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Symposium and Reports: General Themes and focus – Teams and training

1. Packing for Mars: International Research on Humans in Space
2. Participation in NATO and International Research
3. Successful Teams in Global Organizations
4. USN International cooperative clinical and research efforts
5. International Students at National Defense University Washington DC
6. Unpacking when you get to Mars.
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Dr. Bob Roland, Psy.D. Clinical/Operational Psychologist (Col, US Army, Retired)
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- Tom Williams 0835-0850
  **Title:** NASA – Human factors research. Where it is going.

- Armando Estrada 0850-0900
  **Title:** International contributions to Military Psychology, the journal of Division 19; Future trends and directions.

- Emery Clayton et al. 0905-0920
  **Title:** Identifying the differentiating characteristics of successful teams in a global organization.

- Scott Johnston 0925-0940
  **Title:** US Navy, Operational psychology and International outreach

- Stephen Bowles et al 0945-1000
  **Title:** Strategic Leadership Development for International Leaders

- Paul Bartone 1005-1020
  **Title:** Examples of NASA Research – Seminar wrap-up
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Dr. Armando X. Estrada, Ph.D. Research Psychologist at US Army Research Institute for the Social Sciences, Aberdeen, MD, Current Journal Editor of *Military Psychology*. Member APA CODAPAR, Past President and Fellow Division 19.

Emery Clayton, Doctoral Student, Industrial-Organizational Psychology at North Carolina State University. Representing the Cisco Project Authors: (US) Hayes, M., Davis, R.D., Kovach, R. and (UK) Buckingham, M., and Goodall, A.

Dr. Scott L. Johnston, PhD, ABPP (CAPT MSC USN) Navy Clinical Psychology Specialty Leader and Director, Naval Center for Combat & Operational Stress Control Bureau of Medicine and Surgery (M3) scott.johnston@med.navy.mil


Dr. Paul T. Bartone, Ph.D. (Col. US Army, Retired) Research Psychologist as listed above.
Contributing Colleagues, Authors, and Consultants:
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Captain Daniel Ford MA (Hons), PRINCE2, Registered Psychologist, Papakura Military Camp, New Zealand Army, Daniel.ford@nzdf.mil.nz

Dr. Mark Staal, Ph.D. (LTC, USAF, Ret) Operational/Aerospace Psychologist, Former AFSOC Command Psychologist. NASA Fellow and Astronaut Selection Psychologist, now Operational Psychologist BAH, Preservation of the Force and Family. President Elect 2017, Division 19 APA.

Dr. Arlene Saityzk, Ph.D. (CDR, USN), Operational/Aerospace Psychologist, Group Psychologist. Marine Corps Embassy Security Group, Quantico, VA. NASA Astronaut Selection Psychologist. Member-at-Large, Division 19, APA

Dr. Laura I. Neely, PsyD, Research Personnel Psychologist, Defense Suicide Prevention Office. Division 19 representative to The Committee on International Relations Program of the APA (CIRP). laura.I.neely2.civ@mail.mil - See Sample Reports in the Battle book. CIRP and NATO.

Dr. Kim Seaton, Ph.D. Psychologist, Behavioral Health & Performance KBR WYLE, UTMB. 2400 NASA Parkway, Houston, TX77058, USA Office 281.212.1394 kimberly.seaton@nasa.gov

Emery Clayton, MS, Doctoral Student, Industrial-Organizational Psychology at North Carolina State University. Leadership Selection and Assessment Consultant, at CISCO. www.ImpactThread.org amclayton4@gmail.com

Roxanne Bixby Davis, Team Analytics and Research, CISCO – rbisby@cisco.com

Mary Hayes, M.A., The Marcus Buckingham Company, Senior Researcher – mary.hayes@tmbc.com

Invited Attendees/Discussants:

Captain (Army) Niclas Wisén, Licensed Psychologist and Ph.D. Student. Swedish Armed Forces, Unit for Veterans Affairs and Karolinska Institute Department of Experimental Traumatology.

Gunilla Sundqvist, Licensed Psychologist. Swedish Armed Forces, Unit for Veterans Affairs.

Sally Leverty, International Affairs Assistant, Office of International Affairs at The American Psychological Association Washington DC, slererty@apa.org.
Dr. Ann T. Landes, Ph.D. Clinical Psychologist, Health Behavior Coordinator/Primary Care Psychologist North Florida/South Georgia Veterans Health System. President Division 19 APA.

Dr. Sally Harvey, Ph.D., (Col USA, Ret.) Clinical/Operational and Neuro-Psychologist, Former INSCOM Command Psychologist, President Elect (2016) Division 19 APA.

Dr. Mike Mathews, Ph.D. Department of Behavioral Sciences and Leadership, Professor of Engineering Psychology, Deputy Department Head, International Faculty Coordinator. U.S. Military Academy West Point, NY. Past President of Division 19 APA. Fellow of APA and Division 19.

Dr. Michael J. Schwerin, PhD, (CDR, USNR) Research Psychologist, Deputy Program Manager Northrop Grumman. Fellow of APA and Division 19.
Dr. Bob Roland  
Owner at Robert Roland, A Behavioral Sciences Research and Development Company  
RobertR885@gmail.com

---

Summary

Publications: 
See attached Resume

---

Experience

Independent Business Owner at Robert Roland - A Behavioral Sciences Independent Contracting Business  
June 2004 - Present (12 years 3 months)  
- Strategic, Operational and Tactical Consulting in:  
  Behavioral Sciences Research and Support, Program Development & Management, Assessment & Selection.  
Following 31 years of Active Duty US Army commissioned service in 2004, he founded a company focused upon USG, Corporate and International customers. He has executed more than 20 domestic and international R&D contracts covering Recruitment, Assessment, Selection, Training (RAST), and other Support services.

Senior Research Associate at US Army War College  
May 2001 - December 2010 (9 years 8 months)  
- Consultant for the Leadership Development Program. Assisted in the design of the program. Provided Executive level feedback to hundreds of US and Foreign Students (05 to GO) at National Defense University and Army War College from 2001 until 2010.

Behavioral Sciences at Teaching Experience  
July 1973 - December 2010 (37 years 6 months)  
- Dr Roland is an internationally recognized behavioral sciences subject matter expert in military settings. His teaching experience spans 4 decades having held ten academic appointments at Local, State, Overseas, Private and USG institutions from Instructor to Full Professor and Senior Research Fellow. He established The Professor of Behavioral Sciences position for a military psychologist and taught strategic leadership at the Industrial College (Now Eisenhower School) at National Defense University (NDU) Washington, D.C.

Senior Research Fellow at Center For Technology and National Security Policy  
May 2004 - May 2005 (1 year 1 month)  
- Research on the efficacy of SOF Assessment and Selection Programs. Developed and taught an elective course on Bioterrorism. Position was externally funded.

Professor Of Behavioral Sciences at National Defense University - ICAF  
September 2001 - May 2004 (2 years 9 months)
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Tom Williams, Ph.D.
Senior Scientist, Behavioral Health and Performance, Behavioral Health Program, NASA
thomas.j.williams1.civ@mail.mil

Experience

Senior Scientist, Behavioral Health and Performance (BHP) and Director, BHP Laboratory at Wyle Integrated Science and Engineering Group
October 2015 - Present (11 months)

Director, Senior Leader Development and Resiliency at U.S. Army War College
October 2012 - October 2015 (3 years 1 month)

Director, Army Physical Fitness Research Institute at U.S. Army War College
June 2002 - September 2012 (10 years 4 months)

Skills & Expertise

Command
Leadership Development
Military
Operational Planning
Intelligence Analysis
Defense
Policy
Counterterrorism
DoD
Intelligence
Military Experience
Military Operations
Strategic Planning
Top Secret
Special Operations
Foreign Policy
Army
Weapons
Emergency Management
Information Assurance
Crisis Management
Government
Interagency Coordination
Exercise Physiology
Force Protection
National Security
Behavioral Health and Performance

February 6, 2013

The Behavioral Health and Performance (BHP) Element conducts and supports research to reduce the risk of behavioral and psychiatric conditions. These include performance decrements due to inadequate cooperation and communication within a team and the risk of errors due to fatigue resulting from sleep loss or work overload.

