Teaching Leadership To Undergraduates: Lessons From U.S. Military Colleges

Clifford West, Ph.D., Virginia Military Institute, USA

ABSTRACT

Military colleges and service academies are a small and unique subset of the U.S. schools offering undergraduate degrees. With missions of preparing young men and women for serving and leading in perilous circumstances, what lessons, regarding developing leadership skills in young people, can be transferred to traditional schools? This paper argues that undergraduate institutions can strive to build a leadership foundation for their students by combining academic pursuits and leader experience in a comprehensive manner, similar to the "whole person" (i.e., mind, body, character) approach of military higher education. While military-specific topics and grueling training regimens are inappropriate in most cases, certain aspects common to military schools, like rigorous academic standards and honor codes, are relevant and recommended. Similarly, each student should have the opportunity to practice leadership in the relatively safe environment of a college campus, where mistakes do not lead to lost profits or derailed careers. Leadership can be in NCAA or intramural sports, student government or clubs, or in community outreach projects. The crucial element is that participants must be encouraged to reflect on their successes and failures and accurately attribute causality, acknowledging others' contributions and their own deficiencies. Finally, the results of a preliminary study at a well-known U.S. military college, comparing undergraduate leadership experience and perceptions of leader effectiveness, will be presented and discussed. Interestingly, those students with the most experience were the most self-critical, thus arguing that self-awareness is a crucial pre-determinant for effective leadership at any level.

Keywords: Leader Development; Undergraduates; Military Colleges

INTRODUCTION

A recent *Fortune* magazine article focused on job and graduate school opportunities for junior military officers returning from deployments in Iraq and Afghanistan. Lieutenants and captains in their twenties have been responsible for multi-million dollar equipment and weapons, plus the well-being of civilians and their subordinates. Contrary to stereotypes of inflexible military leaders, they have demonstrated creativity, resilience and independence in the face of complexity and ambiguity. In the eyes of major corporations, like GE, PepsiCo and Wal-Mart, and top tier MBA programs, military service has fast-tracked their leadership development. (O'Keefe, 2010)

Clearly, it would be unrealistic to argue that serving *in harm's way* is the best or only way to develop leadership skills in young people. Fortunately, the cauldron of war is not likely to be experienced by the vast majority of undergraduates, at any point in their lifetimes. Yet, U.S. military colleges and service academies have the unique missions of preparing young men and women for serving and leading in perilous circumstances within just a year or two of graduation. What lessons, regarding leader development, can be transferred from this small subset of schools to more *traditional* institutions?

LEADER DEVELOPMENT IN A MILITARY COLLEGE CONTEXT

Husted & West (2008) described the education provided by services academies, like the U.S. Military Academy, the U.S. Naval Academy, the U.S. Air Force Academy, the U.S. Coast Guard Academy, and state-

supported military colleges, like the Citadel and Virginia Military Institute, as comprehensive and well-rounded, combining strong academic preparation and co-curricular programs that emphasize physical training and fitness, basic military skills including leadership, and moral and ethical development, often referred to as the "whole person" concept. (Husted & West, pg. 35) Thus, a young person is not seen solely as a vessel to be filled with academic knowledge. Rather, a military education shapes and hardens that vessel concurrent with its filling. And, the vessel's utility and durability are expected to endure for a lifetime. (Husted & West, pg. 36) The authors posed the following question: "Why do (these) service academies and state-supported military college thrive, when there are living and learning environments at other colleges and universities that are more comfortable and much less restrictive?" Their findings pointed toward unquestioned integrity, a trait possessed by the graduates of these institutions and highly valued by most employers. (Husted & West, pg. 34)

Thus, character building is a core aspect of military higher education. The Citadel, for instance, strives to develop "principled leaders for all walks of life". (www.citadel.edu) The focal point for character building at service academies and military colleges is their honor code. Most have adopted a code which states that a cadet will neither lie, cheat, steal nor tolerate those who do. The toleration clause is omitted at the U.S. Naval Academy, but is an essential part of the codes at the others. (www.usna.edu) From Day One, the honor system pervades all aspects of a cadet's life. While the *reasonable doubt* standard of jurisprudence is practiced, these are single sanction systems (with the exception of the U.S. Naval Academy); "one strike and you are out"…forever. And, no one is exempt, cadet captain or private, NCAA athlete or work study student. For four years, honesty in all regards is neither an abstraction nor an option for cadets. They do not just *behave* honorably; they *are* honorable men and women and likely will remain so for a lifetime. (Bush, et al., 2009, pgs. 33-34; Husted & West, pg. 36).

