

Strategy Research Project

Developing Resilient Leaders of Character for the 21st Century

by

Lieutenant Colonel David C. Foley
United States Army



United States Army War College
Class of 2014

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT: A

Approved for Public Release
Distribution is Unlimited

This manuscript is submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the Master of Strategic Studies Degree. The views expressed in this student academic research paper are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the Department of the Army, Department of Defense, or the U.S. Government.

The U.S. Army War College is accredited by the Commission on Higher Education of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools, 3624 Market Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104, (215) 662-5606. The Commission on Higher Education is an institutional accrediting agency recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education and the Council for Higher Education Accreditation.

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

Form Approved--OMB No. 0704-0188

The public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing the burden, to Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports (0704-0188), 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number. **PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.**

1. REPORT DATE (DD-MM-YYYY) 15-04-2014		2. REPORT TYPE STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT		3. DATES COVERED (From - To)	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Developing Resilient Leaders of Character for the 21st Century				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S) Lieutenant Colonel David C. Foley United States Army				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Colonel Robert M. Mundell Department of Command, Leadership, and Management				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) U.S. Army War College, 122 Forbes Avenue, Carlisle, PA 17013				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Distribution A: Approved for Public Release. Distribution is Unlimited.					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Word Count: 5,078					
14. ABSTRACT Character development is the starting point to build prototypical leaders committed to the Army's enduring purpose and charter. As the Army envisions the Land Force of 2020, it must cultivate prototypical Army leaders to meet the indeterminate demands of the 21st Century. Within its current design and intended purpose, the Army leader development strategy lacks the approach necessary to develop professional prototypical leaders of character who are committed to the Army profession and strategic vision, and reflect institutional values. This paper surveys the Army's archetypical development model as an instrument for professional growth, analyzes the need for committed prototypical leaders of character, and offers prescriptive and descriptive recommendations to the Army's leader development strategy for senior leaders to consider as they continue to shape and influence leader character and institutional behavior. To meet the unique demands of the transnational security community, the Army must invest time, energy, and resources in character development across the institutional and operational domains of leadership.					
15. SUBJECT TERMS Investment in Institutional Values, Army Prototypical Leadership					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	18. NUMBER OF PAGES 32	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT UU	b. ABSTRACT UU	c. THIS PAGE UU			19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER (w/ area code)

USAWC STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT

Developing Resilient Leaders of Character for the 21st Century

by

Lieutenant Colonel David C. Foley
United States Army

Colonel Robert M. Mundell
Department of Command, Leadership, and Management
Project Adviser

This manuscript is submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the Master of Strategic Studies Degree. The U.S. Army War College is accredited by the Commission on Higher Education of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools, 3624 Market Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104, (215) 662-5606. The Commission on Higher Education is an institutional accrediting agency recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education and the Council for Higher Education Accreditation.

The views expressed in this student academic research paper are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the Department of the Army, Department of Defense, or the United States Government.

U.S. Army War College
CARLISLE BARRACKS, PENNSYLVANIA 17013

Abstract

Title: Developing Resilient Leaders of Character for the 21st Century
Report Date: 15 April 2014
Page Count: 32
Word Count: 5,078
Key Terms: Investment in Institutional Values, Army Prototypical Leadership
Classification: Unclassified

Character development is the starting point to build prototypical leaders committed to the Army's enduring purpose and charter. As the Army envisions the Land Force of 2020, it must cultivate prototypical Army leaders to meet the indeterminate demands of the 21st Century. Within its current design and intended purpose, the Army leader development strategy lacks the approach necessary to develop professional prototypical leaders of character who are committed to the Army profession and strategic vision, and reflect institutional values. This paper surveys the Army's archetypical development model as an instrument for professional growth, analyzes the need for committed prototypical leaders of character, and offers prescriptive and descriptive recommendations to the Army's leader development strategy for senior leaders to consider as they continue to shape and influence leader character and institutional behavior. To meet the unique demands of the transnational security community, the Army must invest time, energy, and resources in character development across the institutional and operational domains of leadership.

Developing Resilient Leaders of Character for the 21st Century

The Army has historically produced leaders who displayed high moral, ethical, and valorous character through actions and leadership. During the U.S. Civil War, a Maine college professor that volunteered to serve the Union Army was awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor for his gallantry during the Gettysburg campaign.¹ His citation acknowledged his “daring heroism and great tenacity in holding his position on the Little Round Top against repeated assaults, and carrying the advance position on the Great Round Top.”² Colonel Joshua L. Chamberlain’s professional leadership and selfless service would lead the 20th Maine Regiment against a resilient Confederate Army in a decisive counter-attack for General Meade’s Army of the Potomac.³

In the contemporary era, President Barack Obama posthumously awarded Sergeant First Class (SFC) Jared C. Monti, a member of the 3rd Squadron, 71st Cavalry Regiment, 10th Mountain Division, the Congressional Medal of Honor for “distinguishing himself by acts of gallantry and intrepidity above and beyond the call of duty during combat operations against an enemy in Nuristan Province, Afghanistan.”⁴ During the White House Medal of Honor ceremony in 2009, the President addressed senior political and military leaders and described SFC Monti’s character and leadership.⁵

