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Abstract
What aspects of military experience can help or hinder transitioning veterans in their communication with others? Using the lens of leadership communications, this systematic review seeks to uncover those behaviors which are most likely to result in positive – or negative – outcomes for the veteran transitioning from military service to civilian life. By increasing awareness of these behaviors and their associated outcomes, it is anticipated that service members will have a more positive transition experience.

Leadership communication behaviors were identified by performing a search for available academic studies and associated literature for veteran populations, cataloging the results, and individually reviewing each one to identify either positive or negative outcomes associated with the use of leadership communication behaviors. Behaviors were then ranked by their number of associated citations to determine relative strength.

Key findings of this review show initiative as the most cited positive leadership communication behavior and anger as the most cited negative. A listing of the top ten positive and negative behaviors is provided along with a discussion of the results. An abbreviated summary of the results suitable for placement in a brochure, magazine, or website article is also included.
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What aspects of military experience can help or hinder transitioning veterans in their communication with others? Using the lens of leadership communications, this systematic review seeks to uncover those behaviors which are most likely to result in positive – or negative – outcomes for the veteran transitioning from military service to civilian life. By increasing awareness of these behaviors and their associated outcomes, it is anticipated that service members will have a more positive transition experience.

Leadership communication behaviors were identified by performing a search for available academic studies and associated literature for veteran populations, cataloging the results, and individually reviewing each one to identify either positive or negative outcomes associated with the use of leadership communication behaviors. Behaviors were then ranked by their number of associated citations to determine relative strength.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Call to Action

“All right gents, start hydrating now for Jalune!” Such was the edict issued by our new commanding officer (CO) to me and the roughly 150 other infantry Marines of Echo Company. Despite his holding the most senior – and ostensibly respected – position in our unit, the command was met with muffled laughter and derision by most of the Marines around me. The awkward verbal amalgam of “July” and “June” combined with the thought that drinking water now – in February – would somehow have bearing on a training event over four months away was enough of an absurdity that “Jalune” quickly entered the underground lexicon of inside jokes that we enlisted members shared. More problematic, however, was the shift in status that our CO experienced. Rather than the frank, firm, and down-to-Earth nature of a prior CO whose mannerisms instilled confidence and respect, it seemed this new CO with his jocular and casual attitude was slowly being reduced to the status of “peer,” rather than maintaining the proper and customary distance between officer and enlisted.

Such was one personal observation of behaviors and mannerisms that, while perhaps appropriate in civilian life, could be very problematic when brought into the military domain unchecked. In my own experience, I had little trouble limiting the importation of such “casual” civilian behavior. Perhaps it was due to my status as an enlisted member, but the military – and the Marine Corps especially so – has very strict rules on which behaviors are and are not tolerated, and any errors are quickly discovered and punished. As a member of a Reserve unit, however, who trained monthly with my
unit and then returned to civilian life, I had to quickly adjust my behaviors from being
civilian-appropriate to military-appropriate and back again. Given that civilian domains
are typically much less rigid, strict, and formal than military domains, I found it much
more difficult to know if and when I had improperly transferred over military behaviors
into a civilian domain than vice-versa. There would be no surly Sergeant to yell at me
that I was acting inappropriately in my civilian office setting, only the puzzled and
confused stares of my coworkers.

Gradually, I came to a presumed understanding of the boundaries between the
two domains. Rather than risk potential damage to my career and professional
relationships, I decided – perhaps unconsciously at first – to severely muzzle the military
attitudes and behaviors to prevent them from entering my civilian life and was highly
selective about which elements I did bring over. While I believe such an approach
limited the amount of behavioral conflict I experienced in each domain, I could not shake
the feeling that I was also restraining attributes that may be extremely beneficial as well.
The trouble was in identifying which attribute would be a help and which would be a
hindrance. Rather than take the risk of attempting to find out and pay the price of being
wrong, I took the conservative approach of muzzling everything instead.

Now, several years after being honorably discharged from the Marine Corps, I
wondered if I could have done things differently in my transition to civilian life and if
there might be positive military-derived attributes that remained locked away, waiting to
be released. Too, I suspected there were plenty of other service members who also
experienced this conundrum and were left puzzled trying to decide which military
behaviors they should bring into their civilian lives and which they should “leave on the
"Before I could proceed further with this thinking, though, I first had to examine the current plight of transitioning service members to see whether my suspicions were correct.

**Know Thy Enemy**

Searching the literature in academic journals, trade publications, special reports, and other such sources, I discovered that the challenges — or to be more militaristic, enemies — facing transitioning servicemembers were indeed extensive, even more so than I had originally considered. The more I could learn about these adversaries, the better the chance there was of assisting in their defeat. Thus, the first order of business was to identify some of the issues that recently transitioning servicemembers faced.

For one, alcohol and tobacco use were noted as being considerably higher for active military members than the general population and their increased usage frequently followed the veteran long after their transition into civilian life (Derefinko et al., 2018). Anecdotally, many of the infantry Marines I served with were well-known for being able to drink considerable amounts of alcohol, and a fair number also used tobacco. In combat environments, smoking cigarettes can be a deadly proposition, as the visible — but even more importantly, the invisible infrared — light can quickly expose one’s position, especially if the enemy has the benefit of night-vision or thermal imaging optics. Thus, smokeless tobacco — that is, dip, chew, and snuff — that would not reveal one’s position became popular choices for staying awake and alert during long watches or dull assignments. With few exceptions, most Marines I knew continued these habits after leaving military service.
Certainly, substance use and abuse can play a factor in the success – or lack thereof – in a servicemember’s re-integration into civilian life and long-term wellness. For those where this is not a challenge, mental and physical disabilities can present their own unique set of challenges. As of 2018, approximately one-quarter of veterans living today suffer from some sort of service-connected disability (National Center for Veterans Analysis and Statistics, 2019). For these veterans, additional and sometimes highly specialized care is needed for the proper treatment of their conditions. As most veterans do not receive care from Veterans Affairs (VA) hospitals or locations, civilian hospitals and health care facilities face unique challenges when trying to care for their needs (Olenick, Flowers, & Diaz, 2015).

For those veterans who have avoided mental and physical disabilities or impairments, simply adjusting to working amongst civilians can itself be a personal barrier to a successful transition into civilian life (Keeling, Mary, Kintzle, & Castro, 2018). Specifically, Keeling et al. (2018) found that “veterans reported that communication variances make relating to colleagues and peers difficult” (p. 67), a factor that was cited by every veteran who participated in that study. Given the apparent universality of such communication challenges, this area would appear to provide broad applicability should potential avenues of addressing these difficulties be found.

Exploring the vein of workforce challenges further, veterans also often face difficulties when trying to apply the skills and experience they obtained in the military to appropriate civilian jobs. Employers too can have trouble understanding the duties and experience that a specific military job may entail. Such difficulties matching civilian job requirements and military experience have been cited as one of the most challenging
aspects facing transitioning servicemembers (Hall, Harrell, Bicksler, Stewart, & Fisher, 2014).

As a machine gunner, my particular job in the military does not have any direct civilian equivalent. Conversely, my civilian career in cybersecurity has benefited little from my ability to effectively fire vast amounts of 7.62mm ammunition. Indeed, while some of the members of my unit went on to jobs in physical security or law enforcement – two career tracks most closely aligned towards infantry combat skills – the vast majority undertook employment in entirely unrelated fields. As such, it would seem that every veteran would likely possess at least some skills, behaviors, and mannerisms that do not translate well into their civilian careers. As I consider how my analysis could be of service, being able to speak to some of the items “lost in translation,” as it were, may yet provide some value.

Reservists also present an interesting population to consider, as they face the unique challenge of facing a transition of sorts every time they attend and return from a drill weekend. Those reservists who have deployed abroad face the additional hardship that instead of returning to a military base after their deployment is over, they are quickly thrown back into civilian life with little time for transition, decompression, or adapting to a different environment. Such an abrupt culture shock can lead to anxiety, anger, and irritability (Greenwald, 2006). The nature of such culture transitions, and the friction between them, seemed a rich area worth exploring.

Part of the cultural transition that occurs with any veteran, be they formerly active duty, active reserve, or reservist is the loss of hierarchy and clearly defined leadership roles that occur upon the transition out of military service. Such can lead to loss of
discipline and structure, which – if not provided from some other source – must now be supplied by the veteran (Teeter, 2010). Although some veterans can fill this loss endogenously, others appreciate having specific guidance, instructions, and organizational approaches that are already well-defined and provided for them (Meinert, 2016). This leads me to believe that providing clear guidance, perhaps in the form of a transition document written in an authoritative or directive fashion may be readily received by recently separated veterans who are eager to find specific, concrete steps they should or should not take in their return to the civilian world.

Considering the leadership roles that also often accompany military service, many veterans post-separation may continue to consider themselves leaders, even if they have difficulty describing what the precise process was for their becoming so (Kirchner, Michael J., 2018). Even those service members who have held only the lowest ranks will likely have had to issue instructions or commands, even informally, to peers. While military members may have different experiences issuing or receiving orders, all are unified in their having observed leadership in action. Thus, finding ways to incorporate military leadership elements into my work may also resonate strongly with veterans, regardless of whether they are in a formal leadership role presently.

Although I recognized that there were yet more challenges facing veterans, such as homelessness, drug use, mental health issues, and other topics, I realized that I may be able to do more good by focusing specifically on servicemembers who were currently transitioning or recently had transitioned out of the military. My hope was by easing some of the challenges faced immediately upon separation, later problems may be able to
be avoided altogether, thus reducing the total number of veterans in need and allowing charities/support organizations to better assist those who require their services.