"*Integrity first, Service before self, and Excellence in all we do.* These are the Air Force Core Values. Study them…understand them…follow them…and encourage others to do the same….A person of integrity is honest; displays moral courage; is responsible and accountable; practices justice; encourages a free flow of information; and possesses self-respect and humility…We are entrusted with the security of our nation….In the end, we earn the respect and trust of the American people because of the integrity we demonstrate." (www.usafa.af.mil/core-value, 2006, pgs. 3-7) The U.S. Army framework for leadership, expressed in Field Manual (FM) 22-100, identifies seven core values of crucial importance: loyalty, duty, respect, selfless service, honor, integrity and personal courage. (U.S. Department of the Army, 1999, pg. B-2) Matthews et al. (2006) examined FM 22-100 for elaboration on characteristics of the ideal Army leader. They identified self-discipline, judgment, cultural awareness, a positive attitude, empowerment (of subordinates), creative thinking and critical reasoning as additional character traits the Army seeks to develop in its officers. (pg. S59)

These passages capture the essence of the military approach to leadership. Business leaders shoulder immense responsibilities, but they seldom extend beyond the firm's relationships with and obligations to key constituents (e.g., shareholders, creditors, customers, suppliers, regulatory agencies, etc.). Military leaders are responsible for lethal and expensive weaponry and the lives of civilians and subordinates. Purposely mixing metaphors, military leadership is serious business! Therefore, the methods used in a military context to develop leadership skills in young people are necessarily more intense and compressed than in a civilian setting.

Recently, students in a Principles of Management course at a nationally recognized military college were asked to reflect on their own leadership development. Most of them were less than twelve months removed from a grueling freshman year of military indoctrination and physical training; and, few had served in leader positions beyond squad leader for ROTC cross-country runs or company corporal for new cadet basic training. Therefore, what they described was much more about p*rocess* than *results*, despite assumptions of career benefits.

"…At (*name of school*), we have mandatory formations (i.e., attendance) for almost everything: classes, meals, football and basketball games, physical training, etc. We wear uniforms, have hygiene standards for ourselves and higher standards still for the appearance of our rooms. We even have lights out and sleep time. Since there are so many rules, you need to tiptoe around (*name of school*) to avoid breaking any of them and suffering punishment. So, what does all of this teach us? Well, it enforces punctuality, because there is a consequence to being five seconds late to anything. It instills patience, because we endure inconveniences not faced by normal college students. We master time management, because there are not enough hours in the day to accomplish all that is

required of a (*name of school*) cadet. And, we learn to work and survive in a <u>very high stress environment</u>. But, first and foremost, the strict Honor Code at (*name of school*) is developing my <u>personal integrity</u>, which is essential for effective leadership….” (Cadet #1)

“…The (*name of school*) prides itself on the creation and development of leaders in both the military and business worlds…. Throughout the trials and tribulations of the (new cadet training period), I have experienced challenges that have…focused on (my) <u>mental toughness</u> and <u>emotional stability</u>. And, through all the yelling, workouts and marches, I managed to emerge…with with a great degree of <u>self-confidence</u> and <u>pride</u>….” (Cadet #2)

“…Believe it or not, the environment at (*name of school*) is constantly changing, from rules affecting cadet interactions to various SOPs to our daily schedules, often with short notice. One learns to <u>adapt quickly</u> or face adverse consequences….” (Cadet #3)

Combined, what do these young voices tell us about a military college education? First, they realize (not always happily) that their experience is different than that of most of their friends and siblings. In fact, some of them seem to recognize the purpose of their ordeal. Most are aware of the changes that are occurring in their attitudes and behaviors. Traits mentioned are accountability, punctuality, patience, time and stress management, emotional stability, self-confidence, adaptability and integrity. Therefore, at the lowest levels of the chain of command, these young men and women have begun to acquire *some* of the characteristics of effective leaders mentioned above. During the second half of their cadetships, many will have the opportunity to put these hard-won characteristics to the test, as they assume leadership positions of increasing responsibility.

