A LEADERSHIP COMPETENCY MODEL FOR
U.S. AIR FORCE WING CHAPLAINS

by
Dondi E. Costin, Ch, Lt Col, USAF

Advisor: Edward E. “Dutch” Holland, Col, USAF

A Research Report Submitted to the Faculty
In Partial Fulfillment of the Graduation Requirements

12 February 2009
1. REPORT DATE  
**FEB 2009**

2. REPORT TYPE  
**N/A**

3. DATES COVERED  
**-**

4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE  
**A Leadership Competency Model For U.S. Air Force Wing Chaplains**

5. AUTHOR(S)  
**-**

6. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)  
**Air War College Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama**

7. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)  
**-**

8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER  
**-**

9. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT  
**Approved for public release, distribution unlimited**

10. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:  
**a. REPORT  
unclassified**  
**b. ABSTRACT  
unclassified**  
**c. THIS PAGE  
unclassified**

11. NUMBER OF PAGES  
**145**

12. ABSTRACT  
**-**

13. SUBJECT TERMS  
**-**

14. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT  
**SAR**

15. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON  
**-**

Standard Form 298 (Rev. 8-98)  
Prescribed by ANSI Std Z39-18
DISCLAIMER
The views expressed in this academic research paper are those of the author and do not reflect
the official policy or position of the United States government or the Department of Defense. In
accordance with Air Force Instruction 51-303, it is not copyrighted, but is the property of the
United States government and is not to be reproduced or published without the written
permission of the Air War College.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DISCLAIMER</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TABLE OF CONTENTS.</td>
<td>ii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF TABLES</td>
<td>iv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF FIGURES</td>
<td>vi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOGRAPHY</td>
<td>vii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABSTRACT</td>
<td>viii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chapter</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. RESEARCH CONCERN</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Problem</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Purpose</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. LITERATURE REVIEW</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance of Leadership Development</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of Competencies in Leadership Development</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competency-Based Leadership Development</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competency Modeling</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Process of Competency Modeling</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Development for Ministry Leaders</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Development for Military Leaders</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Leadership Development Approaches</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Force Chaplain Leadership Development</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. METHODOLOGICAL DESIGN</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Question Synopsis</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Overview</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population and Sample</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumentation</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographic Data</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Question 1</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Question 2</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. CONCLUSIONS</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Questions</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implications from Research Question 1</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implications from Research Question 2</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Applications</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Conclusions</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appendix Item</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. COMPREHENSIVE LIST OF MINISTRY LEADERSHIP COMPETENCIES REVIEWED IN PRECEDENT LITERATURE</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. COMPREHENSIVE LIST OF MILITARY LEADERSHIP COMPETENCIES REVIEWED IN PRECEDENT LITERATURE</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. INITIAL LIST OF LEADERSHIP COMPETENCIES SELECTED FOR THE CURRENT STUDY</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. LEADERSHIP COMPETENCIES SURVEY</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. RANK ORDER (BY MEAN) OF 72 WING CHAPLAIN LEADERSHIP COMPETENCIES</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BIBLIOGRAPHY | 117 |
## LIST OF TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Respondents grouped by current military pay grade (N = 419)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Respondents grouped by years of military service (N = 420)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Respondents grouped by current position and assignment level (N = 420)</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Measures of central tendency for personal demographic data</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Range of leadership competency means by category of scores</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Top 10 leadership competencies (arranged by mean from highest to lowest)</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Bottom 10 leadership competencies (arranged by mean from highest to lowest)</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Factor 1 – Strategic Planning</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Factor 2 – Organizing</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Factor 3 – Spiritual Modeling</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Factor 4 – Team Leadership</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Factor 5 – Visionary Leadership</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Factor 6 – Ministry Practice</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Factor 7 – Performance Evaluation</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Factor 8 – Budgeting</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Factor 9 – Ministry Innovation</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Factor 10 – Exemplary Leadership</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Factor 11 – Servant Leadership</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Factor 12 – Volunteer Involvement</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Factor 13 – Community Leadership</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Factor 14 – Team Empowerment</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Factor 15 – Volunteer Training.</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Non-loading competencies.</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Factor rankings in order of factor mean scores.</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Factor rankings with Tukey groupings.</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Measures of central tendency for preparation,</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>performance, and satisfaction for wing and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>installation chaplains and all remaining</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaplain Corps respondents.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Measures of central tendency for preparation,</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>performance, and satisfaction for wing and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>installation chaplains, other chaplains, and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chaplain assistants.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Wing Chaplain Leadership Model.</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1. Rank order (by mean) of 72 wing chaplain leadership competencies</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# LIST OF FIGURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Air Force chaplain career path</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BIOGRAPHY

Chaplain Dondi E. Costin, a native of Wilmington, North Carolina, was commissioned a second lieutenant upon graduation from The United States Air Force Academy in 1986. He then served as a squadron-level scientific analyst evaluating air-to-ground precision guided munitions, chief of scientific analysis on a major command headquarters staff, and assistant professor of aerospace studies. He completed a competitive category transfer into the Air Force Chaplain Corps in 1996.

Chaplain Costin has since served as Protestant chaplain for Air Force Basic Military Training, flightline chaplain and then senior flightline chaplain for both special operations and conventional forces in Europe, senior Protestant chaplain, a readiness instructor/evaluator preparing Chaplain Corps personnel for worldwide deployment, and an Air Staff branch chief. He has deployed in support of Operations NORTHERN WATCH, SOUTHERN WATCH, ALLIED FORCE, ATLAS RESPONSE (Mozambique flood relief), and ENDURING FREEDOM.

An ordained Southern Baptist minister, Chaplain Costin is endorsed by the Liberty Baptist Fellowship to serve as an Air Force Chaplain. He is a graduate of The United States Air Force Academy (B.S.), Liberty University (M.A.), Liberty Baptist Theological Seminary (M.A.R.), Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary (M.Div.), Air Command and Staff College (M.M.O.A.S.), and The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary (D.Min., Ph.D.).
ABSTRACT

This study examines the leadership competencies considered essential for performance as United States Air Force wing chaplains, who serve at the unique intersection of ministry and military leadership. The study is framed as a leadership development issue for wing chaplains and recognizes the lack of a validated competency model as a basis for such development. Producing a validated competency model was the goal of this study.

The methodological design is based on Boersma’s (1988) research into pastoral management competencies and Huth’s (2006) similar study of Air Force healthcare administrators. A preliminary list of ministry and military leadership competencies formed the heart of the initial survey instrument, which was modified by a Delphi panel before being administered to active duty Air Force Chaplain Corps personnel.

Exploratory factor analysis of 72 leadership competencies yielded a 15-factor solution. The study rank orders leadership competencies by calculated mean, details factor analysis results, and analyzes competency factors relative to significant demographic data. The relationship between wing chaplain preparation, wing chaplain performance, and personal job satisfaction is also discussed.

The research concludes that visionary and team leadership competencies are considered essential for U.S. Air Force wing chaplains, while traditional ministry practices are not as important. When possible, the clear preference is for wing chaplains to focus their efforts on leadership issues while delegating most practical ministry tasks to others. This preference is not always possible, however, especially for most Catholic wing chaplains who also serve as the community’s lone Catholic priest. The data clearly indicate that the job satisfaction of Chaplain Corps members is positively correlated with the preparation and performance of wing chaplains. As a result, there was great concern among respondents regarding the need for wing chaplain leadership development to equip wing chaplains for this crucial role. The resultant competency model should assist leadership development professionals in preparing wing chaplains for this essential responsibility.
CHAPTER 1
RESEARCH CONCERN

When asked “how . . . great leaders create the conditions that promote team
effectiveness,” one prominent leadership researcher answers with the trite but accurate response:
“Any way they can.”1 Embedded within that telling question-answer couplet is a bevy of
significant factors contributing to organizational success, not the least of which is the critical role
played by competent leaders. Research in both ministry2 and non-ministry settings3 strongly
suggests that competent leaders generate genuinely positive impact in organizational life.
Military chaplains straddle the seemingly mutually exclusive realms of ministry and military,4
both of which demand unique leadership competencies to foster organizational effectiveness in
their respective contexts.5

In their dual role as God-called ministers and government-commissioned officers, Air
Force wing chaplains are uniquely positioned as recognized leaders in the ministry and the
military. Serving simultaneously as the military community’s senior pastor and a senior military
staff agency chief in the Air Force’s premier war-fighting unit, wing chaplains are expected to
lead two distinct yet overlapping constituencies with equal competence. As ministry leaders,
they are accountable to God for competence in the spiritual care and feeding of the community’s
souls.6 As military leaders, they are accountable to a taxpaying citizenry counting on their
competence for national survival.7 Exploring the leadership competencies necessary for Air
Force chapel effectiveness was the goal of this study.

Research Problem

The research problem emerged as a leadership development issue for Air Force wing
chaplains. Specifically, which leadership competencies should ground the leadership development program for new wing chaplains? Unlike most civilian organizations in both ministry and non-ministry sectors, military organizations are unable to hire senior leaders from the outside and must therefore grow their own. This process takes many years, and there is little margin for error. Since the military “does not have the luxury of raiding competitors for leadership talent, its top leaders must devote themselves to and succeed in developing new generations of leaders who can cope with uncertainty when preparing for crises yet to be defined”.8 Given the high stakes involved relative to securing the national interest, leadership development is an assignment the military has historically taken very seriously.9 In light of the American military’s current transformation, flattening its Cold War-era bureaucracies to best meet twenty-first century challenges, developing a culture of leadership competence is increasingly significant in an era marked by a global war on terrorism.10

Clarifying leadership competence is also increasingly significant for developing ministry leaders. The decline of the American church’s cultural impact and the criticality of competent leadership in stemming the tide are well documented.11 In the American church at large, recent research indicates relatively dramatic decreases in church attendance for Catholic and mainline Protestant denominations as well as a slowing of growth rates for conservative Protestant denominations since the 1970s.12 Even the Southern Baptist Convention, which heralds a passion for evangelism and church growth, reports 70% of its congregations as plateaued or declining and its baptism rate virtually stagnant the last 50 years.13 On the whole, some 100 million Americans are considered unchurched,14 and one study reports that less than 20% of Americans attend church on any given Sunday.15 Ministers labor in this milieu, and research suggests their leadership effectiveness is a major factor in the health and growth of their flocks. As a result, developing effective ministry leaders is a critical concern for the church.16 The same conclusion applies to Air Force chapel settings.
Research Purpose

Due to the high mobility that characterizes military life, there is frequent turnover among United States Air Force wing chaplains, most of whom serve no more than two or three years before being reassigned. As the senior pastor for a particular Air Force community, the wing chaplain is responsible for serving as the wing commander’s (the senior military officer on base) spiritual and ethical advisor, in addition to providing the community with a comprehensive program of worship, religious education, spiritual development, and pastoral care. As a result, wing chaplains typically experience a steep learning curve as they begin a job requiring a host of new leadership competencies, many of which are ill-defined. The result is often a severe lag in both effectiveness and efficiency in chapel leadership.

The purpose of this study was to research this problem through a 360-degree descriptive analysis of the leadership competencies considered essential for Air Force wing chaplain performance, as reported by active duty Air Force Chaplain Corps personnel. The results of this study could be used to better equip new wing chaplains as they enter their positions of leadership, allowing them to generate and leverage momentum early in their tenures. By determining which competencies are deemed critical for success, education and training programs could be tailored to prepare new wing chaplains for this critical role.

The study was designed as a mixed methods (quantitative and qualitative) descriptive analysis of those leadership competencies considered essential for the performance of active duty wing chaplains leading Air Force chapel teams. Specifically, a survey instrument was designed and administered online to active duty Air Force Chaplain Corps personnel to gain insight on how best to lead those teams for the benefit of Airmen and their families. A total of 447 usable responses were received, representing 47% of the Chaplain Corps population. The study’s methodological design is detailed in chapter 3. Analysis was conducted on both quantitative and qualitative data and is reported in chapter 4. Conclusions are discussed in chapter 5.


6 John Piper, *Brothers, We are Not Professionals: A Plea to Pastors for Pastoral Ministry* (Nashville, TN: Broadman and Holman, 2002), 1-4.


11 Barna, “Nothing is More Important than Leadership,” 1997; Stetzer and Dodson, *Comeback Churches*.


13 Stetzer and Dodson, *Comeback Churches*. 


17 An exhaustive treatment of this study can be found in Dondi Enos Costin, “Essential Leadership Competencies for U.S. Air Force Wing Chaplains” (Ph.D. diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2008). The current paper is a tailored abridgement of the larger study approved by the Air War College faculty for partial completion of graduation requirements. The study was conducted June-July 2008 with completion of both documents in view. Data analysis and reporting commenced after the Air War College academic year began.
Perhaps the most-referenced debate in leadership lore addresses the notion of whether leaders are born or made.\(^1\) The answer, of course, is an unqualified “yes!”\(^2\) As popular leadership researchers Kouzes and Posner say, tongue firmly in cheek, “‘all leaders are born. We’ve never met a leader who wasn’t. So are all accountants, artists, athletes, parents, zoologists, you name it.’ We’re all born. What we do with what we have before we die is up to us.”\(^3\) The *doing with what we have before we die* idea is the essence of leader development and is a process that should occur throughout the leader’s personal and professional lifespan. Understanding that process, however, presupposes a belief that leaders can in fact be developed. The leadership literature generally supports such a belief in both military and civilian settings.\(^4\)

While researchers in the leaders-are-born school gravitate toward the twin towers of genetics and family environment as the sole determinants of leadership potential, “the majority of leadership researchers believe that the origins of leadership” extend well beyond those two components. Leaders-are-made researchers contend that such factors as “work experiences, hardship, opportunity, education, role models, and mentors all go together to craft a leader.”\(^5\) In other words, leader development results from a variety of means, making it incumbent upon leadership development professionals to take full advantage of all such means in their quest to enhance leader effectiveness.\(^6\)

**The Significance of Leadership Development**

Leader development is, simply put, “the expansion of a person’s capacity to be effective in leadership roles and processes.” Expanding that capacity relies upon a wide variety of factors bound in the individual leader and the organizational context in which that leader
serves. The leadership-is-learned camp suggests that, although “many possess the potential to lead, the many dwindle down to a few only because most of us do not have the right opportunities or experiences” to effect genuine leadership development. As the compelling leadership research of Zenger and Folkman makes clear, that reality has profound implications for organizational effectiveness. Their findings, based on some 200,000 assessments of more than 20,000 individual leaders in widely diverse industries and cultures, draw a number of significant conclusions in this regard.

First, these researchers conclude that effective leaders produce bottom-line results at a rate vastly superior to average leaders. They “found strong statistically significant relationships between leadership effectiveness and a variety of desirable business outcomes such as profitability, turnover, employee commitment, customer satisfaction, and intention of employees to leave.” Second, their findings indicate there need be no artificial limit placed on the number of great leaders any organization can possess. Such limitations are often organizationally self-induced, largely via lackluster commitment to leader development. Along those lines, thirdly, the researchers “contend that one of the major failings in leadership development programs has been the tendency to aim too low,” thereby unnecessarily settling for mediocrity in this critical arena. Ultimately, they conclude that neglecting leadership development is a costly decision.

The landmark study by Jim Collins, reported in his blockbuster book *Good to Great*, echoes the findings of Zenger and Folkman. In his study of 1,435 companies, there were clear lines of demarcation in long-term performance based in large measure on the organizations’ level of leadership effectiveness. As he discovered, the companies which made the leap from good to great were led by a particular brand of leader, thus confirming the crucial leadership difference. Furthermore, while not an explicit focus of his study, Collins hypothesizes that a large majority of people possess the capability to develop into great leaders. Although this capability is “perhaps buried or ignored” in most potential leaders, he suggests that “practicing the . . . good-to-great disciplines” the study discovered “can help you move in the right direction.” Similar findings are echoed in Rainer’s study of “breakout churches” and the study of 324 “comeback
churches” conducted by Stetzer and Dodson.12

Kouzes and Posner join the chorus by noting, ironically, that while they are often asked the perennial question of whether leaders are born or made, they are never asked that question with respect to managers. They conclude people do not hesitate to ask the latter because nearly everyone assumes management skills can be taught, while many mistakenly see leadership as nothing more than a compendium of innate, unalterable personality traits. They observe the persistently “haunting myth” that leadership cannot be learned “is a far more powerful deterrent to leadership development than is the nature of the person or the basics of the leadership process.” The results of twenty years of research by these authors suggest that, like management, leadership can be learned and should be vigorously pursued. “By assuming that leadership is learnable,” they insist, “we can discover how many good leaders there really are. Somewhere, sometime, the leader within each of us may get the call to step forward—for the school, the congregation, the community, the agency, the company, the union, or the family. By believing in yourself and your capacity to learn to lead, you make sure you’ll be prepared when that call comes.”13 Preparing leaders to answer that call is the purpose of leader development.

This purpose is especially relevant to the ministry of military chaplains. Joining the ranks from some 84 denominational agencies representing all major faith traditions, the full spectrum of leadership potential is in play. In addition to the myriad theological positions held by these nearly 600 chaplains, the leadership pool is populated by ministers from an incredibly diverse variety of personalities, cognitive abilities, natural and spiritual giftedness, personal and professional experiences, and assumptions regarding the role of leadership. It is within this context that the Air Force Chaplain Corps is tasked with formulating a development process to fashion leaders from the diverse batch of raw material comprising the military chaplaincy.

Role of Competencies in Leadership Development

Leadership development is a prime example of the well-worn cliché, “If you aim at nothing, you’ll hit it every time.” The most effective leadership development programs are
strikingly clear in their end goal: producing leaders with the competencies required to engender organizational success.\textsuperscript{14} In this vein, recent researchers have strengthened the significance of the essential connection between the individual leader’s personal growth and leveraging that growth to enhance the larger organization.\textsuperscript{15} Successful leadership development programs strike a delicate balance between the sometimes conflicting yet critical ends of program participants’ personal growth and the organization’s unique needs.\textsuperscript{16}

Leadership development guru Morgan McCall posits an executive development model\textsuperscript{17} that is representative of attempts to synthesize the personal growth versus organizational needs dichotomy by specifying the responsibilities of both parties.\textsuperscript{18} Writing from a business perspective, McCall argues against developing leaders with a purely personal growth agenda, even though many businesses find therein a means to immediate, short-term profit. Instead, he explains, the long view demands coupling business strategy with the human resource function, creating a win-win situation for both. He suggests, following the definition of developmental researchers Seibert et al.,\textsuperscript{19} that “executive development is the (1) implementation of explicit corporate and business strategies through the (2) identification and (3) growth of (4) wanted executive skills, experiences, and motivations for the (5) intermediate and long-range future.”\textsuperscript{20} In other words, executive development programs should purposefully pursue leadership competencies related to organizational goals, in addition to clearly specifying those competencies necessary for personal and professional success.\textsuperscript{21}

Any attempt at devising a leadership development initiative should focus on its desired “impact and the subsequent need to identify all critical components prior to delivering the initiative.” Effective development initiatives identify organizational challenges requiring leadership development, target leadership development needs to meet those challenges, and identify “specific measurable outcomes of leadership development, including the level of mastery desired for these outcomes.”\textsuperscript{22} Simply put, “the first challenge of leader assessment and development in any organization is to determine what functions leaders perform that result in organization success. The next challenge is to build the programs, rules, and environment to
support leaders in carrying out those functions.”23 Determining which leadership competencies are essential for performance is central to this task.

**Competency-Based Leadership Development**

As defined by organizational theorists Spencer and Spencer, “a competency is an underlying characteristic of an individual that is causally related to criterion-referenced effective and/or superior performance in a job or situation.” These authors list five types of competency characteristics (motives, traits, attitudes, knowledge, and skills) which are grouped in two larger categories: (1) **personal characteristics** (motives, traits, attitudes, knowledge) and (2) **behavior** (skills).24 Significantly, these elements are effective to the extent they impact performance. A more relevant definition of competency for this study, in light of its focus on wing chaplain performance vice criterion-referenced effective or identified superior performance, is “a cluster of related knowledge, skills, and attitudes that affects a major part of one’s job (a role or responsibility), that correlates with performance on the job, that can be measured against well-accepted standards, and that can be improved via training and development.”25 In Air Force parlance, “these are the occupational skill sets and enduring leadership competencies that Air Force leaders develop as they progress along levels of increased responsibility.”26

Competency-based approaches “seek to improve individual and group work processes through the application of systematic procedures and research-based principles.” Job analysis and competency modeling have traditionally been the most prominent means of mining the “knowledge, skills, abilities, and other characteristics (KSAOs), tasks, and functions” to serve as “the building blocks of leadership and development processes. Competencies have become a more prevalent method of identifying the requirements of supervisory, managerial, and leadership positions, rather than job or task analysis techniques, because they provide a more general description of responsibilities associated across these positions.”27

In this vein, leadership researchers have long acknowledged that differences in leadership requirements are a function of organizational level.28 This reality has been identified
in both the military and the ministry and is significant for this study. In general, wing chaplains serve at the operational level of leadership, although the direct effects of their leadership take place on the tactical level on a daily basis. In almost every case, new wing chaplains assume their positions as the base’s senior pastor and senior leadership advisor from lower organizational levels which require a much narrower leadership skill set. Examining the specific competencies required for success in this unique leadership position, resulting in a validated leadership competency model, was the goal of this study.

