

ADA 071667

LEVEL II

2

System Development Corporation

FINAL REPORT

TASK ORDER EG-12

RESULTS OF AN ASSESSMENT OF THE NAVY LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT EDUCATION AND TRAINING (LMET) PROSPECTIVE COMMANDING OFFICER/PROSPECTIVE EXECUTIVE OFFICER (PCO/PXO) COURSE

DDC FILE COPY.

JUL 25 1979

MARGARET E. MINTON
KATHERINE J. SAAD
GLORIA L. GRACE

PREPARED FOR:
HEAD, HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT
AND PERSONAL AFFAIRS DEPARTMENT
[COMNAVMIIPERSCOM (N-6)] U.S. NAVY

Approved for public release
Distribution unlimited

4 JUNE 1978

TM(L)-6755/000/00

79 07 2 124

FINAL REPORT

TASK ORDER EG-12

**RESULTS OF AN ASSESSMENT OF THE
NAVY LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT EDUCATION
AND TRAINING (LMET) PROSPECTIVE COMMANDING
OFFICER/PROSPECTIVE EXECUTIVE OFFICER
(PCO/PXO) COURSE**

**MARGARET E. MINTON
KATHERINE J. SAAD
GLORIA L. GRACE**

**PREPARED FOR:
HEAD, HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT
AND PERSONAL AFFAIRS DEPARTMENT
(COMNAVMILPERSCOM (N-6)) U.S. NAVY**

4 JUNE 1979

TM-(L)-8755/000/00

Unclassified

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER SDC-TM-RL-6755/000/00/2	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) Results of an Assessment of the Navy Leadership and Management Education and Training (LMET) Prospective Commanding Officer/Prospective Executive Officer (PCO/PXO) Course		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Final Report
7. AUTHOR(s) Margaret E. Minton, Katherine J. Saad Gloria L. Grace		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS System Development Corporation 2400 Colorado Avenue Santa Monica, California 90406		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s) N00600-78-D-0651
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS Human Resource Management and Personal Affairs Department [COMNAVJILPERSCOM (N-6)] Department of the Navy, Washington, D.C. 20370		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS Task Order EG-12
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office) 12) 99 p		13. REPORT DATE 4 Jun 1979
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release; Distribution unlimited.		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)		15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Leadership Assessment Management Evaluation Competency-based training		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) This report presents results of an assessment of the Leadership and Management Education and Training (LMET) PCO/XO (LPO) course held at the Naval Amphibious Base, Coronado, California from 7 to 18 May 1979. This course was designed to increase the effectiveness of Commanding Officers and Executive Officers by providing them in these billets. Additional objectives of this course was to promote standardized and consistent application of the leadership and management policies as set forth by the CNO. Three Navy		

over

Unclassified

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Data Entered)

Instructors conducted the course that was assessed and 22 officers, ranging in rank from Lieutenant to Captain, participated as students in this course.

The objectives of this assessment were: (1) To perform an on-site evaluation of the delivery of the course. Of specific concern was the ability and proficiency of Navy instructors to teach the course effectively and in compliance with course objectives. (2) To review instructor guides and student journals. Emphasis was to be on the adequacy of materials as they affect delivery. Also any local or program sponsor modifications made in the delivery since the initial course offering were to be evaluated. (3) To provide specific recommendations for management decisions concerning the assignment of Navy instructors to deliver the PCO/PXO course. ←

This assessment utilized an analysis design based on comparisons across units of instruction and across time. The adequacy of the course materials was assessed during and after the course from the student's perspective. Variables measured included: knowledge and skill acquisition, knowledge and skill usefulness, course objectives, course content and process, course materials, instructor effectiveness, and effectiveness of instructional methods.

Student perceptions and evaluations were obtained using assessment instruments designed for administration at the end of each unit and near the end of each week. On-site observations were also made throughout the course. These findings were amalgamated with results of the analysis of assessment instrument data to provide the basis for conclusions and recommendations presented in this report.

Ten conclusions were drawn regarding the ability and proficiency of the Navy instructors to teach the course effectively. Six conclusions were drawn concerning the evaluation of the course materials and modifications as they affected course delivery. Due to insufficient data, only one general conclusion was drawn with respect to the third evaluation objective which was concerned with the assignment of Navy instructors to deliver the PCO/PXO course. Based upon these conclusions, eight recommendations were made concerning improvements for the PCO/PXO course.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Paragraph</u>		<u>Page</u>
<u>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</u>		
	Introduction.....	1
	Objectives.....	1
	Approach.....	2
	Conclusions.....	3
	Recommendations.....	5
<u>SECTION 1 - STATEMENT OF OBJECTIVES</u>		
1.1	Introduction.....	1-1
1.2	Evaluation Objectives.....	1-1
1.3	Background Information.....	1-2
<u>SECTION 2 - EVALUATION PROCEDURE</u>		
2.1	Introduction.....	2-1
2.2	Evaluation Design.....	2-1
2.3	Variables Measured.....	2-1
2.4	Data Collection Procedures.....	2-2
2.5	Nature of Sample.....	2-4
2.6	Statistical Analysis.....	2-5
<u>SECTION 3 - RESULTS</u>		
3.1	Introduction.....	3-1
3.2	Assessment Instrument Results.....	3-1
3.2.1	Findings by Instructional Unit.....	3-1
3.2.1.1	Comparative Items.....	3-1
3.2.1.2	Individual Units.....	3-5
	Unit 1.....	3-5
	Unit 2.....	3-7
	Unit 3.....	3-9
	Unit 4.....	3-11
	Unit 5.....	3-13
	Unit 6.....	3-15
	Unit 7.....	3-17
	Unit 8.....	3-18
	Unit 9.....	3-21
3.2.2	Findings Across Weeks.....	3-25
3.3	Observer Findings.....	3-28
3.3.1	General Findings.....	3-28
3.3.1.1	Instructor Capabilities.....	3-28
3.3.1.2	Classroom Climate.....	3-30
3.3.1.3	Course Objectives.....	3-32
3.3.1.4	Course Materials.....	3-36

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONTINUED)

<u>Paragraph</u>		<u>Page</u>
3.3.2	Findings by Instructional Unit.....	3-37
	Unit 1.....	3-37
	Unit 2.....	3-38
	Unit 3.....	3-41
	Unit 4.....	3-41
	Unit 5.....	3-44
	Unit 6.....	3-44
	Unit 7.....	3-46
	Unit 8.....	3-47
	Unit 9.....	3-49

SECTION 4 - INTERPRETATION OF RESULTS

4.1	Introduction.....	4-1
4.2	Discussion.....	4-1
4.2.1	Course Delivery.....	4-1
4.2.2	Course Materials.....	4-3
4.2.3	Instructor Assignment.....	4-4

SECTION 5 - CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1	Introduction.....	5-1
5.2	Conclusions.....	5-1
5.3	Recommendations.....	5-4
	Appendix A.....	A-1
	Appendix B.....	B-1

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

This report presents results of an assessment of the Leadership and Management Education and Training (LMET) Prospective Commanding Officer/Prospective Executive Officer (PCO/PXO) course held at the Naval Amphibious Base, Coronado, California, from 7 to 18 May 1979. This assessment was conducted by System Development Corporation (SDC) for the Human Resource Management and Personal Affairs Department (NMPC-6C) under Task EG-12 on Contract N00600-78-D-0651. The LMET PCO/PXO course was designed to increase the effectiveness of Commanding Officers and Executive Officers by providing them with competency skills found to be associated with superior performance in these billets. An additional goal of the course was to promote standardized and consistent application of the leadership and management policies as set forth by the CNO. Three Navy instructors conducted the course that was assessed. Twenty-two officers, ranging in rank from Lieutenant to Captain, participated as students in this course. All were men, and with the exception of one black officer, all were white. Career fields varied, and approximately half of the participants were to be stationed on ships out of West coast ports.

OBJECTIVES

The objectives of this assessment as specified in the Task Order were:

- To perform an on-site evaluation of the delivery of the course. Of specific concern are the ability and proficiency of Navy instructors to effectively teach/deliver the course in compliance with course objectives.

- To review instructor guides and student journals. Emphasis should be on the adequacy of materials as they affect delivery, and also to evaluate any local or program sponsor modifications made in the delivery since the initial offering of the course.
- To provide specific recommendations for management decisions concerning the assignment of Navy instructors to deliver the PCO/PXO course.

APPROACH

The LMET PCO/PXO course design was based on results of research on the competencies of superior and average Naval personnel. The curriculum of the assessed course is a two-week training program and consists of nine blocks of instruction. The first is an introduction to the course, and the following five blocks each deal with a specific competency. These are followed by an integration and competency application unit, a block on Human Resource Management issues, and a final command case and course conclusion block.

This assessment of the LMET PCO/PXO course delivery and instructional materials utilized an analysis design based on comparisons across units of instruction and across time. The adequacy of the instructional materials was assessed during and after the course from the student's perspective. Variables measured in this assessment included: knowledge and skill acquisition, knowledge and skill usefulness, course objectives, course content and process, course materials, instructor effectiveness, and effectiveness of instructional methods.

Student perceptions and evaluations were obtained using assessment instruments designed for administration at the end of each unit of instruction and near the end of each week. The data were analyzed and results were interpreted. On-site observations were also made throughout the course. Results of the assessment instrument data and observer findings are discussed separately in this report but were amalgamated to provide the basis for conclusions and recommendations presented below.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the results and findings obtained in this assessment of the LMET PCO/PXO course, the following conclusions were drawn with respect to the ability and proficiency of Navy instructors:

- The PCO/PXO course participants appeared to enjoy the training and considered it to be useful. Most of the participants expressed an awareness of a personal need for this type of education.
- With a few exceptions, the Navy instructors were found to be effective in presenting course material through lectures and group exercises. Delivery was most effective during lessons in which a summarizing/ processing discussion was held.
- In most cases, the Navy instructors were extremely effective at facilitating group processes. All demonstrated a high level of skill in involving participants in discussions, as well as outstanding perception and insight. Occasionally discussions were not directed to the appropriate subject area.
- Classroom atmosphere in general was very open and non-threatening; however, participant interaction indicated a less than ideal climate existed in the classroom.
- Specific enabling objectives for each unit of instruction were not discussed in the classroom.
- With some exceptions, the instructional methods used in the PCO/PXO course were found to be effective, and the balance between the various types of scheduled activities appeared to be appropriate and comfortable for both participants and instructors.

- The PCO/PXO course content and process were found to be oriented toward the acquisition of knowledge. For the most part, the development and improvement of subcompetency skills was given inadequate attention both in the curriculum and in the course delivery.
- Participants' knowledge acquisition level appeared to range from very good to excellent. The amount learned seemed to be greater for those topics for which fewer theoretical concepts were presented and more summarizing/processing discussions were held.
- The level of participants' skill acquisition appeared to range from very poor to adequate. Students seemed to develop or improve skills to a greater degree during the units such as the advising and counseling unit which included skill practice activities which were expressly designed for the particular subcompetency area and during which the focus was properly maintained.
- All the examples used in the classroom and the large group discussions led by instructors were relevant to the Navy and to the specific job responsibilities of a CO or XO.

Conclusions related to the adequacy of course materials as they affected delivery, and modifications made in the curriculum were:

- Participants appeared to gain a great deal from the lecture notes, instructions, readings, and worksheets in the Student Journal. The goals of the LMET program and the overall PCO/PXO course goals were printed in the Student Journal, but the enabling objectives specific to each unit of instruction were omitted.
- Participants seemed to benefit from and enjoy the self-assessment instruments. Although none of the instruments were given thorough interpretations, most were introduced and explained adequately for the purposes of this course.

- A large part of the course material was relevant to the Navy and to the job responsibilities of a CO or XO. Exceptions included many of the homework reading assignments, which were generally academic in nature, and three civilian-produced films. The PCO/PXO course participants did not seem to have difficulty with the readings; however, differences between the situations shown in the films and typical Navy situations appeared to be important to the students. Posted charts outlining course material were apparently very effective.
- Student progress in the PCO/PXO course was not evaluated and no tests were given.
- No Instructor Guide in any form was available for the PCO/PXO course.
- The PCO/PXO course curriculum was modified in Coronado shortly before this course was delivered. There was no evidence that standardization of the course had been assured.

Concerning recommendations for management decisions regarding the assignment of Navy instructors to deliver the PCO/PXO course, data collected from only one PCO/PXO course is not sufficient for making an adequate determination. However, based on available data, it was concluded that a variety of variables are crucial to effective instructor performance. Findings from the course tentatively suggest that factors other than past performance as a commanding officer are important.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the above conclusions, the following recommendations are made:

- The PCO/PXO course curriculum should be standardized and this course should be made available to all commanding officers and executive officers in the Navy.

- Navy instructors should receive additional training in order to improve their skills in group management and their ability to create a favorable atmosphere for participant interaction. Consideration should be given to increasing the emphasis on group management skills in the LMET-I course.
- Participants should be informed of the enabling objectives specific to each unit of instruction in the PCO/PXO course and the objectives should be discussed in the classroom. Objectives should be written to conform to the goal setting criteria taught in the LMET courses.
- Group exercises, case studies, and other learning activities should be examined for pertinence to the competency and particular subskills being covered. Activities which provide general knowledge or behavior practice should be replaced with activities which allow specific skill use and development as well as individual performance feedback.
- The content of the PCO/PXO course should be compared with the course objectives. The curriculum should be modified in order to improve congruence of the course content and process with the PCO/PXO course objectives. It is recommended that information concerning competency-based research be covered with more clarity and thoroughness and that more emphasis be placed on practicing subcompetency skills in situations similar to those found on the job.
- Considerations should be given to the possibility of developing Navy learning aids which present content that is similar to that in the civilian-produced films but which is in a context relevant to the Navy. The lessons on organizational climate and performance counseling, among others, could be improved if the Harvard Business School film and "The Dryden File" film were replaced with new Navy learning aids on the same topics.

- Enabling objectives should be included in the Student Journal for each unit of instruction.
- A formal Instructor Guide should be written and used in all iterations of the PCO/PXO course.

SECTION 1 - STATEMENT OF OBJECTIVES

1.1 INTRODUCTION

This report presents findings from the on-site evaluation of the Leadership and Management Education and Training (LMET) course for Prospective Commanding Officers and Prospective Executive Officers (PCOs/PXOs). This LMET PCO/PXO course was held at the Naval Amphibious Base, Coronado, California, from 7 to 18 May 1979. System Development Corporation (SDC) conducted this evaluation for the Human Resource Management and Personal Affairs Department (NMPC-6C) under Task EG-12 on Contract N00600-78-D-0651. Contained in this report is a description of the course evaluation procedures, results of the assessment instrument data, observation results, interpretation of the findings, and conclusions and recommendations concerning the course.

1.2 EVALUATION OBJECTIVES

As specified in Task Order EG-12, the objectives of this assessment task are as follows:

- (1) To perform an on-site evaluation of the delivery of the course. Of specific concern are the ability and proficiency of Navy instructors to effectively teach/deliver the course in compliance with course objectives.
- (2) To review instructor guides and student journals. Emphasis should be on the adequacy of materials as they affect delivery, and also to evaluate any local or program sponsor modifications made in the delivery since the initial offering of the course.
- (3) To provide specific recommendations for management decisions concerning the assignment of Navy instructors to deliver the PCO/PXO course.

1.3 BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The LMET courses were developed by McBer and Company with the objectives of increasing awareness and building skills necessary to superior job performance. Extensive research was conducted in order to identify the leadership and management competencies of successful Naval personnel at various billet and rank levels. Five general competencies were determined to differentiate between superior and average performers in the Navy.

Twenty subcompetencies deemed important to the success of COs and XO's were included in the curriculum of the two-week PCO/PXO course. These subcompetencies were covered in nine blocks of instruction divided by subject matter. The first of these is an introductory block. This is followed by a block on each of the five general competencies,¹ an integration and competency application block, a block on Human Resource Management (HRM) issues, and a final block consisting of a case study and course conclusion.