A MIXED MODEL FOR LEADER DEVELOPMENT OF UNDERGRADUATES

The U.S. Army’s approach to leader development is captured by the phrase “Be, know, do”. (FM 99-100) In a traditional academic setting, we accomplish the “know” admonition to one degree or another. We explain to our students what leadership is, what describes leaders, and what effective leaders do. We may even be able to impart some basic contingency notions. But, are they any closer to become the effective leader we have described?

Pfeffer & Fong (2002) and Bennis & O’Toole (2005) spoke to the inadequacy, for business students, of theory-based learning derived from a scientific model. They argued that there is a deficiency between business school course content and the knowledge and experience needed for organizational success, given the complexity, variation and rapid evolution of business environments. Opportunities to develop interpersonal and problem-solving skills were viewed as insufficient, as were experiential learning methods. Their critiques were directed at MBA programs; but, they may also be very appropriate at the undergraduate level. Our students become adept at the MRF approach (i.e., memorize, regurgitate, forget) to education; but, how often are they allowed to practice what we preach? If our students can find the correct answers on a multiple choice exam for Fiedler’s contingency theory or the Hershey-Blanchard Life cycle theory or the Vroom-Yetton-Jago decision-making model, all of which are standard fare in Management textbooks, what do they really *understand* about leading?

Although focused on undergraduate engineering students, Farr & Brazil (2009) made several recommendations on combining “soft” skills with technical content. They suggested group design projects, where the team leader position rotated and leader effectiveness was part of each student’s grade. Also, they recommended that oral and written communication be required and evaluated in as many courses as possible. Further, successful professionals would be recruited to serve as mentors and guest lecturers for students. Internships would be encouraged for the obvious “real world” experience gained. And, student membership and leadership in professional clubs and honor societies would be supported and emphasized. (pgs. 6-7) Further, they understood that leader development at the undergraduate level can only provide a *foundation* that must be reinforced and expanded upon, early in a young person’s career.

Drohan & Murray (2001) focused on leader development at the U.S. Air Force Academy. Their arguments were similar to those of Farr & Brazil (2009) in two important ways: First, undergraduate education is best suited for providing a *foundation* for effective leadership. And, the responsibility for developing leaders should be shared and integrated across a curriculum and an institution. Clearly, leader development is a primary goal at the federal

service academies, for reasons noted earlier. But, if viewed as a priority by the administration, *traditional* schools need not be left far behind.

Nirenberg (2003) argued for a comprehensive and integrative model for leader development in business schools: "…Because we value research about leadership, that is what we teach. Faculty members in business programs have removed the experience and practice of leadership from the classroom….Leadership development just does not happen during a teacher-centric course that focuses on theoretic content. Such courses are comparable to a driver education class that does not place the student behind the wheel of a car..." (pg. 7) He described a "Locus of Leadership" that begins with "Mastering oneself". In that first step, a student (gains) "initial exposure to techniques, skills, language, and rationale of leadership and personal development", before progressing to Mastering relation-ships, Team leadership and Organizational leadership. (pg. 9) The "Mastering oneself" step is comparable to the undergraduate foundation described by Farr & Brazil (2009) and Drohan & Murray (2001), emphasizing knowledge, experience and reflection.

A common theme in much of the relevant literature is that leaders cannot be developed in the college classroom. "…Learning about leadership through textbooks versus learning while practicing leadership are two opposite ends of the learning spectrum…." (Morrison et al., pg. 16) "…Rather, leadership competencies are best developed over time through a program that fosters personalized integration of theory and practice and that conceives of leadership development as a recursive and reflective process…." (Connaughton et al., pg. 46) However, the one assumption often made is that combining *knowing* and *doing* will necessarily lead young people to *be* better people and leaders, without <u>specific</u> consideration of a person's character. The military model of leader development considers all three.