Duty, Honor, Country, Service Sacrifice, and Heroism. These are words of weight. But as people – as a people and as a culture, we often invoke them lightly. We toss them around freely. But do we really grasp the meaning of these values? Do we truly understand the nature of these values? To serve, and to sacrifice. Jared Monti knew. The Monti family knows. And they know that the actions we honor today were not a passing moment of courage. They were the culmination of a life of character and commitment.⁶

While these vignettes exemplify the requisite prototypical leadership qualities Army senior leaders encourage in its institution, its culture, and its officers, Colonel

Chamberlain's and SFC Monti's character traits are atypical manifestations of modern leadership within the Army's profession of arms. Beyond the competent and capable warfighting accomplishments, institutional management practices, and strategic envisioning, today's Army officer corps is marred by instances of sexual assault and harassment, senior leader moral failures, unethical decision-making, command toxicity, and organizational malignancy.

In 2004, the nation and the global community witnessed moral malfeasance and a leadership fiasco during the Abu Ghraib prisoner abuse incident in Baghdad, Iraq.⁷ For the Army, the human rights violations and war crimes committed during this incident were indicative of extreme leader character and commitment defects stemming from unsatisfactory education and training certification, and individual immorality. Likewise, in Afghanistan in 2010, the Army's 5th Stryker Brigade, 2nd Infantry Division (5/2 SBCT) perpetrated civilian killings, war crimes, and professional misconduct.⁸ Several Soldiers in 5/2 SBCT were convicted of war atrocities, "including creating a self-described kill team that targeted unarmed Afghan men and cut off their fingers as war trophies."⁹ Through several substantiated reports and official investigative conclusions, this incident was symptomatic of a highly dysfunctional command climate pervasive with egregious leadership principles, culturally-unbecoming character, and organizational ineptitude.¹⁰

While the Army's validated service to the nation is generally held in high regard, these negative examples of unacceptable leader behavior and decision making have stained the institution's reputation. Multiple failures in values-based leadership over the past decade have had a devastating impact not only on the Army, but tarnish the values

of all Americans. More importantly, these leader behavior patterns violate the trust and confidence of Army Soldiers and the nation. Recent feedback provided by junior Army leaders corroborates this concern and reveals that negative senior leader behavior is a major impediment in the Army. Specifically, the 2012 Center for Army Leadership Annual Survey of Army Leadership (CASAL) indicates that many Army leaders are not developing their subordinates, and are seen as putting their own needs before the needs of the units they lead.¹¹

These results are similar to the results contained in a study supporting the Army's Profession of Arms (Center for the Army Profession and Ethic, 2011) which found that only 44% of respondents agree that leaders in their organization invest time and effort to develop them.¹² Furthermore, 60% of junior leaders indicate that negative senior leader behavior is commonly related to poor unit cohesion, unit discipline problems, low subordinate motivation, poor work quality, and lower commitment to the Army in general.¹³ This troubling dynamic does not bode well for the Army moving forward, and highlights the need to re-examine existing leader development efforts. The cumulative effect of these deficiencies were recently realized by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Martin E. Dempsey, during an address at the National Defense University where he communicated that "winning our nation's wars is no longer enough; for the first time our character is being evaluated by experts and pundits while we fight."¹⁴

Within its current design and intended purpose, the Army's leader development strategy lacks the effective methodology necessary to develop comprehensive, capable, and resilient leaders of character who are committed to the Army profession and

strategic vision, and reflect Army and national values. This deficiency is directly associated with the privation of time invested in character development in the Army's institutional education system, over-reliance on self-development, and inefficiencies in preparing emerging leaders to operate effectively in complex and ambiguous environments.

Central to this critical viewpoint is the need to examine, assess and clearly define the requisite attributes and competencies inherent in prototypical Army leaders of character, and the vital role these leaders fulfill in maintaining the Army's ability to remain globally dominant and the world's preeminent land force. These types of leaders influence organizational culture and subordinate perceptions of authentic and legitimate leadership through idealized influence and inspirational motivation. Most importantly, these morally grounded and dedicated leaders have a transformative effect on the Army, which allows the organization to maintain the trust and confidence of the American public, face and overcome the daunting challenges of the 21st century, and adhere to the tenants and principles of the Army profession. The resulting transformational effect these prototypical leaders of character have on the Army is ultimately the true desired outcome of Army leader development.

This paper surveys the Army's archetypical leader development model as an instrument for professional growth, analyzes the need for committed prototypical leaders of character that will realize the nation's grand strategy, and examines existing Army leader development efforts with emphasis on character development. The paper offers prescriptive and descriptive recommendations to the Army's leader development strategy and professional military education model for senior leaders to consider as they

continue to shape and influence current and emerging junior leader character and institutional behavior.

