

THE TEACHING OF LEADERSHIP: A COMPARATIVE  
ANALYSIS

A Development Study

Presented To

The Directorate of Research

Air Command and Staff College

In Partial Fulfillment of the Graduation Requirements of ACSC

by

Lt Col Vatov Krasimir  
Lt Cmdr Christopher P. Fedyschyn  
Maj Michele G. Smith  
Maj Ilan Shamir

Lt Cmdr Richard J. Abresch  
Ch Maj Michael F. Haltom  
Maj Thomas P. Spellman  
Capt Camara Mamadi

April 1996

## **Disclaimer**

The views expressed in this academic research paper are those of the authors and do not reflect the official policy or position of the US Government or the Department of Defense.

## *Contents*

	<i>Page</i>
DISCLAIMER.....	ii
LIST OF TABLES .....	v
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	vi
ABSTRACT .....	vii
INTRODUCTION.....	1
Purpose .....	1
Methodology.....	2
Review of Related Literature.....	3
Assumptions .....	6
Boundaries of Study .....	6
Overview .....	7
HISTORY.....	8
Introduction .....	8
Historical Perspective.....	8
ACSC Today .....	12
FINDINGS .....	16
Introduction .....	16
Course Structure .....	18
Course Structure in Military Institutions .....	18
Course Structure in Businesses and Professional Organizations.....	20
Course Structure in Universities.....	22
Course Content.....	24
Course Content in Military Institutions .....	25
Course Content in Businesses and Professional Organizations.....	26
Course Content in Universities.....	27
Teaching Methods .....	29
Teaching Methods in Military Institutions .....	30
Teaching Methods in Businesses and Professional Organizations.....	30
Teaching Methods in Universities .....	31
Student Evaluation .....	33

Student Evaluation in Military Institutions.....	34
Student Evaluation in Businesses and Professional Organizations .....	35
Student Evaluation in Universities .....	35
Course Evaluation .....	37
ANALYSIS .....	41
Introduction .....	41
Course Structure Analysis .....	41
Course Content Analysis .....	42
Teaching Methods Analysis .....	43
Evaluation Analysis.....	44
RECOMMENDATIONS .....	46
Introduction .....	46
Course Structure .....	46
Course Content.....	48
Teaching Methods .....	49
Evaluation.....	50
Other Recommendations .....	52
CONCLUSION .....	54
APPENDIX A: INSTITUTIONS CONTACTED .....	55
Military Institutions (U.S.).....	55
APPENDIX B: INSTITUTIONS RESPONDING .....	60
APPENDIX C: SAMPLE REQUEST FOR INFORMATION .....	66
APPENDIX D: SAMPLE FOLLOW-UP REQUEST.....	68
APPENDIX E: SAMPLE COVER LETTER TO DEFENSE ATTACHÉS.....	70
APPENDIX F: SAMPLE WORKSHEET .....	72
APPENDIX G: SUPPORTING MATERIALS.....	74
Core Knowledge .....	74
Personal Development.....	74
Management Competencies.....	75
Leadership in Action .....	75
BIBLIOGRAPHY .....	77

## *Tables*

	<i>Page</i>
Table 2-1. Levels of Knowledge and Understanding .....	13
Table 2-2. ACSC Leadership and Command Course Framework .....	13
Table 3-1. Research Summary .....	16
Table 3-2. Military Institution Course Content .....	25
Table 3-3. Business and Professional Organization Course Content .....	26
Table 3-4. University Course Content.....	28
Table 3-5. Teaching Methods.....	29

## *Acknowledgments*

We would like to thank a number of people at Air Command and Staff College (ACSC) for their support for this project. To Colonel John Brooks, ACSC Commandant, thank you for your time and the renewed focus on leadership you have brought to ACSC. To Colonel Mark Richardson, Special Assistant to the Commandant for Leadership and Command, thank you for your guidance and mentorship. To Major Karl Johnson, Leadership and Command Course Director, and Major Kurt Stonerock, our Faculty Research Advisor, thank you for interest and desire to build an outstanding leadership curriculum. Finally, a special thanks to all of the institutions that took the time to respond to our request for information.

### *Abstract*

ACSC put a renewed focus on teaching leadership during the 1996 academic year. A fresh examination of “teaching leadership” was called for by this renewed emphasis. In order to provide the ACSC faculty with information and resources to develop the best leadership curriculum possible, this development study examined the course structure, content, teaching methods and evaluation criteria used in prominent military, professional, business and educational institutions.

The first step in the study was to identify ACSC requirements through a review of both the past and present day ACSC curriculum, as well as interviews with individuals involved in the leadership community within ACSC and Air University. Then the study analyzed the findings which represent responses from seven military institutions, nine business and professional organizations, and twenty-three universities. Lastly, by combining ACSC requirements and the analysis, the study developed recommendations for future enhancements to the ACSC leadership.

Recommendations were made for each of the areas of course structure, course content, methodology and evaluation. The recommendations for course structure included restructuring the sequence of course lessons to take a building block or hierarchical approach that more closely follows Bloom’s Taxonomy. For course content, the school should consider conducting a similar research study next year, narrowing the focus to a specific theme or suggested area of study. Regarding teaching methods, ACSC

should develop or purchase a CD-ROM interactive computer program to teach leadership. The school should increase the number of case studies as defined in the study. Additionally, the study recommends that a psychometric test be used that will help in identifying personality weaknesses. Such a test will balance the picture the individual student gets of him/herself from the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) currently used by ACSC. Lastly, ACSC should tap into the leadership training network that is already available in professional organizations.



# **Chapter 1**

## **Introduction**

### **Purpose**

From George Washington to Douglas MacArthur, from Henry Ford to Bill Gates, from Vince Lombardi to Red Auerbach, history has shown the critical roles leaders and leadership play in organizational success. This is true whether the organization is a military force, business endeavor, sports team or any other grouping of diverse individuals working toward common organizational goals. It should be no surprise then that General Ronald R. Fogleman, Chief of Staff of the United States Air Force says, “The difference between a quality Air Force and just another organization . . . is leadership.”<sup>1</sup> Does the Air Command and Staff College (ACSC) have a role in developing leadership, or is its role to single-mindedly focus on the application of air and space power, perhaps to the detriment of leadership development? The answer comes from Secretary of the Air Force Sheila E. Widnall.

Leaders don’t just appear—they are molded. The Air Force is not handed leaders, we must develop them. It’s a tribute to our officers and noncommissioned officers that they have done just that for almost 50 years; not only for the Air Force, but for the nation as well. Air University is an institution where our past and present leaders gather with our leaders of tomorrow. It’s here that we try to give our officers and NCOs the tools they need to effectively lead the many and varied organizations we place in their charge. No other Air Force mission is more important. And, none

has the potential to yield so many rewards. Out of these halls will come tomorrow's Billy Mitchells and Hap Arnolds. They are our hope for the future, not only for the Air Force, but for the nation.<sup>2</sup>

With these thoughts in mind, ACSC is re-focusing the school's curriculum by increasing the emphasis on leadership development of Air Force officers. The question that now needs to be answered is clear—what is the most effective way of teaching leadership at ACSC? It is this question that this study seeks to answer. The purpose of this development study, therefore, is to provide the primary audience, the ACSC faculty, with the necessary information and resources to develop the best leadership curriculum possible. This is achieved by comparing and analyzing how leadership is taught at institutions worldwide. The paper then recommends changes to the course structure, course content, teaching methods and evaluation instruments used in the leadership curriculum, and provides additional recommendations for future leadership research.

## **Methodology**

The study first identifies ACSC requirements through a review of both the past and present day ACSC curricula, as well as interviews with individuals involved in the leadership community within ACSC and Air University (AU). The interviewees include Colonel John W. Brooks, ACSC Commandant; Colonel Mark Richardson, Special Assistant to the Commandant for Leadership and Command (L&C); Colonel T. K. Kearney, Dean of Technology and Distance Learning; Maj Karl Johnson, L&C Course Director; and Dr. Richard Lester, Educational Advisor, Ira C. Eaker College for Professional Development. This information, in conjunction with a number of speeches

on the subject of leadership by General Fogleman and Secretary Widnall, provides the basis for understanding ACSC requirements.

The majority of research focuses on the collection and analysis of leadership curricula from military institutions, businesses and professional organizations and universities. The research findings are broken into four categories—course structure, course content, teaching methods and evaluation. These findings are presented in Chapter 3.

The material received is in a variety of forms from simple letters to entire course curricula. After compiling the research results, the study compares and contrasts the leadership curricula and associated materials provided by the responding institutions to identify significant commonalities or patterns. This analysis is presented in Chapter 4. From this comparative analysis, the study provides recommendations for future enhancements to the ACSC leadership curriculum, which are presented in Chapter 5.

## **Review of Related Literature**

The primary source of literature for the development study was the curricula received from institutions that teach leadership. In addition to this curricula, the study group reviewed related periodicals and books that identified both ACSC requirements and institutions that teach leadership, and provided background against which the findings and analysis of the paper were measured.

First, the literature review was used to help identify ACSC leadership course requirements. *The Air Force Times* provided several articles and commentaries from both the Secretary of the Air Force and Air Force Chief of Staff identifying service

schools as the medium to teach future Air Force leaders leadership. The team also looked at a group of articles on Army's leadership training programs. In an interview conducted by Patrecia Holis, General William W. Hartzog, Commanding General of the Training and Doctrine Command ("Leadership and TRADOC XXI," *Field Artillery*) said leaders need to know how to use information and be at ease with technology. Lt Col Dean A. Nowowiejski, USA, in "A Leader's Development Paradigm," *Military Review*, identified specific classes Army schools should teach to improve thinking skills. These were logic, problem-solving techniques, decision making and time management.

Numerous other books provided valuable information on leadership to support this paper. *On Becoming a Leader* by Warren Bennis focused on the importance of educating leaders vice training them, and highlights six basic ingredients required for leadership: guiding vision, passion, integrity, trust, curiosity and daring. *On Leadership* by John Gardner addressed many leadership issues from attributes of leaders to leadership development.

Second, the articles and books reviewed identified courses that teach leadership. *Leadership Education 1994–1995: A Source Book*, from the Center for Creative Leadership, provided information on leadership programs and courses at universities, in communities and at nonprofit organizations. The periodical review also provided information on leadership curricula and models used at military institutions. Ursula G. Lohmann's article "Leadership Education Lessons Learned," from *The Journal of Leadership Studies*, described the curriculum at the Army Management Staff College (AMSC), the Army's executive development institution. At AMSC, courses are integrated and focus on leadership management, decision making, strategies, doctrine and

systems. In “Core Values in a Quality Air Force” from the *Airpower Journal*, Colonel Donald Waddell III, USAF described the model presently used at Air War College which is specifically designed for leadership in the military. This model looks at leadership from four perspectives: different levels of leadership, peacetime versus wartime leadership, joint versus combined leadership and staff versus operational leadership.

The third group of articles reviewed provided background for materials and concepts discussed throughout the paper. Several articles identified different methods of teaching leadership. Maria Arnone, Roger L. M. Dunbar, Stephen A. Stumpf, and Thomas P. Mullen in “Management Development: Choosing the Right Leadership Simulation for the Task,” *Journal of Management Education*, discuss nine different leadership simulation models and how to choose the right one. Albert A. Einsiedel Jr., in “Case Studies: Indispensable Tool for Trainers,” *Training and Development*, discusses the merits of case studies.

Additionally, several books provided background on approaches to teaching leadership. *Instructional Design: New Alternatives for Effective Education and Training* by Kerry A. Johnson and Lin J. Foa, and *The Modern Practice of Adult Education: Andragogy versus Pedagogy* by Malcolm S. Knowles, discuss various teaching methods. Larry R. Donnithornes’ *The West Point Way of Leadership: From Learning Principled Leadership To Practicing It*, explains the four steps used to develop future Army leaders. Finally, Air Force Manual (AFMAN) 36-2236, Guidebook for Air Force Instructors, provided a taxonomy for developing course curriculum and recommended methods of teaching.

## **Assumptions**

The study group makes several key assumptions in preparing this development study. The first assumption is that ACSC is responsible in part for the leadership development of Air Force field grade officers who will hold both formal and informal leadership positions. Second, the group makes the assumption that ACSC presents the greatest opportunity for field grade officers to develop their leadership skills in an academic environment. This opportunity for leadership growth and development applies to both in-residence students as well as those students completing the curriculum via distance learning. The third assumption is that all students have demonstrated the potential for leadership as evidenced by their competitive selection for promotion to the rank of major. Fourth, the group assumes that those institutions contacted through the research process have expertise in the areas of either leadership education or human resource development. Finally, the group assumes that leadership can indeed be taught.