Long-duration missions, beyond low Earth orbit, will require crews to adapt to increasingly autonomous operations in isolated, confined, and extreme environments. Crews are faced with other challenges such as long periods of heavy workload, separation from home, and altered day-night/light cycles. Microgravity, carbon dioxide, and radiation are other factors that may also lead to debilitating neurobehavioral and performance outcomes. BHP’s strategy for addressing its risk reduction research is derived in a systematic manner and driven by operations. Spaceflight analogs and other research environments are carefully assessed to ensure that the individual, team, environment, and mission characteristics fit the research question at hand. To address these concerns, BHP categorizes research into three areas: Behavioral Medicine, Team Risk, and Sleep Risks. The Behavioral Medicine Risk area aims to develop self-assessment tools for early detection and treatment that use obtrusive and objective measures of mood, cognitive function, and other behavioral reactions to living and working in space. The Team Risk area examines team performance and other team-related outcomes, including crew cohesion and communication, to develop tools and technologies that monitor and support teams throughout autonomous operations. The Sleep Risk area focuses on countermeasure development, including lighting protocols, medication recommendations, education, and tools that optimize work-rest schedules. The end result is to provide technologies and tools that will optimize the adaptation of the individual and crew to the space environment, and maintain motivation, cohesion, communication, morale, well-being, and productivity.
Armando Estrada
Senior Research Psychologist, Department of Defense

Summary
Armando X. Estrada is currently a Senior Research Psychologist within the Department of Defense. He previously served on the faculty at Washington State University; The US Naval Postgraduate School; The Industrial College of the Armed Forces and the National Defense University. He earned his BS and MS in Psychology from the California State University at Los Angeles and PhD in Industrial and Organizational Psychology from the University of Texas at El Paso. His research focuses on factors influencing cohesion, readiness, resilience and effectiveness within large scale organizations; and factors influencing the career progression of women and minorities within work organizations. Prior to his professional career, Dr. Estrada served in the United States Marine Corps.

Experience
Senior Research Psychologist at United States Department of Defense
July 2011 - Present (5 years 2 months)

Associate Professor at Washington State University
August 2005 - August 2013 (8 years 1 month)

Research Associate Professor at Naval Postgraduate School
2002 - 2005 (3 years)

Research Associate Professor at National Defense University
2002 - 2005 (3 years)

Languages
Spanish

Skills & Expertise
University Teaching
Science
Teaching
Academic Advising
Statistics
College Teaching
Research
Curriculum Development
Qualitative Research
Military Psychology®

Editor: Armando X. Estrada
ISSN: 0899-5605
eISSN: 1532-7876
Published: Bi-monthly, beginning in January
Impact Factor: 0.549
Psychology - Multidisciplinary: 101 of 129
This journal is a publication of APA Division 19 (Society for Military Psychology)

View Table of Contents and Online First Publication
Read Sample Articles
Journal Snapshot
Advertising Information

5-Year Impact Factor: 1.074

Military Psychology® is the bimonthly journal of APA’s Division 19 (Society for Military Psychology). The journal seeks to facilitate the scientific development of military psychology by encouraging communication between researchers and practitioners.

The domain of military psychology is the conduct of research or practice of psychological principles within a military environment. The journal publishes behavioral science research articles having military applications in the areas of clinical and health psychology, training and human factors, manpower and personnel, social and organizational systems, and testing and measurement.

Topics of major concern to military psychology will be covered in special journal issues.

Military Psychology is international in scope, and the editors encourage submission of articles that address research being carried out in a variety of national settings.

Subscribe to the RSS feed for Military Psychology

Military Psychology® is a registered trademark of American Psychological Association
Emery Clayton
Leadership Selection and Assessment Consultant at Cisco

Experience

**Leadership Selection and Assessment Consultant at Cisco**

July 2016 - Present (2 months)

Leadership and Team Intelligence: Connector/Teacher

# Design selection systems for all levels of leaders that are relevant for a forward thinking, digital, fast-moving company.

# Conduct executive leadership assessments, facilitate teams and coach individual executives.

# Contribute as part of a larger team involved with coaching, succession planning and leadership development.

# Manage whole or substantial parts of development programs, assessment processes or projects or interventions.

# Maintain and develop professional knowledge and experience at the highest level.

**Founding Partner at Impact Thread**

December 2015 - Present (9 months)

Boutique Industrial-Organizational Psychology Consulting Services. Responsible for: business development, selection system creation, metric development, impact evaluation, creation of recruitment and retention strategy, customer relationships, survey design and data collection, and analytics, in both national and international organizations.

**Industrial-Organizational Psychology Researcher at United States Army Special Operations Command (USASOC)**

May 2014 - Present (2 years 4 months)

**Board Member at Nourish International**

April 2014 - Present (2 years 5 months)

**Industrial-Organizational Cross-Functional PhD Researcher at Cisco**

May 2015 - July 2016 (1 year 3 months)

Responsible for: Conducting job analyses, test validation, project management, developing tests/assessment tools, researching and applying innovative statistical methods and techniques to solve complex human resource management and business problems.

**Industrial-Organizational Psychology Instructor at North Carolina State University**

August 2014 - May 2016 (1 year 10 months)

**Co Director, Impact Careers Initiative at The Aspen Institute**
Identifying the differentiating characteristics of successful teams in a global organization.

Mary Hayes, Roxanne Bisby Davis, Marcus Buckingham, Ashley Goodall, Emery Clayton & Robert Kovach

August 2016
Organizational Structure is changing…

From Traditional HR Hierarchy

To Dynamic Team Structure

Teams That Play to Their Strengths = Higher Engagement

Higher Engagement = Increased Performance

1.4 MILLION EMPLOYEES
50,000 TEAMS
192 ORGANIZATIONS

Customer Satisfaction 10%
Productivity 21%
Profitability 22%

-25% Turnover
-37% Absenteeism
-48% Safety Incidents

(LESS)
(GREATER)

(Gallup, 2013, 2016)
Research Hypotheses

1. Higher levels of overall engagement exist on high-performing teams as compared to the rest of the organization.

2. Mean differences on individual engagement items can differentiate between the Study Teams and Control group.

3. Using one’s strengths is influenced by multiple aspects of engagement.
Methodology Behind Discovering Our Best Teams

In partnership with The Marcus Buckingham Company we:

- Identified **Study Teams** of 97 high-performing teams as identified by leadership
- Identified a **Control Group** through a **Stratified Random Sample** of Cisco
- Deployed a confidential **12 item survey** to the Study Teams and Control Group with identical messaging
  - Eight items were from the TMBC Engagement Pulse
  - Four items were created on additional topics of interest (inclusion, collaboration, work-life integration and met needs) to validate if they had any influence on the eight already-tested engagement questions
- Examined the differences in **measured responses** of the Study Teams and Control Group
- Provided Leaders with results that **compare their teams** to other top teams across Cisco and the Control Group

*For more information on the research behind the eight of the items included in this study, please see: [TMBC Engagement Pulse Whitepaper](#)
All Surveys Involved the Following Statements

The Marcus Buckingham Company
Engagement Pulse Statements*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“We”</th>
<th>“Me”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am really enthusiastic about the mission of my company.</td>
<td>At work, I clearly understand what is expected of me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Purpose)</td>
<td>(Alignment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In my team, I am surrounded by people who share my values.</td>
<td>I have a chance to use my strengths everyday at work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Shared understanding of excellence)</td>
<td>(Best of me now)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My teammates have my back.</td>
<td>I know I will be recognized for excellent work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Safety)</td>
<td>(Attention to me)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have great confidence in my company’s future.</td>
<td>In my work, I am always challenged to grow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Communication &amp; Leadership Confidence)</td>
<td>(Best of me in the future)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Validation Questions**

| 9 | In my team my voice always counts.                                        |
|   | (Inclusion)                                                               |
| 10 | I really look forward to working with each of my team mates.             |
|    | (Collaboration)                                                          |
| 11 | My work fits my life.                                                    |
|    | (Work/Life integration)                                                  |
| 12 | My manager is quickly available whenever I need to talk.                |
|    | (Met needs)                                                              |

5 point scale:  ○ Strongly Disagree  ○ Disagree  ○ Neutral  ○ Agree  ○ Strongly Agree

*© 2016 TMBC; For more information on the research behind the eight items included in this study, please see: TMBC Engagement Pulse Whitepaper

© 2016 Cisco and/or its affiliates. All rights reserved. Cisco Confidential
Response Rate: Participation

Details

• The distribution of both groups is similar in most strata (particularly in key representation areas*)

• The Control Group was over-sampled due to the historically low response rate at Cisco.