For example, if a veteran can better acclimate to civilian life, perhaps they will have less difficulty at work; if they have less difficulty at work, perhaps they will be more likely to remain employed; if they are employed, perhaps they will be less likely to be homeless; if they are not homeless, then those charities/support organizations who help homeless vets (and others) can make even better use of their limited resources. With the target population now firmly in mind, the question remained how I was going to practically assist them, particularly in light of the many challenges involved. To be successful, however, I was going to have to limit my focus.

The Mission

Although the challenges that transitioning veterans face are numerous, I understood that any efforts to help ameliorate some of these challenges would be best served if I were to focus my efforts on one particular area of research. Thus, my mission became one of deciding which area(s) to assist in, and in what format that assistance would take shape.

It quickly became apparent that some challenges were only experienced by a subset of the total population. For example, I and several other Marines in my unit did not smoke while we served nor after we left service. As such, we would be little served by research focusing on tobacco cessation strategies. For my research to have the maximum impact, then, I would need to choose a subject with near-universal applicability and effect, something that all service members, regardless of rank, branch, or era could relate to.
Looking inward for inspiration, I recognized that the core of what caused me to muzzle certain behaviors was essentially rooted in concerns around appropriate and inappropriate communications. That such communication difficulties exist between veterans and civilians, and that these difficulties can result in transition barriers is well-supported by Keeling et al. (2018) and Olenik et al. (2015). While it was somewhat comforting to know that I was not the only one experiencing internal strife over how to communicate with my civilian counterparts, I realized that it was not necessarily all communication modes that I found in conflict.

For example, informal conversations between peers about mostly inconsequential matters, such as sports, entertainment, or similar “water cooler”-type topics were largely the same in military and civilian contexts. I observed that the biggest differences occurred when I had to issue commands/direction to others, perform disciplinary duties, or coordinate group action. In short, it was those times that I had to exercise authority or leadership that I noticed the most divergence in the range of appropriate communications and behaviors. In contrast, receiving orders - besides perhaps replacing “Aye, sir” with “Sure” – showed much less variation between military and civilian contexts.

Perhaps by personal inclination and desire for the broadest applicability, then, I was directed into the field of leadership communications, a field defined as "the controlled, purposeful transfer of meaning by which leaders influence a single person, a group, an organization, or a community" (Barrett, 2006, p. 386). For our purposes, this term is intended to refer to the full range of communication practices, behaviors, and characteristics that leaders may employ to communicate with those around them. Its use may also apply to those who may not be a formal leader as defined by title or position,
but who nonetheless may employ leadership principles in the course of the profession or job function, and thus may be able to find applicability in a wide range of situations outside the notions of authority as narrowly defined by an organizational chart.

Having a specific field in mind provided a general direction, but I still needed to craft the specific questions I was trying to solve, questions that might be at the heart of other veteran’s communication difficulties and answers to which they – and myself – might both benefit from answering. To that end, I drafted what I believe represents the core research questions for this endeavor:

1) Which leadership communication behaviors positively transfer from military to civilian domains?

2) Which leadership communication behaviors negatively transfer from military to civilian domains?

Although the questions seemed simple, I strongly suspected that obtaining the answers would be much more of a challenge. Rather than being hostile individuals, organizations, or countries, then, the adversary had silently morphed into those characteristics and behaviors that, after having served their useful purpose, continued to project themselves in detrimental ways in the regular life of the veteran. Even positive behaviors may not be identified until much later. How could I presume to be able to cover all the myriad facets and considerations of these two questions?

I perceived from the outset that my contribution in this area would be limited and not represent the entirety of all objectively correct answers – presuming such answers even exist – but this recognition did not divest my impetus for attempting to contribute
what I could. During my time in the military and transition out, I would have greatly appreciated a guide of sorts to ease my communication conundrums. Good but imperfect would have been far preferable to perfect but non-existent. With that in mind, I set my aim on distilling the top positive and negative leadership communication behaviors, such as I could discern them, from my research and present them as constructively as possible. While it certainly would not be the final word in the conversation, it would at least start the discussion, and – I hope – provide a solid starting point for transitioning vets.

Structure of Thesis

This thesis will attempt, through analysis of existing studies and publications, to identify leadership communication behaviors that may benefit or hinder veterans in their integration or transition into civilian life. Some behaviors may be shown to transfer successfully into the civilian domain with little modification; others may require modulation, and still others may have little if any use in most civilian arenas except in the most exceptional of situations.

Chapter 2 reviews the literature that is pertinent to the core topics of study, namely leadership communications and the nature of transferred behaviors and characteristics from military to civilian domains. By defining the specific area of focus as well as outlining the nature of transference between discrete domains, the reader should be well-prepared to engage with the data collection and analysis discussed later.

Chapter 3 describes the inclusion and exclusion criteria employed to identify relevant literature and the process by which leadership communication behaviors were identified. I also introduce a modified Population, Intervention, Comparison, Outcome (PICO) framework and describe its application to this work. The modified PICO
framework is then used to inform the creation of a search strategy which is employed to sift through a searchable academic index of nearly a billion entries. Relevant entries are then analyzed via a defined collection and review process to obtain, classify, and catalog the various behaviors pertinent to this study.

Chapter 4 presents the data collected that was used to generate the identified behaviors, a full listing of which is provided in Appendix B. Several charts and tables are provided, as well as a discussion on data that was expected but not located. Issues encountered with collection as well as surprises found in the data are also included.

Chapter 5 reviews some of the trends and themes present in the reviewed sources. It also describes the core output of the research; namely, the identification of the top 10 positive and negative leadership communication attributes that appear to play a role in veterans’ transition to civilian environments. For each attribute, context is provided regarding the meaning of the behavior and how it was referenced in the literature. A discussion regarding some unexpected findings as well as larger implications for the field of leadership communications as a whole is also included.

Finally, Chapter 6 moves from the discoveries made in the prior chapter to consolidate the major findings into a quick reference guide for the transitioned or transitioning veteran. It also reiterates some of the challenges and limitations of the research and suggests additional areas of research that were not fully explored in this work.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Leadership Communication Defined

To construct findings of value it was first necessary to determine which bodies of work were relevant to build upon. Especially applicable were bodies that helped define leadership communications as well as those that were able to apply this field to transitioning veterans. The research and writings of Dr. Deborah Barrett, Professor of the Practice of Professional Communication at Rice University have been especially instructive regarding the study of leadership communication. In particular, her book *Leadership Communication* – which has been cited by over two hundred publications at the time of this writing – serves as a useful cornerstone on which to begin an examination of this field. Expanding on the definition of leadership communication cited previously, Barrett provides a slightly more comprehensive definition in the latest edition of her seminal work *Leadership Communication*:

Leadership communication is the controlled, purposeful transfer of meaning by which individuals influence a single person, a group, an organization, or a community by using the full range of their communication abilities and resources to connect positively with their audiences, overcome interferences, and create and deliver messages that guide, direct, motivate, or inspire others to action. (2013, p. 7)

It is important to note that not all forms of communication are included in this definition. Accordingly, any form of communication which does not influence or inspire action (present or future) on the part of the receiver would be excluded. Examples may
include inconsequential or trivial matters, such as “The weather is nice today, isn’t it?” or “How about them Eagles?” While perhaps useful in other contexts such as building camaraderie or rapport, these phrases do not necessarily inspire or influence action by themselves.

One should not neglect, however, the effect that non-verbal communication imparts on the message as a whole. It is possible that the non-verbal communication delivered alongside a message may well become a topic within the domain of leadership communication, independent of the message’s literal wording or intention. For example, an arched eyebrow, a stern stare, or a friendly smile could either invite or discourage future interactions or certain topics from being discussed. As such non-verbal communication could most certainly influence the receiver’s present or future behavior, it may then be useful for our present discussion to err on the side of inclusivity whenever there is a question as to whether a given interaction qualifies as leadership communication, lest a subtle element remain unaccounted for.

Following the definition of leadership communications, Barrett also expounds on the application and utility of the field:

Leadership communication uses the full range of communication skills and resources to overcome interferences and to create and deliver messages that guide, direct, motivate, or inspire others to action. Leadership communication consists of layered, expanding skills from core strategy development and effective writing and speaking skills to the use of these skills in more complex organizational situations. (2006, p. 386)
Although not stated explicitly in Barrett’s quote above, I found it interesting that one may communicate well without being a leader of any sort, but it is quite difficult to lead without being a minimally competent communicator. Indeed, communication itself has been noted as an inseparable and foundational component of leadership (Burnison, 2012). A leader who cannot communicate their desires, will, or reasoning – in effect, a statue of sorts – may hardly be considered a leader at all, apart perhaps from certain religious or cultural considerations. Most leaders, however, do not live at the extremes of either perfect communicator or uncommunicative statue, but rather somewhere in between. In such a continuum, then, there must be specific reasons – some knowable, some perhaps not – for why a leader may find themselves at any given point in the range. If these knowable reasons are mutable and may be influenced by the leader themselves, leaders who wish to move closer to the ideal state of perfect communicator may find useful a discussion – such as this paper hopes to provide – on what these factors are and how they may be affected.

