



**NAVAL
POSTGRADUATE
SCHOOL**

MONTEREY, CALIFORNIA

THESIS

STRENGTH OF TEMPERANCE AND USN FITREP

by

Nicolas D. Hart

December 2023

Thesis Advisor:

Co-Advisor:

Erik Helzer

Paul Lester

Approved for public release. Distribution is unlimited.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE			<i>Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188</i>
Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instruction, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188) Washington, DC, 20503.			
1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave blank)	2. REPORT DATE December 2023	3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED Master's thesis	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE STRENGTH OF TEMPERANCE AND USN FITREP		5. FUNDING NUMBERS	
6. AUTHOR(S) Nicolas D. Hart			
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93943-5000		8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) N/A		10. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER	
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES The views expressed in this thesis are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the Department of Defense or the U.S. Government.			
12a. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release. Distribution is unlimited.		12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE A	
13. ABSTRACT (maximum 200 words) This thesis commenced with a meticulous exploration of temperance, employing the well-structured VIA framework developed by Peterson and Seligman. This framework provided a systematic approach to understanding the character strengths associated with temperance. To contextualize these virtues within the military sphere, I conducted a comprehensive comparative analysis among academic literature, Navy doctrine, and the fitness report (FITREP) performance traits. This analytical approach allowed me to determine the extent to which these essential character strengths are acknowledged and integrated into military leadership. By comparing findings from academic studies, official Navy documents, and performance evaluation criteria, I was able to identify gaps, paving the way for the exploration of how temperance-related character strengths can be better incorporated into the Navy's leadership standard. This methodical examination not only sheds light on the existing landscape but also serves as a foundation for advocating for the enhancement of military leadership by aligning it more closely with the character strengths of temperance.			
14. SUBJECT TERMS temperance, forgiveness, mercy, humility, modesty, prudence, self-regulation, FITREP, fitness report		15. NUMBER OF PAGES 55	
		16. PRICE CODE	
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT Unclassified	18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE Unclassified	19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT Unclassified	20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT UU

NSN 7540-01-280-5500

Standard Form 298 (Rev. 2-89)
Prescribed by ANSI Std. Z39-18

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Approved for public release. Distribution is unlimited.

STRENGTH OF TEMPERANCE AND USN FITREP

Nicolas D. Hart
Lieutenant, United States Navy
BS, United States Naval Academy, 2017

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

from the

**NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL
December 2023**

Approved by: Erik Helzer
Advisor

Paul Lester
Co-Advisor

Amilcar A. Menichini
Academic Associate, Department of Defense Management

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

ABSTRACT

This thesis commenced with a meticulous exploration of temperance, employing the well-structured VIA framework developed by Peterson and Seligman. This framework provided a systematic approach to understanding the character strengths associated with temperance. To contextualize these virtues within the military sphere, I conducted a comprehensive comparative analysis among academic literature, Navy doctrine, and the fitness report (FITREP) performance traits. This analytical approach allowed me to determine the extent to which these essential character strengths are acknowledged and integrated into military leadership. By comparing findings from academic studies, official Navy documents, and performance evaluation criteria, I was able to identify gaps, paving the way for the exploration of how temperance-related character strengths can be better incorporated into the Navy's leadership standard. This methodical examination not only sheds light on the existing landscape but also serves as a foundation for advocating for the enhancement of military leadership by aligning it more closely with the character strengths of temperance.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
A.	BACKGROUND	1
B.	RESEARCH AND PURPOSE AND TARGET AUDIENCE	1
C.	RESEARCH QUESTIONS.....	2
D.	METHODOLOGY	2
E.	SCOPE AND LIMITATION OF RESEARCH	3
F.	ORGANIZATION OF THE THESIS.....	3
II.	METHODOLOGY	5
A.	INTRODUCTION TO METHODOLOGY.....	5
B.	METHODOLOGY	5
III.	LITERATURE REVIEW	9
A.	OVERVIEW OF THE VIRTUE OF TEMPERANCE AND ITS CHARACTER STRENGTHS	9
1.	Forgiveness and Mercy.....	11
2.	Humility and Modesty	11
3.	Prudence	12
4.	Self-Regulation	12
B.	STRENGTH OF TEMPERANCE AND LEADERSHIP.....	13
1.	Forgiveness and Mercy.....	15
2.	Humility and Modesty	16
3.	Prudence	19
4.	Self-Regulation	20
C.	NAVY CORE VALUES	22
D.	LEADERSHIP TRAITS MEASURED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY (FITREP)	24
IV.	COMPARATIVE AND GAP ANALYSIS.....	29
A.	ANALYSIS	29
1.	Signature Behaviors of the 21st Century Sailor.....	29
2.	Chief of Naval Operations Navigation Plan 2022	30
3.	Navy Core Values.....	30
4.	FITREP Performance Traits	30
V.	CONCLUSION AND AREAS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH	31

A.	ANSWERS TO RESEARCH QUESTIONS	31
B.	LIMITATIONS AND AREAS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH.....	32
	LIST OF REFERENCES.....	35
	INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST	39

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.	Search Words for Gap Analysis.....	7
Table 2:	FITREP Performance Traits. Adapted from BUPERSINST 1610.10F.	24
Table 3.	Comparison between Navy Doctrine and Character Strengths.....	29

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

BSM	business strategy module
CNO	Chief of Naval Operations
DON	Department of the Navy
FFM	five factor model
FITREP	fitness report
HEXACO	honesty-humility, emotionality, extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, openness to experience
NAVPLAN	navigation plan
NROTC	Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps
OCS	Officer Candidate School
USNA	United States Naval Academy
VIA	values in action

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Thank you to my advisors, the Graduate Writing Center, my thesis processor, and my family. I am thankful for all of you. I could not have done it without your guidance and support.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

I. INTRODUCTION

A. BACKGROUND

Temperance is a moral virtue that protects people from excess (Peterson & Seligman, 2004). In a military context temperance facilitates discipline, self-control, ethical decision-making, professional conduct, and teamwork. Military leaders operate in high-stress environments with limited resources, regularly face ethical dilemmas, lead a diverse group of people, and must always represent the country dignity, all of which can be done better with the strengths of temperance. This thesis examines how the Navy actively cultivates the virtue of temperance in its leaders and assesses temperance in sailors through its formal evaluation systems and doctrine.

Peterson and Seligman introduce the Virtue and Character Strengths framework in their book *Character Strengths and Virtues: A Handbook and Classification*, published in 2004. The framework aims to identify and classify positive character traits that contribute to human flourishing and well-being. The Values in Action (VIA) framework is structured into Six Core Virtues and 24 Character Strengths. The character strengths composing the virtue of temperance are forgiveness and mercy, humility and modesty, prudence, and self-regulation. This thesis reviews the academic literature on the virtue of temperance and its character strengths utilizing the VIA framework as well as aspects of two prominent personality models, the HEXACO model and Five Factor Model (FFM).

B. RESEARCH AND PURPOSE AND TARGET AUDIENCE

The purpose of this thesis is to examine which qualities related to the virtue of temperance the Navy is cultivating, assessing, and the empirical relationships between temperance and positive organizational behaviors. The target audience for this research is military leaders, policymakers and researchers interested in how virtues and character strengths aid in military leader performance. The research builds upon existing studies concerning the virtue of temperance and its role in promoting effective leadership and positive organizational outcomes. The conclusions drawn from this research will aid in identifying opportunities for the Navy to align its stated values with what it is developing

and measuring in its evaluation systems and doctrine, including the fitness report (FITREP).

