

Identifying the Difference between Military and Civilian Leadership Styles and Its Effect on Army Acquisition Organizations Over the Past Twenty Years

Mahmoud (Dave) Ahmad



January 31, 2021

Version Number 4

PUBLISHED BY
DAU

Table of Contents

ABSTRACT	6
CHAPTER 1 – INTRODUCTION	7
<i>Background</i>	<i>11</i>
<i>Problem Statement</i>	<i>12</i>
<i>Purpose of This Study</i>	<i>12</i>
<i>Significance of This Research</i>	<i>12</i>
<i>Overview of the Research Methodology</i>	<i>14</i>
<i>Limitations</i>	<i>18</i>
CHAPTER 2 - REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	20
<i>Introduction</i>	<i>20</i>
<i>Theme: Organizational Values and Management</i>	<i>25</i>
<i>Theme: Military vs. Civilian Leadership Styles.....</i>	<i>26</i>
<i>Theme: Military vs. Civilian Challenges in Leadership.....</i>	<i>30</i>
<i>Theme: Leadership Skills/Core Competencies</i>	<i>31</i>
<i>Theme: Leadership Styles.....</i>	<i>33</i>
<i>Theme: Leadership in an Acquisition Organization.....</i>	<i>35</i>
<i>Summary.....</i>	<i>35</i>
CHAPTER 3 - RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	38
<i>Introduction</i>	<i>38</i>
<i>Research Question.....</i>	<i>38</i>
Research Design	40
Bias and Error	43
CHAPTER 4 – FINDINGS	44
<i>Military Leadership Styles</i>	<i>45</i>
Trait Determination using Lominger LEADERSHIP ARCHITECT® Competency Sort Cards	45

Assessing Transformational Leadership Skills Using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire	49
Personality Types Using the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator	54
The Transition of Military Personnel into the Civilian Workforce.....	56
<i>Civilian Leadership Styles</i>	58
Trait Determination using Lominger LEADERSHIP ARCHITECT® Competency Sort Cards	60
Assessing Transformational Leadership Skills Using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire	63
Personality Types Using the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator	67
Key Skills for Leadership in Varying Levels of Management	68
<i>Comparing the Similarities and Differences in Military and Civilian Leadership Styles</i>	72
Organizational Effectiveness as a Function of Leadership	76
The Effect of Personality on Leadership.....	87
CHAPTER 5 - SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	91
<i>Summary of the Data Analysis</i>	92
Determining Military Leadership Characteristics	92
Determining Civilian Leadership Characteristics	93
Determining Unique Leadership Characteristics.....	94
Defining Effective Army Organizations	98
Leadership Traits that Lead to an Effective Army Organization.....	99
<i>Conclusions</i>	101
<i>Final Interpretation</i>	102
<i>Evidence of Bias and Methods to Minimize its Effect on this Analysis</i>	103
<i>Recommendations</i>	103
<i>Limitations of the Study</i>	104
BIBLIOGRAPHY	105
APPENDICES.....	109
<i>Appendix A - Characteristics of Military Leadership Styles and How They're Viewed</i>	110
<i>Appendix B. Common Characteristics of Good Leaders</i>	112
<i>Appendix C. Common Characteristics of Poor Leaders.....</i>	114
ACRONYMS.....	115

Author Note.....	117
-------------------------	------------

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1-1. Key Leadership Skills.....	10
Table 1-2. Leadership Traits.....	11
Table 4-1. Leadership Traits of Navy Admirals –self-reported & observed.....	46
Table 4-2. Self-Reported Leadership Traits of U.S. Army Generals.....	48
Table 4-3. Cultural Factors Impacting Leadership Perspectives of U.S. Army Generals	48
Table 4-4. MLQ Assessment Results – Former & Retired Military.....	53
Table 4-5. Personality Preference Using the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator.....	56
Table 4-6. Summary of Senior Executive Service Competencies.....	61
Table 4-7. Self-Reported Leadership Traits of Senior Executive Service Members.....	62
Table 4-8. Cultural Factors Impacting Leadership Perspectives of Senior Executives.....	63
Table 4-9. MLQ Assessment Results of Aerospace Leaders – Civilian.....	66
Table 4-10. Personality Preference Using the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator.....	68
Table 4-11. Skills for Effective Leadership at Level 2 Management Levels.....	71
Table 4-12. Skills for Effective Leadership at Level 5 Management Levels.....	72
Table 4-13. Self-Assessed & Observed Competencies of Admirals & SES Members.....	74
Table 4-14. Self-Assessed Competencies of General Officers and SES Members.....	75
Table 4-15. Cultural Factors Impacting Military and Civilian Leadership Traits.....	76
Table 4-16. Areas of Project Management Perspective.....	79
Table 4-17. Desired Attributes of Admirals and Senior Executive Service Members.....	80
Table 4-18. Keys to Effective Leadership.....	90
Table 5-1. Leadership Characteristics of Military Leaders.....	93
Table 5-2. Leadership Characteristics of Civilian Leaders.....	94
Table 5-3. Shared Leadership Characteristics for Military & Civilian Leaders.....	96
Table 5-4. Self-Assessed Leadership Characteristics Unique to Military & Civilian Leaders.....	97
Table 5-5. Observed Shared Military and Civilian Leadership Characteristics.....	97
Table 5-6. Unique Observed Military and Civilian Leadership Characteristics	98
Table 5-7. Keys to Effective Leadership.....	100

ABSTRACT

The placement of either military or civilian personnel in positions of leadership over acquisition organizations presents a potential challenge to organizations faced with leadership styles that may or may not be conducive to the effectiveness of the type of organization being led. The difference between a military culture and a civilian culture may present itself in ways that result in very different leadership styles.

The objective of this research paper is to identify the differences between military and civilian leadership styles and its effect on Army acquisition organizations over the past twenty years. Data was collected through a literature search to identify leadership characteristics for both military and civilian leaders, those characteristics were then compared, and both shared and unique characteristics were identified. The unique characteristics were then compared to the types of leadership traits found to be beneficial as well as traits found to be detrimental to leading acquisition organizations. It was found that military and civilian leaders share many characteristics, both observed and self-assessed, as well as some differences. In the end, the most important trait was to have a contingency, or situational type of leadership style that enables leaders to adapt to the organization.

CHAPTER 1 – INTRODUCTION

The criticality of equipping the warfighter cannot be overstated. The personnel supporting the development, production, fielding, and maintenance of all the systems enabling the soldier, airman, sailor and marine to effectively perform his/her mission depends on the success of acquisition personnel in completing their own mission. The people whose job it is to provide materiel to the warfighters are dedicated to this mission and have proven themselves up to the task. However, the civilian and military leaders in the positions to guide the outcomes of the acquisition personnel efforts come from very different cultures which may influence their own understanding of the people they are charged to lead. This disconnect has the potential to result in reduced effectiveness, morale, and productivity.

This paper seeks to identify the differences between military and civilian leadership styles, and their effect on acquisition organizations. In order to do this, the leadership styles of each group of interest is to be identified through a series of characteristics that can be defined. The impact of these leadership styles on the effectiveness of an organization can be defined in multiple ways, from quantifiable measures of organizational output levels, such as number of successful programs, measured for example by the number of systems fielded, requirements met, etc., to impact on morale of the workforce.

Webster's New World Dictionary, Third College Edition (Simon & Schuster, 1988), defines Leadership as 1. The position or guidance of a leader. 2. The ability to lead, and 3. The leaders of a group. Webster's first definition begins with the person's position or the advice or assistance a person provides to another in the form of guidance. This seems to indicate they are interchangeable, which I would argue is not the case. None of these definitions say anything about the characteristics of a good, bad, effective, or ineffective leader. ADP 6-22 defines an

Army leader as “Anyone who by virtue of assumed role or assigned responsibility inspires and influences people by providing purpose, direction, and motivation to accomplish the mission and improve the organization” (Headquarters, Department of the Army, 2019, p. C1) John C. Maxwell, in his book *The 5 Levels of Leadership* states that “Leadership is a process, not a position” (Maxwell, 2011, p. 4). In addition, he also states that “...leadership is influence. If people can increase their influence with others, they can lead more effectively” (Maxwell, 2011, p. 2). DuBrin states it best, identifying a common characteristic of “...leaders is their ability to inspire and stimulate others to achieve worthwhile goals.” He then goes on to define leadership “...as the ability to inspire confidence and support among the people who are needed to achieve organizational goals (DuBrin, 2019, p. 2) This definition goes further along the continuum, but one more step needs to be taken. To be complete, I believe the best definition of leadership that I have come across further defines leadership as “...the activity of influencing people to cooperate toward some goal which they come to find desirable and which motivates them over the long haul” (Baldwin & Grayson, 2004, p. 8). Similarly, in Tankersley (2007), one of the participants quoted defined leadership as “...the ability to get a diverse set of people with diverse interests and motivations to all pull together in the same direction toward a common goal” (p. 68). For the purposes of this paper, a combination of the definitions from Maxwell and Tankersley will be used and is as follows: “Leadership is the ability to inspire confidence and support among a diverse set of people with diverse interests and motivations to pull together in the same direction towards a common goal”. This sets up the paper to look at effectiveness from the perspective that people are being influenced to support the goals and objectives of the leader, and actions are not being taken through fear of the leader, for example the fear of adverse actions being taken against employees.

In order to begin identifying characteristics that define leadership styles, a search of characteristics was undertaken to begin that process. What was found was that key leadership skills vary widely and are defined differently in different sources. Table 1-1 shows various skills as defined by various sources.

Table 1-1. Key Leadership Skills

Northeastern University (2019)	Indeed Career Guide (2019)	ADP 6-22 (2019, pp. 1-15)
Development, Self	Accountability	Achieves
Development, Team	Empathy	Character
Ethical Practice	Goal Setting	Develops
Innovation	Motivation & Encouragement	Intellect
Strategic Thinking	Self-Improvement	Leads
	Team Building	Presence
	Trust	

Leadership characteristics can be combined “into three broad categories: personality traits, motives, and cognitive factors” (DuBrin, 2019, p. 28). The characteristics of the personality traits as identified by DuBrin that comprise each of these categories has been tabularized into a single table as shown in Table 1-2 below.

Table 1-2. Leadership Traits (Dubrin, 2019)

Personality Traits		Leadership Motives	Cognitive Factors
General	Task Related		
Assertiveness	Emotional Intelligence	Drive/Achievement	Analytical Knowledge
Authenticity	Flexibility/Adaptability	Power, Personalized	Business Knowledge
Core Self-Evaluation	Passion for the people	Power, Socialized	Creativity
Enthusiasm, Optimism, Warmth	Passion for the work	Tenacity	Farsightedness
Extroversion		Work Ethic	Insight
Humility			
Self Confidence			
Sense of Humor			
Trustworthy			

The first major category is that of ‘Personality Traits’, which are those traits that are “observable both within and outside the context of work” (DuBrin, 2019, p. 28). Essentially, these are the unchanging characteristics that are displayed in both a person’s work life and in their personal life. There are two sub-groups, “general personality traits ... and task related traits” (DuBrin, 2019, p. 28).

The second major category is that of ‘Leadership Motives’. In his book *Leadership: Research Findings, Practice, and Skills*, DuBrin states that “leaders have an intense desire to occupy a position of responsibility for others and to control them” (2019, p. 41). This is reflected in the leadership motives that emphasize those motives that drive a person that wants to control the outcome of events.

The last category is that of the ‘Cognitive Factors’ that affect leadership. DuBrin focuses on the requirement for leaders to be “mentally sharp”, to be able to cull out “essential information” and to have “problem-solving” skills (2019, pp. 42-43). Strong abilities in each of these areas will be necessary to be able to lead others.

Each of the above traits are present in all people, but it is the degree of presence that determines how effective one may be when leading an organization.

Background

My interest in this subject has been the ongoing dialog between the personnel that make up the civilian and military teams within Program Management Offices (PMO) at Picatinny Arsenal. In my experience, the civilians assigned to the Program Offices as an Assistant Program Manager (APM) or Program Officer (PO) are generally degreed employees with years of experience supporting and running acquisition programs, with backgrounds in engineering and quality, and support staff in finance and logistics, but relatively little formal training in the leadership of organizations. Military members have come to the PM offices with typically limited experience in acquisition, a broader spectrum of degrees from the humanities to business to engineering, but a significant amount of formal leadership training and experience. In discussions with both military and civilian personnel, I have found that each feels that their training and experience (or those that are similar to themselves) provide better leadership for the organization. I believe that while there are benefits and drawbacks of various leadership styles, it isn’t clear if leadership effectiveness is more influenced by personal characteristics than by background and training. This paper will investigate the differences between military and civilian leadership styles to begin the exploration of any leadership styles that may be identifiable as characteristics of the experience and training as a military or civilian leader.

Problem Statement

Within acquisition organizations such as Program Management Offices, personnel assigned as the Program Manager (PM) or the Product Manager (PdM) will rotate through the position every three years (this may vary due to unusual circumstances). The general problem that this may introduce is an inconsistency in goals and objectives in government acquisition due to the change of personnel in the PM and PdM positions. With the rotation of personnel, leadership style differences and priorities will have an impact on leadership transitions. Since both military and civilian personnel have the opportunity to be a PM or PdM, this raises the question of whether there are differences in leadership styles between military and civilian personnel and if so how, do the differences in leadership styles impact the effectiveness and success of an organization?

Purpose of This Study

The purpose of this study is to determine if differences in military and civilian leadership styles have yielded or have the potential to yield beneficial or adverse effects on the effectiveness of Army acquisition organizations over the past twenty (20) years.

The audience for this paper is Army leadership and the organizations that support them in the acquisition field. These leaders are the Program Executive Officers (PEO), Program/Product Managers (PM), Product Directors (PD) and their supporting organizations.

Significance of This Research

PEO offices were stood up to manage multiple PM offices, which in turn manage products and product lines for the Army and other services for programs that are of joint interest. These PM offices primarily consist of career civilian employees, with the leadership positions of the Program Executive Officers (PEO), the O-6 & O-5 level Project/Program Managers (PMs)

having traditionally been held by military officers with civilian deputies. Frequently, these leaders have a significant level of leadership training and roles, but have not had significant acquisition experience. They are placed in the position to lead career civilians with technical backgrounds that frequently have years of acquisition experience but little formal leadership training. This creates a dynamic that plays a role in the overall organizational effectiveness. Today, PEO, PM, PdM and PD positions are being opened so that what had previously been reserved for military, now provides opportunities for civilian leaders. This in turn introduces a new dynamic between the leadership and acquisition organization members. This change in who leads each organization has the potential to bring about a change in leadership styles that may have significant effects on the effectiveness of Army acquisition organizations. PM and PEO offices and their supporting organizations need to be able to adapt to this changing leadership style to maintain a level of effectiveness regardless of the current leader type. This research is going to be of benefit to organizations that have rotating leaders that may either be civilian or military, and will hopefully provide insight into how to best prepare for potential changes based on the background of the new leader.

This research will be based on existing studies, so no new information will be generated. Existing information will be collected from multiple studies, reviewed, and common findings between studies that are specific to leadership in Army acquisition organizations will be culled and analyzed for characteristics of merit that are attributable specifically to military or civilian leadership styles and how those leadership styles affected the organizations the leaders were chartered to lead.

The potential impact from the findings of this research will be to discover potential leadership characteristics that are common to military and civilian leaders that impact acquisition

organizations in ways that may be beneficial or detrimental. If there are characteristics that are clearly linked to performance of an organization, this may enable the conversation between newly appointed leaders and their subordinates to begin early, and result in a more effective leadership experience right from the start. If the characteristics are clear and ingrained, it may enable the Army to begin to address training needs for future leaders.

Overview of the Research Methodology

The question to be answered by this research is “How do the differences between military and civilian leadership styles impact the effectiveness of an organization?”

This research paper is being conducted using a qualitative approach, based on historical data. This aligns with Yin’s research approach of an “Archival Analysis” which focuses on the “who, what, ... how” and “why” and which no “control over behavioral events” is required, and it “focuses on contemporary events” as well as non-contemporary events (2018, p. 9). This approach will answer the questions of **who** are the types people being investigated, **what** are the characteristics that are significant, **why** those characteristics are significant, and **how** those characteristics impact acquisition organizations. The strategy to be used for this research paper is to conduct literature searches using the sources that are listed later in this paper and using the stated key word searches. I will also use open internet sources as well as books that were provided for the Senior Service College Fellowship (SSCF) program.

The objective of this research paper is to identify, characterize, and attribute those leadership qualities exhibited by military and civilian leaders and the impact on the effectiveness of an acquisition organization.

The outcome of this research paper will be to identify those characteristics of leadership that are both shared by the military and civilian leaders, as well as those characteristics that are

unique and inherent to military or civilian leaders. The intent is to provide the impact on the organization from an effectiveness perspective, but will not be limited to effectiveness as it relates to the mission. If other organizational impacts are found, such as morale, that will also be identified and reported.

My expectation is that the outcome to my research question will be biased towards the value of military leadership from a qualitative perspective. The reason for this is that I expect that more research will have been done by military students as part of military leadership course work and that a preference to a familiar style of leadership will result in a somewhat biased outcome for many of these reports. If the research documentation can be balanced between the two, I believe there will be strong rationale and support for both civilian and military leadership characteristics being beneficial as well as adverse to an organization.

The research topic will provide value to acquisition organizations that may, at various times, be led by civilian or military personnel. In order to ensure that the research topic will be answered fully, I developed supporting questions that each form a part of the overall topic in order to guide the research to determine what characteristics will answer the overall objective.

1. Are there distinct military leadership styles, and if so, what characteristics are common among military leaders?
2. Are there distinct civilian leadership styles, and if so, what characteristics are common among civilian leaders?
3. Given the characteristics identified above, what are the common differences found between the two types of leaders?
4. How is effectiveness defined in an Army acquisition organization?

5. How is effectiveness between Army acquisition organizations attributable to specific characteristics identified as military or civilian leadership styles?

Initial actions for the development of this research paper are to conduct a literature search to ensure there are sufficient sources of information to conduct the case study to answer the overall topic.

Four primary sources of information will be used to support this paper:

1. ProQuest ABI/Inform through the DAU.edu website;
2. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global through the DAU.edu;
3. EBSCOhost Business Source Ultimate, also through the DAU.edu website; and
4. The Webster University online library.

In addition, open internet sources and books that were provided for the Senior Service College Fellowship (SSCF) will be used as appropriate. Once a sufficient number of sources from a variety of backgrounds and perspectives that support this topic have been identified, a detailed review of each source will be conducted to look for specific information to answer each of the supporting questions.

