

LEADERSHIP THROUGH ROTC: A COMPARISON OF ROTC LEADER
DEVELOPMENT WITH NCAA INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS AND THE
TRADITIONAL COLLEGE EXPERIENCE

By

Charles B. Buntin II

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Science in Leisure and Sports Management

Middle Tennessee State University
August 2015

Thesis Committee:

Dr. Steven Estes, Chair

Dr. Tony Johnston

I dedicate this research to my brothers and sisters in Arms. “This We’ll Defend”

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my wife Amber for her unwavering love and support throughout this long process. Without Amber challenging me to better myself everyday, I would not have accomplished what I have to this point in my life. I would also like to thank Dr. Steven Estes. There is no better Coach, Teacher, or Mentor, Dr. Estes. No other person has ever been able to convey to me the importance of education as part of leadership as you have. Dr. Johnston, I am honored to have you as a fellow Officer in the Armed Forces. In that regard I am proud to call you my brother. As an Educator, you embody what a leader should be and I am glad I have had the opportunity to follow you. Thank you all for helping me through this process.

ABSTRACT

Leadership is an art and a science that can be taught through university level leadership development programs. This study examined the effectiveness of United States Army Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC) curriculum by comparing the leadership of ROTC students to the leadership of university student-athletes and traditional students. Leadership is measured by using Kouzes and Posner (2003) Student Leadership Practices Inventory (Student LPI). The Student LPI defines and measures five leadership practices: Model the Way, Inspire a Shared Vision, Challenge the Process, Enable Others to Act, and Encourage the Heart.

1,598 college students took the Student Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI), each a member of one of the following groups: 660 student-athletes, 794 traditional students, and 144 ROTC students participating in an Army ROTC program. ROTC students were more likely ($p < .001$) to perceive themselves to engage in the practices of Model the Way, Inspire a Shared Vision, Challenge the Process, and Enable Others to Act than their student-athlete peers. ROTC students were more likely ($p < .001$) to perceive themselves to engage in all five practices of the Student LPI than their traditional student peers.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	vii
CHAPTER 1: Perceptions of Leader Development Through Army ROTC	1
Method	9
Research Questions	10
Limitations	11
Hypotheses	11
Definitions	11
CHAPTER 2: Literature review.....	13
Arguments for leader development	17
CHAPTER 3: Methodology	26
CHAPTER 4: Results	30
Model the Way	33
Inspire a Shared Vision	35
Challenge the Process	37
Enable Others to Act	40
Encourage the Heart	42
CHAPTER 5: Discussions and Recommendations.....	45
Model the Way	46
Inspire a Shared Vision	48
Challenge the Process	50

Enable Others to Act	53
Encourage the Heart	56
Summary.....	57
References	59
APPENDICES	63
Appendix A Student LPI.....	64
Appendix B Permission to use LPI.....	65
Appendix C Letter to each Professor of Military Science.....	67
Appendix D Letter to ROTC Students	70
Appendix E Request to use LPI.....	71
Appendix F IRB Approval Letter	72

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1: Model the Way.....	33
Table 2: Multiple Comparisons for Model the Way	34
Table 3: Inspire a Shared Vision.....	35
Table 4: Multiple Comparisons for Inspire a Shared Vision.....	36
Table 5: Challenge the Process.....	38
Table 6: Multiple Comparisons for Challenge the Process.....	39
Table 7: Enable Others to Act.....	40
Table 8: Multiple Comparisons for Enable Others to Act	41
Table 9: Encourage the Heart.....	42
Table 10: Multiple Comparisons for Encourage the Heart.....	43

“The Nation that makes a great distinction between its scholars and its warriors will have its thinking done by cowards and its fighting done by fools.”

– Thucydides

CHAPTER 1

Perceptions of Leader Development Through Army ROTC

Leadership is one of the most studied and most perplexing abilities that an individual can possess. A Google search on leadership as of this writing revealed 461,000,000 websites that were in some way associated with leadership. Contemporary Americans are obsessed with leaders. Movies and books are written about great leaders, and these leaders are immortalized in film and literature. *Patton*, *Remember the Titans*, *300*, *Unbroken*, *Saving Private Ryan* are just a few examples of the main character depicted as a great leader with followers who would follow them anywhere. Our culture is in love with following a leader, but only a minority is actually qualified to lead. This study speaks to that idea.

According to demographic studies throughout the United States, the first of the Baby Boomers reached retirement age in 2011 (*Baby Boomers Retire*, 2010). By 2015 19.9 percent of the United States population will reach retirement age (Ewing, 2012). This demographic change will affect all aspects of business and governmental leadership. Specifically, if 20% of the of the population is pending retirement, then it stands to reason that 20% of the country’s leadership will leave the work force and a new

generation of leaders will be needed. Where will these leaders come from? Where will they learn how to lead? Finally, will this new generation of leaders “lead” or manage?

There is much in management and leadership literature that distinguishes between these two necessary components of running bureaucracies, and much of the literature argues that good *leadership* is hard to come by. “The leader is anyone who, by virtue assumed role or assigned responsibility, inspires and influences people to accomplish organizational goals.” (*Fundamentals of leadership*, n.d.) It is arguable that ROTC is an effective leader development mechanism that has benefits that extend well past training college students to be Army officers.

There are many definitions of leadership, so many that some scholars have despaired over an inability to come to an agreed upon definition. In 1978 the noted leadership scholar James MacGregor Burns (1973) argued that “Leadership is one of the most observed and least understood phenomena on earth.” (p.2) Indeed, Rost (1993) has argued that, “In fact, by the end of the 20th century over 300 different definitions of leadership existed (Rost, 1993). Given that there is not a consensus definition of leadership, this paper will use an operational definition consistent with literature from the US Army: Leadership is defined as “... influencing people by providing purpose, direction, and motivation, while operating to accomplish the mission and improve the organization.” (ADP 6-22, 2012,p.1) In contrast, “management” is defined as, “...influencing operational functions and resources to reach a goal.” (Mull, et al, 2005, p. 31) *Fundamentals of Leadership* (n.d.) breaks down leadership into 5 subcategories and defines them as the following: (*Fundamentals of Leadership*, **n.d.**)

- Country Club Manager: “These managers exhibit a high concern for people and

building a friendly environment. They have a lower concern with the task and with getting things done.

- Team Manager: “These leaders are the most effective managers. They are highly focused both on people and task and they maintain high performance standards.
- Middle of the Road Manager: “These managers have minimal focus on people and task. Their main concern is preserving the status quo. They do what must be done, but do not set high standards or raise the bar for performance.”
- Impoverished Management: “These managers take a lazy approach to leadership. They have little regard for people or task and are very poor managers.
- Authority Compliance Management: “These managers have a high concern for task and emphasize productivity and efficiency at all times.”

While the above definitions of managers seem to be somewhat disparaging, it is arguable that both leadership and management are important to successful organizations, with each having its place in social environments with projects or missions needing to be completed. But the difference between leadership and management is important. Leadership implies an emphasis on influencing people to achieve a common task while leaving the organization better off; management implies a more expansive view of administrative operations, processes, and bureaucracies. LTC Hollis Bush of the 1st Cavalry Division said every leader is a manager, but not every manager is a leader (Bush, H., 2010). By this LTC Bush means that the task of influencing Soldiers to perform tasks that may cost them their lives is significantly different than influencing his Soldiers to perform the operations and processes that are necessary in the Army of the 21st century. The men and

women of the 1st Cavalry Division have proven themselves to be leaders in both combat and garrison, indicating that LTC Bush knows the difference between leadership and management. He, like all other Army officers, is continually seeking to replace Soldiers who perform *leadership* functions and who then move on to new Army units, who retire from the military, or who (sadly) are lost due to the nature of their duties in the Army – wounded or killed in action. In contrast, replacing Soldiers who fulfill *management* functions is relatively easy.

The next generation of individuals who will fill leader positions, like all generations before them, will rarely have the background, ability, or desire to lead without some sort of training. While it has been shown time and time again that those who are technically proficient in their jobs will often be the ones to get promoted to leadership positions, it is often in spite of their abilities as leaders (Haslam, 2011, p.8). One need look no further than cartoons of *Dilbert*, or to Google the phrase “the Peter Principle,” to know that there are too many poor leaders in positions of authority. With 20% of all leaders leaving their positions, their units are in a difficult state if these leaders cannot be replaced.

During this exodus of leaders, businesses and other institutions will seek out the next generation of leaders. These new leaders will likely begin their training for leader roles on the college campus (Haber and Komives, 2009). The question is, where do the best leaders come from? And where will these leaders be trained? One logical place to begin looking is the place where almost all American professionals begin their journeys into their professional careers: the American university campus. There are several identifiable areas of the university where one can look for developing leaders: Student

Government, college athletics, and the general college population offer many opportunities for students to develop their leader skills. But one often-overlooked area for developing leaders is the Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC).

The Reserve Officer Training Corps is a commissioning source for individuals who seek a commission as an officer in the United States Military's reserve forces. The branches of the military represented in ROTC programs are the Army, Air Force, and Navy. This study focuses on Army ROTC. As of this writing there are a total of 273 host programs with more than 1,100 partnership and affiliate schools across the country. ROTC produces approximately 60 percent of the Second Lieutenants who join the active Army, Army Reserve and Army National Guard. More than 40 percent of current Active Duty Army General Officers were commissioned through ROTC. (*Fundamentals of Leadership*, n.d.) Graduates of ROTC programs have the opportunity to compete to be an active duty officer depending on the needs of the separate military services from year to year. Students enrolled in ROTC programs receive the military rank of Cadet, and are formally coached, taught, and mentored by cadre who are commissioned officers and Non-Commissioned Officers (NCOs).

Upon completion of this training, Cadets commission as officers in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Air Force. Once commissioned, officers hold the rank of Second Lieutenant in the Army, Air Force, and Marine Corps; and Ensign in the Navy. The commissioned officer then goes into service and continues his or her education by building on the foundation of what she or he learned in ROTC, and serves for a minimum of three years. If the officer chooses to continue to serve he or she will continue an education plan while serving at the ranks of Captain (Lieutenant in the Navy), Major

(Lieutenant Commander in the Navy), and Lieutenant Colonel (Commander in the Navy). ROTC is just the starting point for these officers.

During the four years of ROTC Cadets are taken through rigorous training starting with the basics as a freshmen, and continuing to advanced leadership in their senior year. The freshmen year consists of the basics of being a Soldier. This includes, but is not limited to, marching, rank structure, the Army Values (Values and Ethics), Warrior Ethos (Values and Ethics) and the military decision making process. Year Two is slightly more challenging, with content including the duties and responsibilities of platoon member, Troop Leading Procedures (Tactics and Techniques), equipment usage, and how to work as a member of a unit. Year Two is the first year that Cadets are taught about leadership and introduced to types of leadership. One part of Cadet training is learning “Troop Leading Procedures,” of leader tasks that must be completed to insure the successful completion of a mission (FM 3-21.10, 2006). It is here that the Cadet begins learning what leaders in the military do and how to lead.

