

Table 4.16 Description of Army Officers who Completed the Chemical, Biological, Radioactive and Nuclear Captain's Career Course on Selected Personal Characteristics

Characteristic	Category	<i>n</i>	%
Age (in Years)	22-24	0	0.0
	25-28 ^a	14	35.0
	29-31	11	27.5
	32-34	10	25.0
	35-37	2	5.0
	≥ 38	3	7.5
	Total	40	100.0
Gender	Male	29	72.5
	Female	11	27.5
	Total	40	100.0
Ethnicity	White	20	51.3
	African American	7	17.9
	Other	6 ^b	15.4
	Hispanic	3	7.7
	Asian, Pacific Islander	3	7.7
	Native American	0	0.0
	Total	39 ^c	100.0
Marital status	Married	28	70.0
	Single, Never Married	8	20.0
	Divorced	4	10.0
	Separated	0	0.0
	Widowed	0	0.0
	Other	0	0.0
	Total	40	100.0
Highest degree earned	Bachelor's Degree	30	75.0
	Master's Degree	10	25.0
	Associate Degree	0	0.0
	Doctoral Degree	0	0.0
	Other	0	0.0
	Total	40	100.0

Note. *n* = 40 usable instruments submitted and collected. The variance in sample size is due to subjects electing to not answer or overlooking personal demographic questions.

^aThe age of 25 was mistakenly excluded from the primary instrument and was intended to be included in option 3, ^bOther ethnicity selections include: Indian (*n*=1), Black/Korean (*n*=1), Amish (*n*=1) and no response (*n*=3), ^c1 study participants did not respond to ethnicity.

Professional Demographics of CBRN Captain's Career Course Completers

Within the statistical analysis of CBRNCCC professional demographics, specifically, the characteristic "Source of Commissioning", West Point was identified as number three (*n*=2, 5.4%) and was tied with Academy, non WP and direct commission selections. ROTC was the

top identified commissioning source at 50.0% ($n=20$). All subjects identified themselves as active duty (100.0%) with almost the same percentage identifying their branch of service to be Army ($n=37$, 92.5%). There is some discrepancy in regards to the exact number of foreign armed service participants within the CBRNCCC sampled population. Responses to the “Branch of Military Service” characteristic identifies 3 (7.5%) individuals as foreign armed service subjects, however, the characteristic “Branch” within the subjects selected service identifies 4 subjects as being foreign armed service members. The majority of the CBRNCCC subjects responding to the characteristic “Current Rank” self-identified themselves as CPT (90.0%), with 2 (5.0%) completers, selecting the 1LT (P) category (see Table 4.17).

Table 4.17 Description of Army Officers who Completed the Chemical, Biological, Radioactive and Nuclear Captain’s Career Course on Selected General Professional Demographics

Characteristic	Category	<i>n</i>	%
Source of commissioning	ROTC	20	50.0
	OCS	11	29.7
	West Point	2	5.4
	Academy, non WP	2	5.4
	Direct Commission	2	5.4
	Total	37 ^a	100.0
Current branch of military service	Army	37	92.5
	Foreign Armed Service	3	7.5
	Navy	0	0.0
	Marines	0	0.0
	Air Force	0	0.0
	Total	40	100.0
Service Status	Active Duty	40	100.0
	Army Reserves	0	0.0
	Army National Guard	0	0.0
	Total	40	100.0
Branch within the subjects selected service	Chemical Corps	35	87.5
	Foreign Armed Service	4	10.0
	Other ^b	1	2.5
	Adjutant General Corps	0	0.0
	Air Defense Artillery	0	0.0
	Armor	0	0.0
	Aviation	0	0.0

(Table 4.17 continued)

Characteristic	Category	<i>n</i>	%
Branch within the subjects selected service	Corps of Engineers	0	0.0
	Field Artillery	0	0.0
	Finance Corps	0	0.0
	Infantry	0	0.0
	Medical Service Corps	0	0.0
	Military Intelligence	0	0.0
	Military Police Corps	0	0.0
	Ordinance Corps	0	0.0
	Quartermaster Corps	0	0.0
	Signal Corps	0	0.0
	Transportation Corps	0	0.0
	Total	40	100.0
Current Rank	1LT	1	2.5
	1LT (P)	2	5.0
	CPT	36	90.0
	CPT (P)	0	0.0
	MAJ	1	2.5
	Other	0	0.0

Note. *n* = 40 usable instruments completed and submitted. The variance in sample size is due to subjects electing to not answer or overlooking personal demographic questions.

^a3 study participants did not respond to source of commissioning, ^bOther branch selection was not identified by the subject.

Professional Assignments of CBRN Captain's Career Course Completers

When comparing professional assignments of CBRNCCC completers, over 25% (*n*=11) of those sampled indicated they had not served in a platoon leader assignment. This is the largest percentage of non-platoon leader assignments within the sampled MFE CCC population. One subject identified himself or herself as having served in 7 platoon leader assignments. However, the percentage of subjects identified as previously serving in a command assignment was just under 25% (*n*=21.1%). Half (*n*=20) of the CBRNCCC respondents indicated serving one assignment as an executive officer. Within the characteristic "Staff Officer Positions Held", one third (35.0%) of the CBRNCCC subjects identified themselves as holding the staff position designated as "Other". Of those 14 completers (35.0%), 7 identified their category selection of

“Other” as a BN or BDE chemical officer. The majority of the CBRN subjects selected AS3 as their primary staff category ($n=25$) (see Table 4.18).

Table 4.18 Description of Army Officers who Completed the Chemical, Biological, Radioactive and Nuclear Captain’s Career Course on Selected Professional Assignment Demographics

Characteristic	Category	<i>n</i>	%	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Previous company command assignments	No	30	78.9		
	Yes	8	21.1		
	Total	38 ^a	100.0		
Number of platoon leader assignments	0	11	27.5		
	1	19	47.5		
	2	8	20.0		
	3	1	2.5		
	4	0	0.0		
	5	0	0.0		
	6	0	0.0		
	7	1	2.5		
	Total	40	100.0	2.10	1.105
Number of executive officer assignments	0	17	42.5		
	1	20	50.0		
	2	3	7.5		
	3	0	0.0		
	Total	40	100.0	1.65	.622
Staff officer positions held ^b	AS3	25	62.5		
	Other ^c	14	35.0		
	S3	8	20.0		
	S1	6	15.0		
	None	2	5.0		
	AS2	2	5.0		
	S4	2	5.0		
	AS4	2	5.0		
	AS1	1	2.5		
	S2	1	2.5		
	S6	0	0.0		
	AS6	0	0.0		

Note. $n = 40$ usable instruments completed and submitted. The variance in sample size is due to subjects electing to not answer or overlooking personal demographic questions. With the variable “Staff officer positions held”, respondents were asked to check all that apply.

^a2 study participants did not respond to previous company command assignments, ^bDoes not total 100% since respondents were asked to mark all that apply. Personnel Officer (S1), Assistant Personnel Officer (AS1), Intelligence Officer (S2), Assistant Intelligence Officer (AS2), Operations Officer (S3), Assistant Operations Officer (AS3), Logistics Officer (S4) Assistant Logistic Officer (AS4), Signal Officer (S6), Assistant Signal Officer (AS6), ^cOther

(Table 4:18 continued)

staff selections included: battalion and brigade NBC officer ($n=7$), special staff ($n=1$), battle captain ($n=1$), task force liaison officer (LNO) ($n=1$) and no response ($n=4$).

Assignment durations of CBRN captain's career course completers

The majority of CBRNCCC completers (70.0%) completing the assignment duration portion of the survey, were identified as serving nine years or less before survey application, 4% less than the total sampled MFE CCC average of 74%. Yet, the mass of individuals that previously identified themselves as serving as a company commander, 33.3% ($n=3$), selected between 7-12 months of service in that command assignment and 44.4% ($n=4$) of respondents selected between 13-18 months. Those CBRN officers who were identified as serving in a staff position were more evenly distributed throughout the month selection categories with ≥ 25 months possessing the majority of selections (34.2%) (see Table 4.19).

Table 4.19 Description of Army Officers who Completed the Chemical, Biological, Radioactive and Nuclear Captain's Career Course on Selected Assignment Durations

Characteristic	Category	n	%
Total years of military service	1-3 Years	2	5.0
	4-6 Years	18	45.0
	7-9 Years	8	20.0
	10-12 Years	5	12.5
	13-15 Years	4	10.0
	16-18 Years	2	5.0
	19-21 Years	1	2.5
	> 21 Years	0	0.0
	Total	40	100.0
Months served as a company commander	≤ 6 Months	0	0.0
	7-12 Months	4	44.4
	13-18 Months	3	33.3
	19-24 Months	1	11.1
	≥ 25 Months	1	11.1
	Total	9 ^a	100.0
Months served as a staff officer	≤ 6 Months	3	7.9
	7-12 Months	8	21.1
	13-18 Months	11	28.9
	19-24 Months	3	7.9
	≥ 25 Months	13	34.2
	Total	38 ^b	100.0

(Table 4.19 continued)

Note. $n = 40$ usable instruments completed and submitted. The variance in sample size is due to subjects electing to not answer or overlooking personal demographic questions.

^a31 officers indicated they not had previously held a command assignment, ^b2 officers indicated they had not previously held a staff position.

Deployment statistics of CBRN captain's career course completers

The deployment statistics for CBRNCCC respondents show, 90% of all CBRNCCC completers served either one or two combat deployments. One combat deployment within the sampled CBRN population is identifiable with 67.5% ($n=27$) of all subjects. Of the deployment locations offered within the survey, 59.0% ($n=23$) of the sampled population indicated they had not deployed to Operation Enduring Freedom. While only 38.5% ($n=15$) had not deployed in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom. Predominate service period in months for those who had deployed were between 7-12 months at 61.5% ($n=24$) (see Table 4.20).

Table 4.20 Description of Army Officers who Completed the Chemical, Biological, Radioactive and Nuclear Captain's Career Course on Selected Deployment Statistics

Characteristic	Category	<i>n</i>	%	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Number of combat deployments	0	3	7.5	2.28	.933
	1	27	67.5		
	2	9	22.5		
	3	0	0.0		
	4	0	0.0		
	5	0	0.0		
	6	1	2.5		
	7	0	0.0		
	8	0	0.0		
	> 8	0	0.0		
	Total	40 ^a	100.0		
Deployments to Operation Iraqi Freedom	0	15	38.5	1.72	.647
	1	20	51.3		
	2	4	10.3		
	3	0	0.0		
	4	0	0.0		
	5	0	0.0		
	> 5	0	0.0		
	Total	39 ^b	100.0		

(Table 4.20 continued)

Characteristic	Category	<i>n</i>	%	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Deployments to Operation Enduring Freedom	0	23	59.0	1.41	.498
	1	16	41.0		
	2	0	0.0		
	3	0	0.0		
	4	0	0.0		
	5	0	0.0		
	> 5	0	0.0		
	Total	39 ^c	100.0		
Total months deployed in combat	0 Months	3	7.7		
	≤ 6 Months	2	5.1		
	7-12 Months	24	61.5		
	13-18 Months	6	15.4		
	19-24 Months	2	5.1		
	25-30 Months	2	5.1		
	31-36 Months	0	0.0		
	37-42 Months	0	0.0		
	43-48 Months	0	0.0		
	≥ 49 Months	0	0.0		
	Total	39 ^d	100.0		

Note. *n* = 40 usable instruments completed and submitted. The variance in sample size is due to subjects electing to not answer or overlooking personal demographic questions.

^a4 study participants did not respond to the number of combat deployments served, ^bOf the 40 officers that indicated they had previously deployed 1 did not respond to deployments to OIF, ^cof the 40 officers that indicated they had previously deployed 1 did not respond to deployments to OEF, ^d1 study participant did not respond to how many months they have been deployed

Engineer Captain Career Course Respondents

As one of three CCC's, which serves as part of the Maneuver Support Center of Excellence, the ENCCC approved the survey design requirement of two individual ENCCC classes from which the researcher could survey. The classes were issued a total of 117 instruments and all 117 were returned to the researcher before departing the survey site. Of the 117 collected instruments, 111 provided usable responses while 6 provided unusable data. ENCCC completers provided 13.1% of the total usable survey data. Data pertaining to the distribution of personal and professional characteristics for ENCCC completers can be found in Table 4.21 through Table 4.25.

Personal Characteristics of Engineer Captain's Career Course Completers

The majority of ENCCC completers sampled are definable as white ($n=79$, 72.5%) males ($n=101$, 91.8%), between the ages of 25-28 ($n=54$, 49.1%) of who are married ($n=72$, 65.5%) and have earned a bachelor's degree ($n=94$, 85.5%) (see Table 4.21).

Table 4.21 Description of Army Officers who Completed the Engineer Captain's Career Course on Selected Personal Characteristics

Characteristic	Category	<i>n</i>	%
Age (in Years)	22-24	1	0.9
	25-28 ^a	54	49.1
	29-31	15	13.6
	32-34	20	18.2
	35-37	10	9.1
	≥ 38	10	9.1
	Total	100 ^b	100.0
Gender	Male	101	91.8
	Female	9	8.2
	Total	110 ^c	100.0
Ethnicity	White	79	72.5
	Hispanic	11	10.1
	Asian, Pacific Islander	8	7.3
	African American	6	5.5
	Other	5 ^d	4.6
	Native American	0	0.0
	Total	109 ^e	100.0
Marital status	Married	72	65.5
	Single, Never Married	32	29.1
	Divorced	5	4.5
	Other	1 ^f	0.9
	Separated	0	0.0
	Widowed	0	0.0
	Total	110 ^g	100.0
Highest degree earned	Bachelor's Degree	94	85.5
	Master's Degree	14	12.7
	Associate Degree	2	1.8
	Doctoral Degree	0	0.0
	Other	0	0.0
	Total	110 ^h	100.0

Note. $n = 111$ usable instruments submitted and collected. The variance in sample size is due to subjects electing to not answer or overlooking personal demographic questions.

^a1 study participants did not respond to age, ^bThe age of 25 was mistakenly excluded from the primary instrument and was intended to be included in option 3, ^c1 study participants did not respond to gender, ^dOther ethnicity selections included: no comment ($n=1$), a statement that an

(Table 4.21 continued)

ethnicity question is racist ($n=1$) and no response ($n=3$), ^e2 study participants did not respond to ethnicity, ^f1 study participant did not respond to marital status, ^gOther marital statuses were not described by the one respondent, ^h1 study participant did not respond to highest degree earned.

Professional Demographics of Engineer Captain's Career Course Completers

Professional demographics were one of five focus areas used to describe completers in total and by their specific CCC. Within the characteristic "Source of Commissioning", ROTC provided the largest percentage of officers, infusing 46.8% ($n=51$) of the surveyed population. An active duty ($n=104$, 93.7%) Army ($n=105$, 95.5%) CPT ($n=104$, 93.7%) who branched Corps of Engineers ($n=97$, 90.7%) is also the majority descriptor when looking at this overall sample. When looking at the remaining 10 (9.3%) subjects who identified as serving in branches other than Corps of Engineers, 8 (7.6%) of those individuals selected branches from within MFE (See Table 4.22).

Table 4.22 Description of Army Officers who Completed the Engineer Captain's Career Course on Selected General Professional Demographics

Characteristic	Category	<i>n</i>	%
Source of commissioning	ROTC	51	46.8
	OCS	30	27.5
	West Point	22	20.2
	Academy, non WP	3	2.8
	Direct Commission	3	2.8
	Total	109 ^a	100.0
Current branch of military service	Army	105	95.5
	Marines	3	2.7
	Foreign Armed Service	2	1.8
	Navy	0	0.0
	Air Force	0	0.0
	Total	110 ^b	100.0
Service Status	Active Duty	104	93.7
	Army National Guard	4	3.6
	Army Reserves	3	2.7
	Total	111	100.0

(Table 4.22 continued)

Characteristic	Category	<i>n</i>	%
Branch within the subjects selected service	Corps of Engineers	97	90.7
	Aviation	3	2.8
	Field Artillery	2	1.9
	Signal Corps	2	1.9
	Air Defense Artillery	1	0.9
	Armor	1	0.9
	Military Police Corps	1	0.9
	Adjutant General Corps	0	0.0
	Chemical Corps	0	0.0
	Finance Corps	0	0.0
	Infantry	0	0.0
	Medical Service Corps	0	0.0
	Military Intelligence	0	0.0
	Ordinance Corps	0	0.0
	Quartermaster Corps	0	0.0
	Transportation Corps	0	0.0
	Foreign Armed Service	0	0.0
	Other	0	0.0
	Total	107 ^c	100.0
Current Rank	1LT	0	0.0
	1LT (P)	2	1.8
	CPT	104	93.7
	CPT (P)	5	4.5
	MAJ	0	0.0
	Other	0	0.0
	Total	111	100.0

Note. *n* = 111 usable instruments completed and submitted. The variance in sample size is due to subjects electing to not answer or overlooking personal demographic questions.

^a2 study participants did not respond to their source of commissioning, ^b1 study participant did not respond to current branch of military service, ^c4 study participants did not respond to branch within the U.S. Army.

Professional Assignments of Engineer Captain's Career Course Completers

When describing CCC completers by their branch specific courses ENCCC professional assignments were utilized to describe a portion of the MFE population. With regard to the characteristic "Previous company command assignments", 31% (*n*=35) of the sampled CCC responded in the affirmative. When addressing the number of platoon leader assignments, 4.5% (*n*=5) indicated having never served in such an assignment. Seventy respondents (63.1%)

specified serving in one executive officer assignment, 65 (59.6%) also denoted one staff assignment as an AS3 (see Table 4.23).

Table 4.23 Description of Army Officers who Completed the Engineer Captain's Career Course on Selected Professional Assignment Demographics

Characteristic	Category	<i>n</i>	%	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Previous company command assignments	No	76	68.5		
	Yes	35	31.5		
	Total	111	100.0		
Number of platoon leader assignments	0	5	4.5	2.32	.603
	1	69	62.2		
	2	34	30.6		
	3	3	2.7		
	4	0	0.0		
	5	0	0.0		
	6	0	0.0		
	7	0	0.0		
	Total	111	100.0		
Number of executive officer assignments	0	30	27.0	1.85	.635
	1	70	63.1		
	2	9	8.1		
	3	2	1.8		
	Total	111	100.0		
Staff officer positions held ^a	AS3	65	59.6		
	None	16	14.7		
	S4	14	12.8		
	Other ^b	13	11.9		
	S3	10	9.2		
	AS4	7	6.4		
	S1	6	5.5		
	S2	6	5.5		
	AS2	4	3.7		
	AS1	1	0.9		
	S6	1	0.9		
	AS6	0	0.0		

Note. *n* = 111 usable instruments completed and submitted. The variance in sample size is due to subjects electing to not answer or overlooking personal demographic questions. With the variable "Staff officer positions held", respondents were asked to check all that apply.

^aDoes not total 100% since respondents were asked to mark all that apply. Personnel Officer (S1), Assistant Personnel Officer (AS1), Intelligence Officer (S2), Assistant Intelligence Officer (AS2), Operations Officer (S3), Assistant Operations Officer (AS3), Logistics Officer (S4) Assistant Logistic Officer (AS4), Signal Officer (S6), Assistant Signal Officer (AS6), ^bOther staff positions were not identified by the respondents.

Assignment Durations of Engineer Captain's Career Course Completers

When examining professional assignment selections through the lenses of time, slightly greater than half (55.9%) of the ENCCC sample had served less than 7 years military service, 3.6% ($n=4$) having selected only serving between 1-3 years. When exploring months served as a company commander, 7-12 month ($n=9$, 25.0%) and 13-18 month ($n=10$, 27.8%) assignments only differed by one response. The months served category under the staff officer characteristic remained fairly consistent with the greatest variance in responses generated from 8 subjects (8.6%) with selections between ≤ 6 months and 7-12 months (see Table 4.24).

Table 4.24 Description of Army Officers who Completed the Engineer Captain's Career Course on Selected Assignment Durations

Characteristic	Category	n	%
Total years of military service	1-3 Years	4	3.6
	4-6 Years	58	52.3
	7-9 Years	12	10.8
	10-12 Years	15	13.5
	13-15 Years	13	11.7
	16-18 Years	4	3.6
	19-21 Years	2	1.8
	> 21 Years	3	2.7
	Total	111	100.0
Months served as a company commander	≤ 6 Months	7	19.4
	7-12 Months	9	25.0
	13-18 Months	10	27.8
	19-24 Months	3	8.3
	≥ 25 Months	7	19.4
	Total	36 ^a	100.0
Months served as a staff officer	≤ 6 Months	15	16.1
	7-12 Months	23	24.7
	13-18 Months	24	25.8
	19-24 Months	20	21.5
	≥ 25 Months	11	11.8
	Total	93 ^b	100.0

Note. $n = 11$ usable instruments completed and submitted. The variance in sample size is due to subjects electing to not answer or overlooking personal demographic questions.

^a75 officers indicated they not had previously held a command assignment, ^b18 officers indicated they had not previously held a staff position.

Deployment Statistics of Engineer Captain's Career Course Completers

When exploring the descriptive deployment characteristics of ENCCC, 4.6% ($n=5$) of all ENCCC collected samples indicated 0 combat deployments, the remaining 95.4% of the ENCCC sampled population served between 1 and 6 deployments, with 76% of those respondents having deployed no greater than 18 months. Multiple deployments to both OEF and OIF were among the responses from the ENCCC samples. Respondents serving multiple OIF deployments totaled 16.2% ($n=17$) whereas multiple OEF deployments totaled 8.7% ($n=9$) (see Table 4.25)

Table 4.25 Description of Army Officers who Completed the Engineer Captain's Career Course on Selected Deployment Statistics

Characteristic	Category	<i>n</i>	%	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Number of combat deployments	0	5	4.6	2.50	.867
	1	58	53.2		
	2	39	35.8		
	3	3	2.8		
	4	3	2.8		
	5	0	0.0		
	6	1	0.9		
	7	0	0.0		
	8	0	0.0		
	> 8	0	0.0		
	Total	109 ^a	100.0		
Deployments to Operation Iraqi Freedom	0	34	32.4	1.86	.726
	1	54	48.6		
	2	15	14.3		
	3	2	1.9		
	4	0	0.0		
	5	0	0.0		
	> 5	0	0.0		
	Total	105 ^b	100.0		
Deployments to Operation Enduring Freedom	0	46	44.2	1.64	.637
	1	49	47.1		
	2	9	8.7		
	3	0	0.0		
	4	0	0.0		
	5	0	0.0		
	> 5	0	0.0		
	Total	104 ^c	100.0		

(Table 4.25 continued)

Characteristic	Category	<i>n</i>	%	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Total months deployed in combat	0 Months	6	5.6		
	≤ 6 Months	22	20.4		
	7-12 Months	33	30.6		
	13-18 Months	27	25.0		
	19-24 Months	13	12.0		
	25-30 Months	4	3.7		
	31-36 Months	2	1.9		
	37-42 Months	0	0.0		
	43-48 Months	1	0.9		
	≥ 49 Months	0	0.0		
	Total	108 ^d	100.0		

Note. *n* = 111 usable instruments completed and submitted. The variance in sample size is due to subjects electing to not answer or overlooking personal demographic questions.

^a2 study participants did not respond to the number of combat deployments served, ^bOf the 104 officers that indicated they had previously deployed 6 did not respond to deployments to OIF,

^cOf the 104 officers that indicated they had previously deployed 7 did not respond to deployments to OEF, ^d3 study participants did not respond to how many months they have been deployed.

Field Artillery Captain Career Course Respondents

Surveys collected from the Fires CoE, specifically the FACCC totaled 118. All 118 survey instruments were issued and collected by the researcher during two spate visits. The surveys issued to the sample population were collected the same day. Only 1 instrument returned contained unusable data resulting in *n*=117 usable responses. The total FACCC usable responses collected represent 13.9% of all MFE usable responses, the second largest collected sample population.