The research suggests that the integration of the findings will enhance leadership skills, improve ethical decision-making, raise personal and professional development, and mitigate instances of, and the risks of, impulsive behaviors. The outcomes and recommendations of this research align with Navy values as they emphasize integrity, accountability, and teamwork. Leaders with temperance can positively impact mission success with their restraint, ethical conduct, ability to enhance teamwork and their effective decision making. This research is crucial to sailors as it supports their personal and professional development but also contributes to a culture of ethical leadership, resilience, and effectiveness within the Navy community.

C. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

My research addresses the following research questions:

- (1) How is the U.S. Navy cultivating leadership that draws from the strengths of temperance?
- (2) How is the U.S. Navy assessing temperance among sailors, more specifically, our officers?
- (3) What are the empirical relationships between temperance, its character strengths, and positive organizational behaviors?

D. METHODOLOGY

This thesis applied content analysis linking literature on the strengths of temperance to leadership, as well as what the U.S. Navy is cultivating through their FITREP process for officers. It also combines comparative and gap analysis to rigorously examine and evaluate the existing Navy doctrine like 21st Century Sailor, and NAVPLAN 2022, and the FITREP performance traits against empirical research. The literature review aims to find relevant, credible studies that link the strengths of temperance to better leader performance. Similarly, the literature review includes studies linking improved leader performance to an improved working environment. This literature review included peer-reviewed articles,

scholarly books, relevant instructions for the evaluation of military officers, and Navy doctrine. This research shows how the U.S. Navy is cultivating leadership that draws from the strengths of temperance, how the U.S. Navy is assessing temperance among sailors, and what the empirical relationships are between temperance and positive organizational behaviors.

E. SCOPE AND LIMITATION OF RESEARCH

The evaluation process for military officers varies by branch, and the performance traits evaluated do not include direct, literal references to temperance nor the character strengths specifically outlined by Peterson and Seligman. Consequently, educated inference was used to map these evaluated traits to the virtue of temperance and its character strengths. This inference leads to a potential bias as the strengths of temperance can be subjective and influenced by personal bias. Similarly, there may be some cross-cultural differences between the military and civilian population. As a U.S. Navy sailor, I may misinterpret the performance traits or take the descriptions to mean something that they were not meant to. Finally, the availability of data in certain strengths of temperance are less robust than others. It was more difficult to find empirical relationships between prudence and organizational outcomes versus humility and modesty. This lack of studies indicates that more research is required to gain a complete understanding of the role of the strengths of temperance on leadership and improved working environments.

F. ORGANIZATION OF THE THESIS

This thesis consists of five chapters. In the introduction chapter, I give the overview of the research. In Chapter II, I lay out the methodology used for the analysis. In Chapter III I review the relevant literature on the virtue of temperance and its four character strengths. Chapter IV summarizes the comparative and gap analysis and finally, Chapter V gives the conclusions of this research and recommendations for follow on studies to improve Navy cultivation of leadership that draws on the strengths of temperance.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

II. METHODOLOGY

A. INTRODUCTION TO METHODOLOGY

In this methodology section, I employ a comprehensive approach combining comparative and gap analysis to rigorously examine and evaluate Navy doctrine and the FITREP performance traits against existing research. Comparative analysis allows us to identify similarities and differences between various studies, what the Navy doctrines states about leader's attributes and what the Navy is currently measuring with the FITREP process. Concurrently, gap analysis serves as a tool to pinpoint where the Navy's doctrine and FITREP performance traits fall short when compared to literature. By synthesizing these two analytical methods, I can discern discrepancies between the three sources and provide recommendations to policymakers to reward the behaviors the Navy is trying to develop in its leaders.

B. METHODOLOGY

To start, it was necessary to establish a basis for my research on temperance. To do this, I utilized the VIA framework established by Christopher Peterson and Martin Seligman. Their framework describes six virtues and their associated character strengths and was a good way to organize and present the data. The literature review chapter focused specifically on the virtue of temperance and its four character strengths of: forgiveness and mercy, humility and modesty, prudence, and self-regulation.

When beginning the search for studies on temperance, I utilized keywords and phrases like the strength of temperance, forgiveness, mercy, humility, modesty, prudence and self-regulation as the independent variable and leadership as the dependent variable. These searches started with Google Scholar and the Naval Postgraduate School Dudley Knox Library and eventually brought me to the HEXACO model which indicated three strong parallels between the character strengths of temperance and aspects of the HEXACO model (see Table 1). The parallels were between HEXACO's honesty-humility, agreeableness, and conscientiousness and VIA's humility, forgiveness/mercy, and prudence respectively. Along with HEXACO, the five factor model (FFM) was utilized to

find meta-analyses on conscientiousness. I focused on studies that resulted in positive organizational outcomes like improved leader performance.

Following the academic literature review, I began reading and analyzing Navy doctrine. This search started with the Navy's official website and the documents published to guide the force. Within the website, each major leader within the Department of the Navy has their own page where I took their most recently published statements and documents related to leadership. Following that, I found the instruction which dictates the FITREP process on the Navy's Human Resources website. Specific attention was paid to the performance traits and their definitions.

Upon the completion of the review of the academic literature and Navy doctrine, I began a comparative analysis of the academic literature, Navy doctrine, and the FITREP performance traits. A thorough review of each document against the VIA and paralleled HEXACO and FFM frameworks helped determine whether Navy doctrine addressed forgiveness and mercy, humility and modesty, prudence, self-regulation, and their synonyms. The next step was to perform a gap analysis, drawing on the comparative analysis, for the Navy's FITREP program.

The gap analysis started by evaluating temperance and its character strengths, as well as the HEXACO and FFM facets. Table 1 shows the words that were used to search the navy documents to determine the gap.

Table 1. Search Words for Gap Analysis

VIA	Forgiveness and Mercy	Humility and Modesty	Prudence	Self-Regulation
HEXACO	Agreeableness	Modesty	Conscientiousness	
	Forgivingness	Humility	Organization	
	Gentleness	Sincerity	Diligence	
	Flexibility	Fairness	Perfectionism	
	Patience	Greed Avoidance	Prudence	
FFM			Conscientiousness	
			Perfectionism	
Related Concepts				Self-control

The words and concepts in Table 1 were then compared to 21st Century Sailor, NAVPLAN 2022 and the descriptions for the Navy Core Values. If the words were present in any of the descriptions of leaders, they were coded as including the corresponding strength of temperance. I then used the same words and compared them to the performance traits and descriptions. If they contained the words, it was coded as including the strength of temperance in the Navy’s personnel measurement system.

To conclude, my research commenced with a meticulous exploration of temperance, employing the well-structured VIA framework developed by Peterson and Seligman. This framework provided a systematic approach to understanding the character strengths associated with temperance. To contextualize these virtues within the military sphere, I conducted a comprehensive comparative analysis among academic literature, Navy doctrine, and the FITREP performance traits. This analytical approach allowed me to determine the extent to which these essential character strengths are acknowledged and integrated into military leadership. By comparing findings from academic studies, official Navy documents, and performance evaluation criteria, I was able to identify gaps, paving the way for the exploration of how temperance-related character strengths can be better incorporated into the Navy’s leadership standard. This methodical examination not only sheds light on the existing landscape but also serves as a foundation for advocating for the

enhancement of military leadership by aligning it more closely with the character strengths of temperance.

III. LITERATURE REVIEW

This literature review will begin by introducing the virtue of temperance and how it has been defined by various scholars. From there, I will describe the character strengths that make up the virtue and how each is defined. Once that foundation is set, I will shift to how each character strength contributes to leadership effectiveness using empirical evidence from the literature. Lastly, I will describe the Navy's Core Values, Signature Behaviors of the 21st Century Sailor, CNO's NAVPLAN 2022, the FITREP performance traits and how the Department of the Navy's (DON) leadership is operationalizing and measuring these core values. I will focus specifically on core values that lead to positive organizational outcomes and improved leader performance.