21st Century Strategic Environment

The 21st century strategic environment denotes volatility, uncertainty, complexity, and ambiguity through multinational shifts in power and influence, economic reform and stabilization, and the advent and transition of multi-faceted universal threats. As the U.S. military evolves beyond 2020 the global environment will become even more complex based on the emergence of hybrid threats, strained international alliances, continued fiscal uncertainties, transnational competition for natural resources, climate and environmental concerns, and the predominant need to operate across the Joint, Interagency, Intergovernmental, and Multinational (JIIM) spectrum. U.S. prosperity, security, and national purpose are threatened by terroristic and criminal factions who seek to attack national economic, informational, and military systems. As global jihadist movements become increasingly decentralized, fiscally interdependent, and ideologically persuasive, Al-Qa'ida extremists and their associated affiliates manufacture strategic resolve and opportunity along transitional, insecure, and unstable actors and governments.¹⁵

Throughout the strategic environment, the U.S. understands military developmental pursuits from aggressive actors such as China and North Korea. As China continues to pursue sustained military modernization initiatives designed to enable China's armed forces to achieve success on a 21st century battlefield, North Korea maintains a large, conventional military, well postured to conduct limited attacks with little to no warning.¹⁶ While these threats indicate only a small population of intelligence-based intimidations, they characterize the reality of global flux and the

primacy of national security and defense efforts. In addition to national defense concerns, the institutional Army comprehends a formation rich in post-warfare fatigue, sexual assault, suicide and suicidal tendencies, substance abuse, domestic violence, and immoral and unethical behavior.

The strategic environment described above presents a range of complex threats, challenges, and opportunities, increasing the likelihood of U.S. forces being called on to operate under a broad variety of conditions.¹⁷ This environment requires a capable and resilient force structure that executes innumerable military operational campaigns across the JIIM continuum, in combating antagonistic actors and global challenges, adversities, and aggression.¹⁸ The Army fulfills an important role in shaping the strategic environment by building partner nation and allied capacity, mitigating adverse effects of change and instability, and deterring opportunistic aggressors.¹⁹ Most importantly, the 21st century security environment requires adaptations across the force; the most significant adaptations being how we develop the next generation of prototypical leaders, who must be prepared to learn and adapt faster than their adversaries.²⁰

Army Prototypical Leaders

In its purest form, a prototype is an original model on which something is patterned, an individual that exhibits essential features, or a standard or typical example.²¹ Prototypes are decisive in forming organizational and individual identity because they enhance the salience of a group and make it appear to be a distinct and well-structured entity with clear boundaries, whose members share a common fate.²² Many characterizations of the Army align well with this description. As a national defense institution that parallels leader development principles with intrinsic culture ideologies, the Army aims to produce professional officers that embody functional and

conformed leadership prototypes. Army prototypical leaders associate authority, respect, and credibility with group behavioral norms, expectations, and values, and do not need to exercise power to have influence. These types of leaders are influential because they assimilate members' behavior to the prototype and are intrinsically persuasive because they embody group norms and values.²³

In a 2001 "Social Identity Theory of Leadership" publication, social psychologist and theorist Michael A. Hogg defines prototypes as the cognitive representation and social categorization of groups.²⁴ Hogg further articulates the quintessential prototypical leader by highlighting three interconnected attributes – charisma, effectiveness, and commitment.²⁵ These three attributes are important within the context of developing Army leaders of character and are consistent with many espoused Army values.

Prototypical Army leaders espouse charismatic tendencies as they instinctively motivate followers to achieve collective goals that transcend self-interest and transform organizations.²⁶ Through associative identity and transformational leadership methods, these leaders leverage cooperative interests to manifest selfless contributions toward mutual aims, goals, and objectives. Second, prototypical leaders must be proactive, change-oriented, innovative, motivating, inspiring, and communicate a vision and mission that unites an organization and directs and influences action.²⁷ In complex and ambiguous environments, the prototypical Army leader adapts and evolves, by envisioning a glide path identifiable to essential group practices, cultural identities, and future perspectives.

Hogg particularizes that prototypical leaders professionally engage others to create commitment by empowering others, thereby stimulating greater effort in

achieving desirable outcomes.²⁸ Prototypical leaders inherently influence their environment and organizational dynamic by realizing a climate conducive to professional obligation and trust. Principally, Hogg communicates the need for vibrant, associative prototypical leaders who serve group ideals as charismatic, effective, and committed proponents of an organization's purpose, interests and vision. In alignment with Hogg's social identity theory, the Army visualizes a profession of arms that resonates prototypical leadership through the development of three culturally-attuned leadership attributes – competence, character, and commitment.