The key variables to be examined are:

- Military personnel, to include retired military;
- Civilian personnel, primarily without military experience, but potentially up to 6 years (which may be modified depending on findings);
- Leadership styles, to include any specific characteristics that can be identified;
- Organizations effectiveness, which will be determined as the study progresses to be measured by the ability to carry out the mission, as well as morale.

The key search terms being used to collect data in the conduct of the literature search from the databases mentioned previously includes the following:

- (Military Civilian) and “Leadership Styles”
- (Military Civilian) and “Leadership Styles” and (Army)
- (Leadership) and “Government Acquisition”
- “Military Leadership” and “Government Acquisition”

When conducting the searches, the key words are entered as written above. Terms that are in parentheses are searched as having an “and/or” between them, and the terms that are in quotations must be found as written. Each term that has an “and” between them is an additional term that must be part of the search. That is, the source will be selected if “military” and “Leadership Styles” are found in the document, but will not be selected if “military” and “Leadership” with the word “Styles” separately used in the document.

The data will be analyzed by identifying characteristics of leadership and the associated outcomes for the organizations being led by those leaders. The outcomes will be based on successes achieved which may include the ability to complete their missions, percentage of projects completed on time and within budget, and the morale of an organization. Some of this information may not be available in the research, but may be inferred from other information, such as employee turnover being an indicator of morale.

Based on being able to develop a successfully balanced data search, the outcomes of this research paper will form the basis for a greater understanding of the impact of leadership styles on an acquisition organization and better matches between leaders and organizations. Both military and civilian leaders will be able to recognize characteristics of their own that may be identified in this paper for characteristics that typically lead to successful organizations as well as

characteristics that are associated with unsuccessful leaders. These characteristics are identified by Eldred and are on page 55 of this study. Additional negative leadership characteristics are listed in appendices A and C.

Limitations

One of the key limitations is that no new data will be generated. No surveys, no independent research, and no experiments will be performed. Information will be limited to data and literature in published reports and theses and dissertations that are currently available. The second limitation is that although this topic will be of interest to personnel that have some connection to the Army, whether as a civilian or a soldier, it is more likely that any research conducted on this topic will have been conducted and studied by active duty personnel that have been going to school in support of their career progression. This may introduce bias in how the data was collected and interpreted in favor of military leadership training and styles.

Key assumptions that were made in designing this research paper are as follows:

1. Sufficient information will be available in published form to support answering the problem statement and supporting questions;
2. If there are discernable differences in leadership styles that are attributable to either civilian or military leadership styles, they will be identified within the published reports or identifiable in the text of those reports.
3. There will be data available that identifies how organizations performed under the different types of leadership.
4. Any other assumptions that are made in the course of the research will be added here.

Potential design flaws in the research methodology center upon the lack of ability to tailor the research to directly answer the problem statement in question. While my initial

research indicates there are plenty of sources of information regarding leadership styles, I have not yet come across (nor have I specifically looked at this point) for information taken from the organizational perspective.

If I had the opportunity to change the methodology I selected, I would have selected a survey type of research project. A survey developed to more directly determine attributes of effective leadership, which would be administered to subordinates, supervisors, peers, and other stakeholders that are impacted or influenced by leaders in order to be able to directly identify, describe, and attribute that characteristics considered beneficial to an organization.

CHAPTER 2 - REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

Chapter 1 established a baseline definition for leadership to be used in order to answer the overall topic question. Although considering definitions from the dictionary, ADP 6-22, from Maxwell (2011), Baldwin & Grayson (2004, p. 8) and others, the definition was a combination derived from DuBrin (2019) and Tankersley (2007). The definition being used for the purposes of this paper is “Leadership is the ability to inspire confidence and support among a diverse set of people with diverse interests and motivations to pull together in the same direction towards a common goal”. In addition, a number of characteristics from various sources that are considered indicators of leadership style are identified in the tables on Chapter 1.

In this Chapter, the rationale for the topic of this paper will be outlined, as well as provide information on the research that has been done previously.

Army Program Management Offices (PMOs) have traditionally been led by Central Selection List (CSL) military leaders at the Lieutenant Colonel (LTC) O-5 level, and at the Colonel (COL) O-6 level. Each PM or PdM have traditionally been a civilian Deputy PM (DPM) or Deputy PdM (DPdM). The military leaders assigned to these positions are selected by an independent board comprised of experienced personnel who have previously served in PM positions. Relatively recently, PD positions (which are equivalent to PdM positions) have been created specifically for civilians to assume leadership positions in PMOs, as well as some PM positions being open to civilians. These civilian CSL boards are staffed by “GS-15s and broadband-equivalent civilians who have completed or are currently serving in a GS-15/COL CSL position; GS-15s and broadband-equivalent civilians who have successfully served in at

least a LTC/GS-14 CSL position” and other civilians that have served in a PM role as colonels (Director, Acquisition Career Management Office, 2015, p. 23).

With the opening of these opportunities for civilians, it raises the question of whether having civilians in these previously military roles will create a new leadership dynamic due to the training and experience differential between military and civilian leaders.

This chapter provides an outline of the literature found in support of this topic. It consists of summaries of the studies that were found in the form of journal articles, theses, and dissertations. In order to find information relevant to this topic, search terms consisted of the following key words, word strings, and combinations. For example, a search that uses the words Military Civilian will search for any document that contains Military or Civilian in the document. Military AND Civilian will search for any document that has both Military and Civilian in the document. A search that has the terms in quotes, for example “Military Civilian” will only return those documents with military and civilian together in that order.

- Civilian AND "program management"
- Civilian culture AND "program management"
- Culture AND leadership
- Culture AND "program management"
- Leadership AND "Government Acquisition"
- Leadership AND "program management"
- "Leadership Style" AND Military Civilian
- "Leadership Style" AND Military AND Civilian
- "Leadership Style" AND Military AND Civilian AND "Army Acquisition"
- "Leadership Styles" AND "Civil Service" AND "Military Personnel"

- "Leadership Styles" AND "Civil Service Personnel" AND "Military Personnel"
- "Leadership Style" AND Military AND Civilian
- "Leadership Style" AND Military AND Civilian AND Acquisition
- "Leadership styles" AND military civilian
- "Leadership styles" AND military civilian Army
- "Management Style" AND Military AND Civilian AND "Army Acquisition"
- Military AND Civilian AND "Program Management"
- Military AND Civilian AND "Program Management" AND Army
- Military AND Civilian AND "Program Management" AND "Army Acquisition"
- Military Civilian AND "Leadership Style"
- Military Civilian AND "Leadership Style" AND Army
- Military Civilian AND "Leadership Style" AND "Army Acquisition"
- Military Civilian AND Management AND "Army Acquisition"
- "Military versus Civilian" AND "leadership style"
- "Military Leadership" AND "Program Management"

The terms listed above were utilized to search the following databases

- Dudley Knox Library
- DAU Knowledge Repository
- EBSCOhost
- GAO
- ProQuest ABI/INFORM Global
- ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global
- Harvard Business Review

Leadership appears to be a highly researched topic, undoubtedly because as stated in the Army Doctrine Publication (ADP) No. 6-22, *Army Leadership and the Profession*, the Army stresses that “the ability to influence others is a central component of leadership”, resulting in “leader development” being “an Army priority” (Headquarters, Department of the Army, 2019, pp. 1-13). ADP 6-22 is an essential resource for this research paper because it sets the tone for leadership, clearly articulating the criticality of leadership in the Army as well as the dependencies of subordinates for singularity of purpose and direction, and the motivation provided by Army leaders to achieve a shared goal.

Initial searches resulted in as many as 633,679 hits in the Naval Post Graduate School (NPS) online library (aka Dudley Knox Library) for the search of “culture” and “leadership”. Creating longer search term strings, and limiting searches to documents that were dated no older than January 2000 reduced the total number of hits to a more manageable number. However, creating search strings that were more focused on this paper’s topics, such "Leadership Style" AND Military AND Civilian AND Acquisition studies conducted after January 1, 2000 resulted in searches with numbers of papers in the single digits. In addition, although these extended search strings appeared to better focus the search, the studies found were not necessarily relevant to this research topic.

While there appears to be a difference between the leadership styles of military and civilian leaders, much of the literature seems to be focused on rating leaders based on a military standard that does not seem to have a clear definition. Based on a dictionary definition, a “standard” is defined as “a level of quality, achievement, etc., that is considered acceptable or desirable” (Meriam-Webster, n.d.). The military standard, while frequently referred to in various publications as a seemingly understood and known quality, does not provide a definition of what

that standard is or should be for each characteristic or trait. ADRP 6-22 identified Army leadership as being based on the attributes of character, presence, and intellect. Furthermore, Army leadership includes competencies defined as leads, develops, and achieves (Headquarters, Department of the Army, 2012, pp. 1-5), but once again, no definitive explanation or definition as to what is the Army standard. This undefined standard may present a bias that may come in the form of a researcher that only sees a high quality leader as one who exhibits those attributes as identified for an active duty soldier on the battlefield, or judging by how well the leader follows orders, or the technical expertise of that leader. This study is looking to identify the leadership characteristics that promote the effectiveness of an acquisition organization, not to benchmark styles based on a survey that examines those qualities that the Army deems as being the key criteria to be assessed. In the case of a military leader, the officer's mission for which he/she is trained may not be in alignment with that which is required effectively lead a primarily well-educated civilian organization. Alternatively, those qualities that a research organization may deem as being optimum for technical advancement that do not directly support the mission of getting materiel to the field also may not be aligned with that of an acquisition organization. Ultimately, it may be found that the military leadership style (assuming there is a general set of characteristics associated with military leadership) is a good fit for an acquisition organization, providing attributes that are specific to a person with a military background and are needed to help a civilian organization function at a higher level.

Over fifty (50) documents were found from the literature search conducted on leadership and military and/or civilian leadership. After review of these documents, the list was reduced to fifteen studies that appeared to be the most relevant to the topic of this paper, and those documents were then organized into themes. These themes included *Organizational Values and*

Management, Military vs. Civilian Leadership, Military vs. Civilian Challenges in Leadership, Leadership Skills/Core Competencies, and Leadership Styles. Each of these are summarized below based on the abstracts provided (if available).

Theme: Organizational Values and Management

1. In his dissertation *The Relationship between Organizational Values and Management Behaviors and Their Influence on Organizational Effectiveness in an Army Project Management Organization*, Gabbert (2005) conducted a qualitative study of the behavior of managers and how those behaviors reflected the organizational values that senior level leaders attempted to instill in the organization and the effect on the organization. Data was collected via survey of 154 employees and senior leaders. Two hypotheses were tested: the first hypothesis was that middle manager behaviors should reflect that of the senior leaders. It was found that this was not the case and there was no significant relationship in behavior type between managers and their leaders. The second hypothesis was that managers rated as most effective “need to be able to operate within the full spectrum of the eight roles” as “Monitor, Coordinator, Mentor, Facilitator, Producer, and Director” (Gabbert, 2005, pp. 65-66). Although managers operating in such a way that they are using all eight roles was found to be more effective, it was not necessarily found that managers have a balance of all the roles. It is noteworthy that the author speaks of charisma multiple times in his study, but it is not listed as a characteristic of a leader. The weakness of the study was the sampling was from a single PM Office. The reader should take caution in assuming those findings will apply to other entities outside of this particular PM office.

Theme: Military vs. Civilian Leadership Styles

1. In his thesis *Comparative Study of Leadership between Civilian Engineers and Military Engineers*, Stevens (2013) conducted a comparative study of leadership between civilian engineers, military engineers and engineers with military experience. Leadership qualities from the literature review were used to create a comparison between a leader and a manager, and the qualities and characteristics of a leader. Civilian engineers, military engineers and engineers with military experience were surveyed, with a total of 33 responses to the survey, 27 of which were civilian engineers. A comparison was made between engineers and engineers with military experience, but did not include military engineers due to an insufficient number of responses from which to make a conclusion. The conclusion that the author made was that engineers with military experience did show a “slightly measurable” level of confidence in their leadership skills and characteristics. The comparison was an average rating using a one to five point scale. If this study were to continue, there would need to be a greater number of responses from engineers, military engineers and engineers with military experience to create a more definitive conclusion. A major shortcoming of this thesis is that the survey that was administered for this analysis was done in such a way that engineers were “asked to rate themselves on their technical skills, people skills, conceptual skills, imagination and creativity, character and planning” (Stevens, 2013, p. 30). This creates an issue that people with high self-confidence will rate themselves higher, which would favor engineers with military experience because the military does a very good job of developing service member’s self-confidence. Stevens later notes that “due to the low responses, there shouldn’t be a definitive conclusion to the leadership comparison of engineers, military engineers, and engineers with veteran experience” (Stevens, 2013, p. 30).

2. In his thesis *The Transformational Leadership Effectiveness of Retired Military Service Academy Graduates in Post-Retirement Civilian Careers*, Tiller (2007) conducted a quantitative study utilizing a survey of traits indicative of transformational leadership and basic leadership effectiveness among retired service academy graduates in post-military careers to determine if there are differences compared to their civilian counterparts. The intent of the study was to explore leadership effectiveness brought from military to civilian environments. The study employed “Avolio and Bass’s Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ)” (Tiller, 2007, p. 124), examining mid- to senior-level corporate managers. The first two study hypotheses, each supported by the results, proposed the retired military officers would demonstrate higher measures of transformational traits and leader effectiveness than the group with no service academy experiences. In addition, transformational traits were correlated to higher leader effectiveness, although small sample sizes limited generalizability of all results. Note that Tiller discounted a finding by Johnson in 2001 which had a sample size of 190 subordinates rating 117 Chief Executive Officers (CEOs) due to it being limited to subordinate perceptions. A study by Eldred (2000) also found issues with retired officer’s effectiveness in the areas of communication styles, having followers obey orders, etc., but this was also discounted by Tiller. However, two sources were found to positively reflect transformational traits of retired military and Tiller uses this to support his hypothesis. Another concern was that this study has a sample size of 31, and it is unclear how many were for each group of interest.
3. In their article *A Clash of Cultures in a Merger of Two Acquisition Project Offices* Baughn and Finzel (2009) document a case study research method used to understand a clash of cultures between two U.S. Army Acquisition Project Offices during 2002. The authors

described each culture before the merger, and the combined culture created by the merger. Six selected characteristics were catalogued: artifacts of culture, common language and conceptual categories, group boundaries, power and status, rewards and punishment, and value of people. The findings were that although the PEO for which both PM offices reported did not consider cultural needs, “it was fairly easy for new and old members to function in the GPO” (Government Project Office) (Baughn & Finzel, 2009, p. 13). It was also found that the management team that overtakes an organization sets the culture of that organization.

4. In his dissertation “*United States Navy Admirals and Civilian Senior Executives: An Investigation of Navy Leadership*” Tankersley (2007) investigated the characteristics of USN Admirals and members of the Senior Executive Service employed by the USN. The target population was 225 Navy Admirals holding the rank of Rear Admiral Lower Half (1 star) or Rear Admiral Upper Half (2-star) and 313 Navy members of the Senior Executive Service. The actual sample size was 8 individuals from each category (8 admirals and 8 SESs). It was found that the most desirable traits Admirals wanted in SESs were ‘Integrity and Trust’; ‘Ethics and Values’, and ‘Motivating Others’. SES’s most desirable traits in admirals were ‘Integrity and Trust’, ‘Ethics and Values’, and ‘Command Skills’. The final conclusion was that “The data indicate the similarities are great and the differences small. As expected and discussed above, all of the leaders viewed integrity, trust, values, and ethics as essential characteristics for naval leaders” (Tankersley, 2007, p. 104)
5. In his dissertation *Comparing Corporate Aerospace Leadership Groups With and Without Military Leadership Experience*, Winkler (2009) conducted a quantitative comparison of 290 executive leaders in US aerospace companies. A quantitative comparison was conducted

using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ). Parametric testing confirmed there were significant MLQ leadership behavior differences among executives with civilian experience, executives with retired military officer experience, and executives with former military officer experience. It was found that aerospace executives with former military officer leadership experience had the highest leadership behavioral scores. However, the primary source for determination of leadership abilities were from self-reported ratings of attributes by the leaders themselves. In addition, the author discounted literature that did not support his hypothesis, and accepted the findings from literature that did support his hypothesis without making a supportable distinction as to why he treated the studies differently.

6. In his article *“Management and Leadership Performance in the Defense Department: Evidence from Surveys of Federal Employees”*, Oh & Lewis (2007) conducted a study on the two factors of organizations – ‘Management’, which is “essential for ensuring effectiveness and efficiency in meeting mission requirements” (Oh & Lewis, 2007, p. 1), and ‘Leadership’, which is essential because “the costs of its absence are so great with possibly immediate consequences in loss of life” (Oh & Lewis, 2007, p. 1) in military operations. Especially of interest is that Oh identified that the services “focus on developing persons even at the expense of organizational performance. Conversely, many civilian agencies have focused on organizational performance often with little attention to the cultivation of leaders” (Oh & Lewis, 2007, p. 1). The survey was conducted by the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) twice, with a survey sample size of 200,000 federal employees in the first survey and 275,000 for the second survey.

7. In their thesis, *“Army Transformation Leadership a Study of Core Competencies for Civilian Leadership”*, Garcia et al (2006) address the changes occurring in Army leadership during the Army transformation as outlined by the Department of Defense (DoD) April 2003 Transformation Planning Guidance. Their paper analyzed civilian leadership competencies and capabilities related to the current Army training environment and identified leadership competencies and capabilities deemed crucial for civilian leadership transformation. Through surveys and interviews their findings led to the following conclusions: Civilian and military personnel share a common view of core leadership competencies - building the team/organization, providing direction/goals, listening to your people, and being a coach/mentor. Diversity of leadership experiences was widely regarded as a core leadership competency and is generally considered inadequate for civilian leadership; and cultural differences between civilian and military leadership are narrowing. The authors’ conclusions and recommendations are that a civilian leadership development program be defined; work to dissolve cultural barriers between military and civilian leadership; and current leadership development opportunities be reviewed and potentially mandated as a requirement for certain civilian leadership positions.

