ERDC-EL

Moderator: Courtney Chambers
Conflict and Resolution Styles Assessment Webinar
January 28, 2016
10:30 am CT

Courtney Chambers: Okay now I would like to introduce today's speakers. We have Ms. Julie Marcy a Research Biologist and a Certified Professional Facilitator in the ERDC Environmental Laboratory. She has over 30 years of facilitation experience and enjoys helping teams at ERDC, USACE and beyond accomplish their goals.

Ms. Andrea Carson is an Oakridge Institute for Science and Education Stakeholder Engagement Fellow at the Institute for Water Resources and the Collaboration and Public Participation Center of Expertise. She focuses on teaching about and providing support for collaborative processes between the Corps and its partners.

Ms. Cindy Wood is an Environmental Planner for the Institute for Water Resources and she works with the Public Participation Center of Expertise. She focuses on assisting the Regulatory program and the NRCS and Corps of Engineers partnership. She is a Toastmaster International and is certified in the Self-deployment Inventory and Myers Briggs Type Inventory. More information about Julie, Andrea, and Cindy may be found in their bios posted on the Facilitator's Exchange, along with the rest of today's presentation and meeting documents. So, for those of you who are only able to listen on the phone, we can certainly provide you a link to access all of these documents after the fact. We're excited to learn from you ladies today. At this time, I am going to give Julie the presenter rights and then we can begin.

Julie Marcy: Thank you so much for that introduction and welcome everyone to our Webinar. As Courtney mentioned, we have folks from across the US Army Corps of Engineers participating, along with folks on the US Air Force negotiation team and some individuals from the Navy as well. Welcome everyone and thank you for joining us. It is wonderful to be able to combine our expertise and knowledge to help us all succeed in our group gatherings.

I am going to start us off by talking about some of the origins or root causes of conflict and types of conflict and stages of conflict. Then, then Cindy is going to talk about conflict resolution style. Finally, Andrea will give us more in-depth coverage of our conflict resolution self-assessment results and what the results mean.

Root causes of conflict are shown in this diagram of Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs. You can see that it includes having our basic needs such as food, water shelter, warmth, or cooling if you happen to live in the South. As we get our physical needs addressed, then we can move up and start having our spiritual and emotional needs covered. Our psychological identity needs include wanting to feel that we belong, being valued and respected, being free to make choices and to have a little fun.

In our world, a lack of basic needs might result in disputes between two factions within a country or between countries over rights to water or agricultural land or even warfare based on natural resources or psychological/ spiritual need conflicts from religious or cultural differences. These needs can be expressed in a variety of ways and you will see that in your interaction with co-workers, stakeholders, even your family members. You may see them manifesting in a variety of ways.

They might exhibit jealousy in order to feel a greater sense of belonging or feel that that is lacking. They may expect privileges as a sign of power. They may engage in laughing or gossip for enjoyment or they may be careful about separating professional and personal activity in order to retain their freedom or sense of independence. Wants and needs vary tremendously. Needs are essentially similar for everyone, but the behaviors through which all of us, and sometimes cultural groups, choose to satisfy those needs can be very different.

There can be confusion between desirable wants and actual needs. In general, individuals do their best to satisfy their needs. When I teach this, I often find that parents frequently attempt to differentiate needs from wants, especially if they have teenagers. Our life experiences may result in cultural norms or groups of individuals who may have a different view of the world and different opinions of acceptable behavior. This application of different rules to the same issue can be challenging to resolve.

Be mindful of fundamental attribution error. This is a form of stereotyping where behavior is attributed to a particular background, culture or even physical appearance. Examples might be perceptions of a particular culture as being lazy or corrupt or another culture as being highly skilled and academic. The reality is that diversity exists in all cultures. Much of our work within the Army Corps of Engineers or across DOD involves finite resources of time, money, people, equipment, natural resources and this can often be a root cause of conflict.

This can be resolved if a group learns that cooperating and collaborating by sharing resources versus competing is in their best interest. Value conflicts can be the most challenging to resolve. Different values, beliefs, priorities and principles play a key role in interpersonal interaction. When a person is in a dispute centered on his or her value, he or she has an enduring belief that a

specific action or quality is superior or preferable to a different action or quality.

They may have rigid value systems that may limit their options to satisfy their personal needs. An acknowledgement of the other points of view or even role playing someone else's position and the understanding that we can agree to disagree without being disagreeable on a particular issue can help us address strongly held, disparate beliefs.