History of Leadership Communication Studies

The history of leadership communication in its broadest sense could be traced back to when humanity first organized in leader-follower orientations, the communication component being a natural prerequisite. As a distinct field of study, however, its origins are more difficult to trace, sharing much in common between leadership theory and communication studies, both of which are relatively recent domains. There are, however, some notable figures whose writings could be considered to be a prototype of leadership communication thought, even if not formally described as such. Specifically, Aristotle’s concepts of ethos, pathos, and logos (Barrett, 2013) and
Confucius’ values of humanity, politeness, and generosity (Lynn-Sze, Yusof, & Ahmad, 2014) have been cited as forming the basis of leadership communication. For most of recorded history, however, leadership and communication were largely examined as separate fields. Furthermore, apart from individual examination by philosophers, warriors, or political figures, each field only began to be studied with significant academic rigor starting in the early 20th century (Griffin, Ledbetter, & Sparks, 2018; Northouse, 2018).

Perhaps unsurprisingly, then, the rise of modern leadership communication has an even more recent history. A quantitative search in the realm of academia and peer-reviewed publications for leadership communication has revealed it to be a relatively new domain with the earliest observed references occurring in the past fifty years. Notably, the number of academic articles which reference leadership communication as a discrete field appears to have increased considerably since the 1990s as indicated in Figure 1.

**Figure 1**

*Scholarly and Peer-Reviewed Articles for “Leadership Communication”*

![Graph showing the increase in scholarly articles for "Leadership Communication" over time from 1950s to 2010s.]

This would appear to indicate that leadership communication is increasingly being understood to be an independent realm of study worth investigating by researchers, one that combines aspects of both leadership theory and communication studies while remaining distinct and independent of each.

Examining not only what academic products are created, but also the public interest in this field can help us understand the relative popularity and penetration of this field outside purely academic circles. In non-academic environments, the term “leadership communication” has maintained fairly cyclic search popularity on the Internet search engine Google, as shown in Figure 2.

Figure 2

Google search term popularity for “Leadership Communication”


Examining the data more closely, the cyclic nature appears to be strongly correlated to the traditional academic school year, with the largest declines associated with the summer months and the holiday season from December – January. Indeed, there appears to be more work to be done before the field of leadership communication is no
longer primarily the purview of researchers and college students. Still, I believe it to be a useful lens in which to examine the challenges that many recently separated veterans face. It is notable that while leadership communications itself is not a new or recent phenomenon, the formal study of it does appear so. Accordingly, there were not many studies outside of recent history on which to base observations.

**Leadership Communication Challenges for Veterans**

Military organizations are rich environments for the practice of leadership communications, given their strong hierarchical structures and mission-critical need for the effective transfer of information. Not all approaches are made equal, however, as different communication styles have been shown to correlate with various levels of perceived leadership performance (de Vries, Bakker-Pieper, & Oostenveld, 2010).

The full range of communication behaviors and their outcomes may not always be obvious to former service members whose military leadership may have valued certain behaviors far more than – or even at the expense of – others. Thus, a transitioning veteran and their new civilian leaders (or subordinates) may experience differing expectations as to what manner of leadership communication is appropriate or even tolerable for a given situation. This incongruity may represent a significant source of conflict, and whether it is ultimately productive or harmful may depend on whether the conflict is internalized (not discussed or acknowledged) or externalized (stated or expressed) as well as both parties’ ability to perform effective conflict resolution.

Other challenges that may develop include differences in how tasks are assigned and communicated. Military environments tend to incorporate much more direct, command-oriented language, as opposed to civilian environments which comparatively
tend to value individual creativity and greater personal autonomy in how tasks are executed (Keeling, Mary Elizabeth, Ozuna, Kintzle, & Castro, 2019). This may increase the chance for miscommunication, either on the part of the sender or that of the receiver. Even when the task itself has been communicated accurately, however, differences in how the task is phrased and how it is delivered can result in resentment, invalidation, and negative impacts on one’s self-esteem (Shields et al., 2016). Such styles of leadership communications are not necessarily intended to be injurious; rather, they may simply reflect the manner in which the veteran (or non-veteran) has grown accustomed to issuing and receiving tasks.

Considering the nature of tasks generally, there are also challenges in how the nature of work is viewed from military and civilian perspectives. Frequently, civilian workers adopt the mindset that work is merely something one does, as opposed to military members who often think of their roles in intimate, familial terms such as father, grandmother, child, etc., each with an assigned purpose and function inside the larger group (Popper, 1996). In military environments, every person has a purpose and a meaning, and whether one likes their assigned role or not, their purpose and contribution to the overall mission is typically well-defined and understood. Such clarity of purpose may not always be as well-articulated in civilian environments. When differences in purpose, communication, and work ethic arise, this can lead to significant frustration for the veteran, sometimes to the point of termination or resignation (Keeling et al., 2018). Understanding how such mental patterns are built up over time and what occurs when they are disrupted is a topic worth further exploration.
Habitus and Transition

The renowned French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu refined and heavily promoted the notion of the *habitus*, the general concept of which had existed for millennia, but which Bourdieu described as “systems of durable, transposable dispositions” (Bourdieu, 1977, p. 72). Habitus is not something one acquires consciously, but rather is developed unconsciously through the accreted dispositions that repeated exposure to social structures or social conditions generate. Such dispositions provide the unconscious cues or signals that may guide one’s attitudes, behaviors, and actions in a certain environment. To the extent social conditions are consistent between individuals, so too may be the respective habitus that is created. Given the same set of circumstances, therefore, individuals with the same habitus may thus reach a strikingly similar conclusion on how best to proceed even though they may be unable to articulate the genesis of what prompted them to arrive at their chosen strategy (Bourdieu, 1977).

Habitus thus provides a useful model with which to examine the underlying basis in how behaviors are formed in military domains and the durability by which they may persist into civilian domains as well. Although resistant to change, the same dynamics that originally formed the habitus – repeated exposure to social structures and environments – can also be the cause for its eventual transformation. Such transformation does not necessarily come without struggle, however. Bourdieu terms the internal conflict that occurs between one’s developed habitus and a new environment that is too dissimilar as “hysteresis” (Cooper, Caddick, Godier, Cooper, & Fossey, 2018). For veterans transitioning to a civilian environment, this hysteresis can be the source of
much hardship, but it can also represent a necessary evolution that ultimately enables their successful adaptation and transition (Cooper et al., 2018).

This brings to mind the nature of transition and how it operates, which is another area worth examining. The noted speaker and organizational development consultant William Bridges developed a model (Bridges, 1986) of understanding transitions that is highly relevant to our understanding of how servicemembers transition to veterans and the process for how this occurs. In this model, there are three phases involved in any transition: first, the subject must let go of their former situation and identity; second, they will experience a sort of limbo, a period where they are no longer part of their old self but have not yet reoriented themselves sufficiently to take on the persona of a new self; third, the subject starts their new beginning and accepts their new identity and situation (Bridges, 1986).

It is also worth mentioning the careful distinction that Bridges applies to change and transition. Whereas change represents a discrete difference that occurs at a specific time (or at several different times for a more complex change), transition is a drawn-out process that is exceedingly incremental and far more subtle in operation (Bridges, 1986). Put differently, change is short-term, discrete, and binary, whereas transition is long-term, continuous, and analog. Given our consideration of servicemembers and their adaptation to civilian life – which by nature is not an instantaneous evolution – transition appears to be the most appropriate context in which to understand this process.

Bourdieu’s concepts of habitus and hysteresis along with Bridges’ model of transition serve as welcome guides in better understanding how the process of servicemember transition takes place, as well as understanding the genesis of some of the
challenges that veterans face. A veteran adrift in the doldrums of Bridge’s second phase of transition combined with a strongly-formed habitus that is resistant to change may experience a longer and more difficult transition – along with a greater number of challenges – compared to a veteran with whom these elements are not as pronounced.

Applicability to Present Study

The examined literature clarified that leadership communications is not a new field, but rather a thoughtful merging of two ancient and timeless aspects of the human social experience. It also suggested that civilian and military environments have different preferred methods of communication and that veterans often face a complex path in their transition from military to civilian domains. It was also notable, however, in what was not shown by the literature: particularly, the dearth of formal studies outside of the last quarter-century (and indeed, the relative lack of academic focus entirely beyond the past century). It is hoped that this work will contribute to the bodies of knowledge for both leadership communication and veteran transition challenges.

The literature identified thus far has served to narrow the scope of what could easily become an all-encompassing – and never-ending – quest for exhaustive coverage. Instead, the components of the core research question – which leadership communication behaviors positively and negatively transfer from military to civilian domains – have been clarified. Leadership communication has been shown to reflect a more narrow and specific area of communication. Specific communication and leadership challenges for veterans have been identified. Finally, the conscious and unconscious nature of behavior transference has been explored and better understood.
Armed with this knowledge, we are now better prepared to seek out, identify, and catalog those behaviors that are germane to leadership communication in our selected demographic (veterans and transitioning servicemembers) whilst seeking an indication of their transference and ultimate effect. Of the studies examined thus far, some acknowledged – and fewer described – the communication challenges facing transitioning veterans, but none provided a comprehensive catalog of specific behaviors that were found to be generally positive or negative. This is the primary gap in knowledge that I seek to fulfill in this work.

Given the vast sea of information and potentially relevant studies that surround these topics, however, it was clear that a defined and repeatable methodology would need to be charted to make further progress – but which course to take?
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Approach

Like other demographics or societal groups, transitioning veterans are not a monolith. The backgrounds and specific challenges that every veteran confronts in their transition experience will be unique to that individual. Accordingly, their needs cannot be considered fungible in nature, and must always be considered in the context of the individual. This can present challenges for those who wish to better understand and ease the difficulties that transition can bring, as no two veterans’ journeys will be exactly alike.