Personal Characteristics of Field Artillery Captain's Career Course Completers

When using personal characteristics of FACCC respondents to describe their population the researcher identified 24.1% (*n*=28) of the FACCC sample was of 32 years of age or older. The FACCC sample possessed one female completer (0.9%). White (*n*=89, 76.7%) married (*n*=65, 56.0%) officers are the majority when describing personal characteristics of FACCC

respondents. The FA sample population holds one respondent (0.9%) that indicated completing a Juris Doctor in the entirety of the MFE sampled data (see Table 4.26).

Table 4.26 Description of Army Officers who Completed the Field Artillery Captain's Career Course on Selected Personal Characteristics

Characteristic	Category	<i>n</i>	%
Age (in Years)	22-24	1	0.9
	25-28 ^a	67	57.8
	29-31	20	17.2
	32-34	14	12.1
	35-37	7	6.0
	≥ 38	7	6.0
	Total	116 ^b	100.0
Gender	Male	115	99.1
	Female	1	0.9
	Total	116 ^c	100.0
Ethnicity	White	89	76.7
	Asian, Pacific Islander	13	11.2
	African American	7	6.0
	Hispanic	5	4.3
	Other	2	1.7
	Native American	0	0.0
	Total	116 ^d	100.0
Marital status	Married	65	56.0
	Single, Never Married	47	40.5
	Divorced	4	3.4
	Separated	0	0.0
	Widowed	0	0.0
	Other	0	0.0
	Total	116 ^e	100.0
Highest degree earned	Bachelor's Degree	103	88.8
	Master's Degree	12	10.3
	Other ^f	1	0.9
	Associate Degree	0	0.0
	Doctoral Degree	0	0.0
	Total	116 ^g	100.0

Note. *n* = 117 instruments submitted and collected. The variance in sample size is due to subjects electing to not answer or overlooking personal demographic questions.

^a1 study participant did not respond to age, ^bThe age of 25 was mistakenly excluded from the primary instrument and was intended to be included in option 3, ^c1 study participant did not respond to gender, ^d1 study participant did not respond to ethnicity, ^e1 study participant did not respond to marital status, ^fOther levels of education included: Juris Doctor (*n*=1), ^g1 study participants did not respond to highest degree earned.

Professional Demographics of Field Artillery Captain's Career Course Completers

Field Artillery CCC is the purest sample collected when measured by branch selection within the students selected service. With the exception of the identified 8 foreign students, only 1 participant indicated a branch other than FA. Fewer than 10% ($n=11$) of the sampled FA population indicated they received their commission from a military academy other than West Point. This is the largest academy, non West Point percentage within sampled MFE CCC. Active duty ($n=110$, 95.7%) CPTs ($n=104$, 89.7%) are the majority among all FACCC completers (see Table 4.27).

Table 4.27 Description of Army Officers who Completed the Field Artillery Captain's Career Course on Selected General Professional Demographics

Characteristic	Category	<i>n</i>	%
Source of commissioning	ROTC	44	38.6
	OCS	30	26.3
	West Point	29	25.4
	Academy, non WP	11	9.6
	Direct Commission	0	0.0
	Total	114 ^a	100.0
Current branch of military service	Army	105	90.5
	Foreign Armed Service	8	6.9
	Marines	3	2.6
	Navy	0	0.0
	Air Force	0	0.0
	Total	116 ^b	100.0
Service Status	Active Duty	110	95.7
	Army National Guard	5	4.3
	Army Reserves	0	0.0
	Total	115 ^c	100.0
Branch within the subjects selected service	Field Artillery	106	92.2
	Foreign Armed Service	8	6.8
	Aviation	1	0.9
	Adjutant General Corps	0	0.0
	Air Defense Artillery	0	0.0
	Armor	0	0.0
	Chemical Corps	0	0.0
	Corps of Engineers	0	0.0
	Finance Corps	0	0.0
	Infantry	0	0.0

(Table 4.27 continued)

Characteristic	Category	<i>n</i>	%
	Medical Service Corps	0	0.0
	Military Intelligence	0	0.0
	Military Police Corps	0	0.0
	Ordinance Corps	0	0.0
	Quartermaster Corps	0	0.0
	Signal Corps	0	0.0
	Transportation Corps	0	0.0
	Other	0	0.0
	Total	115 ^d	100.0
Current Rank	1LT	3	2.6
	1LT (P)	6	5.2
	CPT	104	89.7
	CPT (P)	1	0.9
	MAJ	2	1.7
	Other	0	0.0
	Total	116 ^e	100.0

Note. *n* = 117 usable instruments completed and submitted. The variance in sample size is due to subjects electing to not answer or overlooking personal demographic questions.

^a3 study participants did not respond to source of commissioning, ^b1 study participant did not respond to current branch of military service, ^c2 study participants did not respond to current military service status, ^d2 study participants did not respond to branch within the U.S. Army, ^e1 study participant did not respond to their current rank.

Professional Assignments of Field Artillery Captain's Career Course Completers

While examining professional assignments of the FACCC respondents, 6.9% (*n*=8) of the subjects selected “yes” when asked if they had served in a previous company command assignment. This is the lowest command assignment percentage collected within the entirety of MFE CCC surveys. Just under 50% (49.6%) of the FA sampled completers indicated having one platoon leader assignment with an additional 33.0% indicating they served a second platoon leader assignment. More FACCC samples indicated a single assignment as a company executive officer (*n*=64, 56.1%) than a single platoon leader assignment (*n*=57, 49.6%). The collected FACCC surveys display a selection of the staff officer category “Other” (*n*=39, 33.9%) slightly larger than the category “None” (*n*=37, 32.2%) (see Table 4.28).

Table 4.28 Description of Army Officers who Completed the Field Artillery Captain's Career Course on Selected Professional Assignment Demographics

Characteristic	Category	<i>n</i>	%	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Previous company command assignments	No	108	93.1		
	Yes	8	6.9		
	Total	116 ^a	100.0		
Number of platoon leader assignments	0	8	7.0		
	1	57	49.6		
	2	38	33.0		
	3	10	8.7		
	4	2	1.7		
	5	0	0.0		
	6	0	0.0		
	7	0	0.0		
	Total	115 ^b	100.0	2.49	.820
Number of executive officer assignments	0	38	33.3		
	1	64	56.1		
	2	12	10.5		
	3	0	0.0		
	Total	114 ^c	100.0	1.77	.625
Staff officer positions held ^d	Other ^e	39	33.9		
	None	37	32.2		
	AS3	29	25.2		
	S4	15	13.0		
	S2	12	10.4		
	S3	4	3.5		
	AS4	3	2.6		
	S1	2	1.7		
	AS1	1	0.9		
	S6	1	0.9		
	AS2	0	0.0		
	AS6	0	0.0		

Note. *n* = 117 usable instruments completed and submitted. The variance in sample size is due to subjects electing to not answer or overlooking personal demographic questions. With the variable "Staff officer positions held", respondents were asked to check all that apply.

^a1 study participant did not respond to previous company command assignments, ^b2 study participants did not respond to the number of platoon leader positions held, ^c3 study participants did not respond to the number of executive officer positions held, ^dDoes not total 100% since respondents were asked to mark all that apply. Personnel Officer (S1), Assistant Personnel Officer (AS1), Intelligence Officer (S2), Assistant Intelligence Officer (AS2), Operations Officer (S3), Assistant Operations Officer (AS3), Logistics Officer (S4) Assistant Logistic Officer (AS4), Signal Officer (S6), Assistant Signal Officer (AS6), ^eOther staff positions specified: Battalion and Brigade Fire Support Officer (*n*=9), Fire Direction Officer (*n*=7), Aide-de-camp (*n*=1), Movement Control Officer (*n*=1), Unit Movement Officer (*n*=1), and no response (*n*=20).

Assignment Durations of Field Artillery Captain's Career Course Completers

Of the usable FA sampled population, 50.4% ($n=58$) served a total of 4-6 years of military service. The categories of 7-9 years and 10-12 years combined account for 33.9% of the remaining population. Of the participants who indicated in Table 4.28 they had previously held a command assignment, the months of service were almost identically split: 7-12 months ($n=3$), 13-18 months ($n=2$) and 19-24 months ($n=3$). The majority of respondents who served an assignment as a staff officer indicated serving 7-12 months ($n=27$, 35.1%) (see Table 4.29).

Table 4.29 Description of Army Officers who Completed the Field Artillery Captain's Career Course on Selected Assignment Durations

Characteristic	Category	<i>n</i>	%
Total years of military service	1-3 Years	4	3.5
	4-6 Years	58	50.4
	7-9 Years	20	17.4
	10-12 Years	19	16.5
	13-15 Years	8	7.0
	16-18 Years	3	2.6
	19-21 Years	0	0.0
	> 21 Years	3	2.6
	Total	115 ^a	100.0
Months served as a company commander	≤ 6 Months	0	0.0
	7-12 Months	3	37.5
	13-18 Months	2	25.0
	19-24 Months	3	37.5
	≥ 25 Months	0	0.0
	Total	8 ^b	100.0
Months served as a staff officer	≤ 6 Months	16	20.8
	7-12 Months	27	35.1
	13-18 Months	23	29.9
	19-24 Months	8	10.4
	≥ 25 Months	3	3.9
	Total	77 ^c	100.0

Note. $n = 117$ usable instruments completed and submitted. The variance in sample size is due to subjects electing to not answer or overlooking personal demographic questions.

^a2 study participants did not respond to total years of military service, ^b109 officers indicated they not had previously held a command assignment, ^c40 officers indicated they had not previously held a staff position.

Deployment Statistics of Field Artillery Captain's Career Course Completers

When looking at the deployment statistics of FACCC completers, 13 (11.4%) of the population had not served in a combat deployment, while just over half ($n=59$, 51.8%) have served one deployment. When evaluating the locations OIF or OEF, more subjects indicated serving in support of OEF as opposed to OIF, the differential being 2 subjects. Additionally, the majority respondents with regard to both deployment locations OIF and OIR indicated having not deployed with OIF having 50.0% ($n=56$) selecting the category quantity of zero and OEF having 48.2% ($n=54$). The majority of subjects indicating a combat deployment selected the quantity of months served to be 7-12 ($n=52$, 45.6%) with two completers (1.8%) indicating service in excess of 49 months (see Table 4.30).

Table 4.30 Description of Army Officers who Completed the Field Artillery Captain's Career Course on Selected Deployment Statistics

Characteristic	Category	<i>n</i>	%	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Number of combat deployments	0	13	11.4	2.39	.936
	1	59	51.8		
	2	33	28.9		
	3	5	4.4		
	4	2	1.8		
	5	2	1.8		
	6	0	0.0		
	7	0	0.0		
	8	0	0.0		
	> 8	0	0.0		
	Total	114 ^a	100.0		
Deployments to Operation Iraqi Freedom	0	56	50.0	1.64	.733
	1	41	36.6		
	2	14	12.5		
	3	1	0.9		
	4	0	0.0		
	5	0	0.0		
	> 5	0	0.0		
	Total	112 ^b	100.0		

(Table 4.30 continued)

Characteristic	Category	<i>n</i>	%	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Deployments to Operation Enduring Freedom	0	54	48.2	1.61	.649
	1	48	42.9		
	2	10	8.9		
	3	0	0.0		
	4	0	0.0		
	5	0	0.0		
	> 5	0	0.0		
	Total	112 ^c	100.0		
Total months deployed in combat	0 Months	13	11.4		
	≤ 6 Months	5	4.4		
	7-12 Months	52	45.6		
	13-18 Months	19	16.7		
	19-24 Months	17	14.9		
	25-30 Months	3	2.6		
	31-36 Months	3	2.6		
	37-42 Months	0	0.0		
	43-48 Months	0	0.0		
	≥ 49 Months	2	1.8		
	Total	114 ^d	100.0		

Note. *n* = 117 usable instruments completed and submitted. The variance in sample size is due to subjects electing to not answer or overlooking personal demographic questions.

^a3 study participants did not respond to the number of combat deployments served, ^bOf the 101 officers that indicated they had previously deployed 5 did not respond to deployments to OIF,

^cOf the 101 officers that indicated they had previously deployed 5 did not respond to deployments to OEF, ^d3 study participants did not respond to how many months they have been deployed.

Maneuver Captain Career Course Respondents

One of the seven CCCs belonging to MFE is the MCCC. The MCCC is part of the MCoE and is comprised of both the Armor and Infantry branches. Two separate data collections from the MCCC totaling 306 instruments were issued to respondents in attendance and 306 instruments were collected. All but nine survey instruments provided usable responses. Those 297 (97.0%) instruments made up 35.2% of the cumulative usable data within the study.

Personal characteristics of maneuver captain's career course completers

When evaluating personal characteristics of MCCC officers surveyed, the characteristic age, 60.8% (*n*=178) of respondents indicated an age between 25-28 years. The MCCC sample

included a female population of 0.3% ($n=1$). Officers who selected the ethnic category “White” totaled 243 (83.2%) with the category, “Hispanic” having the second highest identified ethnic percentage at 5.8% ($n=17$). The predominance of MCCC officers surveyed indicated their marital status as married ($n=180$, 61.4%). Further identification of MCCC marital responses indicated 2.7% of the sampled population was divorced. MCCC completers also possessed one respondent with the marital category selection of “Widow”. With regard to the characteristic “Highest degree earned”, the sampled completers have a Master’s degrees earned percentage of 6.1% ($n=18$). Additionally, the officers within the MCCC sampled population had earned 3 Doctoral degrees (1.0%) (see Table 4.31).

Table 4.31 Description of Army Officers who Completed the Maneuver Captain’s Career Course on Selected Personal Characteristics

Characteristic	Category	<i>n</i>	%
Age (in Years)	22-24	1	0.3
	25-28 ^a	178	60.8
	29-31	51	17.4
	32-34	22	7.5
	35-37	20	6.8
	≥ 38	21	7.2
	Total	293 ^b	100.0
Gender	Male	292	99.7
	Female	1	0.3
	Total	293 ^c	100.0
Ethnicity	White	243	83.2
	Hispanic	17	5.8
	African American	12	4.1
	Asian, Pacific Islander	12	4.1
	Other	7 ^d	2.4
	Native American	1	0.3
	Total	292 ^e	100.0
Marital status	Married	180	61.4
	Single, Never Married	100	34.1
	Divorced	8	2.7
	Other	3 ^f	1.0
	Separated	1	0.3
	Widowed	1	0.3
	Total	293 ^g	100.0

(Table 4.31 continued)

Characteristic	Category	<i>n</i>	%
Highest degree earned	Bachelor's Degree	271	92.5
	Master's Degree	18	6.1
	Doctoral Degree	3	1.0
	Associate Degree	1	0.3
	Other	0	0.0
	Total	293 ^h	100.0

Note. *n* = 295 instruments submitted and collected. The variance in sample size is due to subjects electing to not answer or overlooking personal demographic questions.

^a2 study participants did not respond to age, ^bThe age of 25 was mistakenly excluded from the primary instrument and was intended to be included in option 3, ^c2 study participants did not respond to gender, ^dOther ethnicity selections not indicated by instrument respondents, ^e3 study participants did not respond to ethnicity, ^f2 study participants did not respond to marital status, ^gOther marital statuses not identified, ^h2 study participants did not respond to highest degree earned.

Professional Demographics of Maneuver Captain's Career Course Completers

Professional demographics with regard to "Source of commissioning" describe the majority of MCCC respondents as ROTC (*n*=113, 39.2%). OCS (29.5%) and West Point (25.3%) commissioning sources accumulate the majority of the remaining respondent population with regard to commissioning sources. Active duty (*n*=266, 91.4%), Army (*n*=273, 93.2%) affiliation is the dominant service status within the MCCC collected usable data. The MCCC sample population identified with 13 of 18 provided branch categories within the two combined collections. Both Infantry and Armor service branches made up the majority of branch within service identification with Infantry (*n*=170, 58.6%), identified as the branch majority and Armor (*n*=66, 22.8%) combined, consuming 81.4% of the respondent identified service branches. The rank of CPT at 92.5% (*n*=270) was the dominant selection among MCCC completers with 1LT and 1LT(P) combined accounting for another 5.5% of the usable data (see Table 4.32).

Table 4.32 Description of Army Officers who Completed the Maneuver Captain's Career Course on Selected General Professional Demographics

Characteristic	Category	<i>n</i>	%
Source of commissioning	ROTC	113	39.2
	OCS	85	29.5
	West Point	73	25.3
	Academy, non WP	12	4.2
	Direct Commission	5	1.7
	Total	288 ^a	100.0
Current branch of military service	Army	273	93.2
	Marines	16	5.5
	Foreign Armed Service	4	1.4
	Navy	0	0.0
	Air Force	0	0.0
	Total	293 ^b	100.0
Service Status	Active Duty	266	91.4
	Army National Guard	25	8.6
	Army Reserves	0	0.0
	Total	291 ^c	100.0
Branch within the subjects selected service	Infantry	170	58.6
	Armor	66	22.8
	Corps of Engineers	15	5.2
	Field Artillery	9	3.1
	Other ^d	5	1.7
	Military Intelligence	4	1.4
	Signal Corps	4	1.4
	Aviation	3	1.0
	Military Police Corps	3	1.0
	Transportation Corps	3	1.0
	Foreign Armed Service	3	1.0
	Air Defense Artillery	2	0.7
	Chemical Corps	2	0.7
	Quartermaster Corps	1	0.3
	Adjutant General Corps	0	0.0
	Finance Corps	0	0.0
	Medical Service Corps	0	0.0
	Ordinance Corps	0	0.0
	Total	290 ^e	100.0
Current Rank	1LT	6	2.1
	1LT (P)	10	3.4
	CPT	270	92.5
	CPT (P)	5	1.7
	MAJ	1	0.3
	Other	0	0.0
	Total	292 ^f	100.0

(Table 4.32 continued)

Note. $n = 295$ usable instruments completed and submitted. The variance in sample size is due to subjects electing to not answer or overlooking personal demographic questions.

^a7 study participants did not respond to source of commissioning, ^b2 study participants did not respond to current branch of military service, ^c4 study participants did not respond to current military service status, ^dNon traditional branches included: Special Forces ($n=3$), Civil Affairs ($n=1$), and PSYOPS ($n=1$), ^e5 study participants did not respond to branch within the U.S. Army ^f3 study participants did not respond to their current rank.

Professional Assignments of Maneuver Captain's Career Course Completers

Participating MCCC officers providing professional assignment data who previously held a company command assignment totaled 15.9% ($n=46$). Platoon leader assignments, as identified by the Maneuver participants remained predominantly between one ($n=162$, 55.9%) and two ($n=96$, 33.1%) assignments, consuming 89.0% of the total assignment selections. Five subjects (1.7%) did categorize themselves as having served in 4 platoon leader assignments. Just under two thirds of the usable population identified as serving in an executive officer assignment ($n=185$, 63.8%), with 29.0% of the completers having selected serving in zero executive officer assignments ($n=84$). The MCCC respondents selected all 12 possible staff categories with a minimum of one selection. This included the category "Other". The staff position AS3, accounts for just under half (49.8%) of all identified staff assignments among MCCC completers with the staff assignment of None (32.1%) and Other (12.5%) following in order of tiered percentages (see Table 4.33).

Table 4.33 Description of Army Officers who Completed the Maneuver Captain's Career Course on Selected Professional Assignment Demographics

Characteristic	Category	n	%	M	SD
Previous company command assignments					
	No	244	84.1		
	Yes	46	15.9		
	Total	290 ^a	100.0		

(Table 4.33 continued)

Characteristic	Category	<i>n</i>	%	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Number of platoon leader assignments	0	7	2.4	2.50	.759
	1	162	55.9		
	2	96	33.1		
	3	19	6.6		
	4	5	1.7		
	5	0	0.0		
	6	1	0.3		
	7	0	0.0		
	Total	290 ^b	100.0		
Number of executive officer assignments	0	84	29.0	1.79	.573
	1	185	63.8		
	2	20	6.9		
	3	1	0.3		
	Total	290 ^c	100.0		
Staff officer positions held ^d	AS3	143	49.8		
	None	92	32.1		
	Other ^e	36	12.5		
	S4	19	6.6		
	S1	11	3.8		
	AS4	11	3.8		
	S2	6	2.1		
	AS1	4	1.4		
	S3	4	1.4		
	AS2	3	1.0		
	S6	2	0.7		
	AS6	1	0.3		

Note. *n* = 295 usable instruments completed and submitted. The variance in sample size is due to subjects electing to not answer or overlooking personal demographic questions. With the variable “Staff officer positions held”, respondents were asked to check all that apply.

^a5 study participants did not respond to previous company command assignments, ^b5 study participants did not respond to the number of platoon leader positions held, ^c5 study participants did not respond to the number of executive officer positions held, ^dDoes not total 100% since respondents were asked to mark all that apply. Personnel Officer (S1), Assistant Personnel Officer (AS1), Intelligence Officer (S2), Assistant Intelligence Officer (AS2), Operations Officer (S3), Assistant Operations Officer (AS3), Logistics Officer (S4) Assistant Logistic Officer (AS4), Signal Officer (S6), Assistant Signal Officer (AS6), ^eOther staff positions not specified by instrument respondents.

Assignment Durations of Maneuver Captain's Career Course Completers

The collected MCCC sample population, in regards to assignment duration shows that over half of the officers served a total of 4-6 years of service ($n=176$, 60.5%), with the next largest selected percentage being the category 7-9 years of service (17.9%). Of the 46 officers who identified themselves as holding a company command assignment, the category with the majority of selections was 7-12 months (42.3%). Two thirds of officers who indicated serving in a staff assignment identified their months of service to have been 12 months or less ($n=130$, 68.1%) (See Table 4.34).

Table 4.34 Description of Army Officers who Completed the Maneuver Captain's Career Course on Selected Assignment Durations

Characteristic	Category	<i>n</i>	%
Total years of military service	1-3 Years	8	2.7
	4-6 Years	176	60.5
	7-9 Years	52	17.9
	10-12 Years	23	7.9
	13-15 Years	19	6.5
	16-18 Years	8	2.7
	19-21 Years	4	1.4
	> 21 Years	1	0.3
	Total	291 ^a	100.0
Months served as a company commander	≤ 6 Months	9	17.3
	7-12 Months	22	42.3
	13-18 Months	7	13.5
	19-24 Months	5	9.6
	≥ 25 Months	9	17.3
	Total	52 ^b	100.0
Months served as a staff officer	0 Months	1	0.5
	≤ 6 Months	63	33.0
	7-12 Months	67	35.1
	13-18 Months	30	15.7
	19-24 Months	20	10.5
	≥ 25 Months	10	5.2
	Total	191 ^c	100.0

Note. $n = 295$ usable instruments completed and submitted. The variance in sample size is due to subjects electing to not answer or overlooking personal demographic questions.

^a4 study participants did not respond to total years of military service, ^b243 officers indicated they served zero months in command whereas 244 officers indicated they had not held a command assignment, ^c104 officers did not respond to months served in a staff position.

Deployment Statistics Of Maneuver Captain's Career Course Completers

When describing MCCC respondents by their deployment statistics, 95.2% of the population identified as having deployed to combat. Of that, 55.0% ($n=160$) of the instruments indicated one deployment with 32.0% ($n=93$) selecting two deployments. Of the deployment categories, OIF and OEF, 54.3% of the officers indicated not deploying in support of OEF whereas only 30.1% not deploying in support of OIF. Half (48.8%) of the instruments identified deployments indicated a total length of between 7-12 months deployed. The total number of respondents indicating zero combat deployments ($n=14$) matches the instruments which selected zero months deployed ($n=14$) (see Table 4.35).