A. OVERVIEW OF THE VIRTUE OF TEMPERANCE AND ITS CHARACTER STRENGTHS

Often confused for mere abstinence from alcohol, temperance is much more than that. Temperance has been defined by philosophers such as Plato, Aristotle and Aquinas, and can be summarized as “the moral virtue that introduces certain order or moderation to the sensible appetites that appear stronger and more attractive to human beings” (Sanz & Fontrodona, 2019, p. 983). The VIA framework conceptualizes a virtue as “the core characteristics valued by moral philosophers and religious thinkers” (Peterson & Seligman, 2004, p. 13). Broad virtues are composed from character strengths, which “are the psychological ingredients—processes or mechanisms—that define the virtues” (Peterson & Seligman, 2004, p. 13). For the virtue of temperance, the four character strengths are forgiveness and mercy, humility and modesty, prudence, and self-regulation. I will utilize this format to define both temperance as a virtue and its associated character strengths.

The virtue of temperance, and its related character strengths, are positive traits that protect people from all forms of excess. For example, “hatred... which we are protected from by forgiveness and mercy. Arrogance, which we are protected from by humility and modesty. Short-term pleasure with long term cost which we are protected from by prudence. And finally, destabilizing emotional extremes which we are protected from by

self-regulation” (Peterson & Seligman, 2004, p. 431). So, while this may include abstinence from alcohol, it also includes the moderation of other vices, such as showing forgiveness instead of hate, humility instead of arrogance, prudence instead of poor decisions with lasting consequences and finally, self-regulation instead of reckless impulses. Having established the significance of the virtue of temperance in managing the extremes, it is now necessary to explore further the character strengths that make up the virtue of temperance.

The character strengths related to temperance in Peterson and Seligman’s model can be mapped onto trait dimensions found in other, broader personality models, such as the Five Factor Model (FFM) and HEXACO. Much of my literature review focuses on traits related to temperance assessed in these personality models because of a lack of empirical research on temperance as conceptualized by Peterson and Seligman. HEXACO is an acronym that denotes six major components of personality. Honesty-humility, which encompasses Peterson and Seligman’s humility and modesty; Extraversion; Agreeableness, which has traits encompassing forgiveness and mercy in Peterson and Seligman’s model; Conscientiousness, which includes the facet of prudence, a core component of temperance; and finally, Openness to experience. It is important to note here that the temperance virtue as conceptualized by Peterson and Seligman spans three of the major six personality traits in the HEXACO model. I will mainly use studies based on the HEXACO model to describe the character strengths laid out by Peterson and Seligman because they have been more thoroughly studied than Peterson and Seligman’s virtues.

This literature review will begin by delving into the character strengths that make up the virtue of temperance, outlined by Peterson and Seligman, and how they are defined in psychology. I will then describe how other psychologists have studied these character strengths (or conceptually-similar personality traits) and how they are associated with positive forms of leadership. I will then review research on interventions and training that have helped these strengths become more apparent in leadership styles. Finally, I provide an overview of the Naval officer’s evaluation process and link the character strengths studied to what is currently being measured in the Navy. From this evaluation, we will begin to see the behaviors and character strengths the Navy is rewarding through its

evaluation criteria. I will reflect on the consequences this may have for the overall force and the leaders it produces.

1. Forgiveness and Mercy

Peterson and Seligman describe individuals possessing the traits of forgiveness and mercy as “those who let bygones be bygones—not because of negative states and traits like fear, shame, guilt, or permissiveness and not because of external incentives or threats but from a positive strength of character” (Peterson & Seligman, 2004, p. 432). Those who let bygones be bygones are those who “forgive and forget past offences or causes of conflict” (Sieftring, 2004, p. 43). Others have defined forgiveness and mercy as “the deliberate decision to work through debilitating emotions and choose relational justice, in which a leader chooses to create an environment in which forgiveness can be asked and granted” (Ferch & Mitchell, 2001, p. 78). There are many ways to define both forgiveness and mercy but central to all of them is the theme of not allowing people’s past failures to affect the relationship moving forward, while also not seeking any form of reprisal for said transgressions. This is important because leaders who habitually hold things against people and make transgressions personal, vice simply holding them accountable to expectations, may begin to erode important senior/subordinate relationships.

2. Humility and Modesty

Humility and modesty can be misconstrued as a weakness for a leader. Oftentimes when one thinks of a leader, or someone with a command presence, the image of someone loud, confident, and proud comes to mind. To that point, humility is “frequently associated with shyness, lack of ambition, passivity, or lack of confidence” (Vera & Rodriguez-Lopez, 2004, p. 393) in people’s minds. While this stigma may exist, it is better to envision the character strengths of humility and modesty as those that “... lead to a presentation of the self in an accurate way but, more important, in a way that deflects attention from the self and onto other people or circumstances” (Peterson Seligman, 2004, p. 436). Therefore, it is not necessarily an accurate assumption that those who possess the strength of humility and modesty are meek, but rather they are individuals who are acutely aware of what they have to offer and understand that the people and circumstances involved can make all the

difference in a person's success. These character strengths are important because they allow a leader to think about their abilities accurately, know where they fall short, and hopefully seek advice where required. Additionally, it allows the leaders to give praise where praise is due. It often takes a team to run any organization, and acknowledging those who have helped will make them more inclined to do so in the future.

3. Prudence

Prudence, much like the previous strengths, is stigmatized. Being called a prude often has undertones of being self-righteous, smug, or even boring. However, “prudence is an orientation to one’s personal future, a form of practical reasoning and self-management that helps one to achieve long-term goals effectively by considering carefully along the way the consequences of actions taken and not taken” (Peterson & Seligman, 2004, p. 438). Using this conceptualization, a prudent person is thoughtful and considers the effects of their decisions on their future but also the future of their organization. These people are not noted for their inaction, but rather, their actions that only tend to benefit their futures and goals. A prudent person will rarely act recklessly.

4. Self-Regulation

A person who possesses the character strength of self-regulation is, “the individual [who] exerts control over his or her own responses so as to pursue goals and live up to standards” (Peterson & Seligman, 2004 p. 442). Those who can practice self-regulation are able to manage various forms of excess. Some examples are those who can stay true to a workout schedule, eat proper foods, or even manage their emotions to not lash out. It is important to acknowledge that despite this being its own character strength as defined by Peterson and Seligman, it is quite broad and closely linked to aspects of the previously mentioned character strengths. To expound on the definition, self-regulation can also be defined as “... an ongoing inner conversation... the component of emotional intelligence that frees us from being prisoners of our feelings” (Goleman, 2004, p. 85). A strength of Goleman’s definition is it takes what we would normally think of self-regulation and applies it to emotional intelligence defining it as a recognition of our feelings and reacting appropriately.

To summarize, the virtue of temperance extends far beyond the misconception of merely abstinence from alcohol. Rooted in ancient philosophical wisdom, temperance addresses the inner conflict within each of us, balancing the logical and illogical aspects of being human while bringing order and moderation to our first inclinations, at times being the easier path. Four character strengths are associated with temperance: forgiveness and mercy, humility and modesty, prudence, and self-regulation. These character strengths are positive attributes that shield people from excess and promote an even keeled and principled life. Forgiveness and mercy enable individuals to let go of past conflicts, humility and modesty help people to present themselves accurately and consider the needs of others, prudence guides thoughtful decision-making for long-term goals, and self-regulation empowers individuals to control their responses and manage emotional extremes. These strengths collectively contribute to a well-rounded and virtuous life, fostering harmony within oneself and in relationships with others.