Notwithstanding, there are clear overall trends that can be observed when examining the challenges that transitioning veterans face on a macro – as opposed to a micro – scale. Although the entirety of these overarching trends may never match precisely to any individual veteran, it is highly probable that the transition challenges of any individual veteran are at least somewhat represented by the observations of larger veteran demographic studies.

Given this reality, the desire to help the largest number of veterans as much as possible, and constraints of time, funding, and other resources, it appeared that pursuing a systematic review of existing research in this work would produce the largest net benefit as opposed to attempting to undertake primary research on individual veterans (such as via a survey or direct interview). While such primary research would undoubtedly provide insight of a different variety, the aforementioned constraints would limit the number of veterans – and thus permutations of said transitional challenges – that I would
be able to effectively catalog and derive new understanding from. Rather than divert my resources to a very small sample of veterans whose results would be difficult to extrapolate, I chose instead to analyze bodies of existing research rather than attempting to perform such primary research myself. By so doing, I can indirectly sample thousands of veterans’ experiences in a way that simply would not be possible otherwise.

It is anticipated that this comparatively larger visibility will result in the findings of this work being applicable to a larger cohort of the transitioning veteran population than would occur via a more limited analysis of direct veteran interviews, surveys, or other direct data collection techniques. As a consequence, the approach chosen for the present work was that of a systematic review (itself a form of secondary research).

By definition, a systematic review “seeks to systematically search for, appraise and synthesis[sic] research evidence, often adhering to guidelines on the conduct of a review” (Grant & Booth, 2009, p. 95). Accordingly, a formal system or guideline would need to be selected or created to perform the review in a methodical and repeatable manner. Additionally, specific inclusion criteria would also need to be defined in order to determine which studies and bodies of knowledge would be considered relevant or irrelevant to the present work. These important considerations are evaluated in the following sections.

**PICO Framework**

The methodological process that appeared most suitable to perform this systematic review is most commonly known by its acronym “PICO,” which stands for Patient (or Population/Problem), Intervention, Comparison, and Outcome. It can be used to perform literature reviews as part of a larger systematic review process, and it is also
used to conduct research for evidence-based medicine (Schardt, Adams, Owens, Keitz, & Fontelo, 2007). PICO’s ultimate purpose is to formally evaluate the effect that a given intervention has on a specified population.

To further understand how the PICO framework can be adapted to assist with this present study, it is first worth examining each element of PICO individually. Patient/Population/Problem describes the demographic makeup or specific problem that is being evaluated, whereas Intervention defines the specific modifying factor(s) involved (Russell et al., 2009). Comparison (or occasionally, Comparator) describes what element(s) will be used to compare the various studies or results, and Outcome describes the effect that the intervention had (Russell et al., 2009). For example, PICO could be used to examine the effect that Ibuprofen (Intervention) has on reducing pain (Outcome) for headache in adults (Population/Problem) compared to placebo (Comparison). Although often used in medical research, PICO is not limited to such contexts.

It is important to note that while Intervention is frequently used to specify the introduction of a new treatment or remedy on the given population, it also may be used to observe an existing effect. As the format of this study is a systematic review, we will use Intervention broadly in a non-clinical capacity to represent either the introduction or current use of a given behavior. This approach was chosen as individual studies may use either meaning and the purpose of our review is to identify outcomes based on the influence of certain identified behaviors. Whether these factors were endemic to the individual or were externally introduced is not strictly germane to the purposes of this study and would be a consideration perhaps better suited for a separate study.
Having defined the PICO framework’s core components, it is perhaps useful to recall the research questions previously created and consider how their essential purpose may be mapped to this framework. As mentioned earlier, the research questions are:

1) Which leadership communication behaviors positively transfer from military to civilian domains?

2) Which leadership communication behaviors negatively transfer from military to civilian domains?

With these questions in mind, we can then develop our corresponding PICO framework:

Population: 1) Veterans who have separated from military service, whether recently or not, and 2) members of the Reserves or National Guard who are subject to frequent domain-switching (i.e., from military to civilian environments and vice-versa).

Intervention: Characteristics, mannerisms, and behaviors associated with the field of leadership communication. Focus will be given to externally visible behaviors, as opposed to purely internal thoughts or mentalities. Examples may include tone of voice, manner of speech, displays of vulnerability, assertiveness, et cetera.

Comparison: How many studies have referenced a given behavior. Multiple studies that reference a given behavior are given a higher ranking than behaviors that are seldom referenced.

Outcome: This describes whether a given behavior was described as having a positive or negative effect on the subject’s experiences in civilian situations.
In our application of this PICO framework, we seek to evaluate those studies that reference leadership communication behaviors in our defined population and, through the comparison of many such studies, rank those behaviors which are correlated with positive or negative outcomes. Although the general approach is now established, some terms require additional clarification, such as behaviors and outcomes.

Behavior Defined

For the purpose of this study, behavior represents those responses, mannerisms, or actions that are both 1) related to leadership communication, and 2) have been cited by scholarly research or associated literature to be correlated with beneficial or detrimental outcomes. Additionally, behavior is understood in an externalized sense to specifically exclude such actions that may reflect inward behaviors only. For example, an entry of "empathy" would not be used if it were describing an individual who is only inwardly empathic in their perception of others. This entry would be used, however, if it were intended to reflect an individual that actively displayed empathy in their outward actions and communications.

If an entry should have the potential for both inward and external behavioral manifestations but remain unspecified as to which type of manifestation is meant, it will be included as a result. This is because internal behaviors often influence our external behaviors as well to some degree – in the example given, an individual who is inwardly empathic is likely to also be outwardly empathetic as well. Thus, unless the literature being examined is solely concerned with the inward-only components of the behavior, a more inclusive meaning will be understood to have been meant.
It is important to note that certain behaviors simply do not have inward or outward components. *Tone of voice*, for example, represents an outward behavior that has no identical internal corollary, for the act of speech itself is an externally observable act. In contrast, *self-talk* is an internal behavior that is not outwardly visible. As this work is focused on externally observable behaviors, internal-only behaviors would be excluded from the results.

The decision to focus solely on outward behaviors as opposed to inward behaviors – or even a mix of the two – stems from the fact that outward behaviors are by definition easier for a third party such as friends, family members, or co-workers to observe and provide feedback on. As the target demographic of this work is transitioning veterans, I believe it would be most practical to start on those behaviors which are easiest for the veteran to identify, solicit feedback for, and adapt if necessary. As progress is made and confidence built, the veteran may then choose to focus on inward behaviors and motivations next. Such a study of inward behaviors would be out of the scope for this particular work but would likely represent a valuable area of additional research.

**Outcomes Defined**

As mentioned previously, the two possible outcomes for an identified behavior (IB) are positive or negative, and which are described in further detail below:

**Positive**: As referenced in the literature, these IBs are likely to be helpful for the transitioning veteran. By way of example, positive IBs may result in greater life satisfaction, improved socio-economic status, enhanced communication abilities with peers, or other similarly positive results.
Negative: As referenced in the literature, these IBs are likely not to be helpful for the transitioning veteran. By way of example, negative IBs may result in a greater probability of poverty, homelessness, disease, or other unfavorable outcomes.

It should be noted that, in the case of positive or negative IBs, the degree of helpfulness or lack thereof is specifically not being evaluated. Without a considerable increase in the resources available and perhaps additional primary research, it is very difficult to say with any confidence whether one positive IB is provably better – and if so, to what degree – than another. Any such findings would invariably fluctuate on the individual, their life circumstances, and the varied applicability of such behaviors to their goals, making accurate side-by-side comparisons difficult if not impossible to generate.

It is, however, quite possible to quantify how many studies reference a particular behavior and rank those behaviors accordingly. For example, if the research showed that displays of vulnerability were referenced in ten studies whereas assertiveness was referenced in only two, the former behavior would be ranked more highly than the latter (presuming both were associated with either positive or negative outcomes). As will be discussed in further detail in Chapter 5 Data Interpretation, this higher ranking simply represents the comparatively larger body of supportive evidence and does not imply a larger measure of efficacy.

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Having properly defined several of the terms that will be foundational to this work, it is important to now consider what studies and academic literature will be considered to house relevant data, and which will be excluded. Having defined such criteria at the outset is crucial for conducting a systematic review whose results are
defensible and reproducible by others. While performing the data collection itself, such criteria also serve to act as an indicator of progress and allow the researcher to conclusively determine when data collection is complete.

A complicating factor worth noting for this work is that all writing and research were performed during the worldwide COVID-19 pandemic and prior to any vaccine’s wide availability to the public. For the safety of the author and others, all research was conducted remotely via Internet-accessible resources. Accordingly, one of the first inclusion criteria we can specify is that any study or work included in the results must be electronically accessible over the Internet. We can further refine this to specify only those results available via the Penn Libraries online searchable index, known as Franklin (https://franklin.library.upenn.edu), that is listed as Full Text Online (meaning that the entire text of the work is remotely available, and not solely the abstract or catalog reference data). This was chosen as Franklin represents the widest and most comprehensive collection of academic resources currently available to the author given the current guidance surrounding the pandemic.

The types of literature to be included also need to be specified. For this work, it was decided that both peer-reviewed and scholarly, non-peer-reviewed works should be part of the inclusion criteria. The justification for this approach derives from the prior analysis performed during the literature review which revealed the relative recency of formal study for leadership communication. As fewer such studies exist, there exists the distinct possibility that limiting data collection to strictly peer-reviewed studies may result in an insufficient sample size on which to synthesize broader conclusions.
Additionally, it should be noted that any potential findings of this work will represent correlations only and not causalities.