As a discussion leader, if you hear individuals in a dispute using words such as honest, equal, right and fair, that is often an indication that the conflict is rooted in a value. Also if they use the opposite terms. When opposing values are present, the participants may think in terms of right and wrong or good and bad. It may also result in different goals for different participants. A good quote to remember is that of the ancient poet Rumi, "Somewhere between right and wrong there is a garden. I will meet you there."

Other common sources of conflict that we may encounter in the workplace include assumptions and perceptions. Remember CYA always check your assumptions for accuracy and try to focus on facts. Sometimes a lack of clarity on roles and responsibilities, miscommunication or even deliberate dis-information, information overload, organizational or political constraints and strong emotions can all play a role in serving as additional sources of conflict.

This chart is shows how conflict can escalate and nine different stages of conflict. It can help you recognize the stage of conflict that your group is in. So, if you are working with a particular group, you might want to have this model handy and look at the different characteristics shown for each of the different stages of escalation to see where you group is. I will give you another moment to take another look at the chart. In Stage 1, the two parties

might just get together and work things out between them. In Stage 2, Debate, a neutral facilitator might be brought in to improve communication between the two parties.

This continues to interventions of conciliation, mediation, arbitration and litigation with the final intervention being a dominant military force and war. Now that's given you an overview of some of the common causes of conflict and some of the deep rooted values that may be driving conflicts between individuals or groups that you work with, I will stop sharing my desktop and Cindy Wood is going to talk to us about conflict resolution styles.

Cynthia Wood: Okay we are going to change gears now and talk about conflict resolution styles. And, what we're going to find is that there are five basic styles and each one of us have maybe a preference for one. We'll go ahead and take a look at those five styles, when they should be used and tips for dealing with each. But before I can go on, we need to look at this road sign (WIIFM) because it's really a road block. If we don't really consider what's in it for ourselves, what's in it for me, a lot of what we say during this webinar will go in one ear and maybe out the other. So why do we need to know these styles?

Very simply, the road sign can take us to success. So often we try to communicate and we get road blocks and we don't get where we're going. A lot of times, we even try to reproduce and repeat failed attempts. Using this analogy of navigating through traffic and using an old stick shift as a prop, as we know when you're driving and trying to get where you need to go, you need to be in the right gear. We might have a preference of what gear we like. Gears can get stuck, and when they do, you're not going to get where you want to go. The same happens when navigating through conflict. We don't talk about gears necessarily. What we do talk about are conflict styles. And

because we do have a preference on what style we like, we might tend to use it all the time and in essence get stuck in that gear.

Let's take a look at where these five styles fall on this grid.

We're looking first at the Y axis that talks about satisfying your own needs. And, that's an assertiveness scale from low to high. Then on this X axis, we're concerned with satisfying the needs of others and we call this the cooperative scale again low to high. The 5 will fit on this grid. Starting with this corner, where there's low assertiveness to satisfy your needs and also low cooperativeness to satisfy the other guy, you're not really looking to win.

In fact, we call this style a lose/lose because we're not going to be satisfying anybody's needs and we call the style the avoider and maybe looking at the old turtle. In an extreme situation, they see conflict and go into their shell. Moving along the axis of cooperation, we go to those folks who are low on asserting their own needs but they're high on making sure the other person gets what they want. This is a lose/win style or we call it the Accommodator. Then, we may think of in extreme situations, that teddy bear.

Now travel completely to the other extreme where there's a high assertiveness, so high maybe even to the point of aggressiveness, on satisfying their needs. On a cooperativeness scale, they're kind of low on caring about the other guy, so we call this the win/lose style or the Competitor and maybe in an extreme situation, it's the shark.

But there in the middle, lies a compromiser. They want to win but not to the extent of the competitor; they do care about the other guy but not to give up everything. So, they fall into that middle. It's not a win or a lose; it's kind of

both. And, they are very adaptable. They can go with the situation, be the chameleon..

And then finally the fifth. These are the folks who are very assertive on satisfying their needs but equally satisfying the needs of others and this would be that win win or the Collaborator. To collaborate, they have to think out their problems and be patient, sometimes taking time, the owl..

So here you have the five styles. When we look at that intent to satisfy your own needs we are looking at being goal driven. On the other axis of cooperation, it's relationship driven. So again, we fall somewhere on here and your results will place you in one of these areas. Take a look at this graph. It's the same graph, but what I like about it is it shows the continuum. Looking here, where it says avoidance, not many people are in the corner of it. Rather, they are up here toward the compromiser or maybe they're right on the border of competitor avoidance.