B. STRENGTH OF TEMPERANCE AND LEADERSHIP

In this next section I will shift to looking at empirical research on the relationship between temperance, and conceptually-similar personality traits, and positive leadership and organizational outcomes. Through a comprehensive examination of existing scholarship, this portion of the review aims to illuminate the impact of these character strengths on personal well-being and the broader leadership context, providing valuable insights into how the Navy can cultivate stronger leadership through its evaluation process.

The initial research I present is a meta-analysis that encompasses studies utilizing the HEXACO framework. With the parallels drawn earlier between HEXACO and VIA frameworks, this study offers a broad summary of findings from literature up until 2020, detailing the HEXACO personality traits' influence on positive and negative leadership qualities. The meta-analysis examined relationships between honesty-humility and exploitation, agreeableness and obstruction, and finally conscientiousness and duty. This meta-analysis included “426 individual meta-analyses, 436 independent samples, and 3,893 effect-size estimates...” (Zettler et al., 2020, p. 723).

Exploitation is “characterized by the opportunity to gain personal benefits (both material and immaterial, e.g., feelings of joy or pleasure) at the expense of other people or organizations” (Zettler et al., 2020, p.727). The meta-analysis indicated a strong negative correlation between honesty-humility and exploitation, which was about two times higher than the closest correlation. Individuals higher in honesty-humility were less likely to exploit others and the organization. The analysis also revealed negative correlations, weaker in strength, between agreeableness (forgiveness/mercy) and conscientiousness (prudence) and exploitation. These results offer indirect evidence that individuals who are higher in three out of the four character strengths of temperance are less likely to exploit for their benefit. The reduced likelihood of taking advantage of others and the organization for selfish reasons will promote a more positive and honorable working environment, making them better leaders of any institution.

Obstruction is conceptualized as an “individual’s inclination ... to seek for revenge and retaliation” (Zettler et al., 2020, p. 729). Results indicated that above all other HEXACO personality traits, agreeableness had the strongest negative correlation with obstruction followed by honesty-humility. This correlation is important because those who possess humility and forgiveness/mercy are less likely to retaliate negatively and seek revenge for wrongdoings.

Duty in this context is the “thoughts, feelings, and behaviors related to individuals’ inclination to plan, organize, or work in general as opposed to immediate impulse gratification or procrastination” (Zettler et al., 2020, p. 729). Much like the former links, the one between conscientiousness and duty was strong and positive and twice that of the next strongest of honesty-humility. This parallel cannot be stressed enough as duty is essential to every leader. Conscientiousness, as a proxy for prudence, can promote increased planning and organization making for a better leader.

While this meta-analysis covers three of the four VIA character strengths, utilizing the parallels between VIA and HEXACO for a broad analysis, I will now review some individual studies examining the potentially positive outcomes associated with the character strengths of temperance.

1. Forgiveness and Mercy

Thompson and Simkins (2016) explore the dynamics of forgiveness in the context of professional leader/follower relationships and its impact on the quality of those relationships. Exchange relationships are defined here as the interactions between the leader and follower and typically how the follower benefits from their contributions to the leader. The article distinguishes between self-oriented forgiveness and other-oriented forgiveness. Self-oriented forgiveness pertains to an individual's ability to let go of resentment and negative emotions for their own well-being, while other-oriented forgiveness involves forgiving someone for the benefit of the other person and the relationship. The research suggests that both self-oriented and other-oriented forgiveness on the part of leaders and followers can contribute to high-quality exchange relationships. Additionally, the article discusses the relevance of forgiveness in organizational settings. It suggests that promoting forgiveness among employees can lead to better workplace relationships, reduced conflicts, and improved overall organizational culture. Ultimately, forgiveness emerges as a valuable tool for building and maintaining positive and productive leader/ follower relationships.

Zdaniuk and Bobocel (2017) theorized that leaders with idealized influence (positive role models) should facilitate the forgiveness of their employees more than those who do not exhibit idealized influence. They conducted an experimental study and a two-part field study. The first study was conducted with fifty undergraduate students. Half were the control group while the other half was shown the mission statement from a hypothetical company and a description of the leader's leadership style. The goal of providing participants with this introduction was to prime this group to view their company's leader as a positive role model or give the leader some idealized influence. The participants of the study were then asked to rate the severity of a vignette's offensiveness and their likeliness to forgive. The second study took a random sample of 1000 alumni in which they conducted a two-part web-survey on their severity rating of an incident conducted by their leader. Their results showed that as a leader, being a positive role model is important to fostering a positive work environment that not only promotes forgiveness, but also "...predicts more distal prosocial motivations and behaviors" (Zdaniuk & Bobocel, 2017, p. 874). And

secondly, these idealized influence leaders may also go on “... to prevent a cycle of negative interpersonal behaviors, which are detrimental to organizations” (Zdaniuk & Bobocel, 2017, p. 874).

Breevaart and de Vries (2017) conducted a study to determine the link between leaders’ HEXACO personality traits and their subordinates’ views of their leadership. They conducted a study of 107 leader-subordinate pairs. The leaders were given a HEXACO personality test to measure their personality while the subordinates rated their leaders on abusive supervision. Their results indicated that both high agreeableness and high honesty-humility were related to lower subordinate-rated abusive supervision. Leaders who measured low in one, or both, personality traits were rated as more abusive by their subordinates. This finding provides evidence that those who rate low in these personality traits and by extension their corresponding character strengths of humility and modesty, and forgiveness and mercy, tend to be viewed as more hostile leaders causing a worse working environment for followers.

2. Humility and Modesty

While the previous meta-analysis drew links between three of the VIA character strengths of temperance and leadership outcomes, a meta-analysis by Heck et al. (2018) establishes the link between honesty-humility from HEXACO, and unethical decision making. Heck et al. reanalyzed sixteen studies with a combined 5,002 participants in which they assessed unethical behavior in an “incentivized, one-shot cheating paradigm” (Heck et al., 2018, p. 356). They found that honesty-humility was the strongest predictor of dishonest behavior like cheating or lying. The higher the participants measured on honesty-humility, the less likely they were to lie or cheat. Ethical decisions for military leaders are paramount as people’s lives are potentially at stake with military leaders’ decisions.

Owens et al. (2013) examine the concept of expressed humility in the context of organizational behavior. Expressed humility refers to individuals openly acknowledging their limitations, mistakes, and areas where they may need assistance. The article highlights several key findings to include expressed humility’s positive impact on performance, benefit for teams, link to increased ethical behavior, and improved leadership effectiveness.

The article suggests that leaders who exhibit expressed humility are viewed as more effective by their subordinates. This leadership style promotes trust and openness, creating a conducive atmosphere for innovation and employee development. Embracing expressed humility can lead to a more positive and productive organizational culture therefore promoting a more positive atmosphere.

Similarly, Vera and Rodriguez-Lopez (2004) set out to address the current disagreement in the business community about the value of humility. They conducted an analysis of the strategic leadership and competitive advantage literature and developed a model of the benefits of humility to the organization. They found that humble leaders create an inclusive environment that encourages diverse perspectives, enabling teams to tap into a wealth of ideas and expertise (Vera & Rodriguez-Lopez, 2004). They also found that humility promotes learning, better service to the firm's stakeholders and resilience within the organization. Humble leaders are extremely important for positive organizational outcomes.