Prototypical Army leaders must convey institutional competence, and must be full spectrum professional warfighters who understand the strategic implications of their actions, behaviors, and decisions.²⁹ They must ascertain core aptitudes, professional judgment, expert knowledge, and inimitable skills to lead trained, proficient, and effective organizations.³⁰ Importantly, they must foster generational leaders that possess a global mindset, can operate with precision across the spectrum of conflict, are able to function within the JIIM environment, and are culturally astute and use awareness and understanding to achieve an intercultural edge across the Army's operational design.³¹

Army prototypical leaders demonstrate immaculate character, and their ethical foundation is deeply rooted in Army values and the warrior ethos. The prototypical leader exudes integrity, moral obligation, discipline, and fortitude, and must do "what is right, legally and morally, and adhere to values deeply embedded in their personal and professional identity."³² They realize organizational influence and power through practices of unquestionable integrity, reliability, and veracity. Army professionals are

expected to internalize a moral responsibility and selflessly serve the nation. This requires prototypical leaders to “submerge emotions of self-gain in favor of the larger goals of mission accomplishment and welfare of the unit.”³³

Across the Army’s diverse domain, Army leaders represent accountable, goal-oriented, and driven professionals who aspire to meet requisite institutional norms and behaviors through personal conduct and discipline. These prototypical leaders guide associative organizations towards attainable aims and ends, and display fortitude and courage in moments of adversity and warfare. They act on ethical instincts to make morally sound and legally succinct decisions in the safeguarding of personal and professional identity.

Finally, the prototypical Army leaders display unassailable commitment to the Army profession and serve honorably and ethically in service to the Army and the nation.³⁴ These leaders understand their professional obligation to serve their organization, the Army, and the Soldiers and families entrusted to their care, direction, and diligence. Prototypical leaders provide a “vital service to American society and do so in subordination; that service is manifested in the duty of the individual professional.”³⁵ Senior Army leaders expect prototypical leaders to remain committed to the preservation of cultural values, beliefs, and attitudes, institutional and operational learning, leader development imperatives, self-actualization, and the Army’s professional ethic. These types of competent and committed leaders of character are central to the maintenance of Army culture.

Prototypical Leadership and Army Culture

Since its formalized inception in 1775, the U.S. Army has evolved through transformation, modernization, and warfare to its current formational posture of

comprehensive supremacy and preeminent military power and influence. Today the Army is a vibrant institution that advocates the preservation of national security, prosperity, and sovereignty. The Army's formidable existence today within the strategic environment is defined by its lineage and heritage, doctrine, professionalization, leadership, and culture.

Edgar H. Schein, a leading scholar on culture, defines culture as a “dynamic phenomenon shaped by leadership behavior and a set of structures, routines, rules, and norms that guide and constrain behavior.”³⁶ Army culture is influenced by a “system of shared meaning held by its Soldiers, the shared attitude, values, goals, and practices that characterize the larger institution over time.”³⁷ The Army's values-based culture promotes adaptation, learning, personal and professional growth, and constructive self-management and self-actualization.

The seven Army values “create a Soldier's identity with a sense of calling and ownership over the advancement of the profession and the exemplary performance of its members, and serve in a bonded unity of fellow professionals with a shared sense of calling.”³⁸ While the Army's foundational values are meant to align personal and societal norms to a culture where honor, integrity, and respect are instinctive ideals, their inculcation validates an associative organizational identity that preserves the Army's vision, strategy, and purpose. These championed values not only enable an institutional design intrinsic of ethical principles, moral values, and individual character, but also articulate a common understanding of the Army as a profession and a national institution for military warfare. Army culture is indicative of prototypical leaders that

prescribe to the principles of national service, professional stewardship, and Army values.

The Army's contemporary culture is reflective of an architecture derived from its voluntary construct and moral obligation ideology. Each year, generations of future leaders enter military service seeking societal identity, personal attainment, and selfless service. These young Americans are decisive in forming Army organizational cultures, and are in keeping with Immanuel Kant's theories of metaphysics and morals, their character is comprised of a solid ethical foundation where "actions are of moral worth when we do the right thing because it is right, and not for what benefit we can get out of it."³⁹

For many Americans, national military service presents tremendous opportunities to serve their country as responsible United States citizens. Military service provides a means of enabling young Americans to not only render service to their nation, but to also reinvigorate national morals, ethics, and values into societal norms. Additionally, military service allows them to increase their quality of life, while defending national interests. These leadership characteristics and attributes are synonymous with the moral responsibility to act and serve. American citizens that obligate to serve the Army manifest tendencies of personal responsibility, loyalty to an institution, and commitment without notions of self-entitlement.⁴⁰

Army culture is "expressed through Army professionals personally identifying with the Army and its values, and who possess a strong sense of unit esprit and camaraderie."⁴¹ The Army demonstrates the criteria for professional certification and identity through competence in proficient and capable work, moral character, and

resolute commitment to the Army profession.⁴² It invests in the development of future leaders to acquire the requisite expertise and skills needed to meet the challenges of the 21st century.⁴³

As the Army's culture reflects its formal underpinning, the obligatory prototypical leader influences the institutional environment by inculcating cultural tendencies and norms, embracing group ideals, and identifying with recognized attributes and competencies. Army prototypical leaders aspire to achieve an ethical base that cultivates trust and faith by subordinate members and the American people.⁴⁴ The Army prototypical professional exemplifies personal loyalty to the military institution, its members, and the American society. Fundamentally, prototypical leaders immersed in the Army's dynamic environment, both influence the development of its resilient culture and allow the Army to adhere to the principles associated with the institution as a profession. One of the key contributors to the Army's culture is the Army Leader Development Strategy.