¹Competencies identified to differentiate between superior and average Naval personnel are:

1. Concern for efficiency and effectiveness
2. Process management
3. Skillful use of influence
4. Problem solving
5. Advising and counseling

SECTION 2 - EVALUATION PROCEDURE

2.1 INTRODUCTION

The procedure used in the evaluation of the LMET PCO/PXO course is presented in this section. The evaluation design is described, and a description of the variables measured and the data collection procedures is included. Also, the research sample is described and the statistical analysis procedures are discussed.

2.2 EVALUATION DESIGN

The LMET PCO/PXO course evaluation utilized an analysis design based on comparisons across units of instruction and cumulative assessments across time. The adequacy of the course materials was assessed from the user's point of view during the course and again following course completion.

2.3 VARIABLES MEASURED

The effectiveness of the LMET PCO/PXO course was evaluated by examining perceptions and forming assessments related to the following variables:

1. Knowledge and skill acquisition
2. Knowledge and skill usefulness
3. Course objectives
4. Course content and process
5. Course materials

6. Instructor effectiveness
7. Effectiveness of instructional methods

2.4 DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES

Two types of assessment instruments were used to solicit the students' perceptions and evaluations of the course. These instruments consisted of items to be answered on five-point Likert-type scales, as well as open-ended questions. The SDC observer administered these questionnaires and explained their purpose to the participants. It was emphasized that individual responses were to be seen by SDC personnel only, and participants were encouraged to be candid and thorough in their assessments.

Nine end-of-unit¹ questionnaires were administered in order to collect data specific to each of the instructional blocks. Following the final lesson in each unit, the appropriate questionnaire was administered to the students who completed it in the classroom and returned it to the SDC assessor. Questions common to all these instruments concerned the appropriateness of the length of the unit and the amount learned about the general subject covered. Instruments assessing the five specific competency units included an item concerning the potential application of the skills. Questions which were specific to each unit concerned perceptions about: amount learned and the usefulness on the job of each of the knowledge areas covered, amount of leadership and management skills learned from each activity, usefulness on the job of these skills, amount of emphasis placed on each subcompetency during the unit, and the job-usefulness of this skill. Students were also asked to write comments or suggestions about each instructional unit.

¹"Blocks" of instruction were also designated as "units" for assessment purposes in order to conform with nomenclature used in other two-week billet-specific LMET courses.

A course overview questionnaire was administered to the participants near the end of each week of the course. This instrument contained general questions about the course overall and was designed to provide cumulative assessment data. Items on this questionnaire concerned course effectiveness, course objectives, personal expectations, learning from participant interactions, general attitude, and effectiveness of the instructors and the instructional methods. Comments and suggestions were also solicited on this questionnaire.

Subjective assessments of the course content, delivery, and materials were made by the SDC observer who was present in the classroom during the entire course. This evaluation was based on direct observations of the instructors' performance, student participation, instructor interactions with participants, and participant interactions with one another. Information on the course process was documented closely. The time, instructional unit, topic, type of learning activity, quality of presentation, degree of fit with LMET objectives, participants' responses and apparent attitudes, and other general observations were noted for each lesson. The appropriate sections of the Student Journal and all handouts were studied as each lesson was presented, and an assessment was made as to the adequacy of these materials for the course and their benefit to the user. A closer examination of the course materials was also conducted following the PCO/PXO course. Information of significance needed to support the objective evaluation data was also collected during many informal conversations between the observer and the participants and instructors.

Variables measured by each data source are presented in Table 2-1. Results of the measured data are described and discussed in Section 3 of this report. Section 3 also contains a presentation of the observer's findings.

Table 2-1. Variables Measured by Data Source.

Evaluation Variables	End-of-Unit Questionnaire	Course Overview Questionnaire	Observer Assessments
Knowledge and Skill Acquisition	✓	✓	✓
Knowledge and Skill Usefulness	✓		✓
Course Objectives		✓	✓
Course Content/ Process	✓	✓	✓
Course Materials			✓
Instructor Effectiveness		✓	✓
Instructional Method Effectiveness		✓	✓

2.5 NATURE OF SAMPLE

Twenty-two officers participated in the LMET PCO/PXO class. All the students were men, and with the exception of one black officer, all were white. The student body was made up of three Captains, eleven Commanders, seven Lieutenant Commanders, and one Lieutenant. Three of the students were Medical Corps officers. The participants' previous duty stations varied widely, but approximately half were under orders to a ship. Eleven of the students were

to be Commanding Officers (COs) of their new units; nine were assigned as Executive Officers (XOs); and two were to be Officers-in-Charge (OINCs). Most of the officers in the class were enroute their new command under Permanent Change of Station (PCS) orders, and the majority of these were West coast commands.

2.6 STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

The questionnaire data were analyzed manually at SDC immediately following the conclusion of the course. Mean responses were computed for each of the questionnaire items which were answered on a numerical scale. Comments and suggestions were grouped for summarized reporting, and representative or unusual comments were selected for reference in this report.

SECTION 3 - RESULTS

3.1 INTRODUCTION

The findings of this evaluation are presented and discussed in this section. Results from the analysis of assessment instrument data are described, and observation findings are discussed.

3.2 ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT RESULTS

Participants' perceptions and evaluations were collected through the use of two types of assessment questionnaires. Findings from the instruments administered at the conclusion of each unit of instruction are presented, followed by the results from the measurements across time.

3.2.1 FINDINGS BY INSTRUCTIONAL UNIT

Nine blocks or units of instruction were given in the LMET PCO/PXO course and an individual assessment instrument was designed for each of these units. These questionnaires were administered immediately upon conclusion of the unit or prior to the beginning of the next unit. Responses to the questions which were repeated at the end of every unit are described as comparative items. Answers to those questions unique to the unit concerning objectives, content, and process are presented by individual unit.

3.2.1.1 Comparative Items

Three general questions applicable to nearly every unit were asked on most of the end-of-unit assessment instruments. Mean responses to those items are displayed in Table 3-1. The relationship of course weeks, dates, and units is shown in Table 3-2.

Table 3-1. Participant Perceptions of Course Units.
(Means)

Question	Unit of Instruction								
	1: Introduction	2: Concern for Efficiency and Effectiveness	3: Process Management	4: Skillful Use of Influence	5: Problem Solving	6: Advising and Counseling	7: Integration and Competency Application	8: Human Resource Management	9: Command Cases and Course Conclusion
* In your opinion, how appropriate was the length of the unit?	3.90	3.55	3.14	3.18	2.82	3.09	3.32	3.10	2.85
* How much did this unit teach you about this specific competency (your job as a CO/AS)?	**	3.65	2.86	1.86	3.05	3.82	3.36	3.14	3.25
* Above what percentage of the teaching objectives were specific competencies taught in this course do you expect you will use during the next 12 to 24 three months on the job?	**	472*	372*	562*	482*	522*	472*	**	**

* Mean percentage
** Not applicable

Table 3-2. Relationship of Course Weeks, Dates, and Units.

Week	Date	Unit of Instruction
1	7 May 1979	Introduction
	8 May 1979	Concern for Efficiency and Effectiveness
	9 May 1979	
	10 May 1979	Process Management
	11 May 1979	Skillful Use of Influence
2	14 May 1979	Problem Solving
		Advising and Counseling
	15 May 1979	Integration and Competency Application
	16 May 1979	Human Resource Management Issues
	17 May 1979	Command Cases and Course Conclusion
	18 May 1979	

The first question on each of the instruments concerned the appropriateness of the length of time spent on the unit. A response of one to this question indicates the unit was felt to be too short; five, too long; and three, about right in length. The course participants judged the 4.7-hour introductory unit as quite long, and the 2.5-day unit on efficiency and effectiveness and the 3.5-hour unit on integration and competency application both as somewhat too long. With the exception of the 4.2-hour problem solving unit, which was considered slightly too short, the students rated the other units about right in length.

Another question asked on all questionnaires except the first end-of-unit instrument concerned the amount taught by the unit about the subject area. For the second through the sixth units, this item concerned the specific CO/XO competencies. A response of one on these questions indicates that little or nothing was perceived to have been taught; five, a great deal; and three, an average amount. Participants felt they had been taught more about the skillful use of influence and about advising and counseling than the other subject areas. They judged the amount taught in these units as quite large. Other moderately high ratings on amount taught were assigned to efficiency and effectiveness in the second block of instruction, and to relating competencies to CO/XO job functions taught both in the integration and competency application unit and in the command cases and course conclusion unit. Slightly lower estimates were made concerning the amount taught about HRM, problem solving, and process management. Participants felt they had been taught only a moderate amount about each of these subjects.

Following six of the units of instruction, participants were asked to estimate the percentage of what they had been taught they would use during the next (or first) two to three weeks on the job. Tabled responses to this item are in mean percentages. Although the skillful use of influence unit and the advising and counseling unit received the most favorable responses on this item, students felt they would use only slightly more than half of the techniques for both competencies when they began working in their new position. Following the integration and competency application unit, participants estimated that they would use slightly less than half of the techniques they were taught for relating competencies to job functions. The techniques judged to be the least applicable were those taught in the process management unit. Students felt they would use only a little more than one-third of these techniques on the job.

3.2.1.2 Individual Units

Unit 1: Introduction (7 May 1979). Participants' responses to questionnaire items specific to the introductory unit are presented in Table B-1.¹ Participants rated knowledge areas covered as groundwork for the LMET PÇO/PXO course on the amount learned and the helpfulness in course preparation. For amount learned, a response of five indicates a great deal learned; for helpfulness, five indicates a great deal of help. On both scales one represents the least positive response, and three, a moderate response. Responses pertaining to the amount learned ranged from a moderately small amount learned about the reasons for change from Leadership and Management Training (LMT) to LMET (Mn = 2.14) to more than a moderate amount learned about learning styles (Mn = 3.64). Participants perceived somewhat less than a moderate amount of learning in the competency-based research area (Mn = 2.36) and slightly less than a moderate amount about LMET course training objectives (Mn = 2.91). Participants' perceptions of the helpfulness of these knowledge areas in course preparation followed the same pattern of responses as for amount learned. Information on the reasons for change from LMT to LMET was considered the least helpful, substantially less than moderate (Mn = 1.86), and the knowledge of learning styles was perceived as the most helpful (Mn = 3.68). Competency-based research and LMET course training objectives were rated closer to the mid-point on helpfulness (Mn = 2.59 and 3.05, respectively).

Participants were also asked two open-ended questions at the end of the introductory unit. The first pertained to why they were attending the course. They were asked if they had volunteered for the course, and if so, why. They were also asked how much they had wanted to attend. The majority of the participants (82%) stated that they had been ordered or required to attend. Over a third of these (39%) made no further comment; 44 percent

¹All remaining tabled data from the end-of-unit questionnaires are presented in Appendix B of this report. Tables are numbered in the order in which they are described in this section.

wanted to attend; and one out of six (17%) wrote they had not wanted to attend. Those who stated they had wanted to attend gave several reasons. One had sent two petty officers to a LMET course who had returned with positive attitudes. Another had attended a three-day "executive overview seminar" at Pearl Harbor and had developed an interest in attending a more formal and expanded course. Other explanations had to do with general positive expectations about benefits to be gained from this type of training. The few reasons given by those not wanting to attend the course included personal concerns connected with the PCS move, and a reservation on the part of one officer who had attended a shore command PCO course sponsored by the Bureau of Naval Personnel (BUPERS) and felt that this course may be redundant and a waste of time. This student continued by writing that after hearing the content of the LMET course, however, he realized it would not be a duplication for him. The four participants who volunteered to attend the class all gave their reasons for doing so. Two officers felt a need to "catch up on the latest buzz words." One of these also mentioned hearing "rave reviews from other PCOs." Another participant wrote that he was going to be faced with a leadership situation and wanted to take every available measure to prepare himself. The fourth said he had been in the Navy ten years and had never had any management training.

The second question asked participants to make comments or suggestions about the unit. All but four participants responded to this item and comments pertained to many areas. Several of the participants made comments about the participant and instructor introductions. One participant felt it was "superb" and another stated it was well worth the time. About twice as many felt it was too long and not productive. They felt it was necessary and interesting to know the many diversified backgrounds of the course participants; however, two participants suggested that this be included in the "welcome aboard" letter. Four students made comments pertaining to the presentation on the history of the course. They all felt it was unnecessary and of little interest. One student thought the organization of LMET should have been given later in the program. Other participants agreed about the need for restructuring. One wrote that he "never found out what LMT was so I was oblivious to all the LMT/LMET conversion". Another commented, "LMT

history and organization is trivial. Tell me how to get quotas. Be specific. Didn't know what the schools were and I was briefed on locations!" Two participants commented on the lesson on learning styles. One person felt it could have been expanded and suggested the possibility of using a guest lecturer. The second said he could see no use for the Learning Style Inventory. Several other general comments were made. One officer suggested that there be fewer breaks, and another of the participants more junior in rank mentioned that the formality/informality of exchanges with superiors was not addressed. It was suggested that a large screen be used to project the videotape picture because the TVs were too small and of poor quality. One student appeared very optimistic: "I think this will be an informative course of instruction especially in that HRM training is perhaps coming of age and may start becoming a management assistance vice hindrance as it was largely in the past." Several of the participants wrote remarks about the instructors. Three of these concerned a particular instructor who they considered inadequate in his knowledge and delivery of the material. Another officer wrote that it "seems that instructors are trying to make presentations much longer than necessary. Asking questions, then writing the answers on the board could insult the intelligence of some people--me for one." Finally, two of the participants commended all the instructors on their knowledge and enthusiasm.

Unit 2: Concern for Efficiency and Effectiveness (7, 8, and 9 May 1979). At the end of Day 3 the second unit of instruction was concluded and the appropriate end-of-unit questionnaire was administered. Mean responses to these items are presented in Tables B-2 through B-4. On this instrument, participants were asked to rate the amount they learned about eight subject areas and the usefulness of the knowledge on their job. As on the first end-of-unit questionnaire, a response of one on the amount learned item indicates a rating of very little learned, and a five indicates a great deal learned. On the usefulness item, a one indicates a rating of not very useful, and a five indicates very useful. On both scales, a three is a mid-range response. Participants' mean responses to these items are shown in Table B-2. The students in this class felt they had learned a moderate amount or more about each knowledge area. More was perceived to have been learned about

motivational styles (Mn = 3.75), three social motives (Mn = 3.55), organizational climate (Mn = 3.50), and motivation theory (Mn = 3.47), than about goal setting criteria (Mn = 3.00). Usefulness ratings were also in the moderately high range. Knowledge about motivational styles was considered to be the most useful (Mn = 3.70), followed by motivation theory (Mn = 3.68). Goal setting criteria and situational leadership, although still judged as useful, were rated the lowest of the areas on this item (Mn = 3.30, for both).

The respondents were also asked how much emphasis was placed on each of five efficiency and effectiveness subcompetencies and how useful the skills would be to them on their job as CO or XO. Anchor points on the emphasis scale are: a great deal of emphasis, 5; medium amount, 3; very little emphasis, 1. Descriptors on the usefulness scale are as previously described. All the subcompetencies of efficiency and effectiveness were considered to be moderately to well emphasized and quite useful on the job. (See Table B-3.) Initiates action was judged to be both the least emphasized (Mn = 3.10) and the least useful on the job (Mn = 3.45). Although demonstrates concern for efficiency and effectiveness was seen as receiving the most emphasis (Mn = 3.85), it was perceived as less useful than coaching subordinates (Mn = 3.80 and 4.00, respectively).

The final category of rating for this unit had to do with the five learning activities used. Each was assessed on the amount learned about leadership and management skills and the usefulness of the skills on the job. (See Table B-3.) On the first item, participants' ratings ranged from a slightly less than medium amount learned from viewing the Target Practice exercise on videotape (Mn = 2.75) to a moderately large amount learned from the Harvard Business School film (Mn = 3.60). Although the usefulness ratings were somewhat lower, they paralleled the amount learned ratings. The skills learned from the Target Practice exercise on videotape were considered only somewhat useful (Mn = 2.45) and those gained from the Harvard Business School film were judged to be of the most use (Mn = 3.30). Ratings were at the midpoint on both scales for the LEAD Instrument (Mn = 3.00, for both amount learned and usefulness).