Husted and West (2009) proposed a series of steps *traditional* college and universities could undertake to benefit from the success of the "Be, know, do" approach to leader development at U.S. service academies and military colleges. The authors did so in full recognition of the divergence in missions of *military* vs. *civilian* schools. And, what can be accomplished in the vertical, command and control structure of a military college may be difficult and time-consuming in a more democratic and heterogeneous non-military setting. (pgs. 39-41)

I.   Be

1. <u>Rigorous academic standards</u>: A diploma should be more than a Certificate of Attendance and a GPA should accurately reflect aptitude and effort. As heretical as it may seem when the cost of higher education continues to rise dramatically, students must realize they are entitled only to an opportunity; and, irresponsibility on their part will yield negative consequences. The benefits are *diligence*, *perseverance, patience*, *time* and *stress management*, and ultimately *self-confidence*.

2. <u>Honor codes or concepts</u>: Adopt an honor code that students agree to abide by (on Day One) and hold them accountable for their actions. Service academies and military colleges are not unique in this regard. The University of Virginia and Washington and Lee University both require students to adhere to honor codes and answer for breeches thereof. However, the result of a *guilty* verdict at these schools is not always as severe as the military "single sanction". McCabe et al. (1997 & 2002) reported on the effectiveness of undergraduate honor codes on reducing dishonesty. And, McCabe et al. (2006) endorsed the sort of *modified* honor codes utilized at the University of Virginia, Washington and Lee University, and the U.S. Naval Academy. The obvious benefit is life-long *integrity*.

II.   Know

1. <u>Leadership studies</u>: It is ridiculous to presume that sufficient knowledge about leadership can be gained from a single Principles of Management or Organizational Behavior course, as part of an undergraduate business curriculum. In fact, "Leadership" is only one of eighteen or twenty chapters in most Management textbooks. Nirenberg (2003) noted that leadership knowledge can be obtained from History, Economics, Political Science, Sociology, Cultural Anthropology and other academic fields as well. (pg. 8) Therefore, leadership could be made an integrating theme across an entire curriculum. Leadership studies could be a program unto itself, offering majors,

minor and concentrations to both business and non-business students. And, leadership knowledge can be gained from studying both what has been done and hearing/seeing what is being done. Connaughton et al. (2003) described a comprehensive program at Rutgers University that included Leadership Forums and Conferences, bringing private- and public-sector leaders to campus. (pg. 49) Further, individual students can be encouraged to expand their leadership knowledge by engaging in research project with faculty mentors. What undergraduate researchers may lack in sophistication, they can gain in experience and perspective. The benefit is exposure to *evolved theory* and *state- of-the art management practice*.

III.   Do

1. <u>Class projects</u>: This is the easiest place to start. Farr & Brazil (2009) recommended senior-level engineering design projects with rotating group leaders and individual leadership grades. Morrison et al. (2003) went farther and suggested an interactive and mutually dependent process by which students directed their own learning about leader ship. Regardless of the specific format, the key ingredients are practice and reflection. Students must be given *real* responsibilities with *real* consequences. They need to learn to accurately and fairly attribute success and failure.

2. <u>Community service projects</u>: Opportunities abound on most campuses to become involved in service projects. They can range from Habitat for Humanity to early childhood literacy to combating hunger to recycling and reclamation projects. And, they need not be local; although, there is a benefit to that as well. Students will likely begin as contributors or members, under the supervision of other students or adults. However, they should be encouraged to assume leadership roles as soon as possible, increasing their level of responsibility as they gain experience and confidence. The obvious benefit is leadership experience; a secondary benefit, if working in the surrounding community, is empathy for those with situations much different than their own.

3. <u>Student government and organizations</u>: On most campuses, the list of organizations with which a student can become affiliated is almost endless. And, while each class has only a handful of officers, each student organization, whether it is the College Republicans or the Fly-fishing Club or the Pre-law Society, needs someone to take charge. Students should be encouraged to find something that interests them, stick with it, and be a part of running it as a junior or senior.