So, we do have gradations of this. With the accommodator (sometimes also called the harmonizer) the same thing. They can be very close to compromising so sometimes they do want a little bit of what they're looking for. Another thing I want to point out is when we talk about conflict management styles, a lot of time we're thinking of our own needs but here's the rub. When you're working at the Corps it's not your needs but rather it's the agency's needs that we're satisfying in a lot of the conflict situations we're in.

So, if you tend to be an accommodator and you really want to help the other person but you have regulations that you have to implement, you will have to be a little more assertive of the agency's needs going against your natural

tendency. It does take energy and effort, but it absolutely can be done once you're aware of these different styles and learn how to navigate through them.

I wanted to show the five different styles. If you look at it, they're all out there (shark, teddy bear, turtle, lizard, and owl). The thing is that we do live in an environment together and sometimes an environment can be very cozy, so cozy that in this particular slide I'd be afraid of seeing the next slide. That teddy bear better get out of there. You may think that's just clip art, but I know we've all been in meetings where all different types show up.

What we need to do is understand these types, understand where others are coming from and shift our gear when necessary so that we can work with others. Now, I'd like to turn to Andrea to take a look at your results and see where you land on that chart.

Courtney Chambers: Just one second Andrea and I'll make you the presenter.

Andrea Carson: Perfect all right okay thank you Cindy. Thank you Julie. And so now we're going to switch gears and we want to talk about your specific conflict resolution styles. Cindy gave you a broad overview of the styles and now we want to know who we have in our "fishbowl" Webinar today. If you look to the right of your screen in a few seconds you're going to have a poll pop up asking you what your conflict resolution style was. And so if you can - if you'll take a moment and answer that polling question based off your assessment results we'll try to get a sense of who is in our fishbowl.

And you might have seen in the Comment box we have someone who has three different styles that they ranked high. What that means is that you had a flat profile and for the purposes of this poll today we ask that you choose the profile that you see you think you go to more often. Perhaps one or two of

them was a surprise or maybe you use all three of them. But whatever you identify most with, please use for the purposes of this poll today. But if you do have a flat profile that generally means that you tend to rely on more than more one style depending on the situation. I'd like to say you're well on your way to being a dexterous user of your conflict management styles which is what the point of this Webinar is today- to teach you how to use and engage in each of those styles.

I tend to like to leave the poll open until about 70% has participated. We're going to close it and we're getting close now. Courtney you can use your judgment to when the poll should be closed? But I also want you all to be aware that as you're taking this assessment you might have found that you found yourself thinking "oh my style changes between the house and the office or depending on whom I'm working with" and that's generally true. But we had asked you to take the poll in terms of the common work environment that you're living in or working in.

All right Courtney if you can close the polls for us and show the results.

Courtney Chambers: All right…

Andrea Carson: Thank you. And we'll see what we have here today in just a moment and they'll pop up.

Courtney Chambers: ...now one reminder Andrea. We do have a lot of phone participants that aren't going to be able to participate in the polls but we'll just remind them that they can still take that assessment, we'll make that document available to them after the meeting if they'd like to find out what they are.

Andrea Carson: Great point thank you Courtney. All right oh wow okay! So today it looks like we have a lot of "collaborators" in the room, which actually to me is quite surprising but maybe because of our audience sending it out to the facilitators and the Collaboration and Public Participation Community of Practice maybe that shouldn't have been such a surprise. It also looks like we have a couple of "avoiders" and "harmonizers" and "forcers" as well.

And I would like to point out you might have noticed on the poll that we had "harmonizing" and "accommodating" together and that's because depending on which assessment you take you'll often find the terms used interchangeably. "Forcing" is also sometimes known as "competing" as well.

Now that we know what each of your styles are, we are going to explore the various styles and talk about what is the best time to use each approach. And then we will also discuss when it's not the best time (to use each approach), tips on what you can do or tips that you can do to also help your colleagues explore styles that perhaps aren't their dominant style it would be more appropriate in a situation. So with that, we're going to start with the avoiding style. As Cindy was telling us, the avoiding style is that turtle- the person who would rather retreat to their shell rather than deal with the conflict.

For the turtle, just as a reminder, the goal is not really that important but neither is the relationship. And one of the things that we're going to do throughout each of these examples is to give an example of what that style would do if they were asked what they wanted to eat for lunch. So the turtle or the avoiding style, if they were asked "Where would you want to eat for lunch?"would likely say something along of the lines of: "Whatever I really don't care." That's the turtle. As I said before, they're neither a goal nor relationship oriented and they'd rather just retreat from the conflict than have to engage or decide at all.