Study = 80% response rate (n=815)  Control = 60% response rate (n=2,139)  Proportion of Cisco Population

Employee Level

Function

Region

*Key representation areas = Gender, Race, Age
Hypothesis #1: Higher levels of overall engagement exist on high-performing teams as compared to the rest of the organization.

*Denotes a statistically significant difference with a P<0.05
Hypothesis #2: Mean differences on individual engagement items can differentiate between the Study Teams and Control group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Study (N=815)</th>
<th>Control (N=2,139)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1 Mission</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>4.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2 Expectations*</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>4.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3 Values*</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>4.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4 Strengths*</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>4.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5 Teammates*</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>4.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6 Recognized*</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>4.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7 Confidence</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>4.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8 Grow*</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>4.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Denotes a statistically significant difference with a P<0.05
Hypothesis #3: Using one’s strengths is influenced by multiple aspects of engagement.

Using Study Teams data only, item 4 was regressed on to the remainder of the survey in order to understand the relationship being able to use strengths every day had on the other facets of engagement.

Revealed: Item 4 - “I have the chance to use my strengths everyday” has the strongest connection to the other items within the survey.

| 2. At work, I clearly know what is expected of me. |
| 8. In my work, I am always challenged to grow. |
| 6. I know I will be recognized for excellent work. |
| 7. I have great confidence in my company’s future. |

Variance Accounted for in Model

$r^2 = .564$
Discussion

• Evidence for statistically significant differences between the Study Teams and the Control Group and helps us understand the characteristics of a “best team” at Cisco in a strengths-based environment.

• Future research should address which aspects of team engagement and performance are specific to a team’s unique environment (e.g., type, size, purpose, etc.) and which are generalizable to all teams.

• Cisco is large, global, and has a strong remote workforce. Further research should be conducted to test whether the findings apply to organizations of various sizes, in various industries, and in different countries around the world.
TOMORROW starts here.
**DIRECTOR - CAPTAIN SCOTT L. JOHNSTON**

**CAPTAIN SCOTT L. JOHNSTON** is a native Californian and received his bachelor’s degree from the University of California at Davis and his Ph.D. in clinical psychology from the Pacific Graduate School in Palo Alto, California. He also completed a postdoctoral fellowship in pediatric psychology at Harvard Medical School. He has been a licensed clinical psychologist since 1995 and is board certified in both forensic and clinical psychology.

Johnston was commissioned in 1993. During his career he has served at Naval Medical Center San Diego (NMCSD); Naval Hospital Yokosuka, Japan; Marine Barracks Washington; Presidential Helicopter Squadron One; and Naval Health Clinic Hawaii. He deployed with the Constellation Strike Group to the Persian Gulf; 31st Marine Expeditionary Unit; Charlie Surgical Company to Fallujah, Iraq; 3rd Battalion, 8th Marine Regiment to Ramadi, Iraq; 3rd Marine Regiment to Haditha, Iraq; and Joint Task Force, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba. He is currently the director for the Naval Center for Combat & Operational Stress Control in San Diego. He also serves as the specialty leader for Navy Clinical Psychology.

Academically, Johnston has published and lectured around the world on treatment of combat-related PTSD, building resilience in Marines and Sailors, and transitional interventions for returning warriors. He is currently investigating virtual reality treatments for PTSD, stress injuries in detention operations and use of meditation in substance abuse treatment.

Johnston’s awards and decorations include the Meritorious Service Medal (three awards), Joint Service Commendation Medal, Navy Commendation Medal (two awards), Navy Achievement Medal, Iraqi Campaign Medal (Fleet Marine Force), Global War on Terrorism Expeditionary Medal (Fleet Marine Force), and various service and unit awards.
The Naval Center for Combat and Operational Stress Control (NCCOSC) is a U.S. Navy Medicine organization established to promote psychological health in the U.S. Navy and Marine Corps. It is a culturally relevant center that leverages sound medical knowledge to improve resilience, preserve psychological health, improve care for sailors, marines and their families and facilitate Navy Medicine research efforts on psychological health and traumatic brain injury.

### Contents

- History
- Mission
In 2007, several American government commissions\textsuperscript{[4][5][6]} examined the healthcare systems of the United States Department of Defense and Veterans Affairs for treating warriors who were wounded in the conflicts in Afghanistan and Iraq. Sweeping recommendations for change were made, the majority of which pertained to what have become known as the signature wounds of the wars, traumatic brain injury (TBI) and posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD).

As a result, the United States Department of Defense and the Veterans Health Administration embarked on an overhaul of how their healthcare systems were addressing the needs of wounded warriors with five strategic goals reflecting the breadth of the psychological-health spectrum:

1. Provide timely access to comprehensive care.
2. Provide evidence-based and consistently excellent quality of care.
4. Promote the use of consistent and effective screening, tracking and monitoring practices.
5. Strengthen psychological health, promote resilience and reduce stigma associated with care through prevention, education, training and outreach.

The U.S. Navy provides all medical services for the Marine Corps. Funded by the Navy Bureau of Medicine and Surgery\textsuperscript{[3]} (BUMED), NCCOSC is located at the Naval Medical Center San Diego; Capt. Paul S. Hammer, a board-certified psychiatrist, was named director of the center in February 2008. Capt. Scott Johnston, a clinical psychologist, succeeded Capt. Hammer as director in April, 2011.\textsuperscript{[7]}

Mission\textsuperscript{Edit}

Naval Center for Combat and Operational Stress Control tries to improve the psychological health of Marines and sailors through comprehensive programs that educate service members, build resilience, aid research and promote best practices in the treatment of combat and operational stress injuries. NCCOSC initiatives are informed by science and provide measurable, wide-reaching results.\textsuperscript{[1]}

To achieve its mission, NCCOSC focuses on these specific areas: \textsuperscript{[1]}

- **Stress injuries, PTSD and TBI.** NCCOSC educates leaders, sailors, marines and their families to recognize the signs and symptoms of stress illnesses and TBI. It also develops and disseminates programs and tools that build psychological resilience to withstand and cope with combat and operational stress.
• **Stress Recognition and Management.** NCCOSC designs programs and products to promote resilience, emphasizing the need for it to begin in boot camp and continue through a service member’s career. Family resilience also is emphasized to help successfully manage the pressures of all phases of deployment and a high-tempo operational environment.

• **Anti-Stigma.** NCCOSC addresses negative perceptions that might be attached to any psychological health concern to overcome any barrier to seeking treatment.

• **Suicide Prevention.** NCCOSC develops instructional materials for all levels of command leaders to actively engage service members in recognizing the warning signs for suicide and the appropriate steps to take for prevention.

• **Common Standards and Processes.** NCCOSC promotes the best practices among clinicians and caregivers for achieving and maintaining psychological health.

**Major NCCOSC Projects in 2011 include:**

• Hosted annual Navy and Marine Corps Combat and Operational Stress Control Conference (April)

• Continued development and presentation of suicide-prevention training modules for various Navy communities;

• Development of psychological health pathways for Navy medical treatment facilities;

• Training military healthcare providers in evidenced-based therapies to treat combat and operational stress injuries and illnesses;

• Preparation of white papers to address evidenced-based research in such areas as resilience, PTSD and physical health, and substance abuse and operational stress;

• Expansion of outreach efforts to erase any stigma associated with seeking help for psychological health issues.

**References**


External links Edit

- Official Web Site of the United States Navy
- Official Web Site of the United States Marine Corps
- Naval Center for Combat and Operational Stress Control Public Website
Stephen Bowles
Associate Professor of Behavioral Science, Department of Leadership at National Defense University

Experience

**Associate Professor of Behavioral Science, Department of Strategic Leadership at Eisenhower School, National Defense University**

*August 2011 - Present (5 years 1 month)*

Serves on Faculty of War College teaching graduate level courses to high potential military (U.S. and International), U.S. government and industry fellows. Courses taught are Strategic Leadership, Lessons in Leadership, Health Care Strategy, Strategic Leadership Human Dimensions: Enhancing Resilience and Well-being and faculty member for Adaptive and Agile Leaders Network.

A current or past member of the following Industry Studies: Finance, Health Care (lead), News Media and Shipbuilding.

Research Projects/Interest: Leadership skills and coaching, Leader resilience and well-being, work-family resilience and well-being, and integrative healthcare.

