

Research Report 1454

DTIC FILE COPY

AD-A190 628

Leader Development Training Assessment of
U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command
(TRADOC) Brigade Commanders

Steven R. Stewart and Jack M. Hicks



Executive Development Research Group
Manpower and Personnel Research Laboratory



U. S. Army

Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences

October 1987

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

88 15 628

U. S. ARMY RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR THE BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

A Field Operating Agency under the Jurisdiction of the
Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel

EDGAR M. JOHNSON
Technical Director

WM. DARRYL HENDERSON
COL, IN
Commanding

Technical review by

Donna C. Angle
Alma G. Steinberg

Accession For	
NTIS CRA&I	☒
DTIC TAB	☐
Unannounced	☐
Justification	
By	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or Special
A-1	



NOTICES

DISTRIBUTION: Primary distribution of this report has been made by ARH. Please address correspondence concerning distribution of reports to: U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences, ATTN: PER-POT, 5001 Eisenhower Ave., Alexandria, Virginia 22333-5600.

FINAL DISPOSITION: This report may be destroyed when it is no longer needed. Please do not return it to the U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.

NOTE: The findings in this report are not to be construed as an official Department of the Army position, unless so designated by other authorized documents.

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER ARI Research Report 1454	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO. ADA190628	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) LEADER DEVELOPMENT TRAINING ASSESSMENT OF U.S. ARMY TRAINING AND DOCTRINE COMMAND (TRADOC) BRIGADE COMMANDERS		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Final Report
7. AUTHOR(s) Steven R. Stewart and Jack M. Hicks		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER --
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences, 5001 Eisenhower Avenue, Alexandria, VA 22333-5600		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s) --
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences, 5001 Eisenhower Avenue, Alexandria, VA 22333-5600		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS 2Q263731A792 6.37.31.A 4.5.5.H.1
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office) --		12. REPORT DATE October 1987
		13. NUMBER OF PAGES 31
		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified
		15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE --
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.		
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report) --		
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES --		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Leader development Leadership policy Brigade commanders Training brigades Mentoring		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) This report documents the conduct and results of the evaluation of a Leader Development Course taught to Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC) Brigade Commanders. After attending the course, 25 brigade commanders received questionnaires to determine (1) what the contribution of the course to enhancing job proficiency relative to costs was and (2) at what stage(s) of an officer's career should such a self/leader development experience occur. All commanders were subsequently interviewed to determine the rationale used in responding to (continued)		

DD FORM 1 JAN 73 1473

EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Data Entered)

ARI Research Report 1454

20. Abstract (Continued)

the questionnaire. Findings of the effort included the following: (1) A leadership development course akin to that provided by the Center for Creative Leadership (CCL) is viewed as being of very positive benefit to the Army; (2) targets for an intense Leader Development experience should be battalion commander designees; (3) the CCL course as now constituted would not be acceptable for general use in the Army; (4) mentoring as a methodology for developing human resource potential within the Army is not well understood; (5) the most significant mind-broadening experience for senior officers appears to be the Army War College; and (6) communication across field grade and general officer rank boundaries appears to be limited. **KEYWORDS:** Army Training

Leadership training

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Data Entered)

Research Report 1454

**Leader Development Training Assessment of
U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command
(TRADOC) Brigade Commanders**

Steven R. Stewart and Jack M. Hicks

**Executive Development Research Group
T. O. Jacobs, Chief**

**Manpower and Personnel Research Laboratory
Newell K. Eaton, Director**

**U.S. ARMY RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR THE BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES
5001 Eisenhower Avenue, Alexandria, Virginia 22333-5600**

**Office, Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel
Department of the Army**

October 1987

**Army Project Number
2Q263731A792**

Manpower and Personnel

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

FOREWORD

This report describes the conduct and results of the evaluation of a Leader Development Course administered to 25 Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC) Brigade Commanders.

The evaluation was supposed to determine at what stage(s) of an officer's career an intensive leader development experience should take place and to ascertain more precisely what the nature of the leader development experience itself should be. These data provide a partial basis for policy decision making--to establish a leader development training program Army-wide. A companion report, soon to be published using battalion commanders as participants and examining the issues herein addressed, will round out the data required by the Department of Army Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel (DA, DCSPER) to develop a policy for leader development training.

This work was carried out by the Executive Development Research Group (EDRG) of ARI's Manpower and Personnel Research Laboratory. The EDRG's mission is to develop and test concept materials for doctrine development at the executive level, formulate an executive development system, and formulate and test methodology for restructuring Army organizations to achieve gains in productivity, effectiveness, and esprit. As indicated, this effort was conducted for the DA, DCSPER in accordance with a general Letter of Instruction dated 17 June 1985. The findings contained in this report were approved for a targeted distribution by the DA, DCSPER on 20 May of this year. These findings should assist the Training and Doctrine Commands Combined Arms Center to more appropriately focus the leadership development training that will be administered as part of battalion and/or brigade pre-command instruction.