Table 4.35 Description of Army Officers who Completed the Maneuver Captain's Career Course on Selected Deployment Statistics

Characteristic	Category	<i>n</i>	%	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Number of combat deployments	0	14	4.8	2.53	1.061
	1	160	55.0		
	2	93	32.0		
	3	13	4.5		
	4	5	1.7		
	5	1	0.3		
	6	3	1.0		
	7	0	0.0		
	8	1	0.3		
	> 8	1	0.3		
	Total	291 ^a	100.0		
Deployments to Operation Iraqi Freedom	0	86	30.1	1.93	.794
	1	146	51.0		
	2	46	16.1		
	3	6	2.1		
	4	1	0.3		
	5	1	0.3		
	> 5	0	0.0		
	Total	286 ^b	100.0		
Deployments to Operation Enduring Freedom	0	152	54.3		
	1	104	37.1		
	2	21	7.5		
	3	1	0.4		

(Table 4.35 continued)

Characteristic	Category	<i>n</i>	%	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
	4	2	0.7	1.56	.711
	5	0	0.0		
	> 5	0	0.0		
	Total	280 ^c	100.0		
Total months deployed in combat	0 Months	14	4.8		
	≤ 6 Months	7	2.4		
	7-12 Months	141	48.8		
	13-18 Months	74	25.6		
	19-24 Months	27	9.3		
	25-30 Months	14	4.8		
	31-36 Months	7	2.4		
	37-42 Months	2	0.7		
	43-48 Months	1	0.3		
	≥ 49 Months	2	0.7		
	Total	289 ^d	100.0		

Note. *n* = 295 usable instruments completed and submitted. The variance in sample size is due to subjects electing to not answer or overlooking personal demographic questions.

^a4 study participants did not respond to the number of combat deployments served, ^bOf the 291 officers that responded to deploying, 9 did not respond to deployments to OIF, ^cOf the 291 officers that indicated they had previously deployed 15 did not respond to deployments to OEF,

^d6 study participants did not respond to how many months they have been deployed.

Military Police Captain Career Course Respondents

When collecting data from the Maneuver Support Center of Excellence, the Military Police CCC provided two independent classes for study, totaling 102 respondents. The researcher personally distributed and collected 102 instruments. Usable responses from the MPCCC respondents totaled 98 or 96.0% of the instruments collected from the Military Police sampled population, with only four instruments identified with unusable data. MPCCC usable instruments total 11.6% of the cumulative surveyed officers within MFE.

Personal Characteristics of Military Police Captain's Career Course Completers

The MPCCC possessed a female population of 15.5% ($n=15$). The majority of respondents within the characteristic "Ethnicity" selected white ($n=69$, 71.9%), with Hispanic ($n=9$) and African American ($n=8$) as the next two tiered majority categories. With just over one third of the usable MPCCC instruments indicating an age range between 25-28 (37.1%), 18.6% of the population selected their age as ≥ 38 . The examined MPCCC instruments also indicate 32.0% of its completers having earned a Master's degree (see Table 4.36).

Table 4.36 Description of Army Officers who Completed the Military Police Captain's Career Course on Selected Personal Characteristics

Characteristic	Category	<i>n</i>	%
Age (in Years)	22-24	0	0.0
	25-28 ^a	36	37.1
	29-31	21	21.6
	32-34	13	13.4
	35-37	9	9.3
	≥ 38	18	18.6
	Total	97 ^b	100.0
Gender	Male	82	84.5
	Female	15	15.5
	Total	97 ^c	100.0
Ethnicity	White	69	71.9
	Hispanic	9	9.4
	African American	8	8.3
	Asian, Pacific Islander	5	5.2
	Other ^d	5	5.2
	Native American	0	0.0
	Total	96 ^e	100.0
Marital status	Married	60	61.9
	Single, Never Married	29	29.9
	Divorced	6	6.2
	Separated	1	1.0
	Other ^f	1	1.0
	Widowed	0	0.0
	Total	97 ^g	100.0

(Table 4.36 continued)

Characteristic	Category	<i>n</i>	%
Highest degree earned	Bachelor's Degree	65	67.0
	Master's Degree	31	32.0
	Associate Degree	1	1.0
	Doctoral Degree	0	0.0
	Other	0	0.0
	Total	97 ^h	100.0

Note. *n* = 98 usable instruments submitted and collected. The variance in sample size is due to subjects electing to not answer or overlooking personal demographic questions.

^a1 study participant did not respond to age, ^bThe age of 25 was mistakenly excluded from the primary instrument and was intended to be included in option 3, ^c1 study participant did not respond to gender, ^dOther ethnicity selections were not identified by participants, ^e2 study participants did not respond to ethnicity, ^fOther marital status selections not indicated by participants, ^g1 study participant did not respond to marital status, ^h1 study participant did not respond to highest degree earned.

Professional Demographics of Military Police Captain's Career Course Completers

When examining the MPCCC completers against their responses to professional demographics the commissioning sources selected identify ROTC (*n*=44, 45.8%) and OCS (*n*=40, 41.7%) as nearly equivalent. The student's selection of Army as their current military branch of service reflected 92.8% of the MPCCC sample population. In similar quantities, collected MP instruments specified the service status, active duty in 91.6% (*n*=87) of all subjects' data. Branch selections within the officers selected service remain predominantly Military Police (*n*=85, 90.4%) along with the rank of CPT (*n*=91, 92.9%) as the majority rank of surveyed MPCCC completers (see Table 4.37).

Table 4.37 Description of Army Officers who Completed the Military Police Captain's Career Course on Selected General Professional Demographics

Characteristic	Category	<i>n</i>	%
Source of commissioning	ROTC	44	45.8
	OCS	40	41.7
	Academy, non WP	6	6.3
	West Point	4	4.2
	Direct Commission	2	2.1
	Total	96 ^a	100.0

(Table 4.37 continued)

Characteristic	Category	<i>n</i>	%
Current branch of military service	Army	90	92.8
	Foreign Armed Service	4	4.1
	Marines	2	2.1
	Navy	1	1.0
	Air Force	0	0.0
	Total	97 ^b	100.0
Service Status	Active Duty	87	91.6
	Army National Guard	5	5.3
	Army Reserves	3	3.2
	Total	95 ^c	100.0
Branch within the subjects selected service	Military Police Corps	85	90.4
	Foreign Armed Service	2	2.1
	Armor	1	1.1
	Infantry	1	1.1
	Military Intelligence	1	1.1
	Ordinance Corps	1	1.1
	Signal Corps	1	1.1
	Transportation Corps	1	1.1
	Other ^d	1	1.1
	Adjutant General Corps	0	0.0
	Air Defense Artillery	0	0.0
	Aviation	0	0.0
	Chemical Corps	0	0.0
	Corps of Engineers	0	0.0
	Field Artillery	0	0.0
	Finance Corps	0	0.0
	Medical Service Corps	0	0.0
	Quartermaster Corps	0	0.0
	Total	94 ^e	100.0
Current Rank	1LT	0	0.0
	1LT (P)	4	4.1
	CPT	91	92.9
	CPT (P)	1	1.0
	MAJ	2	2.0
	Other	0	0.0
	Total	98	100.0

Note. *n* = 98 usable instruments completed and submitted. The variance in sample size is due to subjects electing to not answer or overlooking personal demographic questions.

^a2 study participants did not respond to source of commissioning, ^b1 study participant did not respond to current branch of military service, ^c3 study participants did not respond to current military service status, ^dNon traditional branch identified: PSYOPS (*n*=1), ^e4 study participants did not respond to branch within the U.S. Army.

Professional Assignments of Military Police Captain's Career Course Completers

In addition to investigating MPCCC professional demographics the subject areas surrounding professional assignments were also investigated. A large percentage of the MPCCC officers participating in the study indicated assignments in both platoon leader and executive officer positions with 72.6% ($n=69$) of all MPCCC respondents selecting service in one platoon leader assignment and 60.6% ($n=57$) indicating one executive officer position. Of the usable MPCCC sample, just less than one quarter, 23.5%, of the population identified serving in a company command assignment. Staff officer positions indicate AS3 assignments and None as the top two staff assignments held by MPCCC respondents. AS3 positions incorporated 51.1% ($n=47$) of the MP sampled population. None included a separate 22.8% ($n=21$) of the population (see Table 4.38).

Table 4.38 Description of Army Officers who Completed the Military Police Captain's Career Course on Selected Professional Assignment Demographics

Characteristic	Category	<i>n</i>	%	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Previous company command assignments	No	75	76.5		
	Yes	23	23.5		
	Total	98	100.0		
Number of platoon leader assignments	0	3	3.2		
	1	69	72.6		
	2	17	17.9		
	3	4	4.2		
	4	2	2.1		
	5	0	0.0		
	6	0	0.0		
	7	0	0.0		
	Total	95 ^a	100.0	2.29	.698
Number of executive officer assignments	0	28	29.8		
	1	57	60.6		
	2	7	7.4		
	3	2	2.1		
	Total	94 ^b	100.0	1.82	.655

(Table 4.38 continued)

Characteristic	Category	<i>n</i>	%	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Staff officer positions held ^c	AS3	47	51.1		
	None	21	22.8		
	Other ^d	15	16.3		
	S3	13	14.1		
	S4	9	9.8		
	S1	4	4.3		
	S2	4	4.3		
	AS2	3	3.3		
	AS4	2	2.2		
	S6	2	2.2		
	AS1	0	0.0		
	AS6	0	0.0		

Note. *n* = 98 usable instruments completed and submitted. The variance in sample size is due to subjects electing to not answer or overlooking personal demographic questions. With the variable “Staff officer positions held”, respondents were asked to check all that apply.

^a3 study participants did not respond to the number of platoon leader positions held, ^b4 study participants did not respond to the number of executive officer positions held, ^cDoes not total 100% since respondents were asked to mark all that apply. Personnel Officer (S1), Assistant Personnel Officer (AS1), Intelligence Officer (S2), Assistant Intelligence Officer (AS2), Operations Officer (S3), Assistant Operations Officer (AS3), Logistics Officer (S4) Assistant Logistic Officer (AS4), Signal Officer (S6), Assistant Signal Officer (AS6), ^dOther staff positions were not identified by the respondents.

Assignment Durations of Military Police Captain’s Career Course Completers

Similar to the other six surveyed MFE CCC’s, the subject of assignment durations was evaluated in conjunction with the previously identified professional assignments. While half of MPCCC subjects selected between 4-6 years of military service (*n*=41, 43.2%) the remaining years between 7-18 obtained an additional 49.4% of the category selections with approximately 10% representation in each year category. With 24 completers indicating company command assignments through selection of a period of time category, the total months served as a company commander remain relatively consistent across the sampled population. The category 19-24 months received the least selections from the 24 respondents (*n*=3, 12.5%). Months served as a staff officer, possessed a majority selection within the 7-12 month category with 25 responses (35.7%) (see Table 4.39).

Table 4.39 Description of Army Officers who Completed the Military Police Captain's Career Course on Selected Assignment Durations

Characteristic	Category	<i>n</i>	%
Total years of military service	1-3 Years	0	0.0
	4-6 Years	41	43.2
	7-9 Years	13	13.7
	10-12 Years	14	14.7
	13-15 Years	10	10.5
	16-18 Years	10	10.5
	19-21 Years	5	5.3
	> 21 Years	2	2.1
	Total	95 ^a	100.0
Months served as a company commander	≤ 6 Months	5	20.8
	7-12 Months	6	25.0
	13-18 Months	5	20.8
	19-24 Months	3	12.5
	≥ 25 Months	5	20.8
	Total	24 ^b	100.0
Months served as a staff officer	≤ 6 Months	8	11.4
	7-12 Months	25	35.7
	13-18 Months	15	21.4
	19-24 Months	10	14.3
	≥ 25 Months	12	17.1
	Total	70 ^c	100.0

Note. *n* = 98 usable instruments completed and submitted. The variance in sample size is due to subjects electing to not answer or overlooking personal demographic questions.

^a3 study participants did not respond to total years of military service, ^b74 officers indicated they not had previously held a command assignment, ^c28 officers indicated they had not previously held a staff position.

Deployment Statistics of Military Police Captain's Career Course Completers

Deployment statistics were another way from which each MFE CCC was examined.

MPCCC respondents who selected zero combat deployments totaled 13 or 14.0% of the sampled course population. Half of the respondents, 49.5%, did select one combat deployment inside the characteristic number of combat deployments. The second largest selected category was two combat deployments, with 28.0% (*n*=26). While a greater number of MPCCC respondents indicated deploying in support of OIF, OEF has the largest percentage of officers serving one deployment under that named operation (*n*=35, 39.3%). One officer (1.1%) did select 5

deployments in support of OIF. Total accumulated months deployed among MPCCC subjects ranged from 0 to ≥ 49 . The category 7-12 months received 41.9% ($n=39$) of all selections with 13-18 months receiving the second largest population, 16 respondents (17.2%) (see Table 4.40).

Table 4.40 Description of Army Officers who Completed the Military Police Captain's Career Course on Selected Deployment Statistics

Characteristic	Category	<i>n</i>	%	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Number of combat deployments	0	13	14.0	2.33	.889
	1	46	49.5		
	2	26	28.0		
	3	7	7.5		
	4	0	0.0		
	5	1	1.1		
	6	0	0.0		
	7	0	0.0		
	8	0	0.0		
	> 8	0	0.0		
	Total	93 ^a	100.0		
Deployments to Operation Iraqi Freedom	0	42	45.7	1.79	.920
	1	32	34.8		
	2	15	16.3		
	3	2	2.2		
	4	0	0.0		
	5	1	1.1		
	> 5	0	0.0		
	Total	92 ^b	100.0		
Deployments to Operation Enduring Freedom	0	49	55.1	1.51	.605
	1	35	39.3		
	2	5	5.6		
	3	0	0.0		
	4	0	0.0		
	5	0	0.0		
	> 5	0	0.0		
	Total	89 ^c	100.0		
Total months deployed in combat	0 Months	13	14.0		
	≤ 6 Months	3	3.2		
	7-12 Months	39	41.9		
	13-18 Months	16	17.2		
	19-24 Months	10	10.8		
	25-30 Months	9	9.7		
	31-36 Months	2	2.2		
	37-42 Months	0	0.0		
	43-48 Months	0	0.0		
	≥ 49 Months	1	1.1		

(Table 4.40 continued)

Characteristic	Category	<i>n</i>	%	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
	Total	93 ^d	100.0		

Note. *n* = 98 usable instruments completed and submitted. The variance in sample size is due to subjects electing to not answer or overlooking personal demographic questions.

^a5 study participants did not respond to the number of combat deployments served, ^bOf the 80 officers that indicated they had previously deployed 8 did not respond to deployments to OIF,

^cOf the 80 officers that indicated they had previously deployed 9 did not respond to deployments to OEF, ^d5 study participants did not respond to how many months they have been deployed.

Objective Two

The second objective of the study was to describe Company Grade Officers in the Army on their self-perceived ability to function as a successful company commander. This data was collected using the Leader Behavior Scale (LBS). Means and standard deviations were used to describe each of the 87 items in the scale. Computed sub-scale means and an overall mean score were used to describe the overall leader behavior of the officers as measured by the LBS and its designed sub-scales.

Ability to Function as a Successful Company Commander as Perceived by Company Grade Officers in the U.S. Army

The LBS was used in the study to measure the respondents' perception regarding their ability to function as a successful company commander. The LBS consists of 87 items to which participants were asked to respond on a seven point anchored scale with the following values: 1="Unacceptable", 2="Poor", 3="Fair", 4="Moderate", 5="Good", 6="Very Good", and 7="Excellent". The means and standard deviations were computed for each of the 87 items based on the usable data provided by the total group of study participants (*n*=844). To aid in reporting the item scores, the researcher developed an interpretive scale based on the response scale to help the reader to interpret the findings of the study. This interpretive scale included the following values and descriptors: 1.0 to 1.5, "Unacceptable"; 1.51 to 2.50, "Poor"; 2.51 to 3.50, "Fair"; 3.51 to 4.49, "Moderate"; 4.5 to 5.49, "Good"; 5.5 to 6.49, "Very Good"; and 6.5 to 7.0,

“Excellent”. The item that received the highest rating by the total group was “Demonstrating commitment to the Nation, U.S. Army, one’s unit and Soldiers” ($M=5.96$, $SD=1.000$). This item was in the interpretive category of “Very Good”. The item that received the lowest rating was “Anticipating people’s on-the-job needs” ($M=5.12$, $SD=1.002$). This item was in the interpretive category of “Good”. Overall, 52 items were in the “Very Good” category and 35 items were in the “Good” interpretive category (see Table 4.41).

Table 4.41 Ability to Function as a Successful Company Commander as Perceived by Company Grade Officers in the U.S. Army

Performance Statement	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Interpretation
Demonstrating commitment to the Nation, U.S. Army, one's unit, and Soldiers	5.96	1.000	Very Good
Setting a high ethical tone; demanding honest reporting	5.86	1.001	Very Good
Executing plans to accomplish the mission	5.84	.867	Very Good
Fostering team work, cohesion, cooperation, and loyalty	5.82	.923	Very Good
Keeping cool under pressure	5.79	.988	Very Good
Considering the big picture and impact on others when making decisions	5.76	.940	Very Good
Modeling sound values and behaviors	5.74	.974	Very Good
Modeling Army values consistently through actions, attitudes, and communications	5.74	.997	Very Good
Displaying confidence, self-control, composure, and positive attitude	5.74	1.021	Very Good
Being positive, encouraging, and realistically optimistic	5.74	1.096	Very Good
Making tough, sound decisions on time	5.73	.898	Very Good
Reinforcing verbal guidance through demonstration of own actions	5.73	.930	Very Good
Encouraging subordinates to accept responsibility	5.73	.950	Very Good
Encouraging open and candid communications	5.72	.943	Very Good
Maintaining mental and physical health and well-being	5.72	1.028	Very Good
Making a “good enough” decision now instead of a “best” decision too late	5.71	.854	Very Good
Seeing the big picture; providing context and perspective	5.71	.882	Very Good
Adapting quickly to new situations and requirements	5.71	.888	Very Good
Exemplifying warrior ethos	5.71	1.075	Very Good
Guiding successful operations	5.70	.860	Very Good

(Table 4.41 continued)

Performance Statement	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Interpretation
Setting and maintaining high expectations for individuals and teams	5.70	.907	Very Good
Developing effective plans to achieve unit missions	5.70	1.009	Very Good
Demonstrating good judgment when the situation is unclear	5.69	.857	Very Good
Focusing on the most important aspects of a problem	5.69	.872	Very Good
Building trust with those outside lines of authority	5.69	1.006	Very Good
Clearly explaining missions, standards, and priorities	5.67	.888	Very Good
Expressing and demonstrating care for people and their wellbeing	5.66	1.026	Very Good
Preparing self to lead	5.65	.974	Very Good
Considering long-term consequences of actions not just immediate consequences	5.65	1.030	Very Good
Encouraging fairness and inclusiveness	5.63	.984	Very Good
Establishing and communicating clear intent and purpose	5.61	.903	Very Good
Recognizing and rewarding good performance	5.61	.981	Very Good
Building team skills and processes	5.59	.951	Very Good
Demonstrating technical, technological, and tactical knowledge and skills	5.58	.957	Very Good
Maintaining and enforcing high professional standards	5.58	1.013	Very Good
Working effectively in situations with less-than-perfect information	5.57	.934	Very Good
Maintaining self-awareness and recognizing impact of self on others	5.57	.953	Very Good
Listening actively	5.57	.977	Very Good
Leading others to success	5.56	.929	Very Good
Expanding own conceptual and interpersonal capabilities	5.55	.954	Very Good
Expanding own knowledge of technical, technological, and tactical areas	5.54	.918	Very Good
Evaluating and incorporating personal feedback from others	5.54	.946	Very Good
Seeking and is open to diverse ideas and points of view	5.54	1.000	Very Good
Prioritizing, organizing, and coordinating tasks for teams or groups	5.53	.931	Very Good
Visualizing second and third order effects of decisions before they are made	5.53	1.040	Very Good
Building and supporting teamwork within staff and among units	5.52	.898	Very Good
Conveying the significance of the work	5.52	.916	Very Good

(Table 4.41 continued)

Performance Statement	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Interpretation
Making sound decisions without all of the facts	5.51	.920	Very Good
Conveying thoughts and ideas to ensure understanding	5.50	.946	Very Good
Creating alternate or contingency plans	5.50	.974	Very Good
Building and maintaining alliances	5.50	.994	Very Good
Extending influence beyond chain of command	5.50	1.051	Very Good
Seeking, recognizing, and taking advantage of opportunities to improve performance	5.49	.915	Good
Understanding the importance of conceptual thinking skills and modeling them to others	5.48	.894	Good
Facilitating ongoing development	5.48	.917	Good
Identifying and adjusting to external influences on the mission and organization	5.48	1.023	Good
Presenting recommendations so others understand advantages	5.47	.874	Good
Ensuring shared understanding	5.47	.899	Good
Balancing requirements of the mission with welfare of followers	5.47	.962	Good
Anticipating how different plans will look when executed	5.46	.910	Good
Identifying, contending for, allocating, and managing resources	5.46	.984	Good
Analyzing and organizing information to create knowledge	5.45	.952	Good
Coaching and giving useful feedback to subordinates	5.45	1.013	Good
Knowing how to delegate without "micromanaging"	5.45	1.022	Good
Employing engaging communication techniques	5.44	.965	Good
Coaching, counseling, and mentoring	5.44	1.081	Good
Negotiating to reach mutual understanding and to resolve conflict	5.41	1.007	Good
Fostering growth in others	5.39	.962	Good
Making feedback part of work processes	5.39	1.028	Good
Handling "bad news"	5.39	1.081	Good
Designating, clarifying, and de-conflicting roles	5.37	.917	Good
Creating a learning environment	5.35	.912	Good
Being sensitive to cultural factors in communication	5.35	1.145	Good
Identifying and accounting for individual and group capabilities and their commitment to task	5.34	.915	Good
Creating and sharing a vision of the future	5.33	1.024	Good

(Table 4.41 continued)

Performance Statement	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Interpretation
Setting high standards without a “zero defects” mentality	5.30	1.085	Good
Determining information sharing strategies	5.29	.948	Good
Shaping climate	5.29	.982	Good
Understanding sphere of influence, means of influence, and limits of influence	5.28	1.037	Good
Assessing developmental needs of subordinates	5.27	.939	Good
Removing work barriers	5.27	.942	Good
Fostering job development, job challenge, and job enrichment of others	5.25	.945	Good
Supporting institutional-based development of subordinates	5.25	.955	Good
Accepting reasonable setbacks and failures	5.24	1.087	Good
Maintaining relevant geo-political awareness	5.19	1.217	Good
Maintaining relevant cultural awareness	5.19	1.221	Good
Anticipating people's on-the-job needs	5.12	1.002	Good

Notes. The survey response scale: 1, Unacceptable; 2, Poor; 3, Fair; 4, Moderate; 5, Good; 6, Very Good; and 7, Excellent. The interpretive scale: 1.0 to 1.5, Unacceptable; 1.51 to 2.50, Poor; 2.51 to 3.50, Fair; 3.51 to 4.49, Moderate; 4.5 to 5.49, Good; 5.5 to 6.49, Very Good; and 6.5 to 7.0, Excellent.

Means of Items within the Established Eight Factored Sub-Scales

The LBS instrument was designed to measure eight sub-scales in addition to overall self-perceived ability: “Lead Others”, “Lead by Example”, “Create a Positive Environment”, “Communicate”, “Develop Leaders”, “Prepare Self to Lead”, “Get Results”, and “Extend Influence Beyond Chain of Command”. Since their design factors were structured into the instrument, the researcher organized the data so that the items contributing to each factor are grouped together and presented in Table 4.42, organized in this format. The same interpretive scale is used with the data in this Table.

Within the sub-scale “Lead Others”, the item, “Establishing and communicating clear intent and purpose” held the highest mean score of 5.61 ($SD=.903$) with an interpretation of “Very Good”. In this sub-scale, four items were classified as “Very Good” and two were classified as “Good”. The highest item mean in the “Lead by Example” sub-scale belonged to

“Demonstrating commitment to the Nation, U.S. Army and one’s unit and Soldiers” with a mean of 5.96 ($SD=1.000$) and interpretation of “Very Good”. Demonstrating commitment was also the highest item mean score of all 87 items. In this sub-scale, eight items were classified as “Very Good” and one was classified as “Good”. With a mean score of 5.82 ($SD=.923$) and interpretation of “Very Good”, “Fostering teamwork, cohesion, cooperation and loyalty” was the highest mean within the sub-scale “Create a Positive Environment”. In this sub-scale, six items were classified as “Very Good” and four were classified as “Good”. The sub-scale “Communicate”, possesses the item “Listening actively” as its highest mean with a score of 5.57 ($SD=.977$) and an interpretation of “Very Good”. In this sub-scale, two items were classified as “Very Good” and five were classified as “Good”. Building team skills and processes”, with a mean score of 5.59 ($SD=.951$) and an interpretation of “Very Good” is the highest mean within the sub-scale “Develop Leaders”. In this sub-scale, one item was classified as “Very Good” and six were classified as “Good”. In the sub-scale “Prepare Self to Lead” held its highest mean score of 5.72 ($SD=1.028$) within the item “Maintaining mental and physical health and well-being”. Its interpretation was categorized as “Very Good”. In this sub-scale, six items were classified as “Very Good” and three were classified as “Good”. In the sub-scale “Get Results”, “Executing plans to accomplish the mission” held the highest mean score of 5.84 ($SD=.867$) with an interpretation of “Very Good”. In the sub-scale, four items were classified as “Very Good” and seven were classified as “Good”. “Extend Influence Beyond Chain of Command” sub-scale obtained an interpretation of “Very Good” for the item “Building trust with those outside lines of authority”, with the highest mean score of 5.69 ($SD=1.006$). In this sub-scale, three items were classified as “Very Good” and two were classified as “Good” (see Table 4.42).