**Director of Milt. Psych. & Leadership, Assist. Professor, Department of Medical & Clinical Psych. at Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences**

*2006 - 2011 (5 years)*

Served as the Senior Army Advisor to the President of the University for over 400 Army officers and enlisted personnel providing mentoring and career guidance. Selected as President for the Walter Reed Army Medical Center Inquiry Board. Serves as the liaison for U.S. Army, U.S. Navy, and U.S. Air Force Offices of the Surgeons General Consultants on military psychology. Provides military psychology mentorship to 25 joint service student officers. Taught Military Psychology to psychology students and Introductory Clinical Medicine to medical students. Lab research focus was in military resilience and complementary medicine. Served as an alternate member on the University Institutional Review Board.

**National Capital Region Psychology Consultant, Interim and Deputy Chief of Psychology at Walter Reed Army Medical Center**

*2004 - 2006 (2 years)*

Oversaw a 5 base region for psychology mental health operations and represented Army wide mental health operation as representative for the Army OTSG related to OIF and OEF. Lead a department of 30 staff in a major MEDCEN consisting of sections in testing and assessment, health psychology, and neuropsychology.

Education

**Alliant International University**
Strategic Leadership Development for International Leaders

COL Stephen Bowles, Ph.D.; Allison Bond; Margaret Talbot; Andrea Calderon; Matthew Allen; Raechel Martin, BA; Christine Leonhardt
Students are enrolled in a 10 month program at the two war colleges.

12% of the student body at ES and the National War College are international students.

In the past academic year, a total of 62 students, representing 54 countries, graduated from NDU.

The courses are taught in a Socratic seminar method, which provides students the abilities to think strategically and critically.

Students contribute their own insights to class discussions, attend senior leader lectures, engage with other students' remarks, and think critically about various topics of leading the National Security environment.

The students in the Leadership Department take core classes, which are composed of 40 lessons and executive coaching.
Strategic Leadership Dimension Outline

Challenges of Strategic Leadership

Trust and Empowerment

Creative Thinking

Strategic Negotiations

Diversity and Inclusion within Large Organizations

Leading Effective Organizations

Executive Coaching
Sustained Organizational Effectiveness

Source: Strategic Leadership Department, Eisenhower School

Personal Dimension

Conceptual Skills
- Sense Making
- Systems Thinking
- Perspective Taking/Reframing
- Critical/Creative Thinking
- Scanning
- Visioning

Interpersonal Skills
- Negotiating
- Communicating
- Building Consensus
- Managing Conflict
- Social Competence
- Persuading
- Building Trust

Attributes
- Integrity
- Power Orientation
- Character
- Energy
- Political Savvy

The Work of Strategic Leaders

- Building and Leading Strategic Teams
- Leveraging Power and Politics
- Engaging in Ethical Decision Making
- Managing Strat. Decision Making and Negotiation
- Aligning the Internal Environment
- Influencing Org. Climate and Culture
- Moving from Vision to Actionable Strategy
- Leading Org. Change and Transformation
- Leading Strategically in a Crisis

The Strategic Environment

- The Learning Organization
- Interagency Arena
- Internal Environment
- External Environment
- Wicked and Complex Problems
Strategic Environment

Air & Space Power Journal - Winter 2003, Col Michael Guillot, USAF
Five Dysfunctions of a Team

Results

Focus on Collective Outcomes

Accountability

Confront Difficult Issues

Commitment

Force Clarity and Course

Conflict

Mine for Conflict

Trust

Go First!

The Five Dysfunctions of a Team, A Leadership Fable, Patrick Lencioni
Report: Americans’ Trust of Institutions

Data from: http://www.gallup.com/poll/192581/americans-confidence-institutions-stays-low.aspx?g_source=CATEGORY_INSTITUTIONS&g_medium=topic&g_campaign=titles
Although companies often blame trust violations on “rogue employees” and “a few bad apples,” our research indicates that major organizational trust violations are almost never the result of rogue actors. Rather, they are predictable in organizations that allow dysfunctional, conflicting or incongruent elements of their organizational system to take root.

What is Creative Thinking?

Creative thinking requires an outlook that allows you to search for ideas and play with your knowledge and experience. With this outlook, you try different approaches, first one, then another, often not getting anywhere. You use crazy, foolish and impractical ideas as stepping stones to practical new ideas. You break the rules occasionally, and explore for ideas in unusual outside places. And in the end, your creative outlook enables you to come up with new ideas.

Roger von Oech
*A Whack on the Side of the Head*
Creative Thinking as Part of Problem Solving/Decision Making

DIVERGING

PHASE

GENERATING:
INTROSPECTION/REFLECTION
SUBJECTIVITY
INNOVATION/IDEAS
CREATIVE THINKING
DOING THINGS DIFFERENTLY
ALTERNATIVES

EVALUATING:
DISCUSSION/IMPLEMENTING
OBJECTIVITY
ADAPTATION
CRITICAL THINKING
DOING THINGS BETTER
HUMAN CONSEQUENCES
CLOSURE

CONVERGING

PHASE

TIME

Source: Strategic Leadership Department, Eisenhower School
Characteristics of Creative People

- **Dynamic**
  - Don’t allow their mind to become passive, accepting, unquestioning
    - They manage to keep their curiosity burning

- **Daring** in the sense of:
  - Relatively free of preconceived notions and prejudiced views and less inclined to accept prevailing views

- **Resourceful**
  - The ability to act effectively to conceptualize the approach that solves the problem---even when the problem stymies others and the resources at hand are meager

- **Hardworking**, determined, not intimidated by the prospect of failure, their competitiveness is directed not at people but toward ideas

- **Independent** – instead of looking to others for approval of their ideas, they look within themselves.

What are “strategic” negotiations?

- Negotiating for the long term
- Building relationships and trust for possible future negotiations
- Negotiating matters of extremely high value, risk, complexity, and consequences

**Key Point:** Strategic negotiations are about building positive relationships to handle tomorrow’s strategic crisis
BATNA

- “Best Alternative To a Negotiated Agreement”
- Your best outcome if you do not negotiate – if you walk away from the negotiations
- A good BATNA usually means a strong negotiating position

ZOPA

- “Zone Of Possible Agreement”
- The range of outcomes of the negotiations that are acceptable to all parties
- If there is no ZOPA, there is no basis for negotiations
Diversity

Demographic Diversity

Socio-Cognitive Diversity

Organizational Diversity

Shin and Park, 2013
Leading Effective Organizations
Align the Organization
Implement Change
Influence Culture
Executive Coaching

Personnel Leadership Development Plan
- Develop smart goals for professional development
- Scan social and organizational network
- Self assessment on strengths
- Next job objectives
- Monitoring progress
- ES works with students to enhance their interpersonal skills, understanding of strengths and weaknesses of their own character
- Faculty work with students through executive coaching to help students reach their specific developmental goals
Paul Bartone
Senior Research Fellow at National Defense University
bartonep@gmail.com

Summary
Colonel Paul T. Bartone, Ph.D. (U.S. Army, retired) is Senior Research Fellow at the Institute for National Strategic Studies, National Defense University. Trained as an interdisciplinary research psychologist at the University of Chicago, he is expert in applying psychological, social, cultural, and biological perspectives to the understanding of human behavior. A Fulbright Scholar (Norway, 2006-07), Bartone has taught strategic leadership at the Industrial College of the Armed Forces, National Defense University, and at the U.S. Military Academy, West Point, where he also served as Director of the West Point Leader Development Research Center. As a U.S. Army Research Psychologist, Bartone also served as the Consultant to the Surgeon General for Research Psychology, and as Assistant Corps Chief for Medical Allied Sciences. He is a past-President of the American Psychological Association’s Division 19, Society for Military Psychology, a Fellow of the American Psychological Association, a charter member of the Association for Psychological Science, and a Fulbright Research Scholar (Norway, 2007). Bartone’s research has focused on understanding and measuring resilient or “hardy” responding to stress, identifying underlying biomarkers for resilience, and applying this knowledge to improve selection, training and leader development programs. He holds a U.S. government Top Secret security clearance.

Experience
Professor and Senior Research Fellow at Center for Technology & National Security Policy, National Defense University
June 2007 - Present (9 years 3 months)
Conduct research on human dimensions factors related to defense and national security.

Senior Scientist at The Henry M. Jackson Foundation for the Advancement of Military Medicine
February 2011 - December 2014 (3 years 11 months)
Senior Scientist, conducting research on various topics related to health and resilience in military personnel, veterans and families.