## **Boundaries of Study**

The study has a set of boundaries to ensure clarity and focus of the research. First, the study does not set out to describe what a leader is, nor does it seek to define either the traits of an effective leader or the tasks Air Force leaders can be expected to perform. Second, while ACSC combines the subjects of leadership and command into a single course of instruction, this study focuses solely on the leadership question. Finally, this study is not a statistical analysis of the data received; rather, it is a comparative analysis for the purpose of finding qualitative commonalities between various institutions surveyed.

## Overview

The study opens with a brief history of the teaching of leadership at ACSC. This perspective, along with the current philosophy on the role ACSC plays in developing future leaders, provides the context for current and future methods for teaching leadership. From there, the research findings and analysis of these findings is presented. First, the framework institutions use to structure their leadership courses and curricula are discussed. The study then looks at course content and specific leadership themes under which the various leadership topics are taught, as well as the teaching methods used to communicate these leadership topics. The last step in the comparative analysis is a discussion of the evaluation methods and instruments used to measure the effectiveness of student learning. The study concludes with a set of recommendations for assisting ACSC in developing the leadership curriculum of tomorrow.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> Gen Ronald R. Fogleman, Chief of Staff, US Air Force, “Making it Happen on Our Quality Journey” remarks delivered at the Air Force Quality Symposium Banquet, Montgomery, Ala., 19 October 1995.

<sup>2</sup> The Honorable Sheila E. Widnall, Secretary of the US Air Force, remarks prepared for delivery at the Air Force Leadership Awards Luncheon, Maxwell Air Force Base, Ala., 2 June 1995.

## **Chapter 2**

### **History**

#### **Introduction**

Professional Military Education (PME) provides the Air Force with a vehicle to teach leadership to its future leaders. This chapter presents how the Air Force, specifically ACSC and its predecessors, used PME to educate mid-level officers in the area of leadership. It will briefly review the history of mid-level officer PME within the air services since the 1920s, identifying how the teaching of leadership fit into the overall curriculum. The historical review illustrates the point that leadership teaching at ACSC has depended upon the needs of the Air Force and the emphasis placed on the subject by the Air Force's senior leadership of the times. This review concludes with a brief overview of the present day ACSC leadership curriculum.

#### **Historical Perspective**

The first air service specific school was established in 1920, when the War Department opened the Air Service Officer's School at Langley Field. This school focused on air techniques and tactics and not on teaching leadership, since field grade officers were still expected to attend Army service schools to receive staff and command training. In 1926, the Air Service became the Air Corps and the school's name changed



to the Air Corps Tactical School (ACTS). Although the school broadened the curriculum, it still focused on tactics and techniques.<sup>1</sup> It wasn't until 1938, when there was a major change in the curriculum, that the school began emphasizing leadership training and added classes in command, staff and logistics to prepare officers to fill command and staff assignments.<sup>2</sup> On 30 June 1940, the school closed down because of the war in Europe. After the war, the school reopened under the auspices of the newly founded AU.<sup>3</sup>

AU established three general goals. They were “(1) to provide officers with the narrow technical specialization to do their jobs, (2) to educate officers in the broad context of national security issues, and (3) to encourage forward thinking, unhampered by tradition.”<sup>4</sup> In order to fulfill this mission for the field grade officer rank, the Air Command and Staff School opened on 3 September 1946. In July 1959, the name officially changed to the Air Command and Staff College.<sup>5</sup>

By the mid-1950s, the school's mission dictated that it would improve “students' abilities to execute the command and staff tasks required to implement air strategy and Air Force missions and to contribute to the development of air doctrine, strategy and tactics.”<sup>6</sup> Over the next forty years, mission statements and curricula varied slightly to meet the needs of the Air Force.

Until the mid-1960s, the leadership portion of the curriculum was aligned under military management, which comprised 40 percent of the curriculum<sup>7</sup> and included classes in executive skills, staff management and command fundamentals.<sup>8</sup> Within the command fundamentals area of instruction, classes were given on commander's authority, responsibility, leadership and management in command.<sup>9</sup> Communications were also a

critical part of the curriculum during the early 1960s. Classes were given in listening and reading, logical thinking, writing, committee action and speaking.<sup>10</sup>

Major changes in the military management portion of the curriculum occurred in 1966. The new program consisted of communications and leadership, analysis for military decisions and resource management. The analysis of military decisions was included so students could learn to analyze military problems using modern management tools and techniques, which included problem solving, military analysis, decision making under uncertainty, economic analysis methods and procedures of systems analysis, linear programming simulations and game theory.<sup>11</sup>

The ACSC faculty changed the focus of the command and management areas once again in 1969. Decreases in budgets and resources resulted in a need to increase productivity within the Air Force. As a result, the new command and management curriculum included classes in behavioral and organizational theory, contemporary leadership, personnel, defense organization and financial management, weapon system acquisition, logistics and resource management.<sup>12</sup> During a PME conference in September 1974, AU and major command vice commanders “voiced unanimous opinion that the ACSC curriculum should concentrate on command staff and management skills required by majors and lieutenant colonels.”<sup>13</sup> In light of this, command and management instruction increased from 51 percent of the curriculum to 60 percent and topics of critical importance to the Air Force leadership of the 1970s, such as minority relations, equal opportunity and drug abuse, were added.<sup>14</sup>

During the 1980s, although the school still emphasized leadership, command and resource management, it focused on building skills in war fighting, force employment,

strategy and joint operations.<sup>15</sup> Even though the total amount of time dedicated to the leadership portion of the curriculum decreased, there continued to be an emphasis on both management issues as well as implementation of Air Force policies, programs and directives. This included studies on manpower concerns such as recruiting and the all-volunteer force, as well as a course on the national energy situation.<sup>16</sup>

Beginning in Academic Year (AY) 1990, the ACSC leadership focus was on the operational level of war and the squadron commander. This resulted in increased emphasis on the study of command and a change to the “Leadership Studies” phase name to “Command Studies.”<sup>17</sup> In AY 92, the course was slightly restructured based on Air Force Chief of Staff guidance “to teach students what they need to know to be effective commanders.”<sup>18</sup> Command studies consisted of a profession of arms phase which compared leadership, management and command. Two smaller phases looked at POW issues and the wartime aspects of command. The final phase was strictly designed to give majors the classes they needed to command successfully.<sup>19</sup> During AY 94, the ACSC curriculum was overhauled to increase emphasis on the use of technology to enhance learning. The new curriculum consisted of nine major, interrelated courses “woven around a theater campaign problem solving methodology.”<sup>20</sup> Command Essential Skills was one of five areas within the “Professional Skills” course and provided instruction on skills needed to be successful in command.

A look at ACSC and its forerunner, ACTS, shows that over time the curriculum primarily focused on air power, with leadership usually falling under the management umbrella. Although leadership was addressed as a concern throughout ACSC’s history, it was often overshadowed by other pressing issues within the management arena. ACSC

priorities changed throughout the decades as the key issues facing both the nation and the Air Force changed.

## **ACSC Today**

Where is the emphasis placed in today's ACSC curriculum? Although air power and campaign planning are key elements of the program, there is an increased awareness of leadership and command emanating throughout the Air Force chain of command. At the very highest positions within the United States Air Force, there has been a renewed focus on leadership. Secretary Widnall and General Fogleman note that the increase in "tragic accidents raised issues of command leadership and accountability."<sup>21</sup> This emphasis on leadership also leads Secretary Widnall and General Fogleman to identify three core values that are integral to the profession of arms—integrity first, service before self, and excellence in all we do.<sup>22</sup> In response to this emphasis on leadership and accountability, the AU Commander and ACSC Commandant have taken on the task of leadership development and reinforcement of core values.

Today's ACSC vision is "to become the world's most respected air and space power educational institution"<sup>23</sup> and its mission is to "educate mid-career officers to develop, advance, and apply air and space power in peace and war."<sup>24</sup> Leadership and Command (L&C), one of eleven courses in the ACSC curriculum, strives to contribute to achieving both the school's vision and mission. The L&C thesis is "learning the essence of leadership by developing a leadership capacity, analyzing the changing leadership context (past, present, and future) and preparing leaders for command."<sup>25</sup> This is accomplished through five course objectives:<sup>26</sup>

1. Comprehend the capabilities required of leadership in diverse groups—today, and in the future
2. Analyze the essence of leadership in the context of real life and future challenges
3. Comprehend the complexity and accountability of command
4. Apply critical thinking to decision making and problem solving scenarios
5. Synthesize new leadership ideas in the application of military power

These objectives are compatible with Bloom’s Taxonomy of Educational Objectives:

Cognitive Domain as stated in AFMAN 36-2236. Table 2-1 is a summary of this taxonomy.

**Table 2-1. Levels of Knowledge and Understanding**

<b>Level of Learning</b>	<b>Mental Activity</b>
Knowledge	Recall and recognition
Comprehension	Translate, interpret and extrapolate
Application	Use of generalizations in specific instances
Analysis	Determine relationships
Synthesis	Create new relationships
Evaluation	Exercise of learned judgment

The course is divided into three parts, each of which encompasses a variety of topics.

These are:

**Table 2-2. ACSC Leadership and Command Course Framework**

<b>Leadership Environment</b>	<b>Leadership Tools</b>	<b>Command</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Values and ethics</li> <li>• Anticipating change</li> <li>• Making decisions</li> <li>• Critical thinking</li> <li>• Learning leader</li> <li>• Innovative leadership</li> <li>• Case studies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thinking, theories and ideas</li> <li>• Quality Air Force</li> <li>• Risk analysis</li> <li>• Conflict resolution</li> <li>• Interviewing and counseling</li> <li>• Developing a capacity</li> <li>• Stress and time management</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Taking command</li> <li>• Discipline and responsibility</li> <li>• Personnel issues</li> <li>• Law-judicial issues</li> <li>• Commander involvement</li> <li>• Readiness</li> <li>• Case studies</li> </ul>

**Source:** Maj Karl Johnson, Leadership and Command Course Director, point paper, subject: Leadership and Command Curriculum, 21 September 1995.

In addition to specific classes in the above areas, leadership themes are woven into numerous other courses throughout the year.

In a recent commentary in *Air Force Times*, Secretary of the Air Force Sheila Widnall stated “In the past year, Gen Ronald R. Fogleman, chief of staff, and I, as secretary of the Air Force, have taken a series of mutually supportive steps to ensure the best possible leaders for the future Air Force. Those steps deal with the selection, education and accountability of commanders. . . . The focus on command and leadership extends to Squadron Officer’s School, Air Command and Staff College, Air War College. . . . Armed with this rigorous training and complete education, we can provide the background and resources that our future leaders need to succeed in the future.”<sup>27</sup> In line with Secretary Widnall’s philosophy, ACSC is focusing and will continue to focus on training ACSC students to meet the Air Force goals of providing the best possible leaders for the future Air Force. The goal of this development study is to provide the faculty recommendations to help them meet these Air Force goals.

### Notes

<sup>1</sup>Robert T. Finney, *History of the Air Corps Tactical School 1920–1940* (1955; reprint, Washington, D.C.: Center for Air Force History, 1992), 9–12.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., 38.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., 81.

<sup>4</sup> Lt Col Richard L. Davis and Lt Col Frank P. Donnini, *Professional Military Education for Air Force Officers: Comments and Criticisms* (Maxwell AFB, Ala.: Air University Press, 1991), 21.

<sup>5</sup>History, Air University, October 1973–October 1974, 7:1.

<sup>6</sup>Davis and Donnini, 39.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid.

<sup>8</sup>History, Air University, January–June 1964, 4.

<sup>9</sup>History, Air University, January–June 1964, 7.

## Notes

<sup>10</sup> History, Air University, January–June 1962, 94.

<sup>11</sup> History, Air University, January–June 1966, 6–11.

<sup>12</sup> History, Air University, October 1974–October 1975, 7:1–8.

<sup>13</sup> History, Air University, October 1974–October 1975, 1:24.

<sup>14</sup> History, Air University, October 1974–October 1975, 7:4–9.

<sup>15</sup> Davis and Donnini, 41.

<sup>16</sup> History, Air University, 1980, 1:38–40.

<sup>17</sup> History, Air Command and Staff College, 1 July 1989–30 June 1990, 1:33.

<sup>18</sup> History, Air Command and Staff College, 1 July 91–30 June 1992, 1:34.

<sup>19</sup> History, Air Command and Staff College, 1 July 1991–30 June 1992, 1:34–35.

<sup>20</sup> History, Air Command and Staff College, 1 July 1993–30 June 1994, 1:2.

<sup>21</sup> Sheila Widnall, Secretary of the Air Force, and General Ronald Fogleman, Air Force Chief of Staff, commentary on “Core Values” in ACSC Leadership and Command Course 502, 1996.