Theme: Military vs. Civilian Challenges in Leadership

1. In their white paper, *“Comparing Leadership Challenges Military vs. Civil Service”*, Ferguson et al (2016) explored the leadership challenges experienced by military and civilian leaders to determine if there was a difference in the challenges that each faced, and if there was, why there was a difference. Initial research looked into the Veteran’s Administration (VA) hospital crisis in which Eric Shinseki was appointed to determine why his experiences and leadership abilities developed during his stellar military career was not sufficient to

prevent the failure of his attempt to correct the deficiencies at the VA hospitals. This is one part of a three part series, the other two focusing on Military vs. Private sector, and Civil Service vs. Private sector. The authors found that there are differences in leadership styles between military and civilian leaders, military having a “mission command culture, direct and order-driven communication style, whereas “other departments may possess an independent or interdependent culture requiring more refined emotional intelligence” (Ferguson, Rybacki, Butts, & Carrigan, 2016, p. 16)

Theme: Leadership Skills/Core Competencies

1. In their thesis, *An Identification of Interpersonal Skills for Building Army Civilian Leaders*, Weiss, Elliott, Erickson, Fowler, and Giesecking (2006) identified effective interpersonal skills for four selected leadership levels in the Army civilian workforce. These four levels were “Branch Chief (level 2), Division Chief (level 3), Product Manager (level 4), and Program Manager (level 5)” (2006, p. 15). The authors used the findings from the 2003 Army Training and Leadership Development Panel, Communication Task Force initiative to identify gaps in interpersonal skills exhibited by Army civilian leaders. A total of thirty-eight (38) Army civilian managers completed questionnaires and participated in live interviews describing the important interpersonal skills necessary for their jobs. This study identified ten interpersonal skills required for success, and these ten were grouped into three sets of skills: interactive skills, motivational skills, and negotiating skills. These interpersonal skills were considered to be most important at the different leadership levels and found that current education is lacking for civilian leaders to develop these important skills. The potential weakness in this study is there were a total of 38 leaders spread across four (4) leadership levels, which is a satisfactory sample size as a single sample, but when

broken down into the four levels, levels 2, 3, and 4 each had ten respondents, and level 4 had eight respondents. While the sample size for the total group is probably sufficient for drawing general conclusions, if the conclusions attempt to address individual levels, it should only be considered as an indicator, not a conclusion about the population of leaders at each one of those levels.

2. In their thesis, *Army Transformation Leadership a Study of Core Competencies for Civilian Leadership*, Garcia et al (2006) conducted research to analyze civilian leadership competencies and capabilities deemed crucial for civilian leadership transformation. A survey and interviews revealed the following findings: “interviewees repeatedly stressed the same “most important” competencies that had shown up in the survey results: building the team/organization, providing direction/goals, listening to your people, and being a coach/mentor” (Garcia, Klingel, Mull, Summers, & Taylor, 2006, p. 75). Based on the findings, the authors came to the following conclusions: (1) Civilian and military personnel share a common view of core leadership competencies required for transformative change; (2) Diversity of leadership experiences was widely regarded as a core leadership competency and is generally considered inadequate for civilian leadership; and (3) Cultural differences between civilian and military leadership are narrowing. The benefit of this study was that it was based on a survey and interviews developed and conducted by the authors specifically regarding their topic. The sample size for the survey was 4,178 responses out of an Acquisition Workforce population of 48,000. The interview questions were provided with the surveys, leading the reader to initially believe the interview responses were purely written responses, but in reading the responses, it’s evident there were live interviews conducted. It

is not clear how many live interviews were conducted, but it gives a sense that the authors did their due diligence in this study.

3. In his dissertation “*Comparing Leadership Competencies of U.S. Army Generals and U.S. Army Civilian Senior Executives: A Case Study*” Weaver (2008) sought to identify similarities and differences in leadership competencies between US Army Generals and DA Senior Executive Service employees. The study revealed that organizational culture and upbringing, separated into groups with all military, all civilian, or a combination of background experiences, impacts leadership competencies differently between Senior Executive Service (SES) members and General Officers (GO). There were three primary findings: For civilian members, negotiating is noted as a skilled competency whereas managing personal disclosure is a challenge. For the military, ethics and values is a priority whereas hiring and staffing is a not considered an issue. Both groups in the study express that leaders want the best connection with subordinates and colleagues. The study concludes with a discussion of how leadership training and development programs could be enhanced through the further exploration of competencies of leaders by a 360-degree approach and other venues to increase leader development programs of the United States Army. The potential issue is the combined sample size of fourteen (14) General Officers and SESs is small, and the method is based on a self-assessment.

Theme: Leadership Styles

1. In his article, *Moving Toward Improved Acquisition Outcomes: The Interrelationships Between Culture, Commitment, And Leadership*, Roper (2011), studied the impact of organizational culture, management leadership style, and employee commitment on organizational outcomes to determine which concepts most affect acquisition outcomes and

organizational productivity. one of the key findings was that leadership positively influenced commitment, commitment positively influenced culture, but leadership did not have a significant impact on culture. The findings of this study is that each of these concepts are interrelated and when combined may result in improved acquisition outcomes. The author makes the claim that the combined interaction of these elements may produce a synergistic effect greater than the sum of their individual elements. The analysis was conducted using regression analysis techniques with the weighting of each factor determining the level of impact. According to the author, since there were six (6) possible relationships between the factors, a sample size of at least 120 was needed to adequately support the analysis, and he was able to get a sample of 164.

2. In his thesis, *An Examination of Personality Type Dominating Leadership Positions in Department of Defense Program Management*, Claxton (2004) investigated whether there were certain personality types that dominated leadership positions in program management and integrated teams. He posited the question if using the Myers-Briggs Personality Type Indicator (MBPTI) for acquisition work force personnel in program management training courses, will it predict dominant behaviors and indicate individual leadership training needs?

This was a descriptive research project that used the MBPTI and Profilor databases and a Leadership Effectiveness Profile survey to obtain insight into potential relationships between selected personality preferences, reported behaviors and leadership style preferences. The population of interest was composed of acquisition work force personnel (military, government civilian, and defense industry) participating in program management training and those advancing to leadership positions.

The findings supported the conclusion that Department of Defense program managers not possessing Thinking-Judging (TJ) preferences may have a reduced opportunity for selection to a program management leadership position. Some discrepancy was noted between the expected preferred styles, S1-Telling/S2-Selling for the TJ manager, and the survey data that indicated the preferred style was S3-Participative. This difference may have been caused by workplace environmental factors or may indicate there was no link between type and style. This study was focused on selection of personnel for leadership positions based on personality type rather than the effectiveness of leadership styles and to determine expected behaviors and potential training requirements to improve personal effectiveness.

Theme: Leadership in an Acquisition Organization

1. In their article, *Linking Leadership and Technical Execution in Unprecedented Systems-Of-Systems Acquisitions*, Sisti & Latimer (2007) conducted an analytical assessment of the challenges to the staff in acquisition organizations and the challenges for closer linkages between each of the discrete functional levels within the acquiring organization. The study of the nature of these linkages, and how their performance can influence the probability of success and effectiveness of the acquisition, was examined through the evaluation of a number of case studies. The overall finding was that leadership and technical execution must be tightly linked when developing unprecedented systems-of-systems. This document attempted to directly link leadership with the organization being led.

Summary

The literature search conducted in support of this research paper identified six major themes of research:

1. Organizational Values and Management - which is the finding of what is of importance to leaders;
2. Military vs. Civilian Leadership Styles – which are leadership skills/core competencies that are valued by the leaders;
3. Military vs. Civilian Challenges in Leadership
4. Leadership Skills/Core competencies
5. Leadership Styles, or the characteristics that are indicative of those styles; and
6. Leadership in an Acquisition Organization

The literature found to date seems to indicate that there does appear to be a set of common values, styles, and competencies as well as differences between military and civilian leadership styles, although not all agree on the characteristics of those styles. This directly supports questions 1-3 posed in Chapter 1 regarding common characteristics and distinct differences between military and civilian leadership styles. These differences have been attributed to the differences in emphasis in military vs. civilian environments.

A difference highlighted between military and civilian organizations is that the military will “focus on developing persons even at the expense of organizational performance. Conversely, many civilian agencies have focused on organizational performance often with little attention to the cultivation of leaders” (Oh & Lewis, 2007, p. 1). Although a great deal of information is available that characterize leadership qualities of both military and civilian leaders, the effectiveness of each leadership style in an acquisition organization has not yet been determined, which is the primary focus of this study.

One of the weaknesses of the existing literature found to date in this initial review seems to be a potential bias towards a leadership model established for a military culture created for a

very different environment than that of the acquisition offices this study is looking into. Several studies used the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ), which is a self-assessment survey that intuitively would seem to provide clear indications of values of the respondent, but conversely would not seem to provide an objective assessment of leadership skills exhibited. At least one document used survey results of subordinates to determine leadership qualities and could be considered an unbiased assessment of a leader's characteristics and style. Although the leadership qualities, values, and characteristics may be identified, the effect that has on an organization does not appear to have been overtly studied. The most often used survey, the MLQ, "is composed of 9 scales that measure three leadership styles: transformational leadership (5 scales), transactional leadership (2 scales), and passive/avoidant behavior (2 scales), and 3 scales that measure outcomes of leadership" (Bass & Avolio, 2004). The following competencies were identified by Garcia et al: "Model the Way; Inspire a Shared Vision, Challenge the Process; Enable Others to Act; and Encourage the Heart" (2006, p. 28). An additional leadership model was presented that discussed the factors of emotional intelligence, which include "Self-Awareness; Self-Regulation; Self-Motivation; Social Awareness; and Social Skills" (Garcia, Klingel, Mull, Summers, & Taylor, 2006, p. 30). Each of the competencies and factors of emotional intelligence are described in greater detail and are also comprised of multiple abilities and attributes that affect leadership styles and capabilities.

This paper will organize the findings of multiple research papers to identify the key characteristics and values of leaders as found in the literature. It will also attempt to determine the effectiveness of organizations based on the literature.

CHAPTER 3 - RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Introduction

Acquisition organizations, in this case specifically Program Management Offices, have been traditionally led by military officers. Some of these traditionally military held positions opened to civilians, and LTG Williamson, the Army Director for Acquisition Career Management (DACM) leader, “made talent management one of his key priorities for the Army Acquisition Workforce (AAW) since 2014” (Clements, 2017, p. 2). Understanding that the culture and experience of career military personnel and career civilians are markedly different, the question of how this will affect PM Offices becomes a relevant topic.

Research Question

For this research paper, the principal question to be answered is to identify the difference between military and civilian leadership styles and its effect on Army acquisition organizations over the past twenty (20) years.

Based on the literature review of chapter 2, there is a great deal of research that was conducted on military and civilian leadership leading the author to believe that answering this research question is feasible. A number of studies have been conducted that identified leadership competencies and characteristics.

Several studies have made comparisons between military and civilian leaders, comparing and contrasting what they believe are their primary concerns, strengths and weaknesses as well as a very limited number actually surveying the workforce that is being led by these leaders in order to determine the effectiveness of their leadership styles.

What has not been done, and is distinct to this research paper, is to identify the characteristics that are most effective in leading an organization, and then tying it back to the

types of characteristics that are exhibited by the military and civilian leaders being assessed. Ideally, it would be of benefit to find research that has been done to directly correlate the impact of each style to the effectiveness of specific PM offices.

The purpose of this research paper is reflected in the primary question to be answered regarding civilian and military leadership styles, their differences, and potential impact to acquisition organizations. The broader context for this research paper is how the Army selects and trains its professional members on both the uniformed and non-uniformed sides of the workforce and its potential impact on acquisition.

The research is primarily a literature search of existing studies in this area. During my research, I found thousands of titles using search terms relevant to my topic. Many of these documents addressed components of this research topic, answering one or more of the supporting questions listed below, either directly or tangentially. It is hoped that by addressing the questions below, the answers can be combined to answer the overall question of this paper.

As discussed above, in order to support answering the primary questions, I have developed five sub-questions. Each of these questions answers a part of the larger question, and when combined will provide the complete answer to the overall research topic.

1. Are there distinct military leadership styles, and if so, what characteristics are common among military leaders?
2. Are there distinct civilian leadership styles, and if so, what characteristics are common among civilian leaders?
3. Given the characteristics identified above, what are the specific differences found between the two types of leaders?
4. How is effectiveness defined in an Army acquisition organization?

5. How is effectiveness of Army acquisition organizations attributable to specific characteristics identified as military or civilian leadership styles?

Research Design

A qualitative approach was used in the gathering of information to support this research paper. As stated in *Practical Research: Planning and Design*, this approach focuses “on phenomena that are occurring or having previously occurred in natural settings”, also referred to as the “real world” (Leedy, Ormrod, & Johnson, 2019, p. 228). This is appropriate for evaluating or assessing behaviors in the workplace.

More specifically, this is a phenomenological study which “attempts to understand people’s perceptions and perspectives relative to a particular situation” (Leedy, Ormrod, & Johnson, 2019, p. 233). The literature being used as a basis for this study was collected through various means, including surveys and interviews. This study will be undertaking an ethnography approach “to understand the beliefs and practices of a cultural group” (Leedy, Ormrod, & Johnson, 2019, p. 236), focusing on acquisition organizations, through the use of document collection. Data analysis will involve the identification of the underlying structures and beliefs in organizations and the effect of leaders on that organization.

The reason I am undertaking this research is based on my own experiences in a PM office and the placement of the first CSL selected civilian Product Director within the PM office in 2020. The intent is to look at this type of situation, that of both military and civilian PMs and PDs, from different perspectives to understand the experiences of others and to determine if there are generalities that can be drawn from the studies that have been done.

In order to begin the analysis to identify areas where studies have already been completed, the results from the literature search were organized into themes. These general

themes emerged from the studies found, and were used to determine areas of research that were adequately researched and areas that were not fully researched. This was “the first step in the meaning-making process” (Leedy, Ormrod, & Johnson, 2019, p. 345).

In conducting the research of historical documentation, I conducted a search in the following databases:

- Dudley Knox Library
- DAU Knowledge Repository
- EBSCOhost
- GAO
- ProQuest ABI/INFORM Global
- ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global

Searches were conducted to obtain journal articles, dissertations, theses, and other publications in order to address the topic and the supporting questions.

The key research variables being examined in this study are, from a broad view, the characteristics of program managers to include their background (military or civilian), personality and leadership traits, characteristics, types, and styles. As discussed in Chapter 2, the following is the list of specific search terms utilized:

- Civilian AND "program management"
- Civilian culture AND "program management"
- Culture AND leadership
- Culture AND "program management"
- Leadership AND "Government Acquisition"
- Leadership AND "program management"

- "Leadership Style" AND Military Civilian
- "Leadership Style" AND Military AND Civilian
- "Leadership Style" AND Military AND Civilian AND "Army Acquisition"
- "Leadership Styles" AND "Civil Service" AND "Military Personnel"
- "Leadership Styles" AND "Civil Service Personnel" AND "Military Personnel"
- "Leadership Style" AND Military AND Civilian
- "Leadership Style" AND Military AND Civilian AND Acquisition
- "Leadership styles" AND military civilian
- "Leadership styles" AND military civilian Army
- "Management Style" AND Military AND Civilian AND "Army Acquisition"
- Military AND Civilian AND "Program Management"
- Military AND Civilian AND "Program Management" AND Army
- Military AND Civilian AND "Program Management" AND "Army Acquisition"
- Military Civilian AND "Leadership Style"
- Military Civilian AND "Leadership Style" AND Army
- Military Civilian AND "Leadership Style" AND "Army Acquisition"
- Military Civilian AND Management AND "Army Acquisition"
- "Military versus Civilian" AND "leadership style"
- "Military Leadership" AND "Program Management"

Note that in the search, terms in quotes must be in that order to be selected, and terms connected by 'AND' means that both terms must be in the searched paper, regardless of order or proximity in order to be selected. Terms that are simply written next to each other do not have to both be in the searched article, nor do they have to be in the given order.

This study is being conducted strictly through online research of existing literature that has been published through theses and dissertations, journal articles, and other potential sources of validated information. The Senior Service College Fellowship Program members do not have access to any database that requires a subscription outside of what DAU provides.

Bias and Error

The research design for this undertaking is sound. The key factors to be identified are those characteristics and traits that define a person's leadership style. It will then be compared to how those leadership styles impact an acquisition organization.

Some bias is expected as the research of acquisition organizations in the Army is expected to have been primarily researched by active duty military and who will thus have a better understanding and likely preference for the "military leadership" vs "civilian leadership" style. It will be the goal of this paper to not carry over any biases or to introduce any of my own in the discussion of leadership characteristics.

Another shortcoming is the tools that are used to assess leaders. Two of the primary tools used by the authors of several of the resources this paper is relying on have inherent issues: the Myers Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) and the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ), both are self-administered questionnaires susceptible to a leader's ability to be objective and accurate when using the assessment tool on him or herself.

CHAPTER 4 – FINDINGS

Chapter 1 established a baseline definition for leadership which was “Leadership is the ability to inspire confidence and support among a diverse set of people with diverse interests and motivations to pull together in the same direction towards a common goal”. This provides the guidance to answer the overall topic question to ‘Identify the Difference between Military and Civilian Leadership Styles and Its Effect on Army Acquisition Organizations Over the Past Twenty Years’. I identified a number of characteristics from various sources that were considered indicators of leadership style in Table 1-1.

Chapter 2 has the results of the literature search into the research that has already been conducted using keywords that were relevant this paper’s topics. Using key words that were integral to this paper’s topic, I searched multiple databases and found many dissertations and articles that touched on aspects relevant to this paper, but very few that attempted to characterize both military and civilian leadership characteristics and then use that to investigate the impact on the effectiveness of an organization.

In Chapter 3 I outlined the process I was planning to use in order to find the actual data needed to identify the leadership characteristics that were both shared and unique to civilian and military personnel.

This chapter showcases the information found, and attempts to organize it in such a way that an analysis could be conducted to identify the characteristics of leadership exhibited by military personnel, by civilian personnel, what is common between the two groups, as well as what is unique to each group, and those characteristics identified as beneficial and those identified as detrimental in leading an organization.

The overall topic, *Identifying the Difference between Military and Civilian Leadership Styles and Its Effect on Army Acquisition Organizations Over the Past Twenty Years* has a number of factors that comprise the topic and need to be investigated in order to answer the top level question. Studies have been conducted on leadership styles by a number of researchers but the link between leadership style and effectiveness was not found.

Several themes emerged in support of this research paper, namely military leadership styles, civilian leadership styles, and the impact on organizations of various leadership styles.

Military Leadership Styles

Leadership styles typical of military personnel were found to be broad. Although extensive training focused on leadership is expected for military leaders, individual personalities appear to affect how each individual's leadership styles emerge and are employed.

Trait Determination using Lominger LEADERSHIP ARCHITECT® Competency Sort Cards

Using the "Lominger LEADERSHIP ARCHITECT® Competency Sort Cards and structured personal interviews" in order to investigate the differences and similarities between active duty Admirals and civilian Senior Executive Service (SES) members, James D. Tankersley (2007) investigated leadership characteristics between Navy military and civilian leaders. The author interviewed eight (8) admirals and eight (8) SES members in order to have a balanced assessment.