Senior Advisor in Strategy and Operations at Deloitte
February 2010 - May 2012 (2 years 4 months)
Research and program consultation, development and evaluation, primarily at the Defense Center of Excellence for Psychological Health and Traumatic Brain Injury, Silver Spring, MD. Program reviews and proposal development.
Individual Differences in Adaptability for Long Duration Space Exploration Missions

Paul T. Bartone, Ph.D.
Gerald P. Krueger, Ph.D.
Robert R. Roland, Psy.D.
Albert A. Sciarretta, M.S.
Jocelyn V. Bartone, M.A.
Bjorn Helge Johnsen, Ph.D.

Center for Technology and National Security Policy
National Defense University
Washington, DC, USA

21 June 2016
Questions:

- What is adaptability?
- Where does it come from? What accounts for individual differences in adaptability?
- How does adaptability affect performance and health in ICE environments?
- How do we measure it?
- How can we enhance and sustain it?
Approach

1. Overview of general literature

2. Systematic review of published studies on adaptability in ICE

3. Operational interviews N=9, astronauts, ground controllers, polar explorers
Figure 1: A model of individual adaptability (adapted from Ployhart & Bliese, 2006; our additions appear in red italics)

Distal factors

Proximal factors

Knowledge, Skills, Abilities and Other attributes

KSAOs*

• Cognitive abilities
• Personality
• Values & Interests
• Physical attributes
• Genetic factors
• Biography, past experience

Individual Adaptability

• Handling crises
• Handling stress
• Creativity
• Uncertainty
• Learning
• Interpersonal
• Cultural
• Physical

Mediating processes

• Situation perception & appraisal
• Knowledge acquisition
• Strategy selection
• Coping strategies
• Learning strategies
• Social Support (from peers, supervisors, family)
• Sleep & chronobiology

Outcomes

• Performance
• Health
• Morale
• Survival

Environment

Changes / demands for adaptation

Reactive

Proactive
Results of systematic review: factors linked to adaptability (pp. 24-34)

- Intelligence and cognitive ability
- Emotional stability
- Control
- Openness to experience
- Conscientiousness +/-
- Optimism
- Extraversion – Introversion +/-
- Mastery - achievement orientation +/-
- Hardiness
- Past experience, background
- Sex – gender +/-
- Social support +/-
- Sleep and shift work
- Physical and biological factors
- Coping
Individual factors contributing to adaptability

“**Technical knowledge** and skill are at the core. They give the team members the confidence they need. A high level of professional and performance competence.”

“Technical skill is important, but you also need **passion**. Something drove you to work to develop those skills. Observation and curiosity, flexibility and tinkering.”

“**Experience is important.** People with more experience, that have adapted in the past, are better risks. Experience is an important factor for having the confidence to adapt.”

“Resilience & hardiness, stress tolerance, the ability to be in control of oneself, & without distractions or disorientations. To tolerate a high degree of stress & keep functioning.”

“**Control** is a related concept. In the astronauts we have a population that loves control. People who exert control, they scan, forecast, plan… that mitigates having to adapt.

“Then there are some people who are too rigid. They try to control everything. So control becomes a double-edge sword for them.”

“One of the most common things among the astronaut corps is wanting to learn new things. It sets you up for success.”

Individual differences in adaptability
Social/organizational factors contributing to adaptability

“On station - real time communication is a big part of the activity. Your relationship with home, the flight control team, policy makers. On a Mars mission, you are not going to have real time conversation. So you will have to be more independent on every level.”

“This is a subjective thing. I can’t quote policies. But no one has forgotten the lessons of Skylab when the radio was turned off by the crew. More clear and open communication is important, and not bugging the astronauts unnecessarily.”

“So the home organization must also adapt to what is going on. If the home organization is not in the proper mindset of what the deployed group is going through, there is a disconnect. And that is going to damage adaptability and performance.”

“The importance of connectedness and community was apparent. Even just the perception of connectedness gives some structure of normal life to the setting.”
Implications for enhancing / sustaining adaptability (pp. 63-67)

1. Training and preparation
2. Knowledge and skills
3. Habitability
4. Privacy
5. Journaling
6. Control
7. Connections with home
8. Care packages
9. Crew debriefings
10. Compensatory self-improvement
11. News and information
12. Special meals
13. Personal electronic libraries
Individual differences in adaptability

Implications for additional research - general (pp. 67-68)

1. Clarify concepts and presumed relations (models are useful)
2. Longitudinal studies (to determine causal directions)
3. Investigate processes, not just associations
4. Improve – develop adaptability measures (derive from SBMT?)
5. Converging indicators – psychological, physiological, performance)
Implications for additional research - specific (pp. 68-71)

1. Hardiness & individual differences in resistance to sleep loss
2. Chronobiology – circadian rhythm physiology (JK)
3. Assessing adaptability through astronaut communications
4. Use astronaut journals to understand adaptability
5. Mental workload management as an adaptability indicator (AS)
6. Biomarkers of adaptability in an Arctic traverse
7. Genetic markers for adaptability (T. Williams)
Individual differences in adaptability

Featured in Spring 2016 issue of “The Military Psychologist”
Additional background materials provided by discussants
The audience received an excellent impromptu presentation from Captain (Army) Niclas Wisén, Licensed Psychologist and Ph.D. Student. Swedish Armed Forces, Unit for Veterans Affairs and Karolinska Institute Department of Experimental Traumatology. Captain Wisén described efforts by the Swedish Armed Forces to incorporate aspects of the US Navy’s COSC (Combat Operational Stress Control) model into its psychological support programs.
I provide the psychological support for the HERA studies, which include some international researchers (three German studies).

https://www.nasa.gov/analogs/hera/research

Additionally, here are some links to videos introducing SPACECOT (Study Physiological and Anatomical Cerebral Effect of CO2 and Tilt), studies funded by NSBRI to look at effects of spaceflight simulation on the brain. International partners are conducting the studies in Germany at the :envihab facility.

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DD8x3RZY26Q&sns=em

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ErBi_CZ097M&sns=em

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BHZG8_T1dQY&sns=em
CDR Arlene Saitzyk, Ph.D., Group Psychologist, Marine Corps Embassy Security Group, Quantico, VA. Member at Large, Division 19, APA

Arlene Saitzyk received her Ph.D. from Michigan State University, specializing in Child/Family Clinical Psychology. Her desire to “see the world” propelled her to join the Navy. She has served in hospitals, clinics, and schools in the U.S., overseas, and aboard an aircraft carrier. “Winged” as an Aerospace Experimental Psychologist, she also served at the Naval Aerospace Medical Institute. She is currently stationed with the Marine Corps Embassy Security Group. Dr. Saitzyk is a member of APA, and Division 19, Society for Military Psychology. She chaired the Division 19 Clinical Practice committee, and was recently elected as Member at Large.


Laura L. Neely, Psy.D.

Dr. Laura Neely is a Licensed Psychologist in the State of Maryland. She earned her doctorate in Clinical Psychology from Nova Southeastern University in Fort Lauderdale, FL. She completed her APA accredited pre-doctoral internship at Saint Elizabeth’s Hospital in Washington, D.C. where she gained expertise in the treatment of individuals who are suicidal or suffering from severe mental illness. Dr. Neely completed a two-year Postdoctoral Fellowship in Dr. Marjan Holloway’s Laboratory for the Treatment of Suicide-Related Ideation and Behavior at the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences where she focused on clinical trials methodology, psychotherapy outcome research, and the application of cognitive behavior therapy to patients with histories of attempted suicide. She then served as the Associate Director of the lab for over two years, where she provided oversight and operational leadership for the day-to-day management of clinical research activities that focused on suicide prevention for military personnel. Dr. Neely is currently serving as a Research Personnel Psychologist at the Department of Defense Suicide Prevention Office, Research and Program Evaluation, where she manages a research portfolio and supports an integrated public health, community-based approach to suicide prevention.
Report Objective
To describe Division 19 international activities, interests, and plans, as well as share ideas about needs and opportunities that CIRP may address.

Division 19 Mission
The Society for Military Psychology encourages research and the application of psychological research to military problems. Society members include a growing network of psychologists and other social scientists who are united by their interests in applying psychological principles to a broad range of issues related to global security, peace and stability, and to improving the lives and well-being of millions of men and women who serve in the armed forces and defense agencies of nations throughout the world. There are currently 100 professional affiliates, 475 student affiliates, and 15 international affiliates.

Division 19 International Activities
Division 19 (D19) has formed a committee on International Military Psychology that is co-chaired by Dr. Robert Roland & Dr. Paul Bartone. The following is a summary of the committee’s international activities and progress to date.