Table 4.42 Means of Variables Comprising each of the Established Eight Factored Sub-Scales

Sub-Scales	Items	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Interpretation
Lead Others	Establishing and communicating clear intent and purpose	5.61	.903	Very Good
	Maintaining and enforcing high professional standards	5.58	1.013	Very Good
	Leading others to success	5.56	.929	Very Good
	Conveying the significance of the work	5.52	.916	Very Good
	Balancing requirements of the mission with welfare of followers	5.47	.962	Good
	Creating and sharing a vision of the future	5.33	1.024	Good
Lead By Example	Demonstrating commitment to the Nation, U.S. Army, one's unit and Soldiers	5.96	1.00	Very Good
	Displaying confidence, self-control, composure, and positive attitude	5.74	1.021	Very Good
	Modeling Army values consistently through actions, attitudes, and communications	5.74	1.009	Very Good
	Modeling sound values and behaviors	5.74	.974	Very Good
	Reinforcing verbal guidance through demonstration of own actions	5.73	.930	Very Good
	Exemplifying warrior ethos	5.71	1.075	Very Good
	Demonstrating technical, technological, and tactical knowledge and skills	5.58	.957	Very Good
	Seeking and is open to diverse ideas and points of view	5.54	1.000	Very Good
	Understanding the importance of conceptual thinking skills and modeling them to others	5.48	.894	Good
Create a Positive Environment	Fostering team work, cohesion, cooperation and loyalty	5.82	.923	Very Good
	Encouraging subordinates to accept responsibility	5.73	.997	Very Good
	Encouraging open and candid communications	5.72	.943	Very Good

(Table 4.42 continued)

Sub-Scales	Items	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Interpretation
	Setting and maintaining high expectations for individuals and teams	5.70	.907	Very Good
	Expressing and demonstrating care for people and their wellbeing	5.66	1.026	Very Good
	Encouraging fairness and inclusiveness	5.63	.984	Very Good
	Creating a learning environment	5.35	.912	Good
	Shaping Climate	5.29	.982	Good
	Accepting reasonable setbacks and failures	5.24	1.087	Good
	Anticipating people's on-the-job needs	5.12	1.002	Good
Communicate	Listening actively	5.57	.977	Very Good
	Conveying thoughts and ideas to ensure understanding	5.50	.946	Very Good
	Ensuring shared understanding	5.47	.899	Good
	Presenting recommendations so others understand advantages	5.47	.874	Good
	Employing engaging communication techniques	5.44	.965	Good
	Being sensitive to cultural factors in communication	5.35	1.145	Good
	Determining information sharing strategies	5.29	.948	Good
Develop Leaders	Building team skills and processes	5.59	.951	Very Good
	Facilitating ongoing development	5.48	.917	Good
	Coaching, counseling, and mentoring	5.44	1.081	Good
	Fostering growth in others	5.39	.962	Good
	Assessing developmental needs of subordinates	5.27	.939	Good
	Fostering job development, job challenge, and job enrichment of others	5.25	.945	Good
	Supporting institutional-based development of subordinates	5.25	.955	Good
Prepare Self to Lead	Maintaining mental and physical health and well-being	5.72	1.028	Very Good
	Preparing self to lead	5.65	.974	Very Good
	Maintaining self-awareness and recognizing impact of self on others	5.57	.953	Very Good
	Expanding own conceptual and interpersonal capabilities	5.55	.954	Very Good

(Table 4.42 continued)

Sub-Scales	Items	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Interpretation
	Evaluating and incorporating personal feedback from others	5.54	.918	Very Good
	Expanding own knowledge of technical, technological and tactical areas	5.54	.946	Very Good
	Analyzing and organizing information to create knowledge	5.45	.952	Good
	Maintaining relevant cultural awareness	5.19	1.221	Good
	Maintaining relevant geo-political awareness	5.19	1.217	Good
Get Results	Executing plans to accomplish the mission	5.84	.897	Very Good
	Guiding successful operations	5.70		Very Good
	Recognizing and rewarding good performance	5.61	.981	Very Good
	Prioritizing, organizing, and coordinating task for teams or groups	5.53	.931	Very Good
	Seeking, recognizing, and taking advantage of opportunities to improve performance	5.49	.915	Good
	Identifying and adjusting to external influences on the mission and organization	5.48	1.023	Good
	Identifying, contending for, allocating, and managing resources	5.46	.984	Good
	Making feedback part of the work process	5.39	1.028	Good
	Designating, clarifying and de-conflicting roles	5.37	.917	Good
	Identifying and accounting for individual and group capabilities and their commitment to task	5.34	.915	Good
	Removing work barriers	5.27	.942	Good
Extend Influence Beyond Chain of Command	Building trust with those outside lines of authority	5.69	1.006	Very Good
	Building and maintaining alliances	5.50	.994	Very Good
	Extending influence beyond chain of command	5.50	1.051	Very Good
	Negotiating to reach mutual understanding and to resolve conflict	5.41	1.007	Good

(Table 4.42 continued)

Sub-Scales	Items	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Interpretation
	Understanding sphere of influence, means of influence, and limits of influence	5.28	1.037	Good

Notes. The survey response scale: 1, Unacceptable; 2, Poor; 3, Fair; 4, Moderate; 5, Good; 6, Very Good; and 7, Excellent. The interpretive scale: 1.0 to 1.5, Unacceptable; 1.51 to 2.50, Poor; 2.51 to 3.50, Fair; 3.51 to 4.49, Moderate; 4.5 to 5.49, Good; 5.5 to 6.49, Very Good; and 6.5 to 7.0, Excellent.

To verify that each of the eight defined factors is measuring a single construct and that all of the items in the factor are contributing to that construct, a factor analysis was conducted on each of the eight sub-scales. To determine the appropriate number of factors to extract in each of the factor analysis tests the scree plot technique was employed. Plotting the eigenvalues against the LBS' pre-established factors and identifying the most pronounced curvature in the scree plot graph was the technique utilized to build and evaluate the scree plot. The extraction method used was the Varimax rotation and Principal Component Analysis. Factor loadings for the eight analyses ranged from a high of .819 within the sub-scale "Extend Influence Beyond Chain of Command" to a low of .524 within the sub-scale, "Create a Positive Environment".

To determine the degree of correlation between the items in each factor, the Bartlett's test of Sphericity was used to determine the degree of deviation from normality by comparing provided samples. In order to determine the correctness of using a factor analysis with the items in each analysis, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) Measure of Sampling Adequacy was used. With a KMO score of .5 or higher, a factor analysis is considered appropriate (Hair, Anderson, Tatham & Black, 2006). The computed KMO statistic for all eight sub-scales ranged from .821 to .940 within the data, all of which meet the assumption for the use of factor analysis.

Factor Analysis for the Component Sub-Scale: “Lead Others”

When conducting the analysis on the sub-scale “Lead Others”, a single factor was extracted with loadings ranging from .760 to .697. Based on this factor analysis, a sub-scale score was computed which was the mean of the six items included in the sub-scale ($M=5.51$, $SD=.699$) (see Table 4.43).

Table 4.43 Factor Analysis for the Sub-Scale: Lead Others on the Self-Perceived Ability to Perform as a Company Commander

Factors	Component Matrix
Leading others to success	.760
Establishing and communicating clear intent and purpose	.735
Conveying the significance of the work	.731
Balancing requirements of the mission with welfare of followers	.730
Creating and sharing a vision of the future	.727
Maintaining and enforcing high professional standards	.697

Note. Eigenvalue 3.202, % of variance explained 53.365, Mean 5.51, Standard Deviation .699.

Factor Analysis for the Component Sub-Scale: “Lead by Example”

When examining the factor analysis for the sub-scale “Lead by Example”, one factor was extracted with loadings ranging from .809 to .588. Based on this factor analysis, a sub-scale score was computed which was the mean of the nine items included in the sub-scale ($M=5.69$, $SD=.696$) (see Table 4.44).

Table 4.44 Factor Analysis for the Sub-Scale: Lead by Example on the Self-Perceived Ability to Perform as a Company Commander

Factors	Component Matrix
Reinforcing verbal guidance through demonstration of own actions	.809
Modeling sound values and behaviors	.784
Exemplifying warrior ethos	.775
Modeling Army values consistently through actions, attitudes, and communications	.742
Demonstrating commitment to the Nation, U.S. Army, one’s unit and Soldiers	.718
Displaying confidence, self-control, composure, and positive attitude	.690

(Table 4.44 continued)

Factors	Component Matrix
Understanding the importance of conceptual thinking skills and modeling them to others	.654
Demonstrating technical, technological, and tactical knowledge and skills	.613
Seeking and is open to diverse ideas and points of view	.588

Note. Eigenvalue 4.562, % of variance explained 50.686, Mean 5.69, Standard Deviation .696.

Factor Analysis for the Component Sub-Scale: “Create a Positive Environment”

When reviewing the scree plot created with variables surrounding the sub-scale “Create a Positive Environment”, a single factor was extracted with loadings ranging from .764 to .524. Based on this factor analysis, a sub-scale score was computed which was the mean of the ten items included in the sub-scale ($M=5.53$, $SD=.668$) (see Table 4.45).

Table 4.45 Factor Analysis for the Sub-Scale: Create a Positive Environment on the Self-Perceived Ability to Perform as a Company Commander

Factors	Component Matrix
Shaping Climate	.764
Expressing and demonstrating care for people and their wellbeing	.742
Fostering team work, cohesion, cooperation and loyalty	.721
Anticipating people’s on-the-job needs	.714
Encouraging fairness and inclusiveness	.702
Setting and maintaining high expectations for individuals and teams	.696
Encouraging open and candid communications	.678
Creating a learning environment	.657
Encouraging subordinates to accept responsibility	.644
Accepting reasonable setbacks and failures	.524

Note. Eigenvalue 4.723, % of variance explained 57.233, Mean 5.53, Standard Deviation .668.

Factor Analysis for the Component Sub-Scale: “Communicate”

The scree plot technique utilized within the factor analysis of the sub-scale “Communicate”, extracted one factor with loadings ranging from .812 to .646. Based on this

factor analysis, a sub-scale score was computed which was the mean of the seven items included in the sub-scale ($M=5.44$, $SD=.711$) (see Table 4.46).

Table 4.46 Factor Analysis for the Sub-Scale: Communicate on the Self-Perceived Ability to Perform as a Company Commander

Factors	Component Matrix
Ensure shared understanding	.812
Employing engaging communication techniques	.799
Determining information sharing strategies	.764
Presenting recommendations so others understand advantages	.747
Listening actively	.711
Conveying thoughts and ideas to ensure understanding	.706
Being sensitive to cultural factors in communication	.646

Note. Eigenvalue 3.860, % of variance explained 55.138, Mean 5.44, Standard Deviation .711.

Factor Analysis for the Component Sub-Scale: “Develop Leaders”

Factor loadings within the sub-scale “Develop Leaders” ranged from .819 to .687. The scree plot technique, reviewed during the factor analysis of this sub-scale extracted, one factor. Based on this factor analysis, a sub-scale score was computed which was the mean of the seven items included in the sub-scale ($M=5.38$, $SD=.742$) (see Table 4.47).

Table 4.47 Factor Analysis for the Sub-Scale: Develop Leaders on the Self-Perceived Ability to Perform as a Company Commander

Factors	Component Matrix
Fostering job development, job challenge, and job enrichment of others	.819
Fostering growth in others	.802
Assessing developmental needs of subordinates	.794
Coaching, counseling, and mentoring	.783
Building team skills and processes	.778
Facilitating ongoing development	.713
Supporting institutional-based development of subordinates	.687

Note. Eigenvalue 4.142 % of variance explained 59.176, Mean 5.38, Standard Deviation .742.

Factor Analysis for the Component Sub-Scale: “Prepare Self to Lead”

Factor loadings within the sub-scale “Prepare Self to Lead” ranged from .755 to .593. The scree plot technique, reviewed during the factor analysis of this sub-scale extracted, one

factor. Based on this factor analysis, a sub-scale score was computed which was the mean of the nine items included in the sub-scale ($M=5.49$, $SD=.693$) (see Table 4.48).

Table 4.48 Factor Analysis for the Sub-Scale: Prepare Self to Lead on The Self-Perceived Ability to Perform as a Company Commander

Factors	Component Matrix
Preparing self to lead	.755
Maintaining self-awareness and recognizing impact of self on others	.744
Expanding own knowledge of technical, technological and tactical areas	.728
Expanding own conceptual and interpersonal capabilities	.722
Analyzing and organizing information to create knowledge	.688
Evaluating and incorporating personal feedback from others	.662
Maintaining relevant geo-political awareness	.658
Maintaining relevant cultural awareness	.611
Maintaining mental and physical health and well-being	.593

Note. Eigenvalue 4.246, % of variance explained 57.176, Mean 5.49, Standard Deviation .693.

Factor Analysis for the Component Sub-Scale: “Get Results”

Plotting the eigenvalues for the sub-scale “Get Results” identified one factor with loadings ranging from .767 to .638. Based on this factor analysis, a sub-scale score was computed which was the mean of the eleven items included in the sub-scale ($M=5.50$, $SD=.659$) (see Table 4.49).

Table 4.49 Factor Analysis for the Sub-Scale: Get Results on the Self-Perceived Ability to Perform as a Company Commander

Factors	Component Matrix
Guiding successful operations	.767
Prioritizing, organizing, and coordinating task for teams or groups	.741
Identifying and accounting for individual and group capabilities and their commitment to task	.738
Executing plans to accomplish the mission	.732
Designating, clarifying and de-conflicting roles	.721
Identifying, contending for, allocating, and managing resources	.699
Identifying and adjusting to external influences on the mission and organization	.698

(Table 4.49 continued)

Factors	Component Matrix
Seeking, recognizing, and taking advantage of opportunities to improve performance	.667
Making feedback part of the work process	.651
Removing work barriers	.645
Recognizing and rewarding good performance	.638

Note. Eigenvalue 5.406, % of variance explained 49.147, Mean 5.50, Standard Deviation .659.

Factor Analysis for the Component Sub-Scale: “Extend Influence Beyond Chain of Command”

To verify the construct of the LBS’ designed factor “Extend Influence Beyond Chain of Command”, the scree plot technique was employed. A single factor with loadings ranging from .820 to .696 was identified. Based on this factor analysis, a sub-scale score was computed which was the mean of the five items included in the sub-scale ($M=5.47$, $SD=.775$) (see Table 4.50).

Table 4.50 Factor Analysis for the Sub-Scale: Extend Influence Beyond Chain of Command on the Self-Perceived Ability to Perform as a Company Commander

Factors	Component Matrix
Extending influence beyond chain of command	.820
Building trust with those outside lines of authority	.802
Negotiating to reach mutual understanding and to resolve conflict	.755
Building and maintaining alliances	.728
Understanding sphere of influence, means of influence, and limits of influence	.696

Note. Eigenvalue 2.901, % of variance explained 58.017, Mean 5.47, Standard Deviation .775.

Descriptive Statistics for each of the Eight Sub-Scales

Sub-scale factor scores for each of the eight factors are displayed in Table 4.51 with a high mean of 5.69 for “Lead by Example” ($Min=2.33$, $Max=7.00$) and a low of 5.38 for “Develop Leaders” ($Min=2.14$, $Max=7.00$). Half of the sub-scales, “Lead by Example”, “Creates a Positive Environment”, “Lead Others” and “Get Results” received a descriptive category ranking of “Very Good” with the remaining four sub-scales, “Prepare Self to Lead”, “Extend

Influence Beyond Chain of Command”, “Communicate” and “Develop Leaders” each of which received a score of “Good”.

Table 4.51 Descriptive Statistics for Each of the Eight Factor Analyzed Sub-Scales

Sub-Scales	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>min</i>	<i>max</i>	Interpretation
Lead by Example	5.69	.696	2.33	7.00	Very Good
Create a Positive Environment	5.53	.668	1.90	7.00	Very Good
Lead Others	5.51	.699	2.17	7.00	Very Good
Get Results	5.50	.659	2.18	7.00	Very Good
Prepare Self to Lead	5.49	.693	2.00	7.00	Good
Extend Influence Beyond Chain of Command	5.47	.775	2.20	7.00	Good
Communicate	5.44	.711	2.14	7.00	Good
Develop Leaders	5.38	.742	2.14	7.00	Good

Notes. The survey response scale: 1, Unacceptable; 2, Poor; 3, Fair; 4, Moderate; 5, Good; 6, Very Good; and 7, Excellent. The interpretive scale: 1.0 to 1.5, Unacceptable; 1.51 to 2.50, Poor; 2.51 to 3.50, Fair; 3.51 to 4.49, Moderate; 4.5 to 5.49, Good; 5.5 to 6.49, Very Good; and 6.5 to 7.0, Excellent.

Objective Three

The third objective was to determine if a relationship exists between the respondents’ self-perceived ability to function as a successful company commander among Company Grade Officers in the Army and selected characteristics. The Pearson Product Moment Correlation was used to describe the association between the officers’ LBS sub-scale scores and the following variables: age, previous command years of experience, years of service, number of platoon leader assignments, number of executive officer assignments, number of staff assignments, number of months deployed to combat, and number of deployments in each operating environment. Point bi-serial correlations were used to describe the association between the officers’ LBS scores and gender. Spearman correlations were used to describe the association between the officers’ LBS scores and two variables, namely, rank and highest degree earned. Davis’s (1971) descriptors were used to describe the effect size of any statistically significant correlations.

“Lead Others” Sub-Scale with Personal and Professional Characteristics

When the relationship between the sub-scale “Lead Others” and selected personal and professional demographic characteristics were examined, one demographic characteristic was found to be significant. The variable “Total months deployed to combat” was found to be positively related to the “Lead Others” sub-scale ($r=.071$, $p=.044$); however, the correlation was described as “Negligible” (Davis, 1971). The nature of this association was such that individuals with a higher number of months deployed to combat tended to have higher ratings on the “Lead Others” sub-scale. No other variables were found to be significant within the sub-scale (see Table 4.52).

Table 4.52 Relationships between the Sub-Scale Lead Others and Selected Personal and Professional Characteristics Among CCC Completers.

Lead Others	r^a	p	n	Descriptors ^b
Total months served as a Commander	-.117	.135	165	Low
Total months deployed to combat	.071	.044	812	Negligible
Total number of combat deployments to OIF	.069	.050	802	Negligible
Age	.059	.087	829	Negligible
Total number of Executive Officer positions held	.045	.203	820	Negligible
Total number of Platoon Leader positions held	-.040	.251	822	Negligible
Total years of military service	.039	.265	824	Negligible
Total number of Staff positions held	.031	.375	814	Negligible
Total number of combat deployments to OEF	.000	.997	792	Negligible

Note. ^aPearson Product Moment Correlation, ^bDavis’ descriptors included: .01 to .09, Negligible association; .10 to .29, Low association; .30 to .49, Moderate association; .50 to .69, Substantial association; .70 and above, Very strong association.

“Lead by Example” Sub-Scale with Personal and Professional Characteristics

When the relationship between the sub-scale “Lead by Example” and selected personal and professional demographic characteristics were examined, one demographic characteristic was found to be significant. The variable “Total months deployed to combat” was found to be

positively related to the “Lead by Example” sub-scale ($r=.083$, $p=.018$); however, the correlation was described as “Negligible” (Davis, 1971). The nature of this association was such that individuals with a higher number of months deployed to combat tended to have higher ratings on the “Lead by Example” sub-scale. No other variables were found to be significant within the sub-scale (see Table 4.53).

Table 4.53 Relationships between the Sub-Scale Lead by Example and Personal and Professional Characteristics among CCC Completers

Lead by Example	r^a	p	n	Descriptors ^b
Total months served as a Commander	-.107	.172	165	Low
Total months deployed to combat	.083	.018	812	Negligible
Total number of combat deployments to OIF	.064	.071	802	Negligible
Total number of Executive Officer positions held	.043	.224	820	Negligible
Total number of Platoon Leader positions held	-.030	.398	822	Negligible
Total number of Staff positions held	.027	.449	814	Negligible
Total number of combat deployments to OEF	.010	.782	792	Negligible
Total years of military service	-.009	.792	824	Negligible
Age	-.008	.818	829	Negligible

Note. ^aPearson Product Moment Correlation, ^bDavis’ descriptors included: .01 to .09, Negligible association; .10 to .29, Low association; .30 to .49, Moderate association; .50 to .69, Substantial association; .70 and above, Very strong association.

“Create a Positive Environment” with Personal and Professional Characteristics

When the relationship between the sub-scale “Create a Positive Environment” and selected personal and professional demographic characteristics were examined, one demographic characteristic was found to be significant. The variable “Total number of combat deployments to OIF” was found to be positively related to the “Create a Positive Environment” sub-scale ($r=.074$, $p=.037$); however, the correlation was described as “Negligible” (Davis, 1971). The nature of this association was such that individuals with a higher number of combat tours in

support of OIF tended to have higher ratings on the “Create a Positive Environment” sub-scale.

No other variables were found to be significant within the sub-scale (see Table 4.54).

Table 4.54 Relationships between the Sub-Scale Create a Positive Environment and Personal and Professional Characteristics Among CCC Completers

Create a Positive Environment	r^a	p	n	Descriptors ^b
Total months served as a Commander	-.122	.117	165	Low
Total number of combat deployments to OIF	.074	.037	802	Negligible
Age	.068	.050	829	Negligible
Total years of military service	.058	.097	824	Negligible
Total number of combat deployments to OEF	-.053	.135	792	Negligible
Total months deployed to combat	.053	.129	812	Negligible
Total number of Platoon Leader positions held	-.028	.431	822	Negligible
Total number of Executive Officer positions held	.026	.455	820	Negligible
Total number of Staff positions held	.017	.625	814	Negligible

Note. ^aPearson Product Moment Correlation, ^bDavis’ descriptors included: .01 to .09, Negligible association; .10 to .29, Low association; .30 to .49, Moderate association; .50 to .69, Substantial association; .70 and above, Very strong association.

“Communicate” with Personal and Professional Characteristics

When the relationship between the sub-scale “Communicate” and selected personal and professional demographic characteristics were examined, no variables were found to be significant at the a priori alpha level of .050 (see Table 4.55).

Table 4.55 Relationships between the Sub-Scale Communicate and Personal and Professional Characteristics Among CCC Completers

Communicate	r^a	p	n	Descriptors ^b
Total months served as a Commander	-.064	.412	165	Negligible
Total number of Executive Officer positions held	.052	.138	820	Negligible
Total number of combat deployments to OIF	.042	.230	802	Negligible
Total months deployed to combat	.041	.241	812	Negligible
Age	.038	.279	829	Negligible
Total number of combat deployments to OEF	-.034	.343	792	Negligible

(Table 4.55 continued)

Communicate	r^a	p	n	Descriptors ^b
Total number of Platoon Leader positions held	-.031	.373	822	Negligible
Total number of Staff positions held	.019	.538	814	Negligible
Total years of military service	.014	.690	824	Negligible

Note. ^aPearson Product Moment Correlation, ^bDavis' descriptors included: .01 to .09, Negligible association; .10 to .29, Low association; .30 to .49, Moderate association; .50 to .69, Substantial association; .70 and above, Very strong association.