<sup>22</sup> Ibid.

<sup>23</sup> Air Command and Staff College, *Theater Air Campaign Studies Course Book* (Maxwell AFB, Ala., 1996), i.

<sup>24</sup> Ibid.

<sup>25</sup> Maj Karl Johnson, Leadership and Command Course Director, point paper, subject: Leadership and Command Curriculum, 21 September 1995.

<sup>26</sup> Air Command and Staff College, Leadership and Command Course Syllabus, Academic Year 1996.

<sup>27</sup> Sheila Widnall, “Building Leadership—Step by Step,” *Air Force Times* 56, no. 31 (March 4, 1996): 29.

## Chapter 3

### Findings

#### Introduction

The study group contacted the education and training arm of the United States Army, Navy, and Marine Corps as well as those of 11 foreign military services; 122 businesses and professional institutions; and 52 colleges and universities. This chapter presents the study's findings of information received from these organizations. Table 3-1 is a summary of the organizations contacted and the response rate to the request for information.

**Table 3-1. Research Summary**

<b>Organization Type</b>	<b>Number Contacted</b>	<b>Number of Respondents</b>	<b>Response Rate</b>
Military Institutions	20	7	35%
Businesses and Professional Organizations	122	9	7%
Universities	52	23	44%

Domestic businesses surveyed were selected from the Fortune 500 list and represent a cross-section of the various market segments (e.g., manufacturing, retailing, banking). International business were selected from the *1995 World Business Directory*. Foreign military services surveyed represent countries that are either recognized world powers,



have engaged in recent military conflicts, or were recommended by the Air War College Department of State representative. Universities were selected from the Center for Creative Leadership's "*Leadership Education 1994–1995: A Source Book*," augmented by personal recommendations from several educators. A list of the specific organizations contacted is at Appendix A; a list of those organizations responding is at Appendix B. A sample of the request for information is at Appendix C; a sample of the follow-up request for information is at Appendix D. Additionally, a sample cover letter to the US embassies in foreign countries from whom information was requested is at Appendix E. The material received was distilled into individual worksheets to internally share information within the study group. A sample worksheet is at Appendix F.

The materials collected through this study comprise a variety of syllabi, course catalogs, brochures, reading lists, etc., as well as a demonstration CD-ROM of Harvard Business School's "The Interactive Manager," a CD-ROM of Harvard Business School's complete listing of publications and case studies and a sample video on the Hartwick Classic Leadership Cases. All of these materials will be provided to the ACSC L&C Course Director.

The findings, analysis and recommendation chapters are organized into four areas: course structure, course content, teaching methods and evaluation. These four areas are chosen because they are found in the typical course syllabi and materials provided by responding institutions. Covering these four areas are thus deemed the most appropriate approach to the subject.

## **Course Structure**

A wide variety of course structures are used by institutions to organize leadership curricula. In many cases, however, no discernible course structure is apparent. The following discussion, therefore, seeks to highlight those curricula that have either an explicit or identifiable course structure rather than to chronicle each institution that offers some form of leadership course. Before discussing the findings as they relate to course structure, it is necessary to first define what is meant by the term “course structure.” The definition used is borrowed from the Air Force definition for its curriculum planning process, Instructional Systems Development, which is defined as “a deliberate, but flexible process for planning, developing and managing high quality instructional programs.”<sup>1</sup>

### **Course Structure in Military Institutions**

Four intermediate service schools (Army Command and General Staff College, College of Naval Command and Staff, Royal Air Force (RAF) Staff College and British Army Staff College), three senior service schools (National War College, Industrial College of the Armed Forces and Naval War College), and the Armed Forces Staff College responded to the study’s request for information. The following are the significant course structure observations from the curricula of these organizations.

The Army Command and General Staff College has the most well-developed course structure of any of the military institutions that responded. They teach a 22-hour course entitled “Senior Leadership and the Art of Command” presented over five separate days in the school’s first term. The course is divided into six lessons varying in duration from

two-to-five hours per lesson. The course structure appears to follow Bloom's Taxonomy with the overall course objective written at the synthesis level of learning. Individual lesson objectives are predominantly written at the analysis and synthesis levels of learning, with the notable exception of the initial lesson, "Foundations and Transformational Leadership," which has knowledge-level lesson objectives linked to the study of the Army model of senior-level leadership and the theory of transformational leadership.

The College of Naval Command and Staff teaches "Strategic Leadership" as one of two parts of their course entitled "Policy Making and Implementation." The curriculum does not identify a particular structure, framework or taxonomy used to develop the course. It appears to take a hierarchical approach beginning with the changing nature of leadership, moving through various leadership topics, then finishing with the integration and application of student views on effective organizational leadership.

Both the RAF Staff College and British Army Staff College combine leadership studies with command and/or management studies; both programs acknowledge an almost minuscule emphasis on teaching leadership. Similarly, leadership fails to even appear in the Armed Forces Staff College curriculum.

The senior service schools also take varying approaches to the teaching of leadership. The National War College indicates that "leadership is addressed throughout all the [above] courses, but not in a deliberate, programmed way."<sup>2</sup> The Industrial College of the Armed Forces offers five courses (Visionary Leadership; Generalship; Ethics, Statecraft and War; The Psychology of Military Incompetence; and Strategic Decision Making, which includes lessons on values, ethics, trust and strategic leadership) that

touch upon the subject of leadership, all of which are grouped under the Strategic Decision Making block of instruction. It is unclear if any one course structure is utilized. The Naval War College offers an elective course, "Leadership for Tomorrow," that appears to follow Bloom's Taxonomy as evidenced by the course beginning with a review of historical and traditional views of leadership, proceeding to the exploration and application of the components and principles of leadership, then finishing with a synthesis of leadership principles and modern methodologies into a single model for the military officer of the future.

### **Course Structure in Businesses and Professional Organizations**

Most business and professional organizations take a more vocational training approach to teaching leadership, with the majority of the organizations offering two-to-five day courses on various leadership topics. The most extensive business program is found at USAA, which will soon complete the cataloguing of almost 200 leadership and management skills. USAA will offer instruction in each of these skills through modules of instruction ranging from 2 to 32 hours in duration. The most interesting aspect of USAA's program structure was their goal of linking job requirements, course objectives, measurements and performance appraisal criteria. While there is no identifiable structure to the individual modules, the overall structure of USAA's program is rooted in individually identified job requirements and a shifting of responsibility for leadership development from the organization to the organization member.

A common foundation for several of the business leadership development programs (Ritz Carlton Hotels, Xerox, Ford, Nike) is the teaching of company core values, mission or strategic direction of the organization. These organizations use these elements of

strategic focus to not only serve as the foundation for their respective courses, but also to structure their courses by linking course content back to the overarching purpose or vision of the organization.

Another commonality among the businesses is the use, either in whole or in part, of third-party educators and trainers to provide the required leadership development teaching. Internationally, both Heineken and TNT, Ltd. outsource their leadership development program, while domestically Ritz Carlton and Viacom employ the Covey Leadership Center. Covey offers a variety of workshops, though the two that apply most directly to leadership are the 7 Habits of Highly Effective People workshop and the Principle-Centered Leadership workshop. In the latter, Covey structures the workshop around four levels—personal, interpersonal, managerial and organizational—using a hierarchical approach starting with the personal level and then sequentially building the other three levels on this foundation.

The Center for Creative Leadership proved to be the single greatest source of leadership information for this study. They offer an extensive array of programs, assessments and simulations that preclude individual discussion in this paper, as well as a client list that reads like a “Who’s Who” of business, academic and government institutions. It is important to note that the Center for Creative Leadership is a nonprofit institution with a specifically identified capability of developing tailored leadership programs for other nonprofit and educational institutions.

In terms of course structure, Nike has an innovative business leadership program. While Nike focuses the majority of their efforts on their senior 100 leaders, not on their middle managers, it is worth noting the unique manner in which they structure their

leadership development program. Nike roots their program in 15 dimensions of leadership important to Nike as determined by a series of focus groups. From these 15 dimensions of leadership, Nike works with the leaders of their various business groups to tailor a leadership program that supports the respective business group's business plan. The programs employ 360° feedback (feedback from supervisors, peers and subordinates) while Center for Creative Leadership "mentors" are used as coaches to help managers understand and use this feedback. Nike uses a variety of interesting means for developing leaders to include the use of non-conventional (i.e., non-business related) books, articles and movies. They also rely heavily on experiential learning, placing their business leaders in situations foreign to their own areas of expertise. This includes teaching teamwork to a group of business leaders by having them prepare a gourmet meal under the direction of a professional chef and playing a sports match in a sport where these leaders would be expected to be novices (e.g. cricket). The intent of these programs is to take business leaders outside their comfort zone to learn leadership without the safety net of position power or functional expertise.

### **Course Structure in Universities**

While universities account for the greatest response to the group's request for information, it is within this segment that it is most difficult to find commonalities. This difficulty stems from the diversity of academic leadership programs and curricula. The programs range from a single undergraduate or graduate course within a particular discipline, such as business or teaching, to a bachelor's degree program or graduate program in leadership studies. Given the diversity in these leadership programs and the extensive lack of explicit or discernible course structure in the curricula, what follows is a

discussion of two academic programs with the most well-defined leadership curricula or course structure—the University of Richmond Jepson School of Leadership Studies and North Carolina State University.

The Jepson program consists of 42 credit hours centered around four curriculum components. These components are core, context, competencies and experiential. The prerequisite for all subsequent courses is the “Foundations for Leadership” course. All courses are “sequenced along a continuum of increasing complexity and combine academic knowledge with experiential learning to set the path for life-long, self-directed learning. . . .”<sup>3</sup> The core component includes such topics as history, theory and critical thinking. The context component is the study of the context in which leadership is exerted. This includes the various organizations, movements and systems in which the leadership dynamic is most prevalent. Competencies include the skills a leader needs to be effective such as consensus building, networking, managing cultural diversity and interpersonal skills. The experiential component allows students to put into practice what they have learned in the other three components through internships, community service projects and other experience-based activities<sup>4</sup>.

North Carolina State University offers a doctoral-level course entitled “Macro-Concepts in Administration of Adult Education: Effective Leadership in Groups and Organizations;” the course is divided into 12 units of instruction. The first of these units is an overview of organizational and leadership theories. The second unit concentrates on analyzing and predicting universal and contingent leadership traits and behaviors. The last five units focus on managing conflict, change, culture and evolution and builds from the previous seven units. The course is structured around Baker’s Taxonomy of Mental

Skills A through D, a taxonomy similar to Bloom's Taxonomy of Cognitive Skills. The levels of learning identified are: knowledge, understanding, application of knowledge and application of understanding. It is also interesting to note that the North Carolina State University program is the only program that identifies affective as well as cognitive objectives. The affective levels, as identified by Baker's Taxonomy of Attitudinal Traits E through H are: obedience, acceptance of values, commitment to values and characterized by values.<sup>5</sup> The course syllabus also discusses the specific rationale for the manner in which the course is structured when it states, "this course approaches leadership behavior and decision-making from the view that primary emphasis is placed on learning from your own experience. Each of the twelve units begins with an explanation of relevant concepts and proceeds to group discussion and finally action oriented case analysis, simulation, or film. The purpose of this approach is to have you generate your own data about each of the key concepts to be studied."<sup>6</sup>

Up to this point the development study has compared the curricula in terms of course structure. The typical curriculum can be described as hierarchical in nature and consisting of four tiers—core knowledge, personal development, managerial competencies and leadership in action.

## **Course Content**

The study will now conduct an in-depth review of the course syllabi to isolate course content and leadership topics commonly used in mid-level leader education, training and development. The difficulty in identifying these similarities is a result of the wide range of terms institutions used to describe leadership topics. Combining topics which are felt



to be essentially the same allows the review to be reduced to 20 common topics. The course syllabi also reveal common text books used within the curricula. A list of these books is at Appendix G.

### Course Content in Military Institutions

There is a high degree of unity within the military leadership courses. This unity is most likely due to military organizations essentially having the same needs for leadership. The programs generally do not include many of the basic topics of leadership such as theory or history. Table 3-2 provides a comparison of the topics included in the military programs reviewed.