- Increased strength of D19’s international reach and number of international contributions to our journal, Military Psychology.
- Appointed new members to the International committee: Dr. Rose Rice, US Navy; Dr. Marty Wiskoff, Founding Editor, Military Psychology journal; Dr. Stephen A. Truhon, Austin Peay State University; and Dr. Hubert Annen of Switzerland.
- Facilitated collaboration with the International Military Testing Association (IMTA). In April, 2015, the D19 President sent a letter to Dr. Jacque Mylle, Membership Chair for the IMTA. We requested a re-designation of D19 as associate of IMTA and an appointment of a liaison, Dr. Marty Wiskoff. Dr. Wiskoff is a former President of D19, Founding Editor of the Military Psychology journal, and two time IMTA Lifetime Achievement award winner. Dr. Wiskoff represented D19 at the September IMTA meeting in Stockholm, Sweden, and formally briefed the D19 application.
- Continued international military psychology collaboration with various NATO partners in Recruitment, Assessment, Selection and Training (RAST), with D19 members providing host nation support.
- Presented innovative mental health and sustainment program centered upon “Preservation of the Force and Family” modeled after US Special Operations programs, which focused on military resilience and family support programs. A roundtable session was held in the D19 Hospitality Suite in Toronto, August 2015, with United States, Canadian, and other international contributors. See http://www.hardiness-resilience.com/docs/Battlebook-160-pages-30AUG2015.pdf for a summary.
- Continued research collaboration with Norwegian military psychologists at the University of Bergen (various topics), including development of course on military operational psychology (Dr. Bartone & Dr. Eid).
Initiated a program to bring international military psychologists to West Point for teaching/research fellowships (Dr. Matthews).

Provided the keynote address at the Congress of Italian Military Psychologists, Sapienza University, Rome, Italy, June 2015 (Dr. Bartone).

**Division 19 Needs to be Addressed by CIRP**

- We would like to encourage international military psychologist attendance at the APA annual convention by providing reserved program time and/or funding for travel. This can be accomplished by providing time in the D19 hospitality suite, and/or a special international section during the poster session(s). CIRP can facilitate this providing funding for international military psychologist members to travel to APA meetings.

- We would like to encourage more international student involvement. This can be accomplished by establishing student chapters in military psychology at foreign universities and providing travel grants for foreign student members. CIRP can assist in creating more incentives for international student participation through student travel awards.

**Summary**

A strength of Division 19 is its international reach and participation. Through our international activities, we have upheld CIRP’s broad goal of increasing awareness and opportunities for APA and psychology to be involved in international activities promoting human health, education and welfare, and in international policy arenas. We would like to work towards CIRP’s broad goal of increasing the number and engagement of APA’s international affiliates and members. We respectfully request CIRP’s assistance to facilitate this mission by providing funding for travel for international military psychologist members and students.

Report prepared by Laura Neely, Psy.D., Division 19 Liaison for APA’s CIRP. Correspondence may be addressed to:

Laura L. Neely, Psy.D.
Associate Director, Laboratory for the Treatment of Suicide-Related Ideation and Behavior
Assistant Professor, Department of Medical and Clinical Psychology
Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences
4301 Jones Bridge Road
Bethesda, MD 20814-4799
Office Phone: 301-295-4158
Fax: 301-295-3034
Email: laura.neely.ctr@usuhs.edu
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Enabling Defence Innovation through International S&T Collaboration
MILITARY SUICIDE PREVENTION (HFM-218)

This is the first international Working Group striving to understand, scope and address the problem of military suicide across all NATO Member and Partner Nations.

Dr. Marjan Ghahramanlou-Holloway, USA, Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences

BACKGROUND

Globally, suicide is the second leading cause of death among individuals between the ages of 15 – 29 years (World Health Organisation (WHO), 2014). Suicide remains a significant public health problem for the armed forces. NATO’s evolving crisis management operations across various regions of the world require that increasing attention be paid to psychological fitness and effective strategies that provide timely and evidence-based practices to service members with suicidal intentions.

OBJECTIVE(S)

The objective was to foster international collaboration across NATO Member and Partner Nations for the exchange of ideas and strategies for the prevention of military suicide.

S&T ACHIEVEMENTS

RTG/HFM-218 designed a survey to collect epidemiological data on military suicides, as well as information on suicide prevention, intervention practices, and potential gaps. This systemic data collection, along with literature reviews, and consensus-building meetings among experts, led to recommendations for the development of standardised procedures, definitions, and systematic surveillance for documenting military suicides internationally. Moreover, a series of nine white papers on the following topics have been prepared for NATO leadership: Military Suicide Prevention; Role of Leadership in Suicide Prevention; Myths and Facts on Military Suicide; Technology Based Suicide Prevention; Stigma and Barriers to Care; Tactical Level Leadership; Risk-Taking Behaviours and Suicide; Military Life Stages; and Policy Recommendations on Military Suicide.

SYNERGIES AND COMPLEMENTARITIES

Overall, a total of 14 NATO Nations and three Partner Nations participated in this international effort to systematically collect information on military suicide.

EXPLOITATION AND IMPACT

Military suicide prevention strategies such as minimising stigma and barriers to care, and maximising leadership involvement in promoting timely help-seeking behaviours, will enhance mission readiness, unit morale/cohesion, psychological fitness, hopefulness, and personnel performance.

CONCLUSIONS

According to the WHO, “suicides are preventable”. RTG/HFM-218 acknowledges the significant contributions of NATO leadership, service members themselves, and the military community in preventing suicides. The sharing of knowledge, best practices, and lessons learned across NATO Member, Partner, and contributing Nations is essential in taking the important next step in addressing the public health problem of military suicide.
Mark Staal  
Senior Consulting Associate

Summary

Operational Support Solutions (OSS) is the definitive support solution to complex operational and personnel environments. We apply innovative tactics, techniques, and technologies to enhance national security operations and corporate objectives. This includes: personnel assessment and selection, consultation to strategic communications, leadership development, executive coaching, personnel debriefing, organizational climate assessment, and specialized training support.

http://www.operationalsupportsolutions.com/

Experience

Chief Executive Officer at Operational Support Solutions, LLC  
2013 - Present (3 years)

The OSS staff has been hand-selected based on their training, professionalism, and fidelity. Our lead evaluators have over 25 years of Special Operations and Inter-Agency operational support experience to include assessment and selection of personnel, leadership consultation, and personnel training and development.

As nationally recognized experts, OSS staff have provided direct support to units within US Special Operations Command, NASA’s Astronaut selection program, and the Intelligence community. Our psychologists have provided consultation to sensitive national security activities and high-level strategic communications to include writing briefs for the Secretary of Defense and members of the National Security Council.

All OSS staff psychologists are doctoral-level consultants who are independently licensed/board certified, with extensive operational support experience. Each of our staff holds a current security clearance and all have successfully completed rigorous screening procedures prior to providing support to any OSS initiatives.

Skills & Expertise

Executive Coaching  
Training  
Leadership Development  
Strategic Communications  
Strategic Planning  
Strategy
Stress, Cognition, and Human Performance: A Literature Review and Conceptual Framework

Mark A. Staal
Ames Research Center, Moffett Field, California

This document is available for download at: http://human-factors.arc.nasa.gov/flightcognition/Publications/IH_054_Staal.pdf

National Aeronautics and Space Administration

Ames Research Center
Moffett Field, California 94035

August 2004
Roxanne Bisby Davis is a Sr. Manager in the Leadership and Team Intelligence organization at Cisco Systems. For over a decade she has guided the organization in their understanding of the employee experience. Her charter is to combine expertise with business context that leads to action and outcomes in service of employee sentiment. This is done through investigation, analysis, data visualization and working across all levels of the organization to share insights and recommendation.