For example, displays of vulnerability may be found to be associated with positive outcomes – however, such a linkage would not be causal in the sense that such displays have not necessarily been shown to guarantee a positive outcome in every conceivable scenario. As any such findings would be understood to represent correlations only, the standard of evidence required for such claims would allow for a wider body of work to be considered compared to a study seeking to produce only provable causal relationships, thus permitting the use of both scholarly and peer-reviewed sources for this work. As even peer-reviewed journals occasionally have other content included in their publications, however, specifically excluded from consideration would be news articles, book reviews, and editorials.

Search Strategy

Having now defined our meaning of key terms and specifying our inclusion and exclusion criteria, we can condense these requirements into a formal search strategy. Completing the core elements of a published PICO worksheet and search strategy protocol (Murdoch University, 2021) provides us with a clearly defined approach as well as search parameters that can be utilized in Penn Libraries’ Franklin searchable interface, as indicated in the table below.

Table 1

<p>| Search Strategy |
|-----------------|-----------------|
| Population      | Transitioning or transitioned veterans |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>External leadership communication behaviors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>IBs ranked by reference quantity and outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Positive or Negative associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Question</td>
<td>Which leadership communication IBs positively and negatively transfer from military to civilian domains?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications to Include</td>
<td>Scholarly and peer-reviewed journal articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main &amp; Alternate Topics</td>
<td>Leadership Communication, Veterans, Transition, Behaviors, Challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search Query</td>
<td>(TitleCombined:(veteran OR military OR servicemember OR &quot;service member&quot;)) AND (TitleCombined:(transition OR integration OR reintegration))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limits that apply to search</td>
<td>Publications in the English language only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Databases to search</td>
<td>Any in Franklin with full text available online</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Adapted from: Murdoch University (2021). PICO Worksheet and Search Strategy Protocol*

Consolidating the most crucial aspects of this study into the search strategy format above permits the essential intent of this work to be quickly shared with others and acts as a quick reference guide that can be used to easily determine whether a given article or behavior should be included or excluded.

Identified Behavior Matrix

With our search strategy solidly in place, we must now characterize how qualifying behaviors identified from our corpus of search results – referred to
individually as an Identified Behavior (IB) – will be cataloged and the process by which IBs will be ranked against each another. The IBs generated from the examination of the literature will be plotted on a spreadsheet named the Identified Behavior Matrix (alternatively referred to as the IB Matrix). Each IB in the spreadsheet will be placed on a separate row and have the following column elements:

- Identified Behavior (IB): The behavior that the literature described, expressed as concisely as possible. A forward-slash (/) may be used to delimit multiple, very similar behaviors together.
- Outcome: The associated outcome. The only allowable values for this field are Positive or Negative.
- Reference ID(s): A three-digit numerical index (such as “001”) that is assigned to each source of an IB. If a given IB is referenced by multiple sources, each Reference ID is listed, separated by a comma (e.g., “001, 002, 003”).
- Times Cited: The number of sources that referenced this specific permutation of IB and outcome, represented as an integer.

A separate spreadsheet, known as the Reference ID Database (alternatively referred to as the RefID Database) will also be created that will list all cited sources. Each source will be listed on its separate row along with the following columns:

- Reference ID: An assigned three-digit numerical index unique to each source.
- Year Published: The year the source was published.
• Direct URL: A unique Uniform Resource Locator (URL), or “web address,” that provides a direct link to the source citation via the Franklin database.

• Citation: The source’s citation formatted using APA guidelines.

The approach of separating the collection of references from the cataloging and ranking of IBs was employed to make the data easier to work with while also satisfying the requirement for transparency and the proper citation of all referenced data sources. Both the IB Matrix and RefID Database are reproduced in their entirety in Appendices A and B, respectively, of this work.

Once the results have properly cataloged in the IB Matrix and RefID Database, the data analysis and ranking of IBs may begin. The ranking of the most positively and negatively cited IBs may be accomplished by performing a simple two-step sort function. First, the IB Matrix is sorted by the outcome that is under review (either positive or negative). It is then sorted by the numerical value of the Times Cited column, with the largest value appearing first. The results displayed would then represent, in descending order, the most well-referenced IBs for that given outcome.

It is also worth noting that there exists the possibility that the same IB may be referenced both positively and negatively by different sources. In such a scenario, these conflicting results would not “cancel out” one another – rather, they would continue to be listed separately in the IB Matrix under separate Outcome headings. Depending on how frequently this scenario occurred, it may be fruitful during data analysis to calculate the most contested IBs and examine possible explanations for such a finding.
Search Query Refinement

Anticipating that the first search query conducted may not yield the most relevant results for this effort, several iterations were performed within Franklin to refine the search query. The first search query used – ((Veteran AND challenge AND transition) AND communication OR leadership OR behavior) and which searched throughout the title, abstract, and body – resulted in over 24,000 results. As such a quantity augured the possibility that the search query may have been far too broad, I continued to work on refining and reducing the scope.

After multiple revisions, I arrived at the search query presented in Table 1 as shown previously and which reduced the number of results from 24,595 to 600. Two key adjustments to the query accounted for the difference: the first was to limit the search to only the titles of results (as opposed to abstract and body), and the second was to more carefully specify that the title must include at least one element from both the target demographic (veteran OR military OR servicemember OR "service member") and subject matter (transition OR integration OR reintegration). A cursory review of the results indicated greater applicability to the subject matter than the original query produced, and with only 600 results, a comprehensive review of all search results was now feasible.

It should be noted that without a manual review of all 24,000 results from the original query, the statement that the original query was excessively broad – while perhaps likely – would be difficult to show conclusively. As the review of such a quantity of results is well beyond my present capabilities, however, I must defer such analysis to those that have such resources.
Collection and Review Process

With the methodological approach and parameters defined, the actual process of collection and review may proceed. Collection was performed by executing the search query previously specified in Table 1 in the online Franklin portal and recording the direct URL of each result along with a unique Reference ID in a spreadsheet. This approach permitted all 600 results to be quickly and individually memorialized in the shortest amount of time possible and was chosen to minimize the risk of changes in the results or their ordering.

Like other online searchable databases (e.g., Google, Bing), results from any given query are constantly in flux as sources are added or removed and the searching algorithms themselves are updated. These effects can have implications for research, as the same query performed a week apart may produce slightly different results, or potentially the same results in a different ordering. During preliminary searches, I noted this effect in action as results would occasionally appear in a different order even if provided the same query. Accordingly, I performed the collection of the unique URLs based on the results of a single execution of the search query to minimize these effects.

After collection had completed, review was performed by visiting the direct URL of each result, examining the article for the presence of IBs according to the PICO framework and search strategy previously defined, and recording any such IBs, their outcome, and their Reference ID and citation information in the IB Matrix and Reference ID Database. Results that were not found to contain any IBs were discarded. A thorough review of the IBs collected, issues encountered during collection, and general themes discovered are explored in further detail in the next chapter, Data Collection.
CHAPTER 4

DATA COLLECTED

Data Summary

From the 600 results generated and following the methodological approach previously identified, 22 distinct behaviors were identified from 106 citations across 40 scholarly articles, papers, and journals. There were 503 results (83.8%) generated from the search query that, upon review, were discarded after they were found to not include any behaviors relevant to this work. There were also 57 results (9.5%) that had technical issues with collection and were not unusable. This led to a net relevance rate of 6.7% with relevance for this purpose referring to a study that was found to contain at least one IB. The distribution of studies according to the year they were published is shown in the graph below.

Figure 3

Temporal distribution of responsive studies
With the sole exception of the study from 1973 (which reflects on veterans’ experiences following the Vietnam War), it is notable that relevant studies do not appear again until 2007 with increases starting in 2013. The subjects of these studies largely correspond to the veterans generated from the United States’ wars in Afghanistan (starting 2001) and Iraq (starting 2003).

It is also worth examining how the various IBs were distributed amongst the studies. Overall, there was a clear trend towards the same behaviors being repeatedly referenced by many different studies, with only two behaviors having a single citation. Figure 4 below graphically represents all IBs cataloged during the data collection process and the number of times each IB was referenced.

**Figure 4**

*Distribution of Identified Behaviors in veterans*

As can be observed, self-regulation/discipline, self-determination/initiative, and anger/hostility/aggression were found to be amongst the most highly referenced
behaviors cited by the reviewed literature. This does not, however, take into
consideration whether such behaviors were positively or negatively correlated. For that
perspective, it is necessary to evaluate the top-cited behaviors separated by outcome.

Most Cited Behaviors

The following two tables represent the ten most highly cited behaviors organized
by positive and negative outcomes. Table 2 presents the ten most-cited behaviors that
were associated with positive outcomes and which collectively account for 53% of the
total citations obtained.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive Identified Behavior</th>
<th>Times Cited</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Citations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-determination/Initiative</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-regulation/discipline</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team-oriented</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard-working</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal setting</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational capability</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem-solving</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance under stress</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-sacrificial/servant leadership</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Likewise, the results for the ten most-cited behaviors associated with negative
outcomes are shown in Table 3 below. In this case, the top ten results represent 45% of
the total citations overall.
Table 3

Ten Most Cited Negative Identified Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative Identified Behavior</th>
<th>Times Cited</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Citations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Angry/Hostile/Aggressive</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-tempered</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty communicating with civilians</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypervigilance</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to ask for help</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependence on external structure</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative characterization of civilians</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-regulation/discipline</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectation of immediate response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casting help-seeking as weakness</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As indicated by these two tables, there is a slightly higher representation in the number of citations associated with positive outcomes as compared with negative outcomes. Possible explanations may include positive leadership communication behaviors of veterans being more well-known or consistent, whereas their negative counterparts may more unpredictable or varied. Several additional observations may be able to be derived from the data in these tables, but further discussion on these results will be reserved for Chapter 5, Data Interpretation.

