emergency Leadership

#### Preparing to lead during an emergency

1. Read; learn from other mistakes and victories.
2. Instill win-win. Do not settle for second best.
3. Prepare those below you in rank to take over.
4. Train.
5. Prepare for the worst.
6. Remember that you can either contaminate your environment and your unit with your attitude and actions, or you can inspire confidence.
7. Be visible.
8. Be self-confident.
9. Have a positive attitude.
10. Exhibit determination, the will to succeed.
11. Have the will to win.
12. Remain calm and cool.
13. Never give the appearance that the situation will be lost.
14. Remember that there is always one more thing you can do to influence any situation in your favor.
15. Sometimes you need to detach yourself and reflect.
16. Ask yourself: What am I doing that I should not be doing? What am I not doing that I should be doing?
17. When there is nothing wrong, there is nothing wrong—except there is nothing wrong. This is when you must be most alert.
18. Trust your instincts. Instincts are a product of your
  - a. education,
  - b. training,
  - c. reading,
  - d. personality, and
  - e. experience.
20. Make it happen!
21. When hit with the unexpected, do the following:
  - a. Face the facts.
  - b. Deal with them.
  - c. Move on.

However, remember this prayer: God grant me the serenity to accept the things I cannot change. courage to change the things I can. and the wisdom to know the difference.

## Module 9

### Unified Command and Teams

The NIMS sets forth the requirement for use of a UC when more than one agency is involved. This amounts to a team. Waldman (1994) argued that when multifunctional teams with dissimilar backgrounds are brought together for a limited amount of time to address a problem of significance, the leader's role is critical. Waldman is speaking of members coming together from within the same organization. The importance of leadership is compounded when these members come from different organizations with different cultures, rules, and responsibilities. Waldman stated that individualized consideration, intellectual stimulation, inspirational motivation, and idealized influence are critical to the success of a multifunctional team.

O'Neill (2008) discussed the fundamental elements of putting a team together. First, relationships must be developed among key team members before an emergency.

Other key resources that can be brought to bear if necessary, such as logistical support or personnel from other units or agencies, must be identified. Defining and documenting members' roles and credentials is important. Training and practicing together is critical. Finally, having the ability to share technology, such as communications, is essential. According to Atwater and Bass (1994), among the most significant aspects of the organizational context that affect team success within the organization are (a) its culture, (b) the clarity of the mission assigned, (c) the reinforcers provided for successful performance, (d) the availability of resources, (e) the physical environment, and (f) significant outsiders. These factors are all clearly impactful during an emergency. Team effectiveness may depend on having a clearly defined mission or purpose (Atwater and Bass 1994).

Team conflict can come from a variety of sources. According to Atwater and Bass (1994), common causes of team conflict include (a) poor communications, (b) disagreement on how to carry out a task, (c) varying beliefs regarding how to operate the team, (d) incompatible personalities and values, (e) perception of unfair reward or allocations, (f) disagreement over policy, (g) inability to deal with change, (h) inappropriate leadership styles, and (i) competition among members. The best way to overcome these hurdles is for the team leaders to foster a trusting and open climate where communication flows freely. However, conflict will arise and must be dealt with (Bass 1998).

---

*Common causes of team conflict include poor communications, disagreement on how to carry out a task, varying beliefs regarding how to operate the team, incompatible personalities and values, perception of unfair reward or allocations, disagreement over policy, inability to deal with change, inappropriate leadership styles, and competition among members.*

---

## Module 10

### Theoretical Framework

According to Walsh et al. (2005), in early 2003, in an effort to improve the nation's domestic response capabilities, President George W. Bush promulgated Homeland Security Presidential Directive-5 (HSPD-5). The members of the 9/11 Commission called for greater emphasis on incident management systems (Perry 2003; US Government Printing Office 2004). According to Miller (2007) and Walsh et al. (2005), the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) implemented the NIMS.

The NIMS provides numerous benefits, such as the establishment of standards for planning, training, and exercising;

interoperability in communications processes, procedures, and systems; equipment acquisition and certification standards; and consistent organizational structures, processes, and procedures. The NIMS requires the use of the ICS at the scene of any incident.

One of the many benefits of the NIMS is the premise that there is and can be only one incident commander at the scene. If more than one agency responds and they have some legal or functional responsibility at the

scene, they become part of the hierarchy in the ICS (Bitto 2007; Hanneman 2007; Ruff 2000; Walsh et al. 2005). Walsh et al. explained that each agency retains its autonomy. Each agency still has its individual roles and responsibilities. However, there must remain one primary incident commander. In this situation, the UC system is used. This process places the incident commander, who has the most demanding or obvious immediate task to accomplish, in the lead of the UC. There is no legal or binding document that requires the other commanders to adhere to the decisions of any other incident commander. Hence, cooperation and a team concept remain paramount (Anelli 2006; Herron 2004; Jamieson 2005; Lester 2007; Molino 2006; Perry 2003; Ruff 2000).

According to Oldham (2003), the first-line supervisor sets the tone for his or her unit. Traditional policing has relied on an authoritarian and bureaucratic model, which has been reactionary in nature (Densten 2003). According to Meese and Ortmeier (2004), the typical response has often been reactive and bureaucratic and focused on methods and procedures with little ingenuity or strategic thinking to affect results.