Year Three is the first year that Cadets are assigned specific leader roles, and get to implement what they have learned up until this point in their training. As an “MS III” the Cadet continues his or her education of Troop Leading Procedures and how to properly use them while leading a group of their peers through an exercise. MS III Cadets begin receiving instruction on the *operations order process*. The operations order process is when a leader receives a mission and then articulates his or her plan in written and verbal form. The Cadet then gives that same plan to his or her subordinate leader. The subordinate leaders then receive instruction on the operations order (OPORD) and begin

orders process. This process continues until all subordinate leaders have passed all pertinent information to their subordinates.

An OPORD is a five-paragraph format that is used to convey a plan to subordinate units or personnel (*Fundamentals of Leadership n.d.*). This process starts at the lowest level that has the authority to initiate the order or mission. For example, a Division Headquarters can give an order that has multiple moving parts. It is up to the subordinate leaders to get the information that is needed for his or her subordinates to execute a mission.

Learning this process is part of the Cadets curriculum. The Cadets will take this five-paragraph format or operations order to construct a plan and use the orders process to brief the order to their fellow Cadets. The Cadet will then lead their fellow Cadets through an operation that will test their ability to lead. The conclusion of the Op Order process is the After Action Review (AAR), where the entire process of receiving and executing the mission is debriefed. All parts of this process are examined and discussed, especially the leadership of the MS III who led the mission. It is at this point of critical reflection that the MS III begins to understand how he or she led, and thereby begins the process of developing as a leader through both reflection of the past operation, and the execution of future OPORDs as both follower and leader. .

The fourth year as a Cadet, or MS IV, is when the Cadet begins to learn indirect leadership. Indirect leadership is where the uses indirect influence in situations where clear lines of authority do not exist. The Cadet seeks to influence others through the communication of ideas and common causes. Positive, empowering influence comes by knowing how to lead, relate to others, and freeing others to manage tasks (*ADRP 6-22*,

2012). MS IV Cadets are put in both staff positions as well as positions of direct leadership and told to lead the ROTC Cadet Detachment. MS IVs are constantly monitored for their leader qualities, and their skills are continually reviewed and refined. During all four years, then, Cadets are continually learning leadership lessons for themselves and their peers, and refining how they lead and discussing what they learned. The four years as a Cadet is a continuous education, one of self-assessment, as well as formal peer and cadre assessment, of one's ability to lead others.

ROTC is not the only college level leader training organization. McAfee (2011) showed that business leaders seek to hire former college athletes to be members of their business team because it is believed that college athletics are a good leader development program. McAfee studied 56 corporations and looked at their hiring practices and found that ...

“40% of these recruiters have actively sought college athletes for their leadership abilities. Additionally, of those reporting 89% felt athletics contributed to leadership development, 85% believed that former athletes they hired had been effective leaders and 80% would use athletics as a consideration in hiring” (McAfee, 2011 p. iii).

Denhart et al argued that corporate CEOs believe that there is leadership being learned through athletics. It is believed that athletics reinforce characteristics that are desirable in the corporate world. These characteristics include but are not limited to a sense of responsibility, loyalty, teamwork, competitiveness and time management skills (Denhart, Villwock, and Vedder, 2009).

A study done by the 2006 NCAA research committee found that student-athletes in 18 Football Bowl Subdivisions believed that participating in college athletics added to their education and/or personal development (Potuto and O’Hanlon, 2006). The question asked was, “To what extent, if any, has your athletics participation added to your educational and/or personal development.” 82.2 percent of these college athletes responded with “very much” or quite a bit.” 98 percent said that participating in athletics positively influenced their leadership skills (Potuto and O’Hanlon, 2006, p. 10) Lund (2013) conducted similar study using the Kouzes and Posner’s Student Leader Practices Inventory, or Student LPI. His findings showed that Student-athlete’s have a better understanding of how to properly lead and execute these traits more frequently than their traditional student peers.

The goal of this study is to show that another effective leadership development program is Army ROTC. But how effective is ROTC leader development relative to other college leader development programs? This study seeks to answer that question by surveying the self-perceptions leader skills of ROTC Cadets, their traditional student peers, and college athletes. In doing so this study will attempt to distinguish between these acknowledged leader development opportunities with respect to the measures available in Kouzes and Posner’s Student Leader Practices Inventory, or Student LPI.

Method

Kouzes and Posner’s Leadership Practices Inventory is one of the most widely used leadership assessments in the world (Kouzes, 2006 p.5). The Student LPI is one of the few leadership instruments designed specifically for college-age students (Posner,

2010). Student LPI will be administered to three groups of college students: ROTC students, student-athletes, and traditional students who do not participate in either college athletics or ROTC. The instrument will measure five different leadership practices based on when students believe that are at their “personal best” as leaders.

The Student LPI is an instrument created by Kouzes and Posner (1998) as part of a widespread and ongoing research project into the daily actions and behaviors of exemplary leaders at every level. The Student LPI is a 30-item questionnaire that inventories one’s perceived leadership ability by measuring leadership practices in which the student regularly engages. The Student LPI inventories leadership practices in the following five constructs: Challenge the Process, Inspire a Shared Vision, Enable Others to Act, Model the Way, and Encourage the Heart. Each of these five constructs consists of 6-items (statements) and are measured based on a 5-point Likert-scale: 1 = rarely or seldom; 2 = once in a while; 3 = sometimes; 4 = often; 5 = very frequently. The survey will only be administered to ROTC students. The data will be collected and compared to that of the student-athletes that was already collected by Lund (2013).

Research Questions

The question being asked is whether or not Army ROTC leader development training is significantly different than other leader development programs available on college campuses. Specifically, the research questions being asked are:

RQ 1: What effect does participation in ROTC have on the self-perception of leadership practices of ROTC students compared with their traditional student peers?

RQ 2: What effect does participation in ROTC have on the self-perception of leadership practices of ROTC students compared to their student-athlete peers?

Limitations

1. The survey will only measure an individual's perception of his or her ability to lead, and will not measure the perceptions of cadre, peers, or subordinates.
2. Participants may evaluate and respond to each question differently based on education level and knowledge of leadership behavior.

Hypotheses

H1 ROTC students will perceive themselves to engage more frequently in leadership practices as assessed by the Student LPI traditional student peers.

H2 ROTC students will perceive themselves to engage more frequently in leadership practices as assessed by the Student LPI than their student-athlete peers.

Definitions

Cadet: Anyone taking ROTC classes that has signed a contract with ROTC and the United States Army encoring a service obligation.

ROTC Student: Any College student taking ROTC classes. ROTC Cadets can be ROTC Students, but ROTC Students Cannot be ROTC Cadets.

Student-athlete – Is any student participating in student college athletics recognized as a collegiate sport by that school.

Leadership: process of influencing people by providing purpose, direction, and motivation to accomplish the mission and improve the organization (ADP 6-22, 2012,p.1).

Manager: "...influencing operational functions and resources to reach a goal." (Mull, et al, 2005, p. 31)

CHAPTER 2

Literature Review

There is extensive research on the concept of leadership, both within the military as well as in the social science and humanities literature in the business world. One of the first tasks to be undertaken in any study on leadership is to simply define what leadership is, but this is not as easy as it sounds. As Rost (1991) noted, there are so many definitions of leadership that it is difficult to argue that *leadership* can be considered an academic discipline. Rost (1991) states,

Many leadership scholars and practitioners see the leadership literature since about 1910 as confusing, discrepant, disorganized, and unintegrated... The conventional wisdom about the leadership literature is that, in toto, it does not make sense. Many people are so disgusted by the mess they see in the literature that they consider leadership studies as an academic discipline to be a bad joke. Leadership studies, in their view, is not worth of the name “academic discipline.” (p.91)

This study focuses on comparing the effectiveness of college ROTC programs, and consequently will use a definition of leadership consistent with Army leadership training. *ADP 6-22* defines leadership in the following way: “*Leadership* is the process of influencing people by providing purpose, direction, and motivation to accomplish the mission and improve the organization.” (*ADRP 6-22*, 1-1).

While one may not agree with Rost’s extensive literature review and conclusion, the above definition falls well within the range of most definitions of leadership. For

instance, Haslam et al (2011) defines leadership as, "... influencing others so that they are motivated to contribute to the achievement of group goals." (p.1) The similarities between Haslam et al, a group of social psychologists, and *FM 6-22*, are significant. The beauty of the *FM 6-22* definition is that it leaves up to the individual leader just *how* leadership will be developed and executed without determining if it is exactly the *right* definition.

The Army focuses on leadership at all levels, and expends a fair amount of time and resource energy to train for it. Indeed, the Army boasts one of the most well-read documents in the history of leadership literature, *Army Field Manual 6-22: Army Leadership: Competent, Confident, and Agile* (2006) (*FM 6-22*). As of this writing there are over 4 million internet downloads of *FM 6-22*, making it one of the most well known documents in leadership literature. *FM 6-22* was updated in 2012 to *Army Doctrine and Training Publication 6-22: Army Leadership (ADRP 6-22)*. The content of the newer publication is essentially the same as its older counterpart, but is condensed and used more widely in the Army. Originally meant for the training of noncommissioned officers (NCOs) and officers, *ADRP 6-22* is used at all levels of the Army including enlisted ranks.

Specific to ROTC leader development, the document used for training is *Fundamentals of Leadership* (n.d.). This website introduces leadership content to ROTC Cadets and justifies the study of leadership in the Army, paralleling the information described in *ADRP 6-22* and adjusting it for ROTC's leader development purposes. The Introduction to *Fundamentals of Leadership* paragraph to the website reads:

As a future officer in the United States (US) Army, you must develop and exhibit

character. Your character is a combination of values and attributes that enables you to see what to do, decide to do it, and influence others to follow. You must be competent in the knowledge and skills required to do your job effectively. You must take the proper action to accomplish your mission based on what your character tells you is ethically right and appropriate. (*Fundamentals of Leadership*, n.d.)

The materials presented to the ROTC students include: Leadership Defined, Influencing People, Providing Purpose, Giving Direction, Supplying Motivation, Improving the Organization, and Leadership Gets Results. These sub-areas of the *Fundamentals of Leadership* are followed by other modules such as: The Army Leadership Requirements Model, Army Team Roles and Relationships, and Three Levels of Army Leadership. In sum, the documents provided to Cadets are a thorough reading list of components that are recognizable to scholars of leadership in any discipline.

The position of the Army is that at any one give time a Soldier may be a leader in some way, shape, or form. One of the Army's positions is that, to be effective no matter the style of leadership, the leader must be an ethical person. Proof of this is that the first sentence in *Fundamentals of Leadership* is this statement: "As a future officer in the United States (US) Army, you must develop and exhibit character." (*Fundamentals of Leadership*, n.d.) As leaders, Soldiers have a responsibility to lead ethically, and most definitions and discussions of leadership argue that character development and ethical behavior are of primary importance to effective leadership. Sarwar (2012) conducted a study of the future of ethically effective leadership in which he found that selected leaders report their *ideal* ethically effective leadership performance to be higher than their

typical ethically effective leadership performance. This finding indicates that there is a significant intrinsic desire for ethically effective leadership performance. Put differently, this finding shows that, in general, people want to do good and lead ethically, and that there is a desire for leaders to better themselves with ethical leadership (Sarwar, 2012).

