

①

Research Note 85-84

AD-A160 707

A COMPARISON OF THE VALUES OF HIGHLY SUCCESSFUL SENIOR
FIELD GRADE INFANTRY OFFICERS WITH THOSE OF
COMPANY GRADE INFANTRY OFFICERS AND CIVILIANS

Frederick N. Dyer and Richard E. Hilligoss

for

ARI Field Unit at Fort Benning, Georgia
Seward Smith, Chief

TRAINING RESEARCH LABORATORY
Harold F. O'Neil, Jr., Director

DTIC FILE COPY



U. S. Army

Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences

August 1985

DTIC
ELECTE
OCT 30 1985
S D
E

Approved for public release. distribution unlimited.

85 10 30 048

**Best
Available
Copy**

U. S. ARMY RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR THE BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

A Field Operating Agency under the Jurisdiction of the
Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel

EDGAR M. JOHNSON
Technical Director

WM. DARRYL HENDERSON
COL, IN
Commanding

Accession For	
NTIS GRA&I	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DTIC TAB	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unannounced	<input type="checkbox"/>
Justification	
By _____	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or Special
A-1	



This report has been cleared for release to the Defense Technical Information Center (DTIC). It has been given no other primary distribution and will be available to requestors only through DTIC or other reference services such as the National Technical Information Service (NTIS). The views, opinions, and/or findings contained in this report are those of the author(s) and should not be construed as an official Department of the Army position, policy, or decision, unless so designated by other official documentation.

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER Research Note 85-84	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO. AD-A160707	3. REPORT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) A Comparison of the Values of Highly Successful Senior Field Grade Infantry Officers with Those of Company Grade Infantry Officers and Civilians		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Oct. 1979-Sept. 1980
7. AUTHOR(s) Frederick N. Dyer and Richard E. Hilligoss		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS ARI Field Unit at Fort Benning, Georgia, P.O. Box 2086, Fort Benning, GA 31905-0686		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s) --
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences, 5001 Eisenhower Avenue, Alexandria, VA 22333-5600		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS 2Q162722A791
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office) --		12. REPORT DATE August 1985
		13. NUMBER OF PAGES 13
		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified
		15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.		
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report) --		
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES --		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Infantry Values Value Structures Leadership Value Change		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) The Kokeach Value Scale was used to measure values of highly successful senior Infantry officers at the Army War College (AWC). The values of new and experienced Infantry junior officers were also measured. All Infantry groups, but especially the AWC group, showed major differences from a national sample of males. The AWC group ranked the values "An Exciting Life, A Sense of Accomplishment, National Security, Self-Respect, (being) Capable, (being) Courageous, (being) Honest, (being) Imaginative, (being) Logical, and (being) Responsible" (over)		

DD FORM 1 JAN 73 1473

EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

20. (continued)

much higher in importance than the national sample of males. The AWC group ranked the values "A Comfortable Life, A World at Peace, a World of Beauty, True Friendship, (being) Ambitious, (being) Broadminded, (being) Cheerful, (being) Clean, (being) Forgiving, (being) Loving, and (being) Polite" much lower in importance than did the national sample. The three Infantry groups also showed differences among themselves, with the AWC colonels and lieutenant colonels typically differing from the junior Infantry officers in the same way that all of the Infantry groups differed from the civilians. Implications of these results for research aimed at changing "deficient" values among new Infantry officers are discussed.

CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
METHOD	1
RESULTS	2
AWC-National Sample Comparisons	2
Comparisons Among Infantry Groups	5
DISCUSSION	9
REFERENCES	10

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Terminal Value Median Rankings and Composite Rank Orders for Army War College (AWC) Infantry Students, National Sample Males and College-Educated National Sample Males and Females	3
Table 2. Instrumental Value Median Rankings and Composite Rank Orders for Army War College (AWC) Infantry Students, National Sample Males and College-Educated National Sample Males and Females	4
Table 3. Means, Standard Deviations and Composite Rank Orders for Infantry Groups on Terminal Values	6
Table 4. Means, Standard Deviations and Composite Rank Orders for Infantry Groups on Instrumental Values	7
Table 5. Correlations Among Composite Rank Orders for the Two National Sample Subgroups and the Three Infantry Groups (Terminal Values Above Diagonal--Instrumental Values Below)	8

INTRODUCTION

The Army has a long tradition of emphasis on proper values for its personnel. The values Duty, Honor, and Country, for example, have been the slogan of the U.S. Military Academy since the last century. Proper values for the Army are still a large concern of the Army's senior leadership. This may partly reflect current emphasis in behavioral and management science on the association between individual values and individual behavior (Rokeach, 1973, 1979; England and Lee, 1974). Rokeach (1979) has argued that the values of senior leaders in an organization can be legitimately considered to be the "organization values." The values of these senior leaders or "gatekeepers", undoubtedly were a factor in causing the behavior that led to the rise of these personnel in the organization. These senior leaders are also likely to reward and promote personnel with a similar set of values.