Efficiency and management received more attention than effectiveness and leadership. This mind-set stymied creativity (Bigley and Roberts 2001; Torpman 2004). Kappeler (1995) argued that bureaucracies tend to be closed institutions that try to protect their members. This has potential to create a recipe for conflict when collaborating with agencies from other disciplines during incident response. Organizational culture is a situational variable that may influence the leader (King 2002; Stewart and Manz 1995; Torpman 2004).

---

*The leaders of first responders during an incident must practice command (leadership and management), communication, cooperation, and coordination to maximize the effectiveness and efficiency of any given response.*

---



The leaders of first responders during an incident must practice command (leadership and management), communication, cooperation, and coordination to maximize the effectiveness and efficiency of any given response (Brown 2005; Cardwell and Cooney 2000; Reardon 2005). Responders deserve as much as those who have succumbed to whatever the incident has wrought, be it a major traffic crash, a hurricane, or a terrorist attack. In a catastrophic event such as Hurricane Katrina, there will be mistakes made, and delays will occur due to the sheer magnitude of the event. However, it became apparent that NIMS and UC failed to function as prescribed during Hurricane Katrina (Cooper and Block 2006; Lester and Krejci 2007; Molino 2006).

# Module 11

## Decision Making

Two Decision Models to Consider

### **SWOT**

1. Strengths
2. Weaknesses
3. Opportunities
4. Threats

### **PDCA**

1. Plan
2. Do
3. Check
4. Act

## Module 12

Certain events in history create the impetus for reflection, growth, and change. Change can be referred to as a paradigm shift. Paradigm shifts are not always welcomed or accepted (Covey 1992; Miller 2007; Wise and Nader 2002). Often the need for change in attitude or behavior preexists the event. September 11, 2001 (9/11), was one such paradigm-changing event (US Government Printing Office 2004). Prior to 9/11, leaders of government agencies at all levels operated within the confines of their own paradigms (US Government Printing Office 2004). After 9/11, efforts were made to change all aspects of homeland security, including response strategies (US Government Printing Office 2004; Wise and Nader 2002). One result of these efforts was NIMS and ICS (Anelli 2006; Herron 2004; Jamieson 2005; Walsh et al. 2005).

According to the US Government Printing Office (2004), bureaucratic policies as well as organizational cultures created independent systems that functioned within their own spheres of influence. Sometimes these agencies cooperated out of necessity, sometimes not even then. This failure of communication, cooperation, and coordination affected the various intelligence communities. When evaluating the events leading up to 9/11, it was determined that bureaucratic rules were instrumental in prohibiting the sharing of valuable intelligence (Bitto 2007; US Government Printing Office 2004).

Little research exists regarding the cultures of fire / emergency medical services (EMS) or transportation / public works cultures. After 9/11, much work was undertaken to improve teamwork, interagency cooperation and coordination, and the concept of a unified approach or command (US Government Printing Office 2004). Yet, as noted by Cooper and Block (2006), the response to the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina provided little evidence that significant improvement had occurred. It is surmised that leadership style plays a key role in the level of success of any endeavor, especially activities involving emergency response (Lester 2007; Lester and Krejci 2007; Murgallis 2005).

McCreight and Hagen (2007) stated that there is a dearth of information regarding exactly how the UC/ICS structure will drastically improve coordination and communication problems without jeopardizing effective crisis management. However, McCreight and Hagen recognized the need for a team approach regarding risk assessment, response objectives, and prioritizing tasks. Gehl (2004) stated that organizational habits run deep. Tradition and the desire not to change or adapt hamper collaborative team progress. The cultural norms found in agencies do not support the process of forming teams for interagency partnerships. Gehl (2004) stated that this problem is not confined to policing. Cultural barriers include, but are not limited to, issues of turf, secrecy, organizational isolation, labor issues, resource issues, policy differences, and communication protocols. The paramilitary structure found in policing is not conducive to multi-agency teams in that it rewards individual effort more than teamwork. Many of these issues are not limited to policing and may not apply to all agencies (Bigley and Roberts 2001; Burkle and Hayden 2001).

While the threat of another terrorist attack is imminent, there are other incidents that have occurred in the United States since 9/11. The most prolific disaster since 9/11 has been Hurricane Katrina (Cooper and Block 2006). Cooper and Block stated that the local, state, and federal response to this disaster was disjointed at best (Lester 2007). Martin (2007) stated that the most important lesson learned from the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina was the need for strong leadership. This one event has taught the first responder community that much work still needs to be done. Likewise, incident management must take an all-hazards approach to preparedness (Canton 2007).

## Conducting an After-Action Review

- Sometimes it's helpful to have participants each write down their ideas, and then ask everyone to share. This helps you avoid groupthink, and it allows quieter individuals to contribute.
- Write the key discussion questions on a whiteboard or flipchart. This helps participants focus on the main purpose of the meeting.
- Let the team talk – This is an exercise in good communication, not just feedback and continuous learning. The better the team members communicate with one another and work out differences, the stronger they'll be in the future – as both individuals and team players.
- Record the recommendations – Write down the specific recommendations made by the team. Then forward this information to other team leaders and stakeholders. This is how AARs contribute to organization-wide learning and improvement.
- Provide follow-up and training – If no one follows up on the recommendations, then time spent on the process is wasted. Create a system to ensure that the ideas gathered in the AAR are incorporated into operations and training activities.

AARs can range in scope from less structured reviews or discussions—also referred to as a “debrief” or “hot wash”—to a comprehensive review that follows a rigorous process and a published report. While many AARs are conducted after significant or traumatic events, some industries have scaled them to various levels and implemented AARs after less critical events or incidents and training sessions to ingrain the process in the culture and reinforce the importance of continued learning and improvement.