4. <u>Sports (NCAA or intramural)</u>: Except for the smallest schools, there are many men's and women's inter-collegiate athletic teams, most of which compete outside the televised spotlight. However, a constraining factor is talent; coaches seek more rather than less of it. But, even the most minimally gifted athlete can find *some* activity to become involved in, even if it is Frisbee® golf or slow pitch softball. The key is to rise to captain or co-captain and to be responsible for something besides your own performance.

5. <u>Living-learning communities</u>: Gibson & Pason (2003) described a living and learning community of under-graduate students that combined academics, extracurricular activities, an interest in leadership and a common residence (dorm wing) for some. By designing and implementing service projects, upper class students were able to reflect on and learn from their leadership experiences. (pg. 23) Unofficially, the Virginia Military Institute refers to itself as a "leadership laboratory", where all cadets live in the same, unadorned, four story barracks and a significant amount of self-governance by the Corps of Cadets occurs. In a laboratory, we experiment for purpose of learning. In a military environment, young men and women are learning about their capabilities, character and capacities much sooner than many of their peers.

6. <u>Outdoor leader development programs</u>: These programs can incorporate many of the training activities used by the military to instill confidence and to teach communication, teamwork and planning skills. Examples include low and high ropes courses, leader reaction courses and challenge sports such as rock climbing, white water (or ocean) kayaking and back country camping. (Husted & West, 2009, pg. 40) Similar to other activities described above, students will begin as participants or members, experiencing the leadership of others. Followership, as the military refers to it, has its advantages. Part of developing as a leader is learning how <u>not</u> to lead. So, the benefits of "doing" are twofold: First, newer students can observe and experience effective/ineffective leadership as a follower. Then, students can apply <u>all</u> lessons learned and reflect on the outcomes of their own leadership.

RESEARCH PROPOSITION

For undergraduates, practicing leadership is the key. Therefore, leader experience leads to improved skills and improved confidence in those skills. Those students with the most experience should be expected to view themselves more favorably across evaluation criteria than those with less.

METHODS

The subjects for this study were seventy-four seniors in a business capstone course at a nationally recognized military college, representing two graduating classes. The instruments they completed were part of a comprehensive exit survey that asks them to reflect on their undergraduate experience within the major and at the institution.

The first instrument was an inventory of the students' extracurricular activities and leadership experiences. (Refer to Exhibit 1.) A significant portion (approx. 33%) of the students is NCAA (D-1), scholarship athletes. Therefore, they were asked not only the sport(s) in which they competed but also whether they had served as a team captain or co-captain. Cadets also have opportunities to participate in a wide array of intramural sports and clubs, groups and organizations. We asked not only about the range of students' outside interests and activities but also if they had served as a club or group officer or cadet-in-charge (CIC). On occasion, one or two members of a graduating class may have served as a class officer or on the Honor Court. Within the Corps of Cadets, leadership positions are held by sophomores (i.e., corporals), juniors (i.e., sergeants) and seniors (i.e., lieutenants and captains) at the regiment, battalion (2) and company (9) levels. Beyond that, juniors and seniors can serve in regimental-level officer positions, focusing specifically on academics, athletics, recruiting, peer counseling, etc. Also, there is a ranking cadet (CIC) for each of three ROTC detachments. Due to the large number of positions available, most of the inventory respondents with significant leadership experience had served as officers in the Corps of Cadets. Respondents were divided into two groups; those who had served as lieutenants and captains in the Corps of Cadets, class officers or Honor Court members were placed in the *significant experience* category. We knew with certainty these leader positions were not merely nominal and had clearly articulated responsibilities, lines of authority and consequences for failure.

We also gathered reflective responses on each student's leader characteristics and behaviors, while at the school. On a Likert-type scale, where 1= Never and 7=Always, we requested answers in ten areas. (Refer to Exhibit 2.) With these questions, we sought to capture the essential traits and behaviors of successful, modern leaders, such as decision making under uncertainty, effective communication, emotional stability, integrity and humility. These traits and behaviors were synthesized from the Leadership presentations in popular Management texts (i.e., Certo & Certo, 2012, Daft & Marcic, 2006, Schermerhorn, 2007, Williams, 2012), focusing on transformational leadership, with emotional intelligence, interactive leadership, moral leadership and servant leadership contributing and overlapping, in some cases. While not exhaustive, this approach recognized that, in a turbulent global economy, the identifiable characteristics of effective leaders are evolving, as firm and industry conditions necessitate.

DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

The leadership inventory and reflective survey results are found in Table 1. Without sufficient sample size or control of confounds, statistical tests are premature; but, the "eyeball test" is striking and rather counterintuitive. In essence, those students with the most significant leadership experience as undergraduates were also the most self-critical.

With regard to seven of ten items, students with significant leadership experience judged themselves <u>less</u> favorably than those without. The most plausible explanations are self-reflection and self-awareness. These young people learned the frustrations of lower level leadership and the limits of their authority and expertise. Not every decision you make will be a good one, whether it's your fault or not; not every subordinate will agree with your choice(s); the full cooperation of your subordinates cannot be guaranteed; and, necessary resources (e.g., time, talent, funds) may be inadequate.

With regard to vision and goals and displaying moral courage, both groups of students viewed themselves similarly. At first glance, two possible explanations arise. First, the behaviors described were unimportant for the tasks at hand; so, youthful self-confidence determined responses. Or, these behaviors are more appropriate for leaders at higher levels of an organization.

With regard to honesty/integrity, students with significant leadership experience viewed themselves more favorably than those with less. Part of the explanation may lie with practicality; part may be a function of the environment in which these young people live. Most of us learn very early in our careers that subordinates are less cooperative with leaders they neither respect nor trust. Unless coerced, cooperation must be earned by competence and integrity. And, at a military college, honesty, integrity and honor are synonymous and absolute. As explained earlier, rather than aspirations, they are a way of life from Day One to Day Last.

FUTURE DIRECTIONS

At this early point, it is impossible to draw conclusions, except to observe that something interesting and somewhat counterintuitive is occurring. Or, perhaps, counterintuitive is the wrong term; we see evidence of leaders being developed and necessary self-awareness emerging. Given the importance of developing leaders for all professions and walks of life, the *interesting* preliminary results reported herein are only indicative of a place to start. And, since the vast majority of college and universities do not operate in a military framework, a wider frame of reference seems warranted.

It is possible these results are either accidental or anecdotal. Several steps could be taken to determine if either is the case. First, add explanatory variables to the leadership inventory, like GPA, age and prior work or military service. Since some college-level leadership positions are selective rather than voluntary, perhaps these results are explained by intelligence or diligence or drive to succeed. Perhaps students a few years older than the norm and possessed of *real world* experience see themselves and approach the roles discussed herein differently. Finally, these surveys should also be administered to non-business and non-military undergraduates at public and private schools, large and small for purpose of generalizing results.

Also, to assume that the list of leader traits and behaviors utilized herein is comprehensive and universal is foolish and dangerous. Although agreement seems to be coalescing around a *transformational* style of leadership for modern businesses, from author to author and textbook to textbook, the lists of traits, behaviors and talents vary. The ten categories utilized herein were carefully selected; however, we must recognize they are not "etched in stone". Bartone et al. (2002) and Matthews et al. (2006) examined the effects of various cognitive, personality and character factors on military leader performance of U S. Military Academy cadets (in part), only some of which overlapped with those utilized herein (i.e., honesty, judgment, modesty). Therefore, prudence dictates a longer, more comprehensive set of traits and behaviors should be considered as this research proceeds.

And, a longitudinal study with a pre-post self-evaluation, plus an inventory of undergraduate leadership experience of all types is the logical next step. To measure students' self-awareness at the end of a four year degree program without a sense of where they began leaves us only guessing about causal relationships.

CONCLUSIONS

On the assumption we are better off when leaders are developed purposefully rather than discovered serendipitously, the following conclusions can be drawn from the discussion of military higher education and the preliminary results of what will eventually be a much larger study: First, considerable agreement surrounds the notion that leader development cannot be accomplished in the usual classroom setting and must contain practice and reflection. The very preliminary results presented herein lends some support, in that undergraduates with significant leadership experience tended to be more self-critical, when reflecting on their own leader traits and behavior. Also, opportunities for students to practice and reflect on their own leadership abound at traditional schools. Finally, leader development can be woven into the fabric of all schools and all curricula but will "come up short", if issues of character are not explicitly considered and integrated into a leader development program.