The research reported here was concerned with the values of highly successful senior Infantry officers, namely, Infantry Branch students at the Army War College (AWC). The selectness of this AWC student group is indicated by the fact that only about one of every 100 officers initially commissioned in the Infantry achieve this important career milestone. The research compared the values of this AWC group with the values of all males in Rokeach's National Sample (Rokeach, 1973). It also compared AWC values with the values of a highly-educated subset of the total National Sample (men and women). In addition, the research provided a cross-section comparison of these senior Infantry leader values with the values of newly-commissioned Infantry officers and Infantry officers approximately five years into their careers.

METHOD

The senior Infantry leaders were 33 Lieutenant Colonels and four Colonels from the AWC Class of 1980. Their average age was 41.3 years and average time in service was 19.0 years. These 37 students were all that were available for testing from the total of 41 Infantry students in that class. The experienced junior Infantry officers were all of the students in two Infantry Officer Advanced Course (IOAC) classes at Fort Benning early in 1980. These 240 students were made up of two Second Lieutenants, 142 First Lieutenants and 96 Captains. Their average age was 27.7 years and average time in service was 5.3 years. The 192 newly-commissioned Infantry Second Lieutenants were from a single Infantry Officer Basic Course (IOBC) which began at Fort Benning in June 1980. Their average age was 22.1 years. Rokeach's National Sample of males was made up of 665 men over 21 years of age from all strata of U.S. society (Rokeach 1973). The National Sample had 151 people (including females) with college and graduate degrees who were also compared to the well-educated AWC students.

Values were measured with the Rokeach Value Scale (Rokeach 1973). In this instrument, two lists of 18 values are ranked on their importance to the individual "in his own life". The terminal values and the instrumental values are presented in Tables 1 and 2, respectively. An additional terminal value Physical Fitness and an additional instrumental value Active were added since these values appeared to have high relevance for military personnel. Rokeach's instrument has consistently been successful in discriminating between groups differing in characteristics such as sex, socioeconomic status, education, life style, and occupation (Rokeach 1973).

Feather (1975) has shown the nearly equivalent results that are obtained from rating and from ranking of the values. In the present research all three Infantry groups rated the values on the following scale:

1. Not at all important in my life.
2. Slightly important in my life.
3. Somewhat important in my life.
4. Moderately important in my life.
5. Highly important in my life.
6. Extremely important in my life.
7. One of the most important values in my life.

The IOBC and IOAC groups completed a pencil-and-paper version. The AWC group rated the values at a computer terminal. Following ratings of all values on a list, the AWC student also completed a paired-comparisons procedure which broke ties for values given the same numerical ratings. This provided a complete ranking of the values for each AWC student and allowed comparisons with value rankings of Rokeach's National Sample (Rokeach, 1973).

RESULTS

AWC-NATIONAL SAMPLE COMPARISONS

All Infantry groups showed major differences from the males in Rokeach's National Sample. Statistical comparison was possible between the Army War College group and the National Sample subgroups since median ranks were available for each group. Table 1 presents and compares median ranks for these three groups for the terminal value list. Table 2 presents the median ranks for the instrumental values. The median of the National Sample male subgroup was treated as the "population median" and the AWC "sample" median was compared to it (Hollander and Wolfe, 1973, p. 54). Only four terminal values and only three instrumental values did not differ significantly ($p < .05$) between the AWC students and the National Sample males.

Table 1

Terminal Value Median Rankings and Composite Rank Orders for Army War College (AWC) Infantry Students, National Sample Males and College-Educated National Sample Males and Females

	National Sample (Males) N=665	AWC Infantry Students N=37	National Sample (College-Educated Males & Females) N=151
A comfortable life	7.8 (4)	14.9 (16)	12.9 (14)
An exciting life	14.6 (18)	8.1 (6)	14.1 (16)
A sense of accomplishment	8.3 (7)	5.8 (5)	6.0 (5)
A world at peace	3.8 (1)	11.8 (12)	4.1 (1)
A world of beauty	13.6 (15)	17.6 (18)	12.6 (13)
Equality	8.9 (9)	14.5 (15)	8.6 (7)
Family security	3.8 (2)	3.8 (2)	4.7 (2)
Freedom	4.9 (3)	5.7 (4)	5.0 (3)
Happiness	7.9 (5)	10.1 (9)	10.0 (10)
Inner harmony	11.1 (13)	12.0 (13)	9.3 (9)
Mature love	12.6 (14)	10.6 (11)	10.3 (11)
National security	9.2 (10)	4.1 (3)	11.5 (12)
Pleasure	14.1 (17)	16.8 (17)	15.7 (18)
Salvation	9.9 (12)	10.0 (8)	13.3 (15)
Self-respect	8.2 (6)	2.8 (1)	6.8 (6)
Social recognition	13.8 (16)	10.5 (10)	14.7 (17)
True friendship	9.6 (11)	11.9 (14)	8.7 (8)
Wisdom	8.5 (8)	9.0 (7)	5.2 (4)

Figures shown are median rankings and, in parentheses, composite rank orders. Asterisks indicate level of significance of difference between AWC students and each of the two National Sample subgroups