**Table 3-2. Military Institution Course Content**

	THEORY	QUALITY	HISTORICAL	CAREER DEVELOP	TRAITS	CORE VALUES	PSYCHOLOGY	ANALYTICAL SKILLS	SUBORDINATE DEVELOP	WORKING RELATIONS	DIVERSITY	MANAGEMENT SKILLS	COMMUNICATION SKILLS	FOLLOWERSHIP	VISION	DECISION MAKING	ORGANIZATION DYNAMICS	CHANGE	CONFLICT RESOLUTION	COMMAND
<i>ROYAL AIR FORCE STAFF COLLEGE</i>												x					x			x
<i>BRITISH ARMY STAFF COLLEGE</i>					x	x						x	x		x	x		x		x
<i>NAVAL WAR COLLEGE</i>			x		x	x				x		x	x		x	x		x		
<i>INDUSTRIAL COLLEGE OF ARMED FORCES</i>				x		x		x							x	x	x		x	x
<i>IRA C. EAKER COLLEGE</i>	x		x	x	x	x									x					
<i>ARMY COMMAND AND STAFF COLLEGE</i>					x	x									x		x	x		x

The topics which the military curricula emphasize include leadership traits, vision, core values, decision making, change and command. The command category entails strategic leadership, command issues, the combat environment and community service.

### Course Content in Businesses and Professional Organizations

The course content of leadership courses of businesses and professional organizations have much in common with the curricula of military institutions. This commonalty can be found in the topics of traits, core values and vision. Additional topics emphasized by business curricula include Total Quality Management (TQM), individual career development, working relations (to include interpersonal relationships and team building), managerial skills, communication skills and organizational dynamics.

**Table 3-3. Business and Professional Organization Course Content**

	THEORY	QUALITY	HISTORICAL	CAREER DEVELOP	TRAITS	CORE VALUES	PSYCHOLOGY	ANALYTICAL SKILLS	SUBORDINATE DEVELOP	WORKING RELATIONS	DIVERSITY	MANAGEMENT SKILLS	COMMUNICATION SKILLS	FOLLOWERSHIP	VISION	DECISION MAKING	ORGANIZATION DYNAMICS	CHANGE	CONFLICT RESOLUTION	COMMAND
<i>CENTER FOR CREATIVE LEADERSHIP</i>				x	x	x				x		x			x	x	x	x	x	x
<i>COVEY LEADERSHIP CENTER</i>				x	x	x				x			x							x
<i>FORD MOTOR CO</i>		x		x		x			x	x		x					x	x		x
<i>XEROX</i>		x				x			x	x	x		x		x		x			
<i>RITZ CARLTON</i>		x		x	x	x				x		x	x		x			x	x	
<i>USAA</i>		x			x	x			x	x		x	x		x					

## **Course Content in Universities**

The leadership topics taught at academic institutions cover all levels of leadership studies. There is a strong relationship between the topics taught within business and academic institutions. Some common topics include career planning, leadership traits, managerial skills and communication skills. Academic institutions tend to begin with the leadership basics. In other words, most of the schools teach some aspect of leadership theory, historical analysis or other fundamental topic. In addition, they emphasize the growing diversity of society's pluralism through cultural diversity and conflict resolution training. The objective of these topics is to prepare the individual for an ever-changing society.

**Table 3-4. University Course Content**

	THEORY	QUALITY	HISTORICAL	CAREER DEVELOP	TRAITS	CORE VALUES	PSYCHOLOGY	ANALYTICAL SKILLS	SUBORDINATE DEVELOP	WORKING RELATIONS	DIVERSITY	MANAGEMENT SKILLS	COMMUNICATION SKILLS	FOLLOWERSHIP	VISION	DECISION MAKING	ORGANIZATION DYNAMICS	CHANGE	CONFLICT RESOLUTION	COMMAND
UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE	X		X	X	X	X		X			X	X					X			X
UNIVERSITY OF RICHMOND	X		X	X		X		X			X	X	X				X		X	X
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA				X					X			X				X	X	X	X	
UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO					X			X		X	X									X
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN												X								
HARTWICK COLLEGE				X	X	X			X	X	X		X	X	X	X			X	X
UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA				X	X				X	X	X	X	X				X	X	X	X
UNIVERSITY OF TAMPA				X	X					X			X			X				
ALBERTSON COLLEGE	X			X									X			X				X
GONZAGA UNIVERSITY					X	X	X					X					X	X	X	
KENTUCKY WESLEYAN COLLEGE			X				X													
KUTZTOWN UNIVERSITY	X			X					X			X	X							X
UC SANTA BARBARA	X									X	X		X		X		X	X	X	
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND			X		X								X			X		X	X	X
UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA	X			X				X		X		X	X			X			X	
NORTH CAROLINA STATE	X	X		X	X				X		X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X

## Teaching Methods

How one teaches a particular subject is based on the maturity of the learner, the learning objectives and the constraints of the learning environment such as time, equipment and so forth. Methods are the collections of tools that are available for use in the instructional event. The tool one uses should be appropriate to the maturity of the student, the level of learning desired and the skills/role of the instructor.

Matching teaching methods to desired behavioral outcomes and levels of learning has created several “taxonomy of methods.”<sup>7</sup> AFMAN 36-2236 groups individual teaching methods into three broad categories of “presentational methods, student verbal interaction methods, and application methods.”<sup>8</sup> Table 3-5 presents the specific methods associated with each of the broad categories that are given above.

**Table 3-5. Teaching Methods**

<b>Level of Learning</b>	<b>Category of Method</b>	<b>Specific Teaching Methods</b>
Knowledge	Presentational methods	<b>Lecture</b> (formal, informal, briefing, guest); <b>Indirect Discourse</b> (dialogue, interview, panel, skits and playlets); <b>Demonstration-Performance</b> (coaching, tutoring); <b>Reading</b> ; <b>Self-Paced</b> (programmed, modular; computer-assisted, media)
Comprehension	Student Verbal Interaction methods	<b>Questioning</b> (Socratic, student query); <b>Nondirected Discussion</b> (peer facilitator); <b>Guided Discussion</b>
Application, Analysis, Synthesis, Evaluation	Application methods	<b>Individual Projects</b> ; <b>Field Trips</b> ; <b>Simulations</b> (role playing; in-basket exercises; management games; hardware simulations); <b>Case Study</b>

According to Bloom’s Taxonomy, there are six graduated levels of cognitive learning: knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis and evaluation.

Effective leadership teaching uses methods which take students from the necessary knowledge level to the higher levels of application, analysis and synthesis. The grid above matches a desired level of learning to a particular teaching method. Note that it combines the four highest levels of cognitive learning as does AFMAN 36-2236.<sup>9</sup>

The teaching methods currently used by military schools, business and professional organizations and universities reflect the collective wisdom of professionals who are responsible for instructional design. The following summaries of current methods are presented based on information found in published materials or syllabi in current use.

### **Teaching Methods in Military Institutions**

All of the military schools contacted use readings, generally followed by group discussion and classroom study. Lectures are used and discussions may follow to aid in comprehension of the material presented. Senior leaders are utilized as guests in seminar settings and in larger group presentations to give their perspective and experiences in leadership. This fosters greater comprehension, application, analysis and evaluation of leadership topics and problems. Both the Army Command and General Staff College and ACSC use psychometric tests such as MBTI to assist students in assessing their own individual strengths and weaknesses. The Naval War College uses small groups to develop leadership models, and then use case studies to “practice” the models.

### **Teaching Methods in Businesses and Professional Organizations**

The predominant methods used by civilian leadership training professionals are simulations and case studies that are linked to peer feedback to improve the practice of leadership. In workshops students give presentations on leadership topics which are

video taped. Colleague feedback is presented for personal verification through self awareness and by video replay. The instructor is viewed as a facilitator of self-motivated leadership learning. Most civilian leadership training professionals also use some kind of psychometric test or instrument for helping the student better understand him/herself in areas such as personality traits, temperament traits, values, preferences or feelings.<sup>10</sup> The Center for Creative Leadership has developed a computer simulation called RADMIS which is designed to help people see themselves more clearly by linking leadership decisions and behavior to bottom line performance.

Leading businesses such as Xerox are also entering into development of CD-ROM simulations for training in leadership attributes. Harvard Business School Publishing has entered into a multi-company partnership to test “The Interactive Manager” (TIM), which consists of thirteen interactive case studies with video vignettes, audio commentary, quick-reference question and answer sections and self-assessment tools. TIM won a Summit Award for multimedia excellence from the International Interactive Communication Society.<sup>11</sup> Other businesses are also considering self-paced learning using interactive videodisk for technical and process-skills training. This trend is growing based on research which has shown CD-ROM to be lower cost, safer, more flexible, efficient and effective in comparison to hands-on training.<sup>12</sup> Exercises, role playing and case studies are also relied upon heavily.

### **Teaching Methods in Universities**

Universities and colleges use most of the common methods to teach leadership.<sup>13</sup> The first noteworthy method is found at Hartwick College. It uses case studies almost exclusively by transforming great literature into management/leadership themes. To

teach leadership as communication, they study literature and films on great men such as Winston Churchill. To teach leadership as strategy they use Clausewitz's *On War* and Sun Tzu's *Art of War*. In total there are twenty-nine leadership topics with numerous case studies to illuminate each. Hartwick College is presently developing new leadership teaching materials based on movies. Using the arts and humanities as the primary source to develop leadership teaching plans is Hartwick's strength. Other colleges are now using Hartwick College's products for their leadership classes.

The second method involves student self-awareness. Colleges use different methods for personal assessment. Some use one-on-one interviews for leadership feedback and personal analysis. Almost all universities use psychometric measurement tests such as the Taylor Johnson Temperament Analysis (TJTA) to assist students discover their own weaknesses as well as strengths. Some have even created their own specific instruments for self-assessment for leadership studies.<sup>14</sup> The University of Tampa dedicates a course for state-of-the-art assessment instruments to appraise student leadership behaviors and skills. One graduate program uses journaling supplemented by a journal reflection paper that is turned in for evaluation as part of the course grade. Journals are for personal use in developing self-knowledge of strengths and weaknesses. The student takes the responsibility and lead for the process of self-analysis. Other colleges use the journal as a basis for students to write their leadership philosophy or self-improvement goals.

The only college offering an undergraduate degree in leadership is the University of Richmond Jepson School of Leadership Studies. It is one of the most respected leadership programs in the country and is recognized as such by *The Journal of Leadership Studies*<sup>15</sup> and "*Leadership Education 1994–1995: A Source Book*" published



by the Center for Creative Leadership. The teaching methods the Jepson School rely upon are mentoring, role playing, hands-on service projects, internships and other application-oriented methods designed to develop interpersonal skills. More advanced courses utilize class discussion as their primary method of teaching leadership. Here the learning environment is more like a learning community with the instructor as a partner. Students manage analysis and practice skills in leading and following in discussion.

### **Student Evaluation**

Many institutions have comprehensive evaluation and measurement processes in order to examine their performance. This process helps these institutions ensure they meet their goals and objectives. These same principles apply to the academic environment. Many institutions that teach leadership have specific evaluation methods and grading criteria to measure a student's performance. For Air Force students, their "educational evaluation is a systematic process of judging how well individual's procedures or programs have met educational objectives."<sup>16</sup>

A comprehensive review of material obtained from both institution syllabi and information found in published materials show that student evaluation primarily falls into the categories of class participation, group projects, exams, papers and essays, oral presentations and feedback. This information primarily reflects data from universities and military schools since few business and professional institutions evaluate or grade their students during the course.

## **Student Evaluation in Military Institutions**

Military institutions evaluate students in leadership courses in a variety of ways, with several of the institutions not requiring any graded activities. For those schools that did provide information, class participation, written assignments and papers appear to be the most common evaluation methods.

Class participation, even if not graded, is stressed in several curricula. For example, the Industrial College of the Armed Forces class performance is evaluated. Students are evaluated in six areas: conceptual flexibility/complex understanding, broad perspective/multi-frame thinking, long-term perspective, team performance facilitation, oral communication skills and class participation. Students receive a class participation rating of either “well developed, demonstrated, aware of, or needs improvement.”<sup>17</sup> Instructors complete this survey on their students at the mid-point and at the end of the course. At other institutions, class-participation is highly encouraged, even if it is not graded.

The second method of evaluation used is some form of written paper. From the materials collected, it appears that the papers may not be solely in support of leadership, but rather fall under a broader curriculum perspective. The Army Command and General Staff College is one of the institutions that has at least one writing requirement during their leadership course. At the completion of their Senior Level Leadership and Art of Command course, students turn in a paper comprised of a vision statement and a discussion on how they would use two of four processes (command, control, leadership and management) to meet the vision they develop.

Some military institutions do not provide any formal grade in the leadership area, but focus on feedback evaluation from peers and students instead. The RAF Staff College is one of these institutions.

### **Student Evaluation in Businesses and Professional Organizations**

Most businesses and professional organizations do not formally grade their students at the completion of the course. Any evaluations that are done are accomplished through instructor and peer feedback. Two examples of courses that provide feedback to the students are The Cambridge Management Center and the Center for Creative Leadership.<sup>18</sup>

Few businesses identified formal student evaluations for the classes they provide their employees. USAA is presently updating their leadership training program and is trying to apply an evaluation method, but to date this is still in development. For other businesses, on-the-job performance is the primary evaluation method.