**Competency Modeling**

Based on the seminal efforts of military assessment studies from the First World War and industrial-organizational psychologists in the 1950s, competency-based leadership development traces its more contemporary roots to the work of David McClelland in discounting as a predictor of success the significance of an employee’s intelligence quotient in favor of actual demonstrated competence. Since that time, beginning in earnest in the early 1990s with the work of Prahalad and Hamel, competency modeling has emerged as a major force in leadership development. Its increasing use is due in large measure to its relative flexibility in the face of rapid-fire organizational change and the ease with which leadership competencies can be directly tied to organizational strategy. That upwards of 80% of business organizations employ some form of competency modeling is evidence of its popularity as a viable business strategy and leadership development tool.

A competency modeling approach typically produces a compendium of leadership attributes, knowledge, and skills that tend to settle into a much smaller number of general categories or clusters. For example, after reviewing some nine major attempts at creating competency taxonomies, Mumford, Campion, and Morgeson observe four such categories in the literature: cognitive skills (i.e., investigating, information gathering, basic cognitive capacities), interpersonal skills (i.e., supervision, leading, negotiating, people skills), business skills (i.e., coordination, staffing, resource allocation), and strategic skills (planning, evaluating, decision
making, problem solving). Since leadership competencies can be simplified into definable categories, the bottom-line benefit of competency modeling is its clear focus on behavioral leadership skills that can in fact be developed. Grounding leadership development curricula on such skills greatly increases the odds of an organization developing leaders who consistently generate expected results.

**The Process of Competency Modeling**

The classic competency study design exists as a comparison of so-called superstar performers with average performers, as determined by such criteria as measurable unit performance outcomes or ratings by supervisors when hard data is unavailable. Rather than an exclusive focus on particular leaders, however, other researchers recommend instead a simple focus on the position itself. “By focusing on leadership skill requirements, the focus is shifted from the person holding the job (i.e., the leader) to the job itself. Thus, instead of attempting to identify the characteristics of leaders (which has a checkered history of success), the focus is squarely on the job of the leader, and the skills it requires.” This latter method, which realistically combines the leadership position with relevant leader behaviors and characteristics, is preferred by this researcher for the current study. While methodologically different, its leadership development application is similar to the classic study, providing a comprehensive list of competencies for which educational curricula can be designed. This competency-based methodology is common in both ministry and military approaches to leadership development.

**Leadership Development for Ministry Leaders**

As early as Blizzard’s 1956 study on the minister’s use of time, research has consistently indicated that the average minister in multiple ministry settings spends significant time performing a variety of administrative tasks, a reality for which many do not feel adequately prepared via their seminary training. Interestingly, citing the relative failure of executive development programs to populate the business leadership pipeline vacated as the Boomer generation retires, business researchers Crainer and Dearlove report that master of
business administration degree curricula have essentially the same problem, that is, an inordinate focus on the analytical skills required for technical expertise at the expense of broader leadership competencies required for organizational effectiveness.45

In a comprehensive curriculum review of the master of divinity degree requirements of 148 accredited graduate theological institutions in the United States, Welch discovered that seminarians attending these 148 seminaries in preparation for pastoral ministry will spend slightly over 1 percent...of their total academic course preparation in study for the administrative or leadership responsibilities of the church; and up to three-fourths will receive none. This is an interesting balance of preparation requirements given that studies have demonstrated that a pastor spends 50 to 75 percent of his time in administrative and leadership responsibilities in the church.46

These findings are especially significant since forced terminations are far more often a result of failed leadership than errant theology,47 a reality exacerbated in the case of military chaplains operating in an arena marked by pluralism of the highest order.48 Notwithstanding the perennial debate in the literature as to the respective positions of both the classical theological disciplines and modern praxis as curricular emphases in contemporary theological education,49 the relative lack of leadership preparation in the traditional seminary experience does impact the leadership readiness—whether perceived or real—of its graduates.50

Research on failed managers in the business sector echoes the view that superior technical expertise in itself is no guarantee of leadership effectiveness and is, in fact, sometimes a major detriment to success.51 “This is the Peter Principle at work: People are promoted to their level of incompetence. A person who is promoted because of expertise (‘He’s great with the numbers’) finds himself at a new level, where many or most duties revolve around managing people—not technical skill. This means the working world is peppered with bad bosses.”52 Leadership development, when done well, attempts to reduce the population of bad bosses.

Prominent religious pollster George Barna captures the need for leadership development as a complement to technical prowess in the ministry with this insightful observation:

I have witnessed pastor after pastor, extensively trained to exegete the Scriptures, and gifted to communicate God’s truth, undeniably fail when it comes to guiding the Body of
believers. They have failed in mobilizing the people for action, holding them accountable for their behavior, motivating them to sustain a spiritual revolution and attracting the resources necessary to do the work modeled by Christ.53

Furthermore, a review of three Barna studies of pastors in 1992 found that “many pastors, by their own admission, are neither gifted nor trained to be leaders and are frustrated with ministry.”54 In fact, results of this review revealed that just 18 “percent of our senior pastors claim they have the gift of leadership.”55 Interestingly, Barna discovered that, “compared to pastors with other gifts, those with the gift of leadership had the lowest level of stress resulting from their ministry efforts.”56 As such, leadership development has been recognized as a critical component in the professional competence of ministry leaders, leading several specialists to infuse intentional leadership development into the maturation process for ministry leaders.57

Producing competent leaders is a perennial military challenge, especially with respect to seminary-trained ministers assuming Air Force wing chaplain positions around the globe. Once these ministers don the uniform, of course, they enter a decidedly different culture in which their ministry is to be conducted, “a culture where nothing is valued more highly than sound leadership.”58 Although chaplains lead in the arenas of spirituality and pastoral care rather than combat sorties and bombs on target, the expectation is that they will lead with the same degree of competence in their lane that flying squadron commanders do in theirs. Their development thus occurs in the context of military leadership writ large.

Leadership Development for Military Leaders

The essentiality of competent leadership is especially pronounced for ministers assuming senior leadership positions in the military, operating in a culture where leadership competence is considered more expectation than extravagance.59 Whereas some civilian pastors might enjoy the relative luxury of lackadaisical leadership without immediate consequence, military chaplains are prominently under the leadership microscope and are held accountable for leadership that is consistent with the full range of military standards.60 The words of one Air Force four-star general regarding commanders and their leadership is equally true of chaplains occupying staff-equivalent positions at the Air Force wing level:
When we select commanders, we expect them to create a vision, and motivate and inspire their people toward that vision. We also expect our commanders to face squarely any situations that may undermine unit effectiveness and cohesion. We expect our commanders to be more than the head of a unit; we expect them to be leaders and to be accountable for mission performance. Those who recognize the interdependence of leadership and command are the most effective commanders, can best translate intentions into reality, and sustain momentum. Therefore, we must select for command those who will, with resolve and persistence, meet all the responsibilities—both pleasant and unpleasant—inherent in command.61

Producing such leaders is an unyielding challenge for the military and applies to leaders at all levels throughout the organization.62

Capitalizing on their military experience and business expertise, Carrison and Walsh explain the crucial role of military leadership development in the most straightforward way possible.

Were it not for the highly successful leadership principles practiced by the United States military, the world as we know it would be a vastly different place. Our very way of life depends upon the ability of our military leadership to inspire and direct personnel at all levels, often under unimaginable stress. The military has long understood the critical need for leadership throughout the ranks, the cost of failure being so catastrophic. There is no such thing as Chapter 11 protection from the enemy on the eve of defeat.63

Because of the dramatically high stakes involved in the conduct of its mission, the military must necessarily major on leadership development. Lieutenant General Stephen Lorenz, while commander of Air University, highlighted this need by commenting on the unique nature of military education. Lorenz notes first that “although hundreds or thousands of schools offer instruction in most fields of study, in the United States only a handful of joint/service schools teach military art and science,” which is further narrowed by particular service foci on unique domains (land, sea, and air). Secondly, academicians ordinarily conduct “pure versus applied research” and write largely for academic audiences, in contrast to military theorists, whose audiences are primarily practitioners. Thirdly, “the ideas that we in a military university explore through research and the lessons we teach often pay off—for good or ill—much faster than in other fields of study,” in that results from decisions to include or exclude certain topics (in research and teaching) “will show up on the battlefield with the next graduating class.” Finally, the very nature of military expertise leads to a “need to educate a larger portion of our workforce. Both civilian and military sectors desire more educated workers, but we have a stronger impetus.
In modern warfare, particularly during times of rapid change, education acts as a master power multiplier. Today the US military needs flexible and innovative thinkers almost as much as it needs bombs and bullets.64

Military chaplains serve at the peculiar intersection of ministry and the military.65 As such, leadership competence in both realms is considered essential for performance, especially as these chaplains rise to levels of operational leadership. While each of the military services pursues leadership development in its own way, there are more similarities than differences in their respective approaches. A look at military leadership development approaches emphasizes the degree to which leadership competencies play a role in military leadership development. Significantly, this section will conclude with a look at the leadership development scheme for Air Force chaplains.

**Military Leadership Development Approaches**

Leadership researchers have long acknowledged that differences in leadership requirements are a function of the organizational level at which one leads.66 The military expresses this multilevel view by stratifying leadership requirements at the tactical, operational, and strategic levels. This breakdown corresponds to the traditional stratification of warfare and requires a unique set of competencies that build on those developed at lower levels.67 Each of the five U.S. military branches approaches leadership development in a similar way, one that is competency-based, sequential, and progressive throughout one’s career.68 While using contextualized, service-specific terminology, each service relies upon individual effort and a comprehensive, tailored progression of education, experiences, and assignments to produce a cadre of competent leaders to execute the mission.69 Given its foundational dependence on competencies, the services’ leadership development frameworks assume clear definition of said competencies to facilitate success of their respective leadership development processes.

In the words of one prominent leadership development theorist, leadership development is by far one of the most complex human processes, in that it involves leaders, followers, dynamic contexts, timing, resources, technology, history, luck,
and a few things we have not thought of yet. However, it is in many ways like other complex phenomena, models, and processes in that once we break it down into its essential parts, or get the code, we can begin to understand how the various pieces fit together into the whole.70

The U.S. armed forces have determined that clearly-defined leadership competencies qualify as one of these essential parts. In the military scheme, therefore, the leadership development code depends in large measure on the extent to which each branch and their diverse occupational specialties specify these competencies in a usable manner. Leadership development necessarily suffers in those occupational specialties which lack career field-specific occupational competencies on which to base leadership development curricula and programming.

A number of noted military leadership researchers have observed that, due to the extraordinarily unique nature of leadership within the military, there is a great need for context-specific leadership research.71 Rather than relying solely on leadership theories developed in the corporate sector, the Air Force should instead “capture our own culture and identity—not someone else’s.”72 Developing a context-specific perspective on leadership competence for Air Force wing chaplains was the goal of this study. A look at Air Force chaplain leadership development helps contextualize the need for a wing chaplain leadership competency model.

**Air Force Chaplain Leadership Development**

The Air Force Chaplain Corps approaches chaplain leadership development in a manner consistent with the overarching Air Force leadership and force development construct. Figure 1 depicts the Air Force chaplain career path. At the tactical level, chaplains (first lieutenants and captains) launch their careers and learn personal leadership via assignments at the wing level, experiences which are complemented by basic developmental and professional education. During the first eight years of their careers, these chaplains are expected to master the primary skill sets required of military chaplains as they learn to minister in a diverse religious environment. During years nine through twenty of their careers, chaplains (majors and lieutenant colonels) enter the people/team leadership phase as they gain supervisory experience
as operational leaders. As they progress, intermediate developmental education and assignments at higher headquarters expand their competencies in preparation for institutional leadership. From the twenty-year point through the end of their careers, some of these chaplains (colonels) are responsible for leading large, complex, multi-tiered organizations within the Air Force Chaplain Corps, as well as leading with competence in joint, combined, and interagency operations. Senior developmental education opportunities complete their leadership development as strategic ministry/military leaders.74

Air University researchers have recently suggested that the Air Force leadership and force development construct is not quite as practical as it should be with respect to developing specific occupational leadership competencies at the operational and strategic levels.75 As one Air War College research team explains, “competencies are clearly the one leadership component the Air Force can purposefully develop and mature in our officers. Because of the potential influence the Air Force has over competency development,” this team makes specific “recommendations for the Air Force to modify Force Development to better meet senior leadership competency requirements.”76 The sense is that “the current discussion of competency

Figure 1. Air Force chaplain career path
and occupational skill sets” in the service’s principal leadership development document (Air Force Doctrine Document 1-1, Leadership and Force Development) is “confusing and unclear.” Furthermore, “while AFDD 1-1 identifies personal experience, leadership competencies, and leadership actions as the components associated with effective Air Force leadership, it does not clearly define these leadership components or present a useful relationship between them.” This reality “highlights Air Force leadership doctrine as an area ripe for development,” a sense that is equally true for wing chaplain leadership development. While the broader enduring leadership competencies expected of Air Force leaders is established in the service’s force development doctrine and programming, no such study of specific occupational leadership competencies expected of wing chaplains exists in the literature. Given this glaring gap in the leadership literature and the need for informed leadership development of Air Force wing chaplains, this study was in order.
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CHAPTER 3
METHODOLOGICAL DESIGN

The purpose of this study was to aid wing chaplain leadership development through a descriptive analysis of the leadership competencies considered essential for United States Air Force wing chaplain performance. The desired end was a leadership competency model which can be used to equip new wing chaplains for performance prior to assuming their positions, in hopes of mitigating the effects of the typical trial-and-error approach to learning the job. In addition, the study sought to explore the impact of competent leadership and leadership development on the satisfaction of Chaplain Corps personnel. The research design was a mixed methods, descriptive study of requisite wing chaplain leadership competencies. This chapter describes its methodological design, which was centered on two principal research questions.

Research Question Synopsis

1. What leadership competencies are considered essential for performance as Air Force wing chaplains?
2. What is the relationship, if any, between Chaplain Corps perceptions of wing chaplain preparation, wing chaplain performance, and personal job satisfaction?

Design Overview

A preliminary leadership competency profile was constructed after an exhaustive literature review of ministry (Appendix 1) and military (Appendix 2) leadership competencies. Competencies from both realms were synthesized to form a preliminary profile of 66 leadership competencies considered critical for wing chaplain performance (Appendix 3). The preliminary profile was then evaluated by a panel of recognized experts with first-hand knowledge of competencies required for wing chaplain performance. As explained below, this approach is
traditionally referred to as the Delphi method. The panel consisted of 4 wing commanders, 4 command chaplains, 3 wing chaplains, and 3 chaplain assistant Non-Commissioned Officers-in-Charge (NCOICs). Panel members were selected based on their association with award-winning chapel programs (small, medium, and large) as determined by the Air Force Chaplain Corps annual awards program for calendar years 2006 and 2007. One wing commander was added to the panel when it was assumed after some time that the original wing commander would be unavailable. The wing commander in question, however, was able to complete the questionnaire in time and was included in the results. One wing chaplain was added to the panel when it was assumed after some time that a deployed wing chaplain would be unavailable. The wing chaplain in question, however, was able to complete the questionnaire in time and was included in the results. One NCOIC was substituted on the panel due to convalescent leave; the substituted NCOIC was selected due to recognition as an individual annual award winner competing against those of similar rank.

The Delphi method was developed by the RAND Corporation in the late 1950s and 1960s as “a method of structuring a group communication process so that the process is effective in allowing a group of individuals, as a whole, to deal with a complex problem.” The nature of the particular problem can assume any number of forms, including curriculum development, structuring a model, or any problem which “does not lend itself to precise analytical techniques but which can benefit from subjective judgments on a collective basis.”¹ It has since been recognized “as an effective means for collecting and synthesizing expert judgments” and achieving a sense of consensus relative to the topic at hand. Originally designed for use in the military, the technique has since been used to address a variety of issues in multiple contexts.²

Since a preliminary profile was expected to emerge from the literature review and only then be evaluated by the Delphi panel, the method used has been called a Reactive Delphi approach. Rather than starting from scratch, in other words, the expert panel was supplied with an initial list of competencies to which they were asked to react.³ A sense of consensus thus emerged relative to those leadership competencies considered essential for wing chaplain
performance. With respect to the current study, the Reactive Delphi method has been effectively employed to formulate a usable leadership competency profile for pastors\(^4\) and military healthcare executives,\(^5\) among others. A similar approach was used in this study.

The Delphi panel was slated to occur in two rounds, employing a methodology similar to that effectively used by Wilhite et al. in their study of recommended therapeutic research topics.\(^6\) Based on results of the first round, however, a single round was deemed sufficient. Panelists evaluated the importance of the 66 leadership competencies in the preliminary profile by way of a 5-point Likert scale (1 = not important, 3 = somewhat important, 5 = extremely important) via an online questionnaire administered using the web-based survey tool at the SurveyMonkey.com website. Panelists were also allowed to add additional competencies during the first round. Data from the first round was analyzed such that competencies with a mean score of at least 3.25 (indicating slightly more than moderate importance) would advance to the second round.

In its original conception, the second-round instrument was to include those competencies scoring 3.25 or higher, in addition to any new competencies added by panelists during the first round. Analysis of data from the first round indicated just one competency falling below the pre-determined 3.25 threshold, which indicated no need to conduct another round. That competency (“serves regularly as preacher/worship leader in chapel”) scored 3.00 on the 5-point Likert scale. Since that competency is such a vital element of chaplain ministry, however, it was included in the final competency profile as a basis for comparison relative to the perceptions of junior chaplains.

Analysis of results from the Delphi panel also resulted in the addition of 6 leadership competencies: (1) models high physical fitness standards, (2) consistently models religious support team (RST) concept with Superintendent/NCOIC, (3) actively prays for the wing, its mission, and its people, (4) clearly understands career issues unique to the enlisted force (enlisted force structure, promotion system, documenting career field upgrade training, etc.), (5) effective Enlisted Performance Report (EPR) writer, and (6) effective Officer Performance Report (OPR)
writer. The finalized leadership competency profile thus contained a total of 72 leadership competencies. In addition to these 72 leadership competencies, the finalized questionnaire incorporated a wide range of demographic information and questions related to wing chaplain job performance, wing chaplain job preparation, and job satisfaction to enrich the analysis. A number of open-ended questions were also included to allow Chaplain Corps members to illuminate the quantitative portion of this study with qualitative data.7

Prior to its release to the Air Force Chaplain Corps population, the questionnaire was pilot tested by 22 representative Chaplain Corps members to ensure its comprehensiveness and usability. Minor changes were made before electronically sending the questionnaire to the Air Force Chaplain Corps population via e-mail using the on-line SurveyMonkey.com survey tool. The active duty Air Force Chaplain Corps population was asked to self report the importance level of 72 leadership competencies, self-report selected demographic and other data, and respond to a series of open-ended questions. Consistent with U.S. Air Force requirements, the questionnaire was approved by the Air Force Survey Branch, Randolph Air Force Base, Texas, prior to administration to Air Force personnel. The Air Force Survey Branch assigned survey control number USAF SCN 08-036 to the questionnaire on May 16, 2008 and deemed it valid through May 31, 2009.

**Population and Sample**

The population of this study consisted of all 935 Chaplain Corps personnel currently serving on active duty in the United States Air Force throughout the world, including wing chaplains. Air Force Instruction 52-101 defines the wing chaplain as “responsible to the wing commander for all Chaplain Corps programs and personnel of a specific U.S. Air Force wing.”8

A true census of the population was sought in this study. All 935 Air Force Chaplain Corps members (including wing chaplains) currently serving on active duty in the United States Air Force were to be asked to complete the on-line wing chaplain leadership competency questionnaire. E-mail addresses for these 935 were provided by the Air Force Personnel Center.
for this study. Questionnaires were sent electronically to e-mail addresses of the entire population of 935 active duty Air Force Chaplain Corps personnel. Of these Chaplain Corps members, approximately 110 members were deployed, while some 240 members were in the process of military reassignment. Efforts were made to contact as many of these transitional members as possible during the 20-day study period, and it is estimated that no less than 750 members received the questionnaire electronically. A total of 447 Chaplain Corps members provided usable data, resulting in an estimated return rate of 59%. The 447 figure represents 47% of the Chaplain Corps population.