Mentoring is another important aspect of leader development. In pioneering work done on the mentor relationship, Kram (1983) noted the following:

An individual who is entering the adult world and the world of work is likely to encounter a variety of developmental tasks that are reflected in concerns about self, career, and family... A mentor relationship can significantly enhance development in early adulthood by facilitating work on these tasks... The mentor provides a variety of functions that support, guide, and counsel the young adult as this important work is accomplished. (p.608)

The Army places similar value on the mentor relationship. *FM 6-22* defines mentoring as when "... a leader with greater experience than the one receiving the mentoring provides guidance and advice; it is a future-oriented developmental activity focused on growing in the profession. (*FM 6-22*, 8-11) ROTC considers mentoring, coaching, and counseling one of the significant mechanisms of leader development. A study was conducted by Smith (2013) to assess the effectiveness of mentoring in the grooming of future leaders. This is an aspect of ROTC that is done in a formal process of Cadet Leadership Education. Smith found that individuals who were mentored perceived themselves to have learned how to be a better leader. She followed up her research by asking, "If you had a mentor, is there anything else you would like to share about your experience with

your mentor?” The individuals would answer this question by reflecting on how their mentors helped them cope with the barriers they were facing. The individuals who did not have mentors discussed how mentors would have helped them through the difficulties of leadership (Smith, 2013). More advanced understandings of mentoring, coaching, and counseling are researched and trained for at the Center for Army Leadership. Titled “Army 360 / Multi - Source Assessment and Feedback (MSAF),” this advanced stage of mentoring and coaching is the end-state of the Army’s recognition of the value of mentoring (*Advanced Guide to MSAF Coaching*, 2012). Important to this study, ROTC students are introduced to being mentored, and mentoring, at the beginning stages of leader development.

Arguments for Leadership Development

Central to this thesis is the idea that leadership, no matter how defined or constructed, can be developed. Haslam et al (2011) summarize the state of the literature in leadership studies by noting that the classic arguments of leadership can be reduced to the old “nature versus nurture” arguments. In short, are leaders born? Or are they made?

Haslam et al’s summary of the literature falls firmly into the “nurture” category. As Haslam et al (2011) note,

“If there is one model of leadership that exemplifies the individualistic consensus ... it is that of the ‘great man... It is the model that is found in those history texts that recount the feats, and extol the virtues, of extraordinary figures who seem a race apart from the rest of us.” (p. 2)

In short, the “great man” model of leadership implicitly argues that great leaders are born, and not made – or in the case of this study, developed. Haslam et al go on to argue that the Great Man Theory ...

... (s)uggests that leaders are individuals who are superior to others by virtue of their possession of innate intellectual and social characteristics. In short, leaders are simply people who are made of ‘the right stuff’ and this stuff is seen to be in short supply.” (p.3)

Haslam et al then go to great lengths to argue that the Great Man theory of leadership is incorrect, primarily by demonstrating through the processes and studies of social psychology that the skills and attributes of leadership can be developed by focusing on the interactions of the leader with her or his followers. As social psychologists Haslam et al study *social identity*, and to the extent that an individual can shape his or her sense of social identity then that individual can put him or herself in a position of leadership, and be successful.

A next question would be, “If leadership can be learned at all, can it be learned in the university environment?” One of the best models for this position is Astin and Angeles’ (1996) model for leadership development titled *A Social Change Model of Leadership Development*. Beginning with assumptions consistent with those of Haslam et al, Astin and Angeles argue that one characteristic of successful leadership development is the ability of the “leader” to forge a common purpose for the group. Once this is done then the likelihood of the individual being a successful leader is increased significantly. Critical to the success of the leader are a number of attributes that one must possess to be a successful leader: the demonstration of technical competence that has to do with the

mission of the group; the self knowledge of the leader with regard to one's technical competence as well as one's limitations; a good sense of the nature of the group, their values, passions, talents, skills, and limitations; the ability to listen to others, specifically the members of the group; a sense of the shared vision of the group; and, perhaps most importantly, a sense of respect for the members of the group. All of these attributes of the leader can be studied, practiced, and developed with respect to leading and influencing others. The outcome, according to Astin and Angeles, is the ability to effect social change by influencing others to achieve a common purpose. In other words one who possesses these attributes would be called a "leader"

Astin and Angeles conclude that there are "7 Cs" of leadership development for social change: collaboration, consciousness of self, commitment, congruence, common purpose, controversy with civility, and citizenship (p.21). These values are critical because they go to the character of the leader. Lacking any one of the "7 Cs" will make successful leadership for social change more difficult. Finally, these values cannot be learned without activities that serve the institution or the larger community in which leadership acts are embedded. In Astin's and Angeles' words, leadership is a *process* learned through *actions*. That is, leadership must be learned experientially.

In sum, the literature cited here argues that leadership can be learned, and that successful leadership has common characteristics: most all leadership scholarship argues that leadership is values based; the literature considers character development and values critical to successful leadership; mentoring is critical to personal development, and the processes of leadership are learned in experiential environments. Army ROTC embodies all of these characteristics.

Kouzes and Posner's Student Leadership Inventory

One of the more popular methods of determining leader practices is the Kouzes and Posner Leadership Practices Inventory. Developed in the 1980s, the Inventory was developed to determine best practices of leader behaviors. According to the authors,

The Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) was developed through a triangulation of qualitative and quantitative research methods and studies (Kouzes and Posner, 2002b). In-depth interviews and written case studies from personal-best leadership experiences generated the conceptual framework, which consists of five leadership practices that are used by leaders “when they perform at their personal best”:

- Modeling the Way
- Inspiring a Shared Vision
- Challenging the Process
- Enabling Others to Act
- Encouraging the Heart.

The authors note that the LPI meets criteria for psychometric testing, and as a result has been used by over 500 dissertations and research projects. As of this writing Kouzes and Posner's Inventory has been administered to over 1.3 million respondents. (Kouzes and Posner, 2002b). What makes the Inventory unique is its focus on leader behaviors. As Lund (2013) noted, “What makes the LPI unique from other instruments is the items are more distinct and behaviorally focused than other well-established instruments such as

the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Sashkin, 2004); therefore, feedback can target precise behaviors that factor in effective leadership. (p.29)

The Student Leadership Practices Inventory (Student LPI) was developed in the 1990s to select best practice leader behaviors for "... any student or young person." (Kouzes & Posner, 2015). Based on the LPI, the Student LPI "...measures the frequency with which students engage in 30 distinct behaviors that are the foundation of The Five Practices of Exemplary Leadership." Posner (2012) sampled 77,387 students using the Student LPI, and demonstrated modest to strong internal reliability coefficients across multiple dimensions of the Inventory. In sum, both the LPI and the Student LPI were found to effectively measure best leadership practices over the five constructs for their respective populations.

The leadership practices in the Student LPI developed by Kouzes and Posner are defined as follows (Posner, 2015, p.222):

1. Model the Way: Clarify values by finding your voice and affirming shared ideals; and set the example by aligning actions with shared values.
2. Inspire a Shared Vision: Envision the future by imagining exciting and ennobling possibilities; and enlist others in a common vision by appealing to shared aspirations.

3. Challenge the Process: Search for opportunities by seizing the initiative and by looking outward for innovative ways to improve; and experiment and take risks by constantly generating small wins and learning from experience.
4. Enable Others to Act: Foster collaboration by building trust and facilitating relationships; and strengthen others by increasing self-determination and developing competence.
5. Encourage the Heart: Recognize contributions by showing appreciation for individual excellence; and celebrate the values and victories by creating a spirit of community.

Boyd(2014) examined how the fictional characters of Louis L'Amour, the famous western novelist, can be used to illustrate the Five Practices of Exemplary Leaders. Boyd argued that Lamour's leader has to have a moral compass that guides him or her, and that this moral compass is the basis for the leadership practices of Lamour's characters. This moral compass can be created by upbringing, taught in the classroom, or learned through literature. There is a long tradition of justifying philosophical positions by the use of *narrative knowing*, the use of literary fiction as an educational tool. (Polkinghorne, 1988). Specific to the idea of using narrative knowing to study leadership practices, Bennis and O'Toole (2005) argue that characters in fiction stories can serve as role models for future leaders. Fictional characters deal with ethical issues; they have to manage success and failures. In so doing they provide a model for what all leaders have to do during their time as leaders (Boyd, 2014). Similarly, Kouzes and Posner note the importance of the

moral standing of leaders. They support the idea that good moral character helps to gain the respect of those who follow. It is also important for the leader to show that he or she cares about the overall well-being of the follower. This will assist in growing or building a great organization. To maintain the organization that the leader built he or she must nurture it through providing the followers with motivation and encouragement (Boyd, 2014; Haslam et al, 2011)

Modeling the Way is setting an example for others to follow. Characters in many of L'Amour's books are uneducated. The uneducated hero or heroine will often place the importance of education as a top priority. This sets the standard for all that followed. Education is important because it is important to the leader (Boyd, 2014, p.171).

L'Amour's characters *encouraged the heart* of individuals that had to fight stereotypes in order to survive in the rugged west. Mary Breydon, one of L'Amour's characters, lost her husband in *The Cherokee Trail*. She continued on the job that her husband was traveling west to do before he died. She managed a stage station, a job that was considered to difficult for a woman at the time. L'Amour's Character Boone encouraged her to stay with it despite being attacked by Indians and bandits (Boyd ,2014).

Boyd continues his use of L 'Amour's books in describing the abilities *to inspire a shared vision*. The lead in L'Amour's books is an adventurer and entrepreneur rolled in one. The west is the land of opportunity and there is a desire to find the riches this great country offers. The supporting characters do not have a dream or direction at first but take on the goals of the main character. This ability to get others to share their vision is

Inspire a shared Vision. The individuals in these books consistently did this (Boyd, 2014 p.171).

Challenging the Process is the ability to stand up to the standard that has always been that standard when it is oppressing or hurting someone else. In the L'Amour books the hero of the story would stand up for the weak or the minority. This was not the accepted way to live live but, this is what was done because values were important to these leaders (Boyd, 2014, p. 172)

Encourage the heart is encouraging others to accomplish their goals and support yours by making them feel like they are part of something bigger than themselves. L'Amour would write his characters supporting others that had desires to move west. His characters would say things like “this country needs men like you. (Boyd,2014, p.173)

The LPI has been used to study leadership in Army populations, indicating that the use of the LPI has been seen to have value by Army researchers. In a study conducted by the Army War College, GEN Walter Ulmer used the LPI to examine leadership practices of commanding generals in Iraq during the time of the heaviest fighting (2004-2006) in Iraq. GEN Ulmer, well known for his research on toxic leadership in the US Army, concluded that the best leaders were perceived to have the following characteristics (Rogers, 2015):

- Keeps cool under pressure (Model the Way)
- Clearly explains missions, standards, and priorities (Enable Others to Act)
- Sees the big picture; provides context and perspective (Inspire a Shared Vision)
- Makes tough, sound decisions on time (Model the Way)
- Adapts quickly to new situations; can handle bad news (Challenge the Process;

Enable Others to Act)

- Gives useful feedback; sets a high ethical tone (Model The Way)
- Is positive, encouraging, and realistically optimistic (Encourage the Heart)

Specific to this study, researchers used the Student LPI to assess the effectiveness of leadership training in U.S. Army ROTC programs (Rogers, 2015). In the study the Inventory was administered to 122 Cadets at two New England universities, one of them a private military academy (N=31), and the other at a metropolitan university in Boston (N=91). Students were in their MS III and MS IV years. Modeling was the most frequent practice for Cadets at the Military Academy followed by Enabling; and this order was reversed at the urban university. Encouraging, Challenging and Inspiring followed next in frequency for both groups of Cadets. There were no statistically significant differences found between the two groups of Cadets for any of the five leadership practices. The leadership characteristics of the Cadets were not compared to traditional student Cadets, so no conclusions could be drawn regarding the differences between Cadets and non-Cadets. There were no differences in the leadership practices of ROTC Cadets who attended a military school and those who attended a traditional urban university, indicating that there is good chance that there are similarities between Cadets across institutions with regards to leadership practices. Likewise, no differences were found in the perceptions of Cadets who had attended a leadership camp and those who had not attended. The authors conclude that, “College students participating in Army ROTC demonstrate the leadership practices identified by Kouzes and Posner” (p. 52).