### **Student Evaluation in Universities**

University curricula provide a wealth of information on course evaluation as most universities grade more than one activity per course. The methods of evaluation can be categorized into group interaction, examinations, written papers, essays and feedback.

Interactive group activities such as class participation and group projects often comprise a substantial portion of a grade. Class participation shows up frequently as an integral part of many leadership classes, generally fluctuating between 10 and 35 percent of the final grade. Group projects are also an important part of many of the curricula surveyed. The Jepson School offers an interesting group evaluation. They divide the

class into two groups and conduct a debate between the groups on a relevant topic of leadership such as “should leaders and followers be friends?” The debate takes place during the last sessions of the course, and students are required to apply course material in defense of their priorities. Each student must participate. In some of the group activities at the Jepson School, the group receives a global grade and the students decide how to allocate the grade between themselves.<sup>19</sup>

Written evaluations are also given to students. A number of schools administer mid-term and/or final examinations as a method of evaluation. These examinations range from multiple choice and short answer to essay. Almost all the universities require a minimum of one written paper or essay. Some of these are based on leadership projects. For example, both the University of Maryland and the University of Nebraska require papers written on community projects. A few universities require students to write a paper on or about other people’s leadership styles. In Albertson College, students must write critical analyses on guest speakers’ views of leadership. Some universities tie in the writing requirements with oral presentations. The University of Gonzaga requires its student to perform two interviews with leaders. Students then write a paper and deliver an oral presentation on an analysis of their leadership styles. Case studies often provide the basis for many of the essay requirements. North Carolina State University uses case studies as one of their six evaluation criteria. The University of Southern California, the University of Colorado and the University of California at Santa Barbara are other educational institutions requiring essays based on cases studies.

Numerous universities require essays or papers written from a personal perspective. For example, Gonzaga University, the University of Maryland and the University of

California at Santa Barbara require a paper on the student's personal leadership analysis. The Hartwick Humanities in Management Institute requires students to write a personal literary case on ways and methods to think or practice leadership that can be useful to others. Many of these institutions use journaling (previously discussed under the methods portion of this chapter) as the basis for the analysis.

Feedback as a method of evaluation is used by some universities. Instructors and/or students provide this feedback. The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill provides one-on-one feedback to all its students while Albertson College provides peer and group performance evaluations.

### **Course Evaluation**

Most institutions provide an avenue for their students to evaluate the leadership course through the use of a questionnaire completed by the students, regardless of whether the course is taught by a military institution, business or university. In most cases, the study observed that the students complete a questionnaire at intervals during the course and/or at the end of the course. One exception to this is the RAF Staff College, which not only has the students evaluate the course immediately upon completion, but once again two years later. From a university perspective, the most comprehensive evaluation came from North Carolina State University. Their students accomplish both individual class and end-of-course evaluations. The end-of-course evaluation includes questions on formal influence, collaboration opportunities, organizational structures and student focus.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> AFMAN 36-2236, Guidebook for Air Force Instructors, 15 September 1995, 1.

<sup>2</sup> Col David A. Tretler, Dean of Faculty and Academic Programs, National War College, memorandum to Lieutenant Commander Chris Fedyschyn, 17 November, 1995.

<sup>3</sup> Karin Klenke, "Leadership Education at the Great Divide," *The Journal of Leadership Studies* 1, no. 1 November (1993): 120.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid.

<sup>5</sup> This taxonomy is similar in nature to Krathwohl's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: Affective Domain as identified in AFMAN 36-2236, 7.

<sup>6</sup> Dr. George A. Baker III, Macro-Concepts in Administration of Adult Education: Effective Leadership in Groups and Organizations, course syllabus, North Carolina State University, 1995.

<sup>7</sup> Heimlich, Joe E., and Norland, Emmalou. *Developing Teaching Style in Adult Education* (San Francisco, Calif.: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1994), 160. See also Malcolm S. Knowles. *The Modern Practice of Adult Education: Andragogy versus Pedagogy* (New York: Association Press, 1970), 292–295. In Kerry A. Johnson and Lin J. Foa, *Instructional Design: New Alternatives for Effective Education and training*. (New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1989), 169–177, a "methods taxonomy" is based on a student's cognitive experience from abstract to concrete. Each method is evaluated using six dimensions.

<sup>8</sup> AFMAN 36-2236, Guidebook for Air Force Instructors, 15 September 1995, 89.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid., 122.

<sup>10</sup> The Taylor-Johnson Temperament Analysis (TJTA) is used to by The Center for Creative Leadership, etc., to help students understand weaknesses as well as strengths.

<sup>11</sup> Xerox and other companies have contracted with Harvard University for this service.

<sup>12</sup> Kerry A. Johnson and Lin J. Foa, *Instructional Design: New Alternatives for Effective Education and training*. (New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1989), 170–77.

<sup>13</sup> North Carolina State University listed the following methods for one course alone:

1. Lecture method—a discourse of events, facts, concepts, principles, or explanations for instructional purpose presented by an instructor before a class or an audience.

2. Demonstration method—an accurate portrayal of the precise actions necessary to perform skills or processes. An instructor by performing an operation shows a student what is to be accomplished.

3. Performance method—student practices, performs, and applies, under controlled conditions and close supervision, the skills or knowledge which have been previously explained and demonstrated—learns the desired behavior through "hands-on" experience.

## Notes

4. Guided discussion method—interaction between students and/or an instructor in order to analyze, explore, and/or debate an issue, topic, or problem and achieve a stated objective.

5. Conference Group method—the act of consulting together formally; an appointed meeting for discussing some topic or business, a pool of experiences and opinions among a group of people who are capable of analyzing the problem from information provided by the conference leader.

6. Self-instructional method—self-instruction is a student-centered process of instruction. Instructional materials are prepared specifically to employ techniques of programming. Classical programmed instruction variables include small steps, carefully sequenced and cued to reduce errors; immediate feedback; and freedom on the part of the student to vary the normal rate of learning.

7. Role playing method—an acting out of parts in a job or situation on an improvised basis.

8. Case situation method—students attempt to solve real or hypothetical problem situations by applying sound principles developed through analytical thinking based on the presentation of a written case or an appropriate film.

9. Simulation—representation of some aspects of reality (either a process, event, or hardware) by symbols or devices that can be manipulated more readily than their actual counterparts.

10. Field Trip method—a planned learning experience in which students observe actual operations that illustrate the classroom area of study.

11. Tutoring—a method of direct instructor/student relationships on a one-to-one basis.

<sup>14</sup> Dr. George A. Baker III at North Carolina State University uses the following: The Situational Temperament Sorter (STS) Instrument, the Teaching as Leader Inventory (TALI) Instrument; Motivation Instrument; Work & Careers Instrument; Situational Temperament Sorter Instrument; Leadership Instrument: Power & Influence Style Questionnaire (A National Survey on Chief Executive Officers' use of power/influence); Least-Preferred Co-Worker Scale (LPC). He has also designed his own: Competency-Unit Matrix. This measures leadership role competencies such as visionary, task giver, motivator, ambassador, and liaison. It also measures informational roles such as monitor (mentor), disseminator, and advocate. Finally, it measures decisional roles such as entrepreneur/change agent, problem solver, resource allocator, and negotiator.

<sup>15</sup> Karin Klenke. “Leadership Education at the Great Divide: Crossing into the twenty-first century.” *Journal of Leadership Studies* 1, no. 1 November (1993): 111–127.

<sup>16</sup> AFMAN 36-2236, Guidebook for Air Force Instructors, 15 September 1995, 141.

<sup>17</sup> Industrial College of the Armed Forces, Performance Evaluation

## Notes

<sup>18</sup> Frank H. Freeman, Katherine B. Knott and Mary K. Schwartz, eds., *Leadership in Education 1994–1995: A Source Book* (Greensboro, N.C.: Center for Creative Leadership, 1995), 190–194.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*



## **Chapter 4**

### **Analysis**

#### **Introduction**

The focus of the study now turns to analysis of the findings presented in Chapter 3. The analysis is then compared to ACSC leadership curriculum described in Chapter 2. The intent of this chapter is to distill these findings to identify those trends or commonalities that can be beneficial to ACSC as it builds a leadership curriculum for the future. In particular, the study seeks to highlight those elements of course structure, course content, teaching methods and evaluation uncovered by the research that can enhance the teaching of leadership within the context of ACSC's mission and the guidance provided by General Fogleman and Secretary Widnall.

#### **Course Structure Analysis**

Those curricula that have the most well-defined structure have two significant things in common. First, they tend to start with a clear purpose for either the institution as a whole or the education/training in particular. Second, they follow a building block or hierarchical approach. In the business environment, the hierarchy begins with the strategic focus of the organization. In the military and academic setting, the hierarchy begins with some form of leadership foundation or leadership theory teaching, followed

by the application, analysis and synthesis of the course material. While only the military institutions seemed to mirror Bloom's Taxonomy in this regard, North Carolina State uses Baker's Taxonomy of Mental Skills, and the Jepson School uses a clearly defined hierarchical model that appears to be of their own design.

Looking at ACSC's leadership curriculum, and more specifically the course objectives as outlined in Chapter 2, it is clear that Bloom's Taxonomy was intended to guide the structure of the course. This is only natural given current Air Force guidance to this effect.<sup>1</sup> While a specific recommendation for structuring the course will be made in Chapter 5, the findings of the study indicate that the noteworthy curricula do in fact employ a solid course structure upon which course content is overlaid. In the current method of teaching the leadership and command course, course objectives follow Bloom's Taxonomy, yet the actual sequencing of lessons do not follow a building block or hierarchical approach. Further, ACSC is the only organization found that fragments or piecemeals their leadership instruction throughout the academic year.

### **Course Content Analysis**

The purpose of this section is to identify commonalities in the topics used to teach leadership. When all topics are compared, three distinct commonalities surface. The first consists of topics that are taught by a majority of institutions surveyed. These are traits, management skills, decision making, organizational dynamics, change and leadership in action (also referred to as command). The second consists of topics that pertain primarily to business and military institutions. These are core values, quality and vision. The third

is topics most often taught by universities. This includes theory, career development, diversity, communication skills and conflict resolution.

ACSC falls in line with the trends noted above. The school teaches all the topics most common to military and business institutions as well as most topics that are common to all institutions. Theory and conflict resolution, which are mainly taught in the universities, are also included in the ACSC curriculum.

### **Teaching Methods Analysis**

The purpose of this section of the paper is to identify commonalities in the methods used to teach leadership. It is a descriptive approach based on the assumption that a majority of institutions use a particular method because of its effectiveness in teaching the subject of leadership.

Several trends in teaching methods can be seen. The first is the use of case studies which are taken from a variety of sources ranging from great classics in literature and movies to personal experiences of teachers. The universal human experience of leading and following is found everywhere in life. The second trend is the use and development of CD-ROM interactive videodisk. As discussed in Chapter 3, CD-ROM provides many advantages in terms of flexibility, cost and effectiveness. A third trend is toward the use of psychometric tests and instruments to assist the student in self-awareness as a basis for personal growth as a leader. A final trend is “journaling.” Regardless of how it is used, journaling is becoming a recognized method of teaching leadership.

The majority of institutions surveyed use these methods because of their effectiveness in successfully meeting their educational objectives. ACSC teaching

methods are closely aligned with the trends noted. Case studies, a psychometric instrument (MBTI) and journaling are used at ACSC while CD-ROM interactive video is being considered for future use.

## **Evaluation Analysis**

The team identified several trends in the evaluation of students' performance, which are most commonly a combination of written evaluations, class participation and group activities, oral presentations and some type of personal feedback. It should be noted that these evaluations are primarily conducted at military institutions and universities and not in courses conducted by businesses and professional organizations. Furthermore, only universities consistently grade activities and use more than one evaluation method during courses.

The ACSC curriculum already incorporates many of the evaluation methods discussed above and is most closely aligned with the methods of evaluation found at universities. The present curriculum uses both written and oral methods of evaluation, applying the concept of individual development (journaling) as one basis for evaluation. Commonalties identified by this study which are not presently used but are applicable to the ACSC L&C curriculum framework include evaluating class participation, participation in group or community projects, and evaluating a student's analysis of leadership through the use of literary works, case studies or past and present leadership examples.

Additionally, most military institutions, businesses and universities provide avenues for students to evaluate the performance of the school. The evaluations are primarily

conducted at the end of the class or course. The ACSC course evaluation program is in line with what is being accomplished at other institutions.

### **Notes**

<sup>1</sup> AFMAN 36-2236, Guidebook for Air Force Instructors, 15 September 1995, 5.