Army Leadership Development Strategy

The Army leader development strategy is defined as a

deliberate, continuous, sequential, and progressive process, grounded in Army values, and achieved through lifelong synthesis of the knowledge, skills, and experiences gained through institutional training and education, organizational training, operational experience, and self-development.⁴⁵

As part of its organizational learning culture and doctrinal leadership ideology, the Army's leader development strategy seeks to balance operational experience gained from an era of prolonged conflict with training initiatives and professional military education programs to deliver a dynamic leader capable of meeting the demands of the 21st century. "Through the leader development process, the Army develops leaders with

character and competence for today and tomorrow to be trainers, role models, and standard bearers.”⁴⁶

While the Army’s leader development strategy supports the requirement for adaptive leaders, the focus on professional competence marginalizes the equally important need to develop committed leaders of character. This strategy enables institutional and operational learning through prescriptive educational and organizational imperatives; however, its fundamental flaw resides in the expectations of professional self-development and the inculcation of traditional character traits, values, and professional ethics. One of the strategy’s most significant deficiencies is associated with the Officer Education System (OES).

The Army’s OES continuum marginalizes values-based training within its institutional educational and training enterprise. The Army’s 2012 Center for Army Leadership Annual Survey of Army Leadership (CASAL) study communicates that only 51% of recent OES graduates agree that their most recent course or school effectively prepared them to address ethical challenges.⁴⁷ Additionally, the study notes that only 47% of recent graduates rate their most recent course effective for preparing them to build and sustain a positive command; and only 39% of recent graduates agree that their most recent course was effective in preparing them to develop the leadership skills of their subordinate leaders.⁴⁸ This inefficiency indiscriminately fosters a profession of arms that incapacitates prototypical professional leaders of character, committed to serving the Army and this nation.

Governed by Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC) Regulation 350-36, the Army mandates that officers receive 456 hours of common core military education

encompassing instruction on officership, professional development, technical and tactical competence, values/ethics, leadership, and warrior tasks.⁴⁹ However, the curriculum only prescribes 17 hours (3.79%) of instruction on values/ethics training, and only four hours (0.88%) of instruction dedicated to character development.⁵⁰ This methodology remains institutionally repetitive throughout an officer's OES experience.

At the intermediate level of education (ILE), the scope of ethics training over a 44-week course and 577 hours of academic instruction is relegated to eight training hours (1.39%).⁵¹ The ILE ethics course is designed to “enhance an officer's moral development by reviewing key ethical systems which are foundational to the Army's values, and by reflecting on one's own moral philosophy” through professional dialogue on just war, the ethics of duty and mission, virtue and the Soldier leader, and Soldiering in a post-modern world.⁵²

Finally, the curriculum offered during an officer's ten-month Senior Service College (SSC) education at the U.S. Army War College comprises just nine hours of values and ethics training offered during the Strategic Leadership Course.⁵³ With the intent of providing senior leaders with a better understanding of how laws, morals, and ethics form a comprehensive ethic within the Army's profession of arms, resident students receive instruction on ethical reasoning, command climate and team building, and professional ethics for strategic leaders.⁵⁴

While the primacy for leader development through the officer educational system is to produce the Army's prototypical leader, its secondary imperative is to associate institutional training, education, and learning with operational influence, effectiveness, and execution. As a result, existing institutional professional military education flaws and

shortfalls outlined in the Army's 2012 CASAL study regarding relegated emphasis on institutional values, morals, and ethics directly correlate to developmental inefficiencies within the operational domain of the Army's leader development model.

While the Army's 2012 CASAL study was intended to articulate a comprehensive assessment of the Army's leader development strategy and its intended vision in providing professional prototypical leaders to meet the challenges of the 21st century, it validated several inherent principles associated with leader professionalization and progress. First, it outlined a lack of emphasis by senior leaders and academic institutions in educating professionals on Army ethics and values, and character development. Second, it revealed that the Army's OES inherently develops professionally competent prototypical leaders with deficient character and commitment leadership attributes. Third, the results of this study indicate that the Army's professional military education model's intended outcomes only moderately resonates with the Army's cultural ideology, institutional norms and beliefs, and strategic purpose. As the Army looks forward to the future security environment and envisions the means to develop and retain quintessential prototypical leaders, its contemporary institutional culture and leader development imperative identifies fundamental flaws existent within the mechanisms designed to codify character development and commitment in the corps of professional leaders.

Land Force of 2020 Leader Development Strategy / Recommendations

As the Army transitions from an era of protracted conflict and envisions a land force beyond 2020, senior leaders must prescribe a methodology that promotes the investment of character development in leaders, by integrating and synthesizing actions across both institutional and operational leadership domains. Within the institutional

leader development domain, the Army should examine its values-based education and training curriculums at OES academic institutions. In the organizational leader development domain, the Army must study a model that directs officer Character Evaluation Boards (CEB), introduces a standardized organizational Values-based Mission Essential Task List (VMETL), and indoctrinates character-based leader development strategies.