CHAPTER 3

Methodology

The object of this research is to show the relationship of targeted groups of college students towards leadership as measured by Kouzes and Posner's Student LPI. The three groups in this study are student-athletes, Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC) Students, and college students. The research questions that were asked in this study are:

RQ 1: What effect does participation in ROTC have on the self-perception of leadership practices of ROTC student compared with their traditional student peers?

RQ 2: What effect does participation in ROTC have on the self-perception of leadership practices of ROTC Student compared to their student-athlete peers?

The research questions will be answered by using Kouzes and Posner's Student LPI, an inventory designed to measure self-perceptions of leadership ability. The Inventory breaks down the leadership practices of the subject into five categories: Model the Way, Inspire Shared Vision, Challenge the Process, Enable Other To Act, and Encourage the Heart (Kouzes and Posner, 2002):

- Model the Way is leading as an example for your subordinate to follow. Model the Way means leading by the standards set for those who are being led, and doing so in a manner that inspires others to both follow and lead.

- Inspire a Shared Vision is the ability for the leader to get subordinates to understand and support a goal. Once the subordinate understands what the goal is, desires the same goal, and supports it then the leader has Inspired Shared Visions.
- Challenge the Process is the act in which leaders encourage subordinates to come up with their own ideas or new and inventive ways of solving problems. These leaders do not have the “my way is the only way mentality.” Instead Challenge the Process leaders encourage others to bring what they have to offer to the team.
- Enable Others to Act exists when the leader of a group makes that group a team. “We” is a term that is commonly used, and all ideas that are for the betterment of the group are welcomed. The leader that achieves this understands the value of all members of the team.
- Encourage the Heart is the most personable leadership trait of the five described in the Student LPI. Encourage the Heart is where leaders provide genuine acts of kindness towards the subordinate showing that the leader respects the subordinate, and in so doing expresses their value to the leader and to the team.

Data from ROTC students will be collected by electronic survey using SurveyMonkey in Spring 2015. Data from a study conducted by Lund (2013) will serve as student-athlete and traditional student baseline data. The total N consisted of 1,454 college students from NCAA Division I, II, and III member institutions from around the country-including 660 collegiate student-athletes and 794 collegiate non-athlete peers. (Lund 2013). Data from ROTC Cadets will be collected from 66 colleges that make up the 34 Detachments in the 7th ROTC Brigade, and are composed of approximately 760

ROTC Cadets eligible to take the survey. These programs are located in Michigan, Tennessee, Kentucky, and Ohio. The ROTC Cadets will range in ages of 18-25. An ROTC *Cadet* is a college student taking ROTC classes and is under contract by the US Army to serve as a Commissioned Officer in the Active or Reserve components of the Army. An ROTC *student* is anyone that is taking the class, but is not under contract to serve in the Armed Forces. All ROTC Cadets are students, but not all ROTC students are ROTC Cadets. For the purposes of this study no distinction was made during the survey to separate *Cadets* and *ROTC students*. Therefore the more inclusive *ROTC students* will be used more frequently to describe this population.

The investigator completed IRB training provided by Middle Tennessee State University. This was an online course that went through the steps to insure the research that was being conducted was done so legally and ethically, and insured that no harm would come to participants in the survey process. Upon completion of training the investigator received IRB Approval (Appendix F) from the MTSU Institutional Review Board, Middle Tennessee State University.

Upon completion of the IRB and receiving permission to conduct the survey the investigator emailed all of the Professors of Military Science (PMS) in 7th ROTC Brigade requesting permission to survey ROTC Cadets using the Student LPI (Appendix C). After receiving responses from six of the 64 Schools responding to the request. the investigator contacted the remaining 58 schools. Eight schools agreed to participate. Approximately 700 ROTC students in the eight college and university ROTC Detachments, ranging from MS I to MS IV, received the email with the link to the Inventory with the request for participation (Appendix D). 144 ROTC students participated in the Student LPI.

Inventories completed by ROTC Cadets were merged with the data collected by Lund (2013). A one way a one-way ANOVA was used to determine comparisons between the groups and possible significance. Student-athletes, traditional students, and ROTC Cadets were assigned numerical values, and comparisons were determined using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). A Post Hoc test was conducted to determine if significant differences exist between student-athletes and ROTC Cadets in, and if significant differences exist between traditional students and ROTC Cadets.

CHAPTER 4

Results

1,598 College students took the Student Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI): 660 student-athletes, 794 traditional students, and 144 ROTC students participating in an Army ROTC Program. Of the 1,598 college students taking the Student LPI, 593 were male and 1,005 were female. Data were collected from two different administrations of the Student LPI. The first set of data were gathered for both the traditional students and the student-athletes in 2013 for a doctoral dissertation titled, *A Comparison of Leadership Practices of Collegiate Student-Athletes and Non-Athlete Peer: Seeking the Solution to the Leadership Succession Crisis in Corporate America* (Lund, 2013). The second set of data was collected in Spring 2015 from ROTC Detachments. Data from the two administrations of the Student LPI were merged into one data set composed of the three groups – ROTC students, student-athletes, and college students. Data collected by Lund divided respondents into three NCAA Divisions of competition (Division I, Division II, and Division III). For the purposes of this study data were aggregated and compared holistically including the 144 ROTC students taking ROTC classes, student-athletes, and traditional students.

A one-way ANOVA was conducted comparing the three groups in each category of the Student LPI, with a post HOC test to show the differences. The number “1” represents student-athletes, “2” represents traditional students and “3” represents ROTC students. Results from each of the three groups are expressed below for each of the five constructs: Model the Way, Inspire A Shared Vision, Challenge the Process, Enable

Others To Act, and Encourage the Heart.

Overview of the Five Leadership Practices in the Student LPI

One of the more popular methods of determining leader traits is the Kouzes and Posner Leadership Practices Inventory (Student LPI). Developed in the 1980s, the Inventory was designed to determine best practices of leader behaviors by doing in-depth interviews and gathering written case studies from personal-best leadership experiences of American business leaders. Kouzes and Posner (2002b) generated a conceptual framework that consists of five leadership practices that are used by leaders when they perceive themselves to be performing at their personal best. The subcategories have specific characteristics that emulate the leader based on Kouzes and Posner's Leadership Practices Inventory and are as follows:

Model the Way

1. Clarify values by finding your voice and affirming shared ideals
2. Set the example by aligning actions with shared values.

Inspire a Shared Vision

3. Envision the future by imagining exciting and ennobling possibilities.
4. Enlist others in a common vision by appealing to shared aspirations.

Challenge the Process

5. Search for opportunities by seizing the initiative and by looking outward for innovative ways to improve.
6. Experiment and take risks by constantly generating small wins and learning from experience.

Enable Others To Act

7. Foster collaboration by building trust and facilitating relationships.
8. Strengthen others by increasing self-determination and developing competence.

Encourage the Heart

9. Recognize contributions by showing appreciation for individual excellence.
10. Celebrate the values and victories by creating a spirit of community. (Kouzes and Posner, 2006, p.26)

The 30 questions are divided into six questions for each practice, and in the five broad categories in a 30 item survey that represents the practices: Model the Way, Inspire Shared Vision, Challenge the Process, Enable Other to Act, and Encourage the Heart (Kouzes and Posner, p.14, 2002). Each leadership practice has a minimum score of 6, and a maximum score of 30 based on a 5 point Likert-scale (1=rarely or sldom, 2 = once in a while, 3 = sometimes, 4 = often, 5 = very frequently).

Each respondent answered the questionnaire by stating how often he or she perceives him or herself doing a particular type of leadership task. The question is answered and assigned a numerical rating for analysis. Each score was added and compared against their peers and the sequential subsets based on category. No score could equal below six or greater than 30. The specific questions in the survey are in Appendix (A).

Model the Way

Subset questions asked on the Student LPI for Model the Way were:

1. I set a personal example of what I expect from other people.
6. I spend time and energy making sure that people in the organization adhere to the principles and standards we have agreed on.
11. I follow through on the promises and commitments I make in this organization.
16. I find ways to get feedback about how my actions affect others.
21. I build consensus on an agreed-on set of values for our organization.
26. I talk about the values and principles that guide my actions.

Scores among the three groups for Model the Way can be seen in Table 1:

Table 1: Model the Way

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound	
1	660	22.7515	3.50574	.13646	22.4836	23.0195	11.00
2	794	21.8526	3.65397	.12967	21.5981	22.1072	7.00
3	90	24.9222	3.08030	.32469	24.2771	25.5674	18.00
Total	1544	22.4158	3.63812	.09259	22.2342	22.5974	7.00

660 Student-athletes had an average score of 22.7515. The low score for student-athletes was 11. 794. Traditional students scored an average of 21.853 on the Student LPI, with the lowest score a 7. 00 of the 144 ROTC students completed this portion of the Student LPI. ROTC students' average score was 24.9222, with the

lowest score an 18. ROTC students had the highest average score of the three groups with a difference of 2.17071 ($p<.000$) compared to student athletes, and a difference of 3.06958 ($p<.000$) compared to traditional students.

Table 2: Multiple Comparisons for Model the Way

	(I) Group	(J) Group	Mean Difference (I- J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Tukey HSD	1	2	.89887*	.18753	.000
		3	-2.17071*	.40004	.000
	2	1	-.89887*	.18753	.000
		3	-3.06958*	.39597	.000
	3	1	2.17071*	.40004	.000
		2	3.06958*	.39597	.000
Games- Howell	1	2	.89887*	.18825	.000
		3	-2.17071*	.35220	.000
	2	1	-.89887*	.18825	.000
		3	-3.06958*	.34963	.000
	3	1	2.17071*	.35220	.000
		2	3.06958*	.34963	.000

ROTC students scored higher on Model the Way than both student-athletes and traditional students. ROTC students scored on average 2.17 points higher than student-athletes, and on average 3.069 points higher than traditional students. The differences between the three groups were significant at $p<.000$. There is a significant enough difference among the different participants to say that ROTC students perceive themselves to be better at Model the Way than both student-athletes and traditional college students.