On an individual level, reviewing and reflecting on one's actions can help the individual to improve on them or build on their promising practices for future interactions. On an organizational level, conducting and reviewing AARs regularly can help the organization identify thematic areas for improvement or to build on promising practices.

Many of the AARs conducted following critical incidents have emphasized the importance of practicing National Incident Management System (NIMS) and Incident Command System (ICS) principles as part of everyday operations. NIMS and ICS help agencies to manage incidents and NIMS includes requirements for agencies to complete AARs following incidents, ensuring that lessons are identified and incorporated back into operations.

**After-Action Review versus Critical Incident Stress Debriefing** It is important to note that, while there are similarities between the two, AARs and critical incident stress debriefings (CISD) are not the same process. Therefore, one should not be held in lieu of the other and, to the extent possible, the two should not be combined. An AAR is meant to provide participants an opportunity to reflect and identify tactical and operational promising practices and lessons learned. The focus on collective learning enables the entire group or organization to focus on applications for future responses, not on identifying individuals or assigning blame. CISD is a formal process used to support one or more individuals following a traumatic event.

- Organizations should encourage reflection on both successes and challenges but focus on conducting the review for the purpose of learning rather than to place blame. By avoiding focus on penalizing those involved, AARs can gain honest reflection about the events that occurred. Learning from these experiences helps organizations build on

promising practices and avoid repeating challenges to enhance the organization and the field.

- The process of honestly reviewing and critiquing the response to an incident and using that critique as the foundation for organizational learning and training need not be a formal and taxing process. Nor should it be punitive. AARs should come from a place of learning and enhancing the department and the field. In some cases, conducting a critique is as simple as asking the following questions:
- What was our intended outcome?
- What was our actual outcome?
- What were the decisions, systems, and protocols that got us to that outcome?
- What is the gap analysis?

### **Set initial objectives for the after-action review**

One of the primary objectives of an AAR is to identify promising practices and lessons learned from the response that can be implemented to enhance future responses. AN initial set of objectives should be developed at the beginning of the AAR process to further inform the purpose and scope.

### **Define whether the after-action review will be formal or informal**

Understanding the type, scale, scope, and purpose of the AAR will assist decision-makers in determining whether the AAR should be informal or formal. An informal AAR may be beneficial for smaller incidents and responses where the promising practices and lessons learned are easier to identify and can quickly be addressed or for individual aspects of a larger incident.

A more formal AAR is ideal for large-scale events including those that had a significant impact on the community. A formal AAR may also be more appropriate following large-scale incidents and events that are likely to reoccur, and a formal AAR can serve as a resource in future planning efforts.

Discuss whether the after-action review will be made public, shared only with partner or stakeholder agencies, or for internal use only. Every AAR should identify promising practices and lessons learned, findings and recommendations, or opportunities to enhance future responses. Although not every AAR will result in the publication of a report, it is important to discuss if and how the findings of the AAR will be shared, whom they will be shared with, and when.

These decisions will likely be influenced by a number of factors similar to those that help determine what type of AAR to conduct, including the following:

- The type and magnitude of the incident being reviewed
- The impact of the incident on the community and police-community relations
- The level of external involvement in the AAR process
- Federal and state legislation related to open records and dissemination of publicly funded projects
- Ongoing criminal and civil litigation related to the incident

***Determine whether the after-action review will be conducted internally or by an external entity***

- One of the last decisions to make when determining what type of AAR to conduct should be whether the AAR will be conducted by internal employees or by an external individual or team. The incident being reviewed and the resources available are the two factors that will likely play the largest roles in determining whether the AAR will be conducted internally or externally.
- Select a lead or team to conduct the after-action review
- Based on all the decisions made as part of determining what type of AAR to conduct, the next step involves selecting an individual or team to conduct the AAR. It is important to identify an individual or team who
  - is committed to institutional learning and constant improvement;
  - can take an unbiased view of the agency's response;
  - can direct moving pieces into one cohesive learning product;
  - is well respected and knowledgeable in public safety and agency response policy and protocol;
  - understands the opportunities for collaboration with stakeholders outside of law enforcement;
  - is aware of the potential impacts of their work on the individuals and community involved.

***Gain a foundational understanding of the incident and organization(s) involved***

- Research should initially be focused on providing a foundational understanding of the incident. Research should include reviewing available open-source media and articles related to the incident and the public safety response. Having this information at the beginning will be instrumental in understanding the public's perception of an incident response timeline. Use of timestamped radio and computer-aided dispatch (CAD) transmissions can help verify or refute these timelines and can be used to identify gaps and inform the development of questions for interviews and focus groups.
- Prior to interviews with responders, research should also focus on event-specific materials generated by the department(s) being reviewed. This information will provide context for the response and will provide insight into the department's intended response and outcome. Types of information that might be generated and should be requested and reviewed include the following:
  - Incident Action Plans and other NIMS forms and reports
  - Documentation (victim and witness statements, responding officer reports, crime scene documentation, and other relevant materials)
  - Audio files (radio recordings, E911 dispatches, etc.)
  - Video (body-worn and in-car camera footage, cell phone or private camera footage taken on scene)
  - Specific incident data (time stamps, number of responders, units called out)

### **Best Practice: Provide Confidentiality for Interviewee(s)**

- Providing as much confidentiality for interviews as possible can help to promote openness and honesty without fear of repercussions for the interviewee(s). Interviews based on trust are more likely to garner useful information and insight. Keeping interviews confidential emphasizes the focus of the AAR on collective learning rather than assigning blame. Although identifying individuals may be seen to provide more direct credibility to statements and findings, there are ways to cite statements and protect confidentiality. Depending on the sensitive nature of the statements, citing an interviewee based on their job title or role or their organization may be sufficient to protect their identity. Likewise, citing the focus group or roundtable where information was gained without identifying the speaker may be similarly sufficient. In addition to confidentiality, external reviewers in particular may have an increased ability to provide anonymity to interviewees given their nature as independent reviewers. This ability can further support an open and honest conversation.