Within the Army's OES framework, senior military leaders need to mandate a values-based education and training agenda and philosophy. As the lead proponent for the effort, TRADOC must guide the Army's leader development strategy to direct the prioritization of ethics, morals, and values instruction at the Officer Basic Course, Captain's Career Course, ILE, and SSC. "Ethics training must be seen as something other than a burdensome compulsory duty; rather it must be integrated into military training early on, and fundamental to the development of professional Soldiers."⁵⁵

Institutional curriculums must incorporate appropriate periods of time and instruction for individual reflection, group dialogue, and institutional collaboration on ethical decision-making case studies, Army values, the warrior ethos, and other character development vignettes. In order to realistically revive and edify the Seven Army Values, and make them a way of life, these curriculums should allocate no less than two hours of instruction for each institutional value. Under this premise, an officer's values-based education might include exposure to the moral philosophies of Immanuel Kant, an introduction to the ethical teachings of Aristotle, and the study of John Stuart Mill's theories of immoral consequences and utilitarianism.⁵⁶ Education in morality and ethics from classic philosophers, theorists, and social psychologists also provides an

understanding in determining rules to live by and guideposts to analyze individual actions, decisions, and introspection.⁵⁷

TRADOC's emphasis on values-based instruction will require Army academic institutions to implement accredited learning objectives across the institutional domain to educate and train character development throughout the total Army construct. This includes the Non-Commissioned Officer Education System, to ensure educational initiatives translate from institutional to organizational learning domains. This type of comprehensive approach to values-based learning will not only promote character development in the Army, but also foster an institutional culture that embraces its core values, ethics, and beliefs.

As the Army invests institutional energy to address foundational flaws in officer character development, it must assert similar vigor in accentuating prototypical character personas in the centralized promotion and selection of officers. While the validity of the current Army system selects and promotes capable and competent professionals, its reliance on a Department of the Army photo, an officer's record brief, and several officer evaluation reports represents an incomplete evaluation of professionalism and character.

Centralized promotion and selection boards must consider and review a candidate's character as part of the comprehensive selection process. Rather than simply an evaluation of tactical, operational, and strategic competencies, the Army Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel (G-1) and Human Resources Command (HRC) must implement an informative mechanism that emphasizes the significance of character development as part of existing promotion and selection processes. At a

minimum, centralized selection boards at the Lieutenant Colonel and Colonel Command level should require a formalized interview process to afford board members an opportunity to personally evaluate individual leader and character attributes. These interviews should include a written requirement that communicates an officer's perspective on professional and personal ethics, morals, and values.

As academic institutions modify their curriculum to enhance values-based education and training, and graduate competent leaders of character, an officer's associated Academic Evaluation Report (AER) will inform the certification of character development throughout the OES process. As official documentation of an officer's academic obligation, the character-focused AER will provide HRC a quantitative metric to determine eligibility for entry into the centralized selection and promotion process. Ultimately, it is the professional responsibility for centralized selection boards to review character competencies as part of the comprehensive review of an officer's official file.

As officers are exposed to organizational influences, environmental pressures, and personal and professional challenges; instances of detrimental conduct and unbecoming behavior surface. For those acts that are formally recognized by institutional processes or discipline enforcement agencies, an officer's impudent decisions are controlled and corrected through non-judicial or administrative adjudication within the Uniform Code of Military Justice. Other than cases involving severe criminal or civil delinquency, an officer's actions might only warrant a letter of concern or reprimand for filing into a temporal military record.

Using a similar approach, a recognized act or pattern of unethical behavior or inability to demonstrate the requisite prototypical character conduct, must demand the

orchestration of a regulatory CEB to assess an officer's personal values, professionalism, and cultural identity. Executed by an officer's chain of command or impartial judicial body, the results of the CEB are permanently filed into the officer's professional record and subject to consideration by senior leadership, centralized selection and promotion committees, and administrative separation boards.

For the Army, trained, capable, and competent organizations are critically evaluated and assessed through their concomitant Capability Mission Essential Task List (CMETL) proficiency. To achieve mandated force readiness postures, organizational leaders invest time, precedence, and resources towards CMETL adeptness. Just as the Army guides operational promptness to achieve force generational competence, Forces Command (FORSCOM) must direct the implementation of a VMETL construct tailored to influence and assess character-building tendencies at the individual, leader, and collective levels of operational design. In conjunction with the indoctrinated VMETL, FORSCOM should outline compulsory organizational training and education parameters, guidelines, and standards for values-based character development and learning across the organization leader development domain. A regularly directed Headquarters Department of the Army VMETL review will not only modify existing cultural norms and promote character development in officers and their associated organizations, but will also reveal critical gaps and inefficiencies in the training and education of institutional values and ethics.

A primary goal of organizational leader development strategies is to inculcate the vital skills, attributes, values, and competencies into cultural learning and developmental climates that advocate the advancement of prototypical leadership. Whether

organizational leaders create professional development programs designed to moderate leadership, doctrine, or core competency instruction, they must invest time to teach, educate, and articulate institutional and organizational values.