“Develop Leaders” with Personal and Professional Characteristics

When the relationship between the sub-scale “Develop Leaders” and selected personal and professional demographic characteristics were examined, four demographic characteristics were found to be significant. The variables “Age” ($r=.103$, $p=.003$), “Total years of military service” ($r=.092$, $p=.008$), “Total months deployed to combat” ($r=.087$, $p=.013$), and “Total number of combat deployments to OIF” ($r=.085$, $p=.017$) were found to be positively related to the “Develop Leaders” sub-scale. One of the variables “Age” was described as “Low”, the others were “Negligible” (Davis, 1971). The nature of these associations was such that individuals more senior in age, with greater years of military service, with greater months deployed to combat, and with higher number of combat tours in support of OIF tended to have higher ratings on the “Develop Leaders” sub-scale. No other variables were found to be significant within the sub-scale (see Table 4.56).

Table 4.56 Relationships between the Sub-Scale Develop Leaders and Personal and Professional Characteristics Among CCC Completers

Develop Leaders	r^a	p	n	Descriptors ^b
Age	.103	.003	829	Low
Total years of military service	.092	.008	824	Negligible
Total months deployed to combat	.087	.013	812	Negligible
Total number of combat deployments to OIF	.085	.017	802	Negligible
Total months served as a Commander	-.075	.341	165	Negligible
Total number of Platoon Leader positions held	.027	.444	822	Negligible

(Table 4.56 continued)

Develop Leaders	r^a	p	n	Descriptors ^b
Total number of Executive Officer positions held	.025	.474	820	Negligible
Total number of combat deployments to OEF	-.022	.541	792	Negligible
Total number of Staff positions held	.019	.548	814	Negligible

Note. ^aPearson Product Moment Correlation, ^bDavis' descriptors included: .01 to .09, Negligible association; .10 to .29, Low association; .30 to .49, Moderate association; .50 to .69, Substantial association; .70 and above, Very strong association.

“Prepare Self to Lead” with Personal and Professional Characteristics

When the relationships between the sub-scale “Prepare Self to Lead” and selected personal and professional demographic characteristics were examined, no variables were found to be significant at the a priori alpha level of .050 (see Table 4.57).

Table 4.57 Relationships between the Sub-Scale Prepare Self to Lead and Personal and Professional Characteristics Among CCC Completers

Prepare Self to Lead	r^a	p	n	Descriptors ^b
Total months served as a Commander	-.118	.131	165	Low
Total months deployed to combat	.049	.165	812	Negligible
Age	.045	.194	829	Negligible
Total number of Executive Officer positions held	.026	.449	820	Negligible
Total number of Staff positions held	.022	.533	814	Negligible
Total number of combat deployments to OIF	.020	.581	802	Negligible
Total number of Platoon Leader positions held	-.019	.578	822	Negligible
Total years of military service	.012	.733	824	Negligible
Total number of combat deployments to OEF	.009	.791	792	Negligible

Note. ^aPearson Product Moment Correlation, ^bDavis' descriptors included: .01 to .09, Negligible association; .10 to .29, Low association; .30 to .49, Moderate association; .50 to .69, Substantial association; .70 and above, Very strong association.

“Get Results” with Personal and Professional Characteristics

When the relationships between the sub-scale “Get Results” and selected personal and professional demographic characteristics were examined, two demographic characteristics were

found to be significant. The variables “Total months deployed to combat” ($r=.078, p=.027$), and “Total number of combat deployments to OIF” ($r=.072, p=.042$) were found to be positively related to the “Get Results” sub-scale. Both variables possessed a description of “Negligible” (Davis, 1971). The nature of this association was such that individuals with greater months deployed to combat and with higher number of combat tours in support of OIF tended to have higher ratings on the “Get Results” sub-scale. No other variables were found to be significant within the sub-scale (see Table 4.58).

Table 4.58 Relationships between the Sub-Scale Get Results and personal and professional characteristics among CCC completers

Get Results	r^a	p	n	Descriptors ^b
Total months served as a Commander	-.086	.273	165	Negligible
Total months deployed to combat	.078	.027	812	Negligible
Total number of combat deployments to OIF	.072	.042	802	Negligible
Total number of Executive Officer positions held	.050	.150	820	Negligible
Age	.034	.323	829	Negligible
Total number of Staff positions held	.032	.358	814	Negligible
Total years of military service	.028	.416	824	Negligible
Total number of Platoon Leader positions held	.009	.799	822	Negligible
Total number of combat deployments to OEF	.008	.813	792	Negligible

Note. ^aPearson Product Moment Correlation, ^bDavis’ descriptors included: .01 to .09, Negligible association; .10 to .29, Low association; .30 to .49, Moderate association; .50 to .69, Substantial association; .70 and above, Very strong association.

“Extend Influence Beyond Chain of Command” with Personal and Professional Characteristics

When the relationships between the sub-scale “Extend Influence Beyond Chain of Command” and selected personal and professional demographic characteristics were examined, no variables were found to be significant at the a priori alpha level of .050 (see Table 4.59).

Table 4.59 Relationships between the Sub-Scale Extend Influence Beyond Chain of Command and Personal and Professional Characteristics Among CCC Completers

Extend Influence Beyond Chain of Command	r^a	p	n	Descriptors ^b
Total months served as a Commander	-.094	.231	165	Negligible
Total number of Executive Officer positions held	.061	.082	820	Negligible
Total months deployed to combat	.061	.080	812	Negligible
Total number of combat deployments to OIF	.055	.118	802	Negligible
Age	.049	.157	829	Negligible
Total number of Staff positions held	.046	.193	814	Negligible
Total years of military service	.037	.285	824	Negligible
Total number of Platoon Leader positions held	.012	.735	822	Negligible
Total number of combat deployments to OEF	.000	1.000	792	Negligible

Note. ^aPearson Product Moment Correlation, ^bDavis' descriptors included: .01 to .09, Negligible association; .10 to .29, Low association; .30 to .49, Moderate association; .50 to .69, Substantial association; .70 and above, Very strong association.

Objective Four

The fourth objective was to determine if significant differences exist in self-perceived command ability (as measured by the LBS) by categories of the following independent variables: ethnicity, marital status, branch, highest degree earned, source of commissioning, current rank, and service status (Active Duty, Army Reserves or Army National Guard). When the data were examined for the variable "Service Status", the group Army Reserves included only six respondents; therefore, the number was not adequate to make meaningful comparisons on the variables being investigated. The researcher could either eliminate the group from the analyses or collapse the group into one of the other groups. The Army reserve group was judged by the researcher to be similar enough to justify combining it with the group Army National Guard (ARNG) group. Therefore, in the comparative analysis reported in Objective four, "Service Status" was defined as the two groups: Active Duty and Reserves/ARNG.

Similar processes were utilized when examining the variables “Highest Degree Earned”, “Marital Status”, and “Ethnicity”. The variable “Highest Degree Earned” possessed five categories: Associate Degree, Bachelor’s Degree, Master’s Degree, Doctoral Degree and Other. The category Associate Degree only included nine respondents. Because the number was not adequate to draw meaningful comparisons and the lack of similarity between the other categories, the researcher chose to eliminate the category from the analysis. However, the researcher judged the categories of Doctoral Degree, containing four responses and Other, containing one response (Juris Doctor) to be similar enough to justify combining with the category Master’s Degree. Therefore, in Objective four, “Highest Degree Earned” was defined as two groups: Bachelor’s Degree and Graduate Degree.

The variable “Marital Status” was also refined within the comparative analysis reported in Objective four. The categories Separated, with three respondents, Widowed, with one respondent and Other, with six respondents did not possess adequate numbers to make meaningful comparisons on the variables being investigated. Additionally, the researcher did not feel enough similarity existed between those categories from which a combination was justified. Such observations led the researcher to elect elimination of those categories, thus defining the variable “Marital Status” by the groups: Single, Never Married, Married, and Divorced.

When examining the variable “Ethnicity”, the category Native American included just one respondent; therefore, meaningful comparisons on the variables being investigated were not possible. The researcher chose to collapse the group into one of the other groups. The Native American group was judged by the researcher to be similar enough to justify combining it with the group Other. Therefore, in the comparative analysis reported in Objective four, “Ethnicity”

was defined as the five groups: White, African American, Hispanic, Asian/Pacific Islander and Other.

One way analysis of variance tests were used to determine if differences exist in the LBS sub-scale scores by the variables listed. In cases where the analysis of variance resulted in a significant *F* the Bonferroni's post hoc test was used to determine where the differences existed. Cohen's *f* was used to interpret the effect size of any statistically significant analyses of variance.

Comparison of Sub-scale “Lead Others” by Personal and Professional Demographics

When the sub-scale “Lead Others” was compared by categories of the selected characteristics only one demographic was found to have statistical significance among the groups. Responses to the “Lead Others” sub-scale was significantly different by categories within the variable “Service Status”. Active duty was then compared to the combination of those two components and significance was found. The “Service Status” value of Guard and Reserve had a higher mean perceived sub-scale score within the sub-scale “Lead Others” than the item Active Duty (see Table 4.60).

Table 4.60 Comparison of the Sub-Scale Lead Others by Selected Personal and Professional Demographics Among CCC Completers

Lead Others	F	df	<i>p</i>
Service Status	5.048	1,822	.025
Marital Status	.928	2,817	.396
Source of Commissioning	1.020	4,800	.396
Highest Degree Earned	.719	1,818	.397
Ethnicity	.661	4,819	.619
Branch	.795	9,808	.621
Current Rank	.409	2,819	.664

Table 4.61 Comparison of the Sub-Scale Lead Others by the Professional Demographic, Service Status Among CCC Completers

Lead Others – Service Status	df	Mean Square	F	p
Between Groups	1	2.446	5.048 ^a	.025
With Groups	822	.485		
Total	823			

Note. Post hoc tests were not performed for Lead Others because there are fewer than three groups.

^aGroup mean included Active Duty ($M=5.49$, $SD=.700$) and AR/ARNG ($M=5.73$, $SD=.630$).

Comparison of Sub-Scale “Lead by Example” by Personal and Professional Demographics

When mean scores within the sub-scale “Lead by Example” were compared by categories of the selected characteristics, no significant differences were found (see Table 4.62).

Table 4.62 Comparison of the Sub-Scale Lead by Example by Selected Personal and Professional Demographics Among CCC Completers

Lead by Example	F	df	p
Service Status	2.619	1,822	.106
Source of Commissioning	1.240	4,800	.292
Branch	.987	9,808	.449
Current Rank	.741	2,819	.477
Marital Status	.312	2,817	.732
Highest Degree Earned	.037	1,818	.848
Ethnicity	.110	4,819	.979

Comparison of Sub-Scale “Create a Positive Environment” by Personal and Professional Demographics

When mean scores within the sub-scale “Create a Positive Environment” were compared by categories of the selected characteristics, no significant differences were found (see Table 4.63).

Table 4.63 Comparison of the Sub-Scale Create a Positive Environment by Selected Personal and Professional Demographics Among CCC Completers

Create a Positive Environment	F	df	p
Highest Degree Earned	2.503	1,818	.114
Service Status	2.169	1,822	.141
Ethnicity	1.336	4,819	.255
Marital Status	1.362	2,817	.257
Current Rank	.952	2,819	.387

(Table 4.63 continued)

Create a Positive Environment	F	df	p
Branch	1.053	9,808	.396
Source of Commissioning	.713	4,800	.583

Comparison of Sub-Scale “Communicate” by Personal and Professional Demographics

When the sub-scale “Communicate” was compared by categories of selected characteristics only one demographic was found to possess statistically significant differences among the groups. Responses to the “Communicate” sub-scale were significantly different by categories within the variable “Highest Degree Earned”. Bachelor’s degree was then compared to the combination of the two combined components (Masters and Doctorate) and significance was found. The educational value of master degree or higher had a higher mean perceived sub-scale score within the sub-scale “Communicate” than the item Bachelor’s degree (see Table 4.64).

Table 4.64 Comparison of the Sub-Scale Communicate by Selected Personal and Professional Demographics Among CCC Completers

Communicate	F	df	p
Highest Degree Earned	4.079	1,818	.044
Service Status	2.839	1,822	.092
Branch	1.535	9,808	.131
Ethnicity	1.336	4,819	.255
Current Rank	1.020	2,819	.361
Marital Status	.560	2,817	.571
Source of Commissioning	.392	4,800	.814

Table 4.65 Comparison of the Sub-Scale Communicate by the Personal Demographic, Highest Degree Earned Among CCC Completers

Communicate – Highest Degree Earned	df	Mean Square	F	p
Between Groups	1	2.010	4.079 ^a	.044
With Groups	818	.493		
Total	819			

Note. Post hoc tests were not performed for Communicate because there are fewer than three groups.

^aGroup means included Bachelor’s Degree ($M=5.43$, $SD=.708$) and Graduate Degree ($M=5.57$, $SD=.659$).

Comparison of Sub-Scale “Develop Leaders” by Personal and Professional Demographics

When the sub-scale “Develop Leaders” was compared by categories of selected characteristics two demographics variables were found to have statistically significant differences among the groups. Responses to the “Develop Leaders” sub-scale were significantly different by categories within the variables “Marital Status” and “Ethnicity”. Within the variable “Marital Status”, the category Married was then compared to three categories: Single, Never Married and Divorced, finding significance. Results of Bonferroni’s post hoc test reveal that Single, never married and Married were different from Divorced but Single, never married and Married were not different from one another. Additionally, with the variable “Ethnicity”, the category White was then compared to the four categories: African American, Hispanic, Asian/Pacific Islander, and the two combined components within the category Other, where significance was found. When the Bonferroni post hoc test was run, the test revealed no two groups that were significant from each other (see Table 4.64).

Table 4.66 Comparison of the Sub-Scale Develop Leaders by Selected Personal and Professional Demographics Among CCC Completers

Develop Leaders	F	df	<i>p</i>
Marital Status	4.837	2,817	.008
Ethnicity	3.088	4,819	.015
Highest Degree Earned	3.867	1,818	.050
Branch	1.841	9,808	.058
Service Status	2.945	1,822	.087
Source of Commissioning	.630	4,800	.641
Current Rank	.151	2,819	.860

Table 4.67 Comparison of the Sub-Scale Develop Leaders by the Personal Demographic, Marital Status Among CCC Completers

Develop Leaders – Marital Status	df	Mean Square	F	<i>p</i>
Between Groups	2	2.615	4.837 ^a	.008 ^b
With Groups	817	.514		
Total	819			

(Table 4.67 continued)

Note. ^aGroup means included Single, never married ($M=5.32$, $SD=.773$) Married ($M=5.39$, $SD=.630$) and Divorced ($M=5.69$, $SD=.654$), ^bResults of Bonferroni's post hoc test reveal that Single, never married and married were different from divorced but Single, never married and married were not different from one another.

Table 4.68 Comparison of the Sub-Scale Develop Leaders by the Personal Demographic, Ethnicity Among CCC Completers

Develop Leaders – Ethnicity	df	Mean Square	F	<i>p</i>
Between Groups	4	1.675	3.088 ^a	.015 ^b
With Groups	819	.542		
Total	823			

Note. ^aGroup means included White ($M=5.33$, $SD=.752$), African American ($M=5.60$, $SD=.790$), Hispanic ($M=5.54$, $SD=.609$), Asian, Pacific Islander ($M=5.46$, $SD=.659$), and Other ($M=5.53$, $SD=.700$), ^bResults of Bonferroni's post hoc test reveal that no groups were different from one another.

Comparison of Sub-Scale “Prepare Self to Lead” by Personal and Professional Demographics

When the sub-scale “Prepare Self to Lead” was compared by categories of selected characteristics only one demographic was found to have statistically significant differences among the groups. Responses to the “Prepare Self to Lead” sub-scale were significantly different by categories within the variable “Highest Degree Earned”. Bachelor's degree was then compared to the combination of the two combined components and significance was found. The educational value of Master's degree or higher had a higher mean perceived sub-scale score within the sub-scale “Prepare Self to Lead” than the item Bachelor's degree (see Table 4.69).

Table 4.69 Comparison of the Sub-Scale Prepare Self to Lead by Selected Personal and Professional Demographics Among CCC Completers

Prepare Self to Lead	F	df	<i>p</i>
Highest Degree Earned	4.335	1,818	.038
Service Status	3.831	1,822	.051
Branch	1.534	9,808	.132
Marital Status	.886	2,817	.413
Ethnicity	.969	4,819	.423
Current Rank	.629	2,819	.533
Source of Commissioning	.209	4,800	.933

Table 4.70 Comparison of the Sub-Scale Prepare Self to Lead by the Personal Demographic, Highest Degree Earned among CCC completers

Prepare Self to Lead – Highest Degree Earned	df	Mean Square	F	<i>p</i>
Between Groups	1	2.019	4.335 ^a	.038
With Groups	818	.566		
Total	819			

Note. Post hoc tests were not performed for Prepare Self to Lead because there are fewer than three groups.

^aGroup means included Bachelor's Degree ($M=5.47$, $SD=.689$) and Graduate Degree ($M=5.62$, $SD=.639$).

Comparison of Sub-Scale “Get Results” by Personal and Professional Demographics

When mean scores within the sub-scale “Get Results” were compared by categories of the selected characteristics, no significant differences were found (see Table 4.71).

Table 4.71 Comparison of the Sub-Scale Get Results by Selected Personal and Professional Demographics Among CCC Completers

Get Results	F	df	<i>p</i>
Service Status	3.812	1,822	.051
Highest Degree Earned	.936	1,818	.334
Branch	.367	9,808	.367
Current Rank	.955	2,819	.385
Marital Status	.271	2,817	.763
Source of Commissioning	.138	4,800	.968
Ethnicity	.068	4,819	.992

Comparison of Sub-Scale “Extend Influence Beyond Chain of Command” by Personal and Professional Demographics

When mean scores within the sub-scale “Extend Influence Beyond Chain of Command” were compared by categories of the selected characteristics, no significant differences were found (see Table 4.72).

Table 4.72 Comparison of the Sub-Scale Extend Influence Beyond Chain of Command by Selected Personal and Professional Demographics Among CCC Completers

Extend Influence Beyond Chain of Command	F	df	<i>p</i>
Branch	1.838	9,808	.058
Ethnicity	1.935	4,819	.103
Highest Degree Earned	2.218	1,818	.137
Service Status	1.310	1,822	.253

(Table 4.72 continued)

Extend Influence Beyond Chain of Command	F	df	<i>p</i>
Current Rank	.973	2,819	.378
Marital Status	.617	2,817	.540
Source of Commissioning	.162	4,800	.958

Objective Five

The fifth objective was to determine if selected factors explain the variance in the officers self-perceived command ability. The factors that were used as the potential explanatory variables in this analysis are: age, gender, ethnicity, marital status, branch, highest degree earned, source of commissioning, current rank, previous command assignment, years of service, service status, number of platoon leader assignments, number of executive officer assignments, number of staff officer assignments, number of months deployed to combat, and number of deployments in each operating environment. Several independent variables, categorical in nature, were recoded as dichotomous by the researcher. Categories within selected characteristics were recoded to show 1.00 for a respondent selection of that category and a .00 for the respondent's lack of selection. The variable "Ethnicity" was originally coded as categorical, asking respondents to select 1=White, 2=African American, 3=Hispanic, 4=Asian, Pacific Islander, 5=Native American, and 6=Other. The variable was recoded into a dichotomous selection where the category "White" equates to 1.00 and non-selection of "White" equates to .00, "African American" equates to 1.00 and non-selection of "African American" equates to .00, "Hispanic" equates to 1.00 and non-selection of "Hispanic" equates to .00, and "Asian, Pacific Islander" equates to 1.00 and non-selection of "Asian, Pacific Islander" equates to .00. As discussed previously in Objective 4, the categories of "Native American" ($n=1$) and "Other" ($n=34$) were removed from the variable "Ethnicity" as those categories did not possess enough responses adequate for further inclusion in the modeling. The variables of "Ethnicity", "Marital Status",

“Branch”, “Highest Degree Earned”, “Source of Commissioning”, “Current Rank”, and “Service Status” were recoded as dichotomous. Once the coding was completed the variables were reloaded into the regression model. Because of the explanatory nature of this study, stepwise entry was the method for variable insertion into the regression model.

The dependent variable “Self-perceived command ability” was the summation of the eight sub-scale scores (“Lead by Example”, “Create a Positive Environment”, “Lead Others”, “Get Results”, “Prepare Self to Lead”, “Extend Influence Beyond Chain of Command”, “Communicate”, and “Develop Leaders”) presented in Objective two. The minimal acceptance requirement for the inclusion of a variable was for that item to explain more than one percent of the variance. The initial step within the regression modeling was that of bivariate correlation. None of the variables addressed above possessed significance less than .05, resulting in zero statistical significance. Further examination of the regression data described above by the researcher, found zero regression models. Furthermore, no R^2 values within the analysis exceeded .076.

Hypothesis

The hypothesis for the study asserts that Company Grade Officers in the Army who have held a command position prior to completion of an MFE CCC will have higher self-perceived abilities to function as a successful company commander than those who have not held a command position. To address this hypothesis, nine inferential *t*-tests were conducted with the LBS sub-scale scores and overall score as the dependent variables and “Previous company command assignments” as the independent variable. No *t* values of significance existed. The hypotheses could not be confirmed (see Table 4.73).

Table 4.73 Inferential *T*-Test Comparing LBS Scores and Officers “Previous Company Command Assignments”

Sub-Scales	Held a Previous Command			
	Yes	No	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>
Lead by Example	5.65 (.764)	5.70 (.678)	-.939	824
Create a Positive Environment	5.54 (.747)	5.52 (.646)	.238	824
Lead Others	5.50 (.759)	5.51 (.682)	-.138	824
Get Results	5.49 (.721)	5.50 (.643)	-.133	824
Prepare Self to Lead	5.46 (.744)	5.50 (.680)	-.589	824
Extend Influence Beyond Chain of Command	5.40 (.824)	5.49 (.762)	-1.278	824
Communicate	5.46 (.808)	5.44 (.687)	.274	824
Develop Leaders	5.40 (.792)	5.37 (.728)	.393	824
Command	43.89 (5.785)	44.03 (5.009)	-.308	824

Note. Standard Deviations appear in parentheses below the means

CHAPTER 5: SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATION

Summary

Objectives

The primary purpose of this study was to determine if a relationship exists between demographics of U.S. Army Company Grade Officers that have completed the U.S Army's Captains Career Courses in Maneuver, Fires and Effects and their self-perceived capacity to perform as a successful Company Commander. The objectives are as follows:

1. Describe Company Grade Officers in the U.S. Army who have completed a Captains Career Course under the directorate of Maneuver, Fires and Effects (Air Defense Artillery, Aviation, Chemical Biological Radiological and Nuclear (CBRN), Engineer, Field Artillery, Maneuver (Infantry and Armor) and Military Police) on the following personal and professional characteristics:
 - age,
 - gender,
 - ethnicity,
 - marital status,
 - branch,
 - highest degree earned,
 - source of commissioning,
 - current rank,
 - previous command years of experience,
 - years of service,
 - service status (Active Duty, Army Reserves or Army National Guard),

- number of platoon leader assignments,
 - number of executive officer assignments,
 - number of staff officer assignments,
 - number of months deployed to combat, and
 - number of deployments in each operating environment.
2. Describe Company Grade Officers in the Army on their self-perceived ability to function as a successful company commander.
 3. Determine if a significant relationship exists between the respondents' self-perceived ability to function as a successful company commander among Company Grade Officers in the Army and selected characteristics: age, gender, ethnicity, number of months deployed to combat, and number of deployments in each operating environment.
 4. Determine if significant differences exist in self-perceived ability as measured by the Leader Behavior Scale (LBS) selected by the following independent variables: ethnicity, marital status, branch, highest degree earned, source of commissioning, current rank, and service status (Active Duty, Army Reserves or Army National Guard).
 - Do selected factors explain the variance in the officers self-perceived command ability? The factors that were used as the explanatory variables in this analysis were: age, gender, ethnicity, marital status, branch, highest degree earned, source of commissioning, current rank, previous command years of experience, years of service, service status (Active Duty, Army Reserves or Army National Guard), number of platoon leader assignments, number of executive officer assignments, number of staff officer assignments, number of months deployed to combat, and number of deployments in each operating environment.