At the end of the questionnaire participants were given the opportunity to make comments or suggestions regarding the efficiency and effectiveness unit. Five of the participants did so. Of these, three commented favorably on the value of hearing one of the instructors talk about his first-hand experiences. This session was praised on being "moving and very informative." Another wrote that he felt the unit had relied too heavily on case studies and not enough on the actual experience of the officers attending. One participant suggested spending more time discussing the "activity trap" one can get into in the Navy. Another student wrote that this unit was of an "appropriate length, but most of the hard ideas or concepts are still somewhat fuzzy. Hopefully later material or more review or reflection on my part will help bring it together." This concern was also expressed by a participant who complained that he was not being led to "some logical conclusion as to what the correct way or recommended way to do something is." He expressed frustration in that he had put a lot of work into some lessons, such as writing the goal statement, and felt that he had not gotten anything out of it. A final respondent complained that management by objectives, as it can be applied to a ship, was not covered adequately. This officer felt that MBO would not work without several days of intensive managerial training and a total commitment to the system on the part of the higher authorities. He wrote, "Isn't it foolish to think we can effectively use MBO absent support from above, training for subordinates, and time to learn this system?"

Unit 3: Process Management (10 May 1979). Participants' perceptions of the process management unit are presented in Tables B-5 and B-6. The four subcompetencies of process management were assessed by the participants who estimated the amount of emphasis placed on each and the usefulness of each skill on the job. (See Table B-5.) Anchor points for each of the rating scales are identical to those on the second end-of-unit questionnaire. Participants felt that each of the four skills had been emphasized only a moderate amount, and three of these received identically low ratings on this item (Mn = 2.76, for each). The fourth, systematically monitors progress toward the implementation of a plan, was perceived as receiving the most emphasis (Mn = 3.05). Usefulness ratings were slightly higher, although still

moderate. The most useful subcompetency skill was considered to be gives effective performance feedback (Mn = 3.24). Matches job requirements to individual capabilities was felt to be of slightly less use than the others (Mn = 2.95).

The two learning activities included in the unit were rated on amount of skills learned and usefulness of these skills on the job. (See Table B-6.) Participants felt they had learned somewhat less than a moderate amount about leadership and management skills from the monitoring exercise (Mn = 2.62) and slightly more than a moderate amount from the Seabee Work Center (Mn = 3.19). Both activities received slightly lower than moderate ratings on the usefulness item, the Seabee Work Center being perceived as more useful than the monitoring exercise (Mn = 2.76 and 2.62, respectively).

Participants were also asked how easy they felt it would be to apply the process management skills taught in this unit in their future job as CO or XO. A mean rating of 2.90 was obtained, indicating that they felt it would be slightly less than moderately easy to use the skills.

The students were again given the opportunity to make any comments or suggestions pertaining to the unit. Eighteen of the twenty-one officers who answered the questionnaire chose to do so. Several of the comments pertained to the amount of time spent on this competency and its perceived benefits to participants. Examples of these are, "I got very little from this unit. Process management seems like it is an important topic and I think more time should be spent on the subject;" and "The segment will be of limited value to me in my job as XO. It was fun but was not productive time." Many students commented on the two learning activities also. The monitoring exercise was considered by one participant to "more or less formalize what we know and experience daily as a matter of routine. It will be beneficial in that I am now more aware of means of monitoring and the general applicability of each." However, another student felt that this exercise was "either misunderstood or deliberately ignored by most of the participants." Another wrote that it was "not very useful." In assessing the Seabee Work Center exercise, participants' comments were generally unfavorable. Several enjoyed the

activity and the break in the routine, but considered it of little use to them on the job. A few respondents felt they had learned from it, although one of these considered it too time-consuming for this short unit. Suggestions about several subjects were written, such as holding debates on specific topics of concern in order to generate more interest and help the participants with ideas for possible future use. Another was that more emphasis be placed on the management and allocation of competing resources since, as the student put it, "that is going to be one of our most demanding problems." Many comments about the unit overall were received. One student felt that more control was needed in the classroom. He described one activity where he felt they spent "a lot of time discussing trivia (e.g., is INSURV good or bad) vice what makes good monitoring and what doesn't." Another participant's complaint with the course up to this point was that "a lot of philosophy and methods have been presented but I have gained no specific techniques or new ways of doing business." He felt that all that had been accomplished was to put names on the styles used by Naval leaders. Another student expressed this general confusion about process management subcompetencies by his sole comment: "I had a difficult time relating the questions on the survey to what we did."

Unit 4: Skillful Use of Influence (10 and 11 May 1979). Participants' assessments of the fourth unit of instruction are presented in Tables B-7 through B-10. The first question specific to this unit concerned the four skillful use of influence knowledge areas. (See Table B-7.) Participants rated the amount they learned about each subject and the usefulness of this information to them on the job. Response descriptors are the same as on previous questionnaires. Participants felt they had learned a moderately large amount about each of the areas, particularly about rewards and recognition (Mn = 3.95). The information was also considered useful. Knowledge about empowering techniques was rated the highest on usefulness (Mn = 3.67) followed by rewards and recognition (Mn = 3.62). Specific behaviors of influential and noninfluential COs and XO's, although rated in the moderate range, received the lowest ratings on both dimensions (Mn = 3.38 and 3.24, for amount learned and usefulness, respectively).

The four subcompetency skills covered in the unit were rated for amount of emphasis and usefulness on the job. (See Table B-8.) Participants rated only one skill--controls expressions of anger, coercion, and direct advice-giving--as receiving slightly less than a medium amount of emphasis (Mn = 2.76). The remaining three were considered to be emphasized to a greater degree. Participants felt that uses power in a positive fashion was given the most emphasis (Mn = 3.62). All four subcompetencies were considered to be quite useful on the job. Mean responses to this item ranged from 3.62 for controls expressions of anger, coercion, and direct advice-giving, to 3.86 for uses reward and recognition.

Table B-9 presents participants' perceptions of the learning activities used during this unit. The students felt they had learned quite a bit from the "Pygmalion Effect" film (Mn = 3.86), but only moderate amounts from the Seat 12A exercise in empowering others (Mn = 2.90) and the Strength Deployment Inventory (Mn = 3.05). In judging the usefulness of the skills gained, participants still felt very positive about the "Pygmalion Effect" film (Mn = 4.14). Skills learned from the Strength Deployment Inventory, the Seat 12A exercise, and the role plays were considered to be slightly less than moderately useful (Mn = 2.81, 2.86, and 2.95, respectively).

Participants were also asked three questions about their perceptions of their ability to influence others. (See Table B-10.) When asked to compare their ability to influence others before beginning training with their present ability using the techniques learned in the course, participants considered themselves to be somewhat more effective, following this unit, in influencing their subordinates (Mn = 3.33), their peers (Mn = 3.29), and those higher in the chain of command (Mn = 3.33). Participants also felt they had learned more than a moderate amount about the skillful use of influence from the other participants (Mn = 3.57).

Half of the twenty-two participants made comments or suggestions about the unit. They were overwhelmingly positive. It was considered a good unit, worthwhile and fun. Among the things mentioned as enjoyable and beneficial were the active involvement (as opposed to the formal lecture), the lesson on

empowering techniques, the case studies, and the MBO exercise. Students also felt they had learned more about themselves and that the information was readily applicable to their jobs. The suggestions that were offered were an indication of the level of involvement in this unit. Participants recommended that more time be spent on discussions and on the entire unit, and that additional films showing various leadership styles be used "to bring the material home." The only negative comment was written by an officer who felt that "the MBO exercise wasn't worth all the time."

Unit 5: Problem Solving (14 May 1979). Mean responses to items on the questionnaire administered at the end of the unit are displayed in Tables B-11 through B-13. Six subskills were identified for COs and XO's who were competent problem solvers. Participants were asked to rate the amount of emphasis placed on each skill and to judge the usefulness of each. (See Table B-11.) Anchor points on the response scales are the same as on similar items on the other questionnaires. The participants felt that most of the skills had been emphasized less than an average amount. The subcompetency which was considered to be most heavily emphasized was felt to have been given only a little more than a medium amount of emphasis (Mn = 3.23). This skill was selects appropriate action and was under the general area of develops a plan. Another subskill of develops a plan--determines alternatives--was rated slightly above moderate on this scale (Mn = 3.18). Participants felt that the least emphasized skill was effectively delegates responsibility (Mn = 2.50). All six subcompetencies were considered more than moderately useful on the job. Effectively delegates responsibility, although rated above the mid-point, again received the lowest rating (Mn = 3.23), and determines alternatives (as part of develops a plan) was considered the most useful subskill (Mn = 3.64) followed by selects appropriate alternatives (Mn = 3.50).

Two learning activities were used in this unit, and participants were asked to assess the amount they learned about leadership and management skills from each activity and how useful the skills were to be to them on the job. (See Table B-12.) Participants perceived a moderate amount of learning from both the case study and the role play (Mn = 2.95, for both). Skills gained from

the role plays were considered to be moderately useful to a CO or XO (Mn = 3.00), and those learned from the case studies were judged to be slightly more useful (Mn = 3.23).

This unit also covered two techniques of problem solving, and one item on the questionnaire asked the participants to determine the amount they learned about each technique and the usefulness of each in their future jobs. (See Table B-13.) Brainstorming was rated higher than force field analysis on both dimensions. Participants perceived somewhat less than a moderate amount of learning about both (Mn = 2.86 and 2.09, for brainstorming and force field analysis, respectively). In assessing future use of these techniques, participants felt brainstorming would be useful on the job (Mn = 3.41), whereas force field analysis would be of little use (Mn = 2.27). Participants were also asked a general question to assess the helpfulness of what they had learned about the material in solving problems on the job. The mean response to this item was 2.95, indicating that participants considered the information in general to be somewhat helpful.

Fifteen of the twenty-two participants who responded to the questionnaire made further comments or suggestions about the unit. Responses to this open-ended item were widely varied. For example, one student wrote that this unit was the most concise and useful to date," while another commented that it was the "weakest section to date." Several participants wrote about the learning activities and the problem solving techniques which were taught. One student considered the case study and role plays "very useful exercises, although the rest of the unit lacked theoretical basis and practical utility," and another commented that more case studies on a wider variety of real problems would be beneficial. More than one participant was concerned about the insecurity and artificiality of the role playing, and it was suggested that more time be allotted for the critique of the role plays. According to one respondent, "the interplay of other students was particularly valuable." A student recommended that an example of force field analysis, even if non-military, be included, and that a movie be developed to illustrate the use of this technique. Brainstorming was criticized as a last resort technique to use

when one is desperate. Many participants expressed a need for more time spent in this unit. As one student commented, "very little time spent on an important subject." Another wrote, there was "too little on the 'how to's of the problem solving, (i.e., defining the problem, developing alternatives, evaluating alternatives)." This feeling was expressed by other officers in the class, one of whom wrote that the sparse information delivered left them "too quick to jump to conclusions." He wrote, "problem and analysis and the decision process is one of our most important functions. Emphasis at this course is far too skimpy." Two participants mentioned the problem of discussions focusing on content rather than process. One felt that the role plays and processing concentrated on racial problems more so than on problem solving. The other wrote, "I keep getting confused as to whether the subject or the medium is the substantive part of the course."

Unit 6: Advising and Counseling (14 and 15 May 1979). Data obtained from the questionnaire given following this unit are summarized in Tables B-14 through B-16. The two major knowledge areas, which concern techniques for counseling, were evaluated by participants in terms of how much was learned and the usefulness of the information. (See Table B-14.) The respondents felt they had learned a fairly large amount about the techniques used in both personal problem counseling and performance counseling and that both would be quite useful on the job. The personal problem counseling area was given higher ratings than the performance counseling techniques on amount learned (Mn = 4.18 and 3.77, respectively) and on usefulness (Mn = 4.05 and 3.77, respectively).

Participants were also asked to determine the amount of emphasis placed on the eight advising and counseling subcompetencies and the usefulness of these skills. (See Table B-15.) The respondents felt that all but one of these subskills had been emphasized to a moderately large degree. Seeks out persons with problems, as part of demonstrates positive attitude, was considered to have been given less than a medium amount of emphasis (Mn = 2.77).

Participants judged that the more emphasized subcompetency was listens to others and accurately hears what they are saying (Mn = 3.90). This skill was also considered to be very useful to a CO or XO on the job (Mn = 4.14). Other

usefulness ratings were moderate to moderately high, and rankings paralleled the emphasis ratings fairly closely. The subskill considered the least useful was seeks out persons with problems (Mn = 3.18), which was also judged as the least emphasized.

Participants' perceptions of the learning activities used in the unit are shown in Table B-16. The responses tended to be favorable; participants perceived more than a moderate amount of learning about leadership skills from all three activities. Mean responses on the amount learned question ranged from 3.50 for the "Dryden File" film to 3.82 for the participants' role plays. The skills gained from all three activities were also considered to be useful. Again, the "Dryden File" film was rated slightly below the other activities (Mn = 3.50), but the skills learned from the instructors' role plays were assessed as the most useful (Mn = 3.82).

Participants were also asked how much feedback they received from the unit about their own ability to perform the skills needed to be an effective advisor and counselor. A response of five indicates a great deal of feedback and three, a moderate amount. A mean response of 3.36 was obtained, indicating that the respondents felt they had received slightly more than a moderate amount of feedback.

Sixteen of the twenty-two participants who responded to the questionnaire wrote further comments or suggestions. Many simply said they found the unit practical and applicable. Several participants commented on the role plays, some of them writing that they believed it was worthwhile or even essential for the instructors to be present during the role plays in order to provide a critique. They felt the peer evaluations alone were not sufficient and that they could benefit from the experience of the instructors. One participant suggested it might be helpful to assign roles the day before so that there would be less concern with trying to remember the role and more attention focused on the skill practice. Two participants wrote very different comments about the "Dryden File" film. One remarked that the film was appropriate to the section, but another felt it was counter-productive. This second respondent listed three reasons: "a CO or XO diagnoses, not some outside

expert; drugs and booze aside, there is no place to find counseling for the person with performance problems other than inside the organization; and the instructors' attachment to the film as a teaching tool is not justified--the point of aim is muddled."

Participants also made several comments about changes they would like to see in this unit. These suggestions included more sophisticated case studies ("the existing ones are over simplified"); better evaluations of individual skills after each session; frequent scrambling of the groups so the participants do not always interact with the same people; more solid feedback and perhaps a videotape to help "firm up" the counseling techniques; and less time spent on such things as the instructors writing on the board effective and ineffective behaviors displayed during the role plays. One participant recognized a need for a particular topic to be covered in this unit. He wrote, "Performance counseling did not address the specific use of fitness reports and evaluations as a tool or how to use them as interim measures to affect the behavior of others. I have seen too many COs do poorly in junior officer counseling at fitness report time."

Unit 7: Integration and Competency Application (15 May 1979). The assessment instrument designed for this short unit contained no scaled items specific to the integration and application material or process. A simple open-ended question asking for comments or suggestions was asked on this questionnaire, and about two-thirds of the participants responded to this item. The large majority of the comments were positive, and many of these were short compliments, such as "the movie was enjoyable," "lot of fun and got something out of it at the same time," "enjoyed it--put things together well," and "good flick." Some of the respondents elaborated more by writing about the benefits they received from the unit. A comment representative of these was, "This exercise tied most of the preceding material together in a neat package. It should be helpful in assessing the climate and people of my new command and in helping me to use appropriate management skills and leadership styles."