AUTHOR INFORMATION

Clifford West is a Professor in the Department of Economics and Business at the Virginia Military Institute in Lexington, VA. He received the Ph.D. from Indiana University, Bloomington, in addition to an M.B.A. from the University of Notre Dame and a B.A. from the University of California, San Diego. His current research focuses on teaching and assessing leadership at the undergraduate level. E-mail: westct@vmi.edu.

REFERENCES

1.   Bartone, P.T., Snook, S.A. & Tremble, T.R. (2002). Cognitive and Personality Predictors of Leader Performance in West Point Cadets. *Military Psychology*, 14(4), 321-338.
2.   Bennis, W.G. & O'Toole, J. (2005). How business schools lost their way. *Harvard Business Review*, 83(5), 96-104.
3.   Bush, H.F., Gutermuth, K. & West, C. (2009). Teaching Ethics to Undergraduates: An Examination of Contextual Approaches. *Contemporary Issues in Education Research*, 2(4), 29-40.
4.   Butler, D., Forbes, B. & Johnson, L. (2008). An Examination of a Skills-Based Leadership Coaching Course in an MBA Program. *Journal of Education for Business*, 227-232.
5.   Certo, S.C. & Certo, S.T. (2012). *Modern Management* (12th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ, Prentice Hall.
6.   Connaughton, S.L., Lawrence, F.L. & Ruben, B.D. (2003). Leadership Development as a Systematic and Multidisciplinary Enterprise. *Journal of Education for Business*, September/October, 46-51.
7.   Daft, R.L. & Marcic, D. (2006). *Understanding Management* (4th ed.). Mason, OH, Thomson-South-Western.
8.   Drohan, T. & Murray, D. (2001). Responding to the 'Developing Aerospace Leaders' Initiative. *Aerospace Power Journal*, Summer, 13-22.
9.   Farr, J.V. & Brazil, D.M. (2009). Leadership Skills Development for Engineers. *Engineering Management Journal*, 21(1), 3-8.
10.   Gibson, F.W. & Pason, A. (2003). Levels of Leadership: Developing Leaders Through New Models. *Journal of Education for Business*, September/October, 23-27.
11.   Husted, S.W. & West, C.T., (2008). Developing Leaders of Character: The Case for Military Higher Education. *The John Ben Shepperd Journal of Practical Leadership*, Spring, 34-44.
12.   Matthews, M.D., Eid, J., Kelly, D., Bailey, J.K.S. & Peterson, C. (2006). Character Strength and Virtues of Developing Military Leaders: An International Comparison. *Military Psychology*, 18 (Suppl.), S57-S68.
13.   McCabe, D.L. & Trevino, L.K. (1997). Individual and Contextual Influences on Academic Dishonesty: A Multi-campus Investigation. *Research in Higher Education*, 38, 379-396.
14.   McCabe, D.L., Trevino, L.K. and Butterfield, K.D. (2006). Academic Dishonesty in Graduate Business Programs: Prevalence, Causes and Proposed Action. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, 5(3), 294-306.
15.   McCabe, D.L., Trevino, L.K. and Butterfield, K.D. (2002). Honor Codes and Other Contextual Influences on Academic Integrity. *Research in Higher Education*, 43(3), 357-378.
16.   Morrison, J.L., Rha, J. & Helfman, A. (2003). Learning Awareness, Student Engagement, and Change: A Transformation in Leader Development. *Journal of Education for Business*, September/October, 11-17.
17.   Nirenberg, J. (2003). Toward Leadership Education that Matters. *Journal of Education for Business*, September/October, 6-10.
18.   O'Keefe, B. (2010). Meet the New Face of Business Leadership. *Fortune*, 22 March, 110-118.
19.   Pfeffer, J. & Fong, C.T. (2002). The end of business schools? Less success than meets the eye. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 1, 78-96.
20.   Schermerhorn, J.R., Jr. (2007). *Exploring Management*. Hoboken, NJ. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
21.   Tian, J., Miao, D., Xu, Y. & Yang, Y. (2009). The Leadership Competency Modeling of Military Academy Cadets. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 37(4), 525-537.
22.   Williams, C. (2012). MGMT (4th Ed.). Mason, OH, South-Western, Cengage Learning.
23.   The Citadel website: www.citadel.edu
24.   The U.S. Air Force Academy website: www.usafa.edu
25.   The U.S. Coast Guard Academy website: www.uscga.edu
26.   The U.S. Military Academy website: www.usma.edu