## **Chapter 5**

### **Recommendations**

#### **Introduction**

Based on an analysis of the findings from military institutions, business and professional organizations and universities, the study group identified eight recommendations within the areas of course structure, course content, teaching methods and evaluation. Additionally, the group identified two general recommendations for consideration.

#### **Course Structure**

*Restructure the sequencing of course lessons to take a building block or hierarchical approach that more closely follows Bloom's Taxonomy.* The current ACSC leadership curriculum uses many of the same methods and materials uncovered by the development study group's research, however, the course could be structured more effectively. The study recommends ACSC use a building block or hierarchical approach to the sequencing of the actual lessons to optimize learning and attainment of the stated course objectives. This restructuring would involve breaking the course into four distinct phases: self-awareness, foundations of leadership, comprehension of leadership theories and principles, and finally, application of the leadership teachings.

The first step in this process would be completing the MBTI process as early as possible in the schedule to allow students to personalize their thinking throughout the course. Use of 'personal leadership style' papers or 360° feedback might also enhance the learning process. Clearly explaining the benefits of journaling in this block of instruction, a common practice in the academic institution leadership curricula, could also be beneficial. The second step involves laying the foundation for the rest of the course by presenting the review of leadership and organizational behavior theories and principles in one discreet block that is completed before asking students to undertake case studies or explore historical or fictional examples of leadership. The third step is to cluster the use of videos, case studies, literary leadership examples and other activities geared towards the comprehension-level of learning into a single block of instruction. This will build from and complement the basic theories and principles taught in the earlier block of instruction. The fourth step in this process is to cap off the course with practical, hands-on activities (to include perhaps some type of base or community service project that allows students to both practice and observe leadership in action) focused on the application-level of learning. By restructuring the course in this manner and providing students with a clear road map of how the course is structured and why this framework was selected, it may be possible to enhance student learning.

*Increase the emphasis on leadership and command throughout the curriculum by increasing the percentage of time allocated for the leadership and command portion of the curriculum and increasing the level of leadership integration into all other courses.* During AY 96, L&C comprised approximately 10 percent of the curriculum. Historically, this is a low percentage. In the mid-1960s, military management made up 40 percent of

the curriculum and by the mid-1970s, the Command and Management course comprised 60 percent of the curriculum. Both the present Secretary of the Air Force and Chief of Staff of the Air Force have brought high level attention to leadership and command and stated how the focus of leadership extends to ACSC. This gives significant credence to increasing the specific amount of time allocated to L&C.

Although ACSC courses are presently designed to build on each other and offer a certain amount of integration, the amount of leadership integration in each course could be increased. Military history and air campaigns offer many opportunities to study leadership at its best. This is one reason that titles such as *American Caesar* and *General Kenney Reports* are included in the curriculum. Additionally, while students are learning the art of campaign planning, they could analyze leadership roles in these campaigns. This emphasis on leadership could be clearly stated in course objectives and supported by course instructors.

## **Course Content**

*Continue to provide a variety of course topics to students, with a focus on core values, decision making, cultural diversity and leading change.* ACSC already incorporates most topics found in other curricula. This study recommends the emphasis be placed in four areas: core values, decision making, cultural diversity and leading change. First, core values is an important topic based on current emphasis from the highest levels of the Air Force command structure. Second, since our leaders are required to make tough, timely decisions, decision-making skills require constant honing. Third, based on the composition of the US military force and the probability of working with



other cultures due to the present focus on combined operations, students must understand cultural diversity. Finally, an emphasis on leading change is required due to the reorganization, downsizing, budget constraint and types of tasking military members are asked to support.

## **Teaching Methods**

*Develop or purchase a CD-ROM interactive computer program to teach leadership.*

This recommendation falls in line with the school's vision of becoming the most respected air and space power educational institution. Role playing using interactive computer programs can optimize the benefits of technology while providing students the opportunity to improve their leadership skills in an Air Force context. These programs could take one of two forms. First, they could simulate situations facing commanders and the leadership decisions they have to make. A second alternative could involve leadership decisions facing mid-grade officers working on a staff or at a joint assignment. At the present time there are several institutions that use interactive programs to teach leadership. Two such organizations are the Center for Creative Leadership and Harvard Business School. There are many avenues which can be pursued to develop military-specific scenarios if this is preferred over the existing off-the-shelf programs. The various service schools for commanders and first sergeants are a few organizations that could provide input for the program. This recommendation would also make an ideal research project for the class of 1997. The final product could be used in both the in-residence and distance learning programs, and could also be shared with other intermediate service schools.

*Increase the number of case studies used during the course.* This type of simulation assists in the learning process, especially if an objective is to emphasize critical analysis and problem-solving skills.<sup>1</sup> Three types of case studies are available to course directors. The first is professionally developed studies available commercially. Well-structured case studies are available from institutions such as The Hartwick Humanities in Management Institute and Harvard Business School. The second type of case study which could be used would be developed in-house by the ACSC faculty. Finally, military officers can analyze personal experiences in leadership situations, both in interfacing with subordinates and superiors. Personal experiences are invaluable since they not only increase participation, but also bring in situations that officers either have faced or may face in their careers.

*Increase the use of psychometric tests or instruments to assist the student in self-awareness as a basis for personal growth as a leader.* Besides the use of the MBTI to help students identify their personality styles, the use of another instrument such as the TJTA would allow students to identify personal strengths and weaknesses, thereby enabling them to identify the characteristics needed to achieve their desired personal leadership style.

## **Evaluation**

*Do not give grades for the Leadership and Command course.* This study found that professional business and many military institutions do not grade the leadership portion of their course. Feedback is given to the students in the form of group debriefs/discussions and one-on-one counseling sessions. Although exercises may be

evaluated, formal grades are not given. The only institutions that primarily use grades to evaluate a student's performance are universities. Grades are given in this setting largely to ensure learning is accomplished at the knowledge and comprehension levels. However, leadership primarily falls in the affective domain. Some aspects of leadership such as core knowledge can be quantified, but as a general rule, leadership style is unique to each individual. To place a letter grade on how well individuals learn leadership is counterproductive. It drives students to learn a specific style or concept of leadership that will result in a high grade instead of learning what helps them the most in improving their own leadership abilities. This study recommends that the most appropriate feedback for the leadership and command course should be ungraded feedback from peers and instructors regarding performance on analyzing case studies, execution of CD-ROM simulations and journaling.

*Expand the leadership portion of the ACSC curriculum questionnaires that are sent to alumni and supervisors one to two years after graduation.* Present questionnaires only have one question that specifically relates to the L&C course. This question asks if ACSC helped the student become more effective in the leadership skill area.<sup>2</sup> In order to properly evaluate course success, evaluation personnel should ask specific questions on both the topics and issues taught and the methods used to teach them. Results of this evaluation could provide enlightening data on the effectiveness of the leadership program at ACSC and insight into improving the future curriculum. This analysis could be developed into an ongoing research project with an ultimate aim of curriculum improvement.

## **Other Recommendations**

*Tap into the leadership training network that is already available.* This study laid the foundation for learning what is available worldwide on teaching leadership. The most comprehensive source of information was found at the Center for Creative Leadership, a non-profit organization. It provides the greatest opportunity for networking as a result of their role as a clearinghouse for leadership information. The Center for Creative Leadership holds numerous leadership forums annually and can provide a wealth of information on what leadership programs are available at which institutions. This center publishes a leadership source book that provides information on courses and programs, leadership development tools, leadership bibliographies, films and videos and directories for resource organizations, meetings and conferences. Other military organizations, such as the Army Command and General Staff College, are already working with the Center for Creative Leadership.

*Conduct a similar development study next year, narrowing the focus to a specific theme or area of study.* Leadership training is dynamic, continuous and constantly changing. It would be in the school's best interest to continue this development study next year; perhaps with a narrower focus. This study could focus on a particular topic or method addressed in this study. Themes that could be used as future studies include papers on topics such as mentorship, motivation, managing diversity or transformational leadership. Studies could also be developed on self-analysis methods or use of technology in the academic environment. The materials from this study could provide a starting point for one or more of these focused studies by students next year.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> Einsiedel, Albert A. "Case Studies: Indispensable Tools for Trainers," *Training and Development* 49, no. 8 (August 1995): 50–51.

<sup>2</sup> ACSC Curriculum Questionnaire sent to AY 94 students and their supervisors.

## **Chapter 6**

### **Conclusion**

Throughout the course of this development study, the group strove to maintain its focus on the study's purpose—to provide the ACSC faculty with the necessary information and resources to develop the best leadership curriculum possible. As the study progressed, it became apparent to the team that the school already has a comprehensive leadership curriculum. Furthermore, ACSC employs many of the common practices of the business and academic world, such as the use of a self-analysis instrument (MBTI), selection of commonly used core texts, use of historical lessons learned and a focus on ethics and accountability.

The development study examined the course structure, content, teaching methods and evaluation criteria used at leading military institutions, businesses and professional organizations and universities. This thorough review resulted in recommended changes in course structure, course content, teaching methods and evaluation/grading approaches. Finally, the team provided recommendations for future research projects and points of contact which can provide assistance in keeping abreast of the newest developments in the teaching of leadership. Implementation of this development study's recommendations will bring ACSC closer to their vision of becoming the world's most respected air and space power educational institution.

## **Appendix A**

### **Institutions Contacted**

#### **Military Institutions (U.S.)**

Armed Forces Staff College  
Industrial College of the Armed Forces  
Marine Corps Command and Staff College  
National Defense University  
National War College  
Naval War College  
U.S. Army Command and General Staff College  
U.S. Army War College  
United States Military Academy

#### **Military Institutions (International)**

Argentina  
Brazil  
Canada  
France  
Germany  
Great Britain  
Greece  
Israel  
Japan  
Russia  
Spain

#### **Businesses and Professional Organizations (U.S.)**

Aetna Life and Casualty Company  
American Express Company  
American International Group  
Apple Computer Incorporated

BankAmerica Corporation  
Boeing Company  
Cambridge Management Centres  
Caterpillar Incorporated  
Center for Creative Leadership  
Center for Leadership Studies  
Chrysler Corporation  
Citicorp  
Coca-Cola Company  
Colgate-Palmolive Company  
ConAgra Incorporated  
Corning Incorporated  
Covey Leadership Center  
Dow Chemical Company  
Dun and Bradstreet Corporation  
E.I. DuPont de Nemours and Company Incorporated  
Eastman Kodak Company  
Exxon Corporation  
Federal National Mortgage Association  
Florida Power and Light  
Ford Motor Company  
General Mills Incorporated  
General Motors Corporation  
Georgia-Pacific Corporation  
Harvard Business School Of Publishing  
Hewlett-Packard  
IBM Corporation  
Institute of Heartmath  
Intel Corporation  
International Paper Company  
ITT Corporation  
Johnson and Johnson  
Kravis Leadership Institute  
Marriott Corporation  
Mattel Incorporated  
McDonald's Corporation  
Merck and Company Incorporated  
Metropolitan Life Insurance Company  
Microsoft Corporation  
Mobil Corporation  
Motorola Incorporated  
Nations Bank Corporation  
Nike Incorporated  
Nordstrom Incorporated  
Occidental Petroleum Corporation



PepsiCo Incorporated  
Philip Morris  
Procter and Gamble Company  
Reebok International Ltd.  
Ritz Carlton Hotel Company  
RJR Nabisco Holdings Corporation  
Sara Lee Corporation  
Tenneco Incorporated  
Texaco Incorporated  
Texas Foundation for the Improvement of Local Government  
Texas Instruments Incorporated  
The Aspen Institute  
The Goodyear Tire and Rubber Company  
The Prudential Insurance Company  
Time-Warner Incorporated  
Traveler's Corporation  
Turner Broadcasting System Incorporated  
United Airlines Corporation  
United Technologies Corporation  
USAA  
Viacom Incorporated  
Wal-Mart Stores Incorporated  
Walt Disney Company  
Weyerhaeuser Company  
Xerox Corporation

**Businesses and Professional Organizations (International)**

Aerospatiale  
Alcan Aluminum Limited  
Alcatel Alsthom Compagnie Generale d'Electricite  
Asahi Chemical Industry Co., Ltd.  
Bayer Group  
Benetton Group Spa  
Brambles Industries Limited  
Daewoo Corporation  
Daihatsu Motor Company Ltd.  
Daimler-Benz Aktiengesellschaft  
Danisco A/S  
De Beers Consolidated Mines Limited  
Eni Ente Nazionale Idrocarburi  
Fiat S.P.A.  
Foodcorp Limited  
Four Seasons Hotels Limited  
France Telecom