Sometimes this style of conflict really is appropriate and so we're going to go through those times or those examples of appropriate times now. What you're seeing on the screen and what you won't be able to see on the phone is that I have a list of six different criteria. The first criteria is the "issue is important to you." And this - and the avoiding style is often most appropriate when the issue is not important to the person. Avoiders don't care one way or another about the outcome and at the same time the issue might not be important to the other person as well.

However the issue could be important to that other person and the avoider may purposely be avoiding the conflict because they want to stall and put a decision off for a particular reason because they know that that issue is important to the other person. Another one here is the "ability or willingness to sacrifice." And so the turtle because you are avoiding, you have are willing to sacrifice your say in order to avoid the conflict and that is appropriate in some cases. You'll also see the relationship on the list as well.

Often times when you're avoiding a conflict and you tell someone "Oh I don't care about the outcome- whatever- choose one yourself. You may actually hurt the other person's feelings. As an avoider, be sure that the relationship isn't important to you when you're avoiding a conflict.

Finally sometimes time you may have low resources or low amounts of time and so avoiding the conflict would be appropriate in that situation. When there's not a need for an innovative solution, this avoiding style is appropriate as well. Sometimes we might come into a situation where you know that you would normally avoid conflict but you really shouldn't. Here are some tips for how to engage and work within your avoiding conflict style (in that situation).

The first thing is to recognize that "avoiding" is your style and so you might need to recognize that- or perhaps you have a colleague who's an avoider- You may need to draw them back into the conversation and often times what that means is that you need to create a safe environment for that individual. If you know that they're an avoider but this issue really is important to them, you might try to change the subject or change the tone of the conversation in order to have them come back in and engage rather than avoid because it is important to them.

Along with that, keep the conversation positive. If you know that you're dealing with an avoider but it is a conversation that you need to have, avoid the sarcasm and the eye rolling and even frowns because those avoiders will likely disengage from that conversation even when it needs to be had.

Moving on to the next type, we have the "accommodating" style which is the cute little teddy bear. Cindy was saying that with the teddy bear, the goal is not really important but the stability of the relationship really is.

Often times the accommodator, if they have a colleague who they really care about deeply, or if they have a good friend who constantly asks them for a small but inconvenience favor, or if they have a colleague that doesn't meet that deadline that they set together- the accommodator's tendency is to accommodate the other person and bend into their goal in order to maintain the relationship.

Something that you might hear an accommodator say if they were asked "Where do they want to go out to eat?," they might say "Wherever you want to go! That's fine with me." A few of you might recognize that from hearing other accommodators in your office. I tend to be that way personally. There are often times where an accommodating style really is the most appropriate

style to use. In that case often times when the issue is not important to you, using an accommodating style makes sense.

What you need to be aware of is that if the issue IS important to you, the accommodating style is not appropriate because then you might end up feeling resentful. Even if you have that accommodating personality and you want to keep that relationship going, you might become resentful because that issue really was important to you and you feel as if you're sacrificing at that point.

Next, it is appropriate to accommodate if the issue is of high importance to somebody else and low to yourself and if you are willing to sacrifice then the accommodation style is appropriate. If the time available is low and you know that the other person considers the issue something of importance to them, it is appropriate to accommodate needs. And finally if there's no need for an innovative solution (then accommodating is appropriate).

We're using the assumption that by talking through with others you'll come to an innovative solution or that somebody else already has the solution in hand. So in the accommodating and in the avoiding style, when we say there's a low need for an innovative solution it just means that there's no need to talk it through and really explore all of the options.

We'll move on to the tips for the accommodator. The tips for the accommodator we have here is 1) encourage them to talk about their perspectives and needs. Similar to the avoider, they often will not talk about their needs or their concerns and want to respect or to build their relationship with the other and to have the other person's issues and concerns heard. But if you are an accommodator and you know that this issue is important really take time to talk about your perspectives and have them heard.

If you're dealing with an accommodator, one of the things that you can keep in mind is that the thing that empowers them is the relationship. So say things in a way that shows them that their involvement is supporting your relationship. So using phrases such as "It would make me happy if you tell me what you want to do" would really bring the accommodator out of their shell and have them engage on an issue that is important to them and they need to be involved in.