EDGAR M. JOHNSON
Technical Director

LEADER DEVELOPMENT TRAINING ASSESSMENT OF U.S. ARMY TRAINING AND
DOCTRINE COMMAND (TRADOC) BRIGADE COMMANDERS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Requirement:

To determine when or at what stage(s) of a career an officer should receive an intensive leader development experience and what the nature of the development experience itself should be.

Procedure:

Twenty-five TRADOC brigade commanders participated in a 1-week Center for Creative Leadership (CCL) course. Questionnaires concerning the utility of the course in terms of its value to them along several performance-related dimensions and concerning its timing in an officer's career were distributed to the commanders. Interviews were then conducted with all the commanders to provide qualitative explanatory data for the questionnaire as well as to elicit information related to general human resource development issues within the Army.

Findings:

- A leader development course similar to that provided by CCL is viewed as being of very positive benefit to the Army.
- Targets for an intense leader development experience should be battalion commander designees. This type of instruction should be made part of the Pre-Command Course.
- The CCL course as now constituted would not be acceptable for general use in the Army. A needs assessment should be conducted to determine the nature of required contents, and careful consideration must be given to the delivery strategy for content.
- Mentoring as a strategy for developing human resource potential within the Army is not well understood; many variations exist on what the concept means and how to implement it.
- The most significant mind-broadening experience for Army officers appears to be the Army War College. Self-initiated self-development occurs only rarely.
- Candid communication across field grade and general officer rank boundaries appears to be limited.

Utilization of Findings:

These findings should assist the Training and Doctrine Commands Combined Arms Center to more appropriately focus the leadership development training that will be administered as part of battalion and/or brigade pre-command instruction.

LEADER DEVELOPMENT TRAINING ASSESSMENT OF U.S. ARMY TRAINING AND DOCTRINE
COMMAND (TRADOC) BRIGADE COMMANDERS

CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
Background	1
Purpose	1
METHOD	2
Participants	2
Survey Instruments	2
Procedure	2
Organization of the Remainder of the Report	3
RESULTS	3
CCL Experience Evaluation	3
Additional Findings	10
Mentoring	10
Life Experiences	11
CONCLUSIONS	12
APPENDIX A-1. CCL Leadership Development Program Evaluation	14
A-2. Brigade Commander Interview	18

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Ratings of CCL Course elements	4
2. Ratings of improvement in abilities	6
3. Ratings of improvement in self insights	7
4. Overall worth of the CCL Course	8
5. Grade level where training most impactful/appropriate	9
6. Participant camaraderie	10

Leader Development Training Assessment of U.S. Army Training and Doctrine
Command (TRADOC) Brigade Commanders

INTRODUCTION

Background

In the spring of 1986 discussions were held among senior flag rank officers concerning professional development needs within the Army. Two major issues emerged from these discussions as foci for more in-depth investigation. They were: (1) when or at what stage(s) of an Army officer's career should one receive an intensive self (Leader) - development experience (assessment) and, (2) what should the nature of the development experience itself be. The Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel, Department of Army (DADCSPER), being the Army proponent for leadership policy issues, requested that the Army Research Institute (ARI), in conjunction with the DADCSPER Leader Policy Division, conduct research to assess the utility of leader development training. More specifically, the research would be directed towards providing information relevant for answering the two questions posed above.

Given this general guidance, two related research projects were initiated. Both projects focused upon field grade commanders because (1) it was hypothesized that pre-command leadership development training could be most impactful Army-wide for individuals occupying these key positions and (2) it was unclear where self-development training would be most useful. Accordingly, one project focused on battalion commanders. The other, which is the subject of this report, focused on brigade commanders and was accomplished in coordination with the Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC). To provide a set of experiences for the brigade and battalion commanders of the type that may ultimately be utilized in the leader development arena Army-wide, the course offered by the Center for Creative Leadership (CCL) was selected. This provided an experience base from which the commanders could provide subjective assessments of the value of this type of training to their self-development and their ability to more effectively accomplish the duties and responsibilities associated with their commands. In the case of the investigation dealing with battalion commanders, it was possible to employ a control group. The CCL experience thus provided the basis for assessment of the extent of behavioral change and, therefore, differential job performance effectiveness that such training may produce. The results of the investigation of the impact of the CCL experience on the battalion commanders, an effort which is now ongoing, will be reported separately at a later time.

Purpose

The purpose of this report is to document the findings of the investigation of the perceived worth of the CCL experience to the TRADOC brigade commanders surveyed. The primary focus of the report is upon an assessment of the CCL course as it currently exists, recommendations on how the course might be improved, and an indication from the brigade commander's perspective of the point or points along an officer's career path where an intensive self-development experience might be the most appropriate and beneficial.