**Instrumentation**

No study of wing chaplain leadership competencies could be found in the literature review, which meant there was no available instrument to determine the leadership competencies considered essential for Air Force wing chaplain performance. A number of studies, however, have been conducted to explore essential leadership competencies in both the ministry\(^9\) and the military.\(^{10}\) Boersma’s 1988 study of pastoral leadership competencies\(^{11}\) and Huth’s 2006 study of Air Force healthcare administrators,\(^{12}\) in particular, produced outcomes within their respective populations which closely paralleled the desired outcome of this study. As a result, a composite of their methodologies was used to arrive at an appropriate instrument. In addition, insightful procedures used by Wilhite et al. in their 2003 study of recommended therapeutic research topics were employed to refine the process.

The resultant leadership competency survey, titled the Wing Chaplain Leadership Survey (Appendix 4), was sent electronically to the active duty Chaplain Corps population. Internal reliability calculations for the leadership competency portion of the instrument yielded a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.97, indicating extraordinarily high reliability for the survey instrument.

Analysis of data included descriptive statistics relative to leadership competencies’ perceived level of importance, variability, and relevant correlations with significant demographic data. Factor analysis was performed to yield a leadership competency profile which can be used as the basis for planning and implementing leadership development programming for Air Force
wing chaplains. Additional statistical analysis of quantitative data was conducted to better understand Chaplain Corps perceptions of the leadership competencies considered essential for wing chaplain performance. Open-ended questions were analyzed via content analysis to illuminate data produced by the leadership competencies questionnaire. Analysis of data is reported in chapter 4. Conclusions are discussed in chapter 5.
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CHAPTER 4
ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

This chapter presents findings from the study, the principal purpose of which was to produce an Air Force wing chaplain leadership competency model. This purpose was accomplished by way of a 360-degree analysis of leadership competencies considered essential for wing chaplain performance. Additional information was collected to offer insight into the degree of job satisfaction, performance, and preparation for the position as reported by Air Force Chaplain Corps personnel. In addition, Chaplain Corps personnel of all ranks and positions were asked to offer advice to new wing and installation chaplains via a series of open-ended questions, responses to which are included in the conclusions section reported in chapter 5.

Demographic Data

Data was partitioned to delineate personal and organizational data. All such demographic data was self-reported by Chaplain Corps personnel. The study also included additional questions to be answered only by active duty wing/installation chaplains completing the instrument. Both personal data and organizational data were sought in order to complete the picture for leadership development professionals who may use the resultant profile in planning leadership development programming for Air Force wing chaplains. Demographic data is summarized in Tables 1 through 4 to focus on significant demographic characteristics (pay grade, years in service, religious preference, education level, professional military education level, and leadership experiences) among the survey sample.

Data analysis revealed participation of 116 identifiable chaplain assistants and 303 identifiable chaplains in this study. Given the relative weighting of chaplains (officers) to chaplain assistants (enlisted members) in the Chaplain Corps population and the study sample, it
Table 1. Respondents grouped by current military pay grade (N = 419)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pay Grade</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-6</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-3</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-4</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-5</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-6 (or above)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Respondents grouped by years of military service (N = 420)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Years</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 (or less)</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 – 10</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 – 15</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 – 20</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 – 25</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 – 30 (or more)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

is necessary to point out the reality that composite results necessarily reflect the views of chaplains, particularly junior chaplains, as there were 135 participants (32.2%) at the O-3 level. Notably, this proportional result is representative of the Chaplain Corps population at large. Research questions were designed to partition these data to paint the most accurate picture of wing chaplain leadership competencies vis-à-vis a 360-degree view of the Chaplain Corps.
Table 3. Respondents grouped by current position and assignment level (N = 420)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Position</th>
<th>Wing/Installation (N = 292)</th>
<th>Staff (N = 68)</th>
<th>Other (N = 60)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-supervisory Chaplain Assistant</td>
<td>23 (5.5%)</td>
<td>7 (1.7%)</td>
<td>6 (1.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Chaplain Assistant</td>
<td>25 (6.0%)</td>
<td>2 (0.5%)</td>
<td>1 (0.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCOIC/Superintendent</td>
<td>32 (7.6%)</td>
<td>6 (1.4%)</td>
<td>3 (0.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Field Functional Manager</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5 (1.2%)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-supervisory Chaplain</td>
<td>90 (21.4%)</td>
<td>25 (6.0%)</td>
<td>24 (5.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Chaplain</td>
<td>38 (9.0%)</td>
<td>4 (1.0%)</td>
<td>13 (3.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wing/Installation Chaplain</td>
<td>79 (18.8%)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Command Chaplain (or Deputy)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>15 (3.6%)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5 (1.2%)</td>
<td>4 (1.0%)</td>
<td>13 (3.1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given that the essential purpose of this study was to accurately reflect the views of Chaplain Corps personnel with respect to the importance of leadership and the particular competencies required for baseline performance, this analysis was intended to evaluate the degree to which survey respondents reflected the Chaplain Corps population. Consistent with the overarching aim of this study, it is clear that the demographic profile of study participants was in fact reflective of the Chaplain Corps population.

Based on data revealed from a comprehensive analysis of demographic data (Table 4), the typical respondent in this study was a Protestant chaplain in the pay grade of O-3 who serves at the wing level, holds a Master of Divinity degree, and is a graduate of Air Force Squadron Officer School. This chaplain serves on a staff with five or six chaplains and four or five chaplain assistants. Although the mean time in service was 14.6 years for the study sample, it should be noted that the mean time in service for participants in the grade of O-3 was 9.8 years. Similarly, while the overall mean for number of active duty members supervised was 2.1, the average O-3 respondent was not in a position to supervise active duty members (mean of 0.32...
active duty members supervised). The two research questions account for this O-3 weighting.

Table 4. Measures of central tendency for personal demographic data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current Pay Grade</th>
<th>Years in Service</th>
<th>Religious Preference</th>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>PME Level</th>
<th>Chaplains on Staff</th>
<th>Chap Assts on Staff</th>
<th>Number Supervised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>O-3</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>MDiv</td>
<td>SOS</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>O-3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>MDiv</td>
<td>SOS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>O-3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>MDiv</td>
<td>SOS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>O-6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>NWC</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min</td>
<td>E-3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>3 grades</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With respect to wing and installation chaplains, the 79 respondents represented 83% of this essential segment of the Chaplain Corps population. Some 38.9% of these respondents were serving in their first or second year on the job, and 57% had served three years or less as a wing chaplain. These chaplains are responsible for leading staffs averaging six chaplains, five chaplain assistants, three Reservists, and five paid civilians. In addition, wing and installation chaplains in this study are also responsible for handling worshipping congregations averaging 457 members and multiple budgets approaching $300,000. These data underscore the relative inexperience of the wing chaplain force, the wide variety of their leadership challenges, and the resultant need to adequately prepare them to hit the ground running. The need for training targeted to the specifics required of wing chaplain leadership drove this research and is reflected in analysis of the two research questions considered in this study.

Qualitative Data Insights

Qualitative data pertinent to demographic data revealed a host of leadership challenges inherent to the wing chaplain position, challenges exacerbated by an ill-timed combination of
increasing workload alongside decreasing resources. When examined in concert, these challenges consistently pointed to the increasing need for leadership development targeted to wing chaplains. On this point, when asked about the greatest challenge faced by wing and installation chaplains, 8 major themes emerged from the qualitative data: (1) the need for adequate wing chaplain training, (2) shortage of manpower, resources, and funds, (3) balancing a sometimes overwhelming workload, (4) leadership, (5) administration, (6) team building, (7) communication, and (8) mentoring. As one junior chaplain explained, “there are so many diverse, complex challenges facing our wing chaplains today that it is hard to find individuals who fill all the criteria. Also, I don’t think our wing chaplains are adequately trained for their positions.” A more senior chaplain echoed the need for strong leadership with his insight that “reduced resources and manpower . . . require rethinking [and] readdressing former ways of doing business.” The confluence of the data strongly suggests that sound leadership is on the minds of Chaplain Corps personnel.

Additional evidence of this reality was seen in Chaplain Corps responses to the survey’s request to advise new wing chaplains. For the Chaplain Corps at large, the need for visionary leadership and increased leadership and administrative skills shot to the top of the list. Wing chaplain respondents focused on the need to find and be a mentor, sharpen leadership skills, and provide visionary leadership. One stateside O-4 wing chaplain advised aspirants to “hone your administrative and time management skills. Discover your leadership style and understand its strengths and weaknesses. Learn as much as possible about leadership and management and the differences between them.” An O-6 wing chaplain painted a vivid picture for new chapel leaders regarding the potentially overwhelming nature of the job by describing it “as a plate spinner or juggler keeping all the plates spinning or all the balls in the air.” In sum, both the quantitative and qualitative data analyzed in support of this research question illustrated the need for prospective wing chaplains to focus their efforts on becoming competent leaders.
Research Question 1

Research Question 1 asked, “What leadership competencies are considered essential for performance as Air Force wing chaplains?” The principal purpose of this research question was to analyze the importance rating of the 72 leadership competencies (LC) as reported by Chaplain Corps participants. The bulk of the analysis revolves around the mean scores of each of the 72 leadership competencies and is reported to demonstrate those competencies considered essential for performance as an Air Force wing chaplain. Standard deviation is also reported to discern the level of agreement among respondents. Following a discussion of the rank ordering of these competencies (by mean) as a descriptive indicator of relative importance, exploratory factor analysis results will be presented to demonstrate the latent structure of the leadership competencies as a data set. Results will include a discussion of the factors, individual leadership competencies comprising those factors, and a ranking of factors by mean.

Relative Importance Ranking of the Leadership Competencies

A major feature of this descriptive study is the presentation of a leadership competency profile which can be used by leadership developers and curriculum planners preparing wing chaplains to assume positions of great responsibility. The relative importance of each leadership competency is determined as a function of the mean score. Respondents rated each competency in accordance with a 5-point Likert scale, where 1 indicated the competency was perceived as “not important,” 2 signified the competency was considered “minimally important,” 3 denoted the competency as “somewhat important, 4 indicated the competency was perceived as “very important,” and 5 was used to record the perception that the competency was “extremely important.” Table A1 at Appendix 5 arranges the 72 leadership competencies in order of mean importance rating as reported by Chaplain Corps respondents.

With respect to the importance rating of the 72 leadership competencies, all were considered relatively important by Chaplain Corps members participating in this study. In fact,
60 of the 72 competencies had mean scores of 4.00 or higher ("very important"), and the lowest-ranked competency (LC 13, “carries fair share of the counseling load”) scored 3.00 (“somewhat important”). Table 5 provides a summary of aggregate mean scores categorized by range. Table 6 displays the top 10 leadership competencies for the Chaplain Corps sample arranged in order

Table 5. Range of leadership competency means by category of scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range of Mean Scores</th>
<th>Number of Scores in Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.50 (and above)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.25 – 4.49</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00 – 4.24</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.75 – 3.99</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.50 – 3.74</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00 – 3.49</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Top 10 leadership competencies (arranged by mean from highest to lowest)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Competency (by competency number)</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23. Has a clear vision for the chapel team</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Models Air Force core values</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Communicates vision to chapel team and worshipping community</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Provides sound advice to wing leadership</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Proactively involved with wing leadership</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71. Gives clear, concise directions</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. An example others would like to follow</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Effective Officer Performance Report writer</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70. Leads with calm in times of crisis</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. Builds and maintains staff morale</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of their aggregate means. Table 7 similarly displays the bottom 10 competencies for the sample.

As Table 6 makes clear, the Chaplain Corps was adamant in its reporting of vision as the most important leadership competency. Having a vision (LC 23) was ranked first of 72 leadership competencies, with a mean of 4.79. Communicating that vision (LC 24) was ranked third, with a mean of 4.73. Significantly, the desire for wing chaplains to model the service’s core values (LC 6) was sandwiched between the two, scoring a mean of 4.74. It is also worth noting that while being an “effective Officer Performance Report writer” (LC 54) might seem out of place in the top 10 absent an equal concern for being an “effective Enlisted Performance Report writer” (LC 53), this finding is not surprising given the disproportional weighting of officers (especially junior officers) in the survey sample.

With respect to the bottom 10 (Table 7), it is interesting to note that the ranking of aggregate means suggest that the particularly ministerial tasks bring up the rear in the minds of Chaplain Corps personnel. Although these competencies (preaching, leading worship, and carrying their fair share of the counseling load) were still considered at least “somewhat important,” there is a clear mandate from Chaplain Corps personnel that the emphasis for wing chaplains should be on the classic understanding of leadership rather than the conduct of ministry tasks as traditionally understood.

Interestingly, there was considerable agreement among chaplains and chaplain assistants with respect to the leadership competencies. In fact, of the top 20 (of 72) leadership competencies, chaplains and chaplain assistants shared 13. Of the bottom 20 (of 72), chaplains and chaplain assistants had 12 competencies in common. It is noteworthy that both chaplains and chaplain assistants independently ranked “has a clear vision for the chapel team” (LC 23) as the number one leadership competency required by wing chaplains. In addition, there was extraordinary agreement among all respondents as to the importance of consistent personal and professional leadership on the part of wing chaplains. On the other end of the leadership competency spectrum, it is equally noteworthy that both chaplains and chaplain assistants rated wing chaplains’ regular participation in counseling and worship leadership at the bottom.
Further, chaplain assistants rated “leads from the perspective of the wing’s senior pastor” (LC 1) in their bottom 10, while chaplains ranked this competency as number 42 of 72. These findings further indicate the relative importance of administration and leadership competencies in serving as a wing chaplain.

Table 7. Bottom 10 leadership competencies (arranged by mean from highest to lowest)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Competency (by competency number)</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34. Encourages chapel community to meet base needs before their own</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. Provides training for chapel volunteers to accomplish assigned responsibilities</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Determines ministry plan using DGM processes</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Monitors progress of ministry plan using DGM processes</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. Administers a leadership training program for chapel volunteers</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Proactively involved with wing Integrated Delivery System (IDS)/Community Action Information Board (CAIB)</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Competent preacher</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Competent worship leader/liturgist</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Serves regularly as preacher/worship leader in chapel</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Carries fair share of the counseling load</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>445</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Factor Analysis Results**

Exploratory factor analysis was applied to the importance rating of the 72 leadership competencies, categorizing them for the benefit of leadership development practitioners, curriculum planners, and prospective wing chaplains. This technique has been described as “an
orderly simplification of interrelated measures” used to determine the latent “structure of a set of observed variables without imposing a preconceived structure on the outcome.”1 Exploratory factor analysis was selected as appropriate for this study to allow the latent structure to emerge analytically rather than assigning competencies based on existing theoretical leadership models. A 15-factor solution was determined by this researcher to best fit the data, which accounted for 67.8% of the common variance.²

In order to detail the competency profile, each factor will be discussed in terms of the leadership competencies loading on that factor. Factors have been named by this researcher based on the most logical representation of the compendium of leadership competencies contained in that factor. For example, Factor 1 (Table 8) has been named Strategic Planning because the bulk of individual leadership competencies which loaded on that factor related to strategic planning. Additional factors were similarly titled by this researcher. Tables 8 through 23 display the 15 factors and include the factor name, leadership competencies loading on that factor, factor loadings, means, standard deviations, and mean rankings for the 72 competencies. In addition, these tables identify spurious competencies, those variables which load on a particular factor with factor loadings less than a researcher-determined threshold.³ In this study, variables with factor loadings less than 0.40 are considered spurious competencies.

**Factor 1: Strategic Planning**

The first such factor is Strategic Planning, which accounted for 31.0% of the common factor variance. Table 8 displays the leadership competencies represented by this factor, including 2 spurious competencies. It should be noted that the Air Force Chaplain Corps’ strategic planning model, Doing Global Ministry (DGM), is featured prominently in this factor. Based on the rather low ranking of DGM, however, it appears Chaplain Corps personnel are either unfamiliar with or not enamored by DGM processes. As explained later, DGM’s relative lack of perceived importance may result from its lack of emphasis in formal training during the last 5 years or so.
Table 8. Factor 1 – Strategic Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Competency</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31. Determines ministry plan using DGM processes</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Evaluates ministry needs using Doing Global Ministry (DGM) processes</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Monitors progress of ministry plan using DGM processes</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Conducts needs assessments to determine chapel action plan</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Adjusts plans and takes corrective actions to keep projects on track</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Implements strategic planning processes in leading chapel team</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Identifies/prioritizes key programs to accomplish the mission</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Spurious Competencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25. Involves staff in developing a written mission statement</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Leads staff in developing measurable goals and objectives</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Factor 2: Organizing**

Organizing, the second factor, accounted for 5.7% of the common factor variance.

Table 9 displays the leadership competencies represented by this factor, which includes 1 spurious leadership competency. While the majority of leadership competencies appear to group logically in this category, LC 46 (contracting procedures) and the spurious LC 72 (contingency plans) do not fit as tightly at first glance. Since funding civilian positions in the chapel setting accounts for the bulk of a typical chapel’s contracting budget, however, LC 46 is in fact well placed. The same can be said for LC 72, because developing contingency plans is primarily an organizing issue.
Table 9. Factor 2 – Organizing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Competency</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48. Plans and prioritizes effective use of RESERVE personnel</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Plans and prioritizes effective use of CIVILIAN personnel</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Understands and applies Air Force contracting procedures to meet mission</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Ensures written job descriptions accurately reflect duties of assigned personnel</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Understands and skillfully employs Air Force manpower standards</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Ensures local policies and procedures are consistent with Air Force standards</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Organizes chapel staff to make wisest use of the motivation and abilities of assigned personnel</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Conducts meaningful performance evaluations with appropriate rewards/corrective action</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Spurious Competency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Competency</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>72. Develops written readiness and contingency support plans</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor 3: Spiritual Modeling

The third factor is Spiritual Modeling, which accounted for 4.8% of the common factor variance. Table 10 displays the leadership competencies represented by this factor, which relate to the leader’s personal spirituality, approach to leadership as a person of faith, and/or viewing the wing chaplain role as an act of stewardship performed as the wing’s spiritual leader.

Table 10. Factor 3 – Spiritual Modeling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Competency</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Leads as a primary means of glorifying God</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Practices the spiritual disciplines (prayer, Scripture study, etc.)</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10—Continued. Factor 3 – Spiritual Modeling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Competency</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20. Models life-changing faith and spiritual passion</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Actively prays for the wing, its mission, and its people</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Leads as an act of stewardship to God and Country</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Leads from the perspective of the wing’s senior pastor</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Factor 4: Team Leadership**

The fourth factor, Team Leadership, accounted for 4.1% of the common variance. Results of this factor are displayed in Table 11. This factor is comprised of 4 of the top 11 leadership competencies in addition to 1 spurious competency. Its 4.68 composite mean makes it the second highest-rated factor. The Team Leadership nomenclature was chosen based on the competencies comprising this factor, reflecting leadership that balances the need to be appropriately decisive in a decidedly team context.

Table 11. Factor 4 – Team Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Competency</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70. Leads with calm in times of crisis</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69. Makes effective, timely decisions</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71. Gives clear, concise directions</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. Builds and maintains staff morale</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spurious Competency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68. Plans and initiates effective change processes affecting chapel community</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Factor 5 – Visionary Leadership**

Visionary Leadership represents competencies listed in the fifth factor. Results are
displayed in Table 12. This 4-item factor accounted for 3.3% of the common variance and includes 1 spurious competency. This factor includes the leadership competency ranked first (of 72) and accounts for 3 of the top 4 ranked leadership competencies. The composite 4.75 factor mean makes it the highest-rated factor. If the spurious competency is included, 4 of the top 12 competencies are found in this factor. If LC 22 is deleted from this factor, the subscale reliability rises from 0.79 to 0.80.

Table 12. Factor 5 – Visionary Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Competency</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23. Has a clear vision for the chapel team</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Communicates vision to chapel team and worshipping community</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Provides sound advice to wing leadership</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spurious Competency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Meets suspenses as assigned by wing leadership and higher headquarters</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Factor 6 – Ministry Practice**

Five competencies coalesce in the sixth factor, Ministry Practice. This factor accounted for 2.4% of the common variance. Results are displayed in Table 13. This factor includes the 4 lowest-ranked leadership competencies and 5 of the bottom 13, making it the lowest-ranked competency factor in this study (mean of 3.41). This finding is interesting given the expectation that ministry leaders are, by definition, leaders in the practice of ministry. That these uniquely ministry tasks occupy the bottom of the list indicates that Chaplain Corps personnel prefer their wing chaplains to concentrate on leadership while delegating the majority of counseling, preaching, and worship responsibilities to other staff chaplains.
Table 13. Factor 6 – Ministry Practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Competency</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. Competent worship leader/liturgist</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Competent preacher</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Serves regularly as preacher/worship leader in chapel</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Carries fair share of the counseling load</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Competent counselor</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Factor 7 – Performance Evaluation**

The seventh factor includes critical issues relevant to performance evaluation and enlisted career concerns. This factor accounted for 2.3% of the common variance. Specifically, this factor addresses the wing chaplain’s responsibility in writing effective performance reports for both officers and enlisted members on staff. In addition, the factor deals with the need for wing chaplains to pay close attention to the career particularities of enlisted members, which are often quite different than officer concerns. With a 4.55 mean, it is ranked third of 15 factors. Results are displayed in Table 14.