Fried, Krupp Gmbh  
Fuji Photo Film Co., Ltd.  
Fujitsu Limited  
Heineken N.V.  
Hitachi Ltd.  
Hoechst Ag  
Honda Motor Co., Ltd.  
Hyundai Corporation  
John Labatt Limited  
Kawasaki Steel Corporation  
Kubota Corporation  
Laidlaw Inc.  
Matsushita Electric Industrial Co., Ltd.  
Mazda Motor Corporation  
Mitsubishi Motors Corporation  
Nippon Steel Corporation  
Nissan Motor Co., Ltd.  
Peugeot S.A.  
Philips Gloeilampenfabrieken N.V.  
Pirelli S.P.A.  
Royal Dutch/Shell Group  
Samsung Group  
Sanyo Electric Co., Ltd.  
Sharp Corporation  
Sony Corporation  
Sumitomo Life Insurance Co.  
The Lucky-Goldstar Group  
The Molson Companies Limited  
The Seagram Company Ltd.  
TNT Limited  
Toshiba Corporation  
Toyota Motor Corporation  
Yamaha Corporation

### **Universities**

Albertson College of Idaho  
Coleman College  
Colorado College  
Columbia College  
Creighton University  
Cuesta College  
Duke University  
Fort Hays State University  
Fresno Pacific College

Georgetown College  
Gettysburg College  
Gonzaga University  
Harvard University  
James Madison University  
John Carroll University  
Kentucky Wesleyan College  
Keuka College  
Kutztown University  
North Carolina State University  
North Central College  
Ohio State University  
Peace College  
Stetson University  
Texas A&M University  
University of Akron  
University of California—Santa Barbara  
University of California—Santa Cruz  
University of Colorado—Boulder  
University of Colorado—Colorado Springs  
University of Maryland  
University of Miami  
University of Michigan  
University of Missouri—St. Louis  
University of Nebraska—Omaha  
University of North Carolina—Chapel Hill  
University of North Carolina—Chapel Hill  
University of North Carolina—Charlotte  
University of Puget Sound  
University of Redlands  
University of Richmond  
University of Scranton  
University of Tampa  
University of Tampa  
University of Tennessee  
University of Vermont  
University of Virginia  
Virginia Commonwealth University  
Virginia State University  
Western Michigan University

## **Appendix B**

### **Institutions Responding**

Albertson College of Idaho  
Wallace Lonergan  
Director, Albertson Leadership Program  
2112 Cleveland Blvd.  
Caldwell, ID 83605  
(208) 459-5809

Argentinian Military  
Captain Carlos V. Bahnson (Ret)  
Head of Superior Course  
Maip=FA262  
1084, Buenos Aires, Argentina  
Fax: 54-1-325-3510

Armed Forces Staff College  
Colonel Bruce Bennett, USAF  
Deputy Dean, Curriculum Development  
7800 Hampton Blvd.  
Norfolk, VA. 23511-6097  
DSN: 564-5230

Center for Creative Leadership  
Attn: Client Relations  
PO Box 26301  
Greensboro, NC 27438-6301  
(910) 545-2810  
Fax: (910) 282-3284

Coleman College  
Philip Wolfson  
7380 Parkway Dr.  
La Mesa, CA 91924

Covey Leadership Center  
Lorraine Dieterle  
3507 North University Avenue  
Provo, Utah 84604-4478  
(801) 342-6681  
(800) 331-7716 ext. 6351

Creighton University  
Jody I. Svartoiien  
2500 California Plaza  
Omaha, NE 68178

Duke University  
Director, The Hart Leadership Program  
Box 10248 Duke Station  
Durham, NC 27708-0248

Ford Motor Company  
Neil Sendelbach  
300 Renaissance Center  
PO Box 43350  
Detroit, MI 48243  
(313) 446-8070  
Fax: (313) 446-9309

Fresno Pacific College  
Richard Kriegbaum  
1717 S. Chestnut Avenue  
Fresno, CA 93702

Georgetown College  
L. Bert Hawkins  
Vice President for Student Affairs  
400 E. College Avenue  
Georgetown, KY 40324-1696  
(502) 863-8007

Gonzaga University  
Dr. Joseph Allen  
Chairman, Department of Organizational Leadership  
E. 502 Boone Avenue  
Spokane, WA 99258-0001  
(509) 328-4220

Hartwick College  
John J. Clemens  
Hartwick Humanities in Management Institute  
Oneonta, NY 13820  
(800) 942-2737

Harvard Business School Publishing  
Margo Roberts  
145 North Harvard Street  
Allston, MA 02163  
(617) 496-6344

Industrial College of the Armed Forces  
Ft. McNair  
Washington, DC 20319-6000  
Attn: Leadership Dept.

Kellogg Foundation  
Alice Warner  
(616) 968-1611

Kentucky Wesleyan College  
Dr. Mike Fagan  
Associate Dean of Leadership Studies  
3000 Frederica St. PO. Box 1039  
Owensboro, KY 42302-1039  
(502) 926-3111

Keuka College  
Dr. Jeffrey P. Krans, Ph. D.  
Professor of Political Science and Economics  
Box 117  
Keuka Park, NY 14478

Kutztown University  
Frank A. Bucci  
College of Graduate Studies  
Kutztown, PA 19530

Naval War College  
Captain Dorothy Prose  
Code 132  
686 Cushing Road  
Newport, RI 02841-1207

Nike Incorporated  
Elaine Dixon  
1 Bowerman Drive  
Beaverton, OR 97005  
(800) 272-3648

North Carolina State University  
Department of Adult and Community College Education  
George A. Baker III  
Raleigh, NC 27695-7801  
(919) 515-6289

RAF Advanced Staff Course  
LTCOL Wayne Davidson  
Royal AF Staff College  
Bracknell, Berks, RG1290D

Ritz Carlton Hotel Company  
Mary Anne Ollman-Brigis  
Director of Training and Development  
3414 Peachtree Road  
No. 300  
Atlanta, GA 30326  
(404) 237-5500

Royal Army Staff College  
Captain C. Johnstone  
Camberly, Surrey GU15-4NP  
01-276-412642

The Jepson School of Leadership Studies  
University of Richmond  
Dr. J Thomas Wren, Associate Editor  
Richmond, VA 23173  
(804) 287-6062

University of California—Santa Barbara  
Carolyn Buford  
3151 University Center  
Santa Barbara, CA 93106

University of Colorado—Boulder  
Student Leadership Institute  
400 Norlin Library, Campus Box 363  
Boulder, CO 80309-0363

University of Maryland  
Bruce Adams  
7211 Exeter Rd  
Bethesda, MD 20814  
(301) 217-7957

University of Michigan Business School  
Executive Education Center  
Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1234  
(313) 763-1003  
Fax: (313) 763-9467

University of Nebraska—Omaha  
Ethel Williams  
Department of Public Administration  
62nd and Dodge Streets  
Omaha, NE 68182  
(402) 554-2625/2683

University of North Carolina—Chapel Hill  
Joan Busko  
Kenan-Flagler Business School  
Chapel Hill, NC 27599-3490

University of Scranton  
School of Management  
PO. Box 3718  
Scranton, PA 18505

University of Southern California  
Graduate School of Business Administration  
Dr. Jay Conger  
308 D Bridge Hall  
Los Angeles, CA 90089-1421  
(213) 740-4318/0728



University of Tampa  
Stephen A. Stumpf, Ph.D.  
Dean, College of Business and Graduate Studies in Business  
401 W. Kennedy Blvd.  
Tampa, FL 33606-1490  
(813) 253-6221

University of Tennessee  
Grady Bogue, Professor  
Leadership Studies in Education  
238 Claxton Addition Building  
Knoxville, TN 37996  
(615) 974-6140

USAA  
Mike Dickinson  
Administrative Director  
Organization and Human Skills Development  
9600 Fredricksburg Road  
San Antonio, TX 78288  
(210) 498-4720  
Fax: (210) 498-0170

U.S. Army Command and General Staff College  
Ft. Leavenworth, KS. 66027-6900  
Attn: Leadership Dept.

Xerox Corporation  
Janet Heim  
500 Long Ridge Road  
Stamford, CT 06904  
(703) 724-5386

## **Appendix C**

### **Sample Request for Information**



## DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

Air Command and Staff College/Seminar 44  
225 Chennault Circle  
Maxwell AFB AL 36112-6426

Nike Inc.  
Vice President of Human Resources  
1 Bowerman Drive  
Beaverton OR 97005

Dear Vice President of Human Resources

I am a military officer and student at the United States Air Force Air Command and Staff College (ACSC) conducting research on the teaching of leadership and would like to receive information from you on this subject.

ACSC has an enrollment of approximately 500 students who typically have 12–15 years military experience and graduate or professional degrees. The mission of the college is to prepare mid-career officers to lead in developing, advancing, and applying air and space power in peace and war.

My goal is to gain insight into various methods used to teach leadership throughout the world. I plan to compare and contrast different methods and isolate outstanding aspects within each program to aid in developing a future curriculum for our institution. Specifically, I would like to receive a copy of the syllabus you use to teach leadership to mid-level managers to include (if available):

- a. Course description
- b. Course objectives
- c. Teaching method
- d. Reading list
- e. Sample lesson plans
- f. How you benchmarked your curriculum
- g. How you measure the effectiveness of your leadership program
- h. Any other information on your focus or central theme for teaching leadership

Please send any available information to me at the address shown above. If you have any questions, please contact me at (334) 953-2065, fax (334) 953-2514, or Internet e-mail address SpellmanT%Stu8%ACSC@ACSCSVR2.AU.AF.MIL. Thank you for your assistance.

## **Appendix D**

### **Sample Follow-Up Request**



## DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

January 16, 1996

Air Command and Staff College/Seminar 38  
225 Chennault Circle  
Maxwell AFB AL 36112-6426

Intel Corp.  
Vice President of Human Resources  
PO Box 58119  
Santa Clara CA 95052-8119

Dear Vice President of Human Resources

I am a military officer and student at the United States Air Force Air Command and Staff College (ACSC) conducting research on the teaching of leadership. On November 6, 1995, I wrote you requesting information on this subject. To date, I have not received any response. Therefore, I am following up this request for information.

As stated in my initial request, the goal of my research is to gain insight into the various methods used to teach leadership throughout the world. I plan to compare and contrast these methods and isolate outstanding aspects of each to aid in developing a future curriculum for ACSC. Specifically, I would like to receive a copy of the syllabus you use to teach leadership to mid-level managers, to include (if available):

- a. Course description
- b. Course objectives
- c. Teaching method
- d. Reading list
- e. Sample lesson plans
- f. How you benchmarked your curriculum
- g. How you measure the effectiveness of your leadership program
- h. Any other information on your focus or central theme for teaching leadership

Please send any available information to me at the address shown above. If you have any questions, please contact me at (334) 953-5950, fax (334) 953-2514, or Internet e-mail address SpellmanT%Stu8%ACSC@ACSCSVR2.AU.AF.MIL. Thank you for your assistance.

## **Appendix E**

### **Sample Cover Letter to Defense Attachés**



**DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE**  
Air Command and Staff College  
225 Chennault Circle  
Maxwell Air Force Base AL 36112-6426

MEMORANDUM FOR Office of the Defense Attaché  
American Embassy Buenos Aires  
APO AA 34034

7 Nov 95

FROM: ACSC/Sem 41

SUBJECT: Air Command and Staff College Research Paper

1. I am presently attending Air Command and Staff College at Maxwell AFB, Alabama. As part of my curriculum, I am working on a research paper that compares how leadership is taught at various institutions throughout the world. The research includes civilian businesses, international universities and military institutions. Request your assistance in forwarding the attached letter to any military schools in Argentina that provide leadership training to their mid-level officers.
2. Any information the military institutions can provide will be appreciated, even if it is in Spanish and not in English. Because of the large population of foreign officers attending training at Maxwell AFB, translating a document will not be difficult.
3. If you have any questions, I can be reached at the above address. My phone number is DSN 493-5058 and Civilian (334) 953-5058. My E-Mail is SmithM%Stu8%ACSC@ACSCSVR2.AU.AF.MIL. Your assistance in getting this letter to the right institution will be greatly appreciated.

## Appendix F

### Sample Worksheet

ORGANIZATION TYPE: Business

INSTITUTION: USAA

VISION: None explicitly stated.

MODEL: None (managers create their own personal development plan from a wide range of offerings). USAA has benchmarked their curriculum against a number of sources., but has not found a single leadership model that suits their needs; they are pursuing development of their own model.

#### TOPICS TAUGHT:

- Coaching
- Communication
- Initiative
- Innovation
- Interpersonal Skills
- Management Skills
- People Development/Mentoring
- Positive Attitude
- Professionalism
- Quality/Customer Service
- Teamwork
- Trust
- Vision

#### TEACHING METHODS:

- Video scenarios
- Role playing
- Class discussion
- CD-ROM (currently under consideration)

SUPPORTING MATERIALS: See attached.