Since the commanders were interviewed in addition to responding to a questionnaire, the data provide qualitative information on those topics just enumerated as well as information relating to several additional topics, e.g., mentoring, which were covered either formally or informally in the interview situation and which may be of a more general interest.

METHOD

Participants

Twenty five TRADOC brigade commanders participated in this investigation.¹ All were full colonels (O-6). The length of time in command varied from only a few months to well over one year. Although participation in the course was mandatory, interview data suggest this did not seem to affect the commander's attitudes nor their willingness to provide a candid assessment of their CCL experience. The course was administered to the participants by RDA Associates/LOGICON in Seattle, Washington on 20-26 September 1986.

Survey Instruments

Two data collection instruments were employed in this investigation, a questionnaire and an interview guide. These instruments are attached as Appendix A. Both instruments were designed to evaluate the CCL course in terms of its perceived value to the participants, to the Army in general, and how it might be improved/made more effective. The interview guide was designed to elicit an explanation or the rationale for why the participants had responded the way they had to the questionnaire items. Additionally, as mentioned previously, the interview was designed to explore experiences other than the CCL course which the participants might have had in the past that resulted in growth and/or self-development activities.

Procedure

The data collection consisted of two steps separated by approximately a one month window. Groundwork was laid for data collection by a letter from the DADCSPER Leader Policy Division to each participant that announced the CCL evaluation and requested their participation therein. A copy of this letter is included as Appendix B. These participation request letters were mailed in early November 1986, and were followed-up at the end of the month by a phone call from DADCSPER to confirm willingness to participate. The questionnaires were also mailed to participants by DADCSPER in early January 1987.

The second step of data collection, involving a one- to two-hour interview, began in mid-February 1987 after all useable questionnaires had been returned. Since two interviewers were to be involved in this second phase, both participated in an interview with one of the brigade commanders located

¹All but one individual were still in command of their respective brigades. The one individual out of command was currently assigned to the Pentagon. Although all 25 participated in the interview phase of the investigation, only 20 responded to and returned questionnaires for analysis.

within the Washington, D.C. metro area. This interview served to orient and "synchronize" the interviewers prior to their separation to conduct the remaining twenty-four interviews. One member of the data collection team covered predominantly eastern locations (Forts Eustis, Lee, Jackson, Gordon, McClellan, Devens and Aberdeen Proving Ground, and the Pentagon). The other team member covered predominantly midwestern and southern sites (Forts Harrison, Leonard Wood, Knox, Sill, Bliss, Huachuca, Benning and Rucker). Each team member conducted twelve one-on-one interviews, usually in the commander's office. Thus, a total of twenty-five interviews were conducted during the second data collection phase.

Organization of the Remainder of the Report

In the section which immediately follows are provided the results of the investigation. Questionnaire and interview data are presented and discussed collectively in those instances where it was reasonable and appropriate to do so. For the interview data no attempt was made to maintain frequency counts of exactly how many brigade commanders may have made a given statement or provided some opinion. Rather, the two researchers discussed intensely over a two-day period their interviewing experiences and came to a consensus on the predominant themes, issues, and opinions that had emerged. Thus, when reference is made to the interview data in subsequent paragraphs it represents the consensus of opinion of the brigade commanders in the eyes of the researchers, unless otherwise specified. The results section is broken down into two basic parts. In the first section are provided the combined questionnaire and interview data, subject to the caveats and provisions just outlined. In the second section are presented additional findings which do not have a direct bearing on an evaluation of the CCL type of leadership development experience but which did emerge from the interviews and were thought to be of significant general interest. The final section of the report contains the conclusions which have emerged from this effort and have bearing on professional development initiatives within the Army.

RESULTS

CCL Experience Evaluation

Of the twenty-five questionnaires mailed, twenty were returned and analyzed. As can be seen by an examination of Appendix A, the questionnaire contained three parts. In the first part, the commanders were asked to rate, using a five-point scale ranging from zero ("No Value") to four ("Excellent"), the value of each of the major elements of the CCL course. Mean ratings and their corresponding standard deviations for each element of the course are shown in Table 1.