Table 14. Factor 7 – Performance Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Competency</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53. Effective Enlisted Performance Report (EPR) writer</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Effective Officer Performance Report (OPR) writer</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Clearly understands career issues unique to enlisted members (enlisted force structure, promotion system, documenting career field/upgrade training, etc.)</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Factor 8 – Budgeting**

Budgeting defines the leadership competencies found in the eighth factor and includes budgeting for appropriated and non-appropriated funds. This factor accounted for 2.1% of the common variance. Results are displayed in Table 15.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Competency</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43. Budgets and develops financial plans for appropriated funds</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Budgets and develops financial plans for Chapel Tithes and Offering Funds (CTOF)</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Prepares budgets to meet needs identified in ministry planning process</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Factor 9 – Ministry Innovation**

The ninth factor focuses on creating an environment of innovation, creativity, and risk taking to meet the needs of others rather than simply the needs of the chapel community. This factor accounted for 2.0% of the common variance. While participants may have keyed on the common phrase “to meet base needs” rather than the idea of an environment conducive to its accomplishment, the result is the same. In other words, ministry innovation with an outward focus should theoretically drive the quantity and quality of meeting community needs. Results for this factor are displayed in Table 16.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Competency</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35. Encourages continuous improvement to meet base needs</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Encourages creativity, innovation, and risk taking to meet base needs</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Encourages chapel community to meet base needs before their own</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Factor 10 – Exemplary Leadership**

High standards are the focus of the tenth factor, Exemplary Leadership, which accounted for 2.0% of the variance. Competencies comprising this factor relate to the motivation of chapel leaders to set and maintain high standards for themselves and their teams. Two of these competencies ranked in the top 10; modeling Air Force core values was the second-highest ranking competency in this study. Results are shown in Table 17.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Competency</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Models Air Force core values</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. An example others would like to follow</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Models high physical fitness standards</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Administers corrective actions and military discipline to maintain military standards</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Sets and maintains high expectations for individual and team performance</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Factor 11 – Servant Leadership**

Servant Leadership is the primary descriptor of this factor, which accounted for 1.8% of the variance. Competencies comprising this factor seem equally split between a concern for subordinate staff members (LCs 39, 5, and 58) and decidedly personal characteristics of the leader relative to risk taking (LC 40) and effective initiative (LC 38). As such, there is an equal emphasis on both servanthood and leadership in the classic senses of these words. This brand of leadership is driven from an inner core but is directed toward the benefit of the organization, its mission, and its members. Results for this factor are shown in Table 18.
Table 18. Factor 11 – Servant Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Competency</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39. Balances the needs of people and mission</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. More concerned with others than himself/herself</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. Helps staff develop and achieve personal/professional goals to advance their careers</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Takes appropriate risks to accomplish the mission</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Self-starter who gets things done</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Factor 12 – Volunteer Involvement**

Volunteer Involvement, the twelfth factor, accounted for 1.7% of the overall variance. This factor, while sufficiently descriptive in the logical grouping of leadership competencies, is somewhat problematic because it contains less than the 3 variables ordinarily required by convention. This factor was retained, however, because of its logical interpretability and the critical importance of volunteer involvement in a military chapel setting. Results are displayed in Table 19.

Table 19. Factor 12 – Volunteer Involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Competency</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>59. Encourages chapel congregational members to take ownership of the chapel mission</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. Expects chapel volunteers to take responsibility for their share of the ministry</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Factor 13: Community Leadership**

Community Leadership is comprised of 5 leadership competencies, one of which is
spurious (LC 4). These competencies accounted for 1.6% of the common variance. Results of this factor are displayed in Table 20. This factor refers to the wing chaplain’s involvement at all levels outside the chapel walls. In particular, the factor includes the wing chaplain’s interaction with higher headquarters, wing leadership at all levels, and other Air Force community helping professionals involved in the Community Action Information Board (CAIB) and Integrated Delivery System (IDS).

Table 20. Factor 13 – Community Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Competency</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. Highly visible around the wing</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Proactively involved with higher headquarters</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Proactively involved with wing leadership</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Proactively involved with wing Integrated Delivery System (IDS) / Community Action Information Board (CAIB)</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Spurious Competency

| 4. Leads as a primary means of serving others                     | 0.36           | 4.63  | 0.62               | 13   |

**Factor 14 – Team Empowerment**

Team Empowerment, the fourteenth factor, accounted for 1.6% of the variance. This factor produced a composite mean of 4.51, making it the fourth highest-rated factor among the 15 factors revealed in this study. Its 3 leadership competencies relate to empowering team members to accomplish their assigned responsibilities. Such empowerment occurs to the extent that leaders delegate appropriate authority and responsibility and then hold chapel staff and volunteers accountable for accomplishing their portion of the mission. Results for Team Empowerment are displayed in Table 21.
Table 21. Factor 14 – Team Empowerment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Competency</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>66. Empowers chapel staff and volunteers to accomplish assigned responsibility</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65. Delegates authority and responsibility to chapel staff and volunteers</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. Holds chapel staff and volunteers accountable for assigned responsibilities</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Factor 15 – Volunteer Training**

Volunteer Training, the final factor, accounted for 1.4% of the overall variance.

Results for this factor are shown in Table 22. This factor, while sufficiently descriptive in the logical grouping of leadership competencies, is potentially problematic because it contains less than the 3 variables ordinarily required by convention in factor analysis (Suhr 2006, 3). This factor was retained, however, because of its logical interpretability and the critical importance of volunteer training in a military chapel setting. For purposes of leadership development and curriculum planning, this factor can be logically grouped with Volunteer Involvement (Factor 12), which was the approach taken in building the leadership competency model discussed in chapter 5. This factor (mean of 3.82) was ranked fourteenth of 15 factors and was just 1 of 2 factors with a mean under 4.00 on the 5-point Likert scale (the other being Factor 6, Ministry Practice).

Table 22. Factor 15 – Volunteer Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Competency</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62. Administers a leadership training program for chapel volunteers</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. Provides training for chapel volunteers to accomplish assigned responsibilities</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Non-Loading Competencies

Sixty-nine of the 72 leadership competencies loaded on one of the 15 factors described in this section. Three competencies, however, failed to load on any factor at greater than 0.30, as items with factor loading coefficients less than 0.30 were suppressed. These 3 competencies are reported in Table 23. Because of their relatively high mean scores above 4.0, indicating their having been perceived as “very important” among Chaplain Corps personnel, these competencies should receive due consideration by leadership developers and curriculum planners.5

Table 23. Non-loading competencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Competency</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44. Balances parish ministry and industrial ministry involvement in planning ministry</td>
<td>&lt; 0.30</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Consistently models Religious Support Team (RST) concept with Superintendent/NCOIC</td>
<td>&lt; 0.30</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. Applies conflict management skills to resolve differences as soon as possible</td>
<td>&lt; 0.30</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rank Ordering of Factors

In addition to the grouping of leadership competencies into relevant factors, it may also be helpful for leadership developers and curriculum planners to identify how the various factors rank vis-à-vis their mean scores. Table 24 displays this data, which is ranked in order of factor mean scores (the means of the slate of leadership competencies comprising each factor). Spurious items were not included in the calculation of mean scores. Not surprisingly, factor rankings are consistent with rankings of the individual leadership competencies. Of particular significance are the relatively high rankings of Visionary Leadership and Team Leadership, in sharp contrast to the bottom-of-the-list ranking of Ministry Practice. As previously discussed, this finding indicates the critical importance of leadership and administration in performing the
wing chaplain role.

Table 24. Factor rankings in order of factor mean scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Visionary Leadership</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Team Leadership</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Performance Evaluation</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Team Empowerment</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Servant Leadership</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Exemplary Leadership</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Spiritual Modeling</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Volunteer Involvement</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Community Leadership</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Organizing</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Ministry Innovation</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Budgeting</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Volunteer Training</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Ministry Practice</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A one-way analysis of means was conducted of the 15 factor means to determine the statistical difference, if any, between these factors. The analysis (F = 126.79, 14 d.f., p = 2.2e-16) indicated a strong statistical difference between the means. Table 40 displays the Tukey groupings, such that factors sharing group letters are not statistically different while those factors not sharing group letters are different in a statistically significant way. For example, Visionary Leadership (Factor 1) shares the Tukey grouping letter “A” with Team Leadership (Factor 4) but
no others, indicating these two factors are not different in a statistically significant way. Similarly, Team Leadership (Factor 4) shares the Tukey grouping letter “B” with Performance Evaluation (Factor 7), indicating these two factors are not statistically different. Consistent with previous analysis, results in Table 25 demonstrate the importance of Visionary Leadership and Team Leadership along with the relatively lower importance of Ministry Practice for wing chaplains as reported by Chaplain Corps personnel in this study. This result was clearly the study’s major finding and was consistently echoed in the qualitative data reported by study participants, pertinent highlights of which are reported next.

Table 25. Factor rankings with Tukey groupings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Tukey Grouping</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Visionary Leadership</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Team Leadership</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>AB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Performance Evaluation</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Team Empowerment</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>CD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Servant Leadership</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>CDE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Exemplary Leadership</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>CDE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Spiritual Modeling</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>DEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Volunteer Involvement</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>EFG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Community Leadership</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>FGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Organizing</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>GHI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Ministry Innovation</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>HI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Budgeting</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>HI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Strategic Planning</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Volunteer Training</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Ministry Practice</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Qualitative Data Insights

In keeping with the intent of Research Question 1 to discern the importance of leadership competencies as reported by Chaplain Corps personnel, a series of open-ended questions were asked to amplify the quantitative data. As previously mentioned, the quantitative data noted that Chaplain Corps members desire strong leadership from wing chaplains and appear much less concerned about wing chaplains’ participation in the traditional practices of ministry. This theme was echoed throughout the qualitative data.

When asked, from their experience, what wing and installation chaplains had done well, Chaplain Corps members responded by citing effective leadership, team building, administration, and advising other leaders throughout the wing. Moreover, when asked what these chapel leaders could have done better, the exact same themes emerged: leadership, administration, team building, communication, mentoring, and advising leadership. Consistent with the quantitative data, almost no mention was made of the need for wing chaplains to perform traditional ministry tasks either well or often. In this context, however, it must be noted that this finding was related to the wing chaplain position alone and was in no way a vote for sub-par ministry across the board. Since Protestant wing chaplains comprise the bulk of the wing chaplain force, they are able to delegate worship and counseling responsibilities to other Protestant chaplains on staff. It is likely that wing chaplains would expect excellence in worship, preaching, and counseling by their subordinates when this occurs.

In particular, the qualitative data helped shed light on the principal finding from Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) procedures comparing chaplains’ perceptions of ministry practice by faith group. Specifically, Catholic chaplains placed a statistically higher priority on performing traditional ministry tasks than Protestant chaplains or chaplains from other faith groups (though even Catholic chaplains rated this factor just 3.82 on a 5.00 scale). This finding was not at all surprising in light of decreasing Catholic priest manning levels and increased deployment tempos resulting from the global war on terror.

Due to the global Catholic priest shortage and the concomitant shortage of Catholic
priests in the U.S. military, few if any Catholic priests have the luxury of delegating parish responsibilities to others on staff. Consequently, the vast majority of Catholic priests carry the Catholic community’s clerical load almost singlehandedly. This reality squares with the study’s finding that Catholic wing chaplains lead chapel worship an average of 3.27 times per month, while Protestant wing chaplains lead worship an average of just 1.83 times per month. Absent the near-miraculous appearance of a significant number of additional Catholic priests, this situation is unlikely to change. As a result, the sense of being overwhelmed is common among Catholic priests, especially those who serve as wing chaplains.

When asked what he liked least about being a wing chaplain, a stateside priest noted with some force: “Being BOTH wing chaplain and the sole Catholic priest.” From another perspective, which speaks to ministerial calling, a junior Catholic priest asked, “How could a priest (or a rabbi for that matter) not be involved heavily on a weekly basis in worship leadership, being a competent preacher, etc., even in their role as a wing chaplain? [This] simply doesn’t make sense to me as a Catholic.” This situation produces a tension in the lives of Catholic chaplains that simply cannot be avoided: living out their vocation as a lifelong priest in a culture that demands far more from them than their priestly duties. The tension is exacerbated when the lone Catholic priest must also bear the weight of leading an entire chapel team. Unlike Protestant wing chaplains who can delegate worship leadership to others as they see fit, which is largely the rule rather than the exception in the Chaplain Corps, Catholic wing chaplains are driven practically and theologically in an entirely different direction.

Despite the additional responsibility of serving as a wing chaplain, there was considerable agreement in both quantitative and qualitative results indicating the need for wing chaplains to lead their teams well, even if that means delegating traditional ministry tasks to others. In fact, across all pay grade categories, Ministry Practice (Factor 6) was ranked last, albeit still well in the “somewhat important” range on the Likert scale (mean of 3.41). More curious is the finding that chaplain assistants consistently considered this factor more important than chaplains. It is likely that chaplains, by and large, experience greater benefit from wing
chaplains as leadership force multipliers than as ministry tacticians standing alongside them in the trenches. This view caused a 10-year veteran chaplain assistant to suggest that “the position of wing chaplain should be separated from the parish, a position concerned with the welfare of his/her staff rather than the folks of the parish. The latter is what the other chaplains are for. A wing chaplain should take care of the staff so the staff can take care of the parish and everyone else.”

All constituencies agreed with the principle that wing chaplains should lead as exemplars setting and maintaining high standards for themselves and their teams, a theme that was consistently echoed throughout the qualitative data. The following words from the superintendent of an overseas chapel capture this theme well:

Wing chaplains need to truly understand that leadership is not about them, their status, or their position in the Air Force. Rather, leadership is ultimately about accountability and taking responsibility for the Airmen they lead both inside and outside the chapel. Chaplain leaders need to genuinely know and care for the Airmen entrusted to them and always practice the Air Force core values.

Without a doubt, wing chaplains have been asked by Chaplain Corps personnel at all levels to first lead themselves en route to leading their teams toward mission success.

When possible, Chaplain Corps respondents indicated a clear preference for wing chaplains to focus their attention on sound leadership and administration. One E-5 noted that the “good” wing chaplains in his experience had “connected the chapel mission to the base mission.” A junior chaplain made this comment with an effective wing chaplain in mind: “Set a clear vision, goals, and objectives for staff and then hold them accountable.” An observation from a supervisory chaplain with 16 years in service captures the theme well: “Effective wing chaplains trust and empower their team members. They fight to get them the resources they need. They are mission-focused, not focused on their own careers. They give honest and accurate feedback, chastise when appropriate, and are strong advocates for their subordinates. They are effective writers. The bottom line is that effective wing chaplains are leaders, not managers.” With respect to what wing chaplains could do better as leaders, an insightful E-6 made the following comment as only an NCO could make it:
Have the guts to hold your team accountable. Correct what’s wrong—don’t expect anything less. Get rid of deadbeats; the process is easy if you use it and will save you time and energy in the long run. Consider those who come after you in your position when making every decision—this will help ensure decisions are made selflessly and with integrity. Learn the appropriated funds process; this will help you fight for money. Take care of your team first; they are your flock—this then enables them to take care of the Airmen in need. Be confident in your decision making. Think beyond the chapel walls and Sunday morning—our Airmen need us to be there beyond these confines. Let your team use their imagination and ingenuity and then back them up.

Though stated in different ways by different people, the Chaplain Corps was nearly unanimous in its appeal for wing chaplains to lead well, whether or not they had weekly worship responsibilities. As one recent O-5 wing chaplain-turned-staff chaplain remarked, “discernment, decision making skills, and care and feeding of the staff” are paramount. This chaplain further described the wing chaplain job in this way:

As wing chaplain I found my pastoral care was less with the parishioners and more taking care of the administration so the staff could provide the direct pastoral care. If my folks aren’t worried about computers, mold in their offices, sound systems, and money for their programs, they were more free to do the counseling and provide pastoral care for the wing. My job was to cultivate relationships with senior leadership by providing them pastoral care and advice regarding wing morale. This helped make sure the staff got the resources they needed to get the mission accomplished.

When all is said and done, the forceful words of another O-5 staff chaplain bring the point home: “EVERYTHING is a function of leadership! Be a student of leadership, both secular and spiritual, or be prepared to fail those you have been entrusted to lead. Your leadership is a sacred trust to those you lead; treat it as such.” Clearly, the Chaplain Corps is interested in wing chaplains who lead their teams in support of the wing’s stated mission to prepare for and then execute combat operations.

Research Question 2

Research Question 2 asked, “What is the relationship, if any, between Chaplain Corps perceptions of wing chaplain preparation, wing chaplain performance, and personal job satisfaction?” The question’s principal purpose was to explore this relationship from the perspective of both wing and installation chaplains and the Chaplain Corps at large. Wing and installation chaplains were asked to report their perceptions of how prepared they were for their current job, their impressions of their performance, and their job satisfaction, all of which were
evaluated on a 5-point Likert scale. All other participants were asked, relative to their most recent experience, to evaluate wing chaplain preparation, wing chaplain performance, and their personal job satisfaction on a similar 5-point Likert scale. Results are reported below.

**Descriptive Analysis**

This section reports descriptive statistics on the range of preparation, performance, and satisfaction data collected in this study. Descriptive data is reported in Table 26, indicating respective means, standard deviations, modes, and medians for wing and installation chaplains and all other Chaplain Corps respondents. Interestingly, wing and installation chaplains report higher preparation, performance, and satisfaction relative to the remaining Chaplain Corps respondents in this study. In fact, statistical comparison of the respective means (t-tests) indicates significant differences in each category at the 0.01 level of significance. These differences are noted by an asterisk in Table 26. Relative to this study’s purpose, this finding suggests that wing and installation chaplains assess their job preparation and performance much higher than is assessed by their subordinates and higher headquarters personnel.

Table 26. Measures of central tendency for preparation, performance, and satisfaction for wing and installation chaplains and all remaining Chaplain Corps respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wing and Installation Chaplains</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation (for wing chaplain job)</td>
<td>4.01*</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance (as wing chaplain)</td>
<td>3.92*</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal job satisfaction</td>
<td>4.26*</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Remaining Chaplain Corps Respondents</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation (of wing chaplains)</td>
<td>3.65*</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance (of wing chaplains)</td>
<td>3.52*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal job satisfaction</td>
<td>3.91*</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 27 provides additional analysis along these lines. This table reports similar data
presented in 3 respondent categories: wing and installation chaplains, all other chaplains, and chaplain assistants. These data similarly indicate that wing chaplains generally have a higher view of their preparation and performance than do both other chaplains and chaplain assistants.

Table 27. Measures of central tendency for preparation, performance, and satisfaction for wing and installation chaplains, other chaplains, and chaplain assistants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wing and Installation Chaplains</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation (for wing chaplain job)</td>
<td>4.01*</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance (as wing chaplain)</td>
<td>3.92*</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal job satisfaction</td>
<td>4.26*</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaplains</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation (of wing chaplains)</td>
<td>3.73*</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance (of wing chaplains)</td>
<td>3.55*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal job satisfaction</td>
<td>4.13*</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaplain Assistants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation (of wing chaplains)</td>
<td>3.48*</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance (of wing chaplains)</td>
<td>3.46*</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal job satisfaction</td>
<td>3.48*</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From a descriptive perspective, statistical comparison of the means (t-tests) indicates significant differences at the 0.01 level for all 3 categories (wing chaplain preparation, wing chaplain performance, and job satisfaction), as denoted by asterisks in Table 27. On this point, chaplains and chaplain assistants are generally agreed, but there is a statistically significant difference between the self-reported job satisfaction ratings of chaplains (mean of 4.13) and chaplain assistants (mean of 3.48). The job satisfaction rating of wing and installation chaplains (mean of 4.26) is significantly higher than the satisfaction ratings of both chaplains (mean of 4.13) and chaplain assistants (mean of 3.48). In general, chaplains are more than “satisfied” in their jobs, while chaplain assistants, though less satisfied, are still well into the “somewhat satisfied” range.
This research question sought to discern the relationship, if any, between wing chaplain job preparation, wing chaplain job performance, and personal job satisfaction. With respect to wing chaplain preparation and performance, there was a strong and statistically significant relationship ($r = 0.50; p = 0.001$) between wing chaplain preparation for the job and performance as a wing chaplain. Surprisingly, there was a statistically insignificant relationship ($r = 0.16, p = 0.088$) between job preparation and job satisfaction. There was a moderate yet statistically significant relationship ($r = 0.29, p = 0.008$) between job performance and job satisfaction.