Lee et al. (2019) conducted a meta-analysis of the relationship between the personality trait of honesty-humility and job performance. They found that honesty-humility had a strong negative correlation to counterproductive work behavior and a positive correlation to organizational citizenship behavior and task performance. The study's findings have practical implications for personnel selection and management practices. Organizations may benefit from assessing honesty-humility in candidates during the hiring process, as it can serve as a valuable predictor of future job performance. Additionally, managers can use this insight to foster a work culture that values sincerity and fairness, potentially enhancing overall employee performance and retention by hiring and cultivating humility within the organization. This research underscores the relevance of considering personality traits, specifically honesty-humility, in understanding and improving workplace outcomes.

A study conducted by Ziaran (2015) investigates the role of humility and self-esteem in shaping ethical attitudes among leaders. They found that leaders who exhibit humility are more likely to prioritize ethical decision-making and conduct, fostering an environment of trust and integrity within their organizations. The findings have practical

implications for leadership development and training programs as they emphasize the importance of nurturing humility as a key trait in leaders to promote ethical conduct and moral decision-making within their teams and organizations. These insights provide valuable guidance for organizations and leaders seeking to cultivate ethical leadership and promote integrity within their workplace cultures leading to an overall better working environment.

Ogunfowora and Bourdage (2014) set out to determine if there was a link between honesty-humility and leadership emergence. Leadership emergence happens when peers are put into a group, and one member takes charge. They conducted a study in which participants were randomly put into groups of four to six to work on a major class project. Participants were given a personality test at the onset, a moral disengagement measure (social loafing, or the tendency to sit back while the other group members finish the tasks), and finally, at the end, a leadership emergence exercise, which involved measuring yourself and others' leadership qualities. They found that those with low honesty-humility were less likely to be viewed as emerging leaders. Instead of leading, they were more prone to believing that the ethical standards in the context of the group project did not apply to them. This study is important because it shows that not only are those low in honesty-humility more likely to morally disengage, they also, due to this disengagement, are far less likely to emerge as leaders. This is important in the context of military leadership because we want our leaders to emerge and become effective vice disengaging and not making a positive change in the working environment.

Similarly to how we measure positive traits through personality tests modeled from HEXACO, there are also measures for negative traits like Machiavellianism, psychopathy and narcissism which coincide to low measures of varying HEXACO personality traits. Often defined as the dark triad, these three traits are measurable using self-report scales. This next article attempts to draw the parallel between the dark triad traits and the HEXACO model to show that workplace bullies high in the dark triad are likely low in certain portions of the HEXACO model. They conducted a study measuring the experience of being exposed to bullying type behaviors as well as a self-evaluation of proneness to bullying others. They then measured the dark triad personality traits as well as the

HEXACO personality traits. They found that those who self-identified as utilizing bullying-type behaviors were also high on the dark triad traits and low on HEXACO's honesty-humility and agreeableness. The findings here show the importance of personality on workplace behaviors. They also go as far to say "that applicants for a job, particularly a managerial position, should be screened in terms of their personality because applicants possessing high values in Machiavellianism and low values in honesty-humility are more likely to use bullying tactics in the workplace" (Daderman & Regnestal-Impola, 2019, p. 8). This is important because it shows that not only is low honesty-humility bad in and of itself for the work environment, it is also likely that those who measure low in honesty-humility are also more likely to rate high in the dark triad traits.

3. Prudence

Barrick and Mount (1991) conducted a meta-analysis linking personality dimensions to three job performance criteria: job proficiency, training proficiency, and personnel data. Additionally, they examined the strength of the five dimensions of personality for five occupational groups: professionals, police, managers, sales, and skilled/semi-skilled. The job proficiency measure included performance ratings and productivity data; training proficiency measure was for training proficiency ratings and productivity data, like time to complete training; and personnel data included things like salary, turnover, and time in the position. "The most significant finding in the study relates to Conscientiousness dimension. It was found to be a consistently valid predictor for all occupational groups studied and for all criterion types" (Barrick & Mount, 1991, p. 17). What this means is that above all other personality traits, conscientiousness, linked to prudence through HEXACO, is most important for the completion of work tasks for all jobs. Conscientiousness, or prudent leaders rate higher in job performance and their leadership results in better outcomes for the organization.

Dudley et al. (2006) conducted a meta-analysis to determine if there was a link between the conscientiousness personality trait and job performance. The study went further than others and analyzed the links between the facets (narrow traits) of conscientiousness as well conscientiousness itself (global conscientiousness). They found

that among the narrow traits, dependability appears to be the main component and driver of global conscientiousness and most closely tied to job performance. This means that of all the possible narrow traits, dependability is the primary component that makes up conscientiousness. This shows that not only are conscientious leaders dependable but also better leaders. So, much like the previous study, conscientiousness is a positive indicator of job performance, showing that the prudent leaders perform better.

4. Self-Regulation

Tangney et al. (2004) offered evidence of the psychological benefits and advantages of self-control and introduced a trait scale to assess individual differences in self-control. To do this, Tangney et al. conducted two studies involving multiple sessions with undergraduate participants. They administered batteries of questionnaires and used the data to refine their trait scale. They found that “higher scores on self-control correlated with a higher grade point average, fewer reports of psychopathology, higher self-esteem, less binge eating and alcohol abuse, better relationships and interpersonal skills, secure attachment, and more optimal emotional responses” (Tangney et al., 2004, p.271). These interpersonal benefits are key to all leaders alike as they will provide a better leader/subordinate relationship.

Duckworth and Seligman (2005) conducted a longitudinal study, utilizing self-reported, parent reported, teacher reported, and a monetary choice questionnaire as a measure of students’ self-discipline. They found that students’ self-discipline in the fall accounted for more than twice as much variance as IQ in final grades, high school selection, school attendance, hours spent doing homework and was inversely related to hours watching television, and time of day homework began (Duckworth & Seligman, 2005). While this finding does not directly relate to leadership, it is important because it links self-control to performance while controlling for IQ or raw cognitive abilities. This is important because as a military, we stress discipline which can have twice the impact on outcomes than innate intelligence.

Collins and Jackson (2015) proposed a comprehensive framework that explains the intricate dynamics between self-regulation, leadership behaviors, and their underlying

psychological mechanisms. By integrating attentional resource capacity, or attentional bandwidth, the model illustrates how these factors shape and interact with constructive and destructive leadership styles. It highlights that leaders with higher attentional resource capacity are more likely to engage in constructive leadership behaviors, while those with lower attentional resources may exhibit destructive tendencies. Moreover, the model emphasizes the crucial role of negative emotions, indicating that leaders who experience heightened negative emotions are prone to displaying destructive leadership behaviors. In other words, those who possess large amounts of self-regulation, can temper their negative emotions leading to higher attentional resource capacity and therefore more positive leadership behaviors (Collins & Jackson, 2015).

Yeow and Martin (2013) tested if leader self-regulation was associated with better subordinate measures of leader performance and overall better team financial outcomes. They conducted a longitudinal field experiment with university students where they examined the effectiveness of a leader self-regulation intervention (a coaching session about halfway through the experiment) in teams involved in a Business Strategy Module (BSM). The teams were made up of one leader and four followers who were together for twenty-four weeks. They found that the leaders who had the intervention received higher leader performance scores than those without the intervention. Similarly, the leader intervention increased the team's overall performance to include better financial outcomes at the conclusion of the module. This intervention offered a method for increasing leader self-regulation that led to improved perceptions of leaders' effectiveness and improved team performance. This is important because not only do we want our leaders to exhibit self-regulation, but we also want them to be perceived as effective. This effectiveness, rooted in self-regulation, will lead to a better working environment.