A few criticisms and suggestions were written about this unit. Three students complained about the length of the discussion following the film, and they suggested it be less "drawn out." Another participant felt that this unit lacked realism. According to this officer, "12 O'Clock High ran the whole gamut of managerial and leadership scenarios, much more so than we would ever be exposed to, with none of the administration/human relations crap thrown in--not reality." Again, one of the students expressed the need for the movie to be projected on a screen larger than the TVs which were used. And a final recommendation for this unit was that "a very effective addition to this portion would be to have the student formulate a list of those items or initiatives to be looked into and (1) promulgated within the 30 days in command, (2) promulgated within 30 to 60 days in command, or (3) held in abeyance for a longer period of time." ~

Unit 8: Human Resource Management Issues (16 and 17 May 1979). The results from the questionnaire administered at the end of the Human Resource Management (HRM) unit are presented in Tables B-17 and B-18. Participants were asked to rate three knowledge areas for amount learned and usefulness on the job. (See Table B-17.) The students judged that they had learned only a moderate amount about both HRM issues and the HRM Cycle (Mn = 3.00, for each) and even less about strategies for producing change (Mn = 2.74). All three knowledge areas were considered to be moderately useful on the job.

Participants were also asked to rate six learning activities for amount learned and usefulness on the job. (See Table B-18.) There was a considerable range in participants' perceptions of the amount learned from the different activities. The activity from which students felt most was learned (Mn = 4.25) was a talk given by the visitor from the Navy Drug Rehabilitation Center (NDRC). The information delivered in this talk was also considered quite useful (Mn = 4.00). Participants believed they learned a large amount of useful information from the interviews with the enlisted personnel (Mn = 4.05, for amount learned and Mn = 4.10, for usefulness). The videotaped Counseling and Assistance Center (CAAC) lecture and the analysis of Chief of Naval Operations (CNO) objectives were rated the lowest of the activities for amount learned (Mn = 2.35, for each) and usefulness of information (Mn = 2.70, for each).

In the open-ended question which followed, participants were asked to state their understanding of the relationship between the LMET program and the HRM program. Several considered the two complementary. Some responses were: "related in aim, point, methods, theory; developed and firmed up at different times from different sources"; "I see some of both in both. 'Being effective' can be improved upon and the first tool is the chain of command. They both emphasize 'listen' and 'trust' "; and "Many of the skills and much of the knowledge required of middle managers and top level management imparted in LMET are required to implement MBO indicated by the HRM cycle." Others regarded one system as a component of the other. Sample comments were: "LMET supports HRM"; "LMET program offers ways to implement the HRM program"; "LMET program is supportive of the HRM program--good because it forces PCOs/PXOs to get away from day-to-day jobs and concentrate on formal HRM sessions"; "LMET should help in the problem solving and identification portions associated with HRM"; and "LMET is a subset of the HRM program in that its goal is enhancing the leadership in the Navy and improving resource management." Two participants defined the relationship more precisely: "LMET is a school and one item taught is a description of the HRM program" and "HRM is for sampling squadron atmosphere. LMET is for working effectively in the system." Several others made more general statements that did not directly answer the question. For example, one student wrote, "It takes good leadership to produce results from the HRM program. Poor leadership is often the cause of problems found by the HRM program."

The second open-ended question asked participants how adequately the HRM Cycle was covered. Twenty students responded to the question. Fifteen wrote that they felt an adequate job was done. Several commented further: "Could have shown more examples of how to take feedback and create changes"; and "The cycle itself was covered adequately but the actual evaluation of the ship or shore activity will require much more elucidation by the HRM team." Three participants felt the HRM Cycle was very well covered; two of these students had previous experience with HRM. Another respondent felt that the HRM Cycle was covered too thoroughly. He wrote that most PCOs and PXOs are experienced and will be fully briefed at the start of the HRM Cycle.

Participants were also asked how adequately they felt Navy Equal Opportunity/Race Relation (EO/RR) issues were covered in the HRM issues unit. Four of the participants responded simply that the coverage was adequate, and seven wrote that it was poor or not covered at all. Others elaborated further. One participant wrote that he was glad the issues were covered only briefly because he was "sick of hearing about it." "In my 13 years of Naval service, performance on the job has been the only criteria," he wrote. A distinction was made by some participants between coverage of race relations and that of women in the Navy. Half of those who made direct reference to the women at sea issue felt the emphasis was adequate, and half felt it was inadequate. One participant who considered the coverage insufficient had the following complaints: "Previously submitted questions were not completely covered, particularly with regard to holding women in the Navy to their enlistment or to their obligations for special training such as the U.S. Naval Academy--and its ramifications on holding men to their obligations. I feel this is the primary festering sore of this program Navy-wide which must be addressed. This also applies to initial policies assigning men versus women to sea duty. The women in the Navy discussion should be expanded and more carefully monitored in class to preclude interruptions." Finally, one student commented that there was very little EO/RR exposure as such, but that they were approached obliquely through the women in the Navy discussion, the lesson about the HRM Cycle, and in talks with the enlisted personnel. The direct comments made about the race relations issues indicated participants felt the topic had received little or no attention.

The final open-ended question provided the opportunity for participants to make comments or suggestions about the unit. Twelve participants did so. Three quarters of those who responded said the interviews with the chiefs and petty officers were too short. As one respondent commented, "The issues we will be immediately involved with were there. We didn't have enough time to discuss them." Another student wrote that he "would even go so far as advocating taking time away from the class presentation to expand this segment." Two participants also commented on the women-at-sea issue. One suggested more time be spent on the issue, and the second wrote, "We in the

class kind of blew it with the women. We talked too much when we should have been listening to the women. The instructor should take this into consideration in the future and see that the women get to say what's on their minds."

In reference to the CAAC presentation, one participant felt the videotape was "terrible," and another wrote that there was too much emphasis on why one should use the program and not enough on how to use it effectively and get around deficiencies in the program. This student used "the four to seven weeks it takes to get a man screened and into the CAAC/ARC¹" as an example. Another officer suggested that the course include a visit to the drug and alcohol rehabilitation centers. He wrote, "I know this would take more time, but I feel other items such as some of the role plays are less important."

Unit 9: Command Cases and Course Conclusion (17 and 18 May 1979). The results of the questionnaire administered at the end of the last unit are shown in Table B-19 and B-20. Seven learning activities were rated for amount learned and usefulness on the job. (See Table B-19.) Participants perceived more than a moderate amount of learning from most of the activities. Analyzing command case data was the activity rated the highest on amount learned (Mn = 3.80) followed by the role plays (Mn = 3.75). Least, but still a moderate amount, was judged to have been learned from the short individual exercise in identifying critical CO/XO job functions (Mn = 3.05). Usefulness ratings were all moderately high. Participants felt that what they gained from developing goals for command cases was the most useful information (Mn = 3.80), but that developing an action plan, although useful, was of less use (Mn = 3.45).

Table B-20 presents participants' perceptions of the PCO/PXO skill areas. Participants rated the amount learned about 27 skills pertaining to five areas of instruction. Participants perceived the greatest amount of learning in

¹Alcohol Rehabilitation Center

positive expectations (Mn = 4.00), listening to others (Mn = 3.95), setting goals (Mn = 3.76) and understanding others (Mn = 3.76). Slightly less than a moderate amount of learning was perceived in only six of the competencies: technical problem solving (Mn = 2.71), disciplining others (Mn = 2.81), resolving conflicts (Mn = 2.86), delegating responsibility to others, monitoring results, and acting impulsively (Mn = 2.90, for each). The usefulness of these skills on the job was also rated. Participants generally rated the competencies higher on usefulness than on amount learned. Almost all were considered more than moderately useful. The most favorable ratings were assigned to listening to others (Mn = 4.29), positive expectations (Mn = 4.19), giving feedback (Mn = 4.14), setting goals (Mn = 4.10), and planning and organizing (Mn = 4.10). The four that received ratings below moderately useful all pertained to the area of coercion: acting impulsively (Mn = 2.45), negative expectations (Mn = 2.71), failing to resolve conflicts (Mn = 2.80), and coerciveness (Mn = 2.81).

In this questionnaire participants were also asked how often they thought they would refer to the LMET Student Journal when back on the job performing as a CO or XO. A response of five indicates very often and three, "will refer some." A mean response of 3.14 was obtained, indicating graduates planned to refer to the Student Journal some.

The final scaled item on the questionnaire asked participants what percentage of the subcompetencies taught in the course they expected to use during the next two to three weeks on the job. A mean response of 57 percent was obtained. Individual responses ranged from 25 to 100 percent.

Again, an open-ended question provided the opportunity for participants to make general comments or suggestions about the unit. Eleven of the twenty-one chose to do so. One participant used the opportunity to clarify his responses on the usefulness ratings of the subcompetencies. He said that in rating usefulness of some of the skills he considered the usefulness of the knowledge of the negative impact some behaviors would have and the skill to avoid them. Almost half of those answering this item made some reference to the talk by the representative of the Secretary of the Navy. One person suggested it be scheduled earlier in the second week. Another enjoyed it

because he considered the speaker "excellent, charismatic, and sports-oriented." "Charged me up!" wrote this participant. One respondent qualified his praise. He felt the talk was "super, but did not answer questions or lead up to expectations on what is going on in Washington on retention matters, women in the Navy, or retirement initiatives." Others who commented also expressed disappointment, one quite negatively. This student wrote that he had expected to hear about retention and he resented the approach used by this speaker. He wrote, "If we needed a successful CO to tell us his method, one could be gotten locally and so advertised. I feel he was skillfully patting himself on the back."

Other comments received concerned the command case exercise. Several students felt it was very beneficial and interesting. One mentioned that more time could have been allowed for the presentation feedback. Another respondent commented on a need for clarity and summarization in this unit. He wrote, "I realize that the instructor technique is not to draw conclusions for the class, but it would help us get a sense of obtaining something from the exercise." The only unfavorable response to this question was written by a participant who was "not over-enthused." A final comment about the unit was made by one of the three medical officers in the class who wrote that in this unit it was difficult for him "to deal with the material, to identify with the role of the ship's captain, or to contribute to the work of the group." "Perhaps the Staff Corps officers should have a problem of their own," he suggested.

Participants were asked, as a final open-ended question, if they had any comments about the LMET PCO/PXO course in general. Most of the comments made were positive and included such statements as "I gained by attending"; "most helpful in attitude and people-handling skills"; "good, interesting course which exceeded my expectations"; "surpassed by expectations--I feel I am better for having taken it." One student elaborated further. He wrote, "Overall I learned quite a bit in the two weeks I have been here--different methods of thinking and different ideas. (I am technically oriented.) One thing that surprised me and pleased me was that I had to do a lot of these things before and I was doing good things before." Others singled out more

specific characteristics they liked about the course, such as the "outstanding" instructors, the guest speakers, the "appropriate" films, "the active class involvement," unplanned discussions, and the "practical application with the LPOs and CPOs."

Several students wrote general complaints and suggestions, some of which indicated disagreement with the preceding positive comments. For example, one student felt that "some areas were drawn out just to cover more time and were activity related rather than trying to accomplish something." Another wrote that the course was too long. At least one participant disagreed. He suggested that the course be "condensed a little with longer days or shorter lunch hours and more time for discussions with women in the Navy, the SECNAV representative, successful COs, etc." Other general complaints had to do with loose control in the classroom over "students who rambled," "use of confusing and complicated language," over-use of "artificial teaching tools" and role playing, and too little time spent on real life situations such as the discussions with the enlisted personnel. One participant wrote "the jargon and technical application of common phrases is a negative; if the contractor or curriculum changed, the terms would also, yet the subject is still the same." He also said that not enough attention was placed on the effective directing of others and the nature and sensitivities of junior enlisted personnel. He concluded by writing, "a precise application of course methods would involve a high degree of manipulation." Several specific suggestions were also made. One student felt that it would have been helpful to formulate a plan of action for his own command. Another recommended that more emphasis be placed on problem analysis and solving, and still another mentioned again that he felt brainstorming should be deleted from the material as it was not a useful tool for COs and XO's. Other recommendations were that trips be taken to the drug and alcohol rehabilitation centers, that the videotape be used to provide feedback to every student presenting in the class, and that the tables be arranged into a roundtable configuration to allow for all participants to have eye contact with one another. Another suggestion was made by a participant who wrote that needs for improvement included, "an additional summary at end of each section on key points and what we should have gotten out

of the section and retained, and more overview at the end or start of each day to insure retention of key points and to help tie material together better." One final comment was particularly analytical: "I believe the course assumes a lower level of knowledge of leadership/management than necessary. We could have improved our leadership/management skills more if the class knowledge of the above had been measured and cases designed to build on that knowledge. Early case studies were designed to prove the theory rather than build skills."

3.2.2 FINDINGS ACROSS WEEKS

Near the end of each of the two weeks of the PCO/PXO course, participants completed an overall course assessment instrument. Mean responses to the eight scaled items on this questionnaire, which was designed to provide a cumulative evaluation of the training, are displayed in Table 3-3.

Participants responded favorably to these questions, and ratings made at the end of the second week tended to be somewhat higher than those for the Week 1. In both weeks, participants judged the course as more than moderately effective in training leadership and management skills, and they felt the course had addressed issues or problems important to the Navy quite well. Participants felt that both the course objectives and their expectations had been well met, and that they had learned a large amount from interactions with the other participants. Students also responded that they liked attending the course. Participants' ratings on each of these areas were higher by Week 2.

In assessing the effectiveness of the instructional methods and the capability of the instructors themselves, participants were slightly less complimentary by the time the course was concluding. The officers were still quite favorable in their evaluations, however. They considered the instructional methods to be more than moderately effective on both weeks. At the end of Week 1, the instructors were assessed as very capable in using the methods to get the learning points across. By Week 2, they were judged as slightly less capable, but the rating was still quite high. In responding to this item

Table 3-3. Overall Course Evaluation as Reported by Participants Near the End of Each Week (Means).

Question	Mean Response	
	Week 1	Week 2
• Overall, how would you rate this course as to effectiveness in training leadership and management skills?	3.75	4.00
• To what extent do the course objectives address issues or problems important to the Navy?	3.70	4.11
• In general, how well do you feel course objectives have been met?	3.90	4.11
• How well has this course met your expectations?	3.81	4.11
• How much have you learned from other participants during the course so far?	4.00	4.26
• How do you feel about attending this course?	3.95	4.11
• How effective do you feel the <u>methods</u> used in this course are in getting the instructional points across?	3.86	3.74
• In your opinion, how capable are the <u>instructor(s)</u> in using these methods to get the instructional points across?	4.40	4.17

during the second week, three students felt it was necessary to assign a different rating to each instructor. No names were mentioned, but individual responses ranged from a two on the scale (less than moderately capable) to a five (very capable). Averages of these ratings were included in the data analysis.

Because both times this instrument was administered it accompanied an end-of-unit questionnaire, participants did not respond to the item asking for suggestions or comments about the course thus far.

3.3 OBSERVER FINDINGS

Results from the observation data are presented and discussed below. General findings applicable to this entire iteration of the PCO/PCO course are described, followed by a presentation of observation results specific to each of the nine units of instruction.

3.3.1 GENERAL FINDINGS

Assessments of certain characteristics which apply to this PCO/PCO course overall are discussed below.

3.3.1.1 Instructor Capabilities

Three Navy instructors participated in the teaching of this course. Two of the instructors had been teaching in the LMT program prior to the inception of LMET. The third instructor was new to the assignment and had just completed conversion training at Coronado. All of the instructors were Commanders and were white males. The training load was divided unevenly; those with more experience were responsible for larger portions of the instruction.

Each of the instructors appeared to be knowledgeable of his subject matter and well prepared to deliver his lessons. There was no Instructor Guide, and in most cases the instructors presented their material in a conversational style, speaking without the use of notes. At no time did any of the instructors appear to become confused or lost in delivery of the lessons, and on several occasions participants expressed their appreciation for this degree of preparation. Other differences were evident, however, between the inexperienced and the more experienced instructors. The two instructors who had been teaching for some time were relaxed and at the same time extremely dynamic during their lesson presentations; also they were prepared with several interesting anecdotes to illustrate learning points. The new instructor seemed to lack this degree of comfort in front of the classroom,

and although his performance was not inadequate, it appeared that the students were less interested in his material as a result of his style. This instructor delivered a smaller portion of the course, and it is possible that he was responsible for some of the drier, less interesting subjects. For example, as his introduction to the class, he delivered the LMET briefing which consisted of a 39-minute history of the program including a status report on the courses for other billet levels. The material covered in this non-interactive lecture session was some of the least interesting in the course, a factor which certainly had some effect on the instructor's performance. Improvements in this instructor's stage presence were noted by the end of the course.