Standard multiple regression was conducted using wing chaplain performance as the dependent variable with wing chaplain preparation and job satisfaction as independent variables. The linear combination of the independent variables explained 29% of the variance ($R^2 = 0.29; R^2 \text{ adj} = 0.27$). This finding indicates 29% of self-assessed wing chaplain performance was accounted for by preparation and satisfaction, while 71% was accounted for by other factors. Both independent variables contributed significantly to the prediction of self-assessed performance. Preparation contributed most to the prediction of performance with a beta weight of 0.466 ($p = 0.001$), while satisfaction contributed less with a beta weight of 0.210 ($p = 0.046$).

Additional analysis was conducted with respect to wing chaplain preparation, wing chaplain performance, and personal job satisfaction for the remainder of Chaplain Corps respondents. There was a strong and statistically significant relationship ($r = 0.71; p = 0.001$) between wing chaplain preparation and wing chaplain performance. A small but statistically significant correlation existed ($r = 0.26; p = 0.001$) between wing chaplain preparation and personal job satisfaction. With respect to wing chaplain performance and job satisfaction, there existed a moderate but statistically significant relationship ($r = 0.39; p = 0.001$).
Standard multiple regression was conducted using wing chaplain performance as the dependent variable with wing chaplain preparation and personal job satisfaction as independent variables. This linear combination of independent variables explained more than half of the variance ($R^2 = 0.545$; $R^2 \text{ adj} = 0.543$), indicating nearly 55% of the wing chaplain performance rating was accounted for by ratings of wing chaplain preparation and personal job satisfaction. Both independent variables contributed significantly to the prediction of wing chaplain performance. Preparation contributed most to the prediction of performance with a beta weight of 0.649 ($p = 0.001$), while satisfaction contributed less with a beta weight of 0.224 ($p = 0.001$). This finding indicates that wing chaplains who are solid performers appear well prepared and are likely to have satisfied personnel, an insight that was affirmed throughout the qualitative data.

**Qualitative Data Insights**

The relationship between wing chaplain preparation, wing chaplain performance, and one’s job satisfaction produced interesting findings with respect to this study. Based on the data, wing chaplains’ reported perceptions of their own preparation, performance, and job satisfaction were higher in a statistically significant way than similarly reported data from Chaplain Corps members at large. In fact, there was nearly a 0.5-point difference in the means for wing chaplain preparation, a 0.4-point difference between the means for wing chaplain performance, and a 0.35-point difference between the means for personal job satisfaction. Wing chaplains believe they are more prepared and perform much better than do those above and below them on the organizational chart. It is therefore not surprising that Chaplain Corps respondents’ most recent experiences with wing and installation chaplains resulted in a significantly lower personal job satisfaction rating than the job satisfaction ratings of wing chaplains themselves.

The qualitative data implied that much of this reality rests in the Chaplain Corps perception that wing chaplains are not as prepared for their jobs as respondents expect. Analysis of open-ended questions produced additional insight into wing chaplain preparation vis-à-vis means and ends. All respondents were asked to describe changes to the way wing and
installation chaplains should be prepared for their jobs. A number of significant themes emerged from their responses. Chaplain Corps members suggested that the two-week wing chaplain course should be redesigned to feature a toolkit consisting of more practical administrative and leadership resources. One 13-year supervisory chaplain assistant got right to the point: “Change the intermediate and wing chaplain courses. I have no idea what is being taught right now, but it doesn’t seem to be working.” In addition to this request to modify the wing chaplain course, the larger Chaplain Corps community recommended devising a mentoring program to help ensure new wing chaplains start on the right foot and continue in the right direction. A large number of respondents recommended that chaplains begin supervising enlisted members much earlier in their careers rather than waiting until assuming a wing chaplain job.

Consistent with one of the primary themes emerging from the data in this study, enlisted members overwhelming cited the need for wing chaplains to be better equipped in leadership, team building, funds management, contracting processes, and issues unique to enlisted personnel. A 12-year E-6 recommended that wing chaplains “take a business class—or five—to get into the managing mindset,” while a 10-year E-5 pled for “training as administrators who take care of their staffs, not just pastors who take care of their flocks.” Perhaps better than any other, a 14-year supervisory chaplain assistant (an E-6) expressed the exasperation experienced by many enlisted members with this fairly radical recommendation:

Wing chaplains should receive written training with a set of written requirements that they should follow. They should be required to read the Chaplain Corps regulations and then be tested on their understanding to see if they really get it. Rank should not be a reason to make someone a wing chaplain. If a colonel is not capable of making decisions, managing a team, or being the wing commander’s best friend, then that individual should not advance beyond being a line chaplain and should stick to teaching, preaching, and counseling. But they should not be left in charge of taking a team toward destruction through failed vision and mission.

Certainly, not all enlisted members shared this degree of exasperation, but the general tenor of these comments reflects the broader sense expressed in open-ended comments on this theme. A more positive assessment was proffered by a 12-year E-6 currently serving as a supervisory chaplain assistant. As this mid-level enlisted leader explained, “some of the best wing chaplains
I’ve worked with combined book knowledge (from PME) with practical pastoral leadership to make a VERY effective leader. If a chaplain would like to attain the [wing chaplain] position, they should want to become a more effective leader across the board—not just at the chaplain level.”

Similar sentiments were expressed by chaplain respondents, some of whom suggested that more attention be paid to how wing chaplains are selected for their jobs. The following insight from an O-3 with 23 years time in service makes this point regarding the connection between preparation and performance:

First, determine whether individuals are even suited for this specialized form of leadership. Although rank intrinsically infers this, careful scrutiny would save much heartache where certain wing chaplains offer nothing more than figurehead capacity at best. Then allow for a supplemental feedback system that works bottom-up where staff members are allowed and encouraged to evaluate performance and offer feedback to command that would be shared in formal feedback sessions with the wing chaplain.

A supervisory chaplain (O-3) echoes this sentiment with a specific recommendation:

First, I think the Air Force needs to do a better job with whom they select for the positions to begin with. I would rather work for a person of integrity who has taken some risks that haven’t worked out than for some careerist who is afraid of his or her own shadow. After that, I think that perhaps they should receive some training on how to be a senior pastor of a multi-staffed congregation, maybe even some from the civilian sector. Our jobs are not exactly the same, but [as far as wing chaplains go] it is the ministry leadership where things seem to lack.

Chaplain Corps members offered a number of specific recommendations regarding the content and format of the current two-week wing chaplain course. As to specific content, there was considerable agreement that the course focus on such topics as leadership, strategic planning (especially the Chaplain Corps’ Doing Global Ministry approach), manpower issues, effective performance evaluation (especially enlisted evaluation), budgeting, contracting, the relationship between wing chaplains and their NCOICs/superintendents, team building, conflict resolution, and unique enlisted concerns. Specifically, respondents recommended that the course focus “more on leadership” (E-6), the necessary “change from pastor to leader” (E-7), a stronger “emphasis on improving leadership and management skills” (E-9), “be longer and more administrative-duty oriented” (O-4), “include work on what will actually be included in their
jobs” rather than abstract theory (O-3), “include more practical instruction” (O-4), and use “case studies in vision casting” while spending “more time teaching the ‘nuts and bolts’ of the job” (O-5). A more targeted critique was offered by an O-5 headquarters staff division chief, who said “the wing chaplain course needs to be completely overhauled. It should be more like a D.Min. seminar than ‘Death by Powerpoint.’ Further, the course needs more emphasis on how to lead a chapel team to accomplish the mission than just vague philosophy.” In sum, the general sense among Chaplain Corps respondents was that the wing chaplain course needs a review of its content and an extreme makeover of its format to equip wing chaplains for leadership.

While the immediately previous discussion focused on responses from Chaplain Corps members at large, a number of preparation-minded open-ended questions were asked of wing and installation chaplains as well. Their answers add additional insight to the leadership development equation. When asked about helpful educational experiences, responses ran the gamut from professional military education to clinical pastoral education to earning advanced degrees, particularly the D.Min. degree. For many, however, formal education was not nearly as important as previous leadership experience and the intentional mentoring of selected wing chaplains who took seriously the task of building the next generation of wing chaplain leaders. Others suggested that content currently taught in the wing chaplain course should be “rolled back” to earlier courses, such that junior chaplains become aware of the necessary leadership skills as soon as possible. A fan (O-4) of the current wing chaplain course made this point well, as evidenced by the following assessment:

I strongly believe [formal chaplain education] needs to be rolled back. The intermediate course needs to be for mid-level captains (O-3s), as many of them will be serving as senior faith group chaplains. The wing chaplain course should be targeted at the junior major (O-4) level, as many of them will be serving as wing chaplains. Then, possibly add a headquarters staff course or strategic leader’s course for joint and command-level jobs.

Overall, the current wing chaplain course received mixed reviews, but most respondents commenting on the course suggested it was not yet where it needed to be. A few examples from current O-5 wing chaplains illuminate this issue. One such leader noted that the wing chaplain course was fairly helpful, “though I’d give it a ‘B’ overall.” Another wing
chaplain mentioned that “my D.Min. program and studying management and leadership” were most helpful; “these topics are talked about but not taught in the wing chaplain course. We can talk about things and still not teach the how and why of how they need to be done.” Yet another commented that the wing chaplain course was least helpful in preparing for the job, in large part “because it was put together by chaplains who had never been wing chaplains.” These criticisms affirm this researcher’s recent 4-year review of wing chaplain course critiques.

Continuing the preparation theme, wing and installation chaplains were asked to discuss which of their previous assignments had best prepared them to serve as wing chaplains. A review of their responses suggests that the best preparation for leading a chapel team is to gain as much similar leadership experience as possible along the way. Once again, the mentoring theme was evident across the board. The following comment from a stateside O-5 wing chaplain captures the essence of this idea. He observed that his most helpful preparatory assignment was “serving as a deputy wing chaplain under an awesome wing chaplain who was intentional about mentoring, developing, and preparing others for higher levels of responsibility. Serving on deployments as the lead chaplain allowed me the practical hands-on experience of acting in a leadership role.” Another wing chaplain noted that “two experiences helped me greatly: being deployed as a wing chaplain then returning to my home station and serving as the acting wing chaplain for nine months. These experiences taught me that the ‘buck’ stops at my desk and I’m totally responsible for my people and our success or failure.” Clearly, wing chaplain preparation is a critical factor in their leadership performance.

As previously noted, wing chaplains reported higher job satisfaction than chaplains, chaplain assistants, and Chaplain Corps members at large. On this point, when wing chaplains were asked if they wanted to serve as a wing chaplain again, 50 of 65 respondents to this open-ended question responded in the affirmative. Upon closer examination, 6 of those responding in the negative did so because they were in the process of retiring and thus ineligible to serve in this capacity again. While there was clear dissatisfaction with the heavy administrative load which too often distracts from participation in hands-on ministry and the lack of resources to get the job
done, the large majority of wing chaplains were satisfied with their leadership work.

Sources of this satisfaction included opportunities for vision casting, mentoring and empowering their staffs, and the challenges of leading their teams to accomplish the mission. In the words of one O-3 installation chaplain when asked if he would like to serve again: “Absolutely. As busy as it is, I enjoy the ability (and challenge) of casting a vision and helping steer chapel ministries and dollars to serve as many as possible.” A seasoned O-5 wing chaplain said he “enjoyed the experience personally and professionally. It has broadened my life spiritually, professionally, emotionally, and mentally. I thoroughly enjoy empowering others to reach higher than they believed they could and rejoicing in the staff’s . . . accomplishments.” An O-6 wing chaplain nearing the end of his career said much the same but in stronger terms: “YES. God Almighty, may I? I was once a warrior; now I have the honor to be not only a pastor to the warriors but a pastor to the pastors of warriors. Does life get any better than this in terms of calling and ministry this side of heaven?”

Based on these representative remarks from the qualitative data, it seems wing chaplains are largely satisfied with the leadership opportunities inherent to their jobs. This potential for leadership and ministry satisfaction suggests additional rationale for best equipping wing chaplains for the challenges at hand. Conclusions based on analyses discussed in this chapter relative to wing chaplain leadership development are reported next.


2 Principal components analysis was conducted on the data set to determine the number of factors to be extracted. The Kaiser-Guttman rule, one standard convention to evaluate the number of factors accounting for the greatest variance, was used in this case. This rule suggests that initial factors with eigenvalues greater than 1.0 be used as a beginning solution. Fifteen factors had eigenvalues greater than 1.0, accounting for 67.8% of the common variance. The principal components analysis extraction was rotated obliquely via Promax rotation. Factor coefficients less than 0.30 were suppressed, resulting in 3 variables which failed to load on any factor (LCs 44, 57, and 63). The remaining 69 leadership competency variables loaded on 15 factors, and examination of the results indicated logical groupings of these factors. It should be noted that two of the 15 factors (Factors 12 and 15) loaded with just 2 leadership variables, which is 1 less than the standard convention of 3. These factors were retained because of their logical groupings and can be used as part of an overall wing chaplain leadership competency profile. Despite this fact, the two factors in question still yielded subscale reliability coefficients greater than the standard 0.70 threshold. Overall reliability of the solution resulted in an extraordinarily high Chronbach’s alpha of 0.97. Subscale reliability for all but one factor (Factor 13) eclipsed the 0.70 standard threshold. This factor (Factor 13) yielded a subscale
reliability alpha of 0.69. Of the remainder, 3 subscales yielded reliability measures of 0.90 or greater, 7 subscales yielded measures between 0.80 and 0.89, and 4 subscales fell between 0.70 and 0.79.

3 Stephen Anthony Boersma, “Managerial Competencies for Church Administration as Perceived by Seminary Faculties, Church Lay Leaders, and Ministers” (Ph.D. diss., Oregon State University, 1988), 79.

4 Suhr, “Exploratory or Confirmatory Factor Analysis?,” 3.

5 Boersma, “Managerial Competencies,” 96.

6 Catholic chaplains rated Ministry Practice (Factor 6) with a mean of 3.82 (N = 35); Protestant chaplains rated this factor with a mean of 3.30 (N = 249); Other chaplains rated this factor with a mean of 2.75 (N = 15). Statistically significant differences were noted between Catholic and Protestant chaplains (p adj = 0.0003), Catholic and Other chaplains (p adj = 0.0000), and Protestant and Other chaplains (p adj = 0.0164).

CHAPTER 5
CONCLUSIONS

The quantitative data analyzed in this study clearly validated the need for and importance of leadership and leadership development among the Chaplain Corps’ primary operational leaders, themes which were clarified in the numerous responses to open-ended questions. In examining the variety of qualitative data, it was clear that wing chaplains and their staffs considered the wing chaplain job as one demanding strong leadership in the face of diminished funding and personnel shortages. In addition, the increased deployment tempo resulting from the global war on terrorism was found to be a major contributor to the leadership challenges faced by wing chaplains. These data coalesce to confirm the need for targeted leadership development for prospective Air Force wing chaplains. This chapter completes the study by articulating relevant implications and recommending a leadership development model which could be used by curriculum planners to equip Air Force wing chaplains.

Research Questions

As stated in chapter 3, the following questions were used to guide this study:

1. What leadership competencies are considered essential for performance as Air Force wing chaplains?

2. What is the relationship, if any, between Chaplain Corps perceptions of wing chaplain preparation, wing chaplain performance, and personal job satisfaction?

Implications from Research Question 1

This research question examined the importance rating of the 72 wing chaplain leadership competencies as reported by Chaplain Corps personnel, with the ultimate goal of producing a wing chaplain leadership competency profile. Given that leadership development
requires relevant content to achieve its principal purpose,\textsuperscript{1} determining requisite leadership competencies to ground that content base is crucial for success.\textsuperscript{2} Discovering which leadership competencies are considered essential for performance is a critical first step in the wing chaplain leadership development process. This study provides that step.

Study results indicated considerable agreement among Chaplain Corps members as to the relative importance of the leadership competencies. This point is fundamental, as it paints a consistent picture of leadership requirements across the Chaplain Corps. As a result, leadership developers and curriculum planners can focus their attention on a leadership competency profile that meets the expectations of Chaplain Corps members at every level. More importantly, the study provides insight to wing chaplains as to the leadership competencies required for success. Sixty of the 72 leadership competencies were rated as “very important,” boasting means of 4.0 or higher on a 5-point Likert scale. This fact caused more than one respondent to note with some consternation that performing as a wing chaplain is a tall order indeed. As previously noted, of the top 20 (of 72) leadership competencies, chaplains and chaplain assistants shared 13. Of the bottom 20, chaplains and chaplain assistants had 12 in common, bolstering the sense of agreement among Chaplain Corps members on this point.

A closer look at the leadership competency factors clustering toward the top and bottom offers keen insight into the significance of classic leadership skills vice those of traditional ministry practice as reported by Chaplain Corps respondents. Chaplain Corps members ranked Visionary Leadership (Factor 5) as the most important leadership competency factor (mean of 4.75). Team Leadership (Factor 4) captured the second position not too far behind (mean of 4.68). Significantly, this result is closely aligned with the precedent literature in the realms of both ministry and non-ministry leadership. In their landmark study of leadership through the eyes of constituents at all levels, Kouzes and Posner discovered that visionary leadership is a key component to leadership success. “The message thousands of people are sending is that unless they . . . believe an aspiring leader is forward-looking, they aren’t likely to follow willingly. Just ask yourself, would you voluntarily enlist in a movement or join an
organization in which the leaders have no idea where they’re headed?"3 When the Chaplain Corps asked itself this question, the answer was clearly in the negative.

At the other end of the leadership spectrum, however, Chaplain Corps members consistently rated the following traditional ministry competencies dead last in order of importance: preaching competence, competence as a worship leader or liturgist, “fair share” participation in carrying the counseling load, and regular participation as a chapel preacher or worship leader. More than a little surprising was the finding that, of these traditional ministry practices, chaplains consistently rated them even lower than chaplain assistants. Though this idea is inconsistent with research conducted of local church pastors and lay leaders as to the importance of ministry practice in local church leadership,4 it was maintained across the Chaplain Corps as competencies were grouped into factors via factor analysis. Nevertheless, this finding is understandably disconcerting in light of the wing chaplain’s role as the base’s senior pastor. There is likely more to this finding than first meets the eye.

Whereas Visionary Leadership (mean of 4.75) and Team Leadership (mean of 4.68) both scored well into the “very important” range and neared “extremely important” on the 5-point Likert scale, the lowest-rated (of 15 factors) Ministry Practice (Factor 6) was ranked almost halfway between the “somewhat important” and “very important” ranges (mean of 3.41). Traditional ministry practices are therefore not considered unimportant to Chaplain Corps personnel, but they are not considered the primary function of wing chaplains, primarily Protestants, who can delegate much of that work to other chaplains on staff if they wish. Thus, it is not necessarily correct to conclude that Chaplain Corps members disavow ministry in the classic sense of the word. Rather, the data suggest that Chaplain Corps members want strong leadership from wing chaplains and are therefore much less concerned about their personal participation in traditional ministry practice, especially among Protestant wing chaplains. Whereas local church pastors are expected to major on these ministry practices in their unique leadership roles,5 the exact opposite seems to be expected of Air Force wing chaplains in their decidedly unique leadership roles. This theme was repeated throughout the qualitative data.
One principal finding of this study was the notion that Catholic chaplains placed a statistically higher value on Ministry Practice (Factor 6) than both Protestant chaplains and chaplains from other faith groups. It is interesting to note on this point that while the ministry leadership literature often warns against the dangers of ministers (and seminaries) focusing on the practical tasks of ministry at the expense of classic leadership principles, the Chaplain Corps risks making the precise opposite error. In other words, by relegating such traditional ministry practices as competent preaching, regular worship leadership, and competent counseling to the bottom of the priorities list, ministry leaders may be tempted to forfeit the very reason for their existence as ministers called by God. This need not be the case, to be sure, but wing chaplains (and those who serve alongside them) should check their motives in light of their behavior to mitigate such negative possibilities as laziness, careerism, and the seriously dangerous act of abandoning their calling. As prominent Protestant theologian John Piper has observed with piercing clarity concerning those called to ministry, “Brothers, we are not professionals.”