5. Determine if selected factors explain the variance in the officers self-perceived command ability. The factors that were used as the potential explanatory variables in this analysis were: age, gender, ethnicity, marital status, branch, highest degree earned, source of commissioning, current rank, previous command years of experience, years of service, service status (Active Duty, Army Reserves or Army National Guard), number of platoon leader assignments, number of executive officer assignments, number of staff officer assignments, number of months deployed to combat, and number of deployments in each operating environment.

Based on previous research and logical argument that officers who have served as successful company commanders will be more accepting of the education to be gained from the CCC because of an understood necessity for the education and training versus those officers who have no command experience and feel the CCC is just another course is a series of mandatory instruction, the following hypothesis is proposed:

1. Company Grade Officers in the U.S. Army who have held a command position prior to completion of the Air Defense Artillery, Engineer, Maneuver and Military Police Captain Career Course will have higher self-perceived abilities to function as a successful company commander than those who have not held a command position.

Summary of Methodology

Population and Sample

The target population for this study was defined as company grade officers in the Army who have successfully completed the Captains Career Course (CCC) in the arena of Maneuver, Fires and Effects (MFE). The researcher's accessible population was the officers in all seven MFE CCC CoE's (Ary, Jacobs, & Sorensen, 2010). While this study was being conducted, the branch management categories within the Army's Human Resources Command realigned and

MFE was retitled Operations Division (OD). The two remaining branch categories were also retitled, Operations Support Division (OSD) and Force Sustainment Division (FSD) (Human Resources Command, 2015). Eight of the sixteen primary branches accessible to officers upon commission fall under OD; Maneuver (Infantry, Aviation and Armor); Maneuver Support (Engineer, Military Police and Chemical); and Fires (Field Artillery and Air Defense Artillery). Two independent courses were selected within each of the seven OD CCC schools for a total of 14 courses. The researcher surveyed the following OD CCC's:

1. Air Defense Artillery Captains Career Course
2. Aviation Captains Career Course
3. Chemical Captains Career Course
4. Engineer Captains Career Course
5. Field Artillery Captains Career Course
6. Maneuver Captains Career Course (Armor and Infantry)
7. Military Police Captains Career Course

The frame of the class surveyed consisted of all officers completing each of the 14 courses, who were in attendance at the time of survey and who are still within good academic standing. Officers included in the study from each course fluctuated between 40 and 200. The variance in class sizes is CoE specific. The total number of officers in the fourteen courses in the research frame was 903 with 844 usable surveys.

Instrumentation

The instrument used in the study was The Competency Based Leadership Model (CBLM), which was designed to measure the eight leadership competencies as doctrinally

described in Field Manual (FM) 6-22 (HQDA, 2006). The second instrument was a researcher-designed instrument used to collect personal and professional demographic data.

The survey instrument was organized in two sections. Part one consisted of the 87 items within the CBLM called the Leader Behavior Scale (LBS) (Appendix B). The officers considered their self-perceived command abilities and rated their self-perceived performance on a seven-point anchored scale that ranges from “unacceptable” to “excellent”. In this study, the officers in the research sample used this instrument to self-assess their perceived performance. Based upon Horey et al.’s (2007) research results, the CBLM’s reliability ratings ranged from .85-.96. Criterion-related validity varied from a .40-.45 with supervisory ratings. This study’s reliability ratings ranged from .82-.90.

Part two of the instrument consisted of a researcher constructed personal and professional characteristic data template. The 21 variables were: age, gender, nationality, marital status, branch, highest degree earned, source of commissioning, current rank, previous command years of experience, years of service, service status (Active Duty, Army Reserves or Army National Guard), number of platoon leader assignments, number of executive officer assignments, staff officer assignments, number of months deployed to combat, and number of deployments in each operating environment.

During the time this study was conducted, foundational Army doctrine was reworked and republished as “Doctrine 2015”, consisting of Army Doctrine Publications (ADP) and Army Doctrine Reference Publications (ADRP) as the cornerstones (Mission Command Center of Excellence, 2011). The new Leadership ADP, formerly known as FM 6-22 has further defined the previous eight competencies into six attributes and 23 competencies (HQDA, 2012)

Data Collection

The researcher contacted each OD CCC commander to establish a time and date to distribute the LBS. The surveyed population consisted of the total officers enrolled in each of the two courses within each of the seven OD CCC who are within the last days of the course curriculum.

Data collection took place face-to-face between September 2011, and September 2013. All officers had completed the OD CCC's curriculum at the time of data collection or had accumulated enough course credit to graduate from the course. The researcher distributed the instruments to the officers attending the CCC during an assembly when the entire class was present. The researcher provided all copies of the instrument, supplies for completing the instrument and all instructions for completing the research instrument prior to administering. After completing the instrument, the officers placed their completed documents inside an empty box for transport and data analysis. The respondents remained anonymous.

Summary of Findings

Objective One

The first objective described company grade officers in the Army who have completed the OD CCC's on selected personal and professional characteristics. The majority of the 844 usable respondents were white ($n=611$, 74.2%), married ($n=514$, 61.9%), males ($n=772$, 93.0%) in the rank of CPT ($n=762$, 91.9%) serving in the active duty ($n=778$, 94.4%) Army ($n=774$, 93.3%) who earned a bachelor's degree ($n=708$, 85.4%). Most officers' commissioned into the Army from ROTC ($n=343$, 42.4%) with the majority of branches received being a combination of IN ($n=171$, 20.9%), FA ($n=118$, 14.4%) and EN ($n=112$, 13.7%). The majority of completers had currently served between 4-6 years ($n=435$, 52.8%) in the Army and had never held a

company command assignment ($n=670$, 81.1%). However, the majority of completers had served at least one platoon leader ($n=454$, 55.2%) and one executive officer ($n=491$, 59.9%) position. Most respondents indicated professional staff assignments serving as an AS3 ($n=405$, 49.8%) for periods of time ≤ 6 months through 12 months ($n=309$, 51.9%). Regarding the completers deployment statistics, the majority of officers served at least one combat deployment ($n=424$, 51.8%) with 7-12 total months deployed ($n=350$, 43.1%) being what most officers specified as their cumulative deployed experience. AVCCC and MPCCC were tied for the largest population of female completers of all surveyed OD CCC's classes ($n=15$).

When examining ethnicity across all OD CCC's, "white" ($n=611$, 74.2%) represents the majority of respondent selections with the ADACCC being the most ethnically diverse with only 47.9% ($n=34$) of the respondents selecting "white" as opposed to 83.3% ($n=243$) of MCCC completers. When evaluating the respondents highest academic achievement as defined by ones degree the AVCCC had the lowest percentage, 4.9% ($n=5$) of officers who had attained a degree beyond the level of bachelor's. In contrast, the MPCCC possessed a completer average of 32.0% ($n=31$) for degrees earned beyond that of bachelor's. Of note were the three (1.0%) respondents from the MCCC who described themselves as having completed a doctoral degree. Of the total OD CCC population, 49.0% ($n=401$) is comprised of three branches, IN ($n=171$, 20.9%), FA ($n=118$, 14.4%), and EN ($n=112$, 13.7%) with an additional 12 branches consuming the remaining 51.0% ($n=443$) of the population and three branches not selected by a single respondent with a usable instrument (Adjutant General Corps, Finance Corps, and Medical Service Corps).

The majority of officers completing the OD CCC held the rank of CPT ($n=776$, 93.6%) with seven respondents selecting the rank of "Other". Surprising to the researcher was the

identification that five of the seven “Other” selections identified themselves as Warrant Officers 3’s in the remarks section and that all seven responses came from complete ADACCC instruments. Additionally, of the officers eligible for command within the study’s population, 18.9% ($n=156$) had previously served in a command assignment before completing the CCC. Of those 156 positive respondents, the ENCCC possessed the most officers with a previous command assignment ($n=35$, 31.5%). The FACCC possessed the smallest population of officers who had previously held a command assignment ($n=8$, 6.9%).

When examining deployment statistics of the CCC completers, the data shows 9% ($n=74$) of officer respondents had never participated in a combat deployment as opposed to the majority of respondents who described serving on one deployment ($n=424$, 51.8%). ADACCC completers had the largest non-deployed population of all OD CCC’s with 27.5% ($n=19$) identified as never having deployed. The MPCCC is the next closest non-deployed population but by a margin of 13.5% ($n=13$, 14.0%). The ENCCC data describes their officers as having the least amount of non-deployers within the two classes with 4.6% ($n=5$) indicating having never deployed to combat. Of the single deployment majority, the CBRNCCC completers held the highest single deployment class percentage with 67.5% ($n=27$). The MCCC is second in single deployment statistics, with 55.0% indicating one deployment ($n=160$). The MCCC is also the largest collected usable responses of the study.

Objective Two

The second objective of this study was to describe company grade officers in the Army on their self-perceived ability to function as a successful company commander. Of the 87 item LBS instrument, the item that received the highest rating from all completers was “Demonstrating commitment to the Nation, U.S. Army, one’s unit and Soldiers” ($M=5.96$, $SD=1.000$). This item was in the interpretive category of “Very Good”. The item that received

the lowest rating was “Anticipating people’s on-the-job needs” ($M=5.12$, $SD=1.002$). This item was in the interpretive category of “Good”. Overall, 52 items were identified to be within the researchers interpretive scale category as “Very Good” and 35 items were in the “Good” interpretive category.

The 87 items previously identified and placed into an existing eight factored sub-scales matrix possessed the following mean scores. Within the sub-scale “Lead Others”, the item, “Establishing and communicating clear intent and purpose” held the highest mean score of 5.61 ($SD=.903$) with an interpretation of “Very Good”. “Lead by Example’s” highest item mean belonged to “Demonstrating commitment to the Nation, U.S. Army and one’s unit and Soldiers” with a mean of 5.96 ($SD=1.000$) and interpretation of “Very Good”. Demonstrating commitment was also the highest item mean score of all 87 items. With a mean score of 5.82 ($SD=.923$) and interpretation of “Very Good”, “Fostering teamwork, cohesion, cooperation and loyalty” was the strongest mean within the sub-scale “Create a Positive Environment”. The sub-scale “Communicate”, possesses the item “Listening actively” as its strongest mean with a score of 5.57 ($SD=.977$) and an interpretation of “Very Good”. “Building team skills and processes”, with a mean score of 5.59 ($SD=.951$) and an interpretation of “Very Good” is the highest mean within the sub-scale “Develop Leaders”. The factor “Prepare Self to Lead” held its highest mean score of 5.72 ($SD=1.028$) within the item “Maintaining mental and physical health and well-being”. Its interpretation was categorized as “Very Good”. Inside the sub-scale “Get Results”, “Executing plans to accomplish the mission” held the highest mean score, 5.84 ($SD=.867$) with an interpretation of “Very Good”. “Extend Influence Beyond Chain of Command” sub-scale obtained an interpretation of “Very Good” from the item “Building trust with those outside lines of authority”, with the highest mean score of 5.69 ($SD=1.006$).

During validity confirmation of the eight pre-established sub-scales, a factor analysis was conducted. Verification that no additional underlying constructs existed was also accomplished. Factor loadings for the eight analyses ranged from a high of .819 within the sub-scale “Extend Influence Beyond Chain of Command” to a low of .524 within the sub-scale, “Create a Positive Environment”. When describing each sub-scale the highest mean described was 5.69 by sub-scale “Lead by Example” ($Min=2.33$, $Max=7.00$) and the lowest mean of 5.38 by “Develop Leaders” ($Min=2.14$, $Max=7.00$).

Objective Three

The third objective was to determine if a significant relationship exists between the respondents’ self-perceived ability to function as a successful company commander among Company Grade Officers in the Army and selected characteristics.

When the relationship between the sub-scales “Communicate”, “Prepare Self to Lead”, and “Extend Influence Beyond Chain of Command”, and selected personal and professional demographic characteristics were examined, no variables were found to be significant, having a p value less than .050.

The sub-scale “Lead Others” possessed one demographic characteristic found to be significant. The variable “Total months deployed to combat” was found to be positively related ($r=.071$, $p=.044$) with a descriptor of “Negligible” (Davis, 1971). The nature of this association was such that individuals with higher number of months deployed to combat tended to have higher ratings on the “Lead Others” sub-scale. The sub-scale “Lead by Example” contained one demographic characteristic of significance. The variable “Total months deployed to combat” was found to be positively related ($r=.083$, $p=.018$) with a descriptor of “Negligible” (Davis, 1971). The nature of this association was such that individuals with higher number of months deployed to combat tended to have higher ratings on the “Lead by Example” sub-scale. The sub-

scale “Create a Positive Environment” found one demographic characteristic to be significant. The variable “Total number of combat deployments to OIF” was found to be positively related ($r=.074, p=.037$) with a descriptor of “Negligible” (Davis, 1971). The nature of this association was such that individuals with higher number of combat tours in support of OIF tended to have higher ratings on the “Create a Positive Environment” sub-scale. The sub-scale “Get Results” possessed two demographic characteristics of significance. The variables “Total months deployed to combat” ($r=.078, p=.027$), and “Total number of combat deployments to OIF” ($r=.072, p=.042$) were found to be positively related. Both variables possessed a description of “Negligible” (Davis, 1971). The nature of this association was such that individuals with greater months deployed to combat and with higher number of combat tours in support of OIF tended to have higher ratings on the “Get Results” sub-scale.

Objective Four

The fourth objective was to determine if significant differences existed in self-perceived command abilities (as measured by the LBS) by categories of the following independent variables: ethnicity, marital status, branch, highest degree earned, source of commissioning, current rank, and service status (Active Duty, Army Reserves or Army National Guard).

No significance was found within the following sub-scales when mean scores were compared: “Lead by Example”, “Create a Positive Environment”, “Get Results”, and “Extend Influence Beyond Chain of Command”.

When the sub-scale “Lead Others” was compared, one demographic (Service Status) was found to have statistical significance among the groups. Significance was found when Active duty was then compared to the combination of those two components. When the sub-scale “Communicate” was compared, one demographic (Highest Degree Earned) was found to have statically significant differences among the groups. The selection Bachelor’s degree was then

compared to the combination of the two combined components and significance was found. When the sub-scale “Develop Leaders” was compared, two demographics variables (Marital Status and Ethnicity) were found to have statistically significant differences among the groups. Within the variable Marital Status, the category Married was then compared to the three other categories: Single, Never Married and Divorced, finding significance. Additionally, with the variable Ethnicity, the category White was then compared to the four other categories: African American, Hispanic, Asian/Pacific Islander, and the two combined components within the category Other, where significance was found. When the sub-scale “Prepare Self to Lead” was compared, one demographic (Highest Degree Earned) was found to have statically significance. Bachelor’s degree was then compared to the combination of the two combined components where significance was found.

Objective Five

The fifth objective was to determine if selected factors explain the variance in the officers self-perceived command ability. The minimal acceptance requirement for the inclusion of a variable into the regression analysis was for a singular item to explain more than one percent of the variance. Examination of the regression data found zero regression models or no items explaining a minimum of one percent of the variance. Furthermore, no R^2 values within the analysis exceeded .076. Furthermore, none of the variables addressed above possessed significance less than .05, resulting in zero statistical significance found.

Hypothesis

The hypothesis for the study asserted that Company Grade Officers in the Army who have held a command position prior to completion of an OD CCC would have higher self-perceived abilities to function as a successful company commander than those who have not held

a command position. No *t*-values of significance were identified thus the hypothesis could not be confirmed.

Conclusions

The researcher has drawn the following conclusions from the collected data and previously described objectives:

Conclusion One

No variable was identified that explained the variability in self-perceived ability to command among military officers completing one of the seven OD CCC's.

This conclusion is based on the findings from the study that no statistically significant regression model was found that explained at least one percent of the variance in self-perceived ability to command. The variables examined in this analysis included characteristics such as age, gender, ethnicity, marital status, branch, highest degree earned, source of commissioning, current rank, previous command assignment, years of service, service status, number of platoon leader assignments, number of executive officer assignments, number of staff officer assignments, number of months deployed to combat, and number of deployments in each operating environment.

This conclusion is further supported by the lack of statistical significance among the bivariate data within objectives three and four. When examining each of the eight LBS sub-scales against personal and professional demographics of OD CCC completers', three sub-scales were found to contain only a single variable of significance that was accompanied by a "Negligible" descriptor (Davis, 1971). Three additional sub-scales found zero variables of significance. Only the sub-scale "Develop Leaders" possessed four variables of significance: "Age" ($r=.103, p=.003$), "Total years of military service" ($r=.092, p=.008$), "Total months deployed to combat" ($r=.087, p=.013$), and "Total number of combat deployments to OIF"

($r=.085$, $p=.017$). Of these variables, “Age” owned the highest descriptor rating of “Low” (Davis, 1971). Examination using one-way analysis of variance (one-way ANOVA) found a similar lack of significance amongst the sub-scales. Four sub-scales were found to have no significance while three sub-scales possessed just one item. Again, the sub-scale “Develop Leaders” contained the largest population of significant variables with two.

Implications that arise from the lack of statistical significance within the examined data are: completer’s possessing an above neutral self-perception of command abilities and no statistical significance found within the collected personal and professional variables, the researcher submits that other variables, not included within this study, and not necessarily, personal or professional demographic (family or educational) in nature, may possess significance in the determination of a completer’s self-perceived command ability. Overall, OD CCC completer’s within this surveyed population possess a “Very Good” degree of self-perceived command ability, influenced by elements possibly both within and external to military service. The possibility does exist that these officers possess an elevated self-perception, one not simply related to command. Such a self-perception could then have begun prior to the officer’s oath of commissioning and federal service and the actions within the Army only reinforce or perpetuate such perceptions. The influence of an individual’s past experiences, both professional, in the form of OER’s counseling and training, or personal in nature, such as family demographics, types of educational institutions attended and extracurricular activities engaged in may contain merit for additional research. Moreover, it is worth consideration that there are specific personality traits that draw individuals to federal service. The Pew Research Center, in a study of post 9/11 military and civilian gap in service found that half of one percent of today’s American society has or is serving in the military (2011). Furthermore, when looking at the lack

of statistical significance, a correlation could exist between a specific individual's predisposed self-perception and those individuals drawn to volunteer for service in the Army.

Based on the lack of discovered statistical significance, the researcher recommends further research. The two remaining branch categories, OSD and FSD, each with branch CCC's within their own CoE's have yet to be studied in this manner. Initial research into both OSD and FSD would provide a complete baseline of all CCC completers and their self-perceived command abilities, verifying whether or not the OD CCC was not an anomaly.

Next, it is the researcher's recommendation that a study of the OERs received by officers that are enrolled in OD CCC are evaluated against a pre-established or researcher designed set of criteria to see if self-perceived ability scores correlate with their overall evaluation scores. Difficulties might arise with regard to the basic act of access to OER's of those specific officers enrolled within one of the OD CCC's or simply OER's in general. Next, the OER format and evaluation requirements for both raters and senior raters were restructured as recently as 2014 (HQDA, 2014b). The previous version of the OER asked for senior raters to evaluate an officer on their potential. With that in mind they were asked to check an evaluation box that enumerated that officer as "Above Center Mass" limited to the top 49% of officers of the same grade within that senior rater's profile, "Center of Mass", "Below Center of Mass – Retain", and "Below Center of Mass – Do Not Retain" encompassing the remaining 51% (HQDA, 2014b). There was no requirement for percentage management of the remaining 51% of the population. Although the newly modified reports are comparable to the older OERs a researcher could establish a common evaluation criterion. However, company grade OERs between 2006 and 2014, as directed by HQDA, did not receive a categorical "box check" by their senior rater. Instead, senior raters were only to complete the written portion and were not held to a percentage

requirement when making comments of an individual's potential, thus requiring the promotion and selection boards reviewing such evaluations to interpret responses. This eight year period could pose difficulty to a researcher in the building of evaluation criteria from which to compare possible cohorts.

Finally, a longitudinal study, beginning with officers, possibly even cadets, as they enter the service or their commission programs might provide a baseline of self-perceived ability among individuals and would provide a basis from which to evaluate stages within their career.

Conclusion Two

OD CCC completer's hold a "Very Good" self-perception of their ability to command.

This conclusion is based upon extrapolated data found in Objective two, where, 67.3% of the LBS means were within the researcher's survey response scale score of "Very Good" (Very Good; 5.5 to 6.49), and the remaining 32.7% of the LBS items identified as "Good" (Good; 4.5 to 5.49). The researcher's survey response scale was a seven point scale which the position of "Good" possessed the middle or neutral standing and "Very Good" possessed one standard deviation separation. Within the findings, the LBS item, "Demonstrating commitment to the Nation, U.S. Army, one's unit and Soldiers" ($M=5.96$, $SD=1.000$) possessed the highest mean score and an interpretive category rating of "Very Good". The LBS item that received the lowest rating was "Anticipating people's on-the-job needs" ($M=5.12$, $SD=1.002$). This item was in the interpretive category of "Good".

The examined findings possess the following implications: factors not identified within this study particular to professional or personal development of the OD CCC completer's has provided those officers with a "Very Good" self-perceived ability to command and yet most, 81.1% ($n=670$), of the officers surveyed had not held an official command assignment for any duration. This leads the researcher to infer that officers completing OD CCC's believe they will

be successful without having served in said capacity. The researcher defines the term “successful” as an officer completing a minimum of 12 months of rated command time, receiving at least one OER covering that period of time, and receiving an “Above Center Mass” box check from their senior rater with enumeration in the written section identifying their specific ranking within the organization among the top 10%, potential future assignments and recommended future resident PME opportunities. Because of the professional assignments (platoon leader, executive officer, and staff officer) held by the respondents, this researcher believes that the identified self-perception of “Very Good” would also be applied as the generic title of one’s next assignment capability as well, not just the assignments associated with command. Additionally, because of the “Very Good” self-perception it is rational to believe that the respondents past OER outcomes match or exceed the individual’s self-perception.

It is the researcher’s recommendation that the self-perception aspect of the study be applied in three individual research directions. Within OD, a comparison of self-perceived command ability measured against an evaluation of that officer’s overall self-esteem to differentiate if the aspect of command has any individual significance or if there is an inner correlated relationship between said officer’s self-esteem and their ability to command, as self-perceived. The second recommendation for research is that the self-perceived command survey be used to study both OSD and FSD officers completing the CCC. Similar to recommendations within conclusion one, such a study should identify similarities or differences across the breadth of Army officers and the branches within individual CoEs. It is also recommended that the Army look at self-perceived ability of officers among their individual branches to see if specific traits or capabilities exist within specific populations. This study examined officers as they completed an OD CCC and studied these officers as an academic aggregate. Potential exists that

a study of officers working within their specific branch fields (Infantry, Aviation, Engineer) and homogeneous units (platoons, companies, battalions), might provide varying or unique perspectives. If not, then at the very least the body of knowledge will be able to describe command ability from the core organizational structure as opposed to the PME structure. Finally, the researcher recommends that if the longitudinal study endorsement, presented in conclusion one, pertaining to the study of an officer cohort beginning within their commissioning sources (ROTC, West Point, etc.) were to proceed, then the addition of the research objectives presented within this conclusion be included.

Conclusion Three

A majority of the surveyed OD CCC completer's identified their ethnic demographic as "White".

This conclusion is highlighted in the demographic frequency descriptions within Objective 1. The ethnic description "White" collected 74.2% ($n=611$) of the overall OD CCC respondent population. The next largest identified ethnic population was "Asian/Pacific Islander" with 8% ($n=66$) of respondents. When evaluating ethnic frequencies from each of the seven CCC's, 47.9% of the ADACCC population selected "White" as their ethnicity. ADACCC retained the highest ethnic cross section of all examined OD CCC's. At the other end of the spectrum, the MCCC possessed the highest "White" respondent selection with a score of 83.2%. All remaining OD CCC's held "White" ethnic selection scores in the 70% range with only the ENCCC dipping to approximately 51%.