In order to "examine the leadership characteristics of the two groups" (Tankersley, 2007, p. iii) each "participant was given the stack of 67 cards and asked to read the description of the characteristic on the card and then sort them into one of three categories: 1) those least like or least desired (*Low*), 2) those somewhat like or desirable (*Moderate*), and 3) those most like or

most desired (*High*)” (Tankersley, 2007, pp. 74-75) with respect to their own leadership characteristics.

Tankersley had the Admirals rate themselves in various competencies, and the five highest self-rated competencies of the admirals were “integrity and trust, drive for results, action oriented, approachability, and standing alone” (Tankersley, 2007, p. 76). Tankersley also had their SES counterparts conduct an assessment of the admiral’s competencies. These observed competencies by their SES counterparts identified “drive for results” as the highest competency with the next four highest observed competencies being “action oriented, intellectual horsepower, political savvy, and command skills” (Tankersley, 2007, p. 79). Note that the admirals rated themselves differently than how the SESs rated them as observers. This is summarized in table 4-1 below.

Table 4-1. Leadership Traits of Navy Admirals –Self-Reported & Observed (Tankersley)

Leadership Traits of Admirals	
Self-Assessed	Observed
Integrity and Trust	Drive for Results
Drive for Results	Action Oriented
Action Oriented	Intellectual Horsepower
Approachability	Political Savvy
Standing Alone	Command Skills

In his dissertation *Comparing Leadership Competencies of U.S. Army Generals and U.S. Army Civilian Senior Executives: A Case Study*, Weaver (2008) sought to identify “the similarities and differences in leadership competencies between United States Army Generals and members of the Senior Executive Service” (Weaver, 2008, p. i).

Similar to Tankersley (2007), Weaver used the “Lominger Card Sort self-assessments and leadership interviews with all participant leaders” (Weaver, 2008, p. 77) to gather data. Unlike Tankersley, Weaver did not seek observed competencies of these leaders. The 67 Competency Sort Cards were provided to each General Officer (GO). Each card was read, and then separated by the GO conducting the self-assessment into one of three categories: High, which represented competencies the GO felt were reflective of his own competencies, Moderate, which represented competencies the GO felt were somewhat reflective of their own competencies, or Low, which represented a competency least like the GO.

The General Officers all rated themselves as being “Action Oriented” and “Ranked ‘Ethics and Values’ and ‘Integrity and Trust’, respectively as their top two” (Weaver, 2008, p. 85) competencies after being action oriented. While the remaining competencies rated by the GOs were higher than the averages, the results were more varied than the top three competencies identified. In addition to the action oriented competency, there were six additional competencies found to be common, but with some variation in ratings: “composure, drive for results, perseverance, presentation skills, self-development, and time management” (Weaver, 2008, p. 89). This is summarized in table 4-2 below.

Table 4-2. Self-Reported Leadership Traits of U.S. Army Generals (Weaver)

Self-Assessed Leadership Traits of General Officers
Action Oriented
Ethics and Values
Integrity and Trust
Composure
Drive for Results
Perseverance
Presentation Skills
Self-Development
Time Management

According to Weaver, “organizational culture and upbringing” “impacts leadership competencies” (2008, p. 102). In this regard, the military focus on “ethics and values is a priority” (Weaver, 2008, p. 103). In addition, “the GO group interviewed for the study stressed the importance of leading through discipline and maintaining a strict separation between the leader and follower” (Weaver, 2008, p. 104) (table 4-3).

Table 4-3. Cultural Factors Impacting Leadership Perspectives of U.S. Army Generals (Weaver)

Cultural Factors that Impact Leadership Traits of General Officers
Lead through Discipline
Strict Separation between Leader and Follower

This separation between leader and follower makes sense in that a leader in a battlefield environment must not be distracted by personal feelings when making a decision that will risk

the lives of the soldiers he is sending on a mission. Also, decisions made must be objectively determined and free of personal considerations that may influence or appear to influence assigned actions.

Assessing Transformational Leadership Skills Using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire

The prior section looked at behaviors that are easily observable and can be categorized. The next area of leadership looks into the presence of transformational leadership characteristics. “A transformational leader is one who brings about positive, major changes in an organization” (DuBrin, 2019, p. 61) by focusing the group on a unified goal that is beneficial beyond that of the individual and extends and focuses on the group or the organization. In *The Transformational Leadership Effectiveness of Retired Military Service Academy Graduates*, Tiller (2007) used the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) to investigate the transformational leadership characteristics that he hypothesized military leaders possess and the effect of those transformational leadership skills to private industry. The MLQ was used to generate specific data to complete his study, but he did state that “transformational leader behaviours [on the MLQ 5X] are so highly related that it is more appropriate to conceptualize them as a single factor” (Tiller, 2007, p. 95), meaning that while strength in the underlying factors is important, the MLQ alone cannot determine which individual traits are the driving factor behind effective leadership styles.

To generate data on Transformational Leadership, Tiller administered the MLQ to supervisors who had both a civilian and a retired service academy graduate in their employ, enabling a comparison to be made between the two. This agrees with Eichinger & Lombardo’s assessment of “the boss being the most accurate rater by far in predicting long term performance” (2003, p. 35) which provides the correlation to a transformational leader bringing

change to an organization. Note that Tiller made the determination that the MLQ was not to be administered to sub-ordinates because “subordinate ratings have been shown by other research to be of questionable validity” (Tiller, 2007, p. 56) which may affect the outcome of the survey. This statement may itself be questioned in that it may be argued that the best judges of leaders are those that are being led, but the ability of a subordinate to objectively judge their raters can be influenced by the confidence in the anonymity of their ratings, and without that confidence, “raters may fear retribution and be less than candid in their responses or not respond at all” (Eichinger & Lombardo, 2003, p. 39).

Tiller’s hypothesis is that the subject group (those with military backgrounds) has transformational leadership characteristics, specifically the following four traits:

- “Idealized Influence”, also referred to as charisma, which is the ability to “earn respect, trust and admiration among followers”;
- “Inspirational Motivation”, which is the “ability to arouse intense feelings of enthusiasm and spirit for the work ahead”;
- “Intellectual Stimulation”, which “refers to the leader’s ability to foster in followers the need to think for themselves”; and
- “Individualized Consideration”, where the “leader pays close attention to the needs of persons in the organization” (Tiller, 2007, pp. 15-16)

Additional military leadership traits identified were “honor, courage, duty, integrity, loyalty, self-discipline, perseverance, and commitment” (Tiller, 2007, p. 65). These traits, derived from a leadership development study in industry, was felt to be common in all great leaders.

Tiller's finding was that transformational leadership traits are "effective and desirable" (Tiller, 2007, p. 121). Transformational leadership traits enable a leader to motivate their "subordinates to perform above their expected ability" and to "transform the organization by instilling a self-driven desire to attain more challenging goals, to demand more of oneself, and to reach more effective results for the organization" (Tiller, 2007, pp. 126-127).

A key finding from a number of sources from Tiller's (2007) research was that "there was a definite relationship between personality and leadership" but it wasn't clear which personality traits "contribute to good leadership" (p. 64). It was also found that leaders with military backgrounds and without military backgrounds both scored above 2.0 on the MLQ, which based on the analysis by the MLQ authors, indicated that "both groups of managers displayed transformational leadership characteristics" (Tiller, 2007, p. 108). Though both types of leaders were found to have transformational leadership skills, a statistical analysis conducted between the two showed that military leaders have a greater self-identified difference than civilians. Again, prior studies identified earlier noted that self-assessments are generally not accurate indicators, but in the absence of observed data, the assumption is made that the results shown by these self-assessments are indicative of what the leaders believe are important traits for leaders even if they themselves do not display those traits. This is not to minimize the indicated greater level of transformational leadership skills that military members may possess, but there is no research found to support the indication of a 'higher score' within the transformational leadership spectrum indicating a higher, and therefore better, level of transformational leadership by an individual.

In his dissertation *Comparing Corporate Aerospace Leadership Groups With and Without Military Leadership Experience*, Winkler stated that "transformational leadership is a

term used to describe leadership through inspiring and intrinsic motivation where followers feel challenged, motivated, and empowered, yet guided” (2009, p. 13) and that “transformational leadership is considered the most effective leadership style that can be used in any situation or business” (2009, p. 25). However, to ground that statement, DuBrin noted that “Too much attention paid to charismatic and transformational leadership can divert attention away for other important aspects of the leader- follower relationship” (2019, p. 79). In other words, although Transformational Leadership is considered a positive leadership style with benefits to the organization, it is not the single optimum way to lead.

In Winkler’s research, two surveys were administered, generating “A total of 356 valid responses were collected from both surveys” (Winkler, 2009, p. 76). The responses were solicited from both leaders and their subordinates. Winkler used the MLQ to assess characteristics of the subject leaders. A key finding was that “...aerospace executive leaders with former military leadership experience have the overall highest MLQ scores, followed by civilian aerospace leaders and then by aerospace leaders who are retired military officers” (Winkler, 2009, p. 97), which was reported that “the first 10 years of a military officer’s career is the most important, beyond that, the positional politics add little leadership value” (Winkler, 2009, p. 97). In other words, those leaders who had some military experience, scored the highest MLQ scores, and those military leaders that made a career of the military had the lowest MLQ scores of the three groups.

Table 4-4 lists out the results of the survey, and of interest is that based on the understanding that scores above 2.0 represent strength in those areas, retired military show a self-assessed strength in the characteristics for all of the transformational leadership subscales and the transactional leadership subscales. The former military show a higher self-assessed strength in

the characteristics for all of the transformational leadership subscales than the retired military, and two out of three of the transactional leadership characteristics.

Table 4-4. MLQ Assessment Results – Former & Retired Military

MLQ Subscale	Retired Military (Mean/Std Dev)	Former Military (Mean/Std Dev)
Transformational Leadership Characteristics (higher scores are better)		
Idealized Influence (attributed)	3.33/0.19	3.40/0.28
Idealized Influence (behavior)	3.08/0.41	3.28/0.42
Inspirational Motivation	2.74/0.46	3.38/0.36
Intellectual Stimulation	2.56/0.64	2.99/0.40
Individual Consideration	3.01/0.57	3.13/0.47
Transactional Leadership Characteristics (lower scores are better for management by exception)		
Contingent Reward	3.17/0.60	3.35/0.62
Management by Exception (active)	2.24/0.32	2.51/0.80
Management by Exception (passive)	2.28/0.59	1.04/0.41
Non-Transactional Characteristics		
Laissez-faire Leadership	1.31/0.53	0.31/0.34
Employee Outcomes		
Effectiveness	3.33/0.29	3.79/0.23
Extra Effort	3.22/0.36	3.08/0.33
Satisfaction	3.16/0.30	3.37/0.35

Passive management by exception is defined as a style where the leader “will wait for mistakes to occur before taking action” (Winkler, 2009, p. 29). On this characteristic, lower numbers are better, and former military display better interpersonal skills. The low values for Laissez-faire leadership styles are good; it shows that the military leaders have low likelihood to display a style which “Provides no direction to employees” and “employees must make their own

goals and resolve problems without direction” (Winkler, 2009, p. 30). Although the former military have a significantly lower score for this characteristic than the retired military, there is not information that allows one to draw a conclusion as to whether a conclusion can be drawn from this difference.

He further states that “Many civilian organizations realize the leadership potential former and retired military officers can bring, but it is questionable how they may lead within a highly technical aerospace environment” (Winkler, 2009, p. 101). He also states that one of his sources noted “CEOs with military leadership experience are more likely to deliver stronger performance because the military attracts people who are typically ambitious, disciplined, and goal oriented, which are similar traits to CEOs” (Winkler, 2009, p. 101). This conclusion is drawn from incomplete data as the only military (and civilian) leaders that were surveyed were individuals who had become CEOs. This omits the majority of leaders in lower level positions to fully support this conclusion.

Personality Types Using the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator

In An Examination of Personality Type Dominating Leadership Positions in Department of Defense Program Management, Claxton (2004) analyzed the personality types of leaders in the Department of Defense using the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI), with a sample size of 11,572 attendees from the Advanced Program Management Course (APMC). Claxton limited his leadership type to those indicators identified in the MBTI, specifically Extrovert (E)-Introvert (I), Sensing(S)-Intuition (N), Thinking (T)-Feeling (F) and Judging (J)-Perceiving (P). He found that of the 11,572 attendees, there were “7693 Thinking-Judging (TJ) preferences, or about 66% of all program management course students” (Claxton, 2004, p. 96). Students in the Executive Program Management Course (EPMC) that already held PM or PEO positions, displayed a 74%

preference for TJ characteristics. According to Claxton, the TJ preference shows the typical characteristics were that of being “tough-minded, executive oriented, analytical leaders” whose “tendency towards positions of control is facilitated by their ability to make decisions quickly and effectively” (2004, p. 100). Although this “may give the impression that they act without adequate reflection and present their arguments in a tactless manner” (Claxton, 2004, p. 94), their preference is actually that of being “S3- Participating (consultative, participative)”, rather than the expected “S1-Telling (directive)... and S2-Selling (Persuasive) leadership styles” (Claxton, 2004, p. 130).

Because of “The military-industrial complex... hierarchy, rules and procedures” the most prevalent personality preference, that of the Thinking-Judging (TJ) person, “five out of six 360 degree surveys for leadership effectiveness rated the ISTJ highest” (Claxton, 2004, p. 131). Alternatively, the ENTJ was identified as “...the natural leader with the visionary skills to focus on future needs” (Claxton, 2004, p. 131). Either way, the TJ personality type seemed to be the preferred type for “The government work environment for the program manager” and seemed to be “...supportive of the TJ objective analysis and decisive decision making style” (Claxton, 2004, p. 131).

Within the Claxton study, it was found that the “...military did show a greater preference for TJ (ISTJ, ESTJ, INTJ, ENTJ) at 76.3%” (Claxton, 2004, p. 139) than that of the civilian population, at 57.7% (table 4-5). If this is further broken down into each of the TJ categories, it was found that “the reverse was seen when the civilian preference profile (STJ = 47.7% vs. military 44.3%)” (Claxton, 2004, p. 139) which appears to be negligible. Both “military and government civilian personnel both showed a greater inclination towards the here and now by dealing with facts at hand (Sensing) but the military less than their civilian counterparts. Both

military and civilians were more likely to seek their own counsel (Introversion) before making decisions but the civilians were slightly more extroverted than the military” (Claxton, 2004, p. 139).

Table 4-5. Personality Preference Using the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator

Personality Preference	Military	Civilian
TJ (Thinking-Judging)	76.3%	57.7%

The Transition of Military Personnel into the Civilian Workforce

In her dissertation, *From Warriors to Wingtips: The Leadership Transition of Retired Officers into the Public Sector*, Eldred analyzes the transition of six (6) military officers into public sector roles. She looks at multiple behaviors, and both the successful and unsuccessful “strategies” used by the retired military officers in their civilian roles. The key is that these are strategies, or leadership styles, that were taught in the military, and now those styles are being applied in a primarily civilian organization.

These “Leadership practices” shaped by military training and experiences “include using a contingency leadership style, firm discipline, a controlled environment, straightforward communications, training and development, values, camaraderie building, a command presence, standard operating procedures and centrally mandated change” (Eldred, 2000, p. 7). Eldred found that strategies that led to successful outcomes included “using a coaching style to lead staff following up on directives, actively managing performance, adopting a less direct communications style, improving employee selection and development, creating ownership, actively working to change systems, building influence and political relationships, introducing change by influence, consciously developing their reputation and countering stereotypes of

military officers” (Eldred, 2000, p. 8). There were also strategies that led to unsuccessful or less than successful outcomes, which included “using a direct communication style, using military jargon, assuming compliance, accepting and criticizing the status quo, developing an inner circle, expecting the executive to initiate career development and direct change, becoming frustrated, and failing to react to stereotypes” (Eldred, 2000, p. 8).

It was noted that when officers take command of an organization new to them, they are provided with loyalty, allegiance, and cooperation based on the position. In Eldred, she notes that “In the military, status and respect tend to come with position” (2000, p. 178) as opposed to the civilian sector where respect has to be earned.

The military culture has “shared values of duty, honor, country, and service” (Eldred, 2000, p. 190). Other characteristics identified as being typical of military personnel include “Displaying decision-making abilities, a bias toward quick, decisive action, and portraying control, self-confidence, and decisiveness” (Eldred, 2000, p. 249).

Eldred also noted that “There are certain aspects of charismatic leadership contained in notions of military leadership” (2000, p. 243). Interestingly, she later states that “charismatic leaders were not true leaders because their followers’ actions were based more in a personal attraction to the leader” (Eldred, 2000, p. 243). When explained by DuBrin, charisma is a quality of leadership that appears to be an aspirational characteristic, defined as “a positive and compelling quality that makes many others want to be led by the person that has it” (DuBrin, 2019, p. 59). As explained in DuBrin, being thought of as charismatic is dependent upon the group one is leading, which affects how the leader is perceived, which supports Eldred’s contention that a charismatic leader is able to influence their followers actions based on

likeability more so than leadership capabilities. However, leadership is based on the ability to influence others, and likeability is a component of the ability.

Note that the Navy has a very different approach to leadership when compared to the Army. According to Eldred, the Navy, “places less emphasis on formal leadership training because it has traditionally held that leadership is learned on the job”. And unlike the Army and Air Force, the “Navy has no research center devoted to leadership”, relying instead on “leadership preparation ... through their mentors and through experience, the so-called ‘school of the ship’ ” (2000, p. 109).

A great leader is one who can get results out of an organization regardless of what he is given in terms of personnel. This was illustrated in one of the interviews Eldred conducted where after describing the poor performance of the group the interviewee had been leading, was able to turn them around by communicating “expectations and standards, to reward performance, but not mediocrity: to take care of your people and to demonstrate that care by learning about them as individuals and to be innovative and individual in how you reward them” (Eldred, 2000, p. 110).

The overall theme that Eldred found was that military leaders who made a successful transition to the public sector recognized that their leadership styles had to change. The Navy leaders that used a direct communication style “can distance a retired officer from others and can cause conflicts” (Eldred, 2000, p. 168).

Civilian Leadership Styles

In Sands-Pinot dissertation *Sharing the Bench: Comparing Army Civilian Executive and General Officer Elite Group Identity*, the self-identity of Senior Executive Service Members was studied to determine if “considerable differences exist between how Army civilian senior

executives perceive both the nature of their work and their roles in contrast to that of their general officer counterparts” (Sands-Pingot, 2015, p. iii). According to Sands-Pinot there are “approximately 8,300 executive level positions allocated by the OPM” (2015, p. 12), which represents approximately 0.35% of the total civilian workforce.