Although wing chaplains potentially represent the widest possible variety of religious persuasions, the data clearly demonstrate that the large majority in the study sample (60 of 72 respondents) were self-described Protestants (83%). It is quite possible that the current state of Protestant wing chaplains majoring in the ministry of leadership while minoring in the classic ministry tasks is in fact best for the overall ministry of the typical chapel team. In most cases, it seems, Protestant wing chaplains choose to serve in roles more akin to bishops than as senior pastors, supervising the ministry of other pastors (Catholic, Protestant, etc.) responsible for a host of congregations representing various traditions (liturgical, traditional, contemporary, etc.). As discussed earlier, due to manning constraints, Catholic wing chaplains almost never have the luxury of delegating classic ministry tasks to others on staff. More importantly, Catholic chaplains’ theology and vocational calling all but require them to regularly lead worship regardless of their position. Protestant wing chaplains would benefit from reexamining their own theology and calling to make sure their professional choices are in fact best for themselves and their teams, irrespective of current Chaplain Corps preferences.
The organizational and ministry leadership literature consistently agree as to the importance of communication in the leadership enterprise.\(^9\) This importance increases exponentially when considering the central role of preaching in effective pastoral ministry.\(^{10}\) In light of this study’s revelation regarding the bottom-of-the-list ranking of competent preaching and the like for wing chaplains, it may behoove Protestant wing chaplains to recall the familiar words of the Pauline mandate to “devote yourself to the public reading of Scripture, to preaching and to teaching. Do not neglect your gift, which was given you through a prophetic message when the body of elders laid their hands on you. Be diligent in these matters; give yourself wholly to them, so that everyone may see your progress” (1 Tim 4:13-15). For Christian chaplains, at least, “we proclaim [Christ], admonishing and teaching everyone with all wisdom, so that we may present everyone perfect in Christ. To this end I labor, struggling with all his energy, which so powerfully works in me” (Col 1:28-29). At the very least, the following words serve as a much-needed reminder to Christian wing chaplains, whether or not the choice is made to allow classic leadership tasks to eclipse traditional ministry practice:

> We pastors are being killed by the professionalizing of the pastoral ministry. The mentality of the professional is not the mentality of the prophet. It is not the mentality of the slave of Christ. Professionalism has nothing to do with the essence and heart of the Christian ministry. The more professional we long to be, the more spiritual death we will leave in our wake. . . .

> The world sets the agenda of the professional man; God sets the agenda of the spiritual man. The strong wine of Jesus Christ explodes the wineskins of professionalism. There is an infinite difference between the pastor whose heart is set on being a professional and the pastor whose heart is set on being the aroma of Christ, the fragrance of death to some and eternal life to others (2 Cor 2:15-16).\(^{11}\)

**Implications from Research Question 2**

Research Question 2 explored the potential relationship between Chaplain Corps perceptions of wing chaplain preparation, wing chaplain performance, and personal job satisfaction. Wing and installation chaplains reported a strong and statistically significant relationship \((r = 0.50)\) between their preparation and their performance, indicating the essential connection of leadership preparation and leadership performance. From the lens of the Chaplain Corps at large, this connection is even higher \((r = 0.71)\), affirming the critical link between wing
chaplain preparation and leadership performance. This correlation between preparation and performance was validated by statistical analysis (multiple regression) in this study and is evidenced throughout the literature. From the negative angle, research in both business and seminary education has observed a major disconnect between institutional instruction and that which is required for leadership performance in the field. Similar findings were observed by this researcher when evaluating 4 recent years of Air Force wing chaplain course critiques.

For leadership preparation to be effective, it must be tailored to equipping prospective leaders with the set of specific competencies required to produce contextualized organizational success. This brand of preparation occurs most readily when conceived as a developmental process capitalizing on the composite of one’s personal experiences, work assignments, education, and relationships. By all accounts, no such dedicated developmental program is in place for wing chaplains aside from the current 10-day, lecture-based wing chaplain course, a situation which warrants reevaluation. The wing chaplain course should be competency-based, case study-driven, and mentor-directed. Instead of the course being led by otherwise qualified instructors who have never served as a wing chaplain, credibility and common sense demand that experienced, currently serving wing chaplains be actively engaged to facilitate a reality-based course focused on the leadership competencies required to succeed as a wing chaplain. The leadership development template created as part of this study is commended as a necessary starting point.

Analysis of wing and installation chaplain responses noted a small but statistically significant relationship \((r = 0.29)\) between their own *performance* and their personal job *satisfaction*. Remaining Chaplain Corps members indicated a small but statistically significant relationship \((r = 0.26)\) between wing chaplain *preparation* and their personal *satisfaction*, as well as a moderate but statistically significant relationship \((r = 0.39)\) between wing chaplain *performance* and their personal job *satisfaction*. These findings, too, were confirmed by regression analysis. From these results it can be stated that, in general, wing chaplains who are solid performers appear well prepared and are likely to have satisfied personnel. This finding is
in keeping with the trend of this study and suggests that an emphasis on preparation for wing chaplain leadership can pay huge dividends in both wing chaplain performance and job satisfaction among the staff. This perspective is consistent with precedent literature on the value of targeted education and tailored experience in producing prepared leaders.16

Although job satisfaction as a theoretical construct was not of major concern in this study, it bears mentioning based on the data received with respect to this research question. It is interesting to note once again that wing chaplains reported statistically higher views of their own leadership preparation and leadership performance than did the Chaplain Corps at large. Additionally, wing chaplains reported statistically higher personal job satisfaction than their Chaplain Corps counterparts. These data may suggest that wing chaplains are much better leaders in their own minds than is warranted by their preparation and performance. If so, wing chaplains should more carefully evaluate their performance as assessed by their subordinates, peers, and superiors.

In the end, the junction of preparation and performance bounds this study. As ministry and military leaders, wing chaplains have been charged with leading as an act of stewardship unto God and Country (Gen 1:26-28; Jer 9:23-24; Matt 22:21; Rom 13:1-7; 1 Cor 4:1-2). In this sense, there is no such thing as good enough for government work. Rather, increasing leadership competence is the order of the day (Matt 25:14-30), especially in view of the stricter judgment awaiting ministry leaders (Jas 3:1). Preparation and performance collide upon the realization that “to whom much is given, much is required” (Luke 12:48). As military and ministry leaders, wing chaplains are subject to double stewardship and await double accountability (Heb 13:17). Part of that accountability rests in the care with which they treat their subordinates (to the extent that treatment is under their control), the end of which is some measure of employee job satisfaction (Eph 6:5-9; Col 3:22-4:1). As indicated in this study, there is an identifiable connection between wing chaplain preparation, wing chaplain performance, and the job satisfaction of Chaplain Corps members those wing chaplains have been called to serve.
Summary of Research Implications

The principal aim of this study was to explore the leadership competencies considered essential for wing chaplain performance, the result of which was considerable agreement among Chaplain Corps personnel regarding the preferred leadership competency template. Significantly, the large sample of 447 respondents ensured that a representative, 360-degree view of the Chaplain Corps was indeed produced as part of this study. This summary briefly reviews the major implications of data analyzed in this research.

Need for Tailored Leadership Education

Based on the demographic profile revealed in this study, leadership education tailored to the specific needs of wing chaplains is warranted. Despite the additional leadership training most wing chaplains would have received as standard fare for Air Force officers, there is a decided lack of leadership development aimed at equipping wing chaplains for the unique challenges they face as ministry leaders in a military context.

Importance of Classic Leadership Skills

Implications of this research further suggest that Chaplain Corps personnel considered visionary and team leadership as critical to wing chaplain performance, while the traditional practices of ministry (though still important) were considered last on the leadership competency list. Whereas local church pastors are expected to major on these ministry practices in their unique leadership roles, the exact opposite seems to be expected of Air Force wing chaplains in their decidedly unique leadership roles. This need is especially pronounced in an era of increasing demands and decreasing resources. When possible, therefore, the preference was for wing chaplains to focus the bulk of their efforts on leadership issues while delegating the lion’s share of practical ministry tasks to other chaplains on their teams. Of special note is the finding that the top 7 leadership competency factors revealed in this study square amazingly well with the highly popular five practices of exemplary leadership espoused by Kouzes and Posner.
Catholic/Protestant Disconnect

The preference for wing chaplain concentration on visionary and team leadership at the expense of traditional ministry practice is not always possible, however. This reality is especially true for most Catholic wing chaplains, who typically serve as the community’s lone Catholic priest. In addition, Catholic theology, sense of vocation, and priestly obligation militates against the notion of Catholic priests allowing any leadership position to unnecessarily compete with regular ministerial participation. A number of Catholic chaplains, however, expressed great frustration at having to serve two full-time roles while Protestant wing chaplains have the relative luxury of delegating the bulk of their ministry tasks (preaching, worship leadership, counseling, etc.) to others on staff if they wish. Despite this reality, Protestant wing chaplains would likely benefit from reexamining their calling before assuming any leadership posture inconsistent with their vocation as ministry leaders (Col 1:28-29; 1 Tim 4:13-15).

Importance of Strategic Planning

The relatively low importance rating of strategic planning, which was defined using the Chaplain Corps’ own Doing Global Ministry nomenclature, suggests the need for renewed emphasis on this skill across the Chaplain Corps. Although all Air Force chapel leaders were trained to conduct practical strategic planning as late as 5 years ago, at least 2 generations of wing chaplains have not had that experience. Given its potential to focus teams on clear-cut, achievable missions, which are all the more necessary in light of increasing operations amid decreasing resources, the time is right to renew Chaplain Corps emphasis on strategic planning, specifically Doing Global Ministry, as a force multiplier.

Importance of Spiritual Modeling

Not surprisingly, Spiritual Modeling (Factor 3) was valued significantly more by chaplains (mean of 4.49) than chaplain assistants (mean of 4.15), despite the curious finding that chaplain assistants valued wing chaplains’ ministry practice more highly than did chaplains. It is thus encouraging to observe that chaplains appreciate the value of leaders maintaining their
spiritual center while viewing the wing chaplain role as more leadership-centric than ministry-centric in the classic senses of those words. The importance of ministry leaders riveting their attention on the Lord cannot be overstated, of course. Divine vision should drive ministry vision, an impossible feat without regularly practicing the spiritual disciplines, modeling life-changing faith and spiritual passion (Mark 10:45), and leading for the glory of God (John 17:4-5).

**Stateside/Overseas Competencies Coincide**

Given the paucity of off-base churches overseas relative to stateside bases, it was necessary to determine if Chaplain Corps members stationed overseas had a different perspective than their stateside counterparts. The data showed no statistical difference among leadership competency ratings relative to assignment location (stateside or overseas). This finding suggests a single developmental program can be developed regardless of assignment location.

**Importance of Exemplary Leadership**

Results for Exemplary Leadership (Factor 10) found senior chaplains and senior enlisted members valuing this factor more than junior chaplains, but in all cases the importance rating was well into the “very important” category. It appears that Chaplain Corps personnel recognize the essential importance of character among ministry leaders.

**Preparation/Performance/Satisfaction Link**

The data clearly indicated that wing chaplain performance and Chaplain Corps members’ job satisfaction are positively correlated with wing chaplain preparation. As a result, there was great concern among respondents regarding the need for wing chaplain leadership development to prepare wing chaplains for this crucial role. For leadership preparation to be effective, it must be tailored to equip prospective leaders with the set of specific competencies required to produce contextualized organizational success. Furthermore, the mainstay 10-day wing chaplain course should feature experienced wing chaplains facilitating a case study-driven, competency-based learning experience focused on the realities of leading chapel teams.
Wing Chaplain Self-Assessment

Wing chaplains reported statistically higher views of their own leadership preparation and leadership performance than did the Chaplain Corps at large. Additionally, wing chaplains reported statistically higher personal job satisfaction than their Chaplain Corps counterparts. These data may suggest that wing chaplains are much better leaders in their own minds than is warranted by their preparation and performance as perceived by Chaplain Corps personnel. If so, a more realistic appraisal of both their preparation and job performance is in order.

Research Applications

Due to increasing interest in wing chaplain leadership, this study has the potential for immediate application in the development of Air Force chaplains to serve at higher levels. The foremost application may be a comparative review of this study’s results relative to the current two-week wing chaplain course curriculum. In addition, the results of this study could impact chaplain professional development at all levels, based on the notion that younger chaplains will now have an identifiable skill set for which to prepare. As a result, findings from this study may also have direct application to staff training and professional development conducted in each local Air Force chapel worldwide. The first step in this process is the production of a leadership competency model based on results from this study. That model is now briefly described.

Wing Chaplain Leadership Model

The genesis of this study now matches its exodus in the expression of a preliminary leadership competency model for Air Force wing chaplains. The model is derived from the factor analysis described in this study, which produced a 15-factor solution from the 72 leadership competencies evaluated by Chaplain Corps personnel. The model is designed as a template for use by curriculum planners to guide wing chaplain leadership development.

The Wing Chaplain Leadership Model (WCLM) is conceptually patterned after the Anthony and Estep (2005)28 modification of MacKenzie’s (1969)29 classic systems approach to leadership and management. Widely known in Christian circles for their expertise as church
organization theorists, Anthony and Estep adapted MacKenzie’s scheme (planning, organizing, staffing, directing, and controlling) to fit a ministry context. (The essence of their model can be seen in the comprehensive list of ministry competency models at Appendix 1.) In so doing, these writers incorporated the idea of biblical integration as a leadership engine for ministry professionals. This idea is represented in the WCLM as core values integration and includes spiritual modeling, exemplary leadership, servant leadership, and traditional ministry practices.

For purposes of the model, leadership is used as an umbrella term that includes leadership as commonly understood along with the traditional functions of management. Although Anthony and Estep differentiate between leadership and management, their view of competencies falls within the broader purview of leadership in this study. In their words, “management calls us to commit to organizing the institution to achieve its plans, focusing on the proper utilization of resources, ‘things.’” As a complement to management, “leadership calls us to a multi-phased process of staffing, directing, and evaluating, while focusing on the ‘people,’ not as resources but as participants in our ministry endeavor.” In reality, of course, leaders are responsible for the proper employment of both “things” (management) and “people” (leadership) in accomplishing the organization’s mission. As a result, this model provides a helpful framework by which to view leadership competencies in their broader context. The Wing Chaplain Leadership Model is summarized in Table 28.

The Wing Chaplain Leadership Model (WCLM) logically groups this study’s 15 leadership competency factors into 1 of 6 tasks described by Anthony and Estep. As seen in Table 28, each task is comprised of at least 1 competency factor (listed by competency factor number), which is further divided into a summarized listing of the individual leadership competencies comprising each factor. In most cases, these competencies are listed in order of their appearance in the factor definitions described in chapter 4. In some cases, however, competencies are listed in a more logical order than provided by the factor analysis. Spurious competencies are included for competencies with means greater than 4.0 which are logically consistent with the assigned task. Each task will be briefly discussed to further clarify the model.
Table 28. Wing chaplain leadership model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Competency Factor</th>
<th>Competency Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Core Values</strong></td>
<td><strong>Integration</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3      | Spiritual Modeling    | 1. Leads to glorify God  
2. Sees leadership as stewardship  
3. Leads as wing’s senior pastor  
4. Practices spiritual disciplines  
5. Models faith/spiritual passion  
6. Prays for wing/mission/people |
| 10     | Exemplary Leadership  | 1. Models core values  
2. An example worth following  
3. Models physical fitness standards  
4. Has high expectations for team/self |
| 11     | Servant Leadership    | 1. Balances needs of people/mission  
2. Cares more for others than self  
3. Helps staff develop personal goals  
4. Takes appropriate risks to win  
5. Self-starter who gets things done |
| 6      | Ministry Practice     | 1. Competent worship leader  
2. Competent preacher  
3. Regular preacher/worship leader  
4. Active in counseling ministry  
5. Competent counselor |
| **Planning** | **Strategic Planning** | 1. Employs strategic planning process  
2. Prioritizes key programs  
3. Plans ministry using DGM  
4. Evaluates ministry using DGM  
5. Monitors progress using DGM  
6. Conducts needs assessments  
7. Adjusts plans/keeps project on track  
8. Builds mission statement with staff  
9. Develops measurable goals |
| 5      | Visionary Leadership  | 1. Has a clear vision for chapel team  
2. Communications vision to team  
3. Provides sound advice to leadership  
4. Meets wing/headquarters suspenses |
| 8      | Budgeting             | 1. Appropriated funds budget  
2. Chapel Tithes/Offering Fund budget  
3. Aligns budgets with ministry plan |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Competency Factor</th>
<th>Competency Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Prioritizes use of Reserve members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Prioritizes use of civilians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Applies contracting procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Aligns job descriptions with duties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Applies manpower standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Aligns local policies with Air Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. Organizes staff to maximize gifts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8. Meaningful performance evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9. Written readiness/contingency plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staffing</strong></td>
<td>12 Volunteer Involvement</td>
<td>1. Expects volunteers to own mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Expects fair share from volunteers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 Volunteer Training</td>
<td>1. Hosts leadership training program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Hosts volunteer training program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Directing</strong></td>
<td>4 Team Leadership</td>
<td>1. Leads with calm in times of crisis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Makes effective, timely decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Gives clear, concise directions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Builds and maintains staff morale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Leads change effectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 Ministry Innovation</td>
<td>1. Culture of continuous improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Creativity, innovation, risk taking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Meets base needs before own needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13 Community Leadership</td>
<td>1. Highly visible around the wing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Proactive with higher headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Proactive with wing leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Proactive with wing IDS/CAIB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 Team Empowerment</td>
<td>1. Empowers staff and volunteers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Delegates authority/responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluating</strong></td>
<td>7 Performance Evaluation</td>
<td>1. Effective OPR writer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Effective EPR writer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Understands enlisted career issues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Core Values Integration**

Whereas Anthony and Estep define the first task as an integration of Christian thought (stewardship, ministry, faithfulness, etc.), the WCLM broadens this definition to include competency factors relating to the integration of Air Force core values, spirituality, and the
practice of ministry. Accordingly, Core Values Integration in the WCLM includes the following competency factors: Spiritual Modeling (Factor 3), Exemplary Leadership (Factor 10), Servant Leadership (Factor 11), and Ministry Practice (Factor 6). This task in the WCLM primarily addresses the leadership concerns of character and calling.

Planning

Planning is defined by Anthony and Estep as “a mental picture of where you want to be at some future point in time with the courses of action necessary to arrive at your destination using available resources.” Their model includes in this task such concerns as building mission and vision, goal setting, policies and procedures, budgeting, and strategic planning for ministry. In keeping with this theme, the WCLM includes the following competency factors as part of its Planning task: Strategic Planning (Factor 1), Visionary Leadership (Factor 5), and Budgeting (Factor 8).

Organizing

Organizing implies “the development of organizational structure by defining appropriate roles and authority relationships in order to effectively achieve organizational goals and objectives.” Consistent with the detailed breakdown of this task by Anthony and Estep, the WCLM incorporates the Organizing factor (Factor 2) as the only factor applied to this task.

Staffing

Staffing is “the selection and training of people necessary to accomplish the goals and objectives of the organization” and includes recruiting and screening volunteers, staff development, and legal considerations for ministry. Volunteer Involvement (Factor 12) and Volunteer Training (Factor 15) are most logically related to the Staffing task.

Directing

Directing describes “a leader’s ability to delegate, motivate, and manage the work of a team in order to synchronize their efforts toward the accomplishment of organizational goals and
objectives.”\textsuperscript{36} In the spirit of the Anthony and Estep model, Team Leadership (Factor 4), Ministry Innovation (Factor 9), Community Leadership (Factor 13), and Team Empowerment (Factor 14) are best suited for this task.

\textbf{Evaluating}

Evaluating provides “periodic and cumulative assessment to ensure that an organization’s use of resources [is] effectively accomplishing its goals and objectives,” a task which includes program and personnel evaluation.\textsuperscript{37} The corresponding WCLM task is Performance Evaluation (Factor 7) because of this factor’s near singular focus on conducting effective military performance reviews. It should be noted that this task would logically include some of the program evaluation functions contained in the Strategic Planning (Factor 1) in the Planning task. Because the Chaplain Corps’ Doing Global Ministry (DGM) strategic planning process is a cradle-to-grave process by nature, it is not surprising that its major components, including its evaluative aspects, are expressed alongside the more front-end concerns of the Planning task.

\textit{Potential Applications}

The Wing Chaplain Leadership Model represents the primary end game of this study. As stated from the outset, the study’s principal purpose was to explore the leadership competencies considered essential for wing chaplain performance and produce a preliminary leadership competency model accessible to leadership developers and curriculum planners. The remainder of this section will recommend applications of this model and explore potential beneficiaries of this study.