In conclusion, this review of the literature suggests that those people high in the virtue of temperance and its related character strengths facilitate positive organizational behaviors and outcomes. Forgiving and merciful leaders promote better workplace relationships, are involved in fewer conflicts, and tend to be viewed as less hostile (Thompson & Simkins 2016, Zdaniuk & Bobocel 2017, Breevart & de Vries 2017). Humble and modest leaders acknowledge their limitations, promote learning within the

organization, better perform tasks, and make more ethical decisions (Owens et al. 2013, Vera & Rodriguez-Lopez 2004, Lee et al. 2019, Ziaran 2015). Prudent leaders are more dependable and rate higher in job performance (Barrick & Mount 1991, Dudley et al. 2006). Lastly, self-regulated leaders abuse alcohol less, see better performance outcomes when compared to IQ alone, are more likely to engage in constructive leadership, and finally, can produce better team outcomes like overall performance (Tangney et al. 2004, Duckworth & Seligman 2005, Collins & Jackson 2015, Yeow & Martine 2013).

C. NAVY CORE VALUES

Now that we have reviewed what the academic literature states about the values of the strength of temperance, it is important to understand what the Navy is saying about these strengths. The United States Navy introduces every sailor to the Navy Core Values during their introductory training, whether it is Boot Camp for the enlisted sailor, or the United States Naval Academy (USNA), Officer Candidate School (OCS), or Reserve Officers' Training Corps (ROTC) for officers. These core values are honor, courage, and commitment. The DON Core Values Charter states that just as in our past, we are dedicated to these values as they are foundational to trust and leadership. Guided by these principles, we will be faithful to our Core Values of Honor, Courage, and Commitment as our abiding duty and privilege” (Core Values Charter, <https://www.secnav.navy.mil/ethics>).

The Core Values were further defined from the Signature Behaviors of the 21st Century Sailor published in 2020. An honorable person has honesty and integrity, a high ethical manner, and is forthright. A courageous person makes ethical decisions and acts in the best interest of the DON, while adhering to the highest standards of personal conduct and decency. Lastly, a committed leader is caring of the personal and spiritual well-being of people, showing respect to all regardless of who they are and where they come from.

In addition to the core values and Signature Behaviors, in 2022, the former Chief of Naval Operations (CNO) released the Navigation Plan (NAVPLAN) to denote his four foundational priorities for the force. The four foundational priorities are: readiness, capabilities, capacity, and sailors. In the 2022 NAVPLAN, the CNO introduced the “Get Real, Get Better” call to action. “Get Real, Get Better” is “aimed at advancing a culture of

excellence and accelerating our warfighting advantage in this critical decade” (NAVPLAN, 2022, p. 1). This initiative is striving to boost the Navy’s capabilities by promoting an ethos of continuous improvement in the face of intricate threats. Although the Navy team is exceptionally skilled, there are notable performance differences within the group. To address this disparity, the CNO intends to establish uniformity and encourage impactful leadership practices and effective problem-solving methods throughout the organization. The “Get Real, Get Better” effort underscores the importance of inclusivity, transparency, and candid assessments to unleash the Navy’s complete capabilities:

Get Real requires Navy leaders to ruthlessly self-assess; be honest, humble, and transparent about their capabilities and limitations; challenge their beliefs using data, facts, and diverse input; and “embrace the red”—acknowledge shortcomings—by being curious and taking pride in finding and fixing problems. (CNO NAVPLAN, 2022, p. 13)

Get Better requires Navy leaders to deliberately self-correct; find and fix small problems before they become larger, systemic issues; fix the root causes, not just symptoms; apply critical problem-solving tools and best practices to shift from more activity to better outcomes; set clear accountability; work collaboratively; and quickly identify and remove barriers to progress, elevating problems to higher leadership, if necessary. (CNO NAVPLAN, 2022, p. 13)

Similarly, the Command Charge signifies a new set of expectations for commanding officers, emphasizing self-assessment and self-correction. It clearly outlines the qualities the Navy values in its leaders and expects teams to embody for future success. The Get Real, Get Better leadership behaviors, tools, and systems are pivotal in empowering Navy personnel and enhancing the competitive edge in warfare. The Navy plans to integrate these principles into the leadership education and training, considering them fundamental to Sailor development and team building (NAVPLAN, 2022). Additionally, they will revamp the talent management systems to incentivize Get Real, Get Better behaviors, recognizing and rewarding leaders for their achievements and the positive culture they foster.

D. LEADERSHIP TRAITS MEASURED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY (FITREP)

In this section I will introduce Navy Fitness Reports, or FITREPS, to show what the Navy is actively measuring in its leaders. FITREPS are performance evaluation reports used by the United States Navy to assess the performance and potential of its officers and chief warrant officers. These reports are a crucial component of the Navy’s personnel management system and play a significant role in career development and advancement. They are typically submitted by a reporting senior, such as a commanding officer, and provide an assessment of an individual’s professional performance, leadership abilities, and other qualities relevant to their duties. The reports are used to determine promotions, assignments, and in making decisions about an individual’s career progression.

Aside from the background information included on the FITREP, there are also performance traits (see Table 2) that are measured on a scale from one to five, one being the lowest and five being the highest, while three is considered as a sailor who represents the full Navy standards (BUPERSINST 1610.10F).

Table 2: FITREP Performance Traits. Adapted from BUPERSINST 1610.10F.

Performance Traits	Below Standards (1.0)	Meets Standards (3.0)	Greatly Exceeds Standards (5.0)
Professional Expertise: Professional knowledge proficiency, and qualifications.	-Lacks basic professional knowledge to perform effectively. -Cannot apply basic skills. -Fails to develop professionally or achieve timely qualifications.	-Has thorough professional knowledge. -Competently performs both routine and new tasks. -Steadily improves skills, achieves timely qualifications.	-Recognized expert, sought after to solve difficult problems. -Exceptionally skilled, develops and executes innovative ideas. -Achieves early/highly advanced qualifications.
Command or Organizational Climate/Equal Opportunity: Contributing to	-Actions counter to Navy’s retention/reenlistment goals. -Uninvolved with mentoring or	-Positive leadership supports Navy’s increased retention goals. Active in decreasing attrition.	-Measurably contributes to Navy’s increased retention and

Performance Traits	Below Standards (1.0)	Meets Standards (3.0)	Greatly Exceeds Standards (5.0)
growth and development, human worth, community.	<p>professional development of subordinates.</p> <p>-Actions counter to good order and discipline and negatively affect Command/Organizational Climate.</p> <p>-Demonstrates exclusionary behavior. Fails to value differences from cultural diversity.</p>	<p>-Actions adequately encourage/support subordinates' personal/professional growth.</p> <p>-Demonstrates appreciation for contributions of Navy personnel. Positive influence on Command climate.</p> <p>-Values differences as strengths. Fosters atmosphere of acceptance/inclusion per EO/EEO policy.</p>	<p>reduced attrition objectives.</p> <p>-Proactive leader/exemplary mentor. Involved in subordinates' personal development leading to professional growth/sustained commitment.</p> <p>-Initiates support programs for military, civilian, and families to achieve exceptional Command and Organizational climate.</p> <p>-The model of achievement. Develops unit cohesion by valuing differences as strengths.</p>
Military Bearing/Character: Appearance, conduct physical fitness, adherence to Navy Core Values	<p>-Consistently unsatisfactory appearance.</p> <p>-Unsatisfactory demeanor or conduct.</p> <p>-Unable to meet one or more physical readiness standards.</p> <p>-Fails to live up to one or more Navy Core Values: HONOR, COURAGE, COMMITMENT.</p>	<p>-Excellent personal appearance.</p> <p>-Excellent demeanor or conduct.</p> <p>-Complies with physical readiness program.</p> <p>-Always lives up to Navy Core Values: HONOR, COURAGE, COMMITMENT.</p>	<p>-Exemplary personal appearance.</p> <p>-Exemplary representative of Navy.</p> <p>-A leader in physical readiness.</p> <p>-Exemplifies Navy Core Values: HONOR, COURAGE, COMMITMENT.</p>
Teamwork: Contributions	-Creates conflict, unwilling to work	-Reinforces others' efforts, meets	-Team builder, inspires