All right so then next on our list that we're going to cover are the competing styles and as Cindy was saying those are our sharks. The sharks always have their eye on the prize and they tend to not let anyone or anything stand in the way and they're also typically the folks you find competitive in your offices. The goal for the shark is of the utmost importance and the relationship is not or at least not in comparison and so that gets back to that idea of there's a range (for where someone falls on the conflict style matrix).

Cindy was saying how you might be close to being towards that edge of relationship being important but you'll be in the competitor's piece of the matrix if the relationships is not as important as the issue itself. And so often times, you'll find that as the competitor, if you're in that dream job you're the ones going for the gut or if their paycheck is half of what it should be, they're defending their position of what they believe is correct rather than avoiding the situation.

And if they're ordering lunch the competitor might say something along the lines of "Well we'll go to my favorite restaurant of course! And don't worry I already made reservations." That's how you would characterize a competing style. You might ask when using the competing style is necessary or appropriate. The competing style is often appropriate when the issue is very important to you. If the issue is important then you're going to be very goal

driven and it may not matter as much whether the relationship is important to you.

At the same time it's appropriate to use the competing style when you know that the issue is not important to another person and so if that issue is important to them then you're allowed to have that very goal driven orientation and it won't affect your relationship. Often times with the competing style you might need to use this style if you just cannot sacrifice. If what you need is the whole pie and half the pie is not what you can use or you're not willing to live with that, then that's something to keep in mind and that's when you should use this competing style.

Finally if the time available is really low, you might also use the competing style. I like to use the example of an emergency situation. If you're in an emergency situation and you're the decision maker, then the competing style is completely appropriate because limited time is available, the issue is important, and you know what to do with it. But it also does limit the innovative solution so if there is a low need for an innovative solution then the competing style works.

One of the tips for using the competing style is that if you're working with a competitor, often times they like to feel as if they've won. And so often times if you're in the negotiation, what you want to do is give them small wins to make them feel as if they're coming out on top. They may be less likely to cut you down or bite your head off in the case of a shark.

By giving them these small wins and making them feel as if they're coming out on top - then you'll be able to keep them in the collaborative mentality and work with your team better. Also as the competitor yourself same with- the point of this today is to recognize that this is your dominant style - so often

times if you think you're in a situation where the competitive style is not this appropriate style put yourself in the other person's shoes.

You may have the tendency to want to address your concerns right off the forefront but take that moment to try to understand the other person's underlying concerns and issues as well because perhaps you have an avoider at the table right. Often times you might as the competitor want to take a step back and say, "Oh I need to also address their's as well." What that can ultimately let you do is come up with a mutually beneficial solution rather than that quick win.

Finally as a competitor, what you also need to consider is what it really means to win because we use this the saying that "you win the battle, but you lose the war." Really what that means is - if you're working on a long term project with the team on a project you deeply care about but you keep working for the quick wins or you alienate your teammates because of your competitive mentality, then you won't able to have this support in the long runs to get you to your end goal.

And really that's what as a competitor you want: to win. It's not necessarily the short - the quick win. So just something to keep in mind.

So moving on, now we're going to talk a little bit about the compromising style. The compromising style as Cindy was saying is the chameleon and so the chameleon is both goal and relationship oriented. Both are important but neither are especially important.

Often times the chameleon might be that person who might negotiate for their salary but ultimately will settle for something that's less – (for example) the lessor amount than what they initially went in asking for or if they're working

on a group project and they think they have a really good idea but if every other member also has a good idea, then they'll try to work to incorperate everyone's ideas and maybe not use so much of their own idea in the first place. What you might find is that they'll push a little to reach their goal but not too hard.

They are somewhere right in between that competing and accommodating and likewise they're interested in addressing the issue more directly than the avoider but they don't necessarily want to explore it as in depth as the collaborator. If the compromiser were asked where they want to go out to lunch they might say: "Hmm… let me see. Well, you got to pick last time so why don't I pick this time?" Or visa-versa: "Oh, well… I got to pick last time so you decide this time!" And that's the compromising style.

So some of the times where compromising is appropriate is when the issue is of medium to high importance to the compromiser and when issues are also medium or high importance to the other person involved. The compromiser, because it is a compromise though, needs to be willing to sacrifice something. Often times a compromise is appropriate when getting something is better than a stalemate, but it's not appropriate if you can't live with those compromises.

So relationship is also, as we were saying, medium to high important to the compromiser and if you have time available to kind of work through the compromise - compromising is often appropriate. But when time is low, then the compromising style is not appropriate because a decision needs to be made quickly. And then often times the compromise allows you to get to a medium innovative solution. Maybe you've worked through some of the issues and not all of them and it might not be mutually beneficial but at least meets some people's needs.