Implications resulting from this conclusion pertain to the diversity of the branches within OD. The researcher had personal experience working in parallel with ROTC recruiters. While the researcher was not a recruiter by training or assignment, the exposure to requirements, goals and messaging within the officer recruiting community was of regular discourse. At the officer

initial entry stage, (West Point, Academy, ROTC, or OCS) the Army continues to message the necessary broadening of the officers across ethnic bounds. One might argue that the ethnic population of officers does not match the ethnic population of the enlisted force. Supporting such an argument is the published Army demographics for fiscal year 2014 (October 1, 2013 through September 30, 2014). In the profile report, the active component contains 72% white officers and 56% white enlisted Soldiers. Black officers make up 12% of the officer population where 23% of the enlisted Soldiers identify as black (Maxfield, 2014). For commissioning sources within the Southeastern United States, the discussion surrounded how to recruit Hispanic and African American civilians in greater numbers to serve in the Army's officer corps. As seen in the frequencies provided by OD CCC completers, the preponderance of the leaders and soon to be commanders is "White".

While the Army has improved ethnic diversity throughout all formations and all rank structures, there remains room for improvement. One recommendation for research is to evaluate officer ethnicity with variables such as OER performance, command positions held, time spent in service and commissioning source. Such data would provide an understanding as to performance of the officer and their commissioning source. Such an understanding would provide commissioning source recruiters application in the field as they search for promising candidates. Such results once examined would allow researchers to ask why an ethnicity from a specific institution or program provided greater performance within the Army. If it were found that a specific university or program type provided a higher caliber of officer then examination into the recruiting and educating properties would be of value. Another recommendation for practice by the Army would be the investigation of successful large corporate organizations that are having greater success in ethnic diversification and explore what steps or what modifications

to steps might be needed within the Army to improve the quantity of quality diverse officers. One additional recommendation for practice from the researcher's individual experience is clarity and similarity among recruiters when it comes to messaging and candidate selection. Academic emphasis in fields such as Science, Technology, Engineering and Math (STEM) are weighted as advantages when putting a packet together for commissioning consideration. However, once in the Army, an officer's STEM background has no role with the exception of what that individual applies from his background and education. When the relationship between the sub-scale "Develop Leaders" and selected personal and professional demographic characteristics were examined, four demographic variables were found to be significant. The variables "Age" ($r=.103, p=.003$), "Total years of military service" ($r=.092, p=.008$), "Total months deployed to combat" ($r=.087, p=.013$), and "Total number of combat deployments to OIF" ($r=.085, p=.017$) were found to be positively related to the "Develop Leaders" sub-scale. Only the variable "Age" was associated with a descriptor of "Low" (Davis, 1971). The remaining identified significant variables each possessed a descriptor of "Negligible" (Davis, 1971). The nature of these associations were such that individuals more senior in age, with greater years of military service, with greater months deployed to combat and with higher number of combat tours in support of OIF tended to have higher ratings on the "Develop Leaders" sub-scale. No other variables were found to be significant within the sub-scale

Conclusion Four

OD CCC's remain predominantly homogeneous in nature, attended by officers of the same branch, focusing on enhancing individual branch specific nuances.

In an era where terms such as "combined", "joint" and "partnership" are foremost on the lips of senior leaders, it was surprising to the researcher to discover that five of the CCC's surveyed possess a diversified attendee average of less than 10%, with 90.8% of the CCC

subjects being organic to their branch. The AVCCC and MCCC were the most diverse branch CCC's within OD. The MCCC's branch demographic analysis showed 80% of all completers were either Infantry or Armor and 20% were officers of different branches. Aviation was similar in that 84% of those officers completing AVCCC were branched AV and 14% were from outside branches.

In conjunction with the homogeneity in CCC participants by branch, the number of sister service officers who attended these courses was also exceptionally low. The emphasis placed upon joint and combined arms operations and integration with regard to training, does not appear to carry over to OD CCC's. In aggregate, Marines comprised 3.0% of the total completer population. The Air Force and Navy completers consumed another 1.5% combined. It is important to note that OD CCC course seats are allocated prior to the course window and there are priorities identified within each CoE as to the dispensing of those seats. Other services, branches outside the CoE, and foreign militaries are each given allocations to fill. Therefore, the lack of officers with differing branches or services within the CCC's is not due to individual officer lack of application or attendance. However, it has been the researcher's experience that most pre CCC officers are unaware that they can apply to attend a course outside their branch. This lack of system understanding by pre CCC officers could be one variable in understanding a lack of demand for broadening course opportunities.

The researcher's first recommendation calls for further research. Is the OD CCC design optimal with most officers in attendance coming from the same branch background? Investigations into course design and desired outcomes from the perspective of those in attendance versus instructional outcomes as established by the course may very well differ. Furthermore, the course goals as taught through the same subject matter might be of greater

importance or relevance to those of a specific branch, thus provide a disparate feeling of course success. An initial study could focus on evaluating attainment of course objectives as perceived by those officers within the courses CoE compared with those officers from a separate branch. The researcher's second recommendation is for organizational practice through diversifying the CCC by educating officers from across the Army in branch agnostic format. This format could even be split, between specific CoE emphasis and general junior officer education. Currently, the first time officers come together to study as a non-branch specific cohort is the Command and General Staff College (CGSC) when individuals either hold the rank of Major (approximately 11 years of service) or Captain promotable (approximately 10 years of service). With the exception of minority of officers who attended a CCC other than their branch specific course, there are no PME opportunities before CGSC where different branches come together. During a recent study on the importance of educating young officers one of the top five findings stated, "Students overwhelmingly emphasized the importance of... learning from peers and instructors with diverse backgrounds (Army, other services, and international officers); personal and professional development and networking opportunities" (William, Beurskens, and Carmichael, 2010, p. 54).

Conclusion Five

One quarter of OD CCC completers have never had a staff officer assignment.

The researcher based this conclusion on the finding that 25.8% of the OD CCC completer population had not served in a staff assignment before their attendance in their respective CCC. Furthermore, with the majority of completers (52.6%) having between 4-6 years of military service and that same population of officers indicating service in one platoon leader assignment (55.2%) and one executive officer assignment (59.9%) it is of note that one quarter of the population had not served on a staff. The researcher's professional experience defines an

assignment time period as between 12-18 months. While there is no assigned window of time for a specific assignment, there are some positions that have minimal time windows from which the officer must serve. As discussed previous, a command assignment counts towards ones professional qualification gates once they have completed 12 to 18 months of command and received a satisfactory evaluation for that period of time. Just like any position, the chain of command, Human Resources Command or the individuals' performance may dictate a longer or shorter assignment term. The researcher believes that the lack of staff assignments prior to attending an OD CCC is more of an unexpected discovery than an indicator. The FACCC completers held the highest percentage of officers who had not served within a staff with 32.2% as opposed to the 5.0% of CBRNCCC completers. Of note, branches and the jobs held by those officers differ across OD. The number of chemical, biological, radioactive and nuclear platoon leader assignments is less than the number of infantry platoon leader assignments. The converse is also true with regard to staff assignments. There are defined CBRN staff positions within all formations but there are not specific IN staff positions.

An implication that arises from the data is that professional development of officers through the assignments they serve, differ depending upon what branch you are member. Once assigned to a branch, timing, location of one's organization, luck, performance, and number of positions within the organization, all play roles into where an officer is assigned. Furthermore, one's branch may preclude an officer from serving in some of the more traditional leadership positions such as a platoon leader or executive officer, leaving them excess opportunity to serve among staffs.

A recommendation for an additional research objective within OSD and FSD fields were future studies to occur, should include identification of professional assignment history to allow

researchers to examine whether the 25% of officers without a staff assignment is typical of CCC completers or if OD is the anomaly. This analysis will help to understand if differences exist in the development and assignments of young officers by branch and cohort as they complete their second level of PME, the CCC.

Conclusion Six

ENCCC completers have the highest percent of officers with previous command assignments.

The study's findings identify the ENCCC as having 31.5% of its completers having already served in a command assignment. In contrast, the FACCC had the least amount of completers indicating they had a previous command assignment with 6.9%. The average for all CCC completers who indicated serving in a command assignment prior to attending their CCC is 18.9%. The study does not give any indication as to why one branch might have a higher command assignment rate than another. Other personal and professional demographics between the two independent CCC's do not illuminate a specific inference to the researcher. One example, "Total years of Service" category is similar with 52.2% of the ENCCC completers and 50.4% of the FACCC completers serving between 4-6 years. A slight difference identified between these two groups is the amount of single platoon leader, single executive officer and no staff assignments among completers.

The ENCCC holds a higher percentage of officers with single assignments within platoon and executive officer positions. Also, the number of officers selecting "None" with regard to the staff assignment item is lower than the FACCC by 17.5%. One implication from such data is the possibility of a greater opportunity for an officer to serve in a command assignment before attending the CCC because of the average number of positional assignments. However, without further analysis as to the order of assignments, duration of the individual assignments and the

duration of their officer basic course one cannot equate the average time an officer spent available for assignments. Furthermore, with just one population of data and that population not selected by random sampling, the ability to infer that other OD CCC's would provide similar data is not possible. An additional collection, with more emphasis on random sampling would provide increased external validity when speaking beyond the collected completers self-perceived command abilities. Another implication from the study pertains to the confirmation of the null hypothesis. With a completers self-perceived ability to command not influenced by ones completed command assignment or lack of command assignment at the time of CCC attendance, the significance of completing the CCC before taking a command assignment becomes questionable. As discussed in chapter two, although not doctrine or regulatory, many senior leaders look to place individuals in command who have completed a CCC. Without investigating the performance outcomes of captains who have taken command before attending a CCC and captains who have taken command after attending a CCC, the significance of such a course remains an open issue.

This researcher recommends additional research pertaining to the further investigation of officers' performance abilities and outcomes as they complete command assignments. The comparison of OERs between two groups, pre CCC completers and post CCC completers, is one method that would help to categorize officers before a post command assessment began. Currently, without access to officers' previous evaluation reports, the ability for a researcher to collect data pertaining to an officer's performance is restricted. Self-perceived scales administered at the assignment location on either pre or post command abilities of the officer or the surveying of subordinates, peers and senior officers from which the individual served is one option for additional data collection. Observations and research during an officers command

assignment is another method for in stride data collection. Limitations could arise in that the amount of company commanders at any one installation along similar command timelines is limited thus a sample size similar to the data collected in this study would require a greater period of time and possibly require several military units and installations. Furthermore, the study surrounding an officer's overall operational experience should be broadened beyond the jobs they held. One might begin to look at the officer's immediate supervisors and see what impact, positive, negative or neutral, their relationship had on one's command ability. The leadership experiences of the studied officers may very well play just as important a role in individual development as the individual's self-development.

Conclusion Seven

Demographic data collected from further OD, OSD or FSD fields with regard to self-perceived command ability should be less categorical in nature.

Within the above study the personal and professional demographic survey was a researcher-designed instrument. Questions presented to the study subjects such as "Age", "Total Years of Service", "Numbers of Combat Deployments", and months served in a specific assignment were designed in a categorical fashion (4-6 years, 13-18 months, etc.). It is the opinion of this researcher that the data collected from these categories could have been more precise in nature if the respondent was left to fill in the response as opposed to selecting a category. This data would then have been more exact in nature and provided increased clarity to statistical analysis. Further modification to the researcher designed instrument did not take place for several reasons. First, this instrument design was the researcher's original attempt at developing such a tool. While there are references and guides, along with professors and individuals with greater experience from which to draw experience from, the researcher simply did not have the foresight to determine what the collected data's relationship to the desired

methodology would be and the limitations such categorical data would impose. Second, with the expansion of this study in scope and methodology, the researcher did not relook the instrument to see if categorical values would be the desired response from the sampled population.

Additionally, the lack of research experience played into the lack of re-examination. Finally, the original LBS instrument was lengthy (87 items) and in order to maximize the response rates to an already long survey it was the original decision of the researcher to continue the line of survey questions in a categorical fashion, in an attempt to reduce response bias (Lavrakas, 2008). This researcher does not believe that the instrument design or decision to use said instrument was incorrect. Furthermore, the researcher is not of the opinion that the quantity of categorical questions prohibited or restricted analysis. However, the ability to further describe the subjects through continuous variables versus categorical would bring further accuracy to the overall body of knowledge.

REFERENCES

- Abbott, A. (1988). *The system of professions: an essay on the division of expert labor*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Army Publishing Directorate. (2011). Enhancement to the officer evaluation reporting system. *Milper Message Number 11-282*. Ft. Belvoir, VA: Author.
- Army Research Institute. (2000). *Survey Report: Survey on Officer Careers 2000 Report No. 2000-11*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Ary, D., Jacobs, L., Cheser, S. & Christine K. (2010). *Introduction to Research in Education* (8th ed.). Belmont, CA: Cengage Learning Inc.
- Avolio, B. J. (2005). *Leadership Development in Balance: Made/Born*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Bass, B. M., Avolio, B. J., Jung, D. I. & Berson, Y. (2003). Predicting unit performance by assessing transformational and transactional leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(2), 207-218.
- Bass, B. M. & Bass R.. (2008). *The bass handbook of leadership: fourth edition*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Blumenson, M. & Stokesbury, J. L. (1975). *Masters of the art of command*. Boston, MA: Da Capo Press.
- Borman, W. C., White, L. A., Pulakos, E. D. & Oppler, S. H. (1991). Models of supervisory job performance ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76(6), 863-872.
- Bracken, D., Timmreck, C. W. & Church A. H. (2001). *The Handbook of Multisource Feedback: the Comprehensive resource for Designing and Implementing MSF processes*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Bretz, R. D. (1989). College grade point average as a predictor of adult success. *Public Personnel Management*, 18, 11-22.
- Burk, J. (2003). Theories of Democratic Civil-Military Relations. *Armed Forces & Society*.
- Burner, E. F. (2003). *Army Transformation and Modernization: Overview and Issues for Congress*. Washington, DC: CRS Report for Congress.
- Center for Army Leadership. (2008). *US Army Implements Multi-Source Assessments and Feedback (MSAF) Program*. Ft Leavenworth, KS: Author.

- Church, A. H. & Bracken, D. W. (1997). Advancing the state of art of 360-degree feedback. *Group Organization Management*, 22(2), 149-161.
- Cochran, W. G. (1977). *Sampling Techniques* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Clark, K. E. (1992). *Impact of leadership*. Greensboro, NC: The Center for Creative Leadership.
- Cook, A. (2001) Assessing the use of flexible assessment. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 26(6), 539-549.
- Davis, J. A. (1971). *Elementary Survey Analysis*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Declaration of Independence. (2011). *Columbia Electronic Encyclopedia*, 6th Edition, 1-2.
- Defense Security Cooperation Agency. (2007). *Professional Military Education (PME)*. Retrieved from http://www.dsca.osd.mil/home/professional_military_education.htm.
- Dochy, F., Segers, M. & Sluijsmans, D. (1999). The use of self-, peer and co-assessment in higher education: a review. *Studies in Higher Education* 24(3), 331-350.
- DuFour, R. & Eaker, R. (1998). *Professional Learning Communities at Work: Best Practices for Enhancing Student Achievement*. Bloomington, IN: National Education Service.
- Eckland, B. (1965). Academic ability, higher education and occupational mobility. *American Sociological Review* 30(5), 735-746.
- Ford, J. K., Quinones, M. A., Sego, D. J. & Sorra, J. S. (1992). Factors affecting the opportunity to perform trained tasks on the job. *Personnel Psychology* 45(3), 511-527.
- Fodel, K. (2009). Brining academic focus to military commitment. *Military Advanced Education* 4(1), 4-7.
- Forgues, P. (2000). *Command in a Network-Centric War*. Toronto, Canada: Canadian Forces College.
- Gehler, C. P. (2005). *Agile Leaders, Agile Institutions: Educating Adaptive and Innovative Leaders for Today and Tomorrow*, Carlisle, PA: Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College.
- Gordon, M. (2009). *The future is upon us*. Retrieved from <http://benning.armylive.dodlive.mil/2009/09/11/the-future-is-upon-us/>.
- Greenleaf, R. K. (2002). *Servant Leadership: A Journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press.

- Gronlund, N. E. & Waugh, K. (2009). *Assessment of student achievement (9th Edition)*. Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Hair, J. F., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L. & Black, W. C. (2006). *Multivariate Data Analysis*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall International, Inc.
- Headquarters, Department of the Army. (n.d.). Prepare. *Army 360: Multi-Source Assessment and Feedback*. Retrieved from <https://msaf.army.mil/My360/Prepare/>.
- Headquarters, Department of the Army. (1994). Appointment of commissioned and warrant officers of the army. *Department of the Army Form 71*. Washington DC: Author.
- Headquarters, Department of the Army. (1999). Oath of officer – military personnel. *Army Regulation 601-210*. Washington DC: Author.
- Headquarters, Department of the Army. (2001). *The Army Training and Leader development Panel: Officer Study Report to the Army*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Headquarters, Department of the Army. (2004). *Military Education: DOD Needs to Develop Performance Goals and Metrics for Advanced Distributed Learning in Professional Military Education*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Headquarters, Department of the Army. (2004b). Promotion of commissioned officers and warrant officers other than general officers. *Army Regulation 135-155*. Washington DC: Author.
- Headquarters, Department of the Army. (2006a). Army leadership: competent, confident, and agile. *Field Manual No. 6-22 (FM 22-100)*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Headquarters, Department of the Army. (2006b). Appointment of commissioned and warrant officers in the regular army. *Army Regulation 601-100*. Washington DC: Author.
- Headquarters, Department of the Army. (2007). Evaluation Reporting System. *Department of the Army Pamphlet 623-3*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Headquarters, Department of the Army. (2008). Operations. *Field Manual No. 3.0 (Change 1)*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Headquarters, Department of the Army. (2009a). Army training and leader development. *Army Regulation No. 350-1*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Headquarters, Department of the Army. (2009b). *A leader development strategy for a 21st century army*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Headquarters, Department of the Army. (2009c). Army training and leader development. *Army Regulation 350-1*. Washington DC: Author.

- Headquarters, Department of the Army. (2010a). The operations process. *Field Manual No. 5-0 (Change 1)*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Headquarters, Department of the Army. (2010b). Commissioned officer professional development and career management. *Department of the Army Pamphlet 600-3*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Headquarters, Department of the Navy. (2010c). Enlisted evaluation and officer fitness report guidance. *NSTCINST 1610.1B*. Great Lakes, IL: Author.
- Headquarters, Department of the Army. (2010d). Army physical readiness training. *Training Circular 3-22.20*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Headquarters, Department of the Army. (2011a). Training units and developing leaders for full spectrum operations. *Field Manual No. 7-0*. Washington DC: Author.
- Headquarters, Department of the Army. (2011b). Active and reserve components enlistment program. *Army Regulation 601-210*. Washington DC: Author.
- Headquarters, Department of the Army. (2012). Army leadership. *Army Doctrine Publication 6-22*. Washington DC: Author.
- Headquarters, Department of the Army. (2014a). Army Command Policy. *Army Regulation 600-20*. Washington DC: Author.
- Headquarters, Department of the Army. (2014b). Evaluation Reporting System. *Department of the Army Pamphlet 623-3*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Headquarters, Department of the Army. (2015). *Army commands*. Retrieved from <http://www.army.mil/info/organization/>.
- Human Resources Command. (2015, June 15). Officer personnel management directorate. Retrieved from <https://www.hrc.army.mil/Officer/Officer%20Personnel%20Management%20Directorate>.
- Hogan, D. W. (2004). *Centuries of Service: The U.S. Army 1775-2004*. Washington, DC: Center of Military History.
- Horey, J., Harvey, J., Curtin, P., Keller-Glaze, H. & Morath, R. (2007). *A Criterion-Related Validation Study of the Army Core Leader Competency Model*, Arlington, VA: U.S. Army Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.
- Jordan, K. C. (2004). *The Yin and Yang of Junior Officer Learning: The Historical Development of the Army's Institutional Education Program for Captains*, Arlington, VA: The Institute of Land Warfare.

- Kotrlik, J. W., Williams, H. A., & Jabor, M. (2010). Reporting and interpreting effect size in quantitative research in agricultural education. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 52(1), 132-142, doi: 10.5032/jae.2011.01132.
- Krulak, C. C. (1999). The strategic corporal: leadership in the three block war. *Marines Magazine*. Retrieved from http://www.au.af.mil/au/awc/awcgate/usmc/strategic_corporal.htm.
- Kruzel, J. J. (2009). *Gates calls for increase of 22,000 Soldiers*. Retrieved from <http://www.defense.gov/news/newsarticle.aspx?id=55190>.
- Lavrakas, P. J. (Ed). (2008). *Encyclopedia of survey research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc.
- Lepsinger, R. & Lucia, A. D. (2009). *The Art & Science of 360 Feedback*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Lowe, K. B. & Galen, K. K. (1996). Effectiveness correlates of transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic review. *Leadership Quarterly*, 7(3), 385-425.
- Matthews, M. (1999). *Captain attrition at fort benning*. Asked by Commanding General to investigate the attrition of Captains at Fort Benning, Georgia, Fort Benning, GA.
- Maxfield, B. D. (2014). *Army Demographics:FY14 Army Profile* [Trifold]. Washington, DC: Headquarters, Department of the Army.
- McCann, C. & Pigeau, R. (1999). *Clarifying the Concepts of Control and of Command*. New Ontario, Canada: Defense and Civil Institute of Environmental Medicine.
- McCann, C. & Pigeau, R. (2000). *Human in Command: Exploring the Modern Military Experience*. New York, NY: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.
- McCausland, J. D. & Martin, G. F. (2001). Transforming strategic leader education for the 21st-century army. *Parameters*, Autumn, 17-33.
- McColl-Kennedy, J. R. & Anderson, R. R. (2002). Impact of leadership style and emotions on subordinate performance. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 13(5), 545-559.
- McElroy, K. (2007). *Developing the Army Pentathlete*. Carlisle, PA: U.S. Army War College.
- McHugh, J. M. & Casey, G. W. (2010). *A Statement on the Posture of the United States Army 2010*. Washington, DC: Author.
- McHugh, J. M. (2011). *Army Directive 2011-16 (Changes to the Army Evaluation Reporting System)*, Washington, DC: Headquarters, Department of the Army.

- McKinley, M. H. (2005). *An Assessment of the Army Officer Education System from an Adult Learning Perspective*. Fort Leavenworth, KS: US Army School of Advanced Military Studies.
- Mission Command Center of Excellence. (2011). *Doctrine update 1-12* [PDF document]. Retrieved from http://usacac.army.mil/cac2/adp/Repository/Army%20Doctrine%20Update%201-12_16%20Dec%202011.pdf.
- NATO Standardization Agency. (2008). NATO glossary of terms and definitions (English and French). AAP-6, Brussels, Belgium: Author.
- Nye, R. H. (1986). *The Challenge of Command*. New York, NY: The Berkley Publishing Group.
- Ones, D. S., Viswesvaran, C. & Schmidt, F. L. (1993). Meta-Analysis of integrity test validities: Findings and implications for personnel selection and theories of job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78(4), 679-703.
- PewResearchCenter. (2011). *The Military-Civilian Gap: War and Sacrifice in the Post 9/11 Era*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/files/2011/10/veterans-report.pdf>.
- Pigeau, R. & McCann, C. (2002a). Clarifying the concepts of control and of command. *Defense and Civil Institute of Environmental Medicine*. Toronto, Canada: CCRP, Department of Defense. (1-16).
- Pigeau, R. & McCann, C. (2002b). Re-conceptualizing command and control. *Canadian Military Journal* 3(1), 53-64.
- Raymond, W. M., Beurskens, K. R. & Carmichael, S. M. (2010, November-December). The criticality of captains' education: now and in the future. *Military Review*, 51-57.
- Roth, P. L., BeVier, C. A., Switzer III, F. S. & Schippmann, J. S. (1996). Meta-analyzing the relationship between grades and job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81(5), 548-556.
- Samson, G. E., Graeu, M. E., Weinstein, T. & Walburg, H. J. (1984). Academic and occupational performance: a quantitative synthesis. *American Education research Journal*, 21, 311-321.
- Schifferle, P. J. (2010). *America's School for War: Ft Leavenworth, Officer Education, and Victory in World War II*. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.
- Schoomaker, P. J. (2004). *Defense Department Special Briefing on U.S. Army transformation*. Retrieved from <http://www.defense.gov/transcripts/transcript.aspx?transcriptid=2884>.
- Schoomaker, P. J. & Harvey, F. J. (2006) *A Statement on the Posture of the United States Army 2006*. Retrieved from <http://www.army.mil/aps/06/pdf/APS2006.pdf>.