EVALUATION: Primarily at Kirkpatrick's Level I (did they like it?); transitioning to point where they can test up to Level IV (did it have a bottomline impact?)

POINT OF CONTACT/SOURCE:

Mike Dickinson

Administrative Director

Organization and Human Skills Development

USAA

9600 Fredricksburg Road

San Antonio TX 78288

(210) 498-4720; Fax (210) 498-0170

## Appendix G

### Supporting Materials

#### Core Knowledge

- Bounds, Gregory. M. *Beyond Total Quality Management: Toward the Emerging Paradigm*. New York. McGraw-Hill. 1994.
- Gilder, George, F. *Microcosm: The Quantum Revolution in Economics and Technology*. New York. Simon and Schuster. 1990.
- Gleik, James. *Chaos: Making a New Science*. New York. Penguin Books. 1987.
- Kellerman, Barbara, ed. *Political Leadership: A Source Book*. Pittsburgh. University of Pittsburgh Press. 1986.
- Kosko, Bart. *Fuzzy Thinking: The New Science of Fuzzy Logic..* New York. Hyperion. 1993.
- Peters, Thomas. *Thriving on Chaos: Handbook for a Management Revolution*. J. New York. Harper Perennial. 1991.
- Richards, I. A. (trans) *The Republic of Plato*. Translated by New York. W.W. Norton. 1942.
- Rue, Leslie and Lloyd L. Byars *Management: Theory and Application..* Homewood, IL. Irwin. 1989.
- Wheatley, Margaret. J. *Leadership and the New Science: Learning About Organization from an Orderly Universe*. San Francisco. Berret-Koehler Publishers. 1994.

#### Personal Development

- Bennis, Warren. *On Becoming a Leader*. Reading, MA. Addison-Wesley Publishing Co. 1989.
- Blanchard, Kenneth and Norman Vincent Peale. *The Power of Ethical Management*. New York. Ballantine. 1989.
- Blanchard, Kenneth and Patricia Zigarmi. *Leadership and the One Minute Manager: Increasing Effectiveness Through Situational Leadership*. New York. William Morrow. 1985.
- Burns, James MacGregor. *Leadership..* New York. Harper and Row. 1978.
- Clark, Kenneth and Miriam Clark. *Measures of Leadership*. West Orange, NJ. Leadership Library of America. 1990.

- Covey, Stephen. *Principal Centered Leadership*. New York. Simon and Schuster. 1990.
- Covey, Stephen. *The Seven Habits of Highly Effective People*. New York. Simon and Schuster. 1989.
- Drucker, Peter. *The Effective Executive*. F. New York. HarperBusiness. 1993.
- Fisher, Robert and William. *Ury Getting to Yes: Negotiating Agreement Without Giving In*. New York. Penguin Books. 1991.
- Fox, Richard and Joseph Demarco. *Moral Reasoning: A Philosophical Approach to Applied Ethics*. Orlando. Harcourt Brace Publishers. 1990.
- Johansen, Robert. *Leading Business Teams*, Addison-Wesley, 1991.
- Katzenback, Jon and Douglas Smith. *The Wisdom of Teams: Creating the High-Performance Organization*. Boston. Harper Business, 1993.
- Kouzes, James and Barry Posner. *Credibility: How Leaders Gain and Lose it*. San Francisco. Jossey-Bass Publishers. 1993.
- Kouzes, James and Barry Posner. *The Leadership Challenge: How to Get Extraordinary Things Done in Organizations*. San Francisco. Jossey-Bass. 1987.
- Lawson, James. *Rules for Reaching Consensus*, Pfeiffer and Company, 1994
- Leading Self-Directed Work Teams: A Guide to Developing New Team Leadership Skills*. New York. McGraw-Hill. 1993.
- Locke, Edwin, A. and Shelley Kirkpatrick. *The Essence of Leadership: The Four Keys to Leading Successfully*. New York. Maxwell Macmillan International. 1991.

### **Management Competencies**

- Myers, Briggs. *Introduction to Type*.
- Phillips, Donald. *Lincoln on Leadership: Executive Strategies for Tough Times*. New York. Warner Books. 1992.
- Rees, Fran. *How to Lead Work Teams: Facilitation Skills*. San Diego. Pfeiffer and Company. 1991.
- Sanborn, Mark. *Teambuilt, Making Teamwork Work*, , Master Media, 1992.
- Yukl, Gary. *Leadership in Organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ. Prentice Hall. 1989.
- Zenger, John. *Leading Teams: Mastering the New Role*. Homewood, IL. Business One Irwin, 1994.

### **Leadership in Action**

- Bolman, Lee and Terrence Deal. *Reframing Organizations: Artistry, Choice, and Leadership*. San Francisco. Jossey-Bass. 1991.
- Byham, William. *Zapp! The Lightning of Empowerment: How to Improve Productivity, Quality, and Employee Satisfaction*. New York. Fawcett Columbine. 1992.
- Clemens, John and Douglas F. Mayer. *The Classic Touch—Lessons in Leadership from Homer to Hemingway*. Homewood, IL. Dow Jones-Irwin. 1987.
- Edgar. Novato *19 Stars*. Puryear. , CA. Presidio Press. 1981.
- Forester, C.S. Baltimore. *The General*. Nautical and Aviation Publishing Co. 1982.
- Gardner, John. *On Leadership*. New York. Free Press. 1993.

- Hughes, Richard, Robert Ginnet and Gordon Curphy. *Leadership: Enhancing the Lessons of Experience*. Homewood, IL. Irwin. 1993.
- Kenny, George. *General Kenny Reports: A Personal History of the Pacific War*. Washington DC Office of Air Force History, U.S. Air Force. 1987.
- Kotter, John. *A Force for Change: How Leadership Differs from Management*. New York. Free Press. 1990.
- Manchester, William. *American Caesar*. Boston. Little, Brown and Co. 1978.
- McFarland, Lynne. *21st Century Leadership*. Los Angeles. Leadership Press. 1993.
- Rosenbach, William and Robert Taylor. *Contemporary Issues in Leadership*. Boulder, CO. Westview Press. 1989.
- Smith, Perry. *Taking Charge: A Practical Guide for Leaders*. Washington DC National Defense University Press. 1986.
- Stumpf, Stephen and Thomas Mullen. *Taking Charge: Strategic Leadership in the Middle Game*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ. Prentice Hall. 1992.
- Taylor, Robert and William Rosenbach, eds. *Military Leadership: In Pursuit of Excellence*. Boulder, CO. Westview Press. 1992.
- Tichy, Noel. *The Transformational Leader*. New York. Wiley. 1990.

## *Bibliography*

- Air Command and Staff College. *Course Guidebook*. Maxwell AFB, Ala.: Air University Press, 1996.
- Air Command and Staff College. Leadership and Command, course syllabus, Maxwell AFB, Ala.: Air University, 1996.
- Air Command and Staff College. *Theater Air Campaign Studies*. Maxwell AFB, Ala.: Air University, 1996.
- Air Force Manual 36-2236. *Guidebook for Air Force Instructors*. 15 September 1994.
- Arnone, Maria, Roger L.M. Dunbar, Thomas P. Mullen, Stephen A. Stumpf. "Management Development: Choosing the Right Leadership Simulation for the Task." *Journal of Management Education* 16:220–230 May 1992.
- Baker, Dr. George A. III. Macro-Concepts in Administration of Adult Education: Effective Leadership in Groups and Organizations, course syllabus, North Carolina State University, 1995.
- Bennis, Warren. *On Becoming A Leader*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1995.
- Christensen, Roland C., David A. Garvin, Ann Sweet. *Education for Judgment: The Artistry of Discussion Leadership*. Boston, Mass.: Harvard Business School Press, 1991.
- Davis, Lt Col Richard L. and Lt Col Frank P. Donnini. *Professional Military Education for Air Force Officers: Comments and Criticisms*. Maxwell AFB: Air University Press, 1991.
- Donnithorne, Larry R. *The West Point Way of Leadership: From Learning Principled Leadership To Practicing It*. New York: Currency Doubleday, 1994.
- Einsiedel, Albert A. Jr. "Case Studies: Indispensable Tool For Trainers." *Training and Development* 49:50–53 August 1995.
- Finney, Robert T. *History of the Air Corps Tactical School 1920–1940*. Washington D.C.: Center for Air Force History, 1992.
- Fogleman, Gen Ronald R. "Making It Happen on Our Quality Journey," remarks delivered at the Air Force Quality Symposium Banquet, Montgomery, Ala., 19 October 1995.
- Freeman, Frank H., Katherine B. Knott and Mary K. Schwartz. (eds.). *Leadership in Education 1994–1995: A Source Book*. Greensboro, N.C.: Center for Creative Leadership, 1995.
- Gardner, John W. *On Leadership*. New York: Free Press, 1993.
- Harback, Herbert F. and Ulrich H. Keller. "Learning Leaders XXI." *Military Review* 75:30–37 May–June 1995.

- Heimlich, Joe E. and Norland, Emmalou. *Developing Teaching Style in Adult Education*. San Francisco, Calif.: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1994.
- Hersey, Paul and Blanchard Kenneth H. *Management of Organizational Behavior: Utilizing Human Resources*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1982.
- Hill, Linda A. *Becoming a Manager: Mastery of a New Identity*. Boston, Mass.: Harvard Business School Press, 1992.
- History, Air Command and Staff College. vol. 1, 1 July 1989–30 June 1990.
- History, Air Command and Staff College. vol. 1, 1 July 1993–30 June 1994.
- History, Air Command and Staff College. vol. 1, July 1991–30 June 1992.
- History, Air University. January–June 1962.
- History, Air University. January–June 1964.
- History, Air University. January–June 1966.
- History, Air University. vol. 1, 1 October 1974–31 September 1975.
- History, Air University. vol. 1, 1 October 1979–31 September 1980.
- History, Air University. vol. 1, 1980.
- History, Air University. vol. 7, 1 October 1973–31 September 1974.
- History, Air University. vol. 7, 1 October 1974–31 September 1975.
- Holis, Patrecia Slayden. "Leadership and TRADOC XXI." *Field Artillery* 6:4–6, June 1995.
- Horner, Donald H., "Leaders Development and Why it Remains Important." *Military Review* 75:77–86 July–August 1995.
- Johnson, Kerry A. and Lin J. Foa. *Instructional Design: New Alternatives for Effective Education and Training*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1989.
- Johnson, Maj Karl, Leadership and Command Course Director, lecture, subject: Leadership and Command 500, slide 4, Air Command and Staff College, September 21, 1995.
- Johnson, Maj Karl, Leadership and Command Course Director, point paper, subject: Leadership and Command Curriculum, 20 September 1995.
- Kellar, Elizabeth. "Ethics on Center Stage." *The Public Manager* 24:36–38 Fall 1995.
- Klenke, Karin. "Leadership Education at the Great Divide: Crossing into the Twenty-first Century." *Journal of Leadership Studies*. 1:112–126 November 1993.
- Knowles, Malcolm S. *The Modern Practice of Adult Education: Andragogy versus Pedagogy*. New York: Association Press, 1970.
- Larson, Victoria. "Program Challenges Top Executives." *Personnel Journal* 73:54–62 May 1994.
- Lewis, Chad T. "The Grammar of Leadership Education." *The Journal of Leadership Studies* 2:3–12 Winter 1995.
- Lohmann, Ursula G. "Leadership Education Lessons Learned." *The Public Manager* 23:5–8 Summer 1994.
- Nowowiejski, Dean A. "A Leader's Development Paradigm." *Military Review* 75:70–75 July–August 1995.
- Roberts, Alexander B. "Core Values in a Quality Air Force." *Airpower Journal* 8:40–53 Summer 1994.
- Rosenbach, William E. and Robert L. Taylor (eds.). *Military Leadership In Pursuit of Excellence*. Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1992.

- Smith, Perry. *Taking Charge, A Practical Guide for Leaders*. Washington D.C.: National Defense University Press, 1993.
- Tretler, David A. Memorandum to Lieutenant Commander Chris Fedyschyn, 17 November 1996.
- Waddell, Donald E. "A Situational Leadership Model for Military Leaders." *Airpower Journal* 8:29–42 Fall 1994.
- Widnall, Sheila E. "Building Leadership—Step by Step," *Air Force Times*, 31:29 March 4 1996.
- Widnall, Sheila E. remarks prepared at the Air Force Leadership Awards Luncheon, Maxwell Air Force Base, Ala., 2 June 1995.
- Widnall, Sheila E., Secretary of the Air Force, and General Ronald Fogleman, Air Force Chief of Staff, commentary on "Core Values" in ACSC Leadership and Command Course 502, 1996.