All of the instructors demonstrated varying levels of processings skills, ranging from good to outstanding. Each instructor was successful at stimulating meaningful, Navy-relevant discussions among the participants, and each exhibited a great deal of involvement and insight in leading these talks. Also, all the instructors were extremely aware of opportunities to relate to previously learned material and they accomplished these tie-ins so effectively that on occasion the class participants began to discover and share these relationships. Examples of this processing skill were evident throughout the course. After material on managerial styles and the three social motives was presented and discussed, for instance, the instructors were able to use students' comments during subsequent discussions to expand on these concepts. This occurred throughout the course and served as an excellent reinforcement of previous learning points. That the participants benefited from this practice was evidenced on Day 6 during the group exercise in problem solving, the Tattoo Incident. Although this lesson was intended to provide an opportunity for the participants to practice force field analysis as a problem solving technique, during the processing discussion several students were able to discuss the roles played by the exercise participants in terms of social motives, managerial styles, elements of goal setting, and skillful use of influence. This and other similar discussions indicated that cumulative learning was taking place and that knowledge retention and application were high.

One flaw in the processing behavior of each instructor was evident only on occasion. During many of the discussions following group exercises, participants had a tendency to talk about the content of the activity rather than the process involved. Occasionally the instructors did not redirect the focus of the discussion to the appropriate learning area. The lesson described above, the Tattoo Incident discussion, also serves as example for this deficiency. Feedback provided to the role players concentrated on interviewing behavior, racial problems, and previously learned concepts. The instructor did not appear to attempt to shift the focus of the discussion to the subcompetencies which were to be covered in this unit or the steps and techniques of problem solving. Therefore, although the instructors were skilled in processing techniques, their group management behavior was not always effective.

3.3.1.2 Classroom Climate

The atmosphere in the PCO/PXO classroom was maintained consistently at an open level and in most cases was well controlled. During the morning of Day 1 the ground rules for the course were presented to the students. These were printed on a cardboard chart and left in sight during the two weeks. Rules concerned participation, responsibility, honesty, reality, and class etiquettes, and they were discussed as a contract between the instructors and the students. Shortly after the course got underway, it was evident that the participants felt free to express themselves by asking questions, offering examples from their own experience, providing technical information, disagreeing with presented theories, and even criticizing the material or the instructors. In all cases the students' inputs were acknowledged. With a few exceptions occurring earlier in the course, when participants asked questions in attempts to clarify the material being presented, the floor was turned over to the other students. In this way, the instructors refrained from accepting a position of power, empowered the other participants by encouraging them to answer the question, and stimulated interest in the rest of the class by initiating a discussion on the topic. The exceptions to this style occurred in the first lessons delivered by one instructor who had the tendency to

answer questions directly, thereby closing the topic for discussion. This behavior was corrected in the early part of the course, however, and the typical reaction to a student's question was to turn it over to the other participants. Also, participants were treated with respect when they illustrated a point by describing incidents or situations they had experienced during their careers or when they were able to respond to a question about their own area of expertise. Even when the students did not accept the theoretical concepts being discussed, and in some cases were outwardly negative toward the instructors, their comments were received non-defensively and with respect. An incident illustrating this characteristic occurred during the discussion following the instructors' role plays demonstrating both ineffective and effective counseling behavior. Although the instructors exaggerated the effective behavior slightly, these demonstrations were well done. However, several students criticized the role playing to the extent that they complained about minute and insignificant details of the counselor's behavior. One student was extremely negative in his comments, complaining that that style of counseling was useless and could be accomplished by a "well-articulated mannequin." Rather than reacting defensively to this strong critique, the instructor accepted the comments, writing them on the board and using them as a basis for discussion. Later the same student challenged the instructor about the entire unit on advising and counseling, aggressively demanding to know its purpose. The instructor skillfully avoided making a defensive response by eliciting from the participant an answer to his own question. When it was clear that the student strongly rejected the demonstrated styles of counseling, the instructor displayed a great deal of tolerance and pointed out to the class that a technique or a style should be used only if it makes sense to the user. It probably would have been useful at this point to provide a little more closure concerning styles that are appropriate for use in the Navy; however, this difficult situation was handled well.

Although the instructors demonstrated a great deal of respect for the participants, the students themselves did not always express the same high level of regard for each other. Participants seemed to feel quite a bit of camaraderie by the end of the course, but this was evident within the smaller

groups much more so than in the class as a whole. The ground rule concerning the avoidance of side discussions was perhaps the least-obeyed rule, and occasionally whispered conversations included negative remarks about another participant who had just spoken. The fact that the students held opposing opinions on many issues allowed for some interesting and impassioned discussions. Sometimes a reminder about mutual respect and the ground rules about side discussions and ownership was in order.

All of the instructors were quite skillful in using examples relevant to the specific duties of a CO and XO, and group discussions were almost always kept on Navy-relevant issues. Many of the concepts presented were illustrated with a story about the instructor's own experience as a commanding officer, and some of these were quite entertaining and well-told. Other material was followed by a class discussion about situations the participants had experienced in the past or expected to experience in the future. In all cases, learning points were made real for the students by describing the concepts in terms of actual Navy situations. For example, after his presentation of the three social motives and the "managerial V," one instructor initiated a discussion about where a CO or XO in the Navy might plot on the three social motives graph. This type of tie-in occurred after the presentation on situational leadership, managerial styles, organizational climate, and other theoretical concepts, and was accomplished very effectively.

3.3.1.3 Course Objectives

The mission and goals of the LMET program were printed in the first section of the PCO/PXO Student Journal. Also included was the overall goal for this billet-specific course, which was "To promote standardized and consistent application of the leadership and management policies as set forth by the CNO." Formal objectives for the PCO/PXO course were also listed in the Student Journal as follows:

As a result of this course, participants will be able to create conditions that will improve and promote effective leadership and management practices by:

1. Recognizing and understanding the five leadership and management competencies and their subcompetencies which distinguished outstanding COs and XO's:
 - understanding the results of job competency research in the U.S. Navy.
 - understanding job competency assessment procedures.
2. Recognizing and understanding the extent to which the competencies and subcompetencies will impact performance in their commands:
 - understanding the origins of human motivation in order to promote better command performance.
3. Assuring proper management attention to certain critical issues in Human Resource Management such as retention, EO, substance abuse, etc.
4. Setting goals and plans that will initiate actions toward implementation of the leadership and management competencies within their commands:
 - developing command goals and plans that are consistent with current type commander plans, goals, and policies.
 - determining how to apply the specific competencies in their command.
 - self-assessment and practice relative to the competencies.

In addition to these formal objectives, the following informal objectives were given:

1. Learn the five competencies and subcompetencies.
2. Practice the five competencies and subcompetencies.

3. Apply the five competencies and subcompetencies to Navy cases, role plays, films, simulations, etc.
4. Identify ways to apply these competencies and subcompetencies to your upcoming job.

No goals or objectives specific to each unit of instruction or each day were printed in the Student Journal or discussed in class.

On the morning of Day 1, after the LMET briefing, participants were given their copies of the Student Journal. The instructors asked the participants to read the LMET program goals and the PCO/PXO course goal and objectives. This was accomplished in the classroom and was followed by an informal lecture about what students could expect from the course and from the Human Resource Management Support System (HRMSS) in general.

Because there were no student evaluation criteria set or measures taken, it is impossible to assess the extent to which course objectives were met with any degree of certainty. Observer findings, however, suggest the following:

PCO/PXO Objective 1. From classroom observations and from informal discussions with the students, it appears that most, if not all, the course participants were able to recognize and understand the five leadership and management competencies and a majority of the subcompetencies sufficiently for classroom participation. The degree to which these officers will be able to create conditions that will improve and promote effective leadership and management practices cannot be determined from the available data. It is also the observer's opinion that few participants clearly understood either the results of job competency research in the Navy or job competency assessment procedures. These topics were briefly mentioned during the LMET briefing lecture and were not discussed by the participants.

PCO/PXO Objective 2. Most of the LMET students seemed to be capable of recognizing and understanding in the classroom the extent to which the competencies and some of the subcompetencies will impact performance in their

commands. A minority of the participants did not appear to be very receptive to new information and seemed particularly resistant to changing their own behaviors and attitudes. Although most of the students were interested in learning new leadership and management styles, almost all had difficulty with some of the subcompetencies. Further information on this point is presented by unit later in this section. It is difficult to assess the degree to which participants understood the origins of human motivation in order to promote better command performance. It seemed that the officers in the class learned at least a moderate amount about motivation, but it is unclear whether they would be able to use this knowledge to assist in improving the performance of their personnel. Again, the extent to which the PCO/PXO students will be able to create conditions that will improve and promote better command performance cannot be determined.

PCO/PXO Objective 3. Whether the graduates of this course will be capable of assuring proper management attention to critical HRM issues is also unclear. Class participants were exposed to several HRM concerns, but the quality and usefulness of the information varied. Also, there were some issues which were not covered. This will be further discussed in the paragraphs specific to the eighth unit of instruction.

PCO/PXO Objective 4. Several participants seemed to develop skills in the area of goal setting, although their ability to use goals to implement leadership and management competencies in their command is unknown. The goals written in the classroom did not directly relate to any of the five competencies. Other students did not appear to learn how to set goals or make effective plans. Assessments relative to the sub-areas outlined for this objective vary. Many goals were written which did address compliance with current type commander policies, and several of these were well developed. No goals or plans were developed by participants which had to do with the application of competencies in their command. Plans for self-assessment were part of the goal evaluation steps; however, this did not relate directly to the competencies.

3.3.1.4 Course Materials

The PCO/PXO Student Journal was distributed to the participants in a printed, three-ring, plastic binder on Day 1. Following a title page, the journal was sectioned by day. The material for each day was grouped as a "unit" (e.g., Day 1 material was grouped and labeled "Unit 1.0" in the journal). Each section contained a table of contents, and where applicable, lecture notes, exercise instructions, worksheets, self-assessment instruments, self-evaluations, case studies, other relevant information, and homework assignments were included. The Student Journal was well-organized, with the exception of some misnumbered pages, and appeared to be a very valuable learning aid for the participants.

The reading assignments in the Student Journal varied. Some, such as the Herzberg article, were clearly related to the following day's lecture material. The relationship of other readings to the subject matter was less obvious; however, these articles seemed to provide interesting background information and to stimulate thought processes. The majority of the reading assignments appeared to fall into this category. For example, the article by Alan E. Rush entitled "Troubleshooting Difficulties in Implementation," which was assigned as homework to be read before Day 5, was not discussed in class and had little to do with the material covered. It did, however, concern issues important to consider in an MBO implementation and thus, was probably a worthwhile addition to the course. Another example was the Psychology Today article called "The War Over Marijuana." Although the information contained in this article was in almost direct conflict with the content of the NDRC representative's speech, it served the purpose of providing the student with the views from both angles on this extremely controversial subject. A final processing of this topic could have improved the lesson, however.

No Instructor Guide was used during the PCO/PXO course. Each instructor appeared to lecture from his own handwritten notes, supplemented by the Student Journal, or from memory. This did not seem to detract from the effectiveness of the training, but consistency and accuracy were not assured. Also, it was impossible to assess the degree to which course content was being modified in Coronado.

Other materials used in the course varied in effectiveness. For the most part, films and videotapes were adequate; however, the practice of showing every film over closed-circuit television should be reconsidered. The size and quality of the picture detracted from the films' effectiveness. The instructors made excellent use of abundant cardboard charts, which clearly summarized learning points for nearly every lesson.

3.3.2 FINDINGS BY INSTRUCTIONAL UNIT

Observation results specific to each of the nine units of instruction are described below. Observer data are compared with participants' perceptions, and course content, process, and materials are discussed.

Unit 1: Introduction (7 May 1979). The observer felt that the 4.7-hour introductory unit was slightly too long and included some unnecessary material. The welcoming comments and the administrative remarks were concise and beneficial. Also, the two hours taken for instructor and participant introductions appeared to be time well-spent. In this segment, the participants paired up with one another and interviewed their partners to prepare to introduce them to the rest of the class. The interview period seemed to be a comfortable time for the students, and introductions were warm, interesting, and often entertaining. This initial exercise was valuable in that it broke the ice in an enjoyable and non-threatening way, and it set the stage for future participant interaction. The CNO film clip did not appear to be extremely effective; however, for the amount of time this required (six minutes), it may have been worthwhile as an official welcome and a short introductory note.

The observer agreed with the participants who felt that the LMET briefing was presented ineffectively and at the wrong point in the course. A clear description of competency-based research as the foundation for the LMET program, accompanied by a brief report of the courses available for other billet levels, would have been sufficient at this point for providing essential background information. Participants did not seem interested in

LMT or the history of LMET nor did the subject appear to be particularly relevant. Information on course locations and training goals could have been printed up and handed out to students to save class time, and instructions for requesting quotas in LMET courses should have been provided. This information would have been delivered more effectively toward the end of the course after participants had become familiar with LMET.

Participants were given only six minutes to read the LMET program mission and goals, the PCO/PXO course overall goal, and formal and informal course objectives. No discussion was held on these goals, and reference was not made to them again during the course. Course objectives were poorly written, and could not have served as examples for the students in their own goal setting practice. The informal discussion about what changes LMET training may or may not produce and the presentation of the class ground rules appeared to be beneficial lessons.

The learning styles lesson was introduced with an interesting discussion using racketball and tennis as analogies. Participants completed and scored the Learning Style Inventory (LSI) in the classroom, and a discussion on the styles and related occupations and academic backgrounds followed. Information on the instrument itself was given to the students after it was scored. Thus, participants may have been confused while completing their self-assessments. One student filling out the inventory was overheard to say, "The guy who thought this up wasn't too smart." An adequate, although not thorough explanation of the LSI, its uses, meanings, and limitations, followed the administration of the inventory. Although learning styles were briefly mentioned two or three times later in the course, the relevance of this lesson, and particularly the LSI, to the LMET course remains unclear.

Unit 2: Concern for Efficiency and Effectiveness (7, 8, and 9 May 1979).

Although the second unit of instruction was quite long (2.5 days), the observer felt the time was required for the amount of material to be covered and that, for the most part, the time was well apportioned. It appears that the participants learned a fairly large amount about efficiency and effectiveness and that the competency techniques were generally applicable to their jobs as COs and XO's.

This unit began with a lesson defining all the LMET subcompetencies followed by a long case study from which the students were to identify the competency which could be applied to improve a poor leadership situation. This exercise was an excellent introduction to the relationship of competencies to performance, and the students seemed to gain a great deal.

Lessons on motivation included a short presentation on the stimuli-motive-goal model, homework assignments to read "One More Time: How Do You Motivate Employees" by Fredrick Herzberg and an article about Maslow's hierarchy of needs, and discussions on these readings. This material was processed in Navy-relevant terms and its applications to job situations were discussed.

Participants seemed to enjoy the Target Practice simulation shown on videotape on Day 2, but they did not seem to gain a great deal from this lesson. The discussion processing this simulation was enlivened by student interest and disagreement over the challenging/realistic balance of a good goal. Later in the day a short discussion on goal setting was held and participants were assigned the HS-27, an exercise in goal writing. This consisted of several pages of guidelines concerning the situation in a helicopter anti-submarine squadron for which individual participants were to write goals and each of the four small discussion groups were to present one goal. Several participants complained about the assignment, saying that it was hard to get interested in something so irrelevant to their own situations. At this point the instructor gave the class the option of writing goals for their future command, and three of the four groups presented this type of goal. This seems to indicate that students were more involved in thinking about their future work situations than about leadership in general and could learn more from relating their course work to their new job responsibilities. The goals which were presented by the small groups did not meet all the goal setting criteria. The flaws stimulated discussions which helped clarify the learning points, although these discussions frequently focused on goal content rather than the process of goal writing. Also, it was admitted by both the instructors and participants that the assignment had not been entirely clear.