- Snider, D. M. & Walkins, G. L. (2000). The future of army professionalism: A need for renewal and redefinition. *Parameters*, 30, 18-19.
- Stewart, R. W. (2005). *American Military History Volume II: United States Army in a Global Era, 1917-2003*. Washington, DC: Center of Military History.
- Stogdill, R. M. (1948). Personal factors associated with leadership: A survey of the literature. *Journal of Psychology*, 25, 35-71.
- Taylor, R. L., Rosenbach, W. E. & Rosenbach, E. B. (2009). *Military Leadership: In Pursuit of Excellence*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Thomas, A. B. (1988). Does leadership make a difference to organizational performance. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 33(3), 388-400.
- Toegel, G. & Conger, J. A. (2003). 360-Degree assessment: time for reinvention. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 2(3), 297-311.
- Truskie, S. D. (1995). *CEO Performance Evaluation: How America's Leading Companies Review and Evaluate the Performance of their Chief Executive Officers*. Pittsburg, PA: Management Science & Development.
- U.S. Army Cadet Command. (2009). *Leadership Development Program Handbook*. Fort Monroe, VA: Author.
- U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command. (2011). *School Locations*. Retrieved from <http://www.tradoc.army.mil/schools.htm>.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2010). *Educational Attainment of the Population 25 Years and Over in the United States: 1940 - Detailed Tables*. Retrieved from <http://www.census.gov/hhes/socdemo/education/data/cps/1946/p10-8/tables.html>.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2011). *Education: Educational Attainment*. Retrieved from <http://www.census.gov/compendia/statab/cats/education.html>.
- U.S. Department of Defense. (2011). *The United States Military Officer Rank Insignia*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.defense.gov/about/insignias/officers.aspx>.
- United States Government Accountability Office. (2004). *Military Education: DOD Needs to Develop Performance Goals and Metrics for Advanced Distributed Learning in Professional Military Education*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Van Velsor, E., McCauley, C. D. & Ruderman, M. N. (2010). *Handbook of Leadership Development*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Waldman, D. A. & Bowen, D. E. (1998). The acceptability of 360 degree appraisals: a customer-supplier relationship perspective. *Human Resource Management*, 37(2), 117-129.

- Wardynski, C., Lyle, D. S. & Colarusso, M. J. (2010). Accessing talent: the foundation of a U.S. Army officer corps strategy. *Officer Corps Strategy Series*. Carlisle, PA: U.S. Army War College, Strategic Studies Institute.
- Williams, M. W. (2001). *The relationship of the Officer Evaluation Report to Captain Attrition*. Ft. Leavenworth, KS: US Army School of Advanced Military Studies.
- Williams, J. R. & Levy, P. E. (1992). The effects of perceived system knowledge on the agreement between self-rating and supervisor ratings. *Personnel Psychology*, 45, 835-847.
- Wojack, A. (2010). *Is Experience the Missing Link in Junior Officer Development*. Ft Leavenworth, KS: U.S. Army Command and General Staff College.
- Yukl, G. (1998). *Leadership in Organizations (4th ed)*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Zenger, J. H. & Folkman, J. R. (2009). *The Extraordinary Leader: Turning Good Managers into Great Leaders*. San Francisco, CA: McGraw-Hill Companies Inc.

APPENDIX A: RESEARCH INSTRUMENT

SPECIAL MESSAGE TO CAREER COURSE PARTICIPANTS: Your privacy will be maintained and your responses will be anonymous. You will not be identified in any way in research reports or presentations. By completing and returning this survey, you agree to participate in this study of self-perceived command ability. If you have questions about your rights as a study participant or other concerns, contact Robert C. Mathews, Institutional Review Board Chairman, 203 B-1 David Boyd Hall, (225) 578-8692.

SECTION 1: SELF-PERCEIVED COMMAND ABILITY

Instructions: Please respond to the following statements using the following scale by placing a check mark in the column that represents your perception of your performance in each of the areas listed in the left column.

Performance Statement	Self-Assessment of Ability to Perform						
	Unacceptable	Poor	Fair	Moderate	Good	Very good	Excellent
a. Example of how to record your response to each statement.						X	
b. Example of how to record your response to each statement.		X					
1. Seeking, recognizing, and taking advantage of opportunities to improve performance							
2. Creating a learning environment							
3. Maintaining and enforcing high professional standards							
4. Making feedback part of work processes							
5. Considering long-term consequences of actions not just immediate consequences							
6. Creating and sharing a vision of the future							
7. Identifying and adjusting to external influences on the mission and organization							
8. Demonstrating technical, technological, and tactical knowledge and skills							
9. Making a “good enough” decision now instead of a “best” decision too late							
10. Encouraging subordinates to accept responsibility							
11. Expanding own conceptual and interpersonal capabilities							
12. Facilitating ongoing development							
13. Fostering team work, cohesion, cooperation, and loyalty							
14. Developing effective plans to achieve unit missions							
15. Modeling Army values consistently through actions, attitudes, and communications							
16. Considering the big picture and impact on others when making decisions							

Performance Statement	Self-Assessment of Ability to Perform						
	Unacceptable	Poor	Fair	Moderate	Good	Very good	Excellent
17. Building and maintaining alliances							
18. Supporting institutional-based development of subordinates							
19. Identifying and accounting for individual and group capabilities and their commitment to task							
20. Identifying, contending for, allocating, and managing resources							
21. Conveying thoughts and ideas to ensure understanding							
22. Fostering growth in others							
23. Encouraging fairness and inclusiveness							
24. Guiding successful operations							
25. Establishing and communicating clear intent and purpose							
26. Setting and maintaining high expectations for individuals and teams							
27. Analyzing and organizing information to create knowledge							
28. Prioritizing, organizing, and coordinating tasks for teams or groups							
29. Anticipating people's on-the-job needs							
30. Maintaining relevant cultural awareness							
31. Leading others to success							
32. Visualizing second and third order effects of decisions before they are made							
33. Negotiating to reach mutual understanding and to resolve conflict							
34. Fostering job development, job challenge, and job enrichment of others							
35. Exemplifying warrior ethos							
36. Balancing requirements of the mission with welfare of followers							
37. Focusing on the most important aspects of a problem							
38. Maintaining mental and physical health and well-being							
39. Recognizing and rewarding good performance							
40. Creating alternate or contingency plans							
41. Displaying confidence, self-control, composure, and positive attitude							
42. Shaping climate							
43. Making sound decisions without all of the facts							
44. Maintaining relevant geo-political awareness							
45. Seeking and is open to diverse ideas and points of view							

Performance Statement	Self-Assessment of Ability to Perform						
	Unacceptable	Poor	Fair	Moderate	Good	Very good	Excellent
46. Evaluating and incorporating personal feedback from others							
47. Presenting recommendations so others understand advantages							
48. Expressing and demonstrating care for people and their wellbeing							
49. Anticipating how different plans will look when executed							
50. Assessing developmental needs of subordinates							
51. Expanding own knowledge of technical, technological, and tactical are							
52. Encouraging open and candid communications							
53. Conveying the significance of the work							
54. Ensuring shared understanding							
55. Designating, clarifying, and de-conflicting roles							
56. Understanding sphere of influence, means of influence, and limits of influence							
57. Accepting reasonable setbacks and failures							
58. Working effectively in situations with less-than-perfect information							
59. Understanding the importance of conceptual thinking skills and modeling them to others							
60. Modeling sound values and behaviors							
61. Building team skills and processes							
62. Building trust with those outside lines of authority							
63. Executing plans to accomplish the mission							
64. Reinforcing verbal guidance through demonstration of own actions							
65. Employing engaging communication techniques							
66. Extending influence beyond chain of command							
67. Maintaining self awareness and recognizing impact of self on others							
68. Demonstrating good judgment when the situation is unclear							
69. Being sensitive to cultural factors in communication							
70. Demonstrating commitment to the Nation, U.S. Army, one's unit, and Soldiers							
71. Removing work barriers							
72. Listening actively							
73. Coaching, counseling, and mentoring							
74. Determining information sharing strategies							
75. Preparing self to lead							

Performance Statement	Self-Assessment of Ability to Perform						
	Unacceptable	Poor	Fair	Moderate	Good	Very good	Excellent
76. Keeping cool under pressure							
77. Clearly explaining missions, standards, and priorities							
78. Seeing the big picture; providing context and perspective							
79. Making tough, sound decisions on time							
80. Adapting quickly to new situations and requirements							
81. Setting high standards without a “zero defects” mentality							
82. Handling “bad news”							
83. Coaching and giving useful feedback to subordinates							
84. Setting a high ethical tone; demanding honest reporting							
85. Knowing how to delegate without “micromanaging”							
86. Building and supporting teamwork within staff and among units							
87. Being positive, encouraging, and realistically optimistic							

SECTION 2: PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL INFORMATION

Instructions: Please provide the information requested below.

1) Gender: ☐ Male
☐ Female

2) What is your age: ☐ ≤ 21
☐ 22 – 24
☐ 25 – 28
☐ 29 – 31
☐ 32 – 34
☐ 35 – 37 ☐ ≥ 38

3) What is the highest level of education you have completed: ☐ Associate Degree
☐ Bachelor's Degree
☐ Master's Degree
☐ Doctoral Degree
☐ Other (please specify)

4) What is your current marital status: ☐ Single, never married
☐ Married
☐ Separated
☐ Divorced
☐ Widowed
☐ Other (please specify)

5) What is your ethnicity: ☐ White
☐ African American
☐ Hispanic
☐ Asian, Pacific Islander
☐ Native American
☐ Other (please specify)

6) Current branch of military service: ☐ Army
☐ Navy
☐ Marines
☐ Air Force
☐ Coast Guard
☐ Foreign Armed Service

7) Source of commissioning: ☐ West Point
☐ Academy, non – West Point

☐ ROTC
☐ OCS
☐ Direct Commission

8) Branch within the U.S. Army: ☐ Adjutant General's Corps

☐ Air defense Artillery
☐ Armor
☐ Aviation
☐ Chemical Corps
☐ Corps of Engineers
☐ Field Artillery
☐ Finance Corps
☐ Infantry
☐ Medical Service Corps
☐ Military Intelligence
☐ Military Police Corps
☐ Ordnance Corps
☐ Quartermaster Corps
☐ Signal Corps
☐ Transportation Corps

☐ Foreign Armed Service
☐ Other

9) Current rank: ☐ 1LT

☐ 1LT (P)
☐ CPT
☐ CPT (P)
☐ MAJ

10) Held a previous command
assignment: ☐ Yes
☐ No

11) If you answered yes to #10, how
many months did you serve? ☐ ≤ 6 Months

☐ 7 – 12 Months
☐ 13 – 18 Months
☐ 19 – 24 Months
☐ ≥ 25 Months

12) Total years of military service: ☐ 1 – 3 Years

- ☐ 4 – 6 Years
- ☐ 7 – 9 Years
- ☐ 10 – 12 Years
- ☐ 13 – 15 Years
- ☐ 16 – 18 Years
- ☐ 19 – 21 Years
- ☐ > 21 Years

13) Current military service status: ☐ Active Duty
☐ Reserves
☐ National Guard

16) Number of platoon leader positions held: ☐ 0 ☐ 1
☐ 2
☐ 3
☐ 4

17) Number of Executive Officer positions held: ☐ 0
☐ 1
☐ 2
☐ 3

18) Staff officer positions held (check all that apply): ☐ None ☐ S1
☐ AS1
☐ S2
☐ AS2
☐ S3
☐ AS3
☐ S4
☐ AS4
☐ S6
☐ AS6

☐ Other (please specify)

19) If you served as a Staff Officer, how many months did you serve? ☐ ≤ 6 Months
☐ 7 – 12 Months
☐ 13 – 18 Months
☐ 19 – 24 Months

☐ ≥ 25 Months

20) Number of combat
deployments: _____ 0

_____ 1
_____ 2
_____ 3
_____ 4
_____ 5
_____ 6
_____ 7
_____ 8
_____ > 8

21) How many combat
deployments were to OIF: _____ 0 _____ 1

_____ 2
_____ 3
_____ 4
_____ 5
_____ > 5

22) How many combat
deployments were to OEF: _____ 0

_____ 1
_____ 2
_____ 3
_____ 4
_____ 5
_____ > 5

21) How many months total
have you been deployed
in combat: _____ 0

_____ ≤ 6 Months

_____ 7 – 12 Months
_____ 13 – 18 Months
_____ 19 – 24 Months
_____ 25 – 30 Months
_____ 31 – 36 Months
_____ 37 – 42 Months
_____ 43 – 48 Months
_____ ≥ 49 Months

APPENDIX B: INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL

Application for Exemption from Institutional Oversight

Unless qualified as meeting the specific criteria for exemption from Institutional Review Board (IRB) oversight, ALL LSU research/ projects using living humans as subjects, or samples, or data obtained from humans, directly or indirectly, with or without their consent, must be approved or exempted in advance by the LSU IRB. This Form helps the PI determine if a project may be exempted, and is used to request an exemption.

– Applicant, Please fill out the application in its entirety and include the completed application as well as parts A-E, listed below, when submitting to the IRB. Once the application is completed, please submit two copies of the completed application to the IRB Office or to a member of the Human Subjects Screening Committee. Members of this committee can be found at <http://www.lsu.edu/screeningmembers.shtml>

– A Complete Application Includes All of the Following:

(A) Two copies of this completed form and two copies of part B thru E.

(B) A brief project description (adequate to evaluate risks to subjects and to explain your responses to Parts 1&2)

(C) Copies of all Instruments to be used.

*If this proposal is part of a grant proposal, include a copy of the proposal and all recruitment material.

(D) The consent form that you will use in the study (see part 3 for more information.)

(E) Certificate of Completion of Human Subjects Protection Training for all personnel involved in the project, including students who are involved with testing or handling data, unless already on file with the IRB. Training link: (<http://phrp.nihtraining.com/users/login.php>.)

(F) IRB Security of Data Agreement: (<http://www.lsu.edu/irb/IRB%20Security%20of%20Data.pdf>)



Institutional Review Board
Dr. Robert Mathews, Chair
131 David Boyd Hall
Baton Rouge, LA 70803
P: 225.578.8692
F: 225.578.6792
irb@lsu.edu
lsu.edu/irb

1) Principal Investigator: Michael Shaw Rank: Student
Dept: SHREWD Ph: 706-761-3432 E-mail: mcshaw@lsu.edu

2) Co Investigator(s): please include department, rank, phone and e-mail for each

Michael F. Burnett, Human Resource Education, Director, 225-578-5748, vocbur@lsu.edu

IRB# E5666 LSU Proposal # _____

- ☒ Complete Application
☒ Human Subjects Training

3) Project Title: Command Abilities of Captain Career Course Completers in Maneuver, Fire and Effects

Study Exempted By:

Dr. Robert C. Mathews, Chairman
Institutional Review Board
Louisiana State University
203 B-1 David Boyd Hall
225-578-8692 | www.lsu.edu/irb
Exemption Expires: 9-26-2014

4) Proposal? (yes or no) ☒ N If Yes, LSU Proposal Number _____

Also, if YES, either

☐ This application completely matches the scope of work in the grant

OR

☐ More IRB Applications will be filed later

5) Subject pool (e.g. Psychology students) Active Duty Army Officers

*Circle any "vulnerable populations" to be used: (children <18; the mentally impaired, pregnant women, the aged, other). Projects with incarcerated persons cannot be exempted.

6) PI Signature Date 12 SEP 2011 (no per signatures)

** I certify my responses are accurate and complete. If the project scope or design is later changes, I will resubmit for review. I will obtain written approval from the Authorized Representative of all non-LSU institutions in which the study is conducted. I also understand that it is my responsibility to maintain copies of all consent forms at LSU for three years after completion of the study. If I leave LSU before that time the consent forms should be preserved in the Departmental Office.

Screening Committee Action: Exempted ☒ Not Exempted _____ Category/Paragraph 2

Reviewer Mathew J Signature Robert Mathews Date 9/26/11

APPENDIX C: U.S. ARMY SURVEY REVIEW AND APPROVAL INSTRUCTIONS

Attitude and Opinion Survey: A survey is a systematic data collection, using face-to-face or telephonic interviews, or self-administered questionnaires (including web surveys), from a sample of 10 or more persons as individuals or representatives of agencies (44 USC § 3502). The questionnaires or interview protocols contain identical questions about attitudes, opinions, behaviors, and related demographic information. The results of the survey will be used to assess and guide current and planned Army policies, programs, and services.

Applicability:

1. All attitude and opinion surveys of Army personnel conducted in two or more major commands (Army Commands, Army Service Component Commands, or Direct Reporting Units, see Figure 1) must be approved by ARI prior to administration, IAW AR 600-46 (Attitude and Opinion Survey Program). (For this guidance, “Major Subordinate Commands” are not considered as major commands.) Requests for survey approval from ARI shall be forwarded to ARI (DAPE-ARI-PS) and must provide the information outlined in Figure 2.
2. Attitude and opinion surveys conducted within a single command (e.g., ACOM, division, brigade, battalion, company/detachment) must be approved by the unit commander.
3. Attitude and opinion surveys of military members conducted in two or more DoD Components (Services) must be approved by the Defense Manpower Data Center, IAW DODI 1100.13 (Surveys of DoD Personnel).
4. Surveys also must be submitted to the appropriate Human Use Committee.

Standards: A survey will be approved only if—

- (1) The need for information warrants the expenditure of resources associated with survey development, administration, and analysis.
- (2) The survey is designed without bias to produce reliable and valid information while imposing minimum burden on respondents and supporting organizations.
- (3) Survey design, content, and administration protect the anonymity and respect the personal rights and privacy of individuals selected as respondents. Surveys will avoid offensive or degrading topics. Responses will not be personally identified with the respondents without consent, nor made a part of their personnel files. (The governing Institutional Review Board will assist in making this determination.)
- (4) Justification is furnished to support the need for all questions in the survey.
- (5) The type of information required is suitable for survey methodology.
- (6) The occurrence of events has caused previously collected information to become suspect in terms of accuracy or completeness, or sufficient time has passed to warrant the collection of trend data.
- (7) Information does not exist in other forms or cannot be obtained through other sources.
- (8) When requested by ARI, proponents must obtain a Report Control Symbol (RCS) from their agency. Usually, the RCS for ARI’s surveys will be assigned.

Examples:

1. Assuming the planned survey of Army personnel will be conducted in two or more major commands, the following surveys are examples that would require ARI review and approval:
 - *Survey of Army Families*
 - *IG Supervisors Survey*
 - *Army Leadership Assessment Survey*
 - *Army War College Alumni Survey*
 - *Medical Specialist Corps Survey*
 - *Human Relations Survey*
 - *G-1 Incentives Survey*
2. The following survey and types of surveys are examples that would not require ARI review and approval:
 - *Survey of the 173rd Stryker Brigade Combat Team*
 - *Clinical Investigations*
 - *Command Climate Surveys (within a command)*
 - *Customer Satisfaction Surveys*

It is recommended that Clinical Investigations include only those attitude and opinion questions that are directly related to the health and treatment matters.

Survey Control Number

ARI authorization of all approved attitude and opinion surveys will be indicated by a survey control number (SCN). The series will change each fiscal year. The SCN will be on the first page of the instrument or web site in the following format:

SURVEY APPROVAL AUTHORITY: U.S. ARMY RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR THE BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

SURVEY CONTROL NUMBER: DAPE-ARI-AO-xx-xx RCS: xxxxxx

Submit Request to:

Army Personnel Survey Office
U.S. Army Research Institute
for the Behavioral and Social Sciences
2511 Jefferson Davis Highway (U.S.P.S. mail)
2530 Crystal Drive, 4th Floor
Arlington, VA 22202-3926
(703) 602-7858/7877, DSN 332-7858/7877
ARI_APSO@hqda.army.mil

Army Commands Forces Command (FORSCOM) Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC) Army Materiel Command (AMC)	Direct Reporting Units Network Command (NETCOM) Medical Command (MEDCOM) Intelligence and Security Command (INSCOM) Criminal Investigation Division Command (CIDC) United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) Military District of Washington (MDW) Army Test and Evaluation Command (ATEC) United States Military Academy (USMA) United States Army Reserve Command (USARC) Acquisition Support Center Installation Management Command (IMCOM)
Army Service Component Commands USARCENT (Third Army) USARNORTH (Fifth Army) USARSOUTH (Sixth Army) USAREUR (Seventh Army) USARPAC (United States Army Pacific) Eighth United States Army (EUSA) United States Army Special Operations Command (USASOC) Surface Deployment and Distribution Command (SDDC) Space and Missile Defense Command (SMDC)	

Figure 1. Major Army command structure

1. Title of survey.
2. Name of sponsoring organization or office.
3. Name, title, mailing address, telephone number, email address of senior project officer(s).
4. Proposed schedule for survey instrument completion, survey administration, data analysis, final report.
5. Identification of the Internet site for a web survey (for compliance with AR 25-2, Chapter 5).
6. Name of Institutional Review Board (name of agency, IRB chair).
7. Justification for survey request. (Reason why data are needed, specific objectives and how data will be used.)
8. Background research. (Description of the planning, coordination, and staffing of the survey. Include any applicable military or civilian references.)
9. Target population. (Description and size of total population and any subgroups to be used in analysis.)
10. Sample. (Description and size of sample and any subgroups to be used in analysis, type of sample, selection procedures and rationale, degree of over-sampling for non-response.)
11. Data analysis. (Manner of data processing, plan of statistical analysis, statistical procedures to be used, and justification for each, and description of the expected interaction of the major variables. If scales or indexes are to be formed, provide a detailed statement on how items will be combined.)
12. Administration procedures. (Method of data collection and justification, estimated frequency and duration, command effort required, time required for respondent to complete the survey, expected schedule of events.)
13. Draft of the survey instrument, letters of instruction to respondents, and Privacy Act Statement.
14. Planned distribution of survey results.

Figure 2. Information requirements for requesting survey approval

VITA

Major Michael C. Shaw born in Milwaukee, Wisconsin to Father Michael and Mother Teresa. He was commissioned as a Second Lieutenant in the Army Aviation Branch in 2001 after graduating from Santa Clara University.

His first assignment out of flight school was as an AH-64D attack platoon leader in 2nd Squadron, 6th Cavalry Regiment at Fort Hood, Texas during UFTP. The Squadron then conducted a unit move to Illesheim, Germany where MAJ Shaw moved companies and served as the III/V platoon leader. He later deployed in this position to Afghanistan as part of OEF VI. MAJ Shaw was then assigned as the squadron S4. He served in this capacity through redeployment and the battalion's transformation as part of the 12th Combat Aviation Brigade.

After attending the Maneuver Captains Career Course, MAJ Shaw was assigned to 4th Battalion, 4th Aviation Regiment at Fort Hood, TX where he served as an assistant S3. MAJ Shaw then deployed to Iraq with Headquarters Company in support of OIF 08-10. While deployed, he transitioned into command of Alpha Company "Peacemakers". Following the deployment, MAJ Shaw transitioned to Louisiana State University where he served as the Army ROTC operations officer. Concurrent with his time at LSU, MAJ Shaw earned a Master's Degree in Human Resource Education and Leadership Development.

After a year at Ft Leavenworth for Intermediate Level Education, MAJ Shaw returned to Illesheim, Germany and was assigned as the XO and then S3 of 3rd Battalion, 159th Aviation Regiment (ARB). As the S3 of the 3-159th ARB, MAJ Shaw deployed to Kuwait in support of Operation Spartan Shield and then to Baghdad, Iraq in support of Operation Inherent Resolve.

MAJ Shaw is a graduate of the Aviation Officer Basic Course, Maneuver Captains Career Course, and the Command and General Staff College. He holds a Bachelor's of Arts Degree with a major in History and a Masters in Human Resource and Leader Development.