Inspire a Shared Vision

Subset questions asked on the Student LPI for Inspire a Shared Vision were:

2. I look ahead and communicate about what I believe will affect us in the future.
7. I describe to others in our organization what we should be capable of accomplishing.
12. I talk with others about sharing a vision of how much better the organization could be in the future.
17. I talk with others about how their own interests can be met by working toward a common goal.
22. I am upbeat and positive when talking about what our organization aspires to accomplish.
27. I speak with conviction about the higher purpose and meaning of what we are doing.

Scores among the three groups for Inspire a Shared Vision can be seen in Table 3:

Table 3: Inspire a Shared Vision

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound	
1	660	22.3864	4.06668	.15830	22.0755	22.6972	8.00
2	794	21.1763	4.43836	.15751	20.8671	21.4855	6.00
3	144	23.6944	3.66476	.30540	23.0908	24.2981	12.00
Total	1598	21.9030	4.29617	.10747	21.6922	22.1138	6.00

660 Student-athletes had an average score of 22.3864. The lowest score for the Student-athletes was 8. There were 794 traditional students who had an average score of 21.1763 on the LPI. Their lowest score was a 6. There were 144 ROTC students who had an average score was 23.6944. ROTC students lowest score was a 12. ROTC students had the highest average score of the three groups with a difference of 1.30808 ($p<.001$) compared to student athletes, and a difference of 2.51812 ($p<.000$) compared to traditional students.

Table 4: Multiple Comparisons for Inspire a Shared Vision

	(I) Group	(J) Group	Mean Difference (I- J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Tukey HSD	1	2	1.21004*	.22243	.000
		3	-1.30808*	.38838	.002
	2	1	-1.21004*	.22243	.000
		3	-2.51812*	.38247	.000
	3	1	1.30808*	.38838	.002
		2	2.51812*	.38247	.000
Games- Howell	1	2	1.21004*	.22331	.000
		3	-1.30808*	.34398	.001
	2	1	-1.21004*	.22331	.000
		3	-2.51812*	.34362	.000
	3	1	1.30808*	.34398	.001
		2	2.51812*	.34362	.000

ROTC students scored higher on Inspire a Shared Vision than both student-athletes and traditional students. ROTC students scored on average 21.308 points higher than student-athletes, and on average 2.518 points higher than traditional

students. The differences between the three groups were significant at $p < .001$.

There is a significant enough difference among the different participants to say that ROTC students perceive themselves to be better at Inspire a Shared Vision than both student-athletes and traditional college students.

Challenge the Process

Subset questions asked on the Student LPI for Challenge the Process were:

- 3. I look around for ways to develop and challenge my skills and abilities.
- 8. I look for ways that others can try out new ideas and methods.
- 13. I keep current on events and activities that might affect our organization.
- 18. When things do not go as we expected, I ask, "What can we learn from this experience."
- 23. I make sure that we set goals and make specific plans for the projects we undertake.
- 28. I take initiative in experimenting with the way we can do things in our organization.

Scores among the three groups for Challenge the Process can be seen in Table 5:

Table 5: Challenge the Process

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound	
1	660	21.7212	3.86626	.15049	21.4257	22.0167	10.00
2	794	20.7317	4.12354	.14634	20.4445	21.0190	6.00
3	144	23.3681	3.39219	.28268	22.8093	23.9268	15.00
Total	1598	21.3780	4.03179	.10086	21.1801	21.5758	6.00

660 Student-athletes had an average score of 21.7212. The lowest score for the Student-athletes was 10. There were 794 traditional students that had an average score of 20.7317 on the LPI. Their lowest score was a 6. There were 144 ROTC students who had an average score was 23.3681. ROTC students lowest score was a 15. ROTC students had the highest average score of the three groups with a difference of 1.64684 ($p < .000$) compared to student athletes, and a difference of 2.63632 ($p < .000$) compared to traditional students.

Table 6: Multiple Comparisons for Challenge the Process

	(I) Group	(J) Group	Mean Difference (I- J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Tukey HSD	1	2	.98947*	.20846	.000
		3	-1.64684*	.36399	.000
	2	1	-.98947*	.20846	.000
		3	-2.63632*	.35845	.000
	3	1	1.64684*	.36399	.000
		2	2.63632*	.35845	.000
Games- Howell	1	2	.98947*	.20991	.000
		3	-1.64684*	.32025	.000
	2	1	-.98947*	.20991	.000
		3	-2.63632*	.31832	.000
	3	1	1.64684*	.32025	.000
		2	2.63632*	.31832	.000

ROTC students scored higher on Challenge the Process than both student-athletes and traditional students. ROTC students scored on average 1.646 points higher than student-athletes, and on average 2.636 points higher than traditional students. The differences between the three groups were significant at $p < .000$.

There is a significant enough difference among the different participants to say that ROTC students perceive themselves to be better at Inspire a Shared Vision than both student-athletes and traditional college students.

Enable Others To Act

Subset questions asked on the Student LPI for Enable Others To Act were:

4. I foster cooperative rather than competitive relationships among people I work with.
9. I actively listen to diverse points of view.
14. I treat others with dignity and respect.
19. I support the decisions that other people in our organization make on their own.
24. I give others a great deal of freedom and choice in deciding how to do their work.
29. I provide opportunities for others to take on leadership responsibilities.

Scores among the three groups for Challenge the Process can be seen in Table 7:

Table 7: Enable Others to Act

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound	
1	660	23.7848	2.76808	.10775	23.5733	23.9964	15.00
2	794	23.8312	3.02019	.10718	23.6208	24.0416	12.00
3	144	24.8889	2.37737	.19811	24.4973	25.2805	17.00
Total	1598	23.9074	2.87980	.07204	23.7661	24.0487	12.00

660 Student-athletes had an average score of 23.9074. The lowest score for the Student-athletes was 17. There were 794 traditional students that had an

average score of 23.8312 on the LPI. Their lowest score was a 12. There were 144 ROTC students who had an average score was 24.889. ROTC students lowest score was a 17. ROTC students had the highest average score of the three groups with a difference of 1.10404 ($p<.000$) compared to student-athletes, and a difference of 1.05765 ($p<.000$) compared to traditional students.

Table 8: Multiple Comparisons of Enable Others to Act

	(I) Group	(J) Group	Mean Difference (I- J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Tukey HSD	1	2	-.04639	.15091	.949
		3	-1.10404*	.26350	.000
	2	1	.04639	.15091	.949
		3	-1.05765*	.25949	.000
	3	1	1.10404*	.26350	.000
		2	1.05765*	.25949	.000
Games- Howell	1	2	-.04639	.15198	.950
		3	-1.10404*	.22552	.000
	2	1	.04639	.15198	.950
		3	-1.05765*	.22525	.000
	3	1	1.10404*	.22552	.000
		2	1.05765*	.22525	.000

ROTC students scored higher on Challenge the Process than both student-athletes and traditional students. ROTC students scored on average 1.104 points higher than student-athletes, and on average 1.057 points higher than traditional students. The differences between the three groups were significant at $p<.000$.

There is a significant enough difference among the different participants to say that

ROTC students perceive themselves to be better at Challenge the Process than both student-athletes and traditional college students.

Encourage the Heart

Subset questions asked on the Student LPI for Encourage the Heart were:

5. I praise people for a job well done.
10. I encourage others as they work on activities and programs in our organization.
15. I give people in our organization support and express appreciation for their contributions.
20. I make it a point to publicly recognize people who show commitment to our values.
25. I find ways for us to celebrate accomplishments.
30. I make sure that people in our organization are creatively recognized for their contributions.

Scores among the three groups for Challenge the Process can be seen in Table 9:

Table 9: Encourage the Heart

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound	
1	660	23.4076	3.68431	.14341	23.1260	23.6892	10.00
2	794	22.0516	4.14870	.14723	21.7626	22.3406	6.00
3	144	23.5486	3.33833	.27819	22.9987	24.0985	14.00
Total	1598	22.7466	3.95279	.09888	22.5526	22.9405	6.00

660 Student-athletes had an average score of 23.407. The lowest score for the Student-athletes was 10. There were 794 traditional students that had an average score of 22.051 on the LPI. Their lowest score was a 6. There were 144 ROTC students who had an average score was 23.5486. ROTC students lowest score was a 14. ROTC students had a higher average score than traditional students with a difference of .141 ($p<.894$) compared to student-athletes, and a difference of 1.496 ($p<.000$) compared to traditional students.

Table 10: Multiple Comparisons for Encourage the Heart

	(I) Group	(J) Group	Mean Difference (I- J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Tukey HSD	1	2	1.35594*	.20513	.000
		3	-.14104	.35817	.918
	2	1	-1.35594*	.20513	.000
		3	-1.49697*	.35272	.000
	3	1	.14104	.35817	.918
		2	1.49697*	.35272	.000
Games- Howell	1	2	1.35594*	.20553	.000
		3	-.14104	.31298	.894
	2	1	-1.35594*	.20553	.000
		3	-1.49697*	.31475	.000
	3	1	.14104	.31298	.894
		2	1.49697*	.31475	.000

ROTC students scored higher on Encourage the Heart than traditional students. ROTC students scored on average 1.496 points higher than traditional students. The differences between the ROTC students and traditional students were

significant at $p < .000$. There is a significant enough difference among the different participants to say that ROTC students perceive themselves to be better at Encourage the Heart than traditional college students.

CHAPTER 5

Discussions and Recommendations

The purpose of this study is to compare the differences of three identifiable groups of college students using the Student LPI. The question being asked is whether or not Army ROTC leader development training is significantly different than other leader development programs available on college campuses. Specifically, the research questions being asked are:

RQ 1: What effect does participation in ROTC have on the self-perception of leadership practices of ROTC students compared with their traditional student peers?

RQ 2: What effect does participation in ROTC have on the self-perception of leadership practices of ROTC students compared to their student-athlete peers?

The hypotheses of this study are:

H1 ROTC students will perceive themselves to engage more frequently in leadership practices as assessed by the Student LPI than their traditional student peers.

H2 ROTC students will perceive themselves to engage more frequently in leadership practices as assessed by the Student LPI than their student-athlete peers.

DISCUSSION

Model the Way

Model the Way seeks to inventory the individual's perception of their practice of clarifying values by finding one's voice and affirming shared ideals, and setting the example by aligning actions with shared values. ROTC students scored higher in Model the Way than both student-athletes and traditional students. ROTC students scored an average of 24.4158, student-athletes scored 22.7515 and traditional students scored 21.853. These differences were significant ($p < .001$) compared to both student-athletes and traditional students.

One of the questions on the Inventory for Model the Way reads, "I set a personal example of what I expect from others." This is a leadership trait that is taught in the ROTC curriculum. The *Army ROTC eBook* states...

Indirect approaches to motivation can be as successful as direct approaches.

Setting a personal example can sustain the drive in others. This becomes apparent when you share the hardships. When your unit prepares for a deployment, you should share in the hard work. This includes your presence at night, weekends, and in any conditions or location where your subordinates are working (Leadership n.d).