27.   The U.S. Naval Academy website: www.usna.edu
28.   The University of Virginia website: www.uva.edu
29.   The Virginia Military Institute website: www.vmi.edu
30.   The Washington and Lee University website: www.wlu.edu

EXHIBIT 1

Cadet Leadership & Extracurricular Survey 2011-12

Your name:_____ We are asking for your name <u>only</u> for bookkeeping purposes. You will <u>never</u> be identified personally, and all data for your class will be aggregated for reporting purposes.

Instructions: Please indicate all activities in which you have been or are currently involved at [*school*]. Identify the year(s) of your experience as follows: Fourth Class = 4/C; Third Class = 3/C; Second Class = 2/C; First Class = 1/C

Significant Leadership Opportunities

Athletics

Captain or Co-Captain of an NCAA sport: Which sport? _____ Which years? _____

Captain or Co-Captain of a Club sport: Which sport? _____ Which years? _____

Corps of Cadets (indicate all that apply)

Regimental positions: Capt. _____ Lt. _____ Sgt. _____ Corp. _____

Battalion positions: Capt. _____ Lt. _____ Sgt. _____ Corp. _____

Company positions: Capt. _____ Lt. _____ Sgt. _____ Corp. _____

Cadet Governance (indicate all that apply)

Class Officer: Which position? _____ Which years? _____

OGA Officer: Which position? _____ Which years? _____

RDC Officer: Which position? _____ Which years? _____

Honor Court: Which position? _____ Which years? _____

ROTC Branch CO Which years? _____

Extracurricular and Social (indicate all that apply)

President or CIC of Cadet Club, Society or Council: Which activity? _____ Which years? _____

Tutor or Academic mentor: Which years? _____

Rat Challenge CIC: Which years? _____

Ring Figure Committee or Sub-Committee Chair: Which one? _____ Which years? _____

Cadet Program Board CIC: Which years? _____

Other: Which activity? _____ Which years? _____

EXHIBIT 2

Inventory of Leadership Characteristics & Behaviors

Instructions: For each item in **bold** below, reflect on your leadership experience(s) at [*school*]. To what extent does the characteristic or behavior ***actually*** describe you? Please be candid; there are <u>no</u> absolute right or wrong answers.

1. Making good decisions under uncertainty (facing time pressures & lacking complete info.)

Never…………………………..…Sometimes…………………………….…Always
   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

2. Building strong interpersonal relations (with superiors, peers & subordinates)

   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

3. Communicating well orally & in writing

   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

4. Being aware of one's emotions & able to manage them

   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

5. Articulating an organizational vision & influencing others to achieve goals

   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

6. Displaying courage (to do the right rather than easy or popular thing)

   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

7. Displaying integrity (by holding to high moral principles, including honesty)

   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

8. Displaying humility (as opposed to pride & arrogance)

   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

9. Displaying selflessness (by putting the interests of others before your own)

   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

10. Displaying empathy (by being sensitive to the feelings, thoughts & experiences of others)

   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

Table 1
Results of Leadership Inventory

		Significant leader experience (n=35)	Less leader experience (n=41)
1.	**Decisions under uncertainty**	5.11	5.86
2.	**Strong interpersonal relations**	5.35	6.00
3.	**Effective communication**	5.24	5.65
4.	**Emotional awareness & control**	5.35	5.92
5.	**Articulate vision & influence to goals**	5.41	5.38
6.	**Displaying moral courage**	5.50	5.60
7.	**Displaying integrity**	6.35	6.00
8.	**Displaying humility**	5.18	5.55
9.	**Displaying selflessness**	5.24	5.75
10.	**Displaying empathy**	4.82	6.00