So that's when the compromising style is appropriate: when you need to work through some things but maybe not everything. Often times while collaboration might be better if the time and resources are limited, then compromise may be the most appropriate style.

The tips for the compromiser are that when you're dealing with the compromiser, since both the issue and the relationship is important, you want to make sure that you're working to ensure that both sides have been heard and valued and that some level of cooperation has been reached.

Compromisers often want to make sure that they've at least heard some of the issues on both sides in order to maintain the relationship. That's something important that you need to consider when you're entering into negotiation stage with the compromiser.

And then also as a compromiser yourself you want to remember that you want to slow down and sometimes maybe you can find something that's not only a somewhat win lose situation but an actual win win alternative. The compromiser's tendandacy is to want to sacrifice immediately and say "Oh well! We're getting some of what we want". But compromisers should take their time to really try to see if there is a win win solution instead. You know, for instance there's an example that we use about the orange. Rather than splitting the orange in half and getting half the juice and half the rind, maybe you're entering into a situation where someone really only needs the rind and someone else needs the juice.

If you had taken the time to explore that, then you really could have both walked out of that situation with a win win.

Finally we come to the collaboration style and the collaboration style is our owl. The owl is for them both the issue and the relationship are really, really important and it may be impossible to decide which one is actually more important.

Perhaps an owl finds themselves in a situation where their closest friend is applying for their same dream internship or their advisor wants them to focus on their dissertation topic that they have no interest in. What their reaction might be is they use the problem solving approach to really try to find ways in which all parties can reach an agreement that satisfies everyone. For instance if they were asked for lunch they might say, “Hmm.. what are you in the mood for and what is your budget? I can go on Yelp and try to find things that meet both of our needs. Or worse case, we can always hit the buffet so that we get all that we want!”And that’s what a collaboration style person might say or do.

In terms of when to use the collaborating style and when it’s most appropriate, it’s used when the issue is important to both you and the other person and when often times we have a yes or a no here. Often times if you’re not able to sacrifice or you really want to work through as much as you can without sacrificing, that’s when this is most appropriate.

When the relationship is also important and you have lots of time available - that’s often times the key to a collaborative process: that is, having that time available. So if you’re a collaborative person but that time’s not available that’s when it would be inappropriate. Often times, it’s most appropriate when there is a definite need for an innovative solution. This allows you to explore both sides and talk to people.

So tips for a collaborator. Often times, we say that when you're on teams that collaboration really is very important, but sometimes we need to recognize that there is a time and a place for collaboration and sometimes there's something called "over collaboration" and that there's, as we were saying, the limited resource. Maybe there is really a need for 15-minute check ins rather than six hour meetings to discuss everything. Having the collaborators check themselves and realize when it is appropriate and when it's not is a really key component of this.

At the same time if you're a collaborator, there's something to consider for the appropriate *type* of collaboration. So for one – we're all today on this Webinar as an example. And so maybe virtual collaboration is more useful than talking on the phone every week. Or maybe there's something where you should only send emails or you have a message board. So things to consider. And then finally, if you're a collaborator, it's also important to remember that other people are not. You need to help them work through how to collaborate.

And so it's important to talk about why it's important for someone to express their interest in the negotiation and why it's actually worthwhile to deal with the problem because often times you might find people who aren't willing to work through that situation through you or with you.

So with that, we've gone through all the conflict styles and we've gone through these tables about when it's appropriate and when it's not. It really boils down to these three questions: 1) What is my true goal? Am I really trying to better improve this relationship or come out with an innovative solution? Maybe I have a goal that I'm trying to achieve. What is my true goal? And then the second question is: How important are the relationships that the conflicts or outcome could affect?

And then third: Which is more important to me the goals or the relationship or both? So those are all things to consider. Now we want to take what you've learned today as far as what to consider and when to apply it through a scenario posttest. What we're going to do is we're going to introduce a new poll so you'll be looking to your right. It'll pop up momentarily and we're going to ask you the question. We're going to ask you the question of…

Courtney Chambers: I'm sorry just one second it's going to take me just a minute. Okay I'll advance the slide for you.

Andrea Carson: Right so the question here is that you reserve the main conference room with the PowerPoint projector and you needed it for a teleconference call to secure funding for your project. Two other people will be joining you in the room and three more by phone. When you get there a weekly check in meeting with your supervisor and another ten people is well under way and the PowerPoint projector is not being utilized. You noticed on the way there that the other conference room without a PowerPoint projector was available. How should you resolve this conflict?