“It is clear that when viewed together, the way the US Army “grows” civilian and military senior executive leaders is fundamentally different.” (Sands-Pingot, 2015, p. 40). This is important to consider with “The transformation of thousands of positions formerly held by uniformed members of the military over the...2000-2015 (time period) as a result of strategic decisions made by then Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld has changed many of the roles and responsibilities for positions that previously had exclusively been held by uniformed military personnel” (Sands-Pingot, 2015, p. 46).

Just as with military leaders, it is important for this study to determine if there are common leadership traits that characterize civilian leaders. It is expected that civilians will have a much broader variety of characteristics compared to one another due to much greater variation in experiences between SES members leading up to their leadership roles that are largely driven by their unique personal experiences as compared to their military counterparts which in each service has a shared experience, beginning with basic training, to required training in order to progress through the ranks, and commands of greater responsibility at prescribed ranks in their progression to leadership roles. As stated previously, the civilian workforce typically was found to not have as broad of a variety of experiences, so can therefore be expected that their individual experiences will have less overlap with other executives who may have emerged from organizations different than themselves.

Sands-Pingot surveyed 105 then-current members of the SES corps as of 1 May 2015 (2015, p. 116). A key factor noted about SESs that responded to his inquiry is that “two-thirds of all Army SES members had prior uniformed military service (Sands-Pingot, 2015, p. 125). Although it was not elaborated on the number of years of active duty service, Sands-Pingot did note that “approximately 45% of all current SES members held the rank of Colonel, Brigadier General, or Major General prior to their being selected as a civilian senior executive” (Sands-Pingot, 2015, p. 125). Therefore, it can be assumed that the 45% of the SESs in question had at least 20 years’ experience, which would further support the assumption that their military experience was long enough to impact their perspective and leadership style in their civilian role to be more like military leaders than their career civilian counterparts. This may impact the findings of this research paper by diluting the differences between civilian and military leaders.

Trait Determination using Lominger LEADERSHIP ARCHITECT® Competency Sort Cards

In his dissertation, *United States Navy Admirals and Civilian Senior Executives: An Investigation of Navy Leadership*, Tankersley (2007) researched both military and civilian leaders in determining traits unique and shared between the two groups. As with the admirals, the SES participants were provided the 67 “Lominger LEADERSHIP ARCHITECT® Competency Sort Cards” which described “67 competencies related to leadership” (Tankersley, 2007, p. 74). Each SES participating in this study was given and asked to read the description of the characteristic on the card. Each participant was asked to sort them into one of three categories that assessed how closely the characteristics described their own leadership characteristics. The categories were: 1) those least like or least desired (*Low*), 2) those somewhat like or desirable (*Moderate*), and 3) those most like or most desired (*High*)” (Tankersley, 2007, pp. 74-75). As shown in table 4-6, the SESs self-rated five highest

competencies were “integrity and trust, dealing with ambiguity, ethics and values, command skills, and decision quality (Tankersley, 2007, p. 76). The five highest observed competencies by Admirals of their SES counterparts started with ethics and values” (Tankersley, 2007, p. 79) with the next four highest observed competencies being “functional/technical skills, integrity and trust, fairness to direct reports, and intellectual horsepower”. The two traits that were common between the self-assessed traits and the observed traits are highlighted and were “ethics and values” and “integrity and trust”.

Table 4-6. Summary of Senior Executive Service Competencies (Tankersley)

Navy Senior Executive Service Members	
Self-Assessed Leadership Traits	Observed Leadership Traits
Integrity and Trust	Ethics and Values
Dealing with Ambiguity	Functional/Technical Skills
Ethics and Values	Integrity and Trust
Command Skills	Fairness to Direct Reports
Decision Quality	Intellectual Horsepower

In his dissertation *Comparing Leadership Competencies of U.S. Army Generals and U.S. Army Civilian Senior Executives: A Case Study*, similar to Tankersley, Weaver (2008) sought to identify “the similarities and differences in leadership competencies between United States Army Generals and members of the Senior Executive Service” (Weaver, 2008, p. i). The results for the Army Generals were discussed in the military leadership section, and the findings for members of the SES will be discussed here. The process of self-evaluation was followed as with the Army generals, namely using the Lominger Card Sort self-assessment. As with the GOs, the SESs also self-identified themselves as being “action oriented”. Weaver’s study also found that SESs

“ranked two others as priority; negotiating and managing diversity” (Weaver, 2008, p. 85) which in terms of importance, or skill level, followed that of being ‘Action Oriented’.

In addition to the three competencies cited above, there were six additional competencies identified by the SESs as important: “composure, drive for results, perseverance, presentation skills, self-development, and time management” (Weaver, 2008, p. 89). After the top three listed in importance, the remaining traits are listed in alphabetical order in table 4-7.

Table 4-7. Self-Reported Leadership Traits of Senior Executive Service Members (Weaver)

Self-Assessed Leadership Traits of SESs
Action Oriented
Negotiating
Managing Diversity
Composure
Drive for Results
Perseverance
Presentation Skills
Self-Development
Time Management

According to Weaver, “organizational culture and upbringing” “impacts leadership competencies” (Weaver, 2008, p. 102). In addition, “SES leaders appear to be comfortable with the politics of business. Politics of business meaning negotiating. Lominger defines the concept as dealing with tough situations; being knowledgeable in settling conflicts quickly and without attention being drawn to it, ensuring possible future policies, practices, trends, and information affecting his/her organization; being a diplomat and gaining trust of other parties, as needed” (Weaver, 2008, pp. 102-103).

During “the personal interview portion of Weaver’s study, the SES group articulated a desire to seek out a more “authentic connection” with those they led” (Weaver, 2008, p. 104) “with the thought that this type of relationship would strengthen the leader-follower bond”.

Table 4-8. Cultural Factors Impacting Leadership Perspectives of Senior Executives
(Weaver)

Cultural Factors that Impact Leadership Traits of SES Members
Authentic Connection
Leader and Follower Bond

This desire to strengthen the bond between leader and follower appears to recognize that “Leadership is defined as a social influencing process in which the leader focuses on obtaining the voluntary participation of employees to reach organizational goals and objectives” (Weaver, 2008, p. 104). As a social process, it becomes clear that the bond between those leading and those being led needs to be strengthened. This may become evident with the level of respect and trust in the abilities of the other to be able to successfully carry out their assigned and/or perceived roles.

Assessing Transformational Leadership Skills Using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire

In his dissertation *The Transformational Leadership Effectiveness of Retired Military Service Academy Graduates*, Tiller used the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ), “to identify the individual characteristics, or traits, of (Transformational Leadership) TL within two populations of business leaders, relate the traits to leadership effectiveness, and compare the results” (Tiller, 2007, p. 104). As described by Tiller, the subjects of interest were “U.S. military service academy graduates who retired after 20 years of service” and subsequently gained

employment as “mid- to senior-level managers in corporations and businesses” and that “of mid- to senior-level civilian leaders” with “no military leadership training” with similar positions (Tiller, 2007, p. 104). In this section, the focus will remain on the civilians.

Although considered to be a reliable and stable indicator from multiple sources, the MLQ used self –assessed leadership characteristics that were shown to not be accurate measures of observed characteristics. In fact, Tiller’s research confirmed this, making reference to “the validity of 360-degree evaluations, and discovered that self-ratings do not correlate well with either reality or other raters’ assessments” and that “the most accurate ratings were given by a supervisor, or immediate boss” (Tiller, 2007, p. 77). In addition, in supporting studies, Tiller found that “the MLQ should not be used to measure separate TL traits because there was low discriminant validity and high correlation among the traits tested by the MLQ.”

To overcome the issue of inaccuracies in self-assessments, Tiller identified supervisors that agreed to perform the MLQ assessments on subordinates. Therefore, rather than depend on self-assessments, he incorporated observational information into the study, minimizing the poor results associated with self-assessments. Thirty-one supervisors agreed to perform the ratings, which required ratings of two managers; one who was a civilian careerist, and one with a military background prior to becoming a manager as a civilian.

As reported by Tiller, the scoring methodology for the MLQ results in a range from 0.0 to 4.0, and “Score values above 2.0 (midway on the MLQ range from 0.0 to 4.0) are considered to be indicative of transformational leadership” (Tiller, 2007, pp. 108-109).

As calculated by Tiller, the managers without military backgrounds had a mean MLQ score of 2.85 (2007, p. 113). This result indicates that the civilian managers in this sample are considered to be transformational leaders, and therefore, are considered to be effective. Tiller

notes that “recent research in leadership has shown transformational leadership to be both effective and desirable for organizational excellence” (2007, p. 121).

In “Comparing Corporate Aerospace Leadership Groups With and Without Military Leadership Experience” Winkler (2009) presents research conducted into the transformational leadership characteristics of leaders in industry. As previously discussed, transformational leadership is an area of interest that is widely believed to be an effective style for leading organizations. Winkler conducted a survey in which the MLQ was administered to civilian personnel, of which there were 132 total responses received, 66 of which were leaders, and 66 of which were matched subordinates. Each respondent was asked to take the survey to provide a self-assessment of their leadership characteristics.

Winkler broke out the individual attributes from the MLQ in order to determine which subscales were significant in identifying differences between civilian and military leaders with respect to transformational leadership. Table 4-9 lists out the results of scoring of those attributes for civilian personnel. Scores are based on a 0.0 to 4.0 scale, where 0.0 is the lowest score or least likely to be associated with that characteristics, and 4.0 is the highest score, or most likely to be associated with that characteristic.

Table 4-9. MLQ Assessment Results of Aerospace Leaders – Civilian

MLQ Subscale	Civilian (Mean/Std Dev)
Transformational Leadership Characteristics (higher scores are better)	
Idealized Influence (attributed)	3.06/0.53
Idealized Influence (behavior)	2.92/0.58
Individual Consideration	3.03/0.56
Inspirational Motivation	3.11/0.49
Intellectual Stimulation	3.12/0.67
Transactional Leadership Characteristics (lower scores for Management by Exception are better)	
Contingent Reward	3.07/0.58
Management by Exception (active)	2.06/0.63
Management by Exception (passive)	1.41/0.66
Non-Transactional Characteristics	
Laissez-faire Leadership	0.71/0.52
Employee Outcomes	
Effectiveness	3.31/0.40
Extra Effort	3.06/0.43
Satisfaction	3.30/0.44

The civilian leaders rated high (above 2.0) in each of the transformational leadership characteristics, and relatively lower for two out of three transactional characteristics. This shows that the self-assessed civilian leadership characteristics are transformational in nature, and tend to avoid those leadership behaviors that are more transactional or uninvolved with subordinates. The civilians also rated low in the Laissez-faire Leadership, meaning that it is unlikely or unusual for civilian leaders to “provides no direction to employees” or stay uninvolved to the

point where “employees must make their own goals and resolve problems without direction” (Winkler, Comparing Corporate Aerospace Leadership Groups with and without Military Leadership Experience, 2009, p. 30).

Personality Types Using the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator

In *An Examination of Personality Type Dominating Leadership Positions in Department of Defense Program Management*, Claxton (2004) analyzed the personality types of leaders in the Department of Defense using the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI), with a sample size of 11,572 attendees from the Advanced Program Management Course (APMC). As stated earlier, Claxton limited his leadership type to those indicators identified in the MBTI, specifically Extrovert I-Introvert (I), Sensing(S)-Intuition (N), Thinking (T)-Feeling (F) and Judging (J)-Perceiving (P). He found that of the 11,572 attendees whose results were examined, there were “about 66% of all program management course students” (Claxton, 2004, p. 96) indicated they had Thinking-Judging (TJ) preferences. It was also found that students in the Executive Program Management Course (EPMC) that already held PM or PEO positions, displayed a 74% preference for TJ characteristics. According to Claxton, the TJ preference shows the typical characteristics were that of being “tough-minded, executive oriented, analytical leaders” whose “tendency towards positions of control is facilitated by their ability to make decisions quickly and effectively” (2004, p. 100). Unfortunately, this ability is not always interpreted in a positive way. This, when looking at the total population of EPMC students, compares with “A total of 57% of the sample resided in the TJ Preference” (Claxton, 2004, p. 94). The “results showed the highest style preference to be S3- Participating (consultative, participative), rather than the expected S1-Telling (directive) and S2-Selling (Persuasive) leadership styles (Claxton, 2004, p. 130).

Because of “The military-industrial complex... hierarchy, rules and procedures” the most prevalent personality preference is that of the Thinking-Judging (TJ) person in which “five out of six 360 degree surveys for leadership effectiveness rated the ISTJ highest” (Claxton, 2004, p. 131). Alternatively, the ENTJ was identified as “...the natural leader with the visionary skills to focus on future needs” (Claxton, 2004, p. 131). Either way, the TJ personality type seemed to be the preferred type for “The government work environment for the program manager” and seemed to be “supportive of the TJ objective analysis and decisive decision making style” (Claxton, 2004, p. 131).

Within the Claxton study, it was found that the “the overall TJ preference level with civilians is 67.7%” (Claxton, 2004, p. 139) which includes the ISTJ, ESTJ, INTJ, and ENTJ type indicators. “Government civilian personnel showed a greater inclination towards the here and now by dealing with facts at hand (Sensing)”. “Civilians were more likely to seek their own counsel (Introversion) before making decisions but the civilians” (Claxton, 2004, p. 139) did tend to display some level of extroversion.

Table 4-10. Personality Preference Using the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator

Personality Preference	Military	Civilian
TJ (Thinking-Judging)	76.3%	57.7%

Key Skills for Leadership in Varying Levels of Management

In their thesis, *An Identification of Interpersonal Skills for Building Army Civilian Leaders*, Weiss, Elliott, Erickson, Fowler, and Giesekeing “identified a perceived gap in interpersonal skills exhibited by Army civilian leaders” (2006, p. v) through questionnaires and face-to-face interviews with thirty-eight (38) Army civilian managers. The authors based their

study on the findings of the Army's Training and Leadership Development Panel (ATLDP) report. There were four imperatives identified that were expected to maximize civilian's contributions to the force which included "accountability, lifelong learning, Army culture, and interpersonal skills" (Weiss, Elliott, Erickson, Fowler, & Giesecking, 2006, p. 1) with interpersonal skills being the area that Army civilians were considered to be the least effective.

The project undertaken by Weiss et al identified "effective interpersonal skills for four selected leadership levels in the Army civilian workforce" (2006, p. i). These four levels range from Level 2 to Level 5 as follows: "Branch Chief (level 2), Division Chief (level 3), Product Manager (level 4), and Program Manager (level 5)" (Weiss, Elliott, Erickson, Fowler, & Giesecking, 2006, p. 15). These levels correspond to the 'Seven Levels of Leadership' as discussed by Weiss et al where:

"Level 2 is described as 'managing others.' " with "...responsibility for the performance of others, but may not have direct supervisory responsibility over them.

"Level 3 is described as 'managing managers' " and "...are typically responsible for the largest groups of individuals within the organization, who do the most hands-on work."

"Level 4 is described as a 'functional manager.' At this level, managers must think strategically about the overarching function of the organization.

"Level 5 is described as a "business manager." responsible for integrating organizational functions" and have a "perspective (that) must extend beyond the direct functioning of the organization" (Weiss, Elliott, Erickson, Fowler, & Giesecking, 2006, pp. 12-13).

Weiss et al focused on "Thirty-eight (38) Army civilian managers from four leadership levels" to determine "which interpersonal skills were considered most important at the different levels" (2006, p. i). Through surveys administered to the managers, there were ten (10)

interpersonal skills that were ranked. These skills were grouped into three (3) bins by the authors: ‘Interactive Skills’, ‘Motivational Skills’, and ‘Negotiating Skills’.

According to the authors, “Within these categories, providing guidance, listening, and conveying information are grouped as interactive skills; motivating & inspiring, team building, fostering commitment and mentoring are grouped as motivational skills; and providing employee feedback, conflict resolution, and persuading are grouped as negotiating skills” (Weiss, Elliott, Erickson, Fowler, & Gieseeking, 2006, pp. 66-67). “Interactive skills involved the direct interaction between the manager/supervisor with his or her superiors, peers, and subordinates, for routine communication transactions in the performance of their jobs” (Weiss, Elliott, Erickson, Fowler, & Gieseeking, 2006, pp. 40-41). Motivational skills “consisted of motivating and inspiring, teambuilding, fostering commitment, and mentoring”.

Based on surveys administered to the participants, the above skills were rank ordered based on comparison and subsequent ranking. “Providing guidance or direction ranked as the most important of the ten interpersonal skills considered, followed closely by listening. Conveying information ranked as the third most important skill. Motivating and inspiring ranked fourth followed by teambuilding as the fifth most important skill. Fostering commitment and mentoring ranked sixth and seventh, followed by providing employee feedback at number eight, conflict resolution at number nine, and persuading as number ten” (Weiss, Elliott, Erickson, Fowler, & Gieseeking, 2006, p. 66). “Negotiating skills were focused on resolution of problems where conflicting or differing ideas, opinions, and perceptions are prominent in a given situation” (Weiss, Elliott, Erickson, Fowler, & Gieseeking, 2006, p. 41). These skills are summarized in the reported order of importance in table 4-11 below:

Table 4-11. Skills for Effective Leadership at Level 2 Management Levels (Weiss, Elliott, Erickson, Fowler, & Gieseeking, 2006, p. 70)

Ranking of Interpersonal Skills (I = Interactive Skills, M = Motivational Skills, N = Negotiating Skills)		
Most Important	Important	Least Important
1. Providing Guidance (I)	4. Motivating & Inspiring (M)	8. Employee Feedback (N)
2. Listening (I)	5. Team Building (M)	9. Conflict Resolution (N)
3. Conveying Information (I)	6. Fostering Commitment (M)	10. Persuading (N)
	7. Mentoring (M)	

Notable results demonstrated that those skills deemed as most important all were related to communication. These were combined and described as ‘Interactive Skills’. The second column, and next most important are focused on achieving the goals of the organization. This grouping, labeled as ‘Motivational Skills’, focuses on encouraging both individual and team level productivity. Although the group of skills labeled as ‘Negotiating Skills’ are considered the least important, they are nonetheless important skills to have for a well-functioning organization.

As shown in table 4-12, as leaders move up the management ladder, the focus on the broad categories (Interactive Skills, Motivational Skills, and Negotiating Skills) that are identified as most important to least important remains the same, with some minor reordering within the categories.