Positive vs Negative Skew

A unique visualization of the data is provided by evaluating the relative strength of references for the ten most positive and negative IBs in a side-by-side fashion. As the IBs will be unique in the positive and negative domains, it is not the individual behaviors that are compared but rather their placement in the overall rank and their citation strength
that are compared. Sourcing from the data provided in Tables 3 and 4 mentioned previously provides us the following figure:

**Figure 5**

*Comparative Distribution of Identified Behaviors by Outcome*

This graph illustrates that the majority of citations for positive IBs are contained in the top four behaviors, whereas the citations for the negative behaviors are slightly more distributed.

**Issues with Collection**

As mentioned, 57 results – 9.5% of the total number of results evaluated – were not usable due to issues with the collection process. Specifically, this corresponded to the following causes:

- 32 results referenced the same study as another result.
• 10 results could not load due to an error in the URL generation.
• 9 results were simply supplemental material for another study.
• 4 results were merely corrections of another study.
• 2 results were duplicates due to user error in copying the URL.

Some of these errors were user-generated, such as the two duplicate results that were, unfortunately, my mistake when copying the links from the Franklin database to the spreadsheet. The majority of unusable results, however, were due to some results identifying the same study as another, previously examined result. Frequently I would observe the duplicate result as differing only slightly from the original, such as a slightly longer title name or additional information in the citation. This may be the result of different online academic databases publishing the same source slightly differently, and thus resulting in duplicate results in Franklin who may catalog them as two separate sources (rather than a single source available via two academic databases as is typical).

The next most commonly encountered cause of unusable results was due to apparent technical issues with the direct URL produced by Franklin that were only observed after collection had been completed and review was underway (as discussed in the prior chapter). In short, the URL produced – which utilizes the TinyURL service which acts as a redirect to a single result in Franklin – would occasionally return zero results, or it would appear to be missing one of the last letters in the URL, causing the TinyURL service to be unable to locate the intended destination. Both had the effect of making the URL (and thus result) unusable.
Due to the previously discussed challenges of relying on the output of a query performed at two different times, it was not possible to re-run the search query in an attempt to regenerate the URL a second time without also invalidating the other results previously obtained (and perhaps introducing this issue into other results not previously affected). Therefore, the 57 results were noted as unusable.

**Themes and Surprises**

By far, the most unexpected figure generated during data collection and review was the extremely low relevance rate – 6.7% – of the results that contained useful data for this study. When examining the studies that were discarded, several trends began to emerge. The first was that many of the results pertained to medical challenges facing injured veterans, such as traumatic brain injury (TBI), post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), and other medical conditions. While noble pursuits of inquiry, they were often not found to be germane to the present study as they did not detail a leadership communication behavior transferring between military and civilian domains.

Accordingly, collection for most medical studies was less productive, save for the comparatively few studies that did explore culture and communication transfers as part of their analysis.

The second trend of discarded studies was observed to be a large prevalence of political science studies that described the interactions and strategies used between present or historical nation-states, but which rarely described the individual veteran or their transition into civilian life. There was also a third trend represented by many studies on the development and use of military technologies. These last two trends may have been due to the inclusion of “military” and “transition” or “integration” in the terms of
the search query. While these terms did result in some relevant studies being included that would not have been otherwise considered, they also had the effect of returning many irrelevant studies that needed to be discarded as well.

Although these trends explain the rationale for why many of the results were discarded, they do not explain the overall paucity of applicable results. Possible hypotheses include the relative recency of formal leadership communication studies as discussed in Chapter 2 as well as research or funding priorities which may emphasize the study of injuries, ailments, and disabilities as opposed to leadership communication behaviors not otherwise connected to such conditions. There is, however, much to be discussed on the data that was successfully collected and the possible implications for transitioning veterans, and are explored in the following chapter, Data Interpretation.
CHAPTER 5

DATA INTERPRETATION

Review of Data

The data collected resulted in 11 Identified Behaviors (IBs) for both positively and negatively associated outcomes, with positively associated outcomes receiving slightly more academic support. This would appear to suggest that military service does not impart only – or even mostly – positive or negative leadership communication behaviors on the individual, but rather a blend of both that are likely unique for each individual and which must be sorted through to identify the ones most helpful for the veteran in their successful transition to civilian life.

Except for two IBs, Professional Demeanor and Direct/Forceful Speech, all other IBs were correlated with multiple academic sources, suggesting that such results were not an aberration of an individual study but were instead reflective of a larger commonality amongst veterans writ large. To better understand the context of these findings and their possible implications for day-to-day usage, it is worthwhile to review the individual behaviors themselves, and which is discussed in the next two sections.

Positive Behaviors

The following list of IBs, in descending order of academic citations (represented by a number in parenthesis to the right of the IB), have been associated with positive outcomes.
Self-determination/Initiative (10)

This behavior reflected the demonstrated ability to initiate a new course of action, often in environments where there was not a formally identified leader in a given cohort (students, coworkers, etc.). This behavior was not only looked upon favorably by others in formal authority positions (such as professors or managers) but in some cases was also an anticipated or expected characteristic of veterans generally.

Self-regulation/discipline (10)

The ability to self-regulate one’s emotions – especially through the limitation of negative expressions such as complaining, procrastination, and blaming – as well as showcasing discipline in the face of adversity was cited in mostly favorable contexts by the identified literature. There were, however, instances where this was viewed in a negative interpretation as well, and this particular dynamic is further explored later in this chapter.

Team-oriented (9)

The tendency of veterans to respond favorably to teamwork and group-facilitated objectives was similarly viewed favorably by the associated literature. This likely corresponds to the mission-oriented nature of many military organizations that emphasize the collective over the individual, such that team-oriented behaviors are readily demonstrated by veterans when provided the opportunity to exercise them.

Hard-working (8)

Many veterans were also positively associated with a natural tendency to be hard-working, not stopping until the mission was complete (in whatever new context their “mission” may be). This was looked upon favorably by civilian employers and others who desired the extra effort and dependability that these veterans demonstrated.
Goal-setting (6)

Although related to Self-determination/Initiative, this IB is distinct in that it reflects the demonstrated ability to plan and structure a series of objectives towards the accomplishment of an individual or group mission (and not whether the individual takes independent, self-directed action to undertake or create those objectives).

Organizational capability (4)

This behavior describes the ability of the veteran to group and order personnel, assets, or other resources in a logical and efficient manner and was associated with positive outcomes, particularly in employment and academic settings, where this behavior was more highly valued.

Problem-solving (3)

Veterans who were able to conduct problem-solving activities and were seen to do so were viewed favorably by others and were more likely to be assigned tasks that had a greater degree of independence.

Performance under stress (2)

The reliable completion of tasks under stressful situations was a positively associated behavior that was identified by the literature, though only in workplace environments.

Self-sacrificial/servant leadership (2)

This behavior refers to the scenario where a veteran is seen to put the needs of his peers or subordinates above those of his own. Servant leadership is often associated with positive organizational results, and it is not surprising to see it associated with positive outcomes here.
Confidence (2)

It is important to note that confidence is used here in its most positive sense and does not refer to over-confidence, cockiness, or self-aggrandizement. Veterans that displayed confidence were also looked upon favorably by the literature.

Professional demeanor (1)

There was one study that specifically – and positively – referenced the professional attitudes and bearing that veterans were observed to have.

Negative Behaviors

The following list of IBs, in descending order of academic citations (represented by a number in parenthesis to the right of the IB), have been associated with negative outcomes.

Angry/Hostile/Aggressive (10)

By far the most commonly cited behavior associated with negative outcomes was anger or hostility. Whereas such emotions may serve as protective in combat or other stressful military situations, they may be maladaptive in many civilian contexts and were generally associated with greater conflict and strife with family members, coworkers, and peers.

Short-tempered (7)

Although often related to Angry/Hostile/Aggressive, this behavior was distinct in that it referred solely to the rapidity by which a veteran may transition between relative calm and a highly agitated or angry state. The suddenness often took others by surprise and was associated with negative outcomes such as communication obstacles where others
self-censored out of fear of saying the “wrong” thing and accidentally triggering an outburst.

*Difficulty communicating with civilians (6)*

A number of studies referenced the difficulty that veterans had communicating with their civilian counterparts. Veterans often expressed their difficulty in finding common ground or the ability to relate to everyday civilian concerns, though occasionally it was the veteran’s manner of communication (such as style of humor) that was off-putting to civilians.

*Hypervigilance (6)*

Another commonly cited behavior by the examined literature was the tendency for some veterans to be excessively focused on the identification of possible threats, particularly in social settings or even when driving vehicles. Interestingly, this increased awareness did not appear to be associated with any positive contexts or outcomes.

*Unwilling to ask for help (5)*

This behavior refers to the hesitance or unwillingness to seek assistance when faced with a challenge the veteran is not fully skilled or resourced to complete and which was associated with negative outcomes in academic, vocational, and interpersonal contexts.