Roxanne is an active board member of the Information Technology Survey Group (ITSG), a consortium of employee research practitioners. Here she is championing the change amongst the IT industry on how we approach and analyze employee feedback.
Mary Hayes, MA, serves as the Senior Researcher for The Marcus Buckingham Company. Mary has a Master’s degree from University of Nebraska - Lincoln in Qualitative, Quantitative, and Psychometric methods. She is in the final stages of completion of her PhD in Educational Leadership with a minor in Survey Research Methodology.
Identifying the Differentiating Characteristics of Successful Teams in a Global Organization
Mary M. Hayes and Marcus Buckingham
The Marcus Buckingham Company, Beverly Hills, CA
Roxanne Bisby Davis, Ashley Goodall, Emery Clayton, and Robert Kovach
Cisco Systems, Inc., San Jose, CA

July 21, 2016
Introduction

Traditional organizational hierarchies are giving way to organic structures that function more fluidly as groups of teams. Haslam and Reicher (2016) recently wrote that, in light of this new reality, leadership needs to shift from the glorified "I" of the leader to the collective "we" in teams in order to be successful. Leader effectiveness is beginning to be evaluated not as an individual measure of success, but as a reflection of those on their team (Bennis, 1999). Leaders, like coaches, must engage their followers and understand the strengths of all team members (Haslam & Reicher, 2016).

An engaged workforce has been shown to have strong connections to meaningful and beneficial organizational outcomes (Harter, Schmidt & Hayes, 2002). Employee engagement has been shown to have a statistical relationship with higher levels of performance (e.g., Harter et al., 2002; Saks, 2006; Rich, LePine & Crawford, 2010), profitability (e.g., Harter et al., 2002; Harter, Schmidt, Killham, & Agrawal, 2009), safety (e.g., Harter et al., 2009; Nahrgang, Morgeson & Hofmann, 2011; Wachter & Yorio, 2014; Zohar, 2000), customer satisfaction (e.g., Coffman & Gonzalez-Molina, 2002), and lower turnover and intention to leave (e.g., Bakker, Demerouti & Euwema, 2005; Brunetto et al., 2014; Harter et al., 2002; Saks, 2006; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004). In addition, employee engagement at the business unit level has been connected to customer satisfaction, productivity, profit, employee turnover, and accident rates (e.g., Harter, Schmidt & Hayes, 2002; Schneider, Macey, Barbera & Martin, 2009; Xanthopoulou, Bakker, Heuven, Demerouti, & Schaufeli, 2008).

Just like players on a sports team, each employee has characteristics that make him or her successful in one area over another. To be effective a leader must understand and build the team around these strengths (Percy, 2016). Over the past several decades, there has been a shift in
psychology to understand the entire human experience from suffering to happiness (Seligman, Steen, Park & Peterson, 2005), i.e., Positive Psychology, the study of what makes an individual strong as opposed to weak (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000). This approach has led to the development of strengths-based techniques to help individuals reach their potential by focusing on what makes them feel strong. Cisco Systems (Cisco), realizing this shift, wanted to understand further how their most successful teams are embracing and are engaged in this strengths philosophy within their culture, strategy, and economic environment.

At Cisco, teams have long been a part of the fabric that make up the company’s structure; therefore, it was an intuitive decision to evaluate the engagement of individuals in the context of their teams. The following applied research study, in partnership with The Marcus Buckingham Company (TMBC), was conducted to zero in on the differentiating engagement characteristics of individual members of identified “best” teams compared to the “rest” of the organization, specifically at Cisco. Cisco has made it a priority to define, develop, and optimize the performance of its teams.

The following study sought to define what makes up a “best” team at Cisco by identifying common characteristics and strategies. This information will be used to build more “best” teams while introducing reliable ways to measure the impact of engagement.

Three hypotheses were specifically tested during this study:

H1: Higher levels of overall engagement exist on high-performing teams as compared to the rest of the organization.

H2: Mean differences on individual engagement items will differentiate between the Study Teams and Control Group.
H3: The opportunity to use one's strengths every day is influenced by multiple aspects of engagement.

**Method**

**Participants**

Cisco leaders and HR partners were asked to identify the team they “want more like.” The teams identified were to be considered “go-to” teams when things needed to be done well, and include 5–15 members. In total, leaders and partners identified 97 teams and a population of 1,020 employees considered “best.” These teams became the Study Teams. The Control Group was created via stratified random sampling based on function, region, role, tenure, gender, generation, and ethnicity. To ensure that the control group matched the population at Cisco, Engineers were intentionally sampled separately from the rest of the group in order to capture a representative sample of the largest group within Cisco. Historically, Cisco has a low response rate for surveys; therefore, the goal sample size was increased in an attempt to achieve the desired group size. In sum, 1,200 participants from Engineering and 2,400 participants from the rest of Cisco were selected for a total of 3,600 Control Group members.

**Design and Procedure**

The selection of the teams for the "Best Teams" varied across function within the organization. Each function took a varied approach, depending on how the leaders interact with their people. Some of the executive partners felt it appropriate to enlist the help of client facing human resources (CFHR) while others left the decision to their management chain.

Once selected, Study Teams and Control Group members received five emails. To minimize the Hawthorne effect, the emails were identical for both groups. The first email was sent from a Cisco executive providing notification of the upcoming survey accompanied by an
invitation for participation. The second email came from the project coordinator echoing his invitation for participation in the online survey. The last three emails were reminders to participate, the first sent five days after the initial email, the second seven days after that, and the final sent sixteen days after the initial email. Emails can be viewed in Appendices A-F.

**Measured Variables**

Demographic information was collected to determine differences in gender and age on engagement.

**Engagement.** Twelve items ($\alpha=.87$) were contained on the survey. The first eight items originated as the TMBC Engagement Pulse and are used to assess engagement. An example item includes, “I have a chance to use my strengths every day at work.” Four additional items were created for this study to examine additional topics of interest (inclusion, collaboration, work-life integration, and met needs) and to validate whether they had any influence on the eight TMBC engagement questions. The response options for all items were a five-point Likert agreement rating scale, ranging from 1 (*Strongly Disagree*) to 5 (*Strongly Agree*). Survey items are available in Table 1. The analysis will only address the eight items included on the TMBC Engagement Pulse survey.

The intent of the Engagement Pulse survey is to measure engagement of individuals with the content zeroing in on things under the control of the team leader. The items measure causal conditions to engagement, such as mission (Balfour & Wechsler, 1990), expectations (Spreitzer, Lam & Fritz, 2010), shared values (Cannon-Bowers & Salas, 2001), job-fit (Saari & Judge, 2004), team camaraderie (Baumeister & Leary, 1995), recognition (Raft & Clifton, 2004), job clarity (Lu et al., 2014) and growth (Crawford, LePine & Rich, 2010).
Saari and Judge (2004) conclude, based on empirical studies, that the most accurate way to measure engagement is a well-constructed employee survey. The Engagement Pulse survey was designed to understand both employee engagement and leader effectiveness through the eyes of team members. The Engagement Pulse is based on decades of accumulated qualitative and quantitative research from multiple organizations and industries (TMBC, 2015). It is designed to gauge a leader’s effectiveness with his or her team. Each of the items was included based on its usefulness for a team leader to create change in the workplace.

**Results**

To test H1, whether the mean engagement score was group dependent, an independent samples t-test was conducted. The test was significant, \( t(2975) = 4.27, p < .000 \). Study Team participants scored higher \( M = 4.21(0.54) \), on average, than the Control Group participants \( M = 4.12(0.58) \). The Cohen's \( d \) (\( d = 0.16 \)) indicated that 8% of the variance of the engagement score was explained by group membership. To evaluate H2, whether items on the Engagement Pulse could differentiate between groups, a series of independent samples t-test were completed for each of the eight items. Prior to conducting analyses, all between-group comparisons were preceded by a test of homogeneity of variance using Levene's Test for Equality of variances. The assumption held true for all items with the exception of item six. To correct for this violation on item six the degree of freedom was adjusted accordingly. The analysis indicated that six of the eight items on the Engagement Pulse showed statistically significantly differences between the Study Teams and Control Group (see table 2 for values).

To determine meaningfulness of the difference we look to statistical significance as well as practical significance. Statistical significance is concerned with whether a research result is due to chance or sampling; practical significance is concerned with whether the result is useful or
meaningful in the real world (Hojat & Xu, 2004). For statistical significance, a threshold of $p < .05$ was assumed. Additionally, an effect size was used to determine the size of the difference. Three of the items had moderate practical differences between groups: item three "Values" (Diff = 0.13), four "Strengths" (Diff = 0.19), five "Teammates" (Diff = 0.14). For items three, four, and five, the Cohen's d of 0.2 indicated that 58% of the Study Teams would be above the mean of the Control Group.

H3, whether the opportunity to use one's strengths every day is influenced by multiple aspects of engagement, was evaluated using a multiple linear regression to predict levels of engagement for item four "I have the chance to use my strengths every day" based on the other seven items on the Engagement Pulse. A significant regression equation was found ($F(4,782) = 235.075, p < .000$), with an $R^2$ of 0.56. Four items contribute significantly to predict the strengths item.