Table 4-12. Skills for Effective Leadership at Level 5 Management Levels (Weiss, Elliott, Erickson, Fowler, & Giesecking, 2006, p. 91)

Ranking of Interpersonal Skills (I = Interactive Skills, M = Motivational Skills, N = Negotiating Skills)		
Most Important	Important	Least Important
1. Providing Guidance (I)	4. Motivating & Inspiring (M)	8. Persuading (N)
2. Conveying Information (I)	5. Team Building (M)	9. Employee Feedback (N)
3. Listening (I)	6. Mentoring (M)	10. Conflict Resolution (N)
	7. Fostering Commitment (M)	

Additional information gathered by Weiss et al were factors that contributed to effective leadership. Five factors were identified, and in order of importance are as follows: “Effective communication and interpersonal skills consistently ranked as the most important factor” with “...natural leadership ability” next but “ranked slightly higher in importance” “than technical proficiency”. “Years of experience and formal leadership training consistently ranked as the two least important factors” (Weiss, Elliott, Erickson, Fowler, & Giesecking, 2006, p. 50). It is an interesting finding that training is ranked as one of the least important factors, since the current emphasis in the Army is to increase formal leadership training for civilians to better align with military training. Weiss et al does call out this disparity, noting that “the consistently low ranking of formal leadership training as a factor attributable to effective leadership should be of concern to the Army as an indicator of the perceived lack or inadequacy of such training for civilian leaders” (2006, p. 97). Note that even though these factors are called out separately by Weiss et al, they are integral to the skills tabularized in the tables in chapter 4.

Comparing the Similarities and Differences in Military and Civilian Leadership Styles

In his dissertation *United States Navy Admirals and Civilian Senior Executives: An Investigation of Navy Leadership*, self-assessed surveys, personal interviews, and observed

competencies were used by Tankersley to identify leadership characteristics for civilian executives and Navy Admirals. There was some overlap in terms of competencies, but notably there was a significant disparity between the self-assessed competencies the Senior Executives and the Admirals rated themselves and the observed competencies assigned by their counterparts.

For example, for 'Command Skills', which was defined as "Relishes leading; takes unpopular stands if necessary encourages direct and tough debate but isn't afraid to end it and move on; is looked to for direction in a crisis; faces adversity head on; energized by tough challenges" (Tankersley, 2007, p. 148), the Senior Executives rated themselves at an average score of 2.75 (out of 3.00). The observed ratings by the Admirals of those same Senior Executives was 1.50 (Tankersley, 2007, p. 97). This difference is an example of the difficulty of being objective when rating one's own skills and abilities

As a second example, in Total Work Systems, which is a commitment "to continuous improvement through empowerment and management by data" and to deliver "the highest quality products and services which meet the needs and requirements of internal and external customers", admirals rated themselves significantly higher (score = 2.5) than did SESs (score of 1.5) on a scale that ranges from 1 (low) to 3 (high). Interestingly, the observed scores for the Admirals were rated significantly lower (1.125) vs. their SES counterparts (2.0) (Tankersley, 2007, p. 91). Once again this appears to demonstrate the inaccuracies in self-assessment type analysis. While it may be good for highlighting what a leader believes is important, a 360-degree type assessment seems to be a more objective method to determine the actual leadership style of a leader.

Table 4-13 identifies those attributes measured above, and identifies those attributes that were considered desirable for SESs by their admiral counterpart, and vice versa.

Table 4-13. Self-Assessed & Observed Competencies of Admirals & SES Members

Admirals Top Rated Competencies		Senior Executives Top Rated Competencies	
Self-Assessed	Observed	Self-Assessed	Observed
Action Oriented	Action Oriented	Integrity and Trust	Ethics and Values
Approachability	Command Skills	Dealing with Ambiguity	Functional/Technical Skills
Drive for Results	Drive for Results	Ethics and Values	Integrity and Trust
Integrity and Trust	Intellectual Horsepower	Command Skills	Fairness to Direct Reports
Standing Alone	Political Savvy	Decision Quality	Intellectual Horsepower

In terms of self-assessed competencies, the only shared competency between that of admirals and that of senior executives is that of ‘Integrity and Trust’. In terms of observed competencies, the only shared competency is that of ‘Intellectual Horsepower’. This does support the idea that military and civilian leadership styles are different and those differences can be used to in the assessment of leadership effectiveness. This will be used later in this paper in the establishment of unique military and civilian leadership characteristics.

As discussed earlier, Weaver conducted a study similar to Tankersley comparing General Officers and civilians in the Senior Executive Service. His study did not include observed assessments nor desired attributes and used only self-assessments to derive conclusions on leadership effectiveness. In table 4-14 below, the self-assessed competencies of the General

Officers and the Senior Executives are listed together along with the scores that were assigned to each of the competencies. Shared competencies are shown in italics.

Table 4-14. Self-Assessed Competencies of General Officers and SES Members (Weaver)

Self-Assessed Competencies			
General Officers	Score	Senior Executive Service	Score
Ethics and Values	3.00	Managing Diversity	3.00
Integrity and Trust	3.00	Negotiating	3.00
Action Oriented	2.62	Action Oriented	2.52
Perseverance	2.33	Drive for Results	2.43
Presentation Skills	2.33	Composure	2.33
Composure	2.29	Presentation Skills	2.33
Self-Development	2.29	Self-Development	2.33
Time Management	2.29	Perseverance	2.24
Drive for Results	2.24	Time Management	2.24

Of interest is that unlike the admirals and the Navy senior executives in Tankersley's study which showed very little similarities in competencies, seven (7) out of nine (9) competencies between the army general officers and their senior executive counterparts are identified as being strengths they share as leaders. As stated above for the discussion from Tankersley's (and others) research, since self-assessments are not an accurate measure of one's own leadership skills, it will be used to establish the desirable characteristics of an effective leader.

Weaver did also identify two factors that impact how leaders view their relationships with their followers which may provide some insight into why and how they make their decisions. These are shown together in table 4-15 below.

Table 4-15. Cultural Factors Impacting Military and Civilian Leadership Traits (Weaver)

Cultural Factors that Impact Leadership Traits of Military and Civilian Leaders	
Military	Civilian
Lead through Discipline	Authentic Connection
Strict Separation between Leader and Follower	Leader and Follower Bond

Organizational Effectiveness as a Function of Leadership

Effectiveness of an organization is a very difficult measure as there are many external influences that may impact the success of an organization in meeting its goals and commitments. However, in his article *Moving Toward Improved Acquisition Outcomes: The Interrelationships Between Culture, Commitment, and Leadership*, Roper (2011, p. 206) “determined that leadership, culture, and individual commitment all have a direct effect on organizational outcomes.” He also found “that leadership may affect culture and commitment while culture may only affect commitment” (page 206). Using a multivariate regression model, the author developed a model that was stable and indicated “the commitment level of employees affects the leadership style” “rather than management leadership style affecting the commitment of the employees” (Roper, 2011, p. 211) which puts into question the validity of the military service’s emphasis on transformational leadership training, and instead shift the focus to contingency leadership when leading a predominantly civilian acquisition organization as opposed to a military organization.

“The first significant relationship among the data collected for this study demonstrated that leadership does in fact affect commitment” and “commitment affects culture” (Roper, 2011, pp. 214-215). He confirmed this finding through his use of regression analysis that “the leader has the ability to influence the commitment of the employees and that the commitment level of the employees affects the culture of the organization” (Roper, 2011, p. 215). “Leadership, however, was found to have no significant impact on culture” (Roper, 2011, p. 215). I would offer that the style of leadership can indirectly affect culture, but by focusing on the followers and working to increase their commitment, rather than trying to directly change the culture.

“A common assumption is that the culture within the organization is directly linked to the outcomes of an organization, and that changes to culture traits will impact effectiveness” (Roper, 2011, p. 216). However, Roper found that there is “evidence that this presumption alone may not be true” (Roper, 2011, p. 215).

There are two types of cultures that have different reactions to either external or internal stimuli. “An externally focused culture type...” “...is a culture that brings together the elements of mission and adaptability” (Roper, 2011, p. 216) and is sensitive to and ready to react to the external environment and its customers. “In an internally focused culture, outcomes are significantly influenced by the extent to which a leader is supportive of followers and includes followers in decision-making processes” (Roper, 2011, p. 216). Depending on the type of culture that an organization has will determine how the leader should apply leadership principals in order to “manage both environments effectively to see outcome improvements” (Roper, 2011, p. 216).

Based on Roper's findings, it would appear that in order for a leader to attain success, (s)he must be able to adapt to the situation, meaning that a contingency or situational type of leadership is required.

In their thesis *Army Transformation Leadership: A Study of Core Competencies for Civilian Leadership*, Garcia, Klingel, Mull, Summers, and Taylor "identifies leadership competencies and capabilities deemed crucial for civilian leadership transformation" (2006, p. i). The authors surveyed a total of 4,200 personnel, both civilian and military personnel, and presented tables that show the respondents were primarily from the grade of GS-12 to GS-15 civilians, as well as military officers primarily from the rank of Captain (O-3) to Colonel (O-6) (Garcia, Klingel, Mull, Summers, & Taylor, 2006, pp. 41-42).

"The civilian and active military workforce ranked the same top six competencies as being the most important: 1) Team Building, 2) Direction/Goal Setting, 3) Importance of Effective Listening, 4) Professional Ethics, 5) Being a Coach and Mentor, and 6) Strategic Thinking" (Garcia, Klingel, Mull, Summers, & Taylor, 2006, p. 48).

For the role of Project Manager, "Active military and civilian personnel agreed" on what "areas are most important for the leadership position of Project Manager (PM)". These were reported as "Direction/Goal Setting, Professional Ethics, Team Building, Strategic Thinking, and Empowerment Importance and Techniques" (Garcia, Klingel, Mull, Summers, & Taylor, 2006, p. 54). Interestingly, the authors noted that where there was similar training already received, both military and civilians seemed to agree on the need or importance of those characteristics developed in that training. There were five areas in which the military and civilian members agreed. These were: "Professional Ethics, Team Building, Understanding Motivational Theory, Knowledge of Personnel Policy, and Technical Competency" (Garcia, Klingel, Mull, Summers,

& Taylor, 2006, p. 54). This seems to indicate that the training is impacting both military and civilian personnel in a way that is consistent in developing their viewpoints into a unified view of the “competencies most important to executing the position” (Garcia, Klingel, Mull, Summers, & Taylor, 2006, p. 54). For the purposes of this study, I will only use the traits that remained constant between the two columns as this indicates that these are both desirable and durable traits of an effective leader.

Table 4-16. Areas of Project Management Perspective

Most Important Traits	Most Important Traits after Shared Training
Direction/Goal Setting	Professional Ethics
Professional Ethics	Team Building
Team Building	Understanding Motivational Theory
Strategic Thinking	Knowledge of Personnel Policy
Empowerment Importance and Techniques	Technical Competency

Continuing to assess leadership effectiveness, table 4-17 shows desired traits data from Tankersley (2007) from the competencies identified by the flag officers and the senior executives to identify those attributes that are considered effective in a leadership position. Those attributes that are desirable by both military and civilian leaders will be added to develop the types of attributes of an effective leader.

Table 4-17. Desired Attributes of Admirals and Senior Executive Service Members
(Tankersley, 2007, p. 101)

Desired Competencies Identified by Military/Civilian Counterparts	
Traits Desired in Admirals	Traits Desired in Senior Executives
Ethics and Values	Ethics and Values
Integrity and Trust	Integrity and Trust
Command Skills	Motivating Others
Action Oriented	Business Acumen
Motivating Others	Composure
Decision Quality	Dealing with Ambiguity
Managing Vision and Purpose	Interpersonal Savvy
Standing Alone	
Strategic Agility	

There is a focus on leadership which has been a key attribute in the military for the simple reason that, according to the policy brief *Management and Leadership Performance in the Defense Department: Evidence from Surveys of Federal Employees* (Oh & Lewis, 2007) “the costs of its absence are so great with possibly immediate consequences in loss of life”. However, “Managerial skills are essential for ensuring effectiveness and efficiency in meeting mission requirements” (p. 1). This seems to support the idea that there is a role for both good leadership, and for good management, and the difference seems to be short term vs long term considerations.

In their policy brief, Oh and Lewis find that “significant differences exist between performance in the military services and non-service portions of DOD. The military service agencies get systematically higher evaluations in leadership and work climate but not management” (2007, p. 3). To clarify the difference between leadership and management, as stated by DuBrin, “Leadership deals with change, inspiration, motivation, and influence”, and management deals with “planning, organizing, and controlling”. Note that strength in either one

and weakness in the other may lead to failure of an organization. “Effective leaders have to be good managers themselves or be supported by effective managers” (DuBrin, 2019, p. 4) in order to be successful.

Interestingly, one of their findings is that an important “background characteristic that is clearly related to performance is tenure in the job” (Oh & Lewis, 2007, p. 3) which seems intuitive, but conflicts with the findings of Weiss et al that it is the least important factor as discussed earlier.

This is further clarified within the article that a purposeful decision is made to focus on leadership rather than organizational performance by the “...military services to cultivate persons by rotating them regularly through positions” which “may enhance the leadership capabilities and evaluations of military leaders but hurt the management of the specific programs within the defense bureaucracy. Specifically, regular rotation and short tenures decreases the likelihood that managers have a long term perspective toward the organization’s goals and resources needs” (Oh & Lewis, 2007, p. 4).

Although it was found by Oh & Lewis that “short tenures in a position do not adversely affect leadership” these findings seem to question the validity of emphasizing leadership as a key component for those assigned to acquisition roles when “The frequent rotation does seem to shortchange an executive’s ability to manage an organization” (Oh & Lewis, 2007, p. 4).

In their article *Perceptions of Appropriate Leadership Style: Participation Versus Consultation Across Two Cultures*, Campbell, Bommer, and Yeo (1993) examined “the effects of 4 factors on the perceived appropriateness of a displayed leadership style” (p. 1). The four factors investigated were “leader style (participative or consultative), leader gender (male or female), organizational setting (civilian or military), and eventual task outcome (successful,

unsuccessful, or no information)” (Campbell, Bommer, & Yeo, 1993, p. 1). Campbell et al noted that in multiple research studies conducted in the past, it is “clear that no one particular style of leadership is effective in all situations” (1993, p. 2). While it has been noted that “Factors such as the knowledge and ability level of subordinates, task characteristics, work-group goals and norms, personality, etc., have all been identified as important considerations in selecting an appropriate leadership style” (Campbell, Bommer, & Yeo, 1993, p. 1), Campbell et al decided to view the application and effectiveness of leadership style from a “subjective, perceptual approach”, by investigating if a leadership style is effective “because it is perceived by followers as being particularly appropriate for the context at hand” (Campbell, Bommer, & Yeo, 1993, p. 1) even when objective measures would indicate a different type of leadership style would be more effective.

Campbell et al focused on two types of leadership styles: “a participatory leadership style (i.e., the leader shares the problem with subordinates, facilitates discussion and analysis, and then accepts and implements the group decision) with a consultative style (i.e., the leader shares the problem with subordinates, obtains their ideas and suggestions, and then reaches a decision which may or may not reflect their input)” (Campbell, Bommer, & Yeo, 1993, p. 2). Interestingly, “the "autocratic" style was not included...” as it already been “...demonstrated empirically that unilateral decision-making is almost never perceived as more appropriate than participatory leadership” (Campbell, Bommer, & Yeo, 1993, p. 2). Campbell et al also offered the perspective that “the consultative style retains the essential characteristic of the autocratic style (unilateral control of the final decision) without its more unpopular connotations (e.g. arrogance and inconsiderateness)” (Campbell, Bommer, & Yeo, 1993, p. 2). This seems to be an extreme view of the consultative style, but implementation of an autocratic style in a government

acquisition organization doesn't seem likely as multiple independent organizations frequently must work together to meet mission requirements, such as a program office with the contracting office and the user community, effectively eliminating the potential for a single decision maker to meet mission requirements without input from others.

Although the study conducted by Campbell et al looked at differences in gender, and prior research had indicated there were differences in how certain leadership approaches were perceived were found, this was not considered for this study. Their study also looked at Singaporean situations to contrast with American findings, but this too will not be included in this paper.

As previously discussed, the perception of a person's "leadership ability differed significantly depending on whether the manager's style was seen as more or less appropriate" (Campbell, Bommer, & Yeo, 1993, p. 8). Reinforcing this idea is that "a leader who uses an "inappropriate" style may initially be viewed in an unfavourable light, (but) it appears that such negative perceptions can be substantially modified by eventual task success" (Campbell, Bommer, & Yeo, 1993, p. 9). Unfortunately, the opposite is also true, as task failure will increase the perspective of a leader's style being ineffective. If this finding is taken as true, it implies that which leadership style is selected and applied is more important than developing a single leadership style. A good leader understands that his/her "leadership style must vary with the situation" although "a participatory style still appears to be a clear-cut favourite" (Campbell, Bommer, & Yeo, 1993, p. 10). This ability to use "a contingency approach is so evident to those who manage, but much less so to those managed" (Campbell, Bommer, & Yeo, 1993, p. 10).

"Of the four variables originally hypothesized to influence perceived appropriateness, only two actually did so: the leadership style itself and eventual task outcome" (Campbell,

Bommer, & Yeo, 1993, p. 7). Campbell et al used a case study approach, developing a matrix where twelve (12) constructs were of interest to this study, which included two (2) Leadership Styles, two (2) Levels of Appropriateness, and three (3) outcome levels as discussed above.

It was found that Gender (male vs female) and organizational setting (military vs. civilian) “had no effect on these perceptions” (Campbell, Bommer, & Yeo, 1993, p. 7) as it was shown to not be a significant contributor to the outcome. Overall, it was found that “the participative style was perceived as significantly more appropriate than the consultative style” (Campbell, Bommer, & Yeo, 1993, p. 7). Campbell et al also concluded that “eventual task success is a potent influence on judgments of leadership appropriateness” and “With eventual task failure, the leader's style was seen as significantly less appropriate” (Campbell, Bommer, & Yeo, 1993, p. 7) when compared to instances when people are not aware of the outcome. This is understandable in a case study approach, but the ability to apply the leadership style that best influences the team or organization cannot wait to be determined after a task or objective has been achieved or has failed to have been achieved.

Sisti and Latimer investigated the link between leadership and technical execution of unprecedented systems-of-systems (SoS) acquisitions. In their analysis, they found that a transactional leadership style is appropriate for “predictable situations which are closely related to the definition of a preceded SoS acquisition” (Sisti & Latimer IV, 2007, p. 6) (“preceded” SoS acquisitions are those acquisitions that are seeking to acquire or develop systems that have been or are similar to systems that have been acquired in the past).

The focus of a transactional leadership style is the accomplishment of discrete tasks, where “discrete transactions occur as the leader requires a particular action to be performed by someone or some subordinate organization where there is the expectation of some measure of

discrete reward being supported upon completion of the task” (Sisti & Latimer IV, 2007, p. 7).

In addition, “the transactional leader focuses on more routine transactions, rewarding group members for meeting standards” (DuBrin, 2019, p. 71). Therefore, transactional leadership can be considered as a form of leadership where specific instruction is given by a supervisor to a subordinate who then carries out those instructions.