### **Best Practice: Use Open-Ended Questions During Interviews and Focus Groups**

The purpose of interviews and focus groups during an AAR is to gather reflections, perceptions, and observations from individuals who were directly involved in the incident. To encourage participation and guide discussion, the interviewer should use open-ended questions and ask follow-up questions based on the responses. Starting with the statement, “tell us your story regarding the response to this incident,” is a good lead and the response will likely assist in the development of a series of follow-up questions. Some other examples of good open-ended questions to use during AAR interviews and focus groups include the following:

- Where were you when you got the call and what did you do?
- Why was that decision made?
- How did the department’s response affect your actions?
- What did you learn from the event?

### **Best Practice: Be Sensitive to Potential Trauma**

Interviewers must be sensitive to the trauma experienced by responders, witnesses, and survivors during interviews. Especially during an AAR following an incident of mass violence, natural disaster, or other large-scale incident, it is possible that recounting and providing specific details about the incident and their involvement will be difficult. The person or team conducting the AAR should create an environment in which persons being interviewed are comfortable and are aware that they can skip questions and conclude the interview at any time. Interviewers should also consider having resources—such as mental health practitioners—on site or readily available when discussing sensitive topics in environments where people are highly traumatized. Mental health practitioners are uniquely prepared to support individuals as they understand their emotions and manage stress during and following traumatic incidents.

*Develop recommendations that are actionable*

- Recommendations should be actionable and, to the extent possible, be made with an understanding of the potential implications on budgets and feasibility of implementation. If there are recommendations that will have significant impacts on budgets or be more difficult to implement, an explanation detailing the steps that should be taken or relevant funding opportunities if available should be provided.

#### *Vet the draft after action review*

- A powerful quality control measure is to vet the draft AAR with trusted stakeholders—including practitioners—who can add perspective to the findings and recommendations. Agencies should be encouraged to share the report with mutual aid agencies and other stakeholders or even publicly to maximize the exposure of the lessons. Once the AAR is complete and a draft report is compiled, including stakeholders and subject matter experts into the editing process is important to identify inaccurate, unclear, or unexplored areas.

### **Communicate findings**

- Because one of the primary goals of an AAR is to contribute to the larger body of knowledge related to law enforcement and larger public safety response to various events, a written report that can be shared publicly is the easiest way to communicate the findings to a broad audience. While a report is ideal, there are additional ways to share practices and lessons learned and findings and recommendations identified through the AAR. Decision-makers should make every effort to ensure that at least some of the results are shared publicly. Town halls, presentations for relevant stakeholders, and community meetings can be effective ways to communicate important parts of an AAR. A series of smaller informal AARs may be noted in aggregate on the department's website or documented as part of a larger annual report.

### **Implement lessons learned and recommendations**

Finally, an AAR does not achieve its intended purpose until the lessons learned and recommendations have been incorporated back into the organization or jurisdiction. It is important to ensure that department and jurisdictional leadership understand the importance of this step and champion the recommendations. The AAR can serve as a blueprint for implementing changes to department policy, protocol, culture, and training, including to identify which recommendations are priorities. Whether the changes are implemented directly by organization and jurisdiction leaders or an external organization is consulted to provide training and technical assistance based on promising practices, it is important to identify and implement some of the less-contentious or simpler lessons learned and recommendations as quickly as possible to demonstrate commitment to enhancing responses to similar events and to positively contribute to public safety.

Develop actionable steps to implement identified recommendations

Based on the completed AAR, organizations should develop a timeline with actionable steps to implement recommendations, the timeframes in which the implementation will occur, and—where applicable—relevant partners and stakeholders to engage in the process. If it does not



already exist, leadership should work to gain buy-in from all staff so everyone understands the importance of making the recommended adjustments and to further this collective learning experience. Agencies should also identify priority recommendations and develop a faster implementation timeline with goals addressing those recommendations. Some recommendations may also be addressed as they occur or incorporated into a larger strategic plan.

### **Follow up on the implementation of recommendations**

Agencies should provide updates on the status of their implementation of the recommendations and provide explanations for recommendations that were provided that they are not going to address. An organization may invite a reviewer back to assess progress in implementing recommendations a year after the initial review. If goals to implement recommendations have been missed, leaders should be held accountable for explaining why the deadline was missed and adjusting their plan as appropriate to more effectively reach their goals. Providing this open communication with relevant stakeholders is an important part of demonstrating commitment and transparency. Department priorities may also adjust the implementation plan over time, but the organization should not lose sight of their ultimate goals to learn from the experience and foster a culture of learning.