Table 1

Ratings of CCL Course Elements

Element Name:	Mean:	Standard Deviation:
Decision Making	3.05	.70
Situational Leadership	3.53	.51
Utilizing Group Resources	3.16	.83
Innovative Problem Solving	2.95	1.08
Presentation & Preparation for Goal Setting	2.90	.74
Goal Setting Activities	2.84	.76
Presentation of Feedback	3.26	.81
Peer Feedback	3.16	.83
Staff Feedback	3.64	.50
Assessment Activities	3.21	.92

As can be seen, the ratings for all items are above the scale neutral point of 2.0. The two elements receiving the highest ratings were "Situational Leadership" (SL) and "Staff Feedback" (SF) with mean ratings of 3.53 and 3.64 respectively. The standard deviations for these items are also the smallest (.51 and .50, respectively) indicating that the consensus among the respondents was the highest for these course elements. These data agree completely with the interview findings, i.e., interviewees overwhelmingly identified these attributes of the program to be the outstanding ones. Although many of the concepts presented in the SL instruction did not seem to be new to the commanders, how they were packaged and the conceptual model that was provided to discuss them constituted essentially a new language for them. In essence, they had been given a new and powerful tool that was proving to be useful to them for what amounted to two purposes, viz., as a professional development mechanism, i.e., they were using the new language to conduct leadership development classes for their subordinates, and as a vehicle for performance counseling of subordinates, i.e., the SL model which specifies a continuum from absolute control of the situation to total delegation of work to subordinates was being used to provide the rationale/context for performance ratings, assuming that the goal of both the subordinate and superordinate is to move toward the delegation end of the continuum. Those who had not already conducted training themselves using the SL material were either planning to or were going to arrange for the individual who had taught this block of instruction for RDA to visit their command and conduct the class.

As for the SF session, respondents reacted so favorably to this because they were at the outset of training given a battery of tests measuring a wide variety of person attributes, e.g., Leadership Style, Meyers Briggs Type Indicator, estimates of verbal ability, abstract reasoning, etc., and were provided feedback from a professional vis-a-vis their standing on these instruments. Most of the commanders, although they had been exposed previously to some portions of this type of material, had never before received feedback this comprehensive about their own person attributes nor had they received it

from a known behavioral expert. This combination of attributes - intensity, variety, and attendant environment of professionalism - is a distillation of the commander's rationale for their positive reaction to this portion of the course. However, the quality of the feedback was not perceived as equally high by all commanders. Apparently more than one behavioral expert had provided feedback and their effectiveness at doing so was not uniform.

Referring back to Table 1, the general areas of goal setting and innovative problem solving are ones which received the lowest evaluations. The reason for this is that these activities involved the use of a business game or simulation which generated an environment both alien and of little interest to most of the commanders. Some indicated that had these course elements taken the form of a war game or simulation, they would have been more palatable and applicable. Another reason for a relatively negative reaction is because facets of these program elements inadvertently focused the commanders on their own retirement plans because they were required to look five to ten years into the future. They didn't feel that their retirement plans were a subject worthy of attention in the course, given that the Army was expending funds to make them better commanders, not ease their transition from active duty to retirement status.

Before leaving those attributes which were viewed least favorably, it should be mentioned that one facet of the course was inadvertently omitted from the questionnaire. This area had to do with physical fitness training. The commanders resoundingly identified this block of instruction to have been the poorest aspect of their CCL training for basically two reasons. First, it was "off-the-mark"--they didn't need the instruction--and second, the delivery mechanism used for the training was not in keeping with the status and maturity level of the targeted audience. Thus, there is some evidence that the instruction as a whole was not given "a common sense test", i.e., the trainers had not properly diagnosed their audience and tailored the instruction accordingly.

One final aspect of the course viewed universally negatively by the respondents had to do with its general upward mobility orientation. Here, again, a fallacious assumption, resented by most of the commanders, was made that all the attendees aspired to become general officers and would appreciate a course designed to help them succeed in achieving this goal. In point of fact, the colonels desired to be good brigade commanders and headed into the course with the notion that such instruction would help them to be more proficient in their current assignment. Again, this represents a misdiagnosis of the targeted training audience, in this case that their motivations should, on balance, be the same as their civilian counterparts.

Part II of the questionnaire dealt with the extent to which the CCL course was perceived by respondents to have improved their abilities in targeted areas, e.g., set and achieve work goals, listen, communicate, give positive and negative feedback, etc. (see Part II, section 2.0 of the Questionnaire). Table 2 summarizes the findings in these areas.

Table 2

Ratings of Improvement in Abilities

Ability to....	Mean:	Standard Deviation:
Set and achieve work goals	2.10	.66
Set and achieve personal goals	2.26	.81
Listen	2.53	.61
Communicate	2.32	.95
Generate creative solutions	1.95	.97
Receive and use negative feedback	2.53	.90
Delegate effectively and appropriately	1.79	1.08
Manage subordinates	1.90	.99
Balance work and personal life	1.84	1.07
Give positive feedback	2.26	.65
Give negative feedback	2.10	.81
Use groups in decision making	2.05	1.08
Facilitate group discussion	2.16	.90
Draw out people in groups	2.16	.96
Resolve conflict in groups	1.95	.62
Promote teamwork in groups	2.16	.76
Be assertive	1.58	.96
Be self confident	1.68	1.00

The twenty commanders who responded to this set of questions used a five-point scale which ranged from zero ("No Improvement in Ability to...") to four ("Very Much Improved Ability to..."). Thus, in a relative sense, the respondents generally rated improvements in their ability to perform these activities (which are related to their command duties) somewhat lower than they rated the overall elements of the program as can be seen from comparing the results shown in Tables 1 and 2. On balance, the respondents felt the course only "Somewhat Improved (their) Ability to ..." accomplish the tasks specified. The two items which stand out, if any can be truly cited as doing so, are the ability to "listen" and to "receive and use negative feedback". These tasks received mean ratings of 2.53 and 2.58, respectively and the standard deviations indicate that there was a fairly high consensus among the commanders for these responses.