The transformational leadership style as described by Sisti & Latimer is described in a less defined way, stating that the leader considers “all applicable variables associated with the task or task-set that is under consideration and the broader programmatic impact from variables that are not linked to specific tasks” (2007, p. 8). Though this definition is not clear, Sisti & Latimer provide a list of characteristics of transformational leadership that makes it clear the focus of the transformational leader is on developing the capabilities of his/her subordinates, empowering the team, building trust, etc.

Although the two styles are called out as being very different and to be applied in different situations, “It is noted that there is not an *all or nothing* scenario ascribed to either leadership style” (Sisti & Latimer IV, 2007). For “success-oriented acquisition organizations” it is required “that a clear understanding exists relating to the respective roles and responsibilities of the acquisition senior leadership, middle-management, and technical engineers.” In addition, “the acquiring organization must understand the difference between leadership and management and between transactional and transformational leadership styles” (Sisti & Latimer IV, 2007) in order to best employ the proper leadership style to the type of acquisition being contemplated.

Gabbert (2005) conducted research into “the relationship between management behaviors and organizational values and the success of the organization (p. iii) as reported in *The Relationship between Organizational Values and Management Behaviors and Their Influence on*

Organizational Effectiveness in an Army Project Management Organization. Based on a survey of three Army Project Management Offices from PEO Aviation which yielded a sample size of 154 from a total population of 293 personnel, and eighteen (18) of forty-five (45) industry partners also responding, both subordinates and senior managers were asked to rate the managers overall use of the following leadership behaviors:

- | | | | |
|-------------|----------------|------------|---------------|
| - Broker | - Facilitators | - Monitor | - Coordinator |
| - Innovator | - Producer | - Director | - Mentor |

The effectiveness of the managers was determined, and then the characteristics of actions listed above were compared against those managers to determine which behaviors correlated to their effectiveness. Although Gabbert found that those managers that have higher means across all behaviors tended to be regarded as more effective (2005, p. 139), “The results suggest (that) two of the eight leader roles show significantly different” levels of employment of those behaviors when comparing “the Effective and Most Effective managers” (Gabbert, 2005, p. 138). The two behaviors are that of “Director” and “Mentor”. The behaviors associated with the Director role are “clear expectations through planning and goal setting, providing solutions to problems, selecting the solution, providing direction, and establishing and working to accomplish goals” (Gabbert, 2005, p. 138). The behaviors associated with the Mentor role are “showing concern, listening, understanding and mentoring and developing subordinates” (Gabbert, 2005, p. 138). Note that this does not mean that these were identified as the highest rated behaviors but were shown as having the greatest rating difference between the “most effective” and “effective” managers. Gabbert’s results were found to have the top three most highly rated behaviors as first, that of a Producer, second, that of a facilitator, and third as that of a Director. Mentor was

actually the lowest scored behavior for effectiveness of leaders (2005, p. 140). Overall, “The data suggest that the Most Effective managers stress the role of Director ... significantly more than they do the behaviors of Monitor or Coordinator, but this pattern seems to be similar for those rated as Effective also” (Gabbert, 2005, pp. 151-152). Gabbert also looked at pairing of behaviors to see if there were specific pairings that were evident in the Most Effective leaders and Effective leaders. There were “28 possible pairing of roles for the Most Effective managers and when those pairings “were compared with those for the Effective managers, only two combinations of role comparisons were found to be significantly different”. These roles consisted of the roles of Director /Monitor and Director /Coordinator (Gabbert, 2005, p. 156).

The Effect of Personality on Leadership

In their article, *What We Know About Leadership: Effectiveness and Personality*, Hogan, Curphy, and Hogan (1994) note that leadership must be evaluated based on “...the actual performance of their team or organizational unit” (p. 7). The second point that their research found was that “...subordinates are often in a unique position to evaluate leadership effectiveness” and that the “the evaluation of a manager’s performance depends, in part, on the relationships that the person has established with his or her subordinates” (p. 7). This correlates with the definition of leadership which requires that a leader have the ability to influence subordinates to act in the interest of the group, rather than in the self-interest of the employee. Again, the findings by Hogan et al supported the position that self-ratings by leaders of their overall effectiveness “...were uncorrelated with the ratings provided by the other groups” (1994, p. 8). While leaders evaluated themselves on perceived technical abilities, “...subordinates’ ratings of a manager’s overall effectiveness were largely influenced by judgments of integrity” (Hogan, Curphy, & Hogan, 1994, p. 8). Another aspect of leadership as evaluated by people not

familiar with a potential leader was the “need for advancement, general mental ability, written communication skills, overall communications skills, flexibility, creativity, and organizing and planning” (Hogan, Curphy, & Hogan, 1994, p. 8).

A link between personality and leadership emergence found that specific leadership characteristics were identified as follows: “Dominance, Capacity for Status, Sociability, Social Presence”, “Self-Acceptance, Achievement via Independence (i.e., emotional stability), and Empathy are significantly correlated with peer and staff ratings for emergent leadership in leaderless discussion groups” (Hogan, Curphy, & Hogan, 1994, p. 11).

Hogan et al found that “certain personality dimensions are consistently related to rated leadership effectiveness”. The following characteristics were found to be indicative of good leadership, and are “dominance, assertiveness, energy or activity level, speech fluency, sociability, and social participation), emotional stability (i.e., adjustment, emotional balance, independence, and self-confidence), conscientiousness (i.e., responsibility, achievement, initiative, personal integrity, and ethical conduct), and agreeableness (i.e., friendliness, social nearness, and support)” (1994, p. 13).

Hogan et al further expands the relationship between personality and leadership as that of “charismatic leadership”. As defined, a charismatic leader has “a vision that others find compelling”. They are also “able to recruit a group of people who share that vision”, and the leaders are “able to persuade them to work for and to support the vision” (Hogan, Curphy, & Hogan, 1994, p. 14). In their research they found that the charismatic leaders are more effective than non-charismatic leaders with “substantially higher (a) promotion recommendation or performance appraisal ratings from superiors; (b) satisfaction, morale, or approval ratings from

subordinates; (c) historians' ratings of greatness; or (d) levels of team performance" (Hogan, Curphy, & Hogan, 1994, p. 14).

In addition, it was found that "The key to a leader's effectiveness is his or her ability to build a team" (Hogan, Curphy, & Hogan, 1994, p. 16). The ability to build a team are reliant on eight leadership challenges: "communicate a clear mission or sense of purpose, identify available resources and talent, develop the talent, plan and organize, coordinate work activities, and acquire needed resources. On the maintenance side, they minimize and resolve conflicts among group members and they ensure that team members understand the team's goals, constraints, resources, and problems" (Hogan, Curphy, & Hogan, 1994, p. 16)." The key characteristics can be summarized as ability to communicate, manage both personnel and other resources, to keep the team apprised of the team's goals, limitations and risks. These and other keys to effective leadership are listed in chapter 5, as well as the observed leadership characteristics that were found to be unique to military and civilian leaders.

Based on the findings from the sources used for this research paper, there were a large number of traits identified as being indicative of an effective leader. These were selected based on ranking by the authors, shared identification by participants in the studies, etc. These included Gabbert identifying two key traits: that of a Director, and a Mentor. Sisti focused on the traits of a Transformational Leader, breaking it down to one who empowers the members of the team, develops his/her subordinates and creates trust between himself and his followers. Campbell et al focused on two leadership styles, with a participative leadership style emerging as the key to effective leadership. Hogan et al took a broad look and created a detailed list of leadership traits ranging from assertiveness to team building and ten (10) traits in between. Tankersley narrowed it down to three key traits: Integrity and Trust, Ethics and Values, and

Motivating Others. Lastly, Weiss' research led him to five key leadership traits, starting with Communication, and ending with Team Building. The complete list of traits are listed in table 4-18 below.

Table 4-18. Keys to Effective Leadership

Keys to Effective Leadership			
Traits, Skills & Styles	Source	Traits, Skills & Styles	Source
Agreeableness	Hogan	Ethics and Values	Tankersley
Assertiveness	Hogan	Integrity	Tankersley
Charisma	Hogan	Listening Skills	Weiss et al
Communication Skills	Hogan, Weiss	Mentor	Gabbert
Conscientiousness	Hogan	Motivating & Inspiring	Tankersley, Weiss
Director	Gabbert	Participative Leadership	Campbell
Dominance	Hogan	Providing Guidance	Weiss et al
Emotional Stability	Hogan	Resource Management	Hogan
Empathy	Hogan	Sociability	Hogan
Employee Development	Sisti	Team Building	Hogan, Weiss
Empowerment	Sisti	Trust	Sisti, Tankersley
Energy or Activity Level	Hogan		

CHAPTER 5 - SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Chapter 1 established a baseline definition for leadership to be used in order to answer the overall topic question which is “Leadership is the ability to inspire confidence and support among a diverse set of people with diverse interests and motivations to pull together in the same direction towards a common goal”. This was derived from DuBrin (2019) Tankersley (2007). I identified a number of characteristics from various sources that are considered indicators of leadership style in the tables of Chapter 1.

Chapter 2 conducted a literature search into the research that has already been conducted using keywords that were relevant to this paper’s topics. Using key words that were integral to this paper’s topic, I searched multiple databases and found many dissertations and articles that touched on aspects relevant to this paper, but very few that attempted to characterize both military and civilian leadership traits and then use that to investigate the impact on effectiveness of an organization.

Chapter 3 outlined the process planned to be used in order to find the actual data needed to identify the leadership characteristics that were both shared and unique to civilian and military personnel as well as the organizational effectiveness of an organization as related to leadership styles.

Chapter 4 pulled together the data that emerged, and identified three general themes to support this paper’s topic: Military Leadership Styles, Civilian Leadership Styles, and Organizational Effectiveness based on those Leadership Styles.

In this Chapter, the overall topic, Identifying the Difference between Military and Civilian Leadership Styles and Its Effect on Army Acquisition Organizations Over the Past Twenty Years has a number of factors that comprise the topic and need to be investigated in

order to answer the top level question. These factors were represented by five supporting questions, that when combined lays out the leadership styles and characteristics of military and civilian leaders, the similarities and differences between military and civilian leaders, and the impact on the effectiveness of an acquisition organization.

According to findings by Hogan et al, Eichinger et al, etc. even though self-ratings are used, and in fact have been used by resources used for this paper, “The evidence is clear... that self-ratings tell us little about leader effectiveness” (1994, p. 8). Due to this finding from multiple sources (e.g. Tankersley (2007), Hogan (1999), and Eichinger (2003), the observed characteristics were used as the primary sources for determining leadership styles, but in the absence of observed source data, the self-assessed evaluations were used as leadership priorities.

Summary of the Data Analysis

Determining Military Leadership Characteristics

In answer to the first supporting question that helps to answer the overall topic is ‘Are there distinct military leadership styles, and if so, what characteristics are common among military leaders?’ Chapter 4 identified traits for military officers and were listed in the supporting tables. Both self-assessed characteristics and characteristics observed by others were listed and even though there seemed to be a great deal of consensus on the poor ability of people to assess themselves, it does allow one to identify what is important to leaders that they feel they are attempting to model in their leadership role. However, at this point the focus is on observed characteristics and are listed in table 5-1 below.

Table 5-1. Leadership Characteristics of Military Leaders

Observed Leadership Characteristics for Military Leaders	
Action Oriented	Intellectual Horsepower
Charismatic	Lead through Discipline
Command Skills	Participative Leadership
Contingency Style	Political Savvy
Controlling	Self-Confident
Decisive	Separation between Leader and Follower
Direct Communication	Thinking-Judging
Drive for Results	Transformational Leadership
Firm Discipline	

In table 5-1 the key characteristics of Military leaders are listed. The only observed leadership characteristics of military members that the military leaders self-identified as having and were corroborated through observation from others provide an overall generalized perspective of distinct leadership styles of military leaders. The observed leadership characteristics of admirals were found to be ‘Drive for Results’ and ‘Action Oriented’. The remaining characteristics were unique to each source of results, and may be considered to not necessarily be a leadership characteristic unique to service members.

Determining Civilian Leadership Characteristics

The second supporting question that helps to answer the overall topic is ‘Are there distinct civilian leadership styles, and if so, what characteristics are common among civilian leaders?’ In chapter 4, traits for civilian leaders officers were identified and listed in Table 4-6 through 4-8. Both self-assessed characteristics and characteristics observed by others were listed. Once again, although it’s understood that self-assessment is not an accurate measure of

abilities or traits, it allows for the identification of what's important to leaders that they feel they are attempting to model in their leadership role.

Table 5-2. Leadership Characteristics of Civilian Leaders

Observed Leadership Characteristics for Civilian Leaders	
Authentic Connection	Intellectual Horsepower
<i>Ethics and Values</i>	Leader and Follower Bond
Fairness to Direct Reports	Participative Style
Functional and Technical Skills	Transformational Leadership
<i>Integrity and Trust</i>	Thinking-Judging (MBTI)

In table 5-2 the Army and Navy SESs identified two key characteristics of both Navy SESs and Army SESs that the leaders believe they are modeling or possessing; namely 'Integrity and Trust'; and 'Ethics and Values' (italicized in table 5-2).

Determining Unique Leadership Characteristics

The third question begins to look at civilian and military leaders together to identify their common traits/characteristics as well as the traits and characteristics in which they differ. By combining these characteristics, it allows a comparison of leadership traits to identify where the separation as well as the overlap between civilian and military leadership styles occurs.

In his dissertation *The Transformational Leadership Effectiveness of Retired Military Service Academy Graduates*, Tiller found that managers with a military background and managers without a military background were found to have transformational leadership skills. The results of Tiller's study using the MLQ found that managers with a military background had a mean score of 3.17, and a sample standard deviation of 0.378 meaning that they had

transformational leadership skills. Managers without a military background had a mean score of 2.85 with a sample standard deviation of 0.325. The sample size for both was thirty-one. Tiller indicated that there was a difference between military and civilian transformational leadership scores, and by conducting a 2-sample T-test, I was able to confirm his conclusion. However, I could not find from published research as referenced support that “a higher score for one sample over the other would indicate a potential for more effective leadership” (Tiller, 2007, p. 121) when using the MLQ and both groups are rated as having transformational leadership skills. It should also be noted that the results for the managers with a military background had a greater standard deviation than the civilian managers, to the point that all usual (or expected) values of civilian career managers ($\bar{x} \pm 2\sigma$) were contained within that of the manager with a military background.

Although previously stated that self-assessed leadership characteristics are not accurate, a comparison of these characteristics provide an idea of what the leaders believe is important to focus on regardless of whether or not they are displaying these traits. In table 5-3 below, the characteristics have been divided into two columns, one for military and one for civilian. Each group is placed into alphabetical order to ease comparison of the leadership characteristics the military and civilian leaders have identified for themselves. Table 5-3 below shows the Self-Assessed Leadership Characteristics that are shared between Military and Civilian Leaders. The traits shown are shared traits from the Tankersley and Weaver surveys for both military and civilian leaders that each have identified as self-assessed leadership traits. From this comparison, it's clear to see that there are many shared behavioral leadership traits between civilian and military leaders that they believe they are displaying.

Table 5-3. Shared Leadership Characteristics for Military & Civilian Leaders

Self-Assessed Leadership Characteristics - Shared	
Military Leaders	Civilian Leaders
Action Oriented	Action Oriented
Drive for Results	Drive for Results
Ethics and Values	Ethics and Values
Integrity and Trust	Integrity and Trust
Perseverance	Perseverance
Self-Development	Self-Development
Time Management	Time Management

The traits unique to civilian or military characteristics are identified in table 5-4, and are placed in alphabetical order. These traits demonstrate that, in addition to the shared focus of priorities that the military and civilian leaders have as discussed above, they also hold very different perspectives on a number of areas where a leader's focus should be in terms of leadership characteristics.

Table 5-4. Self-Assessed Leadership Characteristics Unique to Military & Civilian Leaders

Self-Assessed Leadership Characteristics - Shared	
Military Leaders	Civilian Leaders
Approachability	Fairness to Direct Reports
Composure	Functional/Technical Skills
Presentation Skills	Intellectual Horsepower
Standing Alone	Managing Diversity
	Negotiating
	Command Skills
	Composure
	Dealing with Ambiguity
	Decision Quality

Although the above self-assessed leadership characteristics are of interest, for the purpose of this research paper it is the observed characteristics that will be used for comparison. Combining the military and civilian observed leadership traits that are shared between both yields table 5-5 below.

Table 5-5. Observed Shared Military and Civilian Leadership Characteristics

Observed Leadership Characteristics – Shared Leadership Behaviors	
Military Leaders	Civilian Leaders
Intellectual Horsepower	Intellectual Horsepower
Participative Leadership	Participative Leadership
Thinking-Judging	Thinking-Judging (MBTI)
Transformational Leadership	Transformational Leadership

The shared observed leadership skills were highlighted above. Table 5-6 below displays the unique leadership traits observed for military and civilian leaders, which were distilled from

the overall traits yielding a picture of how military and civilian leaders emerge. These key differences are shown in table 5-6 below.

Table 5-6. Unique Observed Military and Civilian Leadership Characteristics

Observed Leadership Characteristics – Unique Leadership Behaviors	
Military Leaders	Civilian Leaders
Action Oriented	Authentic Connection
Charismatic	Ethics and Values
Command Skills	Fairness to Direct Reports
Contingency Style	Functional and Technical Skills
Controlling	Integrity and Trust
Decisive	Leader and Follower Bond
Direct Communication	
Drive for Results	
Discipline (Firm & Lead through)	
Political Savvy	
Self-Confidence	
Separation between Leader and Follower	

Since the point of determining if the difference in leadership style affects acquisition organization effectiveness, the differences between the leaders shown in the table 5-6 will be used to compare the effect of a leader on an organization.

Defining Effective Army Organizations

One of the more difficult questions to be answered is ‘How is effectiveness defined in an Army acquisition organization?’ The difficulty this presents is to identify the measure of effectiveness that is linked solely to leadership style. The outcome of fielding a product or the number of products fielded, inventing a new device, creating a new process, etc., is probably not

a good measure of leadership as much as it a good measure of subordinate skills, number of approved requirements, resources in place (i.e. funding appropriated by Congress), etc. In addition, there was no information in the available literature that sought to identify traits of an effective organization. However, there is literature available that supports those leadership traits that can lead to organizations becoming more effective.