As the national standard for incident management, the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) National Incident Management System (NIMS) recommends that after action reviews (AAR) following emergency training exercises and incidents identify areas of improvement and learn from the response. FEMA defines the Critical Incident Response report and Critical Incident Response report/improvement plan as follows:

- “Critical Incident Response Report (CIRR): A document intended to capture observations of an exercise and make recommendations for post-exercise improvements. The final CIRR and Improvement Plan (IP) are printed and distributed jointly as a single CIRR/IP following an exercise.
- Critical Incident Response Report/Improvement Plan (CIRR/IP): The main product of the Evaluation and Improvement Planning process. The Critical Incident Response Report/Improvement Plan (CIRR/IP) has two components: a Critical Incident Response Report (CIRR), which captures observations of an exercise and makes recommendations for post-exercise improvements; and an Improvement Plan (IP), which identifies specific corrective actions, assigns them to responsible parties, and establishes targets for their completion.”

### **Best Practice: Key Qualifications for an Independent Review Team or Consultant**

An independent review team or consultant should

- understand responses to critical incidents;
- be able to approach the review from a balanced position, identifying evidence-based lessons learned and promising practices;

- be able to bring all the responding agencies together to review promising practices and lessons learned and discuss recommended adjustments;
- be able to assist agencies with incorporating lessons learned back into their training, policy, and culture;
- be able to explore evidence about the response;
- have familiarity conducting interviews and focus groups with first responders, relevant stakeholders, victims and witnesses, and other community members with empathy and professionalism;
- understand the intricacies around pending criminal and civil legal proceedings;
- be experienced in having important and potentially difficult conversations with public safety and government officials throughout the AAR process.

## Module 13

### Takeaways

1. There are four phases of emergency management: mitigation, preparedness, response, and recovery.
2. Command, control, coordination, cooperation, and communications are considered key elements to effective incident management.
3. A leader's influencing skills are critical during a crisis.
4. There are seven basic principles of ICS: standardization, functional specificity, manageable span of control, unit integrity, unified command, management by objectives, and comprehensive resource management.
5. FIRESCOPE identified six major problem areas found while fighting California wildfires. These six areas were lack of common organization, poor on-scene and interagency communications, inadequate joint planning, lack of valid and timely intelligence, inadequate resource management, and limited prediction capability.
6. Transformational leaders are innovative in nature and are more concerned with the quality of life of their followers.
7. Transformational leaders provide energy-producing characteristics. On the other hand, transactional leaders use power and authority that already exist.
8. Transformational leaders motivate followers to create new and greater change.
9. About 50 to 70 percent of change fails to take hold.
10. Transformational leaders can transform emergencies into developmental challenges by presenting a crisis as intellectual stimulus to encourage followers to seek thoughtful, creative, adaptive solutions to stressful conditions instead of hasty, defensive, or maladaptive ones.
11. Teams typically rely on organizational culture to establish and clarify values that will guide their actions.
12. Influence is the core foundation of leadership.
13. Leaders and followers are beholden to one another.
14. One major key to leadership is influence through empowerment.
15. Path-goal theory emphasizes the relationship between the leader's style and the characteristics of the employees and the work setting.
16. Participative leadership increases role clarity.
17. Achievement-oriented leadership increases employee effort and satisfaction.
18. Social relationships are essential to the success of ICS.
19. Read; learn from other mistakes and victories.
20. Instill win-win. Do not settle for second best.
21. Prepare those below you in rank to take over.

22. Train.
23. Prepare for the worst.
24. Remember that you can either contaminate your environment and your unit with your attitude and actions, or you can inspire confidence.
25. Be visible.
26. Be self-confident.
27. Have a positive attitude.
- 28 Exhibit determination, the will to succeed.
29. Remain calm and cool.
30. Never give off the appearance that the situation will be lost.
31. Remember that there is always one more thing you can do to influence any situation in your favor.
32. Sometimes you need to detach yourself and reflect.
33. Ask yourself: What am I doing that I should not be doing? What am I not doing that I should be doing?
34. When there is nothing wrong, there is nothing wrong—except there is nothing wrong. This is when you must be most alert.
35. Trust your instincts.
36. Efficiency is the foundation for survival. Effectiveness is the foundation of success.
37. Under normal conditions, we are efficient. As emergencies arise, we become effective.

## References

- Albert, D. S., & Hayes, R. E. (2006). *Understanding command and control*. Washington, DC: CCRP Press.
- Alsabrook, C. L., Aryani, G. A., & Garrett, T. D. (2001, June). The five principles of organizational excellence in police management. *Law & Order, 49*(6), 109-115.
- Antonakis, J., Avolio, B. J., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (2003). Context and leadership: An examination of the nine-factor full-range leadership theory using the multifactor leadership questionnaire. *The Leadership Quarterly, 14*, 261-295.
- Atwater, D. C., & Bass, B. M. (1994). Transformational leadership in teams. In B. M. Bass & B. J. Avolio (Eds.), *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership* (pp. 48-83). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Avolio, B. J., Sivasubramaniam, N., Murray, W. D., Jung, D., & Garger, J. W. (2003). Assessing shared leadership. In C. L. Pearce & J. A. Conger (Eds.), *Shared leadership: Reframing the hows and whys of leadership*, (pp. 143-172). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Barton, L. (2008). *Crisis leadership now*. New York, NY: McGraw Hill
- Bass, B. M. (2008). *Bass & Stogdill's handbook of leadership: Theory, research, & managerial application* (4th ed.). New York, NY: Simon & Schuster, Inc.
- Bass, B. M. (1997, February). Does the transactional-transformational leadership paradigm transcend organizational and national boundaries? *Journal of Applied Psychology, 52*(2), 130-139.
- Bass, B. M. (2005). *Transformational leadership: Industry, military, and educational impact* (2nd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership* (2nd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Beck, J. D. W., & Yeager, N. M. (1996, Fall). How situational leadership fits into today's organizations. *Supervisory Management, 41*, 1-3.
- Bennis, W. (1995). The artform of leadership. In J. T. Wren (Ed.), *The leader's companion insights on leadership through the ages* (2nd ed.), (pp.377-378). York, NY: The Free Press.
- Berger, K. S. (2019). *The Developing Person through the Life Span*. (11th ed.). New York, NY: Worth Publishers.