The three social motives material was presented effectively, as was the lesson on categories of achievement thinking. The latter was augmented by a discussion of the Picture Story Exercise, a description of the stick figure, and an analysis of a case study in terms of the achievement categories. The instructor managed this lesson well, reminding the participants on several occasions that they would not be professional scorers, but, as he said, "We are telling you this because it's a way of thinking that you might put into your own 'computer'."

The lesson on situational leadership began with the Leader Effectiveness and Adaptability Description (LEAD) Instrument followed by a discussion of the results of this self-assessment and the task/relationship leadership quadrant. Participants seemed to enjoy this activity; however, there were indications that many were feeling confusion and even frustration with the number and complexity of the theoretical concepts presented. Instructors sensed this and encouraged the participants to think about the theories as just one way of looking at things. They often said, "Maybe it fits and maybe it doesn't."

The managerial style lesson was built around the results of the Motivational Style Questionnaire (MSQ) which most of the participants had completed as homework for Day 2 and others completed in the classroom. The students discussed managerial styles the Navy valued and those they valued personally, as well as those they tended to use. Each participant attempted to describe on paper a situation where they had used each of the six styles. Students appeared to benefit from this lesson although the extent to which attitudes and style tendencies changed as a result was unclear.

Organizational climate was introduced by an informal brainstorming session held as an attempt to define the concept, which was followed by the Harvard Business School film on the organizational climate/managerial style experiment. The factors of climate and the managerial styles were well illustrated and apparently were clearly understood by most of the students. However, again it seems quite possible that the cognitive learning will not

result in skill development. Also, this film is greatly lacking in relevance to the PCO/PXO job situation. It concerns the civilian, profit-making organization, and is also outdated. A film of this type developed by the Navy could be very effective.

The lesson on management by objectives (MBO) was clearly presented on Day 3 by use of the lecture/discussion method and was enhanced by an interesting account by one instructor of his experiences in implementing MBO as commanding officer of a ship. Participants were absorbed in this activity and enjoyed it a great deal; however, by the end of the lesson much resistance to MBO as a time-wasting, ineffective, paper work activity was evident among the class participants.

Homework assigned at the conclusion of Day 3 consisted of the following readings: "Achievement Motivation Can Be Developed" by David C. McClelland, "Power is the Great Motivator" by David C. McClelland and David H. Burnham, and an article on the elements of MBO.

Unit 3: Process Management (10 May 1979). This 4.3-hour unit of instruction was, in the observer's opinion, entirely too short to cover the process management competency adequately. This unit consisted of a presentation of the process management subcompetencies, a group exercise in which participants evaluated several monitoring tasks commonly used in the Navy, and the Seabee Work Center exercise. Participants had only a very limited opportunity to learn about and practice the four subskills during these lessons, particularly managing and allocating resources and matching job requirements to individuals. An expansion of this unit to include more practical applications of these subcompetencies would probably improve results.

Unit 4: Skillful Use of Influence (10 and 11 May 1979). The SDC assessor felt that the fourth unit was about the right length, and that participants learned at least some skills they could use on their job. Skill development appeared to vary greatly among participants. To introduce the unit on skillful use of influence, a lecture/discussion session was held on the categories of power thinking and another case study was used to illustrate

these elements. This lesson served as a useful introduction to the competency and seemed to assist the participants in their understanding of how the subskill of using power in a positive fashion can be applied effectively. This was followed by a lecture presentation on the four stages of power. Again the observer sensed some impatience on the part of the students with the models being presented. Fortunately, the instructor was also aware of this and helped alleviate the problem by assuring the students that this was only one way of thinking about power in the work situation.

Day 5 instruction began with a short clip from the film "Patton" in which the General is talking to his troops. The film was used as an excellent illustration of certain leadership styles, types of motivation, and empowering techniques. A discussion on these topics followed, and the instructor presented and gave examples of each of the techniques for empowering others. Students seemed to gain a great deal from these lessons. They were given a chance to practice these skills in the Seat 12A exercise in which the instructor role-played as an XO who had a suggestion to make and each participant attempted to respond to him as CO by using an empowering technique. The situation appeared too contrived for maximum effectiveness, and the results indicate that few students were comfortable with responding in an empowering manner. Six techniques were discussed in this lesson; however, over half of the students used one of two techniques--say what you are concerned about, and ask "What if ...?" and "How can ...?". None of the participants said what they liked about the XO's idea; only one paraphrased; and a few gave credit. In most cases, however, the credit statement was followed by a "but ..." and a negative comment. Several students gave responses that were not empowering at all. This was processed well in the discussion which followed the exercise.

Because many of the participants appeared uncomfortable with empowering others as well as with the role playing in general, the MBO policy exercise, a classroom activity concerning influence and power, was not extremely effective. Participants seemed to focus their efforts more on the elements of MBO and the content of the objectives rather than on influence. Instructions to this exercise should have made its purpose clear, and control of the processing discussion should have been better exercised.

The lecture on rewards and recognitions was well presented. It was supplemented by a group exercise in which participants described either existing effective rewards programs or personal rewards they could implement at their command. The Strength Deployment Inventory (SDI) was administered, and was processed well, but not thoroughly. The instructor was careful to remind the participants of the extent to which the results from this type of self-assessment instrument can be utilized. Day 5 and this unit were concluded with the showing of a film called "The Pygmalion Effect." This was an outstanding stimulus for a discussion on the self-fulfilling prophecy and how it can be determined by a variety of factors in a command.

The observer noted that more emphasis was given to the influence subcompetencies--uses power in a positive fashion, communicates and convinces others, and uses rewards and recognition--than was given to controls expressions of anger, coercion, and direct advice-giving. Emotional self-control was rarely mentioned and then only in a negative context. Participants were given accounts of situations where a CO or XO had no self-control and the results were disastrous. Lessons were not given on how to control one's own anger and other emotional responses to situations in which the officers might find themselves.

The last page in the Student Journal for Day 5 was a PCO/PXO Survey Data Sheet on which students were to record their individual area scores and total scores for the MSQ, SDI, LEAD, and LSI and to turn the information over to the school staff. They were told not to identify themselves by name but to include pay grade, designator, next billet, and number of previous commands. According to the sheet, this information was intended for use in a correlation study. It is interesting to note that in a class of 22 participants who give their pay grade and designator alone, most can readily be identified through a simple comparison of the personal data against the class roster. This data collection effort needs to be examined to insure that it conforms with provisions of the Privacy Act.

As homework for the weekend, students were to read an article on Kurt Lewin's "Force Field Analysis" and a reading about emotional first aid on the job.

Unit 5: Problem Solving (14 May 1979). The observer agreed with several of the participants who thought this unit was far too short to cover this competency adequately. Also, it appeared that participants learned few skills they could use in solving problems at their new command. The entire unit lasted only 4.2 hours and consisted of a short introductory lecture defining the six subcompetencies, a small group exercise on brainstorming, and a three-hour exercise involving a case study and role playing. The latter exercise concerned a racial incident aboard ship, and although students may have used the two problem solving techniques which were taught, the processing discussion focused on the role playing performance, solution validity, racial unrest in general, and previously learned concepts such as organizational climate. The unit was concluded at this point and it appeared very little had been taught about the specifics of problem solving and its identified subskills.

Unit 6: Advising and Counseling (14 and 15 May 1979). Again the SDC assessor agreed with the participants that the sixth unit was about right in length. It was felt that in this unit more than the others students had the opportunity to practice the subcompetencies and receive feedback on their performance. As a result it is estimated that a great deal of applicable knowledge was gained.

This unit began with a short introduction and a demonstration by two instructors of both ineffective and effective counseling. Participants were to note significant behaviors, and following the demonstration, these were written on the board and discussed. This seemed to be an adequate introduction to the lessons on advising and counseling, and although the role play behaviors were quite exaggerated, the instructors did an outstanding job of stimulating interest in the topic.

An informal lecture was given on request masts, rights to redress, and Article 138 UCMJ complaints. The instructor read through a list of suggested techniques for non-directive counseling to use in personal problem situations. He gave examples and reasons for each technique and for some he

told a story for illustration. These talks appeared to be interesting and valuable to the students. However, the subject of body language was brought up and the instructor digressed into a discussion of the meaning of various postures. He suggested that students be aware of their body language and that changing it may result in a change in feelings. This seemed to make many students uncomfortable and appeared to be inappropriate in the context of this lesson. This area can be of great value to leaders and managers if it is appropriately addressed.

Following these lessons, participants divided into triads and practiced personal problem counseling. Individuals rotated the pre-described roles--playing counselor, counselee, and observer. The participant observing made notes in the Student Journal to critique the counseling behavior according to several criteria. Observation of these role plays indicated that the majority of students practiced many of the subcompetencies of advising and counseling. Those who did not demonstrate effective behavior in a counseling situation appeared to have difficulty with role playing in general. Many comments to this effect were overheard (e.g., "I'm not a very good actor."). Participants were assigned "Leadership and Organizational Excitement" by David E. Berlew to read and a task sheet on the topic of women at sea to complete for homework on Day 6.

Day 7 began with the "The Dryden File" film about both a personal and performance problem and referral in a civilian work situation. The film and the discussion appeared to be effective, although much of the processing concerned alcoholism detection and referral rather than counseling techniques. This was followed by a role play concerning performance problem counseling. Students practiced in triads as they had done previously, and the situations given them to act out included some personal problems. Unfortunately the scenarios were not sufficiently thorough in that past performance on the job had not been documented. Thus, the role play situation was very artificial and participants spent a great deal of energy creating details to fill in the gaps. An extensive background sheet on the scenarios would improve this skill practice.

The Student Journal included a three-page information sheet on conducting performance analysis. Four steps were described--observing behavior, documenting behavior, reviewing and evaluating behavior, and establishing new performance expectations. Participants were not given a chance to practice or discuss these techniques, and the information was not mentioned.

Six of the eight subcompetencies of advising and counseling were well-emphasized. Two--offers helpful plans and alternatives, and demonstrates a positive attitude by seeking out persons with problems--were emphasized very little. Participants were instructed very clearly not to offer suggestions during personal problem counseling, and they were not encouraged to do so in performance counseling. Ways in which to seek out persons with problems were mentioned only briefly.

Unit 7: Integration and Competency Application (15 May 1979). Instruction in this unit appeared to be very successful in assisting the integration and application of the material learned to date. The unit required 3.5 hours and, in the observer's opinion, was well worth the time. The viewing and discussion of the film "12 O'Clock High" made up the entire unit. Participants were assigned one of three things to observe in the film and to report on afterwards. They were to look for subcompetency applications, critical incidents conducive to mission accomplishment, or actions indicating management styles and organizational climate. The film was stopped only once for a break, and upon conclusion, students reported their observations with evidence to support their findings. This method of assigning only one task to an individual seemed to result in more thorough coverage of the material and less frustration than have "12 O'Clock High" lessons in other LMET courses. . Assignments were clear and they were facilitated by worksheets in the journal.

As homework on Day 7 in preparation for the unit on HRM issues, participants were asked to read a Navy Times article headlined " 'Deglamorize', Drinking, Top Navy Medic Urges," "The War Over Marijuana" reprinted from Psychology Today, and a reprint from the Naval Institute Proceedings entitled "Women in a Changing Military."

Unit 8: Human Resource Management Issues (16 and 17 May 1979). The observer felt that the time spent in this 12.5-hour unit could have been better distributed if not shortened. It seemed that some of the time was wasted, although if the quality of presentations were to improve, this may not be the case.

On the morning of Day 8, participants were handed a typed list of questions generated from the task sheet assigned as homework on Day 6. Each discussion group was to select one or two items of significant negative impact over which the CO or XO has some control and to strategize a plan of action for reducing or removing that item as a deterrent to readiness. This activity was in preparation for the panel discussion in which four Navy women participated with one instructor and the class. One of the women was a junior officer, and three were petty officers. One petty officer was black, and all three had limited experience at sea. Each discussion group presented an area of concern, and an informal discussion took place. In the first part of this activity, the students had a tendency to discuss among each other rather than to ask questions of the women. This was corrected later, and by the second hour an enlivened discussion between the men and women was taking place. Topics covered were whether the senior woman at the command should respond to the problems and needs of all women at the command, whether berthing on board ship should be segregated by sex, and if so, whether the women's area should be guarded, how to deal with women's emotional needs, what orientation information is passed on to male and female crew members and female dependents, the effects women going to sea will have on marriages, and harassment of women in previously all-male jobs.

Following the discussion on women at sea, the commanding officer of the Naval Drug Rehabilitation Center (NDRC) at Naval Air Station (NAS) Miramar gave a talk to the class. His presentation was primarily lecture but participants were given the opportunity to ask questions and make comments at the end of the 2.3-hour talk. The focus of this presentation was on facts about drugs, drug users, and NDRC patients. Participants appeared interested, but later observations indicated that at least some were offended by the speaker's alarmist approach to the topic of drug abuse in the Navy and in society in general.

Two representatives from the Alcohol Rehabilitation Center (ARC) delivered a short presentation on their center and the Navy alcohol program. Participants asked questions and carried on a discussion with the guests concerning ARC and Alcohol Rehabilitation Service (ARS) clientele and alcoholism in general. Because the Counseling and Assistance Center (CAC) representatives were unable to attend the class, a videotaped presentation which had been made to an earlier class was shown. The lecture concentrated on the counseling system and facts and psychological theories about substance abuse. Much of the material was redundant, and participants appeared to be saturated with information on HRM issues by this point. Also, the videotape was of poor quality, which was particularly annoying to a class who had been able to interact with guest lecturers all day. The videotape was supplemented with a handout diagramming the CAAC cycle.

The homework assignment for Day 8 was to read an article on planned renegotiation. Day 9 began with a short introductory presentation on the history of survey-guided organizational development and facts about the HRM Cycle. The HRM Survey was handed out and discussed. Each student was given a copy of the sample HRM printout for a fictitious command, the "U.S.S. Philoh McGiffin," and the instructor gave an extremely clear and useful explanation of the data. It was obvious to the observer that the participants understood the document and were very interested in the HRM Cycle.

The small discussion groups were given 20 minutes to read the seven CNO objectives and to complete a worksheet on the information they would like to gain from the remaining guests. Half the class then interviewed five first and second class petty officers while the other half talked with five chief petty officers, one of whom was an observer from CNET, Pensacola. Discussions were informal and focused primarily on the CNO objectives, particularly retention, enlisted professionalism, and administrative overload. Both the officers and the enlisted personnel appeared to benefit from these sessions and many participants expressed regret that they did not have more time for interviews, which were the concluding activities for this unit.

Unit 9: Command Cases and Course Conclusion (17 and 18 May 1979). The final unit of the course began in the early afternoon of Day 9 and lasted 8.7 hours. In the observer's opinion, the time in the unit was well-spent.

The major portion of this unit was given to the analysis of a complete case study involving a ship or aircraft squadron. Each of the four discussion groups was given a large binder full of information on a particular command, including data from a HRM Survey, inspection results, type commander evaluations, and other information relevant to the particular command situation. Participants studied the material and prepared their presentations for approximately four hours on Day 9. They also were given information on presentation skills to read as homework and a planning checklist to assist them in their presentations.

Presentations began in the morning of Day 10. A different student from each group presented each of the following: an analysis of the command, three identified goals, a strategy for implementation of the goals, and a Captain's Call speech. Following each group's presentation, other participants critiqued both the content of the material and style of the delivery, paying particular attention to the CO role play. Each presentation was timed, and participants were held within strict limits. The Captain's Call role play was videotaped, and these students were encouraged to critique themselves after the class.