*Dependence on external structure (4)*

Perhaps due in part to the rigid, more hierarchical structures that govern most military organizations and day-to-day life, several citations and negative outcomes were found for veterans that grew dependent on such external structures and became “lost” or directionless when these structures were no longer available.
Negative characterization of civilians (3)

This behavior reflects the finding in several studies that demonstrated some veterans’ portrayal of civilians negatively, often to other veterans but occasionally to civilians as well. Civilians were variously described as unmotivated, undisciplined, or too concerned with trivial matters.

Self-regulation/discipline (3)

Curiously, this behavior – while one of the most cited behaviors with positive outcomes – was also associated with negative outcomes as well. When described negatively, discipline was often a barrier to effective and transparent dialogue, and sometimes facilitated unhealthy controlling or compulsive behaviors.

Expectation of immediate response (2)

Two academic sources also cited the behavior of expecting (or demanding) an immediate response when making a request, order, or asking a question, and was typically found in domestic settings. Outside of military environments, this behavior was considered inappropriate and associated with increased conflict and/or poorer communication.

Casting help-seeking as weakness (2)

Some studies also specifically referenced the degradation of help-seeking generally, casting it instead as a sign of weakness or shortcoming on part of the help-seeker. It should be noted that this behavior is functionally distinct from Unwilling to ask for help (which simply refers to one’s hesitancy to ask for help), although both may present simultaneously.
Direct/forceful speech (1)

One study mentioned the direct nature of how some veterans communicated generally. This frank and direct manner of speaking was occasionally off-putting to peers and co-workers who were more accustomed to indirect and passive methods of communication.

Unexpected Findings

As mentioned previously, Self-regulation/discipline was associated with both positive and negative outcomes and may thus be considered a conflicted behavior. This likely reflects the dichotomy inherent within self-regulation and discipline generally: while perhaps useful in contexts where order and adherence to customs or norms are desirable, it may also be restrictive of self-expression or independent action. Veterans who are more proficient at modulating their self-regulation and discipline based on context and situation may find they have less difficulty in transition than similarly situated veterans for whom such disciplined patterns of behavior are not as easily disengaged.

Although the association to both positive and negative outcomes was unexpected, perhaps equally curious was the finding that Self-regulation/discipline was the only Identified Behavior found to be so associated. This may have implications for the remainder of the other Identified Behaviors and the consistency with which they are aligned with outcomes. Specifically, the lack of additional conflicted behaviors suggests greater reliability for both positively and negatively associated IBs, such that positively associated behaviors may very rarely – if ever – be associated with negative outcomes and vice versa.
Another unexpected finding after reviewing the data was the slight majority that positive outcomes had over negative outcomes. While examining the hundreds of results, it became clear that the preponderance of veteran-based studies was focused on studying and identifying problems and negative outcomes, as opposed to identifying and developing positive experiences gained through military service. As this trend in veteran research towards pathologies and difficulties has been noted by others (Kirchner, Michael & Akdere, 2019; Neill-Harris et al., 2016), it was relatively unsurprising to find this pattern repeated when examining the 600 results produced by the present work’s search strategy.

More unexpectedly, however, was the finding that as more and more studies were discarded as part of data analysis, the overall sentiment of the studies that were retained become more clearly focused on positive outcomes and the benefits of military service. Although the total number of Identified Behaviors was ultimately found to be the same for both positive and negatives outcomes – 11 each – the positively-associated behaviors had 8% more citations overall (57 to 49, respectively). It was notable that the superset of results was largely biased towards the negative due to their focus on medical, psychological, or social issues. When the data set is trimmed to focus on leadership communication behaviors, however, the ratio of positive to negative results becomes much more balanced.

Accordingly, the prevalence of such studies may present a skewed representation of veterans in general if one were to judge solely by their quantity, as many veterans may not present with TBI, PTSD, poly-trauma, or the other specific conditions considered in the studies. When the exclusion criteria are properly applied to represent only those
behaviors associated with leadership communication behaviors, however, such discrepancies begin to disappear. This provides further support for the argument that military service may provide as many (if not more) potential benefits for leadership communication purposes as it does potential liabilities.

Implications for Leadership Communications

Overall, these findings indicate that initiative, discipline, and being team-oriented are amongst the most well-supported and beneficial leadership communication behaviors derived from military service. Even outside a military context, one may see how such attributes are likely supportive of leadership roles and facilitative of effective communication as well. Employers, for example, may value these behaviors and favor or reward veteran employees or candidates that exhibit them, potentially leading to positive more employment outcomes and a less difficult transition experience.

Interestingly, the most-cited detrimental leadership communication behaviors were not simply the inverse of the topmost positive ones (such as lazy, chaotic, and individualistic), but were rather represented by their own wholly unique sets of behaviors with very marginal overlap. Hostility, being short-tempered, and difficulty communicating with civilians were noted as the topmost negative behaviors. It is not difficult to imagine how such behaviors may cause issues may cause difficulty in employment scenarios – particularly in organizations where there are few to no veterans already – or in other interpersonal contexts, such as family life or other social settings.

Although these findings were specific to veterans and transitioning service members, to the extent that this systematic review is also a study of leadership communication behaviors, the results may also apply to non-veteran populations. A
separate study would be required to substantiate any definitive claims, but correlations may be useful; ergo if initiative, discipline, and being team-oriented lead to positive outcomes for veteran populations who acquired these through military service, such behaviors may also result in positive outcomes for non-veteran populations who are able to acquire these behaviors via other methods.
CHAPTER 6

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Key Findings

This study resulted in several key findings applicable to both the field of leadership communications and transitioning veterans. The first was the finding that leadership communications as a domain of discrete study is still relatively new, with the majority of studies being published within the past 25 years – a finding that was found to be consistent with the published date of studies examined by the present work as well. Although academic interest and publications have increased in recent years, this encouraging trend will need to continue if this domain is to acquire the same body of evidence held by more established fields of study, such as leadership theory, behavioral psychology, and communication studies.

The second major finding of interest was the equal number of behaviors that were associated with both positive and negative outcomes. Although positive behaviors had more academic support than negative behavior, it was informative that both existed in roughly equal measure, suggesting that every veteran leaves military service with a unique mix of imparted leadership communication behaviors. This finding further suggests that a guide for how to interpret these imparted behaviors may be helpful for transitioning veterans who are unaware of these behaviors and/or unsure which ones to retain in civilian contexts.

Finally, the third key finding was derived from the Identified Behaviors themselves, namely that proactive, collaborative, and disciplined behaviors were associated with positive outcomes, whereas aggressive, hypervigilant, and isolating
behaviors were associated with negative outcomes (with individual behaviors described in further detail in Chapter 5: Data Interpretation). After reviewing the data collected and considering the target population, however, it became clear that an academic paper may not be the most effective method for which to communicate these findings to the actual target audience of transitioned or transitioning service members. Thus, a “Leadership Communication GO/NO-GO List” was created for this audience and is designed to present the most useful data in a practical, compact, and accessible format. For brevity, only the top five positive and negative behaviors were included. Additionally, military references and a non-academic writing style were specifically employed to increase reader engagement with the target demographic. This list appears in the following section, though other possible formats could include a brochure, printed handout, website or magazine article, or as supplemental information for a larger veteran transition initiative.

Leadership Communication GO/NO-GO List

A New Mission

SITUATION: You’ve been discharged from the military (or are going to be soon) and are facing many transitions. Housing, employment, healthcare, and family/social situations are just some of the areas that may look much different in civilian life. In many of these circumstances, you’ll be using skills and behaviors picked up in the military. Many of these behaviors are helpful: civilian employers tend to like the discipline many vets show when they arrive to work on time, for example! Some aren’t, though – complaining about how slow or lazy civvies are probably won’t win you many points from your civilian friends and co-workers. If you’re left scratching your head
wondering which behaviors are good to go and which aren’t, you aren’t alone. Keep reading – this guide is for you.

**Pop a Red Star Cluster**

Need help? Enter the domain of leadership communications (LC), which is a wide field that covers the intersection between leadership theory and communications studies. You probably use LC-based behaviors every day without even realizing it, but don’t let the “leadership” part fool you – you can still be a leader even if you don’t have a formal title. Anytime you ask a co-worker to do something, explain a concept or process to a friend, or volunteer to pay for lunch, you’re demonstrating LC behaviors. You pick up a lot of these behaviors in the military, regardless of your rank. Knowing which behaviors are helpful in the civilian world and which are not can be useful in making your transition smoother and more successful.

**GO/NO-GO Behaviors**

The following list of LC behaviors is provided as a guide to aid in your transition. “GO behaviors” have been associated with positive outcomes, whereas “NO-GO behaviors” have been associated with negative outcomes. They were obtained from a systematic review conducted on academic studies and papers related to veteran transitions and outcomes. This list shouldn’t be expected to cover every possible situation, but rather something that provides overarching guidance. Think Commander’s Intent, not Standard Operating Procedure (SOP).

**GO Behaviors:**

Self-determination/Initiative
• Employers (and others) tend to like people who are eager to help and are willing to take proactive action when something is broken. Remember: you can’t be voluntold if it was your idea to begin with!

Self-regulation/discipline

• Military discipline tends to be appreciated when others notice that you don’t often complain about trivial things and do your tasks in a methodical, structured way. Just don’t overdo it – being able to unwind, share your hopes and struggles with a trusted friend, and being ok with something not being “perfect” is just as important and is one of the benefits of being in 1st Civ Div.