- Blanchard, K. H., & Hersey, P. (1996, January). Great ideas revisited. *Training & Development*, 50(1), 42-48.
- Blank, W., Weitzel, J. R., & Green, S. G. (1990, Summer). A test of the situational leadership theory. *Personnel Psychology*, 43, 579-597.
- Boin, A., Hart, P., Stern, E., & Sundelius, B. (2017). *The politics of crisis management public leadership under pressure* (2nd ed.) New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (2003). *Reframing organizations artistry, choice, and leadership* (3rd ed.). San Fransico, CA: Wiley.
- Bono, J. E., & Llies, R. (2006). Charisma, positive emotions and mood contagion. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17, 317-334.
- Bourne, M. (2005, December). Need for NIMS. *Fire Chief*, 49(12), 46-53.
- Bridges, W. (2017). *Managing organizational transition* (25th ed.). Mill Valley, CA: Wm. Bridges Assoc.
- Bryman, A., & Stephens, M. (1996, Fall). The importance of context: Qualitative research and the study of leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, 7(3), 353-371.
- Buhler, P. (1993, March). The flip side of leadership – cultivating followers. *Supervision*, 54(3), 17-20.
- Butler, Jr., J. K., & Reese, R. M. (1991, Summer). Leadership style and sales performance: A test of the situational leadership model. *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management*, 11(3), 37-46.
- Chen, J., & Silverthorne, C. (2005). Leadership effectiveness, leadership style and employee readiness. *Leadership & Organization Development*, 26(3/4), 280-289.
- Choi, J. (2006). A motivational theory of charismatic leadership: Envisioning, empathy, and empowerment. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 13(1), 24-44.
- Clements, C., & Washbush, J. B. (1999). The two faces of leadership: Considering the dark side of leader-follower dynamics. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 11(11), 170-179.
- Collard, J. M. (2002, July/August). All leaders are not created equal. *Commercial Law Bulletin*, 17(4), 8-11.

- Bridges, W. (2017). *Managing organizational transition* (25th ed.). Mill Valley, CA: Wm. Bridges Assoc.
- Collins, J. (2001). *Good to great*. New York, NY: Harper Collins.
- Covey, S. R. (1992). *Principle centered leadership*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster. (Search S. R. Covey – many great books)
- Covey, S. R., A. R. Merrill, & Merrill, R. R. (1995). *First things first*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.
- Dees, R. F. (2013). *The resilience trilogy. Resilient leaders*. San Diego, CA: Creative team Publishing.
- Densten, I. L. (2003). Senior police leadership: Does rank matter. *Policing*, 26(3), 400.
- Dessler, G. (2001). *Management leading people in organizations in the 21<sup>st</sup> century* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Drabek, T. E. (2010). *The human side of disaster*. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.
- Ensby, M. (2005). Quality leadership situational style. *ASQ World Conference on Quality and Improvement Proceedings*, 59, 341-347.
- Epitropaki, O., & Martin, R. (2005). From ideal to real: A longitudinal study of the role of implicit leadership theories on leader-member exchanges and employee outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(4), 659-676.
- Fisher, Jr., J. R. (2005, October). Leaders at a loss. *Leadership Excellence*, 22(10), 13-15.
- Flin, R (1996). *Sitting in the hot seat leaders and teams for critical incident management*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- Fox, J. C. (2009). Analyzing leadership styles of incident commanders (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest LLC. (3383115).
- Fox, J. C. (2015). *The ultimate guide to excellent teaching and training: Face-to-face and online*. Thorofare, NJ: Xlibris.
- Fox, J. C. (2017). *The ultimate guide to being a great police officer: A guide to professional policing*. Thorofare, NJ: Xlibris.
- Fox, J. C. (2018). *The ultimate guide to excellent public service leadership and management: A guide for professional public leadership*. Thorofare, NJ: Xlibris.