Organizational commanders must develop programs that guide, reinforce, and educate subordinate officers, non-commissioned officers, and Soldiers entrusted to their command authority. Values-based education and training must be an organizational priority supported by adequate time and resources. With the appropriate emphasis, character development within organizational formations will reflect the cultural norms, beliefs, and values of its members.

Conclusion

As the Army transitions from an era of protracted conflict to an epoch of global complexity, uncertainty, and ambiguity, it faces a strategic security environment indicative of shifts in foreign policy, national security dilemmas across the JIIM spectrum, and institutional reform. For national and military executives envisaging the Army of 2020, the need to develop professionally competent and capable leaders of character committed to lead the men and women entrusted to their authority and care is imperative. As such, the strength of the Army's institutional framework is its organizational professionalization through a holistic leader development strategy.

The Army aims to produce prototypical leaders that embody functional and conformed leadership prototypes, and manifest professional competencies, ethics, values, and character. In order to meet the unique demands of the transnational security community as a national instrument of power, the Army must invest time, energy, and resources in character development across both the institutional and operational domains of leadership. The nation and the men and women who selflessly

serve to protect its inherent liberties deserve prototypical leadership developed by an Army that invests in institutional values that produce competent and committed Army leaders of character.

Endnotes

¹ The Latin Library, "Joshua Lawrence Chamberlain (1828-1914)," 1, <http://www.thelatinlibrary.com/chron/civilwarnotes/chamberlain.html> (accessed November 10, 2013).

² *Ibid.*, 5.

³ James R. Brann, "Defense of Little Round Top," *America's Civil War Magazine*, 2013, 1, <http://www.civilwar.org/battlefields/gettysburg/gettysburg-history-articles/defense-of-little-round-top.html> (accessed November 16, 2013).

⁴ Barack Obama, *President's Remarks for Sergeant First Class Jared Monti – Medal of Honor Recipient* (Washington, DC: The White House, September 17, 2009), 3, <http://www.army.mil/medalofhonor/monti/remarks.html> (accessed November 16, 2013).

⁵ *Ibid.*, 1.

⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷ Paul T. Barone, *Understanding Prisoner Abuse at Abu Ghraib: Psychological Considerations and Leadership Implications* (Washington, DC: National Defense University, November 1, 2008), 1, <http://www.stolaf.edu/people/huff/classes/social/Reports/Bartone%20.pdf> (accessed November 16, 2013).

⁸ Mark Boal, "The Kill Team: How U.S. Soldiers in Afghanistan Murdered Innocent Civilians," *Rolling Stone Magazine*, March 27, 2011, 1, <http://www.rollingstone.com/politics/news/the-kill-team-20110327> (accessed December 8, 2013).

⁹ Anna Mulrine, "Pentagon Had Red Flags about Command Climate in 'Kill Team' Stryker Brigade," *The Christian Science Monitor*, March 28, 2010, 2, <http://www.csmonitor.com/USA/Military/2010/1028/Pentagon-had-red-flags-about-command-climate-in-kill-team-Stryker-brigade> (accessed December 7, 2013).

¹⁰ Michelle Tan, "Report Blames Lapses on Stryker Commander," *Army Times Online*, November 27, 2011, <http://www.armytimes.com/article/20111127/NEWS/111270307/> (accessed December 7, 2013).

¹¹ Jon J. Fallesen, et al., *2012 Center for Army Leadership Annual Survey of Army Leadership (CASAL): Main Findings Technical Report 2013-1* (Fort Leavenworth, KS: Center for Army Leadership, April 2013), 57-58,

<http://usacac.army.mil/cac2/CAL/repository/2012CASALMainFindingsTechnicalReport2013-1.pdf> (accessed January 19, 2014).

¹² Ibid., 62.

¹³ Trevor Conrad et al., *2011 Center for Army Leadership Annual Survey on Army Leadership (CASAL): Main Findings*, Technical Report 2012-1 (Fort Leavenworth, KS: Center for Army Leadership, May 2012), iv, http://usacac.army.mil/CAC2/Repository/CASAL_TechReport2012-1_MainFindings.pdf (accessed January 19, 2014).

¹⁴ Walter Pincus, "General Dempsey: Winning Our Nation's Wars is No Longer Enough," *Washington Post Online*, July 1 2013, 1, http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/national-security/gen-dempsey-winning-our-nations-wars-is-no-longer-enough/2013/07/01/7d005270-e03c-11e2-963a-72d740e88c12_story.html (accessed November 2, 2013).

¹⁵ John R. Clapper, *A Statement of Record: Worldwide Threat Assessment of the U.S. Intelligence Community*, Senate Select Committee on Intelligence (Washington, DC: Office of the Director of National Intelligence, March 12, 2013), 3, <http://www.intelligence.senate.gov/130312/clapper.pdf> (accessed January 9, 2014).

¹⁶ Ibid., 22.

¹⁷ John M. McHugh and Raymond T. Odierno, *2013 Army Strategic Planning Guidance*, (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Army, 2013), 1, http://usarmy.vo.llnwd.net/e2/rv5_downloads/info/references/army_strategic_planning_guidance.pdf (accessed September 9, 2013).