Team-oriented

• Something you probably learned from the military: one person can’t do it alone. While civilian life is typically much more individualistic than your former unit, being a team player tends to be highly valued by employees, as there is usually a common purpose that drives everyone to row in the same direction. Action plan? Keep rowing.

Hard-working

• No surprise here – everyone likes a hard worker. Everyone, that is, except perhaps those put off by your diligent efforts or see it as a threat to their position. You may need to adjust your tempo somewhat to better reflect your environment, but don’t stop being responsive to the needs of your job, friends, or family. Vets are known to be hard workers for good reason.
Goal-setting

• Marking your next waypoint is good for more than just passing land-nav class – it sets you up for success long-term. Need to create a budget, find a house, or mark out a new career trajectory? Do the research, make a plan, and stick to it. It doesn’t need to be a five-paragraph order, but placing structure around the goals you want to achieve – and how you will get there – is key for mission success.

NO-GO Behaviors:

Angry/Hostile/Aggressive

• Aggression can certainly have its uses in the military – perhaps even save your life – but in civilian life, it’s needed much less often. This might be difficult to reduce at first, so give yourself an extra second to temper your response before reacting when something angers you. It won’t be easy, but it’s worth it – when examining LC behaviors and negative outcomes for vets (like losing your job, house, etc), anger and hostility were at the top of the list for behaviors that would behoove you to avoid or reduce.

Short-tempered

• Closely related to anger, having a short temper is another behavior you’ll likely want to avoid. Most civilian situations and decisions aren’t life-and-death and allow you to take more time to respond than you’re probably used to. Use that to your advantage, and instead of bringing out the knife hands, calmly ask the person to tell you more. You’ll buy a few seconds to calm
down, the person will appreciate being heard, and you may get more info that shows the situation wasn’t as bad as it first seemed.

Difficulty communicating with civilians

- “My Amazon package is late.” “There’s nothing to watch on TV.” If you haven’t already, you may notice that the concerns of most civilians – and even the way they talk – probably don’t line up with your own, making you think you have nothing in common. Although your backgrounds may be different, you probably have something in common, even if it’s just the local sports team at first. Keep trying to find common ground on whatever topics you can and build from there.

Hypervigilance

- It may be second nature to scans roadways for IEDs while driving or to constantly scan crowds for threats when shopping at a store, but these behaviors can be distracting and even harmful to yourself and others. Constantly being on alert puts a lot of stress on your mind and body, so make sure you’re getting enough sleep and exercise to help reduce the physical effects. Also consider mindfulness or talking to a therapist to help ease the mental effects (and ultimately help reduce the triggers in the first place).

Unwilling to ask for help

- While the military might have told you how to make your bed, there’s no equivalent to a platoon sergeant or drill instructor in the civilian world. You’ll need to learn how to ask for help, frequently from civilians themselves, to
successfully navigate your own transition journey. Unlike the military, folks will rarely tell you what to do unless asked. Like the military, however, you can’t go it alone, so don’t be afraid to ask for help when you need it.

Debrief

If you’re wondering where these results came from, it came from a systematic review done by another vet like yourself who was puzzled at which behaviors could be safely “imported” – or – not – from the military to civilian life. Need the full briefing? For more details and additional behaviors not covered in this list, you can access the entire paper at [LINK].

Limitations

Although this work was based on many studies, there are several important caveats and areas that were not able to be explored that are worth mentioning here. First, although the modified PICO framework and search strategy previously defined attempt to prescribe objective measures of inclusion and exclusion, it must be noted that there still exists a fair degree of subjectivity on the part of the reviewer for what qualifies as a leadership communication behavior or not. For example, I recognized Short-tempered as a leadership communication behavior because its use is externally visible to others and I believe it has clear implications for both leadership and communication effectiveness. Another reviewer, however, may judge such behavior to only have implications in the communication domain or prefer to consider it strictly a conflict resolution behavior, not a leadership communication one.
Such perspectives may be equally correct in their own right, leading to a large and potentially inconsistent range of possible approaches one could defensibly use in their analysis depending on how wide or narrow one was in their interpretations. How then to adjust for the existence of multiple “correct” ways in which to review this data? As the sole reviewer for this work, I have the limitation of only being able to provide my subjective perspective on how to classify these behaviors and do not have the benefit of incorporating another’s view alongside my own. This does, however, provide a benefit inasmuch as all the results are internally consistent, as the same individual and perspective were used to review all the results produced.

Accordingly, one may view these results as a photo taken at a particular time of day. Another’s perspective of the same data may yield slightly different results, such as a photo taken of the same scene but at a different time of day. The actual details between each perspective (or photo) may differ, but over time as more perspectives are gained and compared, we obtain a larger, more accurate view of what exactly we are looking at.

Secondly, there was the straightforward limitation of this study only examining academic works indexed via the Franklin database and thus were accessible online. It is certainly plausible that many relevant studies may exist on online databases or journals not cataloged by Franklin, and yet more that may only be available in paper format and are not available electronically. There was also the limitation of the technical issues that occurred with some of the results, rendering the results unusable as previously stated in Chapter 4: Data Collected.
Future Research

Although the majority of studies were based on US service members and veterans, there were several UK-based studies as well, and a handful from countries around the world (Ethiopia, South Africa, etc.). Given the overwhelming prominence of US-based studies and target populations, it may be instructive to exclusively examine non-US regions and/or countries to determine whether these findings were representative of veteran populations around the world or whether significant regional or national variability existed.

As mentioned in the prior section, it may also be a useful area of future research to have others review the data covered by this work and share their conclusions to build a more complete understanding of what counts as LC data and outcomes. Such validation, rebuttal, or simply the addition of additional behaviors would serve to strengthen what appears to be an area of limited research.

There also may be a benefit in conducting a similarly structured review as this work which focuses solely on inward-facing behaviors, such as negative self-talk, circular thinking, obsessive behaviors, etc. Whereas external behaviors are limited to those that are visible to others (and typically require another person to effectuate), internal behaviors may be running continuously with no social settings or external triggers required. Granted, such behaviors may be more difficult to determine empirically as they would require self-reporting or other externally visible signs of an internal behavior at work. Nonetheless, such may present a useful pairing to this work, thus encompassing both internal and external leadership communication behaviors and advancing the field for transitioning veterans overall.
Personal Observations

My aim when I started this work was to improve the experiences of transitioning veterans in at least some measure so that perhaps another servicemember approaching this transition would not feel as puzzled and unsure as I once did. I endeavored not just to fulfill an academic requirement but to find and research a topic that would in some way improve the lives of others. With this research, I hope to have achieved that goal. After this work is published, too, I wish not for it to be archived but to serve as an active stepping-stone for others to improve upon. It is entirely anticipated that others will perform similar and more superior work than what I have presented here.

It is in this spirit of continual self-improvement and mutual contribution that I encourage others to build on what they find here. I invite the reader to not take these findings at face value, but to investigate the studies referenced by this work – and engage in adjacent works not cited – to determine whether your observations are similar or quite different than my own. Undoubtedly others will find novel correlations that I may have overlooked or extract some new meaning not recognized here. To these explorers, I wish the utmost success.

For veterans – of which I count myself one – I hope this work is as instructive for you in reading as it was for me in writing. At the beginning of this study, I was uncertain about which behaviors to bring forward and which to leave behind. Having now conducted this research, that uncertainty has been replaced with knowledge. I have learned that discipline is highly valued by others – but that it also has a dark side. I see too that team orientation is highly appreciated and that I should be especially mindful to avoid being short-tempered with others. If nothing else, I have learned not to consider
my “military self” with reservation, but to embrace it mindfully and employ it strategically where it may provide utility. While this knowledge is not complete, it has been more than sufficient to begin charting a new and better path for my civilian life. While I am under no illusion that all veteran leadership communication difficulties will be resolved based on the findings of this work, if I can guide at least one other veteran in better navigating their journey towards a productive, healthy, and happy civilian life, I will have considered this work successful.
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APPENDIX A

IDENTIFIED BEHAVIORS (IB) MATRIX

Lists all behaviors identified as part of the systematic review of literature.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identified Behavior (IB)</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Reference ID(s)</th>
<th>Times Cited</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal setting</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>002,014,100,154,244,388</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-regulation/discipline</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>002,058,100,120,122,154,178,221,266,353</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to ask for help</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>010,044,130,212,260</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative characterization of civilians</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>013,058,353</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casting help-seeking as weakness</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>013,266</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-determination/Initiative</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>016,154,178,202,211,244,256,261,353,388</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angry/Hostile/Aggressive</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>023,039,044,077,091,095,120,142,309,551</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-tempered</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>023,039,044,095,245,309,551</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team-oriented</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>026,058,120,143,178,202,211,306,353</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectation of immediate response</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>039,100</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypervigilence</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>039,081,089,095,100,109</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-regulation/discipline</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>081,142,245</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational capability</strong></td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>100,211,221,388</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Difficulty communicating</strong></td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>120,143,244,261,266,353</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>with civilians</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependence on external</strong></td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>120,143,245,287</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>structure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Confidence</strong></td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>122,256</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Problem-solving</strong></td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>122,306,353</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance under stress</strong></td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>143,178</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional demeanor</strong></td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-sacrificial/servant</strong></td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>178,353</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>leadership</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct/forceful speech</strong></td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

REFERENCE ID DATABASE

Lists the Reference ID (Ref ID), Year Published (Year), URL, and Source Citation for all Identified Behaviors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref ID</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>URL</th>
<th>Source Citation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DOI</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>URL</td>
<td>Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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