\textbf{Leadership Development Professionals}

Until now, wing chaplain leadership development has been largely ad hoc. Whereas previous generations of chaplains enjoyed a Career Field Education and Training Plan (CFETP) to help guide professional development over the course of a career,\textsuperscript{38} the Air Force decision to
dispense with mandatory officer CFETPs has negatively affected intentional development of Chapelion Corps leaders. This study sought to lessen the challenge of developing wing chaplain leadership by identifying specific leadership competencies considered essential for wing chaplain performance. This study has accomplished that purpose by clarifying fundamental content for a tailored leadership development program, not unlike the former chaplain CFETP. Since upwards of 80% of business organizations employ some form of competency modeling and competency clusters (or factors) have been shown to vary based on organizational level, having access to a competency model targeted to a specific organizational level should benefit the field. Now, by use of this model, the possibility exists for wing chaplains to be trained to a specific, identified standard that can ground leadership development both theoretically and practically.

**Curriculum Planners**

In addition to leadership development professionals, curriculum planners can employ this model to guide training from one stage of career development to another. Now that a desired end state has been identified at the operational level of leadership, curriculum planners possess the basis by which they can run a common leadership thread through all levels of training, officer and enlisted. By identifying the established standard to all parties, chaplain and chaplain assistant alike, they can evaluate the extent to which instructors, students, and the curriculum itself is aligning with that standard. In addition to its application in formal courses, the model could help set the agenda for continuing education across the Chaplain Corps.

**Chaplain Corps Leadership**

Since this study revealed a clear link between wing chaplain preparation, wing chaplain performance, and Chaplain Corps job satisfaction, renewed attention to preparing wing chaplains systematically for their positions is warranted and could pay big dividends across the force. Furthermore, it is not beyond the realm of possibility to employ this framework as a basis for leadership selection and assessment, a notion that squares well with a large body of responses to the open-ended questions in this study. While such an approach might be difficult
to conduct in practice, it could be a viable target in considering the best leadership fit when selecting and assigning wing chaplains. Additionally, the model could be used (even informally) by command chaplains to offer concrete feedback to the principal operational leaders under their care. Even if the model is not used as a selection tool for wing chaplains or a top-down evaluation tool for wing chaplain leadership assessment, it should be used to develop a 360-degree evaluative tool as a feedback mechanism by chapel teams at the wing level.

**Wing Chaplains**

The leadership development literature posits competency modeling as a self-awareness tool, as well as one that can be used for institutional assessment. Current and prospective wing chaplains could use the WCLM as the basis for their own self-assessment as part of their personal leadership development program. Wing chaplains could periodically evaluate their performance against an established standard like that provided by the WCLM. The bravest among them could even provide it to their wing commanders as a feedback tool based on a validated, objective standard. Once wing chaplains better understand where room for improvement exists, they can then chart a course to close the gap between what “is” and what “could be.”

Significantly, in light of the repeated recommendation to establish mentoring programs for up-and-coming wing chaplains, the WCLM could serve as the basis for an objective mentoring effort tied to those skills considered essential for wing chaplain performance. More to the point, using this tool could become standard curriculum for wing chaplains’ efforts to train their replacements. Given that many junior chaplains often perform the wing chaplain’s role in the absence of the wing chaplain due to combat deployments or other reasons, it makes sense to use an objective standard as the theoretical and practical basis for wing-level educational programming. Since there is such considerable agreement among Chaplain Corps personnel as to the importance of the leadership competencies, a plan of this type would be welcomed.
Summary of Conclusions

This research has underscored the unique role wing chaplains play as military and ministry leaders, a role which is all the more critical in a time of war. Given the weight of their responsibility in providing pastoral care to warriors and their families, Barna’s words can be echoed without equivocation: “Nothing is more important than leadership.”43 The data indicated a consistent preference for visionary and team leadership skills, even at the expense of the traditional ministry practices for wing chaplains. Results from this study revealed a leadership competency profile that can be used by leadership developers and curriculum planners to elevate leadership across the Air Force Chaplain Corps. Moreover, the data showed a strong connection between wing chaplain preparation, wing chaplain performance, and the personal job satisfaction of Chaplain Corps personnel.

The composite of quantitative and qualitative data considered in this study revealed that wing chaplain leadership is more both/and than either/or. Wing chaplains serve simultaneously as senior pastors called by God and as senior military leaders commissioned by the government. Success requires a delicate balance of these two essential roles. Yet in managing this delicate balance, a clear preference is for leadership. In the words of an overseas wing chaplain with 28 years of experience,

Wing chaplains need to provide administrative ministry and leadership. While they should maintain their spiritual disciplines, wing chaplains should lead, lead, lead and make decisions to keep the staff focused, properly resourced, and free to do their best. I’ve been most frustrated with wing chaplains who saw themselves as just another chaplain on staff and not the “C.O.O.,” or Chief Operating Officer. A wing chaplain must pull away from the pastoral role to really focus on the staff and administrative issues.

In so doing, the wing chaplain becomes a leadership force multiplier unleashing his team for the good of warriors and their families. In so doing, the wing chaplain also becomes a force with which to be reckoned for the glory of God.

Some wing chaplains, of course, can—and should—serve their communities best by maintaining a primary presence in the pulpits and counseling rooms of their chapels. In so doing, they will demonstrate the critical importance of technical competence in ministry for
ministry leaders, stay true to their calling, and take full advantage of the leadership benefits available to senior pastors familiar with their worshipping communities. Wing chaplains making that choice should not, however, neglect the wide variety of leadership responsibilities inherent to their unique role as wing chaplains—ministry leaders in a military context. All wing chaplains should remember that effectiveness likely resides in the healthy balance of both/and rather than the more convenient either/or. The following comments from an O-6 command chaplain, offered as advice to new wing chaplains as part of this research, make the point well and serve as a fitting conclusion to this study:

With respect to how the Chaplain Corps does business, you will be well served to network, learn, and apply lessons that are working at other locations. Remember, Doing Global Ministry is a mindset, not a program. With respect to leadership, this is the true challenge: to put others before yourself, to use your position to serve others, to make others’ career progression more important than your own, to help your staff fulfill their hopes, dreams, and desires. May you always decrease that others may increase. Finally, and most importantly, don’t forget that your calling began by kneeling before the Master’s throne. Therefore, return to the throne often. Make an appointment to visit the Holy of Holies each day to refresh, restore, and receive your Air Tasking Order. It may sound obvious, but if you lose your spiritual focus, you will be ineffective as a wing chaplain. So, kneel in order to stand.
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APPENDIX 1

COMPREHENSIVE LIST OF MINISTRY LEADERSHIP COMPETENCIES REVIEWED IN PRECEDENT LITERATURE

Blizzard (1956)
1. Administrator (manager of the parish)
2. Organizer (leadership/participation/planning in local church/community contexts)
3. Pastor (developing and maintaining interpersonal relationships)
4. Preacher (preparation and delivery of sermons)
5. Priest (liturgist, worship leader, and officiating in rites of the church)
6. Teacher (preparation for/instruction in local church schools, classes, and study groups)

Moates (1981)
1. Preacher-Worship leader (sermons, public worship, and administering sacraments)
2. Teacher (activities concerned with instructing others, primarily in the church)
3. Scholar-Thinker (all study activities in preparation for worship, teaching, etc.)
4. Pastor (involvement in interpersonal activities with members/others as shepherd)
5. Counselor-Advisor (formal counselor role vice more informal pastor role)
6. Priest (sacraments/ceremonies: communion, baptism, funerals, and weddings)
7. Evangelist-Outreacher (communicating the gospel to those outside the church)
8. Fellowshopper-Friend (activities involving fellowship with members or others)
9. Ministerial Peer (professional interaction with other ministers)
10. Church-Ministerial Figure (representative of church served or ministerial profession)
11. Devotionalist-Intercessor (giving devotionalals, offering prayer for church and others)
12. Administrator-Manager (planning, organizing, controlling, leading, finances/facility)
13. Administrator-Worker (all management activities not involving other persons)
14. Worker (errands, janitorial work, opening and closing the church, etc.)
15. Subordinate (direct contact with a superior)
16. Unsuccessful Visitor (time spent in unsuccessful attempts to contact others)
17. Believer-Saint (all private meditation, prayer, and personal devotional exercises)

Boersma (1988)
Strategic Pathfinding
1. Develop written, measurable goals/objectives
2. Environmental scanning to identify obstacles to the mission
3. Understand and implement a planning process in the church
4. Develop policies and procedures
5. Develop a staff plan based on church goals/objectives
6. Identify/prioritize key programs to accomplish the mission
7. Develop/maintain a church mission statement
8. Develop/maintain a philosophy of ministry
9. Plan/implement a needs assessment
Operational Pathfinding
1. Develop a reporting system to monitor implementation of the plan
2. Determine how critical data will be gathered to monitor plan implementation
3. Develop an organization plan/structure to fit the church’s strategic plan
4. Use techniques such as MBO to control/evaluate
5. Develop a church-wide organization chart to depict line/staff relationships
6. Develop/set individual performance criteria
7. Develop written job descriptions for staff/leadership
8. Help staff/leadership develop personal goals/objectives
9. Conduct consistent staff evaluations with appropriate rewards/punishment
10. Apply standards of evaluation consistent with church’s management plan
11. Use well-planned information systems to communicate with staff/leadership
12. Develop human resource plan
13. Plan staff/membership development activities
14. Develop/administer a leadership training program to populate leadership pool

Interpersonal Skills
1. Create an environment to encourage independent thought
2. Apply conflict management skills to resolve differences
3. Practice group leadership skills
4. Build and maintain staff morale
5. Use knowledge of power and authority effectively
6. Involve staff and lay leadership in developing performance standards
7. Apply leadership techniques in managing staff activities
8. Participate in continuing education programs for personal growth
9. Develop accurate evaluation standards that mirror the church’s organization/structure
10. Design/modify individual positions to fit capabilities/motivation of existing staff
11. Work to create harmony of all activities to facilitate goals/objectives
12. Delegate authority and responsibility to staff and lay leadership

Staffing
1. Participate in defining individual qualifications for staff/leadership positions
2. Modify organizational plan to account for available staff/leadership
3. Assist in recruiting, selecting, training, and developing staff/lay leadership/others
4. Involve existing staff/lay leadership in developing a mission/purpose statement

Directing
1. Use group activities to facilitate communication, decision making, problem solving
2. Plan and initiate change effectively
3. Harmonize individuals’ personal goals with church goals
4. Apply policies, procedures, and rules uniformly
5. Make decisions and give clear, concise directions
6. Plan and use time effectively in setting work priorities

Controlling
1. Adjust plans and take corrective action to keep projects on track
2. Maintain an evaluation program that provides for ongoing feedback on major activities
3. Budget allocation of resources required to support approved plans

Barna (1997)
1. Effective communication
2. Identifying, articulating, and casting vision
3. Motivating people
4. Coaching and developing people
5. Synthesizing information
6. Persuading people
7. Initiating strategic action
8. Strategic thinking
9. Resolving conflict
10. Developing resources
11. Delegating authority and responsibility
12. Reinforcing commitment
13. Celebrating successes
14. Decision making
15. Team building
16. Instigating evaluation
17. Creating a viable corporate culture
18. Maintaining focus and priorities
19. Upholding accountability
20. Identifying opportunities for influence
21. Relating everything back to God’s plans and principles
22. Modeling spiritual disciplines
23. Managing other key leaders

Ford (1997)
Leads like Jesus
1. Can articulate and demonstrate a Christ-centered leadership philosophy
2. Servant attitude
3. Understands the importance of team ministry
4. Raises up leaders
5. Empowers followers
6. Develops strategies for ministry
7. Grasps the role of suffering in leadership
8. Communicates vision and purpose effectively

Manages Well
1. Manages priorities and self
2. Knows how to strategize, plan, organize, control, and evaluate
3. Knows how to staff, build a team, and supervise
4. Can administratively manage systems
5. Can budget, raise funds, and control them responsibly

Leads Skillfully
1. Understands his/her leadership style and can adapt it to meet the group’s need
2. Can engage conflict constructively and lead groups to reconciliation
3. Has an effective strategy for problem solving and decision making
4. Communicates well verbally and in writing throughout the organization
5. Continually questions followers and others for feedback

Coggins (2004)
Character
1. A strong faith
2. Assurance of calling
3. Possessing integrity
4. Having a love for people
5. Leading by example
6. Being authentic
7. Having a healthy marriage, if married
8. Being a personal disciple
9. Being a person of prayer and witness
10. Exhibiting the fruit of the spirit

Knowledge
1. Knowledge of God’s word
2. God-centered biblical ministry
3. Spiritual disciplines
4. Relating faith to the modern world
5. Leading change
6. Knowledge of people being served
7. Knowledge of self
8. Team ministry dynamics
9. Knowledge of personal limitations
10. Basic leadership principles and theory

Behavior
1. Being evangelistic
2. Communicating effectively
3. Relationship skills
4. Preaching to change lives
5. Able to cast vision
6. Leading by serving others
7. Developing others for ministry
8. Accurate interpretation of biblical material
9. Developing and leading from a shared vision
10. Building an effective ministry team

Transfer Competencies
1. Having a teachable spirit
2. Being a self starter
3. Willing to assume responsibility
4. Flexible
5. Being a motivator
6. Cooperative with others
7. Possessing a healthy self confidence
8. Adaptable to varying situations
9. Being a problem solver
10. Being a willing team member instead of a team leader

Anthony and Estep (2005)

Biblical Integration
1. Leading from a theological perspective

Planning
1. Building a mission and vision
2. Developing a strategic ministry plan
3. Developing goals and objectives
4. Developing policies and procedures as planning tools
5. Preparing and reading a budget
6. Employing ministry by objectives or other planning techniques

Organizing
1. Developing appropriate organizational structures
2. Preparing job descriptions
3. Conducting effective meetings
4. Leading change effectively
5. Effective decision making

Staffing
1. Recruiting and screening volunteers
2. Staff development
3. Legal and ethical considerations in ministry

Directing
1. Developing leaders
2. Mentoring others
3. Transforming groups into teams
4. Understanding and employing effective leadership strategies
5. Working with boards and committees

**Evaluating**
1. Conducting performance reviews
2. Evaluating the effectiveness of programs

Thomas (2004)
1. Vision
2. Integrity
3. Risk taker
4. Change agent
5. Empowerment
6. Strategist
7. Communicator
8. Motivator
9. Decision maker
10. Competent
11. People skills
12. Time management
13. Delegating
14. Servanthood
15. Trustworthy
16. Encourager
17. Team builder
18. Conflict management
19. Modeling

Jones (2005)
**Visionary**
1. A sense of mission
2. A clear vision of what God wants for their local church
3. Effective communication of the vision.

**Change Agent**
1. Creating an environment conducive to change
2. Providing opportunities for the congregation to take ownership for change
3. Taking calculated risks
4. Making difficult decisions as required

**Shepherd**
1. Being a people person
2. Receiving positive feedback from congregants indicating a caring approach to ministry
3. Following through with commitments
4. Being a good listener

**Servant to Constituency**
1. Discerning needs in the congregation
2. Being more concerned with others than self

**Delegator**
1. Releasing people to carry out their responsibilities
2. Seeing congregants as being able to carry out most duties as well as the pastor
3. Providing leadership training for the congregation
4. Trusting lay leaders in the church

**Lifelong learner**
1. Being self-described as a lifelong learner
2. Having a personal development plan for continuing education, research, and study
Meade (2006)

Thinking (Head)
1. Semiotic awareness (the ability to pay attention)
2. Visioneering (engineering a shared, God-honoring vision)
3. Imagineering (imagination and creativity)
4. Lifelong learning

Doing (Hand)
1. Being a good example
2. Translating biblical material in culturally relevant ways
3. Being an intentional architect of healthy corporate culture
4. Strong relational skills
5. Using mechanisms to filter information and translate it into wisdom
6. Clearly communicating with others using multiple modes
7. Building high-performing teams

Being (Heart)
1. Strong moral character
2. Spiritual passion
3. Integrity in public and private
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COMPREHENSIVE LIST OF MILITARY LEADERSHIP COMPETENCIES REVIEWED IN PRECEDENT LITERATURE

U.S. Army (FM 6-22, 12 October 2006)

Leads Others
1. Establishes and imparts clear intent and purpose
2. Uses appropriate influence techniques to energize others
3. Conveys the significance of the work
4. Maintains and enforces high professional standards
5. Balances requirements of mission with welfare of followers
6. Creates and promulgates vision of the future

Extends Influence Beyond the Chain of Command
1. Understands the sphere of influence, means of influence, and limits of influence
2. Builds trust
3. Negotiates for understanding, builds consensus, and resolves conflict
4. Builds/maintains alliances (business associations, interest groups, support networks)

Leads by Example
1. Displays character by consistently modeling Army values through actions/attitudes
2. Exemplifies the Warrior Ethos
3. Demonstrates commitment to the Nation, Army, unit, soldiers, community, partners
4. Leads with confidence in adverse situations
5. Demonstrates technical and tactical knowledge and skills
6. Understands importance of conceptual skills and models them to others
7. Seeks and is open to diverse ideas and points of view

Communicates
1. Listens actively
2. Determines information-sharing strategies
3. Employs engaging communication techniques
4. Conveys thoughts and ideas to ensure shared understanding
5. Presents recommendations so others understand advantages
6. Is sensitive to cultural factors in communication

Creates a Positive Environment
1. Fosters teamwork, cohesion, cooperation, and loyalty
2. Encourages subordinates to exercise initiative, accept responsibility, take ownership
3. Creates a learning environment
4. Encourages open and candid communications
5. Encourages fairness and inclusiveness
6. Expresses and demonstrates care for people and their well-being
7. Anticipates people’s on-the-job needs
8. Sets and maintains high expectations for individuals and teams
9. Accepts reasonable setbacks and failures
Prepares Self
1. Maintains mental and physical health and well-being
2. Maintains self awareness; employs self understanding and recognizes impact on others
3. Evaluates and incorporates feedback from others
4. Expands knowledge of technical, technological, and tactical areas
5. Expands conceptual and interpersonal capabilities
6. Analyzes and organizes information to create knowledge
7. Maintains relevant cultural awareness
8. Maintains relevant geopolitical awareness

Develops Others
1. Assesses current developmental needs of others
2. Fosters job development, job challenge, and job enrichment
3. Counsels, coaches, and mentors
4. Facilitates ongoing development
5. Supports institutional-based development
6. Builds team or group skills and processes

Gets Results
1. Prioritizes, organizes, and coordinates taskings for teams or other organizational units
2. Identifies and accounts for individual and group capabilities and commitment to task
3. Designates, clarifies, and deconflicts roles
4. Identifies, contends for, allocates, and manages resources
5. Removes work barriers
6. Recognizes and rewards good performance
7. Seeks, recognizes, and takes advantage of opportunities to improve performance
8. Makes feedback part of work processes
9. Executes plans to accomplish the mission
10. Identifies/adjusts to external influences on the mission or taskings and organization

U.S. Navy (Center for Naval Leadership)

Leading Change
1. Creativity and innovation
2. External awareness
3. Flexibility
4. Service motivation
5. Strategic thinking
6. Vision

Leading People
1. Developing people
2. Conflict management
3. Leveraging diversity
4. Professionalism
5. Team building
6. Combat/crisis leadership

Working with People
1. Influencing/negotiating
2. Oral communication
3. Partnering
4. Political awareness
5. Written communication

Resource Stewardship
1. Financial management
2. Leveraging technology
3. Human resource management
Accomplishing Mission
1. Responsibility, authority, and accountability
2. Decisiveness/risk management
3. Continuous improvement
4. Problem solving
5. Technical credibility

U.S. Marine Corps (MCWP 6-11, 3 January 1995)
Leadership Traits
1. Integrity
2. Justice
3. Enthusiasm
4. Bearing
5. Endurance
6. Unselfishness
7. Loyalty
8. Judgment
9. Tact
10. Initiative
11. Dependability
12. Decisiveness
13. Courage
14. Knowledge

Leadership Principles
1. Be technically and tactically proficient
2. Know yourself and seek self-improvement
3. Know your Marines and look out for their welfare
4. Keep your Marines informed
5. Set the example
6. Ensure the task is understood, supervised, and accomplished
7. Train your Marines as a team
8. Make sound and timely decisions
9. Develop a sense of responsibility among your subordinates
10. Employ your unit in accordance with its capabilities
11. Seek responsibility, and take responsibility for your actions

U.S. Coast Guard (Commandant Instruction M5451.3, 9 May 2006)
Leading Self
1. Accountability and responsibility
2. Aligning values
3. Followership
4. Health and well-being
5. Self awareness and learning
6. Personal conduct
7. Technical proficiency

Leading Others
1. Effective communication
2. Team building
3. Influencing others
4. Mentoring
5. Respect for others and diversity management
6. Taking care of people
Leading Performance and Change
1. Conflict management
2. Customer focus
3. Decision making and problem solving
4. Management and process improvement
5. Vision development and implementation
6. Creativity and innovation

Leading the Coast Guard
1. Financial management
2. Technology management
3. Human resource management
4. External awareness
5. Political savvy
6. Partnering
7. Entrepreneurship
8. Stewardship
9. Strategic Thinking