Setting a personal example through continued education, physical fitness, and family life is a requirement of an officer in the United States Army and is taught to the Cadets as part of the ROTC curriculum. It is also part of what is called a Leadership Developmental

Program, or LDP (*Fundamentals of Leadership* n.d). Part of the LDP includes the counseling and mentoring of senior level Cadets by cadre. In turn, senior level Cadets are encouraged and taught to properly coach, teach, and mentor Cadets who are junior to them. In so doing Cadets are seen practicing Model the Way in front of their superiors, peers, and subordinates, and Model the Way practices are rewarded both explicitly in Cadet Evaluation Reports as well as more informally when being mentored. Another opportunity to learn Model the Way leadership is done through training opportunities where senior level Cadets (MS IIIs and MS IVs) are assigned leadership positions throughout the year. In so doing senior level Cadets are provided opportunities to both lead and follow. Following these leadership and followership opportunities, Cadets then are counseled on their effectiveness in these Model the Way activities (*Leadership* n.d)

Questions in Model the Way ask how much the respondent builds consensus on agreed-on values for the organization, and how often the respondent talks about the values and principles that guide his or her actions. Techniques of building consensus surrounding values inherent in the organization, as well as promoting Army values, are taught, reinforced, and lived in every school and unit in the Army. The Army Values of Loyalty, Duty, Respect, Selfless Service, Honor, Integrity, and Person Courage make up the acronym LDRSHIP, and posters of this acronym emphasizing Army values can be seen in buildings all over the world (*Army Values*, n.d.). Cadets are taught that these values should be evident in their behaviors whenever they are engaged in leader acts. The *Warrior Ethos* (*Army Values*, n.d.) is another means of teaching and reinforcing Army values. The *Warrior Ethos* reads:

I will always place the mission first.

I will never accept defeat.

I will never quit.

I will never leave a fallen comrade.

Army values and the *Warrior Ethos* are considered to be the spiritual backbone of the United States Army, and are taught to Cadets and ROTC students from their first day in ROTC. Having explicit, shared values that Cadets are encouraged to live by and talk about gives ROTC Cadets a distinct advantage over the student-athletes and traditional students when it comes to Modeling the Way. Cadets know that they will see these values throughout their Army career, and that these values represent Army culture.

Inspire a Shared Vision

Inspire a Shared Vision is the practice where the leader envisions the future by imagining exciting and ennobling possibilities while achieving the assigned mission. The task of the leader is to enlist others in a common vision by appealing to shared aspirations. ROTC students scored higher in Inspire a Shared Vision than both student-athletes and traditional students. ROTC students scored an average of 23.6944, student-athletes scored 22.3864, and traditional students scored 21.1763. These differences were significant ($p < .001$) with both student-athletes and traditional students.

In an important sense the Army is designed to communicate shared visions, and ROTC teaches these communications methods to help insure mission success. If the Army could be described as having one means of accomplishing missions, it would be to “get everyone on the same page” so that the successful mission is most likely to be achieved. The United States Army uses a standard format to communicate information

through its channels to try to insure that soldiers “get the word.” The Operation Order (OPORD) is the means by which the Army passes information regarding mission specifics, commanders intent, conditions under which the orders will be carried out, and the standards that will be used to determine mission success (*Fundamentals of Leadership*, n.d.). The Operation order consists of 5 paragraphs that have numerous sub paragraphs laid out in a specific order. It is organized in a manner that is easy to follow and can be referenced in a timely fashion. The rationale for the OPORD to be in this format is to minimize communications errors, and thereby to insure mission success. OPORD’s are communicated to the Army unit from squad level (4 soldiers) up through the Chief of Staff of the Army (as of this writing over 500,000 soldiers), and in all cases the purpose of the OPORD is to Inspire a Shared Vision. This format is taught as part of the lesson plan in ROTC in conjunction with Troop Leading Procedures (Tactics and Techniques n.d.)). Troop Leading Procedures articulates the systematic process used to deliver the OPORD to subordinate units and personnel. A formal learning component of ROTC on how and when to pass clear and concise information to peers and subordinates leads directly to the skilled practice of Inspire a Shared Vision (Tactics and Techniques n.d.). Specifically, learning and practicing the technique of receiving, writing, and executing the OPORD, along with learning and practicing troop leading procedures, teaches Cadets to “look ahead and communicate what he or she believes will affect the unit in the future, and facilitates the ability of the Cadet to describe to others what the unit should be capable of accomplishing.

The Army’s definition of leadership in *ADP 6-22* is: “(T)he process of influencing people by providing purpose, direction, and motivation to accomplish the mission and

improve the organization (ADP 6-22 p. 1-1). The Student LPI addresses practices regarding speaking with others in the unit about sharing a vision of how the organization could be better in the future; speaking with subordinates about how their interests can be met by working toward a common goal; about the affect of the leader, of being positive about the aspirations of the organization; and of the practice of speaking with conviction about the higher purpose and meaning of what the organization is doing. ROTC students are shown how to do this in practice in exercises the Field Training Exercise (FTX), in “garrison” (usually the ROTC Cadet Lounge) and in “down time” among the Cadets. Communicating shared vision is supported by curriculum in in the ROTC eBooks, specifically the eBook titled “Leadership.” “You can encourage your subordinates to set goals on their own and to set goals with the team. When goals are accepted, they focus attention and action, increase the effort and persistence expended even in the face of failure, and develop strategies to help in goal accomplishment” (Leadership n.d.). In sum, it is understandable that ROTC students would be familiar with the practice of communicating a shared vision, and scoring higher on this measure than student-athletes or traditional students seems a logical outcome of the curriculum.

Challenge the Process

Challenge the Process asks respondents to indicate if they engage in the practice of searching for opportunities by seizing the initiative and by looking outward for innovative ways to improve, experiment, and to take risks by constantly generating small wins and learning from experience. ROTC students scored higher in Challenge the Process than both student-athletes and traditional students. ROTC students scored an

average of 23.3681, student-athletes scored 21.7212 and traditional students scored 20.7317. These differences were significant ($p < .001$) with both student-athletes and traditional students.

ROTC Cadets and students are afforded the opportunity to challenge their leadership skills, physical ability, and mental agility through activities such as the Leadership Reaction Course (LRC). The LRC is a training exercise specifically designed to encourage ROTC Cadets and students to work as a team and to think through a problem. ROTC students are broken into small groups, and a ROTC Student is assigned a leader role and the others are designated as followers. Each group is given a task to accomplish, and a limited amount of time and resources to accomplish the task. The leader usually comes up with a plan, and then leads the group through the task. However, within the group the followers are encouraged to speak up, and in appropriate ways, to provide useful solutions that will help the *group* be successful at accomplishing the task. If there is a lesson to be learned in an LRC, it is that no leader gets the job done by forcing his or her will upon the group – the leader learns quickly that he or she is limited in knowledge and experience relative to the sum total of knowledge and experience of the group. The successful leader is taught to encourage members of the group to speak up and to offer suggestions to make mission success the likely outcome. At the same time the leader learns how to use this information, and when “enough is enough” and a decision must be made. This balance of leadership against the seeking of opinion generates both more knowledge as well as a sense of respect and trust among the members of the group. Over time this skill becomes a habit, and is utilized in practice in widely different leadership environments.

Upon completion of the task the ROTC student conduct an After Action Review (AAR) of the exercise. The AAR consists of a step-by-step analysis and discussion of what happened, what they could have done better, what was done well, and most importantly what was learned from the exercise. Upon conclusion of an LRC the Cadre will then often change the leader, replacing him or her with another member of the group. Then Cadre will tell the new leader to come up with a plan that is different from the previous leader's but still accomplishes the same goal.

This process is one of the educational tools that ROTC uses to teach ROTC students to Challenge the Process. Accomplishing the task – or in the Army, accomplishing the mission – is critical. Getting the right person in the right place, receiving information from everyone in the group, creating an environment where all members of the group are encouraged to contribute what they know and what they can do to achieve the task is the leadership practice. The leader is responsible for all aspects of task success. In the end both developing a plan, as well as encouraging others to *challenge* the plan to be successful, is one of the significant learning outcomes for both leader and followers. Having experiences like this in the classroom or field environment encourages ROTC students to think and execute these techniques and attitude in their military life.

Lessons like these teach ROTC Students the important of conducting of being flexible in their planning. Working as a team and looking at what they have just done and learning from it is one of the important outcomes of ROTC curriculum, and explains in part why ROTC students score higher on measures of *Challenge the Process*. Having formal education in these processes makes these students more likely to use this in their

day-to-day ROTC and military experiences. Given that ROTC students literally practice the art of both leading and encouraging peers to lead it is not surprising that they are confident in their ability to Challenge the Process.

Enable Others to Act

Enable Others To Act seeks to foster collaboration between leader and followers, and among followers, by building trust and facilitating relationships. "Enable" seeks to assess how much a leaders tries to strengthen others by increasing self-determination and developing competence among followers. ROTC students scored higher in Enable Others To Act than both student-athletes and traditional students. ROTC students scored an average of 24.8889, Student-athletes scored 23.7848 and traditional students scored 23.8312. These differences are significant ($p < .001$) against both student-athletes and traditional students.

Army ROTC teaches students about military and civilian roles in the Army. These roles are Army Officer, Army Non Commissioned Officer (NCO), Army Enlisted, and Army Civilian (Leadership n.d.). All four roles have important jobs that support the primary mission of the Army: to enforce the national political will on the enemies of the United States by means of lethal force. ROTC students learn the importance of allowing these groups to take charge of their specific portion of the mission. Enabling Others To Act also is a skill taught when ROTC students study Direct Leadership, one of the three types of leadership discussed in *ADP 6-22*, the other two types of leadership being Organizational and Strategic (*Army leadership*, 2012).

An example of Direct Leadership is helpful. An Infantry Platoon Leader will, for example, tell the Squad Leader where he wants the machine guns located, and the desired rate of fire for the weapons system based on enemy threat and ammunition available. It is up to the Squad Leader to understand the orders of the Platoon Leader, and to come up with their plan on how to execute those orders. The Platoon Leader will allow his subordinates the freedom to control his squad and not go directly to the Machine Gunner and Assistance Machine Gunner to give these orders. In so doing the Gunners are entrusted – in the measure of the Inventory they are *enabled* – to carry out their orders as they best see fit. The Army is critically concerned with this process, and much literature is written discussing the problem of micromanagement in the military. Enable Others To Act is the exact and polar opposite of micromanagement. It is important for the Platoon leader to understand that the Squad Leader is a subject matter expert on the weapon system, and therefore the Platoon Leader learns that trusting the Gunners to make good decisions. Taking recommendations from him on placement and rate of fire is encouraged in ROTC.