The findings shown in Table 3 reflect the mean responses to a set of questions on the CCL course's impact on the commander's self-insight (see section 3.0 of Part II of the Questionnaire). Here, again, a five-point scale was used which ranged from zero ("No Improvement in Insights Into") to four ("Very Much Improved Insights Into"). The responses shown in this table tend to be slightly higher than those shown in Table 2 but not quite as high as the commanders' overall evaluations of the course elements (Table 1). The highest rating in terms of enhanced self-insight had to do with "How Others Perceive Me". The interview data suggest that this finding is probably a result of two elements of the course, that having to do with SL where the commanders had access to leadership behavior descriptions which had been provided by either their current or past subordinates, and the Staff Feed-

back. The latter-mentioned element was discussed previously as being perceived by the respondents as one of the most valuable thrusts of the program. Most interviewees believed the feedback which they recieved indirectly via the leader behavior description questionnaire data provided by their subordinates was very beneficial. From the commander's perspective, these data served to confirm what they thought they already knew about themselves. In this sense, those facets of the course just mentioned as well as others served to solidify the commander's opinions vis-a-vis their own behavior which appeared to act as an anxiety reduction mechanism, i.e., they became more comfortable that they understood themselves and, concomitantly, were in more control of their job environment. This line of reasoning helps to explain why the results presented in Table 1 are on average higher than those shown in Tables 2 and 3. That is, although the course did not lead to significant behavioral changes or to any great self-insights, it did have psychological impact which manifested itself in the overall course evaluations. It is difficult to place a value on this psychological impact except in a fairly gross sense. One question, reproduced below, does shed some light on this issue. The commanders' responses are also provided along with the question in Table 4.

Table 3

Ratings of Improvement in Self Insights

Insight into..	Mean	Standard Deviation
Strengths as a person	2.63	.76
Weaknesses as a person	2.68	.88
Strengths as a manager	2.42	.69
Weakness as a manager	2.32	.75
How others perceive me	3.10	.74
My individual needs	2.05	.97
My individual motivations	2.32	1.00
Others' needs	2.37	.76
Others' motivations	2.26	.81
My career in the Army	1.84	1.17
My relationship to the Army	1.84	1.07
Relationship with others in general	2.37	.76

Table 4

Overall Worth of the CCL Course

"Do you feel that the CCL LDP* was sufficiently worthwhile to you to justify the Army's investment of \$3,000 and at least a week away from the job?"

<u>Response</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Yes (2)	14	70
Uncertain (1)	2	10
No (0)	3	15
(Missing Data)	1	5

Mean = 1.56

Standard Deviation = .77

*LDP = Leadership Development Program

As the results in Table 4 clearly show, most of the commanders did feel there was substantial value in taking the course; at least 70% of them felt it was worth \$3,000 plus a week of their time. The interview data confirm these findings and indicate that the percentage of "yes" responses obtained via the questionnaire is low. That is, all of the commanders revealed during the interviews that a CCL course type of experience was definitely beneficial to them. Those that responded "No" and "Uncertain" were operating from the position of evaluating the CCL course per se and not thinking of it in any more general sense. It was the opinion of the majority of the commanders that the course could be shortened and improved, with the greatest improvement coming through efforts to more skillfully tailor the course's contents to the needs, predilections, maturity level, and career backgrounds of the target audience. Thus, with the caveats just mentioned in mind and from a more general frame of reference, the commanders strongly endorsed the potential benefits which could be derived from CCL type instruction.

One other significant issue addressed during this investigation had to do with the point or points along an officer's career path where the self-development experience provided by CCL type training would be most beneficial. Two companion questions were asked which directly addressed this issue. They are reproduced from the questionnaire in Table 5 along with the responses that were received on each. As should be readily apparent, the most meaningful responses were obtained via the first question presented in the Table. The brigade commanders confirmed the hypothesis stated in the Background section of this report in that the majority (65%) felt the career points at which a CCL type of experience could have its greatest impact would be at the lieutenant colonel and colonel levels or at those times when command of a battalion or a brigade is possible.

Table 5

Grade Level Where Training Most Impactful/Appropriate

"At what point in an officer's career is it most crucial that he or she take the LDP?"