Student performance in this exercise indicated to the observer that the officers were extremely involved in preparing for their new command but that their skill levels varied. The analyses of the strengths and weaknesses of the command cases were adequate; however, the goals were, for the most part, poorly written and many of the strategies for implementation lacked clarity and practicality. The content of some of the Captain's Call speeches also suggested that at least some of the participants had not actually internalized the material taught over the preceding two weeks. For example, the student role playing as CO of one group gave a very informal talk intended for his crew which heavily emphasized liberty ports, shorter working hours and

returning to home port. Mission accomplishment was barely mentioned. Thus, it appeared that this participant and even the students in his group had not retained a great deal of the information on motivation, goal setting, organizational climate, MBO, empowering personnel, or recognition. Also, participants' criticisms of the presentations focused primarily on the stage presence of the role player, and many students found fault with very insignificant details of the performances. It seemed to the observer that many of the major flaws in the material presented, such as the one described earlier, went unnoticed by the class.

Following the command cases, a representative from the office of the Secretary of the Navy made a presentation to the class. The content of this talk was to be on retention and it was expected that the class would hear current information on the retention problem from an official source. Instead the representative gave somewhat of a locker-room pep-talk about setting an example, creating a good Navy image, and being organized. Football was used as an analogy several times during the 42-minute talk, and the speaker often illustrated his points by telling a story from his own experiences as CO. Participants had varying reactions to this presentation. Several felt it was a motivating talk which presented them with a challenge. Others were disappointed because they had not received valuable information from SECNAV and were irritated with the speaker's apparent vanity. The observer tended to agree with the latter opinion and felt that the time could have been better spent.

Participants were assigned worksheets to complete individually on critical CO/XO job functions, strategies for effective performance, and related subcompetencies. Time did not permit a final goal setting exercise or a discussion on the worksheets. The final activity of the course was a positive feedback session in which each participant complimented every other member of his small discussion group. Examples of feedback statements were printed in the Student Journal. Participants seemed to enjoy this activity and felt it was a good conclusion to the course.

Assessment instruments were administered and collected; the senior member of the class made some very favorable comments; and the course was concluded. No graduation ceremonies were held.

SECTION 4 - INTERPRETATION OF RESULTS

4.1 INTRODUCTION

The results of this assessment are interpreted in this section as they relate to the three evaluation objectives.

4.2 DISCUSSION

As described in Section 3 of this report, observer findings were generally supportive of participants' assessments. Summarized interpretation of these results is discussed in terms of course delivery, training materials, and instructor assignment policies.

4.2.1 COURSE DELIVERY

The performance of the PCO/PXO course instructors varied in effectiveness, but it was generally very good. With the exception of one instructor whose current level of lecturing ability was only adequate, performance in the lecture/discussion sessions was extremely effective. When time was taken to process material, the instructors demonstrated a high level of competence in facilitating meaningful discussions. Unfortunately, on a few occasions the focus of the processing activity was inappropriate. Also, several topics were not allowed a processing period. For the most part, group exercises were conducted well.

Classroom climate was open and warm, and the instructors were particularly supportive of the students and of one another during the course. The participants, however, did not appear to feel the same level of concern and respect for one another. The fact that several of the students were quite opinionated and that loosely defined cliques appeared to form early in the course probably contributed to this problem.

Delivery of course material also varied in effectiveness. Subject areas covered most successfully were those for which appropriate skill practice activities were held in conjunction with the presentation of cognitive material. Most of the units were structured to insure an adequate balance between knowledge acquisition activities and skill development exercises. In several cases, however, the skill practice exercises were not optimally relevant to the subcompetencies, and therefore, participants did not have the opportunity to try using the subcompetency skills and to receive feedback on their performance.

Competencies or areas covered most adequately were concern for efficiency and effectiveness, skillful use of influence, advising and counseling, and competency integration and application. A large quantity of material was presented in the unit on efficiency and effectiveness, but participants also had several opportunities to practice skills they were learning or to see them applied through case studies. Also, since this unit was given very early in the course, material on achievement, social motives, goal setting, managerial styles, organizational climate, and MBO was continuously referred to during the rest of the training. Thus, learning was reinforced naturally. The units on skillful use of influence and advising and counseling were successfully delivered primarily because they included an abundant amount and appropriate type of skill practice exercises and processing discussions. The integration and competency application unit was excellent as a summary and a final opportunity to tie learning points together. Units found to be inadequately covered were the process management and the problem solving units. Both were entirely too short to allow sufficient opportunity for learning and skill practice to take place, and both included activities which were less than maximally pertinent to the competency. Exercises in each unit were inappropriate for competency application and feedback purposes.

Because student performance was not measured, the degree to which the PCO/PXO course objectives were met cannot be determined. The data suggest that the instructors were successful in their efforts concerning student recognition of the five leadership and management competencies and their subcompetencies. Participants' understanding of the competencies and related research, however,

did not appear to be thorough. The instructors seemed to be at least somewhat successful in teaching students to recognize and understand the extent to which the competencies and subcompetencies impact performance. It seems that this objective would have been met to a greater degree if skill practice activities and processing discussions had been focused more clearly on the specific subcompetencies. The instructors seemed to be effective in directing participant attention to HRM issues, not only in the eighth unit of instruction, but during the entire course. The extent to which the PCO/PXO course graduates will pay proper attention to these issues while in command, however, is unknown. Finally, the instructors did not appear to be successful in teaching all the participants how to develop goals and plans to use in their jobs. In addition, resistance to goal setting and MBO, as management practices for use in Navy commands, appeared strong among many participants. Therefore, although it is impossible at this point to estimate future performance on the job, classroom results indicate that the PCO/PXO course was not taught clearly in line with the specified objectives.

4.2.2 COURSE MATERIALS

As discussed in Section 3 of this report, the Student Journal was a very useful tool for participants and was well constructed. The Student Journal used in this course, however, was not identical to the journal provided to SDC by MoBer in March 1979. Apparently, this manual was revised and reprinted in Coronado shortly before the course began. The Student Journal used in this course changed the division of units from the seven subject areas to the ten days. Process management was taught independently instead of with concern for efficiency and effectiveness, as in the original journal. Problem solving was also given a separate block of instruction, as opposed to the original journal in which this topic was taught in conjunction with skillful use of influence. HRM issues were covered in a separate, more comprehensive unit than in the first journal, and the command planning lesson and the final case study were combined into one final unit of instruction.

Case studies in the Student Journal were well written, and for the most part, the content was relevant to CO/XO job responsibilities. Appropriateness of other reading assignments varied. Some of the films and videotapes were acceptable and others were excellent learning aids. In general, the effectiveness of civilian films was lower than that of films made about or for the military. The outlines printed on cardboard charts were very effective in assisting students.

The instructors did not use any sort of Instructor Guide, but followed either their own notes or no written material at all. Although it appeared that the original content and process of the course had been revised in Coronado rather extensively, it could not be ascertained to what degree modifications had been made. Also, if no Instructor Guide is used in these courses, the effectiveness of the instructors will depend entirely on the research materials made available to them, their degree of preparation and dedication, their backgrounds, and other characteristics which vary with the individual. Thus, consistency of course delivery cannot be guaranteed and instructor effectiveness cannot be controlled to any extent. This use of an approved, published Instructor Guide in the PCO/PXO training is needed to promote standardization required of all LMET courses.

No objective student evaluation measures were taken during the course, and it appears that student progress was not objectively assessed at all.

4.2.3 INSTRUCTOR ASSIGNMENT

Interpretation of the findings regarding assignment procedures is difficult. Only three instructors in the PCO/PXO class were observed, and limited background data was supplied. Because observer findings support participants' perceptions, it appears that quality of instructor performance was confirmed subjectively. The apparent difference between one instructor's obvious shyness and the other instructors' tendencies to entertain indicates that these previously unconsidered traits may be of significance in predicting

future performance in the classroom. Because lecturing ability was the only area in which large differences in performance were noted, no other findings relevant to this evaluation objective can be discussed. As mentioned previously, the need for standardization of course delivery is an important consideration that impacts on instructor selection requirements.

SECTION 5 - CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 INTRODUCTION

Conclusions and recommendations concerning the assessment objectives of the LMET PCO/PXO course are presented in this section. The basis for the conclusions is documented by reference to the preceding sections of this report.

5.2 CONCLUSIONS

The first evaluation objective was to provide an assessment of the ability and proficiency of Navy instructors to effectively teach/deliver the LMET PCO/PXO course in compliance with course objectives. The following conclusions concern this objective:

1. The PCO/PXO course participants appeared to enjoy the training and considered it to be useful (3.2.1.1, 3.2.1.2, 3.2.2). Most of the participants expressed an awareness of a personal need for this type of education (3.2.1.2).
2. With a few exceptions, the Navy instructors were found to be effective in presenting course material through lectures and group exercises (3.2.1.2, 3.2.2, 3.3.1.1, 3.3.2). Delivery was most effective during lessons in which a summarizing/processing discussion was held (3.3.1.1, 3.3.2).
3. In most cases, the Navy instructors were extremely effective at facilitating group processes. All demonstrated a high level of skill in involving participants in discussions, as well as outstanding perception and insight. Occasionally discussions were not directed to the appropriate subject area (3.2.1.2, 3.3.1.1, 3.3.2).

4. Classroom atmosphere in general was very open and non-threatening; however, participant interaction indicated a less than ideal climate existed in the classroom (3.2.1.2, 3.3.1.2, 3.3.2).
5. Specific enabling objectives for each unit of instruction were not discussed in the classroom (3.3.1.3).
6. With some exceptions, the instructional methods used in the PCO/PXO course were found to be effective, and the balance between the various types of scheduled activities appeared to be appropriate and comfortable for both participants and instructors (3.2.1.2, 3.2.2, 3.3.2).
7. The PCO/PXO course content and process were found to be oriented toward the acquisition of knowledge. For the most part, the development and improvement of subcompetency skills was given inadequate attention both in the curriculum and in the course delivery (3.2.1.2, 3.3.1.1, 3.3.2).
8. Participants' knowledge acquisition level appeared to range from very good to excellent. The amount learned seemed to be greater for those topics for which fewer theoretical concepts were presented and more summarizing/processing discussions were held (3.2.1.1, 3.2.1.2, 3.3.2).
9. The level of participants' skill acquisition appeared to range from very poor to adequate. Students seemed to develop or improve skills to a greater degree during units such as the advising and counseling unit which included skill practice activities which were expressly designed for the particular subcompetency area and during which the focus was properly maintained (3.2.1.1, 3.2.1.2, 3.3.2).

10. All the examples used in the classroom and the large group discussions led by instructors were relevant to the Navy and to the specific job responsibilities of a CO or XO (3.2.1.2, 3.2.2, 3.3.1.1, 3.3.2).

The second evaluation objective concerned the adequacy of course materials as they affected delivery, and the evaluation of local or program sponsor modifications made in the delivery since the initial offering of the course. The following conclusions pertain to this objective:

1. Participants appeared to gain a great deal from the lecture notes, instructions, readings, and worksheets in the Student Journal. The goals of the LMET program and the overall PCO/PXO course goals were printed in the Student Journal, but the enabling objectives specific to each unit of instruction were omitted (3.2.1.2, 3.3.1.3, 3.3.1.4, 3.3.2).
2. Participants seemed to benefit from and enjoy the self-assessment instruments. Although none of the instruments were given thorough interpretations, most were introduced and explained adequately for the purposes of this course (3.2.1.2, 3.3.2).
3. A large part of the course material was relevant to the Navy and to the job responsibilities of a CO or XO. Exceptions included many of the homework reading assignments, which were generally academic in nature, and three civilian-produced films. The PCO/PXO course participants did not seem to have difficulty with the readings; however, differences between the situations shown in the films and typical Navy situations appeared to be important to the students. Posted charts outlining course material were apparently very effective (3.2.1.2, 3.2.2, 3.3.1.4, 3.3.2).
4. Student progress in the PCO/PXO course was not evaluated and no tests were given (3.3.1.3).

5. No Instructor Guide in any form was available for the PCO/PXO course (3.3.1.1, 3.3.1.4).
6. The PCO/PXO course curriculum was modified in Coronado shortly before this course was delivered. There was no evidence that standardization of the course had been assured (3.3.1.4).

The third evaluation objective was to provide recommendations for management decisions concerning the assignment of Navy instructors to deliver the PCO/PXO course. Data collected from only one PCO/PXO class is insufficient for the determination of conclusions concerning this objective. Only three LMET instructors were observed during this course, and complete information on their educational backgrounds, teaching experience, and other factors involved in selection was not provided to SDC. Background and performance data gathered systematically from an adequate sample of courses and instructors must be analyzed carefully in order to make the type of assessment required by the third evaluation objective. It was concluded, however, that a variety of variables are crucial to effective instructor performance. Findings from the course evaluation tentatively suggest that factors other than past performance as a commanding officer are important (3.3.1.1).

5.3 RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the above conclusions, the following recommendations are made:

1. The PCO/PXO course curriculum should be standardized and this course should be made available to all commanding officers and executive officers in the Navy.
2. Navy instructors should receive additional training in order to improve their skills in group management and their ability to create a favorable atmosphere for participant interaction. Consideration should be given to increasing the emphasis on group management skills in the LMET-I course.

3. Participants should be informed of the enabling objectives specific to each unit of instruction in the PCO/PXO course and these objectives should be discussed in the classroom. Objectives should be written to conform to the goal setting criteria taught in the LMET courses.
4. Group exercises, case studies, and other learning activities should be examined for pertinence to the competency and particular subskills being covered. Activities which provide general knowledge or behavior practice should be replaced with activities which allow specific skill use and development as well as individual performance feedback.
5. The content of the PCO/PXO course should be compared with the course objectives. The curriculum should be modified in order to improve congruence of the course content and process with the PCO/PXO course objectives. It is recommended that information concerning competency-based research be covered with more clarity and thoroughness and that more emphasis be placed on practicing subcompetency skills in situations similar to those found on the job.
6. Considerations should be given to the possibility of developing Navy learning aids which present content that is similar to that in the civilian-produced films but which is in a context relevant to the Navy. The lessons on organizational climate and performance counseling, among others, could be improved if the Harvard Business School film and "The Dryden File" film were replaced with new Navy aids on the same topics.
7. Enabling objectives should be included in the Student Journal for each unit of instruction.
8. A formal Instructor Guide should be written and used in all iterations of the PCO/PXO course.