Performance Traits	Below Standards (1.0)	Meets Standards (3.0)	Greatly Exceeds Standards (5.0)
toward team building and team results.	with others, puts self above team. -Fails to understand team goals or teamwork techniques. -Does not take direction well.	personal commitments to team. -Understands team goals, employs good teamwork techniques. -Accepts and offers team direction.	cooperation and progress. -Talented mentor, focuses goals and techniques for team. -The best at accepting and offering team direction.
Mission Accomplishment and Initiative: Taking initiative, planning/prioritizing achieving mission.	-Lacks initiative. -Unable to plan or prioritize. -Does not maintain readiness. -Fails to get the job done.	-Takes initiative to meet goals. -Plans/prioritizes effectively. -Maintains high state of readiness. -Always get the job done.	-Develops innovative ways to accomplish mission. -Plans/prioritizes with exceptional skill and foresight. -Maintains superior readiness, even with limited resources. -Gets jobs done earlier and far better than expected.
Leadership: Organizing, motivating and developing others to accomplish goals.	-Neglects growth/development or welfare of subordinates. -Fails to organize, creates problems for subordinates. -Does not set or achieve goals relevant to command mission and vision. -Lacks ability to cope with or tolerate stress. -Inadequate communicator.	-Effectively stimulates growth/development in subordinates. -Organizes successfully, implementing process improvements and efficiencies. -Sets/achieves useful realistic goals that support command mission. -Performs well in stressful situations. -Clear, timely communicator.	-Inspiring motivator and trainer, subordinates reach highest level of growth and development. -Superb organizer, great foresight, develops process improvements and efficiencies. -Leadership achievements dramatically further command mission and vision.

Performance Traits	Below Standards (1.0)	Meets Standards (3.0)	Greatly Exceeds Standards (5.0)
	-Tolerates hazards or unsafe practices.	-Ensures safety of personnel and equipment.	-Perseveres through the toughest challenges and inspires others. -Exceptional communicator. -Makes subordinates safety-conscious, maintains top safety record. -Constantly improves the personal and professional lives of others.
Tactical Performance: (Warfare qualified officers only) Basic and tactical employment of weapons systems.	-Has difficulty attaining qualification expected for the rank and experience. -Has difficulty in ship(s), aircraft, or weapons system employment. -Warfare skills in specialty are below standards compared to others of same rank and experience.	-Attains qualifications as required and expected. -Capably employs ship(s), aircraft, or weapons systems. Equal to others in warfare knowledge and employment. -Warfare skills in specialty equal to others of same rank and experience.	-Fully qualified at appropriate level for rank and experience. -Innovatively employs ship(s), aircraft, or weapons systems. Well above others in warfare knowledge and employment. -Warfare skills in specialty exceed others of same rank and experience.

To conclude, the FITREP is a metric used by higher military leaders on boards to evaluate who is going to be promoted within the Navy and who is not. They evaluate professional knowledge, equal opportunity, military bearing, personal conduct, the adherence to Navy Core Values, as well as teamwork, initiative and finally leadership. It is imperative we measure through our FITREP process what we are telling our Navy through doctrine we care about as an organization.

IV. COMPARATIVE AND GAP ANALYSIS

A. ANALYSIS

The methodology described in Chapter II laid the groundwork for the analysis and how the Navy is cultivating leadership that draws on the strength of temperance. Table 3 shows which Navy doctrine contains the strengths of temperance.

Table 3. Comparison between Navy Doctrine and Character Strengths

Doctrine	Forgiveness/Mercy	Humility/Modesty	Prudence	Self-Regulation
Signature Behaviors of the 21 st Century Sailor				X
Chief of Naval Operations Navigation Plan 2022 (Get Real Get Better)		X		
Navy Core Values				
FITREP Performance Traits			X	

1. Signature Behaviors of the 21st Century Sailor

Signature Behaviors of the 21st Century Sailor is a set of guiding principles and behaviors established by the Navy to promote professionalism, personal responsibility, and accountability among its sailors. These behaviors encompass a range of qualities, including integrity, accountability, initiative, toughness, and agility, among others. They serve as a framework to help sailors navigate their roles effectively, both on and off duty, emphasizing the importance of ethical conduct, continuous learning, adaptability, and teamwork in fulfilling their duties and responsibilities within the Navy community. As part

of signature behavior number nine, the Navy states that “we will maintain self-control and sound judgement and thoughts, speech, and actions” (Signature Behaviors, p. 17). However, aside from that, none of the other character strengths are mentioned.

2. Chief of Naval Operations Navigation Plan 2022

The NAVPLAN 2022’s “Get Real Get Better” initiative “requires Navy leaders to ruthlessly self-assess; be honest, humble, and transparent about their capabilities and limitations” (CNO NAVPLAN, 2022, p. 13). This statement falls under VIA’s humility/modesty character strength per our methodology, and according to Owens et al. (2013), expressed humility allows leaders to accurately acknowledge their limitations, mistakes, and areas where they may need assistance.

3. Navy Core Values

The Navy Core Values do not include any of the specific character strengths of temperance.

4. FITREP Performance Traits

The performance traits only include organization under the character strength prudence. The FITREP Performance trait titled LEADERSHIP’s overall description is “organizing, motivating, and developing others to accomplish goals” (Table 1).

In summary, the strengths of temperance and the other search words were found sparingly throughout Navy doctrine. Self-regulation was found in Signature Behaviors of the 21st Century Sailor, humility/modesty was found in the “Get Real Get Better” portion of the Chief of Naval Operations Navigation Plan 2022, and finally prudence was found among the FITREP Performance Traits.

V. CONCLUSION AND AREAS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The analysis underscores a significant gap within the Navy’s approach, revealing a lack of attention given to the cultivation of the virtue of temperance. There exists a substantial opportunity for enhancement by integrating these strengths into the metrics used to evaluate leadership. By integrating the principles of temperance into leadership assessments, the Navy stands to bolster the development of these leadership qualities within its officer corps, subsequently fortifying the overall strength and effectiveness of the force.

In conclusion, while the current analyses acknowledge the significance of cultivating the strengths of temperance, there remains a notable gap between recognizing its importance and actively implementing strategies to harness and foster these virtues effectively. Emphasizing the strengths of temperance within various facets of life, including education, leadership development, and institutional practices, is crucial. Incorporating tailored programs, mentorship initiatives, and ongoing training that specifically target the development of temperance-related qualities could yield substantial benefits. To bridge this disparity between recognition and action, a concerted effort is required—one that not only acknowledges the virtues of temperance but also actively seeks to embed them into the fabric of organizational culture and individual development. This proactive approach is pivotal in nurturing a more resilient, ethically grounded, and well-balanced community capable of navigating complexities with wisdom and restraint.

A. ANSWERS TO RESEARCH QUESTIONS

This research answers the following research questions:

- (1) How is the U.S. Navy cultivating leadership that draws from the strengths of temperance?

While the U.S. Navy promotes various aspects of leadership, there are not explicit, structured programs solely focused on cultivating leadership that directly draws from the strengths of temperance. The Navy emphasizes numerous leadership qualities, and virtues such as self-discipline, moderation, and balanced decision-making—integral components

of temperance. However, the emphasis leans more towards operational effectiveness, technical proficiency, and mission accomplishment rather than explicitly highlighting these temperance-related virtues in leadership development. Similarly, the Navy indirectly promotes aspects of temperance through its emphasis on ethics, character development, and mentorship.