- Fox, J. C. (2021). *The ultimate guide to understanding terrorism and counterterrorism*. Thorofare, NJ: Xlibris.
- Fox, J. C. (2021). *The ultimate devotional for first responders and those who serve others*. Thorofare, NJ: Xlibris.
- Fyfe, J. J., Greene, J. R., Walsh, W. F., Wilson, O. W., & McLaren, R. C. (1997). *Police administration* (5th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Gabris, G. T. (2004, Summer). Developing public managers into credible public leaders: Theory and practical implications. *International Journal of Organization Theory and Behavior*, 7(2), 209-331.
- Garcia, H. G. (2006). Effective leadership response to crisis. *Strategy & Leadership*, 34(1), 4-10.
- Gehl, A. R. (2004, October). Multiagency teams: A leadership challenge. *The Police Chief*, 71(10).
- James, R. K., & Gilliland, B. E. (2017). *Crisis intervention strategies* (8th ed.). Boston, MA: Cengage.
- Goodson, J. R., McGee, G. W., & Cashman, J. F. (1989, December). Situational leadership theory: A test of leadership prescriptions. *Group & Organizational Studies*, 14(4), 446-462.
- Greene, C. N. (1979, March). Questions of causation in the path-goal theory of leadership. *Academy of Management Journal*, 22, 22-41.
- Guzzo, R. A., & Dickson, M. W. (1996). Teams in organizations: Recent research on performance and effectiveness. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 47, 307-339.
- Hansen, P. (1991, October). Developing police leadership. *FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin*, 60(10), 4-8.
- Harmening, W. M. (2014). *Crisis intervention: The criminal justice response to chaos, mayhem, and disorder*. New York NY: Pearson.
- Hilgenfeldt, K. (2001, November). Where have all the leaders gone? *Law & Order*, 49(11), 117.
- Hofmann, D. A., & Jones, L. M. (2005). Leadership, collective personality, and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(3), 509-522.
- House, R. J., & Aditya, R. N. (1997). The social scientific study of leadership:



- Quo Vadis? *Journal of Management*, 23(3), 409-482.
- Howard, W. C. (2005, Winter). Leadership: four styles. *Education*, 126(2), 384-392.
- Howell, J. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1993). Transformational leadership, transactional leadership, locus of control, and support for innovation: Key predictors of consolidated-business-unit performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78(6), 891-902.
- Hughes, R. L., Ginnett, R. C., & Curphy, G. J. (1995). Power, influence, and influence tactics. In J. T. Wren (Ed.), *The leader's companion insights on leadership through the ages* (2nd ed.), (pp. 339-351). New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Hunter, D. (2006, September). Leadership resilience and tolerance for ambiguity in crisis situations. *The Business Review*, 5(1), 44-50.
- Iannone, N. F. (2019). *Supervision of police personnel* (9th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Ijames, S. (2005, January/February). Leadership tips for team unity. *Tactical Response*, 5(1).
- In praise of followers. (1992, September). *Psychology Today*, 36(5), 10.
- James, E. H., & Wooten, L. P. (2010). *Leading under pressure: From surviving to thriving before, during, and after a crisis*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Jermier, J. M. (1996, Fall). The path-goal theory of leadership: A subtextual analysis. *Leadership Quarterly*, 7(3), 311-317.
- Jones, H. B. (2001, June). Magic, meaning and leadership: Weber's model and the empirical literature. *Human Relations*, 54(6), 753-771.
- Jones, M. D. (1998). *The thinkers toolkit. 14 powerful techniques for problem solving*. New York, NY: Three Rivers Press.
- Jones, R., & Becker, K. (2002). "Getting Prepared for the Underprepared." *The Mentor* 4(2).
- Jordan, D. J. (1998). Leadership: The state of research – results of leadership research. *Parks & Recreation*.
- Jung, D., & Sosik, J. J. (2002). Transformational leadership in work groups: The role of empowerment, cohesiveness, and collective-efficacy on perceived group performance. *Small Group Research*, 33(3), 313-336.

- Justis, R. T. (1975, March). Leadership effectiveness, a contingency approach. *Academy of Management Journal*, 18(1), 160-167.
- Kearney, E., & Gebert, D. (2009). Managing diversity and enhancing team outcomes: The promise of transformational leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(1), 77-89.
- King III, G. (2002, December). Crisis management & team effectiveness: A closer examination. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 41(3), 235-250.
- Klann, G. (2003). *Crisis leadership using military lessons, organizational experiences and the power of influence to lessen the impact of chaos on the people you lead*. Greensboro, NC: CCL Press.
- Kotter, J. P. (2012). *Leading change*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2017). *The leadership challenge* (6th ed.). San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Lewis, P. S., Goodman, S. H., & Fandt, P. M. (1998). *Challenges in the 21st Century Management* (2nd ed.). Cincinnati, OH: South-Western College Publishing.
- Lievens, F., Geit, P. V., & Coetsier, P. (1997). Identification of transformational leadership qualities: An examination of potential biases. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 6(4), 415-430.
- Maccoby, M. (2000, January/February). Understanding the difference between management and leadership. *Research Technology Management*, 43(1), 57-59.
- Massey, M. E. (1980). *The people puzzle*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Maxwell, J. G. (2017). *The 21 irrefutable laws of leadership (Updated)*. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson Publishers. (Search J. G. Maxwell – many great books)
- McLean, J. (2005, October/November). Management and leadership dispelling the myths. *The British Journal of Administrative Management*, 16.
- Meese, E. III, & Ortmeier, P. J. (2009). *Leadership, ethics, and policing* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Miller, L. (2006, October). Psychological principles and practices for superior law enforcement leadership. *The Police Chief*, 73(10).