<u>Response</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
01	0	0
02	1	5
03	1	5
04	2	10
05	8	40
06	5	25
GO	1	5
N/A	2	10

"Are there other career points at which the LDP would be beneficial?"

<u>Response</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
01	1	5
02	0	0
03	1	5
04	0	0
05	3	15
06	4	20
GO	3	15
N/A/missing	8	40

Very few felt that training of this sort would be beneficial either before or after these career points. Even the majority of those who responded to the second question shown in Table 5, i.e., their second choice, bracketed the lieutenant colonel and colonel levels as those career points where a CCL experience could be most beneficial. The interviews helped shed some light on the reasoning process which was used in responding to these questions. It was felt that company grade officers and below could not benefit substantially from self-development training because of the relatively low level of maturity possessed by officers of their age groups. At this age and/or career point, the typical officer does not have a very firm grasp of self or of his/her impact on others and would lack the maturity to accept and fully absorb the meaning of an intensive self-development experience. Lacking this, change would be difficult to produce, i.e., change can come about only when there is a realization of the need for it. Even though some of the respondents did identify the General Officer (GO) level as being an appropriate target for CCL type instruction, most felt that it would be a waste of time. Individuals who have achieved such rank have also had those behavior patterns substantially rewarded that have led to their current stature. It was felt that, accordingly, those behavior patterns would be very resistant to change.

In concluding the discussion of the data presented in Table 5, it should be stated that the commanders interviewed never mentioned the lieutenant colonel and colonel levels as the appropriate targets for CCL type training outside the context of command. Thus, it was not the lieutenant colonel and colonel levels per se that should be targets for self-development efforts but rather lieutenant colonels and colonels who have been designated to be or are currently in command of a battalion or a brigade. There was a fairly strong consensus, then, that should the Army pursue developing and institutionalizing a leadership development program it should be made a part of the applicable pre-command courses.

Table 6 presents data regarding the extent to which the CCL experience generated camaraderie among the participants.

Table 6

"How much camaraderie was generated in the group which took the LDP?"

<u>Response</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
"Very Much" (4)	10	50
"Much" (3)	3	15
"Some" (2)	6	30
"Little" (1)	0	0
"None" (0)	0	0
missing	1	5

Mean = 3.21

Standard Deviation = .92

As is apparent, a majority (65%) of those surveyed felt "Much" to "Very Much" camaraderie was generated among group members as a result of the training experience. In fact, the experience seemed to have solidified the group into a network which was used for problem solving purposes, i.e., many of the commanders felt the experience made it easier to confer with their counterparts in other locations on issues and problems they were having difficulty in addressing or solving. Thus, this spin-off result of the CCL experience has the potential of producing substantial benefits.

Additional Findings

Mentoring

Mentoring is a time-honored procedure for professional and/or social development. A mentor is simply a loyal trusted advisor and teacher, usually older and wiser than the individual under the mentor's tutelage. There have been attempts in recent years, primarily at the instigation of the Leadership Community and as a result of studies of officer professional development,

e.g., RETO, to develop a "system" of mentoring within the U.S. Army. To determine how widespread mentoring is within the Army at the current time, several questions were incorporated in the interviews guide for the CCL course evaluation. All brigade commanders were queried about the procedure, the extent they use it and for what purposes, the extent to which they are currently mentored, and whether or not they had been mentored in the past. A precis of the findings on these topics is provided below.

There was evidently a pronounced degree of confusion about the concept of mentoring. To some it consisted of the counseling sessions that go along with or are a part of the formal Officer Evaluation process. To others it meant providing the political connections that are sometimes thought to either assure rapid promotion at a given point in time or secure the positions/assignments that will lead to rapid advancement in the future. The latter view of "mentoring" was the most prevalent among those brigade commanders sampled. There were other conceptions, however. For some, individuals (subordinates) considered to be outstanding were not singled out for attention. But, rather, those in the most need were targeted. This was perhaps done without the realization that even the "good" can be "better", provided the mentor can actually make a significant contribution toward this end. For still others, mentoring consisted of "sessions" that were convened periodically for the purpose of teaching or counseling, usually involving all officers within the command down through captain.

The targets for mentoring also varied among the commanders interviewed. Some felt that the appropriate targets were battalion commanders. Others thought both battalion and company commanders, but the most often cited target within a brigade was the company commanders. The brigade commanders felt they were in the most advantageous position to influence the destinies of those individuals over whom they had senior rating authority.

Most of the commanders stated they had been mentored in the past. However, this finding has to be interpreted in light of the various concepts of mentoring that were outlined above. A substantial number of them had had more than one mentor.

All but one of the commanders felt they were not being mentored at the current time. Implicitly, most opined that mentoring involved "living" within an environment that was failure-tolerant in that to learn one must be allowed to make mistakes. Thus, the commanders felt that the zero-defects mentality which has been so prevalent in the Army in the past is still very much alive and well. Accordingly, it may take the retirement of another generation or two of senior officers before conditions are ideally conducive for implementing the practice of mentoring. This finding is very indicative of a lack of open and candid communication across field grade and general officer rank boundaries.