U.S. Air Force (AFDD 1-1, 18 February 2006)

Personal Leadership
1. Exercise sound judgment
2. Adapt and perform under pressure
3. Inspire trust
4. Lead courageously
5. Assess self
6. Foster effective communications

Leading People/Teams
1. Drive performance through shared vision, values, and accountability
2. Influence through win/win solutions
3. Mentor and coach for growth and success
4. Promote collaboration and teamwork
5. Partner to maximize results

Leading the Institution
1. Shape Air Force strategy and direction
2. Command organizational success via enterprise integration and resource stewardship
3. Embrace change and transformation
4. Drive execution
5. Attract, retain, and develop talent

Office of Personnel Management (2006)

Functional Competencies
1. Interpersonal skills
2. Oral communication
3. Integrity/honesty
4. Written communication
5. Continual learning
6. Public service motivation

Leading Change
1. Creativity and innovation
2. External awareness
3. Flexibility
4. Resilience
5. Strategic thinking
6. Vision

**Leading People**
1. Conflict management
2. Leveraging diversity
3. Developing others
4. Team building

**Results-Driven**
1. Accountability
2. Customer service
3. Decisiveness
4. Entrepreneurship
5. Problem solving
6. Technical credibility

**Business Acumen**
1. Financial management
2. Human capital management
3. Technology management

Air Force Chaplain Leadership (CFETP 52RQ, 1 July 1995)
1. Volunteer recruitment, training, equipping, supervision, and recognition
2. Developing readiness and contingency support plans
3. Needs assessment for parish and industrial ministry
4. Developing religious support plans
5. Strategic planning for military ministry
6. Maintaining necessary documentation
7. Conducting military evaluations (feedback, performance reports, awards, decorations)
8. Administering corrective actions/military discipline (letters of counseling/reprimand)
9. Understanding Air Force manpower standards
10. Supervising government civilians and contract employees
11. Budgeting and developing financial plans for chapel funds
12. Budgeting and developing financial plans for appropriated funds
13. Understanding Air Force contracting procedures
14. Supervising Reserve personnel
15. Coordinating with wing leadership and higher headquarters
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1. Leads from the perspective of the wing’s senior pastor
2. Leads as a primary means of glorifying God
3. Leads as an act of stewardship to God and Country
4. Leads as a primary means of serving others
5. Is more concerned with others than himself/herself
6. Models Air Force core values
7. Is an example others would like to follow
8. Serves regularly as preacher/worship leader for the chapel community
9. Is a competent preacher
10. Is a competent worship leader/liturgist
11. Has reputation as a competent counselor
12. Carries fair share of counseling load
13. Is highly visible around the wing
14. Proactive involvement with wing leadership
15. Proactive involvement with higher headquarters
16. Proactive involvement with wing Integrated Delivery System (IDS)/Community Action Information Board (CAIB)
17. Provides sound advice to wing leadership
18. Practices spiritual disciplines (prayer, Scripture study, etc.)
19. Models life-changing faith and spiritual passion
20. Meets suspenses as assigned by wing leadership and higher headquarters
21. Has a clear vision for the chapel team
22. Communicates vision to the chapel staff and worshipping community
23. Involves staff in developing a written mission statement
24. Leads staff in developing measurable goals and objectives
25. Implements strategic planning process in leading chapel team
26. Conducts needs assessments to determine chapel action plan
27. Identifies/prioritizes key programs to accomplish the mission
28. Evaluates ministry needs using Doing Global Ministry (DGM) processes
29. Determines ministry plan using Doing Global Ministry (DGM) processes
30. Monitors progress of ministry plan using Doing Global Ministry (DGM) processes
31. Adjusts plans and takes corrective actions to keep projects on track
32. Encourages chapel community to meet base needs before their own
33. Encourages continuous improvement to best meet base needs
34. Encourages creativity, innovation, and risk taking to meet base needs
35. Sets and maintains high expectations for individual and team performance
36. Is a self-starter who gets things done
37. Balances the needs of people and mission
38. Takes appropriate risks to accomplish the mission
39. Prepares budgets to meet needs identified in ministry planning process
40. Budgets and develops financial plans for Chapel Tithes and Offering Funds (CTOF)
41. Budgets and develops financial plans for appropriated funds
42. Balances parish ministry and industrial ministry involvement in planning ministry
43. Understands and skillfully employs Air Force manpower standards
44. Applies Air Force contracting procedures to meet the mission
45. Organizes chapel staff to make wisest use of motivation/ability of assigned personnel
46. Plans and prioritizes effective use of Reserve personnel
47. Plans and prioritizes effective use of civilian personnel
48. Ensures written job descriptions accurately reflect duties of assigned personnel
49. Ensures local policies and procedures are consistent with Air Force standards
50. Conducts meaningful performance evaluations with appropriate rewards/punishment
51. Administers corrective actions and military discipline to maintain military standards
52. Assists staff develop and achieve personal/professional goals to advance their careers
53. Encourages chapel congregational members to take ownership of the chapel mission
54. Expects chapel volunteers to take responsibility for their fair share of the ministry
55. Provides training for chapel volunteers to accomplish assigned responsibilities
56. Administers a leadership training program for chapel volunteers
57. Applies conflict management skills to resolve differences as soon as possible
58. Builds and maintains staff morale
59. Delegates authority and responsibility to chapel staff and volunteers
60. Empowers chapel staff and volunteers to accomplish assigned responsibilities
61. Holds chapel staff and volunteers accountable for assigned responsibilities
62. Plans and initiates effective change processes affecting the chapel community
63. Makes effective, timely decisions
64. Leads with calm in times of crisis
65. Gives clear, concise directions
66. Develops written readiness and contingency support plans
Agreement to Participate:

The research in which you are about to participate is designed to better understand the leadership competencies required for performance of U.S. Air Force wing chaplains. This research is being conducted by the Chaplain Service Resource Board (POC: Ch, Lt Col Dondi Costin) for purposes of informing wing chaplain leadership development. This survey has been approved by the Air Force Survey Branch with Survey Control Number USAF SCN 08-036.

In this research, you will be asked to complete a brief questionnaire seeking your input on the importance of wing chaplain leadership competencies. Any information you provide will be held strictly confidential, and at no time will your name be reported or your name identified with your responses.

Participation in this study is totally voluntary, and you are free to withdraw from the study at any time. By your completion of this survey, you are giving informed consent for the use of your responses in this research.

* Do you agree to participate in this survey?
  ○ YES
  ○ NO

Instructions:

This survey consists of 3 sections and should take no more than about 20 minutes to complete.

Section 1: Evaluation of Wing/Installation* Chaplain Leadership Competencies -- 7 minutes
 (*Installation Chaplains serve as Wing Chaplain-equivalents at smaller installations)

Section 2: Professional Information -- 3 minutes

Section 3: Open-Ended Questions -- 10 minutes

Let's begin...

SECTION 1: Wing Chaplain Leadership Competencies (Page 1 of 5)

Please indicate your opinion of the importance of the following Wing Chaplain Leadership Competencies by selecting the button which best answers the question:
In your opinion, how important is it for Wing Chaplains to possess the following leadership competencies?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Minimally Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Extremely Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Leads from the perspective of the wing's senior pastor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Leads as a primary means of glorifying God</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Leads as an act of stewardship to God and Country</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Leads as a primary means of serving others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. More concerned with others than himself/herself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Models Air Force core values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. An example others would like to follow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Models high physical fitness standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Serves regularly as preacher/worship leader in chapel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Competent preacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Competent worship leader/liturgist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Competent counselor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Carries fair share of the counselling load</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Highly visible around the wing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Proactively involved with wing leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION 1: Wing Chaplain Leadership Competencies (Page 2 of 5)

In your opinion, how important is it for Wing Chaplains to possess the following leadership competencies?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Minimally Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Extremely Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16. Proactively involved with higher headquarters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Proactively involved with wing Integrated Delivery System (IDS)/Community Action Information Board (CAIB)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Provides sound advice to wing leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Practices the spiritual disciplines (prayer, Scripture study, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Models life-changing faith and spiritual passion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Actively prays for the wing, its mission, and its people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Meets suspenses as assigned by wing leadership and higher headquarters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Has a clear vision for the chapel team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Communicates vision to chapel team and worshipping community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Involves staff in developing a written mission statement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Leads staff in developing measurable goals and objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Implements strategic planning processes in leading chapel team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Conducts needs assessments to determine chapel action plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Identifies/prioritizes key programs to accomplish the mission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Evaluates ministry needs using Doing Global Ministry (DGM) processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**SECTION 1: Wing Chaplain Leadership Competencies (Page 3 of 5)**

In your opinion, how important is it for Wing Chaplains to possess the following leadership competencies?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Minimally Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Extremely Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31. Determines ministry plan using DGM processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Monitors progress of ministry plan using DGM processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Adjusts plans and takes corrective actions to keep projects on track</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Encourages chapel community to meet base needs before their own</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Encourages continuous improvement to meet base needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Encourages creativity, innovation, and risk taking to meet base needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Sets and maintains high expectations for individual and team performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Self-starter who gets things done</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Balances the needs of people and mission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Takes appropriate risks to accomplish the mission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Prepares budgets to meet needs identified in ministry planning process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Budgets and develops financial plans for Chapel Tithes and Offering Funds (CTOF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Budgets and develops financial plans for appropriated funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Balances parish ministry and industrial ministry involvement in planning ministry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Understands and skillfully employs Air Force manpower standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SECTION 1: Wing Chaplain Leadership Competencies (Page 4 of 5)**
In your opinion, how important is it for Wing Chaplains to possess the following leadership competencies?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Minimally Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Extremely Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>46. Understands and applies Air Force contracting procedures to meet mission</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Organizes chapel staff to make wisest use of the motivation and abilities of assigned personnel</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Plans and prioritizes effective use of RESERVE personnel</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Plans and prioritizes effective use of CIVILIAN personnel</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Ensures written job descriptions accurately reflect duties of assigned personnel</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Ensures local policies and procedures are consistent with Air Force standards</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Conducts meaningful performance evaluations with appropriate rewards/corrective action</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Effective Enlisted Performance Report (EPR) writer</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Effective Officer Performance Report (OPR) writer</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Administers corrective actions and military discipline to maintain military standards</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Clearly understands career issues unique to enlisted members (enlisted force structure, promotion system, documenting career field/upgrade training, etc.)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Consistently models Religious Support Team (RST) concept with Superintendent/NCOIC</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. Helps staff develop and achieve personal/professional goals to advance their careers</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. Encourages chapel congregational members to take ownership of the chapel mission</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. Expected chapel volunteers to take responsibility for their share of the ministry</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION 1: Wing Chaplain Leadership Competencies (Page 5 of 5)

In your opinion, how important is it for Wing Chaplains to possess the following leadership competencies?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Minimally Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Extremely Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61. Provides training for chapel volunteers to accomplish assigned responsibilities</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. Administers a leadership training program for chapel volunteers</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. Applies conflict management skills to resolve differences as soon as possible</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. Builds and maintains staff morale</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65. Delegates authority and responsibility to chapel staff and volunteers</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66. Empowers chapel staff and volunteers to accomplish assigned responsibilities</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. Holds chapel staff and volunteers accountable for assigned responsibilities</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68. Plans and initiates effective change processes affecting the chapel community</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69. Makes effective, timely decisions</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70. Leads with calm in times of crisis</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71. Gives clear, concise directions</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72. Develops written readiness and contingency support plans</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
List below ADDITIONAL COMPETENCIES you think should have been on this list, if any:

SECTION 2: Professional Information

CURRENT PAY GRADE:

TIME IN SERVICE (YEARS):

RELIGIOUS PREFERENCE:

HIGHEST EDUCATION LEVEL:

HIGHEST PME LEVEL:

HIGHEST PME LEVEL--METHOD OF COMPLETION:

CURRENT ASSIGNMENT (AT HOME STATION):

LEVEL OF CURRENT ASSIGNMENT (AT HOME STATION):

SECTION 2: Professional Information

Number of ACTIVE DUTY CHAPLAINS on your staff:

Number of ACTIVE DUTY CHAPLAIN ASSISTANTS on your staff:

Number of ACTIVE DUTY MEMBERS you CURRENTLY SUPERVISE (all those in your reporting chain):

Number of RESERVISTS (Chaplains and Chaplain Assistants) you CURRENTLY SUPERVISE (all those in your reporting chain):
Number of PAID CIVILIANS (including contractors) you CURRENTLY SUPERVISE (all those in your reporting chain):

* CURRENT POSITION:

SECTION 2: Professional Information

Number of ASSIGNMENTS (including this assignment) you have served as a WING/INSTALLATION CHAPLAIN:

Number of TOTAL YEARS (including this year) you have served as a WING/INSTALLATION CHAPLAIN:

Level of assignment IMMEDIATELY PRIOR to your CURRENT job:

Position held IMMEDIATELY PRIOR to your CURRENT JOB:

On average, number of WEEKENDS PER MONTH you preach or lead worship in your chapel:

CHAPEL INFORMATION:

(NOTE: Use NUMBERS only, as the system will NOT accept other characters such as dollar signs or commas.)

CHAPLAIN-LED WORSHIP
ATTENDANCE (WEEKLY)
RELIGIOUS EDUCATION ATTENDANCE (WEEKLY)
ANNUAL APPROPRIATED BUDGET (IN DOLLARS)
ANNUAL CTOF BUDGET (IN DOLLARS)

SECTION 2: Professional Information

How PREPARED did you feel for your CURRENT JOB as a WING/INSTALLATION CHAPLAIN?

- Highly Unprepared
- Unprepared
- Somewhat Prepared
- Prepared
- Highly Prepared

How would you rate your CURRENT level of PERFORMANCE as a WING/INSTALLATION CHAPLAIN?

- Poor
- Marginal
- Satisfactory
- Excellent
- Outstanding
**How PROFESSIONALLY SATISFIED are YOU in your CURRENT JOB as a WING/INSTALLATION CHAPLAIN?**

- Highly Dissatisfied
- Dissatisfied
- Somewhat Satisfied
- Satisfied
- Highly Satisfied

**SECTION 3: Open-Ended Questions**

**Describe what you LIKE MOST about being a WING/INSTALLATION CHAPLAIN.**

**Describe what you LIKE LEAST about being a WING/INSTALLATION CHAPLAIN.**

**Describe your GREATEST CHALLENGE as a WING/INSTALLATION CHAPLAIN.**

**Discuss which of your EDUCATIONAL EXPERIENCES prepared you most to serve as a WING/INSTALLATION CHAPLAIN.**

**Discuss which of your PREVIOUS ASSIGNMENTS prepared you most to serve as a WING/INSTALLATION CHAPLAIN.**

**SECTION 3: Open-Ended Questions**

**Do you want to serve as a WING/INSTALLATION CHAPLAIN again? Why?**

**What CHANGES should be made to the way WING/INSTALLATION CHAPLAINS are PREPARED for their jobs?**

**What ADVICE would you give to a NEW WING/INSTALLATION CHAPLAIN?**

**Please provide any ADDITIONAL COMMENTS you have regarding WING/INSTALLATION CHAPLAIN LEADERSHIP.**
* Click here to complete this survey

☐ End Survey

SECTION 2: Professional Information

Based on YOUR most recent experience, how PREPARED are WING/INSTALLATION CHAPLAINS for their jobs?

☐ Highly Unprepared  ☐ Unprepared  ☐ Somewhat Prepared  ☐ Prepared  ☐ Highly Prepared

Based on your most recent experience, how well do WING/INSTALLATION CHAPLAINS PERFORM their jobs?

☐ Poor  ☐ Marginal  ☐ Satisfactory  ☐ Excellent  ☐ Outstanding

How PROFESSIONALLY SATISFIED are YOU in your CURRENT JOB?

☐ Highly Dissatisfied  ☐ Dissatisfied  ☐ Somewhat Satisfied  ☐ Satisfied  ☐ Highly Satisfied

SECTION 3: Open-Ended Questions

Describe from your experience what WING/INSTALLATION CHAPLAINS have DONE WELL in their leadership roles.

Describe from your experience what WING/INSTALLATION CHAPLAINS could DO BETTER in their leadership roles.

Describe the GREATEST CHALLENGE faced by a WING/INSTALLATION CHAPLAIN.

What CHANGES should be made to the way WING/INSTALLATION CHAPLAINS are PREPARED for their jobs?

What ADVICE would you give to a NEW WING/INSTALLATION CHAPLAIN?

Please provide any ADDITIONAL COMMENTS you have regarding WING/INSTALLATION CHAPLAIN LEADERSHIP.

Thank you!
APPENDIX 5

RANK ORDER (BY MEAN) OF 72 WING CHAPLAIN LEADERSHIP COMPETENCIES
Table A1. Rank order (by mean) of 72 wing chaplain leadership competencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Competency (by competency number)</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23. Has a clear vision for the chapel team</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Models Air Force core values</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Communicates vision to chapel team and worshipping community</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Provides sound advice to wing leadership</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Proactively involved with wing leadership</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71. Gives clear, concise directions</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. An example others would like to follow</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Effective Officer Performance Report writer</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70. Leads with calm in times of crisis</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. Builds and maintains staff morale</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69. Makes effective, timely decisions.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Meets suspenses as assigned by wing leadership and higher headquarters</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Leads as a primary means of serving others</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Balances the needs of people and mission</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. More concerned with others than himself/herself</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66. Empowers chapel staff and volunteers to accomplish assigned responsibility</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Conducts meaningful performance evaluations with appropriate rewards/corrective action</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Effective Enlisted Performance Report (EPR) writer</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. Holds chapel staff and volunteers accountable for assigned responsibilities</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A1—Continued. Rank order (by mean) of 72 wing chaplain leadership competencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Competency (by competency number)</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47. Organizes chapel staff to make wisest use of the motivation and abilities of assigned personnel</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Leads as an act of stewardship to God and Country</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Practices the spiritual disciplines (prayer, Scripture study, etc.)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65. Delegates authority and responsibility to chapel staff and volunteers</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Highly visible around the wing</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Leads as a primary means of glorifying God</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Actively prays for the wing, its mission, and its people</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. Helps staff develop and achieve personal/professional goals to advance their careers</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Ensures local policies and procedures are consistent with Air Force standards</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Identifies/prioritizes key programs to accomplish the mission</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Clearly understands career issues unique to enlisted members (enlisted force structure, promotion system, documenting career field/upgrade training, etc.)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Sets and maintains high expectations for individual and team performance</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. Encourages chapel congregational members to take ownership of the chapel mission</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. Applies conflict management skills to resolve differences as soon as possible</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Administers corrective actions and military discipline to maintain standards</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Competency (by competency number)</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Self-starter who gets things done</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Leads staff in developing measurable goals and objectives</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Models life-changing faith and spiritual passion</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Implements strategic planning processes in leading chapel team</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Encourages creativity, innovation, and risk taking to meet base needs</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. Expects chapel volunteers to take responsibility for their share of the ministry</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68. Plans and initiates effective change process affecting the chapel community</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Takes appropriate risks to accomplish the mission</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Budgets and develops financial plans for appropriated funds</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Adjusts plans and takes corrective actions to keep projects on track</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Understands and skillfully employs Air Force manpower standards</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Proactively involved with higher headquarters</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Balances parish ministry and industrial ministry involvement in planning ministry</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Encourages continuous improvement to meet base needs</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Prepares budgets to meet needs identified in ministry planning process</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Conducts needs assessments to determine chapel action plan</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Leads from the perspective of the wing’s senior pastor</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A1—Continued. Rank order (by mean) of 72 wing chaplain leadership competencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Competency (by competency number)</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>72. Develops written readiness and contingency support plans</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Consistently models Religious Support Team (RST) concept with Superintendent/NCOIC</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Ensures written job descriptions accurately reflect duties of assigned personnel</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Plans and prioritizes effective use of CIVILIAN personnel</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Understands and applies Air Force contracting procedures to meet mission</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Plans and prioritizes effective use of RESERVE personnel</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Involves staff in developing a written mission statement</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Budgets and develops financial plans for Chapel Tithes and Offering Funds (CTOF)</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Competent counselor</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Models high physical fitness standards</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Evaluates ministry needs using DGM processes</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Encourages chapel community to meet base needs before their own</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. Provides training for chapel volunteers to accomplish assigned responsibilities</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Determines ministry plan using DGM processes</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Monitors progress of ministry plan using DGM processes</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. Administers a leadership training program for chapel volunteers</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Proactively involved with wing Integrated Delivery System (IDS)/Community Action Information Board (CAIB)</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A1—Continued. Rank order (by mean) of 72 wing chaplain leadership competencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Competency (by competency number)</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. Competent preacher</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Competent worship leader/ liturgist</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Serves regularly as preacher/ worship leader in chapel</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Carries fair share of the counseling load</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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