You'll see here that we have five different options. You could A) without saying anything, take the other conference room. You can do without the PowerPoint and let your participants know the change. You could B) peek your head in the meeting to ask if they will be done soon since you're hoping to use the room but upon hearing 'No,' offer to go to the other room and do without the PowerPoint.

You can C) interrupt the meeting stating that you reserved the room but let them know the other conference room is open or D) interrupt the meeting and let the group know that you did reserve the conference room and need the PowerPoint projector. Agree that if they could wrap up their meeting in the

next 30 minutes you'd postpone their meeting so that you could both use the room. Or E) first confirm the availability of the other conference room then interrupt the meeting and explain that you had reserved the main conference room because of this PowerPoint capability. But that since the other conference room is open let them know that you can postpone your meeting by five minutes to allow them to relocate.

So with that, the polling question will be opening up momentarily and using the skills that we taught you today about how to evaluate when it's appropriate or non-appropriate to use a certain conflict resolution skill, we'd like you to answer how we should resolve this conflict. I know I often times want to answer what my gut feeling, my dominant side would be, but try to think through how you should resolve this conflict using what we learned about today.

Okay and the polling question is up and so feel free to answer that question. And we'll give you a moment to read through and think about it.

Courtney Chambers: ...50% have responded.

Andrea Carson: Thank you. Courtney why don't we shut it down in five seconds and then we'll look at the results. All right thank you Courtney. If you could pull up those results.

So what you might have found here, and what I'm hoping that you would do was walk through the importance of the issues to yourself as a person who needs the conference room to secure their funding and the importance of the other person who is your supervisor but it's a weekly check in meeting and they went over and also your ability or willingness to sacrifice and the time available to you.

If your meeting's about to happen, if you had seen that maybe five minutes before then maybe you would have more time to do something else. But if you're meeting is happening right now, since you don't have time to adjust, your schedule and it's such an important meeting. I think here that a lot of people chose collaboration and I will agree with you. It took me a little while to decide what would be most appropriate because I was wondering whether I would compete or collaborate. And really I think what it came down to was depending on the time permitting that I could make this decision as well as the relationship between me and my supervisor.

If my relationship with my supervisor is a good relationship and I stopped them and said, "Hey, I really needed this to secure funding" then perhaps my supervisor would be willing to compromise with me and/or actually collaborate with me and move to that other room. But if I'm afraid of hurting that relationship and I might be scared to ask my supervisor then maybe I compromised and asked them to finish up their meeting so then I could start mine.

Some of the other things that might have also changed your answer would be that if the issue is important in reverse, i.e. you had the meeting room and you were just doing a weekly meeting and somebody else needed it to secure their funding. You might actually accommodate them and move to the other room. And so those are some of the factors to consider when you're deciding on which conflict style is appropriate. But hopefully this table could be useful to you moving forward.

All right so to summarize today what we were hoping to really convey to you is that conflict is neither good or bad and we often we know that we're going to be hitting up against it and really there's a way to learn from it and have a healthy conflict, right? So it doesn't have to necessarily be something that's

bad. It's something that we can all work from and benefit from. With that, we have these different conflict styles. We have different working styles and so it's really important to embrace the diversity and use it as an opportunity for growth and increase understanding.

So by recognizing what people's conflict styles are or the issues that they're bringing to the table, it really can make a superior solution in the end if you're willing to think about it and work through it and embrace it. And finally by being aware of your own conflict resolution style and how it may influence yours and other's behaviors you can really become adept at working with others and really coming with the best outcomes and the best type of working environment that you can have.

So with that, we are going to open up for questions. While you're leaving or if you need to get off the phone, this is part of a upcoming Webinar series on the Conflicting and Collaborative Problem Solving. So as we're answering questions feel free to fill out the poll that'll show up on the side of your screen to answer what you'd like to see next as far as the Webinars are concerned. And with that I'd like to open it up for questions to any of our presenters Julie Cindy or myself.

Courtney Chambers: All right great thank you very much Andrea. Okay, at this time we will take questions. We are going to have to stay in mute mode to avoid the background noise that is occurring. If you have a question for the ladies, please type it in the Chat feature and submit it to everyone and then they can decide who best to address it.

Julie Marcy: Courtney this is Julie. We had a chat question come in earlier asking about when collaboration is not appropriate. Remember that if your time is short, if

your issues are unimportant or the goals of others are wrong, then that is when that collaboration style would not be the most beneficial.