Life Experiences

During the interview, a general question was asked about any major shifts in outlook towards the world, including how events and/or people were viewed, which might have taken place over the course of their career and to

identify the event(s) or experience(s) which precipitated the change. If any such "shifts" were viewed positively and if one could identify the causes for them, it might be possible to engineer conditions for such shifts in any Leader Development program which the Army might eventually formally adopt. Though the question did not yield responses from all commanders, several did comment. A sub-grouping of the respondents identified their experience at the Army War College as a major turning point. Ostensibly, the reason for this was very similar to the rationale provided for their perceptions of value for the CCL course, in part at least. This involved having enough time to think. General experience with the Army environment suggests that action-oriented behavior patterns are what are rewarded in most positions/situations, even at the more senior levels. If this is true, there is very little time to reflect and to develop alternative "world views". Although most of the brigade commanders had developed "peripheral vision", their positions still required them to maintain a substantial action orientation.

One individual mentioned becoming familiar with a body of literature having to do with the power of positive thinking which had a substantial impact upon his outlook. This individual realized after becoming familiar with the literature that the Army's modus operandi in most cases is very judgementally negative in nature. Being able to turn this around in one's mind had helped this individual to reinterpret his environment and take positive actions to accomplish goals rather than invoke negative sanctions. This would seem to be a very reasonable implicit suggestion for change of one of the system's dynamics.

CONCLUSIONS

From the data presented in the previous section it is possible to draw several conclusions related to the major objectives of this effort. Where the reason for the conclusion is not obvious from the data already presented, additional elaboration has been provided.

- . A Leadership/Self Development course in concept akin to that of the CCL is viewed as being of very positive benefit to the Army.
- . If a Leadership/Self Development course is developed and institutionalized within the Army, the targets for its consumption should be battalion or brigade command designees as part of their pre-command transition training. The data collected in this effort strongly suggest that the most appropriate targets should be battalion commanders. From the brigade commander's perspective the greatest amount of growth must occur at this level, where one must transition between a hands-on mode of operation to one in which tasks have to be accomplished through others, i.e., subordinate commanders and staff.
- . Taking the CCL course as it is now constituted as a model for future Army initiatives in this area would be inappropriate. The course is now too long given the relevance of its current contents to commander's needs. The content of the course itself needs to be put to a "common sense test" vis-a-vis Army needs from the

perspective of the intended target audience. Supervisors at least one echelon removed, preferably the senior rater, should be queried on needs for training of the intended audience.

- Mentoring as a methodology for the development of human resources potential within the Army is a poorly understood concept, i.e., there appears to be little consensus concerning what the concept means and/or how to implement it.
- Candid communication across field grade and general officer rank boundaries about significant issues still is not universal within the Army. A zero-defects mentality is still very much alive. This condition will continue to hamper human resources development initiatives until it is changed.
- The Army War College appears to be the most significant mind-broadening experience for senior officers. Engagement in such exercises on other than an institutional basis or through self-initiative apparently occurs on only a limited basis.

APPENDIX A-1

CCL LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM EVALUATION

You recently participated in the Leadership Development Program (LDP) conducted by the Center for Creative Leadership, designed to provide extensive assessment and feedback on personal and professional strengths and weaknesses. This questionnaire will aid in the evaluation of the LDP Program, and thus will aid in decision-making about the future utility of the Program to the US Army. The questionnaire is divided into three parts. In Part I we would like your reactions to the major elements of the program as to their value in terms of your development. Part II asks for longer term behavioral changes that you have noted in yourself that you can attribute to the LDP. In Part III we would appreciate your input concerning how the Army might better utilize the LDP Program.

PART I

1.0 The major elements of the LDP are listed below. Please rate each according to the following scale:

4. Excellent 3. Good 2. Neutral 1. Poor 0. No value

- 1.1 ____ Decision Making
- 1.2 ____ Situational Leadership
- 1.3 ____ Utilizing Group Resources
- 1.4 ____ Innovative Problem Solving
- 1.5 ____ Presentation and Preparation for Goal Setting
- 1.6 ____ Goal Setting Activities
- 1.7 ____ Presentation on Feedback
- 1.8 ____ Peer Feedback
- 1.9 ____ Staff Feedback
- 1.10 ____ Assessment Activities

PART II

2.0 To what extent do you feel the LDP has improved your abilities in those areas outlined below.

4. Very Much Improved Ability to	3. Much Improved Ability to	2. Somewhat Improved Ability to	1. Little Improved Ability to	0. No Improve- ment in Ability to
--	-----------------------------------	---------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	---