Leadership Traits that Lead to an Effective Army Organization

The final supporting question was ‘How is effectiveness between Army acquisition organizations attributable to specific characteristics identified as military or civilian leadership styles?’ The data did not provide an answer to enable a direct answer based on organizational outcomes for this question. However, based on the literature referenced in this paper, table 4-18, Keys to Effective Leadership, identified those skills most important to be an effective leader can now be compared to those unique attributes found for military and civilian leaders. These attributes are independent of the application – that is, these skills and styles are not limited to either civilian or military leaders. As previously discussed, these attributes were compiled from the findings discussed in Chapter 4 generated from the literature. These Key Interpersonal Skills were identified by Weiss et al, Key Program Management Traits from Garcia et al, Desired Competencies at the executive levels from Tankersley and Weaver, and Leadership Style from Gabbert and Campbell et al.

Table 5-7. Keys to Effective Leadership

Key Traits, Skills and Styles for Effective Leadership			
Characteristic	Source(s)	Characteristic	Source(s)
Agreeableness	Hogan	Energy or Activity Level	Hogan
Assertiveness	Hogan	Ethics and Values	Tankersley
Charisma	Hogan	Integrity and Trust	Tankersley, Sisti
Communication Skills	Hogan, Weiss	Listening Skills	Weiss et al
Conscientiousness	Hogan	Mentor	Gabbert
Contingency/Situational	Weaver, Eldred, Campbell, Roper	Motivating & Inspiring	Tankersley, Weiss
Director	Gabbert	Participative Leadership	Campbell
Dominance	Hogan	Providing Guidance	Weiss et al
Emotional Stability	Hogan	Resource Management	Hogan
Empathy	Hogan	Sociability	Hogan
Employee Development	Sisti	Team Building	Hogan, Weiss
Empowerment	Sisti		

As shown in table 5-7 above, there are many characteristics that are indicative of an effective leader that can positively influence an organization. This is not to imply that an effective leader must possess all of these characteristics, but looking at those characteristics that were identified by more than a single researcher, it may be inferred that these may be considered among the most important. Specifically, these are: Communication Skills (all), Contingency Leadership Style, Motivational/Inspirational, and Trustful.

Comparing those key skills identified by multiple authors, military leaders seem to have the Contingency Leadership Style which was identified most often as being a key indicator of being an effective leader. This was supported by Eldred who found that military leaders who made a successful transition to the public sector recognized that their leadership styles had to

change. Although communication skills was also identified as a key indicator, it was found that military leaders were frequently described as using a direct communication style which was not found to be an effective communication method. Unfortunately, descriptors applied to military leadership styles did not include motivational or trustful characteristics. Although there were many characteristics attributed to military leaders, the only other characteristic that was identified as being indicative of highly effective leadership was that of charisma.

Civilian leaders appeared to have much fewer unique leadership characteristics as compared to their military counterparts. Comparing their attributes to those key skills identified by multiple authors, civilian leaders also have a single key indicator to which they match – that of Trust. Civilians were also found to have only one other characteristic identified as being key to effective leadership which is Ethics & Values.

Of the shared characteristics, a participative leadership style was identified for both military and civilian leaders and was also identified as being a beneficial characteristic.

Conclusions

Based on the analysis conducted in support of the primary question, ‘Identifying the Difference between Military and Civilian Leadership Styles and Its Effect on Army Acquisition Organizations Over the Past Twenty Years’, several things become clear.

Simply put, there was no clear evidence that provided a definitive answer as to whether military leadership or civilian leadership styles provided significant benefits or were detrimental to acquisition (or other) organizations. Based on research done for this paper, Winkler is correct in stating that there is “No substantive literature... to validate whether military leadership experience is preferred over civilian experience” (Winkler, 2009, p. 101). There are some interesting findings that state otherwise, such as Tiller noting that his research found that in “the

general population of ex-military officers ... several studies indicated a poor performance record” (Tiller, 2007, p. 68). In addition, he stated that “some studies have shown that these individuals, as civilian leaders, do not outperform their civilian counterparts” (Tiller, 2007, p. 19). His finding was that military leaders had Transformational Leadership Styles, but it was not unique to the military.

It appears that there is a connection between leadership and organizational outcomes, but the “associations between leadership styles and organizational outcomes are mediated by some form of organizational culture” (Roper, 2011, p. 216). As has been a recurring theme through the research, it was noted that “An evolving and adapting leadership style has been found to be important to career progression and leadership maturity for both groups in the study” (Weaver, 2008, p. 105). This highlighting of the need for a leader to use a situational, or contingency type of leadership highlights the importance of recognizing an organization’s culture and adapting or properly responding to that culture in order to be able to effectively lead the organization.

While there are differences between military and civilian leaders, there are also similarities. Borrowing a statement from Tankersley, when comparing military to civilian leaders, “the similarities are great and the differences small” (2007, p. 104).

Final Interpretation

The topic question for this paper was to find those leadership attributes that were unique to military and civilian leaders and the impact on organizational effectiveness. What was found was that while there were identifiable differences, there were also a number of similarities, and based on the findings there were not any significant key indicators that showed that either military or civilian leaders have a better leadership style as a cohort. From this research, military leaders were identified as having better situational leadership skills, which based on their typical

rotation through leadership positions would be expected, and civilian leaders were found to have a greater level of integrity and trust, which likely has a connection to their longer tenure and focus on building relationships with subordinates.

The importance of this study was that it strongly suggests that the focus of leadership development should not be to attempt to make civilians more like military or vice versa when leading an acquisition organization, but to focus on those traits that result in effectiveness of an organization.

Evidence of Bias and Methods to Minimize its Effect on this Analysis

The appearance of bias in the research was limited to that of statements in the literature that were used to describe the rationale for the studies that had been undertaken. This did not affect the data collection for the source papers nor the data collection for this paper.

Recommendations

There are a number of areas that this research uncovered that could have been expanded upon or used to build upon this research. These areas include:

1. To better delineate differences between military and civilian leadership styles, a need to conduct 360-degree style surveys is critical. In addition, ensure civilians are represented by career civilians, or potentially set a maximum number of years of prior military service (for example less than five years), rather than retired military in order to prevent blurring the differences between civilian and military characteristics.
2. Focus on one service, rather than across the services in order to increase the focus to the characteristics found for that one service since there appeared to be a difference in the approach for developing leaders between services.

3. Conduct a study to determine if the emphasis of leadership skills over management skills is the appropriate position for Army acquisition organizations. A balance of both types of skills seems critical to the long term health and success of an organization. Further detail may include looking into the educational backgrounds of both military and civilian leaders to determine if there is a difference that impacts leader effectiveness.

Limitations of the Study

This study was limited to existing literature and data, resulting in data that may not have been focused on the primary question as it otherwise could have been. The data used was not limited to Army personnel, and included personnel from the Navy and Air Force in order to better round out the findings across all military and all civilian personnel. In addition, some data was generated by studies that looked outside of government acquisition organizations, but it did look at traits that are generalizable.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Baldwin, D., & Grayson, C. (2004, March/April). Positive Influence: How Leaders Get Others to See It Their Way. *Leadership in Action*, 24(1), pp. 8-11. Retrieved September 19, 2020
- Bass, B., & Avolio, B. J. (2004). *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire Manual* (3rd ed.). Menlo Park, California: Mind Garden, Inc.
- Baughn, M., & Finzel, P. A. (2009, June). A Clash of Cultures in a Merger of Two Acquisition Project Offices. *Engineering Management Journal*, 21(2), pp. 11-17.
- Campbell, D. J., Bommer, W., & Yeo, E. (1993, April). Perceptions of Appropriate Leadership Style: Participation Versus Consultation Across Two Cultures. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 10(1).
- Claxton, J. D. (2004). An Examination of Personality Type Dominating Leadership Positions in Department of Defense Program Management.
- Clements, T. (2017, February 21). A Peek Behind the Curtain: An Analysis of the FY17 Project Manager and Product Manager Selection Board. *Defense Visual Information Distribution Service*, 3. Retrieved January 1, 2021, from <https://www.dvidshub.net/news/printable/224230>
- Director, Acquisition Career Management Office. (2015). *Civilians and the Centralized Selection List Administration Handbook*.
- DuBrin, A. J. (2019). *Leadership: Research Findings, Practice, and Skills* (9th ed.). Boston, MA: Cengage Learning, Inc.
- Eichinger, R. W., & Lombardo, M. M. (2003). Knowledge Summary Series: 360-Degree Assessment. *Human Resource Planning*, 26(4), 34-44. Retrieved 2020, from <https://search-proquest-com.dauknowledge-repository.idm.oclc.org/trade-journals/knowledge-summary-series-360-degree-assessment/docview/224570560/se-2?accountid=40390>
- Eldred, L. M. (2000). *From Warriors to Wingtips: The Leadership Transition of Retired Officers into the Public Sector*. University of San Diego. San Diego: Bell & Howell Information and Learning Company.
- Ferguson, J., Rybacki, M., Butts, D., & Carrigan, K. (2016). Comparing Leadership Challenges Military vs. Civil Service.

- Gabbert, J. A. (2005). *The Relationship between Organizational Values and Management Behaviors and Their Influence on Organizational Effectiveness in an Army Project Management Organization*. Argosy/Sarasota University, Sarasota.
- Garcia, J., Klingel, J., Mull, J., Summers, D., & Taylor, V. (2006, September). *Army Transformation Leadership - A Study of Core Competencies for Civilian Leadership*. Monterey, California. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/10945/2586>
- Graduate Programs Staff. (2019, September 4). *Top 5 Leadership Skills for the Workplace of Tomorrow*. Retrieved December 30, 2020, from Northeastern University Graduate Programs: <https://www.northeastern.edu/graduate/blog/essential-leadership-skills-for-tomorrow/>
- Headquarters, Department of the Army. (2012). *ADRP 6-22 Army Leadership*. Department of the Army.
- Headquarters, Department of the Army. (2019). *ADP 6-22 Army Leadership and the Profession*. Washington, DC: Army Publishing Directorate.
- Hogan, R., Curphy, G. J., & Hogan, J. (1994, June). What We Know About Leadership: Effectiveness and Personality. *American Psychologist*, 49(6), 493-504. Retrieved from <https://www.dwhr.co.uk/uploads/news-documents/10-2-12-What20We20Know20About20Leadership.pdf>
- Leedy, P. D., Ormrod, J. E., & Johnson, L. R. (2019). *Practical Research: Planning and Design* (12th ed.). New York, New York: Pearson Education Incorporated.
- Maxwell, J. C. (2011). *The 5 Levels of Leadership*. New York, NY: Hachette Book Group.
- Meriam-Webster. (n.d.). *Merriam-Webster.com dictionary*. Retrieved January 26, 2021, from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/standard>
- Oh, M. P., & Lewis, D. (2007, February). *Management and Leadership Performance in the Defense Department: Evidence from Surveys of Federal Employees*. 1-4. Princeton, NJ. Retrieved from <http://www.wws.princeton.edu/policybriefs/>
- Q&A: *What is Leadership?* (2019, December 12). Retrieved December 29, 2020, from Indeed.com: <https://www.indeed.com/career-advice/career-development/what-is-leadership>

- Roper, E. (2011). Moving Toward Improved Acquisition Outcomes: The Interrelationships Between Culture, Commitment, and Leadership. *Defense Acquisition Research Journal*(2), 196–221.
- Sands-Pingot, G. (2015, November 23). Sharing the Bench: Comparing Army Civilian Executive and General Officer Elite Group Identity. Omaha, Nebraska: ProQuest LLC.
- Simon & Schuster. (1988). *Webster's New World Dictionary of American English* (Third College Edition ed.). (V. Neufeldt, & D. B. Guralnik, Eds.) New York, New York: Webster's New World Dictionaries.
- Sisti, F. J., & Latimer IV, D. T. (2007). Linking Leadership and Technical Execution in Unprecedented Systems-Of-Systems Acquisitions. *Journal of Integrated Design & Process Science*, 11(2), 73-89.
- Stevens, R. B. (2013, July). Comparative Study of Leadership Between Civilian Engineers and Military Engineers. Moon Township, Pennsylvania: ProQuest LLC.
- Tankersley, J. D. (2007). United States Navy Admirals And Civilian Senior Executives: An Investigation Of Navy Leadership. Ann Arbor, Michigan: ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.
- Tiller, S. R. (2007, June). The Transformational Leadership Effectiveness of Retired Military Service Academy Graduates in Post-Retirement Civilian Careers. Ann Arbor, Michigan: ProQuest Information and Learning Company.
- Weaver, J. S. (2008, November). Comparing Leadership Competencies of U.S. Army Generals and U.S. Army Civilian Senior Executives: A Case Study. Capella University.
- Weiss, M. P., Elliott, K. A., Erickson, M. D., Fowler, E. T., & Giesecking, J. K. (2006, September). *An Identification of Interpersonal Skills for Building Army Civilian Leaders*. Naval Post Graduate School.
- Winkler, D. S. (2009). *Comparing Corporate Aerospace Leadership Groups with and without Military Leadership Experience*. Dissertation, Northcentral University, Prescott Valley.
- Winkler, D. S. (2009, April). Comparing Corporate Aerospace Leadership Groups With and Without Military Leadership Experience. Prescott Valley, Arizona: ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.
- Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case Study Research and Applications - Design and Methods 6th edition* (6th ed.). Los Angeles, California, USA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Zaccaro, S. J., Foti, R. J., & Kenny, D. A. (1991). Self-Monitoring and Trait-Based Variance in Leadership: An Investigation of Leader Flexibility Across Multiple Group Situations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76(2), 308-315. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=bsu&AN=9105202514&site=bsi-live&scope=site>

APPENDICES

Appendix A - Characteristics of Military Leadership Styles and How They're Viewed

Characteristic	Author	Outlook
Idealized Influence	Tiller	Positive
Inspirational Motivation	Tiller	Positive
Intellectual Stimulation	Tiller	Positive
Individualized Consideration	Tiller	Positive
Contingency Leadership	Eldred	Positive
Firm Discipline	Eldred	Positive
Controlled Environment	Eldred	Positive
Straightforward Communications	Eldred	Positive
Training and Development	Eldred	Positive
Values	Eldred	Positive
Camaraderie Building	Eldred	Positive
Command Presence	Eldred	Positive
Standard Operating Procedures	Eldred	Positive
Centrally Mandated Change	Eldred	Positive
Direct Communication Style	Eldred	Negative
Using Military Jargon	Eldred	Negative
Assuming Compliance	Eldred	Negative
Accepting and Criticizing the Status Quo	Eldred	Negative
Developing an Inner Circle	Eldred	Negative
Expect others to initiate Career Development	Eldred	Negative
Expect Others to Direct Change	Eldred	Negative

Fail to React to Stereotypes	Eldred	Negative
Decisiveness	Eldred, Claxton	Negative
Portraying Control	Eldred	Negative
Self-Confidence	Eldred	Negative

Appendix B. Common Characteristics of Good Leaders

Characteristic	Source	Outlook
Honor	Tiller	Positive
Courage	Tiller	Positive
Duty	Tiller	Positive
Integrity	Tiller	Positive
Loyalty	Tiller	Positive
Self-discipline	Tiller	Positive
Perseverance	Tiller	Positive
Commitment	Tiller	Positive
Coaching Style	Eldred	Positive
Actively Manage Performance	Eldred	Positive
Less Direct Communications Style	Eldred	Positive
Creating Ownership	Eldred	Positive
Build influence and political relationships	Eldred	Positive
Introduce Change by Influence	Eldred	Positive
Charisma	DuBrin	Positive
Need for advancement	Hogan et al (1994)	Positive
Mental Ability	Hogan et al (1994)	Positive
Communication Skills	Hogan et al (1994)	Positive
Flexibility	Hogan et al (1994)	Positive
Creativity	Hogan et al (1994)	Positive
Organizing and Planning	Hogan et al (1994)	Positive

Dominance	Hogan et al (1994)	Positive
Capacity for Status	Hogan et al (1994)	Positive
Sociability	Hogan et al (1994)	Positive
Social Presence	Hogan et al (1994)	Positive
Self-Acceptance	Hogan et al (1994)	Positive
Achievement via Independence	Hogan et al (1994)	Positive
Emotional Stability	Hogan et al (1994)	Positive
Empathy	Hogan et al (1994)	Positive

Appendix C. Common Characteristics of Poor Leaders

Characteristic	Source	Outlook
Exploitation	Hogan et al (1994)	Negative
Inability to make good decisions	Hogan et al (1994)	Negative
Irritability	Hogan et al (1994)	Negative
Micro-management	Hogan et al (1994)	Negative
Not Trustworthy	Hogan et al (1994)	Negative
Over Control	Hogan et al (1994)	Negative
Unwillingness to use discipline	Hogan et al (1994)	Negative

ACRONYMS

AAW	Army Acquisition Workforce
ABI	Abstracted Business Information
ATLDP	Army's Training and Leadership Development Panel
APM	Assistant Program Manager
APMC	Advanced Program Management Course
CCL	Center for Creative Leadership
CEO	Chief Executive Officer
CSL	Central Selection List
COL	Colonel
DACM	Director for Acquisition Career Management
DoD	Department of Defense
DAU	Defense Acquisition University
DPdM	Deputy Product Manager
DPM	Deputy Program Manager
EBSCO	Elton B. Stephens Company
EPMC	Executive Program Management Course
ENTJ	Extrovert- Intuition-Thinking-Judging
ESTJ	Extrovert-Sensing-Thinking-Judging
GO	General Officer
GS	General Schedule
INTJ	Introvert-Intuition-Thinking-Judging

ISTJ	Introvert –Sensing-Thinking-Judging
LTC	Lieutenant Colonel
MBTI	Myers-Briggs Type Indicator
MBPTI	Myers-Briggs Personality Type Indicator
MLQ	Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire
OPM	Office of Personnel Management
PdM	Product Manager
PEO	Program Executive Officer
PM	Program Manager
PMO	Program Management Office
PMSW	Program Manager Soldier Weapons
PO	Program Officer
SES	Senior Executive Service
SoS	System of Systems
SSCF	Senior Service College Fellowship
Std Dev	Standard Deviation
TJ	Thinking-Judging
TL	Transformational Leadership
VA	Veteran’s Administration

Author Note

Thanks to Ms. Katie Multop, Research Librarian, DAU Knowledge Repository & Acker Archives for her instruction on how to conduct research in the DAU archives, her incredible knowledge, lightning fast responses to my requests, and always having a positive response in her emails.

Thanks to Mr. Thomas Neff for providing input, suggestions, and guidance to keep my research paper focused on the topic, and to help me to remain objective in my analysis and discussion.

Thanks to Mr. Thomas Conroy for providing guidance on how to formulate my topic, conduct research properly, and for making time to meet with us outside of the formal workshops to help us stay on track.

Correspondence concerning this paper should be addressed to Mr. M. David Ahmad, Picatinny Arsenal, NJ 08706.

E-mail: mahmoud.d.ahmad.civ@mail.mil