Courtney Chambers: Very good thanks Julie. We will give a few minutes for others to type questions. We had somebody comment that they thought the chameleon in the middle could also equal a fox. Any thoughts on that? Agree or disagree?

Julie Marcy: Courtney, let's try to open up again in a few minutes and hopefully our other individual has muted their lines so that our folks that are only connected on the phone can ask questions.

Courtney Chambers: Okay great.

Julie Marcy: (Kelly) in Chat is asking if there a decision tree for which style of conflict resolution to use? I have not seen an actual decision tree (Kelly). I have seen charts similar to the great chart that Andrea shared with us. Andrea and Cindy have you seen an actual decision tree?

Andrea Carson: We were hoping the chart would serve the purpose of a decision tree, but I've actually heard a couple of other people ask whether the decision tree exists. It doesn't, but it sounds like even having something a little bit more parsed out for your situation would actually be useful So, that might be something that we were creating in the future.

Julia Marcy: And Andrea I see another question there from (Michael).

Andrea Carson: "How to implement collaboration when the other person or group is a competing style?" And that's great. And (Michael) to answer your question I think that gets to the point that I was trying to make about if you're the collaborator having other people see the value in collaboration. And so often

times it's working with that idea for the competitor: if they don't understand what their - the big win is, if they understand the war instead of the battle or the big picture rather than the quick win then they might be more likely to engage in the collaboration.

So explaining why it's in their interest to negotiate and worthwhile really could take you a long way of bringing them out of their competing style and having them recognize that the collaboration is actually the better approach in that sense. But as a collaborator if you recognize that they are competing, you might also try to understand based off of that the chart we were looking at as to whether the issue is important to them and is it important to me?

So walking through the chart and trying to identify what it is you need to articulate to them should really make them see the value and collaborating could take you a long way.

Julie Marcy: This is Julie again. If we could ask everyone to individually mute their phone. Courtney, why don't we try to open it up again so our folks on the phone have an opportunity?

Courtney Chambers: Certainly and also notice the poll is now available.

Julie Marcy: We still have some background noise, but let's go ahead and try to take questions from folks on the line. Our meeting will not cut off at the designated end time, so if you can stay a little longer we'll hang in there and answer a few more questions. Does anyone on the phone have another question for us?

(Nicole): Yes, could I ask a question? (Nicole) from Louisiana.

Courtney Chambers: Hi (Nicole).

(Nicole): I know I was one of the participants that couldn't (follow along on the computer). Is there any way we'll be able to access some slides?

Julie Marcy: Yes (Nicole) this is Julie. I've actually I sent all the slides to (Paul Firman) who forwarded the invitation to many of you, but it appears he's out of the office today. I am going to follow-up on that to make sure that we get the PowerPoint to all of you.

(Nicole): Okay I appreciate it.

Julie Marcy: We are also recording, so we will have recorded slides with narrative and a transcript.

(Nicole): Okay thank you.

Julie Marcy: You are welcome. Any other questions on the phone?

Courtney Chambers: About 50% of our participants answered our poll about future topics and we really appreciate your feedback on that. If you did have a suggestion for another topic like in selection E, please submit your suggestion to the Chat box so we can receive your idea.

Cindy Wood: This is Cindy Wood and I'm going to be signing off. I appreciate everybody's participation I enjoyed it. Thank you.

Courtney Chambers: Thanks Cindy.

Julie Marcy: Any other questions from any participants?

(Karen White): Yes this is (Karen White) calling from the National Guard Bureau. If we can't access the Chat box, how are we to get suggestions to you?

Courtney Chambers: If you are comfortable sharing it over the phone line we'll take them like that or you can Julie at Julie.B.Marcy@usace.army.mil.

Courtney Chambers: We are sorry that these slides were not available ahead of time, but we are very happy that you were able to join and hope that you can participate in our future meetings.

(Karen White): Okay.

Courtney Chambers: Are there any other questions before we wrap up today? Any final comments Andrea or Julie before we finish?

Julie Marcy: This is Julie… thank you everyone for joining us. For those who took the time to give us some feedback on future topics or will be emailing those to me, we really appreciate that because we want to be sure that the topics we're addressing meet your current needs and challenges. Andrea, did you have any additional thoughts?

Andrea Carson: No but thank you all for attending and have a great day.

Julie Marcy: Remember that we will have the PowerPoint and transcript available in our archive, so you will have access to all of those. Thank you and that will conclude our session.

END