APPENDIX A
LMET PCO/PXO COURSE SCHEDULE
MAY 1979

LMET PCO/EXO COURSE SCHEDULE - MAY 1979

<u>PERIOD</u>	<u>UNIT</u>	<u>TOPIC</u>	<u>LEARNING ACTIVITY</u>
Monday <u>7 May 79</u>			
0800-1012	Introduction	Administration, participant and instructor introductions and expectations	Lecture/discussion, group exercise
1012-1018		CNO film clip	Film
1030-1109		LMET briefing	Lecture/discussion
1114-1148		Course objectives, introduction and schedule	Lecture/discussion
1302-1333		Learning styles	Lecture/discussion, self-assessment instrument
1340-1354		SDC assessment	Form 1A (End of Introduction Unit)
1359-1408	Concern for Efficiency and Effectiveness	Competency definition	Lecture/discussion
1408-1559		Competency identification	Group exercise, discussion
1607-1631		Motivation	Lecture/discussion
1631-1640		SDC assessment	Form 10A (End of Day)
Homework		Motivation, motivational styles	Readings, self-assessment instrument
Tuesday <u>8 May 79</u>			
0730-0926	Concern for E & E (Cont.)	Motivation	Discussion
0937-1101		Target Practice simulation	Videotape, writing
1233-1340		Three social motives	Lecture/discussion
1338-1430		Categories of achievement thinking	Lecture/discussion, reading, discussion
1440-1551		Situational leadership	Lecture/discussion, self-assessment instrument
1604-1620		Goal setting elements	Lecture/discussion, reading
Homework		Goal setting	Reading, writing

LHET PCO/PXO COURSE SCHEDULE - MAY 1979 (Cont'd)

<u>PERIOD</u>	<u>UNIT</u>	<u>TOPIC</u>	<u>LEARNING ACTIVITY</u>
Wednesday 9 May 79			
0732-0934	Concern for E & E (Cont.)	Goal setting	Lecture/discussion, group exercise, discussion
0946-1145		Managerial styles	Lecture/discussion, writing, discussion
1303-1507		Organizational climate	Lecture/discussion, film, writing, discussion
1517-1715 1715-1725		Management by objectives SDC assessment	Lecture/discussion Form 2A (End of Concern for Efficiency and Effectiveness Unit) Readings
Homework		Motivation, management by objectives	
Thursday 10 May 79			
0730-0848	Process Management	Management control	Lecture/discussion, group exercise, discussion
0905-1149 1320-1328		Seabee Work Center SDC assessment	Group exercise, discussion Form 3A (End of Process Management Unit) Lecture/discussion
1333-1359 1359-1441	Skillful Use of Influence	Skillful use of influence	Lecture/discussion, reading, discussion
1441-1503 1503-1609	Homework	Categories of power thinking Four stages of power Critical incident scoring Implementation difficulties, role playing in training	Lecture/discussion Reading, group exercise, discussion Readings

LMFT PCO/PXO COURSE SCHEDULE - MAY 1979 (Cont'd)

<u>PERIOD</u>	<u>UNIT</u>	<u>TOPIC</u>	<u>LEARNING ACTIVITY</u>
Friday 11 May 79			
0730-0934	SUI (Cont.)	Empowering techniques	Film, discussion, role plays
0934-1130		Influence and power	Group exercise, role plays, discussion
1211-1307		Rewards and recognition	Lecture/discussion, group exercise, discussion
1312-1355		Interpersonal interaction	Self-assessment instrument, discussion
1355-1424		Pygmalion Effect	Film
1430-1440		SDC assessment	Form 4A (End of Skillful Use of Influence Unit)
	Homework	Forre field analysis, personal problem counseling	Form 20A (End of Week) Readings
Monday 14 May 79			
0730-0745	Problem Solving	Problem solving subcompetencies	Lecture/discussion
0745-0829		Brainstorming	Group exercise
0838-1140		Problem solving techniques	Reading, group exercise, role plays, discussion
1300-1310		SDC assessment	Form 5A (End of Problem Solving Unit)
1315-1350	Advising and Counseling	Advising and counseling demonstration	Lecture/discussion, reading, instructor role plays, discussion
1350-1440		Request masts and Navy Regulations	Lecture/discussion
1440-1705		Personal problem counseling techniques	Reading, lecture/discussion, role plays, discussion
	Homework	Charismatic leadership	Reading

LMET PCO/PXO COURSE SCHEDULE - MAY 1979 (Cont'd)

<u>PERIOD</u>	<u>UNIT</u>	<u>TOPIC</u>	<u>LEARNING ACTIVITY</u>
Tuesday <u>15 May 79</u>			
0730-1040	A & C (Cont.)	Performance counseling	Reading, film, writing, discussion, lecture/discussion, role plays
1050-1100		SDC assessment	Form 6A (End of Advising and Counseling Unit)
1220-1345	Integration and Competency and Application	Identification of competency application	Film, writing, discussion
1545-1555		SDC assessment	Form 7A (End of Integration and Competency Application Unit)
Homework		Alcohol, marijuana, women in the military	Readings
Wednesday <u>16 May 79</u>			
0730-0958	Human Resource Management Issues	Women in the Navy	Discussion (panel of Navy women)
1010-1225		NDRC and drug abuse in the Navy	Lecture/discussion (representative of NDRC)
1345-1519		ARC and alcohol abuse in the Navy	Discussion (representatives of ARC)
1533-1623		Functions of Counseling and Assistance Center	Videotape (representative of CAAC), lecture/discussion
Homework		Renegotiation	Reading

LMET PCO/PXO COURSE SCHEDULE - MAY 1979 (Cont'd)

<u>PERIOD</u>	<u>UNIT</u>	<u>TOPIC</u>	<u>LEARNING ACTIVITY</u>
Thursday 19 May 79			
0738-0954	HRM Issues (Cont.)	HRM cycle	Lecture/discussion
1005-1025		CNO objectives and analysis of tasking	Reading, writing
1025-1145		Interviews with CPO's and LPO's	Discussion
1300-1310		SDC assessment	Form 8A (End of HRM Issues Unit)
1320-1340		Retention	Discussion
1343-1800	Command Cases and Course Conclusion	Command cases	Reading, discussion, writing, group exercise
Homework		Presentation skills	Reading
Friday 18 May 79			
0730-0933	Command Cases and Course Conclusion (Cont.)	Command case presentations	Role plays, discussion
0946-1028		Retention	Lecture (representative from office of SECNAV)
1037-1100		Critical job functions and action planning process	Writing
1110-1140		Positive feedback	Writing, group exercise
1145-1155		SDC assessment	Form 9A (End of Command Cases and Course Conclusion Unit)
1200	<u>Course Completion</u>		

APPENDIX B
END-OF-UNIT QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

Table B-1. Participant Perceptions
of Introductory Knowledge Areas.
(Means)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This unit covered several areas as ground-work for the PCO/PXO course. In the box below, please indicate how much you feel you <u>learned</u> about each area and how <u>helpful</u> this information is to you as preparation for the PCO/PXO course. 	Amount Learned	Help in Course Preparation
Competency-based research	2.36	2.59
Learning styles (from Learning Style Inventory)	3.64	3.68
Reasons for change from LMT to LMET	2.14	1.86
LMET course training objectives	2.91	3.05

Table B-2. Participant Perceptions of
Efficiency and Effectiveness Knowledge Areas.
(Means)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Several important knowledge areas were covered during this unit. How much did you learn about each listed below and how useful do you feel the information learned will be to you in your job as a CO/XO? 	Amount Learned	Usefulness on Job
Motivation theory	3.47	3.68
Three social motives	3.55	3.35
Categories of achievement thinking	3.40	3.35
Goal setting criteria	3.00	3.30
Situational leadership	3.25	3.30
Organizational climate	3.50	3.55
Motivational styles	3.75	3.70
Management by objectives	3.32	3.60

Table B-3. Participant Perceptions of Efficiency and Effectiveness Skill Areas (Means).

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This unit covered five subcompetencies of efficiency and effectiveness. How much emphasis do you feel this course placed on each competency area, and how useful do you feel the skills you learned will be to you in your job as a CO/XO? 	Amount of Emphasis	Usefulness on Job
Sets challenging and realistic goals and expectations	3.65	3.75
Initiates action	3.10	3.45
Coaches subordinates	3.60	4.00
Encourages cooperation and teamwork	3.25	3.70
Demonstrates concern for efficiency and effectiveness	3.85	3.80

Table B-4. Participant Perceptions of Efficiency and Effectiveness Learning Activities (Means).

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This unit included several different learning activities. In the box below, please indicate how much you feel you learned about leadership and management (L&M) skills from each, and how useful the skills will be to you in the job as a CO/XO. 	Amount Learned	Usefulness on Job
Case Studies	3.37	3.21
Viewing Target Practice exercise on videotape	2.75	2.45
Motivational Style Questionnaire	3.45	3.25
Harvard Business School film	3.60	3.30
LEAD Instrument	3.00	3.00

Table B-5. Participant Perceptions of Process Management Skill Areas (Means).

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This unit covered four subcompetencies of process management. How much emphasis do you feel this course placed on each competency area, and how useful do you feel the skills you learned will be to you in your job as a CO/XO? 	Amount of Emphasis	Usefulness on Job
Manages and allocates competing resource requirements	2.76	3.19
Matches job requirements to individual capabilities	2.76	2.95
Systematically monitors progress toward the implementation of a plan	3.05	3.14
Gives effective performance feedback	2.76	3.24

Table B-6. Participant Perceptions of Process Management Learning Activities (Means).

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This unit included two learning activities. Please indicate how much you learned about leadership and management (L&M) skills from each and how useful the skills will be to you in your job as a CO/XO. 	Amount Learned	Usefulness on Job
Monitoring exercise	2.62	2.62
Seabee Work Center	3.19	2.76

Table B-7. Participant Perceptions of Skillful Use of Influence Knowledge Areas (Means).

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Several important knowledge areas were covered during this unit. How much did you learn about each listed below and how useful do you feel the information learned will be to you in your job as a CO/XO? 	Amount Learned	Usefulness on Job
Categories of power thinking	3.52	3.48
Specific behaviors of influential and non-influential COs and XOs (critical incident scoring)	3.38	3.24
Empowering techniques	3.57	3.67
Rewards and recognition	3.95	3.62

Table B-8. Participant Perceptions of Skillful Use of Influence Skill Areas (Means).

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This unit covered four subcompetencies of skillful use of influence. How much emphasis do you feel the course placed on each competency area and how useful do you feel the skills you learned will be to you in your job as a CO/XO? 	Amount of Emphasis	Usefulness on Job
Uses power in a positive fashion	3.62	3.67
Communicates and convinces others	3.33	3.81
Uses rewards and recognition	3.52	3.86
Controls expression of anger, coercion, and direct advice-giving	2.76	3.62

Table B-9. Participant Perceptions of Skillful Use of Influence Learning Activities (Means).

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This unit included several different learning activities. Please indicate how much you learned about leadership and management (L&M) skills from each and how useful the skills will be to you in your job as a CO/XO. 	Amount Learned	Usefulness on Job
Case Studies	3.38	3.38
Role plays	3.29	2.95
Seat 12A exercise in empowering others	2.90	2.86
Strength Deployment Inventory	3.05	2.81
"The Pygmalion Effect" film	3.86	4.14

Table B-10. Participants' Perceptions About Ability to Influence Others (Means).

Question	Mean Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Compared with your ability to influence others before entering this course and using the techniques learned in this course, how effective do you think you will be from now on in influencing your <u>subordinates</u>? 	3.33
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comparing similarly, how effective do you think you will be from now on in influencing your <u>peers</u>? 	3.29
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comparing similarly, how effective do you think you will be from now on in influencing <u>those higher in the chain of command</u>? 	3.33

Table B-11. Participant Perceptions of Problem Solving Skill Areas (Means).

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This unit covered six subcompetencies of problem solving. How much emphasis do you feel this course placed on each competency area, and how useful do you feel the skills you learned will be to you in your job as a CO/XO? 	Amount of Emphasis	Usefulness on Job
Conceptualizes a problem:		
Recognizes discrepancies between an actual and a preferred situation	2.68	3.32
Gathers facts to support a problem definition	2.73	3.32
Determines forces that promote or restrain change	2.77	3.27
Develops a plan:		
Determines alternatives	3.18	3.64
Selects appropriate action	3.23	3.50
Effectively delegates responsibility	2.50	3.23

Table B-12. Participant Perceptions of Problem Solving Learning Activities (Means).

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This unit included two learning activities. Please indicate how much you learned about leadership and management (L&M) skills from each, and how useful the skills will be to you in the job as a CO/XO. 	Amount Learned	Usefulness on Job
Case study	2.95	3.23
Role play	2.95	3.00

Table B-13. Participant Perceptions of Problem Solving Techniques (Means).

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This unit covered two problem solving techniques. Please indicate how much you feel you learned about each and how useful these techniques will be to you in the job as CO/XO. 	Amount Learned	Usefulness on Job
Force field analysis	2.09	2.27
Brainstorming	2.86	3.41

Table B-14. Participant Perceptions of Advising and Counseling Knowledge Areas (Means).

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Two important knowledge areas were covered during this unit. How much did you learn about each listed below and how useful do you feel the information learned will be to you in your job as a CO/XO? 	Amount Learned	Usefulness on Job
Techniques of personal problem counseling	4.18	4.05
Techniques of performance counseling	3.77	3.77

Table B-15. Participant Perceptions of Advising and Counseling Skill Areas (Means).

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This unit covered subcompetencies of advising and counseling. How much emphasis do you feel this course placed on each competency area, and how useful do you feel the skills you learned will be to you in your job as a CO/XO? 	Amount of Emphasis	Usefulness on Job
Listens to others and accurately hears what they are saying	3.90	4.14
Checks understanding of the problem: Asks for clarification	3.41	3.73
Checks for clarification	3.55	3.68
Indicates understanding	3.77	3.82
Offers helpful plans and alternatives	3.41	3.77
Demonstrates positive attitude: Shows genuine interest	3.82	4.00
Establishes rapport	3.55	3.68
Seeks out persons with problems	2.77	3.18

Table B-16. Participant Perceptions of Advising and Counseling Learning Activities (Means).

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This unit included several different learning activities. Please indicate how much you learned about leadership and management (L&M) skills from each and how useful the skills will be to you in your job as a CO/XO. 	Amount Learned	Usefulness on Job
Instructors' role play	3.73	3.82
Participants' role plays	3.82	3.77
"Dryden File" film	3.50	3.50

Table B-17. Participant Perceptions of Human Resource Management Knowledge Areas (Means).

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Several important knowledge areas were covered during this unit. How much did you learn about each listed below and how useful do you feel the information learned will be to you in your job as a CO/XO? 	Amount Learned	Usefulness on Job
HRM issues	3.00	3.16
Strategies for producing change	2.74	3.11
HRM Cycle	3.00	3.10

Table B-18. Participant Perceptions of Human Resource Management Learning Activities (Means).

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This unit included several different learning activities. Please indicate how much you learned about Human Resource Management (HRM) from each and how useful the skills will be to you in your job as a CO/XO. 	Amount Learned	Usefulness on Job
Panel discussion on women at sea	3.43	2.81
Visiting drug speaker	4.25	4.00
Visiting alcohol speaker	3.16	3.58
Counseling speaker videotape	2.35	2.70
Analyzing CNO Fleet Commander goals	2.35	2.70
Interviews with chiefs and petty officers	4.05	4.10

Table B-19. Participant Perceptions of Competency Application Knowledge Areas (Means).

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This unit included several different learning activities. Please indicate how much you learned about leadership and management (L&M) skills from each and how useful the skills will be to you in your job as a CO/XO. 	Amount Learned	Usefulness on Job
Analyzing command case data	3.80	3.65
Developing goals for command cases	3.60	3.80
Developing an action plan for command cases	3.35	3.45
Role plays (Captain's call)	3.75	3.70
Identifying critical CO/XO job functions (individual exercise)	3.05	3.50
Setting goals (individual exercise)	3.21	3.47
Positive feedback exercise	3.60	3.60

Table B-20. Participant Perceptions of PCO/PXO Skill Areas (Means).

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LMET PCO/PXO course is designed to increase your ability to perform a variety of competency skills important for effective leadership and management. Reflecting back over the entire course, how much do you feel you learned about each skill listed below, and how useful will the skills learned be to you in the job as a CO/XO? 		Amount Learned	Usefulness on Job
Task Achievement	Concern for achievement	3.38	3.70
	Taking initiative	3.05	3.62
	Setting goals	3.76	4.10
	Coaching others	3.52	4.05
	Technical problem solving	2.71	3.05
Skillful Use of Influence	Concern for influence	3.52	3.62
	Influencing others	3.67	3.95
	Conceptualizing a problem	3.00	3.43
	Team building	3.29	3.81
	Rewarding others	3.19	4.05
	Self-control	3.52	3.86
Management Control	Planning and organizing	3.38	4.10
	Directing others	3.05	3.57
	Delegating responsibility to others	2.90	3.86
	Optimizing (people-tasks)	3.10	3.55
	Monitoring results	2.90	3.57
	Resolving conflicts	2.86	3.57
	Giving feedback	3.62	4.14

Table B-20. Participant Perceptions of PCO/PXO Skill Areas (Means). (Cont'd)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LMET PCO/PXO course is designed to increase your ability to perform a variety of competency skills important for effective leadership and management. Reflecting back over the entire course, how much do you feel you learned about each skill listed below, and how useful will the skills learned be to you in the job as a CO/XO? 		Amount Learned	Usefulness on Job
Advising and Counseling	Listening to others	3.95	4.29
	Understanding others	3.76	3.95
	Helping others	3.29	3.76
	Positive expectations	4.00	4.19
Coercion	Coerciveness	3.14	2.81
	Negative expectations	3.19	2.71
	Disciplining others	2.81	3.29
	Acting impulsively	2.90	2.45
	Failing to resolve conflicts	3.19	2.80