- (2) How is the U.S. Navy assessing temperance among sailors, more specifically, our officers?

FITREPs and evaluation mechanisms emphasize professional competence, job performance, leadership abilities, and adherence to core values but do not explicitly break down assessments to measure temperance-related traits. They do however bring up prudence in as much as needing to be organized.

- (3) What are the empirical relationships between temperance and its related character strengths and positive organizational behaviors?

Forgiveness and mercy enable individuals to let go of past conflicts, humility and modesty help people to present themselves accurately and consider the needs of others, prudence guides thoughtful decision-making for long-term goals, and self-regulation empowers individuals to control their responses and manage emotional extremes. All of these character strengths are valuable traits for all leaders, and they somewhat align to what Navy leadership values in its leaders. However, the Navy should be cultivating leadership that draws from these character strengths more.

B. LIMITATIONS AND AREAS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The research was primarily focused on textual analysis of Navy documents and the literature review. It lacked empirical data or qualitative interviews with Navy personnel. Future studies could benefit from conducting surveys, interviews, or observational studies to gain insights directly from Navy leaders and personnel on the value they place on the virtue of temperance and associated character strengths. Additionally, while the gap analysis highlighted the lack of temperance cultivation, it did not address the challenges or barriers to implementing changes within the Navy's extensive organizational structure.

Areas for further research on the strengths of temperance, its benefits, and how it can be cultivated in the U.S. Navy could include comprehensive empirical studies to measure the correlation between temperance-related virtues and leadership effectiveness, mission accomplishment, and overall unit performance within the Navy. Additionally, investigating how temperance influences readiness, resilience, and adaptability in the face of evolving threats and challenges. Research could explore how these virtues contribute to mission success, especially in high-stress or complex operational environments. Lastly, researching effective ways to integrate the cultivation of temperance-related virtues into existing leadership development programs, curricula, and mentorship initiatives within the Navy. These research areas could contribute significantly to understanding the role of temperance-related virtues in naval leadership, their impact on organizational effectiveness, and the development of strategies to foster these strengths within the United States Navy.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

LIST OF REFERENCES

- Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (1991). The big five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 44(1), 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1991.tb00688.x>
- Breevaart, K., & De Vries, R. E. (2017). Supervisor’s HEXACO personality traits and subordinate perceptions of abusive supervision. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 28(5), 691–700. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2017.02.001>
- Chief of Naval Operations. (2022). *Navigation Plan*. https://media.defense.gov/2022/Jul/26/2003042389/-1/-1/1/NAVIGATION%20PLAN%202022_SIGNED.PDF
- Chief of Naval Operation. (2020). *Signature Behaviors of the 21st Century Sailor Version 2.0*. <https://www.med.navy.mil/Portals/62/Documents/BUMED/SG/signature-behaviors.pdf?ver=ZobKa9grGZscP7404QZBfg%3D%3D>
- Chief of Naval Personnel. (2022, Aug. 18). *Navy Performance Evaluation System*. Department of the Navy. https://www.mynavyhr.navy.mil/Portals/55/Reference/Instructions/BUPERS/BUPERSINST%201610.10F%20CH-1.pdf?ver=VF4vJ7_1vjkjO2t87Z1AiA%3d%3d
- Collins, M. D., & Jackson, C. J. (2015). A process model of self-regulation and leadership: How attentional resource capacity and negative emotions influence constructive and destructive leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 26(3), 386–401. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2015.02.005>
- Dåderman, A. M., & Ragnestål-Impola, C. (2019). Workplace bullies, not their victims, score high on the Dark Triad and Extraversion, and low on Agreeableness and Honesty-Humility. *Heliyon*, 5(10), e02609. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2019.e02609>
- Secretary of the Navy. (n.d.). *Department of the Navy core values charter*. Retrieved December 6, 2023, from <https://www.secnav.navy.mil/ethics/pages/corevaluescharter.aspx>
- Duckworth, A. L., & Seligman, M. E. P. (2005). Self-discipline outdoes iq in predicting academic performance of adolescents. *Psychological Science*, 16(12), 939–944. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2005.01641.x>
- Dudley, N. M., Orvis, K. A., Lebiecki, J. E., & Cortina, J. M. (2006). A meta-analytic investigation of conscientiousness in the prediction of job performance: Examining the intercorrelations and the incremental validity of narrow traits. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(1), 40–57. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.91.1.40>

- Ferch, S. R., & Mitchell, M. M. (2001). Intentional forgiveness in relational leadership: A technique for enhancing effective leadership. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 7(4), 70–83. <https://doi.org/10.1177/107179190100700406>
- Goleman, D. (2004). What makes a leader? *Harvard Business Review*, *Best of HBR 1998*, 1–11.
- Heck, D. W., Thielmann, I., Moshagen, M., & Hilbig, B. E. (2018). Who lies? A large-scale reanalysis linking basic personality traits to unethical decision making. *Judgment and Decision Making*, 13(4), 356–371. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1930297500009232>
- Mendonca, M. (2001). Preparing for ethical leadership in organizations. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences/Revue Canadienne Des Sciences de l'Administration*, 18(4), 266–276. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1936-4490.2001.tb00262.x>
- Ogunfowora, B., & Bourdage, J. S. (2014). Does Honesty–Humility influence evaluations of leadership emergence? The mediating role of moral disengagement. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 56, 95–99. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2013.08.026>
- Owens, B. P., Johnson, M. D., & Mitchell, T. R. (2013). Expressed humility in organizations: Implications for performance, teams, and leadership. *Organization Science*, 24(5), 1517–1538. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1120.0795>
- Peterson, C., & Seligman, M. E. P. (2004). *Character strengths and virtues: A handbook and classification*. American Psychological Association ; Oxford University Press.
- Sanz, P., & Fontrodona, J. (2019). Moderation as a moral competence: Integrating perspectives for a better understanding of temperance in the workplace. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 155(4), 981–994. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-018-3899-x>
- Siefring, J. (Ed.). (2005). *The Oxford dictionary of idioms* (2nd ed). Oxford University Press.
- Tangney, J. P., Baumeister, R. F., & Boone, A. L. (2004). High self-control predicts good adjustment, less pathology, better grades, and interpersonal success. *Journal of Personality*, 72(2), 271–324. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0022-3506.2004.00263.x>
- Thompson, B., & Simkins, T. J. (2017). Self-oriented forgiveness and other-oriented forgiveness: Shaping high-quality exchange relationships. *Journal of Management & Organization*, 23(5), 741–765. <https://doi.org/10.1017/jmo.2016.18>

- Vera, D., & Rodriguez-Lopez, A. (2004). Strategic virtues: *Organizational Dynamics*, 33(4), 393–408. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2004.09.006>
- Yeow, J., & Martin, R. (2013). The role of self-regulation in developing leaders: A longitudinal field experiment. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 24(5), 625–637. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2013.04.004>
- Zdaniuk, A., & Bobocel, D. R. (2015). The role of idealized influence leadership in promoting workplace forgiveness. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 26(5), 863–877. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2015.06.008>
- Zettler, I., Thielmann, I., Hilbig, B. E., & Moshagen, M. (2020). The nomological net of the hexaco model of personality: A large-scale meta-analytic investigation. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 15(3), 723–760. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691619895036>

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST

1. Defense Technical Information Center
Fort Belvoir, Virginia
2. Dudley Knox Library
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, California



DUDLEY KNOX LIBRARY

NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL

WWW.NPS.EDU

WHERE SCIENCE MEETS THE ART OF WARFARE