- 2.1 ____ set and achieve work goals.
- 2.2 ____ set and achieve personal goals.
- 2.3 ____ listen
- 2.4 ____ communicate
- 2.5 ____ generate creative solutions
- 2.6 ____ receive and use negative feedback
- 2.7 ____ delegate effectively and appropriately.
- 2.8 ____ manage subordinates
- 2.9 ____ balance work and personal life.
- 2.10 ____ give positive feedback.
- 2.11 ____ give negative feedback.
- 2.12 ____ use groups in decision making.
- 2.13 ____ facilitate group discussion.
- 2.14 ____ draw people out in groups.
- 2.15 ____ resolve conflict in groups.
- 2.16 ____ promote teamwork in groups.
- 2.17 ____ be assertive
- 2.18 ____ be self confident

3.0 To what extent do you feel the LDP has increased your self insights in those areas outlined below.

4. Very Much Improved Insights into	3. Much Improved Insights into	2. Somewhat Improved Insights into	1. Little Improvement in Insights into	0. No Improvement in Insights into
-------------------------------------	--------------------------------	------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------

3.1 _____ strengths as a person.

3.2 _____ weaknesses as a person.

3.3 _____ strengths as a manager.

3.4 _____ weaknesses as a manager.

3.5 _____ how others perceive me.

3.6 _____ my individual needs.

3.7 _____ my individual motivations.

3.8 _____ others' needs.

3.9 _____ others' motivations.

3.10 _____ my career in the Army.

3.11 _____ my relationship to the Army

3.12 _____ relationships with others in general.

PART III

3.0 Do you feel that that the CCL LDP was sufficiently worthwhile to you to justify the Army investment of \$3000 and at least a week away from the job?

Yes	Uncertain	No
-----	-----------	----

3.2 Do you have any alternatives to suggest?

Yes	Uncertain	No
-----	-----------	----

3.2.1 If yes, what? _____

3.2.2 Why? _____

3.3 Have you had prior experiences in similar courses?

Yes

No

3.3.1 If so, what? _____

3.4 At what point in an officer's career is it most crucial that he or she take the LDP?

01 02 03 04 05 06 GO N/A

3.5 Are there other career points at which LDP would be beneficial?

01 02 03 04 05 06 GO N/A

3.6 How much comradery was generated in the group which took the LDP?

4. Very Much Comradery	3. Much Comradery	2. Some Comradery	1. Little Comradery	0. None
---------------------------	----------------------	----------------------	------------------------	---------

3.7 Would you have additional brief remarks which might be useful in assessing the future value of the LDP to the Army?

APPENDIX A-2

BRIGADE COMMANDER INTERVIEW

1. WHAT ARE YOUR REACTIONS TO THE MAJOR ELEMENTS OF THE LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM (LDP) AS TO THEIR VALUE TOWARD YOUR PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT.

- * Decision making

- * Situational Leadership

- * Utilizing group resources

- * Innovative problem solving

- * Presentation and preparation for goal setting

- * Goal setting activities

- * Presentation on feedback

- Peer feedback

- Staff feedback

2. TO AMPLIFY ONE OF THE ISSUES ADDRESSED IN THE QUESTIONNAIRE TO WHICH YOU RESPONDED, DO YOU THINK THE LDP WAS WORTH THE TIME AND EXPENSE? THAT IS, \$3000 AND A WEEK AWAY FROM THE JOB.

AT WHAT POINT OR POINTS SHOULD LDP BE TAKEN, IF ANY, IN AN OFFICER'S CAREER?

3. TO WHAT EXTENT DO YOU FEEL THE LDP INCREASED YOUR SELF INSIGHTS-- THAT IS, HELPED YOU IDENTIFY YOUR STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES?

WHAT HAVE YOU DONE WITH THIS INFORMATION?

4. HAVE YOU NOTED ANY LONG TERM BEHAVIORAL CHANGES IN YOURSELF THAT YOU CAN ATTRIBUTE TO THE LDP?

If so, what are they and how have they affected your ability in dealing with the challenges of your current position?

With life, in general?

5. HAVE YOU NOTED OVER THE COURSE OF YOUR CAREER/ADULT LIFE, ANY MAJOR CHANGES IN YOUR OUTLOOK TOWARD THE WORLD, INCLUDING HOW YOU VIEW EVENTS AND/OR PEOPLE?

If so, when did these shifts occur?

What was the nature of the change in perspective?

Did any particular event, experience, or personal association serve to trigger the change in your "world view?"

6. HOW MUCH COACHING/MENTORING/TEACHING DO YOU ENGAGE IN AS A BRIGADE COMMANDER?

Whom do you mentor? Why?

Is the environment conducive to this activity? I.e., is it encouraged or discouraged?

Do you receive mentoring yourself? From whom?

- In what form?

What mentoring have you received in the past?

What was it's importance in your development?