Snider (2005) explains why Enable Others To Act is critically important to the Army: it is trust that makes the Army a profession, and absent an ethic of professionalism the officer corps will fail to perform its leadership function. As Snider argues, the absence of Army professionalism will lead to the demise of the officer corps:

Perhaps more than civilian occupations, trust in the military goes to the heart of the profession's ethic and therefore to its effectiveness on the battlefield. Unless commanders establish a culture of trust within Army units, soldiers will not feel free to tell the truth, and without transparent honesty in interpersonal relations and

official reporting systems, effectiveness suffers. This downward spiral induces micromanagement on the part of leaders, and risks adverse responses on the part of followers. (p 26)

One can see that professionalism, Enable Others To Act, and Challenge the Process are closely related. ROTC students will either execute orders as members of a platoon, or will give these orders as the Platoon Leader, in their Field Training Exercises held every semester while enrolled in ROTC. In so doing they learn to Enable Others To Act, as well as to begin the process of becoming a member of the Profession of Arms. ROTC students are taught to delegate authority to their subordinates, and to receive orders from their superiors, as part of their training. The expectation is that ROTC students will acquire an understanding of delegation of authority in order to be a successful leader. Indeed, ROTC students are graded on their ability to give and receive orders as part of the Cadet Evaluation Report (CER) (Leadership n.d.).

ROTC students are taught that leaders make the final decisions, but are reminded that a platoon, section, or other form of unit is often composed of subject matter experts who are willing to help with the plan. The Platoon Leader learns to trust his subordinates, and the subordinate learns to respect the leadership of his superior officer. The important thing is that the leader understands that the members of the team are subject matter experts in their specialty areas, and knowing for this allows both the Platoon Leader to lead and for the subordinate soldiers to execute as the expert soldiers that they have been trained to be. In sum, ROTC students learn quickly that effective leadership is trusting leadership. It stands to reason then that they will perform higher on Enable Others To Act than their student-athlete and traditional student peers.

Encourage the Heart

Encourage the Heart recognizes the contributions of others by showing appreciation for individual excellence. Leaders who practice Encourage the Heart celebrate the values and victories of others by creating a spirit of community. ROTC students scored higher in Encourage the Heart than traditional students ($p < .001$), but there was not a significant difference ($p < .918$) between ROTC students and student-athletes on this measure. ROTC students scored an average of 23.5485, compared to student-athletes who scored 23.4076. However, ROTC students measured higher on Encourage the Heart than traditional students, who scored 22.0516.

It is not surprising that both ROTC students and student-athletes perceive themselves to practice Encourage the Heart more than their traditional student peers. The concept of team and encouraging one's teammates is an important part of athletic performance, and is learned from a young age by successful athletes. Similarly, ROTC students engage in numerous activities as team members, and the individual performance of each ROTC student is measured by the success of the unit(s) of which they are members.

Napoleon Bonaparte once said, "I could conquer the world if only I had enough ribbon." ROTC students are taught the importance of rewarding subordinates by going through the process of earning various decorations for performance. Cadre recognize ROTC students in official ceremonies, recognizing everything from high grades and GPAs, to outstanding performances in physical training, to being assigned various leader roles within ROTC. Cadets and ROTC students receive medals, books, and monetary scholarships for their hard work and dedication to the program. All of these

acknowledgements are important, and are ritualized from the moment when a Cadet enters ROTC and raises his or her right hand and pledges to uphold the Constitution of the United States. This ceremony is both reward and public acknowledgement of commitment to ROTC, the Constitution of the United States, and to the United States Army. And, at the end of a military career, the soldier “musters out” in a retirement ceremony that acknowledges one’s career of service to the nation. In all of these events Encourage the Heart is evident – each moment and acknowledgement is designed to promote the morale of the individual, as well as the community, of the Profession of Arms and the United States Army.

They are also rewarded by giving opportunities to receive training such as Airborne school, Air Assault School, Cadet Leadership Training, and Culture and Language Training. All of which are important opportunities that influence their lives as leaders.

Summary

H1 ROTC students will perceive themselves to engage more frequently in leadership practices as assessed by the Student LPI than their traditional student peers.

ROTC Cadets measured higher on the Student LPI in all five practices than their traditional student peers. The differences between these groups were significant ($p < .001$) in all five areas, indicating that there is a significant difference in these leadership practices between the two groups. It cannot be said with 100% certainty what is causing this difference; it is possible that ROTC students enter the program with higher scores in

these five practices than their traditional student peers. This would be a good question for future research – to determine if there is a difference over time among ROTC students in perception of leadership practices. In conclusion, ROTC students practice the leader skills measured by the Student LPI more frequently than do their traditional student peers. The hypothesis is accepted for all five measures of the Inventory.

H2 ROTC students will perceive themselves to engage more frequently in leadership practices as assessed by the Student LPI than their student-athlete peers.

ROTC Students perceived themselves to be leaders in 4 of the 5 sections of the Student LPI, and these differences were significant ($p < .001$) for Model the Way, Challenge the Process, Inspire a Shared Vision, and Communicate a Shared Vision. There was no a significant difference in the two groups in the subcategory of Encourage the Heart. As with the differences between ROTC students and their traditional student peers, a suggestion for future research would be to see if both student-athletes, as well as ROTC students, change with respect to the measures of the Student LPI over time. Such an inventory, beginning prior to the leadership experience, would help determine if the differences in these measures are due to the program, or to the nature of the college students entering the programs that are being measured.

REFERENCES

- Advanced Guide to MSAF Coaching.* (2012). Retrieved June 16, 2015, from [http://msaf.army.mil/Files/Advanced%20Coaching%20Guide.Final\(2\).pdf](http://msaf.army.mil/Files/Advanced%20Coaching%20Guide.Final(2).pdf)
- ADP 6-22: Army leadership.* (2012). Washington, DC: Hq, Dept of the Army.
- Army Values. (n.d.) Retrieved June 22, 2015 from <http://www.army.mil/values/warrior.html>.
- Astin, H., & Angeles, C. (1996). *A social change model of leadership development: Guidebook: Version III.* Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Baby Boomers Retire. (2010, December 28). Retrieved July 1, 2015, from <http://www.pewresearch.org/daily-number/baby-boomers-retire/>
- Bennis, W. & O'Toole, J. (2005). How business schools lost their way. *Harvard Business Review, May*, pp.1-9.
- Boyd, B. (2014). Leadership that steeled the frontier. *Journal of Leadership Education, 12*(2), 169-175.
- Barrow, J. (1977). The variables of leadership. A review and conceptual framework. *Academy of Management Review, 2*, 231-251.
- Burns, J.M. (1978). *Leadership.* New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Bush, H, personal communication, March 15, 2010.
- Custom Edition for BOLC I: Army ROTC. (2006). *Introduction to leadership: MSL I.* Boston, MA: Pearson Custom Publishing.
- Denhart, M., Villwock, R., and Vedder, R. (2009). The academics athletics trade-off. Center for College of Affordability and Productivity.
- Ewing, Walter A. (2012). *The future of a generation: How new Americans will help support retiring baby boomers.* Imagination Policy Center American Immigration Council.
- FM 3-21.10 Troop leading procedures.* (2006). Retrieved July 1, 2015, from <https://rdl.train.army.mil/catalog-ws/view/100.ATSC/423B3CC4-3606-4E1B-86A6-F37C4BC792C3-1274572553978/3-21.10/chap2.htm>

FM 6-22: Army leadership: Competent, confident, and agile. (2006). Washington, DC: Hq, Dept. of the Army.

Fundamentals of leadership. (n.d.). Retrieved June 16, 2015, from <http://www.rotcebooks.net/Leadership/index.html#>

Haber, P., and Komives, S. (2009). Predicting the individual values of the social change model of leadership development: The role of college students' leadership and involvement experiences. *Journal of leadership education*, 7(3), 133-66.

Haslam, S., & Reicher, S. (2011). *The new psychology of leadership identity, influence, and power.* Hove England: Psychology Press.

Kouzes, J.M, & Posner, B. Z. (2002a). *The leadership challenge* (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kouzes, J.M., & Posner, B.Z. (2002b). The leadership practices inventory: Theory and evidence behind the five practices of exemplary leaders. Retrieved June 17, 2015 from http://www.leadershipchallenge.com/UserFiles/lc_jb_appendix.pdf

Kouzes, J. M., and Posner, B. Z. (2003). *Leadership practices inventory* (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Pfeiffer.

Kouzes, J. M., and Posner, B.Z. (2015). The student leadership challenge. Retrieved June 17, 2015 from <http://www.studentleadershipchallenge.com/home.aspx>.

Kouzes, J., & Posner, B. (2006). *Student leadership practices inventory: Facilitator's guide* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Kram, K. (1983). Phases of the mentor relationship. *Academy of management journal*. 26 (4), 608-25.

Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) Assessments. (n.d.). Retrieved June 17, 2015, from <http://www.leadershipchallenge.com/leaders-section-assessments.aspx>

Leadership (n.d.). Retrieved June 17, 2015, from <http://www.rotcebooks.net/Leadership/index.html>

Legacy and Values . (n.d.) . Retrieved June 16, 2015 from <http://www.goarmy.com/rotc/legacy-and-value.html>

- Lund, Bruce L. (2013). A Comparison of leadership practices of collegiate student-athletes and non-athletic peers: Seeking solutions to the leadership sustention crisis in corporate America. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Middle Tennessee State University.
- McAfee, Doreen. (2009). *The recruitment and hiring of collegiate student-athletes in corporate America*. (Doctoral dissertation). ProQuest, UMI Dissertation Publishing.
- Mull, R., Bayless, K., and Jamieson, L. (2005). *Recreational sport management*. Champaign, Illinois: Human Kinetics.
- Officership (n.d.). Retrieved June 17, 2015, from <http://www.rotcebooks.net/Officership/index.html>
- Personal Development (n.d.). Retrieved June 17, 2015, from http://www.rotcebooks.net/Personal_Development/index.html
- Posner, B. (2012). Effectively measuring student leadership. *Administrative sciences*. 2, 221-234.
- Polkinghorne, D. (1988). *Narrative knowing and the human sciences*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Pouto, J.R., and O'Hanlon, J. (2006). National study of student-athletes regarding their experiences as college students. NCAA Research Committee.
- Rogers, J. (2015). Does the leadership challenge fit the Army's leadership doctrine? Retrieved June 17, 2015 at <http://www.leadershipchallenge.com/resource/model-the-way-february-2012.aspx>.
- Rost, J. (1993). *Leadership for the 21st century*. Westport, Connecticut: Praeger Publishers.
- ROTC eBooks Leadership (n.d.). Retrieved March 2, 2015, from <http://www.rotcebooks.net/index.html>
- Sarwar, Chaudhary (2012). Future of ethically effective leadership. Springer Science+Business Media
- Shane, S. (2010). *Born entrepreneurs, born leaders: How your genes affect your work life*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Smith, Daniella L. (2013). *The Role of Mentoring in the Leadership Development of Pre-Service: School Librarians* Department of Library and Information Sciences College of Information University of North Texas.

Snider, D. (Ed.). (2005). *The future of the Army profession*. 2nd Ed. Boston, Massachusetts: McGraw Hill.

Tactics and Techniques (n.d.). Retrieved June 17, 2015, from http://www.rotcebooks.net/Tactics_and_Techniques/index.html

Values and Ethics. (n.d.). Retrieved June 17, 2015, from http://www.rotcebooks.net/Values_and_Ethics/ind

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Student LPI

How frequently do you *typically* engage in the following behaviors and actions? Circle the number to the right of each statement, using the scale below, that best applies.