¹⁸ Ibid., 2.

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ Martin E. Dempsey, "Leader Development," *Army Magazine*, February 2011, 15, <http://www.ousa.org/about/prescorner/Pages/GENDempseys2020Vision.aspx> (accessed August 29, 2013).

²¹ Merriam-Webster Dictionary, "Prototype," <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/prototype> (accessed January 5, 2014).

²² Michael A. Hogg and Scott A. Reid, *Social Identity, Self Categorization, and the Communication of Group Norms*, *Communication Theory* (Brisbane, Australia: University of Queensland, International Communication Association, 2006), 10, <http://www.scribd.com/doc/140921575/Hogg-Reid-2006-Social-Identity-Self-Categorization-And-the-Communication-of-Group-Norms> (accessed December 22, 2013).

²³ Michael A. Hogg, "A Social Identity Theory of Leadership," *Personality and Social Psychology Review* 5, no. 3, 194, <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.301.4183&rep=rep1&type=pdf> (accessed November 22, 2013).

²⁴ Ibid., 187.

²⁵ Ibid., 185.

²⁶ Ibid.

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ Ibid.

²⁹ U.S. Department of the Army, *Army Leadership*, AR 600-100 (Washington DC: U.S. Department of the Army, March 8, 2007), 1.

³⁰ U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command, *Army White Paper: The Profession of Arms*, (Fort Eustis, VA: TRADOC, December 8, 2010), 6, <http://www.benning.army.mil/armor/content/PDF/Profession%20of%20Arms%20White%20Paper%208%20Dec%2010.pdf> (accessed September 9, 2013).

³¹ U.S. Army Combined Arms Center, *A Leader Development Strategy for a 21st Century Army*, (Fort Leavenworth, KS: November 25, 2009), 8, http://cgsc.edu/ALDS/ArmyLdrDevStrategy_20091125.pdf (accessed September 2, 2013).

³² U.S. Department of the Army, *Army Leadership*, ADP 6-22 (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Army, August, 1, 2012), 6.

³³ John A. Wickam, Jr., *Guideposts for a Proud and Ready Army* (Washington, DC: Office of the U.S. Army Chief of Staff, March 1, 1985), 2.

³⁴ U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command, *U.S. Army Profession Campaign* (Fort Eustis, VA: TRADOC, April 2, 2012), 5, <http://cape.army.mil/repository/CY11ArmyProfessionAnnualReport.pdf> (accessed August 16, 2013).

³⁵ U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command, *Army White Paper: The Profession of Arms*, 6.

³⁶ Edgar H. Schein, *Organizational Culture and Behavior*, 3rd ed. (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2006), 1.

³⁷ U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command, *Army White Paper: The Profession of Arms*, 9.

³⁸ Ibid., 4.

³⁹ Joseph G. Brennan, *Foundation of Moral Obligation* (Novato, CA: Presidio, 1994), 87.

⁴⁰ Wickam, Jr., *Guideposts for a Proud and Ready Army*, 2.

⁴¹ U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command, *U.S. Army Profession Campaign*, 14.

⁴² Ibid., 5.

⁴³ U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command, *Army White Paper: The Profession of Arms*, 2.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 2.

⁴⁵ U.S. Department of the Army, *Army Leadership*, AR 600-100, 4.

⁴⁶ U.S. Department of the Army, *Commissioned Officer Professional Development and Career Management*, DA PAM 600-3 (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of the Army, February 1, 2010), 2, http://content.dcmsnet.org/Courses_ARMY/CAS3/Fd112-2/Lesson/p600_3.pdf (accessed December 1, 2013).

⁴⁷ Fallesen et al., *2012 Center for Army Leadership Annual Survey of Army Leadership (CASAL): Main Findings*, 90.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 91.

⁴⁹ U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command, *Basic Officer Leader Training Policies and Administration*, TRADOC Regulation 350-36 (Fort Eustis, VA: TRADOC, October 19, 2012), 19,45, <http://www.tradoc.army.mil/tpubs/regs/tr350-36.pdf> (accessed December 21, 2013).

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 19. (Para 2-3g, CCTL link <https://www.us.army.mil/suite/files/36842275>).

⁵¹ U.S. Army Command and General Staff College, *E100: Ethics Theme Advance Sheet*, (Fort Leavenworth, KS: Command and General Staff Officer Course Common Core, August 2013), 1.

⁵² *Ibid.*

⁵³ U.S. Army War College, *Strategic Leadership Course Directive*, (Carlisle Barracks, PA: Department of Command, Leadership, and Management, August 9, 2013), 11.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 29.

⁵⁵ Paul Robinson, "Ethics Training and Development in the Military," *Parameters*, Spring 2007, 34, <http://strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pubs/parameters/Articles/07spring/robinson.pdf> (accessed November 4, 2013).

⁵⁶ Brennan, *Foundation of Moral Obligation*, Chapters 4, 5, and 6.

⁵⁷ James Bond Stockdale, *The World of Epictetus: Reflections on Survival and Leadership*, (Boston: The Atlantic Monthly Company, 1974), 6.