**Discussion**

This preliminary study was completed to help understand how engagement can differentiate the "best" from the “rest.” The Engagement Pulse survey was part of the foundational research that will shape actions related to improving team performance and engagement at Cisco. With this data, leaders can begin to strategize around the replication of the characteristics of “best teams” confidently. This will drive individual engagement while ultimately increasing team performance across the enterprise.

Cisco is large, global, and has a strong remote workforce. Further research should be conducted to test whether the findings apply to organizations of various sizes, in various industries, and in different countries around the world. Future research within Cisco will be completed to further understand the characteristics of the “Best Teams” to help educate the rest
of the organization and drive performance. As is often the case in applied research, different study environments may provide different results. The authors of this study heartily recommend further validation of the components of engagement that were shown to be the biggest differentiators between teams identified as "best" and the "rest." Further, future research should address which aspects of team engagement and performance are specific to a team’s unique environment (e.g., type, size, purpose, etc.) and which are generalizable to all teams.

One Cisco-specific differentiator of note is the strategic shift to a strengths-based organization. The strengths-based approach aligns an organization’s policies and practices, anchoring them in a positive, growth-oriented environment. Employees’ innate talents, acquired skills, gained experience, and learned knowledge are leveraged such that an employee feels energized—moving the needle on engagement as primary outcome of interest (Drucker, 2006; Gallup, 2012; Seybert, 2012). It is our position that as this paradigm shift takes over at Cisco, the characteristics of the best teams will permeate the rest of the teams. This theory of permeating performance is not unique; Li and colleagues (2016) recently revealed that the recognition of a team member’s success leads to positive changes in other team members’ individual and collective performance. Future research should focus on extending the recognition to that of effective strength positioning (framed as a specific type of success) to test whether it is a mechanism that provides a motivational and engagement-boosting effect beyond that of the individual.

In sum, it has been made clear that individual levels of engagement amongst team members has an additive effect at the team level. Through data, effective storytelling, and manager encouragement, Cisco is working toward creating an entire organization of “best teams.”
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Item Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>I am really enthusiastic about the mission of the organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>At work, I clearly understand what is expected of me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>In my team, I am surrounded by people who share my values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>I have the chance to use my strengths every day at work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>My teammates have my back.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>I know I will be recognized for excellent work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>I have great confidence in the organization's future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>In my work, I am always challenged to grow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>In my team, my voice always counts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>I really look forward to working with each of my team mates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>My work fits my life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>My manager is quickly available whenever I need to talk.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These items (1-8) are proprietary and copyrighted by TMBC. Copyright (c)2016 TMBC. All rights reserved. Reproduction in any manner without the written consent of TMBC is strictly prohibited.
### Table 2

**Study Teams and Control Group Mean Comparisons**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Study Teams (n=815)</th>
<th>Control Group (n=2159)</th>
<th>t(1, 2952)</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>4.27 .71</td>
<td>4.27 .69</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>.961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>4.32 .70</td>
<td>4.21 .75</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>4.26 .72</td>
<td>4.13 .75</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>4.21 .79</td>
<td>4.02 .90</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>4.36 .71</td>
<td>4.22 .79</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6</td>
<td>3.99 .90</td>
<td>3.87 .96</td>
<td>3.21*</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7</td>
<td>4.15 .72</td>
<td>4.15 .73</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>.909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8</td>
<td>4.08 .83</td>
<td>3.98 .89</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>4.24 .74</td>
<td>4.09 .82</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10</td>
<td>4.28 .74</td>
<td>4.18 .75</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11</td>
<td>4.12 .84</td>
<td>4.07 .80</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12</td>
<td>4.40 .78</td>
<td>4.34 .81</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>.040</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* df adjusted to t(1, 1557.69) to correct for homogeneity of variance violation
Figure 1

*Participant Characteristics: Tenure*

![Tenure Chart]

- **New Hire to 4 Years:**
  - Study: 30%
  - Control: 43%
  - Cisco: 43%

- **5–10 Years:**
  - Study: 35%
  - Control: 34%
  - Cisco: 33%

- **11–15 Years:**
  - Study: 19%
  - Control: 13%
  - Cisco: 14%

- **16 Years or More:**
  - Study: 15%
  - Control: 11%
  - Cisco: 11%
Figure 2

*Participant Characteristics: Employee Level*

![Employee Level](image)
Figure 3

*Participant Characteristics: Function*

**Function**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Cisco</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Others</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4

*Participant Characteristics: Region*

Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Cisco</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AMERICAS</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APJC</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMEA</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ITEM 1: Email from Ashley to announce Team Study

Subject: HELP NEEDED: Best Teams Study

You spend most of your day interacting in teams. Shouldn’t you make that time count?

Teams can produce extraordinary organizational results and accelerate personal development. That’s why we are launching a study of teams at Cisco to identify the characteristics that drive team performance.

You have been identified to share your thoughts about working in teams. Tomorrow, you will receive an invitation from Roxanne Davis to complete a 12 item survey that will take no more than 3 minutes.

Your participation in this confidential survey is critical, as we need 100% participation to get a representative sample.

Thank you in advance for participating in this short but important study. If you have any questions, please reach out to our study lead, Roxanne Davis.

Thank you,

Ashley Goodall

SVP, Leadership and Team Intelligence
Appendix B

Email #2 Initial Invitation

Subject: ACTION: Share Your Experience Working in Teams

Cisco Team Study

***BELOW IS YOUR INDIVIDUAL URL FOR THE TEAM STUDY. PLEASE DO NOT FORWARD TO OTHERS***

<NAME>

Teams can produce extraordinary results and accelerate personal development. That’s why we are launching a study to understand the experience of teams at Cisco.

You’ve been specifically chosen to share your thoughts on your experience within your current team. Please take 3 minutes to complete this confidential 12 question survey by January 27.

Click on the following link to launch the survey: %[Cisco Team Study]URL%

Thank you for participating. It’s essential that we hear from you in order to understand a varied sample of experiences that represents all of Cisco.

You spend most of your day interacting in teams. Shouldn’t you make that time count?

With gratitude,

Roxanne
Appendix C
Email #3
Subject: REMINDER: Share Your Experience Working in Teams

Cisco Team Study

***BELOW IS YOUR INDIVIDUAL URL FOR THE TEAM STUDY. PLEASE DO NOT FORWARD TO OTHERS***

<NAME>

If only we could read your mind…

But mind reading is highly unpredictable so we're asking you to spend 3 minutes to provide feedback on your experience working in a team at Cisco.

Click on the following link to launch the survey: %[Cisco Team Study]URL%. Please complete the survey by January 27, 2016.

For the study to have validity, it is important to have all invited employees take part. No personally identifiable information will be associated with your responses. Instead the data will be used in aggregate to inform leaders of the general sentiment expressed by the survey respondents.

With gratitude,

Roxanne
Appendix D

Email #4

Subject: Action: Cisco Team Study

Cisco Team Study

Cisco has stayed in front of the market for decades; we believe this is in part because of our teams. Your perspective will help us to understand the important characteristics of teams at Cisco. In turn, these learnings will help Leaders focus on what matters most to you, and what matters most when building amazing technology together.

Take two minutes to complete the survey today and we’ll send you our high level findings once results are in.

Access your survey here: Cisco Team Study

With gratitude,
Roxanne

Note: This is your personal URL, please do not forward.
Email #5

Subject: Google, Facebook, and Apple Aren't Doing This

This isn’t just a survey.

It’s a chance to impact the experience people have around the world when they come to work at Cisco. And nobody including Google, Facebook, or Apple has attempted a study like this before. You were personally selected to represent your function and currently we lack enough responses to provide meaningful insights to your leadership team.

We need your response. Please complete the %[Cisco Team Study]URL% today.

Besides, two minutes of your time will stop all these reminders.

Thank you,

Roxanne Davis
Study Lead

Note: This is your personal URL, please do not forward.
Appendix F

Email #6

**Last Call: Cisco Team Study**

As you all know, we can’t serve our customers without good data. And HR can’t serve all you without good data, either. For us, good data means that we have representative samples when we conduct research.

You’ve been carefully selected to take this survey, and we really do need to hear from you. So, please: **take two minutes in the next 24 hours to answer 12 multiple-choice questions.** That’s really all it takes, and it really is that important.

With gratitude,

Roxanne

**Note:** This is your personal URL, please do not forward.