	1	2	3	4	5
	RARELY OR SELDOM	ONCE IN A WHILE	SOMETIMES	OFTEN	VERY FREQUENTLY
1. I set a personal example of what I expect from other people.	1	2	3	4	5
2. I look ahead and communicate about what I believe will affect us in the future.	1	2	3	4	5
3. I look around for ways to develop and challenge my skills and abilities.	1	2	3	4	5
4. I foster cooperative rather than competitive relationships among people I work with.	1	2	3	4	5
5. I praise people for a job well done.	1	2	3	4	5
6. I spend time and energy making sure that people in our organization adhere to the principles and standards we have agreed on.	1	2	3	4	5
7. I describe to others in our organization what we should be capable of accomplishing.	1	2	3	4	5
8. I look for ways that others can try out new ideas and methods.	1	2	3	4	5
9. I actively listen to diverse points of view.	1	2	3	4	5
10. I encourage others as they work on activities and programs in our organization.	1	2	3	4	5
11. I follow through on the promises and commitments I make in this organization.	1	2	3	4	5
12. I talk with others about sharing a vision of how much better the organization could be in the future.	1	2	3	4	5
13. I keep current on events and activities that might affect our organization.	1	2	3	4	5
14. I treat others with dignity and respect.	1	2	3	4	5
15. I give people in our organization support and express appreciation for their contributions.	1	2	3	4	5
16. I find ways to get feedback about how my actions affect other people's performance.	1	2	3	4	5
17. I talk with others about how their own interests can be met by working toward a common goal.	1	2	3	4	5
18. When things do not go as we expected, I ask, "What can we learn from this experience?"	1	2	3	4	5
19. I support the decisions that other people in our organization make on their own.	1	2	3	4	5
20. I make it a point to publicly recognize people who show commitment to our values.	1	2	3	4	5
21. I build consensus on an agreed-on set of values for our organization.	1	2	3	4	5
22. I am upbeat and positive when talking about what our organization aspires to accomplish.	1	2	3	4	5
23. I make sure that we set goals and make specific plans for the projects we undertake.	1	2	3	4	5
24. I give others a great deal of freedom and choice in deciding how to do their work.	1	2	3	4	5
25. I find ways for us to celebrate accomplishments.	1	2	3	4	5
26. I talk about the values and principles that guide my actions.	1	2	3	4	5
27. I speak with conviction about the higher purpose and meaning of what we are doing.	1	2	3	4	5
28. I take initiative in experimenting with the way we can do things in our organization.	1	2	3	4	5
29. I provide opportunities for others to take on leadership responsibilities.	1	2	3	4	5
30. I make sure that people in our organization are creatively recognized for their contributions.	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX B**Permission to use LPI****WILEY**

April 8, 2015

Charles Buntin 109 Durham Court Murfreesboro, TN 37128

Dear Mr. Buntin:

Thank you for your request to use the LPI®: Leadership Practices Inventory® in your research. This letter grants you permission to use either the print or electronic LPI [Self/Observer/Self and Observer] instrument[s] in your research. You may *reproduce* the instrument in printed form at no charge beyond the discounted one-time cost of purchasing a single copy; however, you may not distribute any photocopies except for specific research purposes. If you prefer to use the electronic distribution of the LPI you will need to separately contact Eli Becker (ebecker@wiley.com) directly for further details regarding product access and payment. Please be sure to review the product information resources before reaching out with pricing questions.

Permission to use either the written or electronic versions is contingent upon the following:

(1) The LPI may be used only for research purposes and may not be sold or used in conjunction with any compensated activities;(2) Copyright in the LPI, and all derivative works based on the LPI, is retained by James M. Kouzes and Barry Z. Posner. The following copyright statement must be included on all reproduced copies of the instrument(s); "Copyright © 2013 James M. Kouzes and Barry Z. Posner. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Inc. All rights reserved. Used with permission";

(3) One (1) **electronic** copy of all papers, reports, articles, and the like which make use of the LPI data must be sent **promptly** to my attention at the address below; and,(4) We have the right to include the results of your research in publication, promotion, distribution and sale of the LPI and all related products.

Permission is limited to the rights granted in this letter and does not include the right to grant others permission to reproduce the instrument(s) except for versions made by nonprofit organizations for visually or physically handicapped persons. No additions or changes may be made without our prior written consent. You understand that your use of the LPI shall in no way place the LPI in the public domain or in any way compromise our copyright in the LPI. This license is nontransferable. We reserve the right to revoke this permission at any time, effective upon written notice to you, in the event we conclude, in our reasonable judgment, that your use of the LPI is compromising our proprietary rights in the LPI.

Best wishes for every success with your research project. Cordially,



Ellen Peterson Permissions Editor

One Montgomery, Suite 1200, San Francisco, CA 94104-4594 U.S. T +1 415 433
1740

APPENDIX C

Letter to each Professor of Military Science

Sir or Ma'am,

I am MAJ Charles B. Buntin II, APMS MTSU ROTC. I am writhing my thesis for my Master of Science in Leisure and Sports Management at Middle Tennessee State University. My thesis studies Army ROTC leader development, and compares the leader skills of ROTC Cadets to those of the average college student. My request is to ask you to forward a separate email to your Cadets that will take them to an Inventory in SurveyMonkey. Project details are below. If you wish to see the Inventory in SurveyMonkey and take it and receive immediate results then please follow this link:

<https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/Leadsershipcadre>

If you agree to support this project then you can skip the information below and simply Reply in the affirmative back to me. I will send you a separate email that you will forward directly to your Cadets.

Project Details:

My hypothesis is that ROTC cadets outperform their college peers with regards to leader skills as measured by a well known leadership survey. Given the Army's interest in developing leadership, the emphasis in ROTC on leader development, and your own experiences with Army leader development you can see why I hypothesize that Cadets will outperform the average college student with respect to leader skills.

The Inventory is formally known as Kouzes and Posner's Student Leader Practices Inventory. I can provide detailed information on the Inventory upon request, but if you wish to have immediate information on it you can info at http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Leadership_Challenge. The Inventory will take approximately 15 minutes to complete. After gathering survey information I will be able to provide preliminary results to you, and to your cadets, of how Cadets compare to college students. My goal is to publish these results in *The Cadet* and other appropriate journals.

The usual permissions have been obtained for me to perform this study, and if you wish to see any documentation of the following I am glad to provide it: IRB Approval from MTSU, permission from U.S. Army Center for Initial Military Training (CIMT) Identification and Management of Human Subjects (Detachment level PMS approval is all that is required), and permission to use the Kouzes and Posner Student Leadership Practices Inventory. After receiving approval for the administration of the Inventory by you I will send an email to you that you can Forward to your MS III and MS IV Cadets.

Thank you for your support of this project. If you need any additional information please do not hesitate to contact me, and I will be in touch with you by phone to answer any additional questions you may have. Thank you again for your support!

Very respectfully,

CHARLES B BUNTIN II
MAJ, EN
Asst. Professor of Military Science
Middle Tennessee State University ROTC

Blue Raider Battalion

Office [\(615\)898-2293](tel:(615)898-2293)

Cell [\(931\)801-2393](tel:(931)801-2393)

APPENDIX D

Letter to ROTC Students

Greetings!

You are receiving this email from your PMS in regards to an Inventory. If you need more detail then see below. Otherwise please follow this link to the Inventory in

SurveyMonkey: <https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/learnedleadership>

I am Charles B. Buntin II, a masters student writing a thesis for my degree in Leisure and Sports Management at Middle Tennessee State University. My thesis studies Army ROTC leader development, and compares the leader skills of ROTC Cadets to those of the average college student. My hypothesis is that ROTC cadets outperform their college peers with regards to leader skills as measured by a well known leadership survey titled the Student Leadership Practices Inventory. Information on this Inventory can be found at http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Leadership_Challenge.

I have received permission from your PMS to request your assistance in gathering the data needed for the study. You will receive preliminary results at the end of the Inventory. If you wish to receive the final results of the study in its entirety then please contact me at charlie.buntin@gmail.com, or my major professor Dr. Steve Estes at steven.estes@mtsu.edu in Fall 2015.

Thank you for your participation!

Charles B. Buntin II
Masters Student
Middle Tennessee State University
Charlie.buntin@gmail.com

APPENDIX E
Request to use LPI

Health and Human Performance
119 Alumni Memorial Gymnasium
MTSU P.O. Box 96
Murfreesboro, TN 37132
Office: 615.898.2906 – Fax: 615.898.5020



03 April 2015

Ellen Peterson
Permissions Editor
Jossey-Bass Publishers
989 Market St. Fifth Floor
San Francisco, CA 94103-1741

Ms. Peterson:

My name is Major Charles Buntin, United States Army, and a graduate student in Leisure and Sport Management at Middle Tennessee State University. I am currently writing my thesis tentatively titled, "Comparing the Leadership Abilities of ROTC Cadets and College Students."

I am respectfully requesting to use the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) (attached to this letter), authored by James Kouzes and Barry Posner (© 2006) to collect my data. I will be giving this survey in written form.

Attached is also a copy of my IRB approval letter from MTSU. If you need any other information for this request then I am pleased to provide it. Thank you for your assistance, and I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Very Respectfully,

Charlie Buntin

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Charles B. Buntin II".

CHARLES B. BUNTIN II
MAJ, EN
Assistant Professor of Military Science

Email: Charles.buntin@mtsu.edu
Office: (615)898-2293
Cell: (931)801-2393

APPENDIX F**IRB Approval Letter**

3/17/2015

Investigator(s): Charles Buntin Department: Health and Human Performance Investigator(s) Email: Charles.buntin@mtsu.edu

Protocol Title: " The preserved leadership abilities of student in ROTC vs College students not in ROTC "

Protocol Number: 15-173

Dear Investigator(s),

The MTSU Institutional Review Board, or a representative of the IRB, has reviewed the research proposal identified above. The MTSU IRB or its representative has determined that the study poses minimal risk to participants and qualifies for an expedited review under 45 CFR 46.110 and 21 CFR 56.110, and you have satisfactorily addressed all of the points brought up during the review.

Approval is granted for one (1) year from the date of this letter for 600 (SIX HUNDRED) participants.

Please note that any unanticipated harms to participants or adverse events must be reported to the Office of Compliance at

(615) 494-8918. Any change to the protocol must be submitted to the IRB before implementing this change.

You will need to submit an end-of-project form to the Office of Compliance upon completion of your research located on the IRB website. Complete research means that you have finished collecting and analyzing data. **Should you not finish your research within the one (1) year period, you must submit a Progress Report and request a continuation prior to the expiration date.** Please allow time for review and requested revisions. Failure to submit a Progress Report and request for continuation will automatically result in cancellation of your research study. Therefore, you will not be able to use any data and/or collect any data. Your study expires **3/18/2016**.

According to MTSU Policy, a researcher is defined as anyone who works with data or has contact with participants. Anyone meeting this definition needs to be listed on the protocol and needs to complete the required training. **If you add researchers to an approved project, please forward an updated list of researchers to the Office of Compliance before they begin to work on the project.**

All research materials must be retained by the PI or faculty advisor (if the PI is a student) for at least three (3) years after study completion and then destroyed in a manner that maintains confidentiality and anonymity.

Sincerely,

Institutional Review Board Middle Tennessee State University