- Mirsalimi, H., & Hunter, M. (2006, August). Influential leadership. *Rough Notes*, 149(8), 76-79.
- Mitroff, I. I. (2004). *Crisis leadership: Planning for the unthinkable*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Mitroff, I. I. (2005, October). Crisis leadership. *Leadership Excellence*, 22(10), 11.
- Moran, L., Perrin, C., & Blauth, C. (2005, Winter). Getting real: The need for genuine leaders. *The Catalyst*, 34(3), 7-12.
- Morreale, S. A., & Ortmeier, P. J. (2004, October). Preparing leaders for law enforcement. *The Police Chief*, 71(10).
- Murgallis, R. P. (2005, July/August). Performance under fire. *Harvard Business Review*, 83(7/8), 44-45.
- Northouse, P. G. (2001). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Ohman, K. A. (2000, January/February). The transformational leadership of critical care nurse-managers. *Dimensions of Critical Care Nursing*, 19(1), 46-54.
- Oldham, S. (2003, June). Are you leading? *Law & Order*, 51(6), 136.
- Palmer, B., Walls, M., Burgess, Z., & Stough, C. (2001). Emotional intelligence and effective leadership. *Leadership & Organizational Development Journal*, 22(1).
- Paul, R. W., & Elder, L. (2013). *Critical Thinking: Tools for Taking Charge of Your Professional and Personal Life* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Peddy, S. (2015). *The Art of Mentoring: Lead, Follow, and Get Out of the Way* (2nd ed.). Houston, TX: Bullion Books.
- Perkel, S. E. (2005, June). Bad leadership: What it is, how it happens, why it matters. *Consulting to Management*, 16(2), 59-62.
- Phills, Jr., J. A. (2005, Spring). Leadership matters-or does it. *Leader to Leader*, 36, 46.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Ahearne, M., & Bommer, W. H. (1995, Fall). Searching for a needle in a haystack: Trying to identify the illusive moderators of leadership behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 21(3), 423-471.
- Pottruck, D. S. (2015). *Stacking the deck: How to lead breakthrough change against any odds*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Riggio, R. E., Bass, B. M., & Orr, S. S. (2004). Transformational leadership in nonprofit organizations. In R. E. Riggio & S. S. Orr (Eds.), *Improving leadership in nonprofit organizations* (pp. 49-62). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Rosenthal, U. (2003, May). September 11: Public administration and the study of crises and crisis management. *Administration & Society*, 35(2), 129-138.
- Sapriel, C. (2003, February). Effective crisis management: Tools and best practice for the new millennium. *Journal of Communication Management*, 7(4), 348-356.
- Schoenberg, A. (2005, Spring). Do crisis plans matter? A new perspective on leading during a crisis. *Public Relations Quarterly*, 50(1), 2-7.
- Slahor, S. (1999, July). Ethical leadership. *Law & Order*, 47(7), 123-125.
- Smallwood, N., & Seemann, P. (2003, December). Leading in times of crisis. *Executive Excellence*, 20(12), 7-9.
- Smith, B. N., Montagno, R. V., & Kuzmenko, T. N. (2004, Spring). Transformational and servant leadership: content and contextual comparison. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 10(4), 80-92.
- Smits, S. J., & Ally, N. E. (2003, Winter/Spring). "Thinking the unthinkable" – Leadership's role in creating behavioral readiness for crisis management. *American Society for Competitiveness*, 13(1), 1-23.
- Staveley, S. (2002). Taking a closer look at leadership. *Journal of California Law Enforcement*, 36(1), 18-26.
- Stephan, E., & Pace, R. W. (1991, January). Five keys to effective leadership. *Executive Excellence*, 8(1), 7-9.
- Stewart, G. L., & Manz, C. C. (1995). Leadership for self-managing work teams: A typology and integrative model. *Human Relations*, 48(7), 747-770.
- Stone, A. G., Russell, R. F., & Patterson, K. (2004). Transformational versus servant leadership: A difference in leader focus. *Leadership & Organizational Development*, 25(3/4), 349-359.
- Torpman, J. (2004). The differentiating function of modern forms of leadership. *Management Decision*, 42(7/8), 892-906.
- Tucker, B. A., & Russell, R. F. (2004, Spring). The influence of the transformational leader. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 10(4), 103-112.

- Van Auken, P. M. (1992, Winter). Leading in four arenas. *American Society for Competitiveness*, 20(1), 14-16.
- Waldman, D. A. (1994). Transformational leadership in multifunctional teams. In B. M. Bass & B. J. Avolio (Eds.), *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership* (pp. 84-103). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Waugh, Jr., W. L., & Streib, G. (2006, December). Collaboration and leadership for effective emergency management. *Public Administration Review*, 66, 131-140.
- Weiss, R. P. (2002, March). Crisis leadership: Since September 11, business leaders have been reassessing how well prepared they are to lead. *Training & Development*, 56(3), 28-35.
- Wofford, J. C., & Liska, L. Z. (1993). Path-Goal theories of leadership: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Management*, 19(4), 857-876.
- Wren, J. T. (1995). *The leader's companion*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.
- Wuestewald, T., & Steinheider, B. (2006, January). Shared leadership: Can empowerment work in police organizations? *The Police Chief*, 73(1), 48-55.
- Yagil, D. (2002). Substitution of a leader's power bases by contextual variables. *International Journal of Organization Theory and Behavior*, 5(3/4), 383-399.
- Yemm, G. (2006, June 27). *Leadership – Do you use or abuse power?*
- Yukl, G. (1989). Managerial leadership: A review of theory and research. *Journal of Management*, 15(2), 251-289.
- Yukl, G. (2012). *Leadership in organizations* (8th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Education.
- Yukl, G., Gordon, A., & Taber, T. (2002). A hierarchical taxonomy of leadership behavior: Integrating a half century of behavior research. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 9(1), 15-32.
- Zaccaro, S. J., Rittman, A. L., & Marks, M. A. (2001). Team leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 12, 451-483.