* p < .05
 ** p < .01
 *** p < .001

Table 2

Instrumental Value Median Rankings and Composite Rank Orders for Army War College (AWC) Infantry Students,
National Sample Males and College-Educated National Sample Males and Females

	National Sample (Males) N=665	AWC Infantry Students N=37	National Sample (College-Educated Males & Females) N=151
Ambitious	5.6 (2)	8.1 (7)	7.3 (4)
Broadminded	7.2 (4)	11.1 (10)	6.0 (3)
Cafable	8.9 (8)	3.9 (4)	9.2 (9)
Cheerful	10.4 (11)	16.9 (17)	11.8 (15)
Clean	9.4 (9)	16.8 (16)	13.5 (16)
Courageous	7.5 (5)	3.2 (3)	7.9 (5)
Forgiving	8.2 (6)	13.2 (14)	10.1 (11)
Helpful	8.3 (7)	12.2 (11)	8.7 (6)
Honest	3.4 (1)	1.1 (1)	3.1 (1)
Imaginative	14.3 (18)	8.8 (8)	11.1 (14)
Independent	10.2 (11)	6.6 (5)	8.8 (7)
Intellectual	12.8 (15)	12.9 (12)	9.4 (10)
Logical	13.5 (16)	7.0 (6)	10.7 (13)
Loving	10.9 (14)	17.1 (18)	10.3 (12)
Obedient	13.5 (17)	13.1 (13)	15.9 (18)
Polite	10.9 (13)	15.1 (15)	13.5 (17)
Responsible	6.6 (3)	2.9 (2)	5.5 (2)
Self-controlled	9.7 (10)	9.1 (9)	8.9 (8)

Figures shown are median rankings and, in parentheses, composite rank orders. Asterisks indicate level of significance of difference between AWC students and each of the two National Sample subgroups:

* p < .05
 ** p < .01
 *** p < .001

All the Army War College students had a least an undergraduate degree and for this reason their values were also compared with the values of the 151 college-educated people in Rokeach's National Sample. These 151 included both males and females since available breakdowns of the National Sample did not allow the more appropriate comparison of AWC students with college-educated males. For 24 of the 36 values, the same differences and absence of differences that had appeared between AWC students and the all-male sample were found between AWC students and the new college-educated male-female sample. However, for the values A Comfortable Life, A Sense of Accomplishment, Happiness, Mature Love, Pleasure, Ambitious, Independent and Polite; former large differences in value rankings disappeared or were greatly reduced. Social Recognition and Obedient, which previously had not shown differences between AWC students and civilian males, now were ranked significantly lower in importance by the college-educated National Sample. Wisdom had not differed between AWC students and all males but was rated higher in importance by college-educated males and females.

These differences between the comparative rankings for the two National Sample subgroups may have reflected either the education differences, the sex differences or both. However, evidence exists that the education differences outweighed sex differences. Rokeach had found no overall male-female difference in rankings of the value Obedient. Yet this value which previously had shown no AWC-National Sample male differences, differed significantly when the comparison group changed in education and sex composition. In addition, the overall male-female difference Rokeach found in rankings of A Sense of Accomplishment would have operated to magnify the AWC-male National Sample difference, when AWC students were compared to the college-educated group, not eliminate it, as actually occurred.

Average ratings, standard deviations and the composite rank orders for terminal values for the three Infantry groups are presented in Table 3. Table 4 presents these data for the instrumental values. It can be seen that the composite rank orders (rank orders based on the average ratings for the entire group) are very similar among the three groups. Correlations among these composite rank orders were calculated and are presented in Table 5. Table 5 also includes the correlations among the composite rank orders for the two National Sample subgroups and composite rank orders for each of the Infantry groups. Correlations involving terminal values are presented above the diagonal and correlations involving instrumental values are presented below the diagonal. The very high correlations among Infantry groups contrast sharply with the low to moderate correlations between the National Sample subgroups and each of the Infantry groups.

Comparisons Among Infantry Groups

Although similarity among the three Infantry groups was the primary result, significant differences ($p < .05$) existed among these three groups on their ratings of both lists of values. Considering first the terminal values, the Army War College group rated the values Physical Fitness, Self-Respect and

Table 3

Means, Standard Deviations and Composite Rank Orders for Infantry Groups on Terminal Values*

Value	ASC		IOAC		IOEC	
	\bar{X}	S. d.	\bar{X}	S. d.	\bar{X}	S. d.
A Comfortable Life	4.34	1.21	5.03	1.20	4.61	1.45
An Exciting Life	5.58	1.01	5.50	1.09	5.49	1.20
A Sense of Accomplishment	6.20	1.08	6.00	1.01	5.94	0.97
A World at Peace	4.90	1.61	4.46	1.65	4.53	1.63
A World of Beauty	3.47	1.35	4.33	1.38	4.50	1.46
Equality	4.47	1.45	4.83	1.38	4.77	1.68
Family Security	6.28	0.92	6.02	1.22	6.08	1.02
Freedom	6.12	1.04	6.15	1.00	6.17	0.91
Happiness	5.36	1.14	5.77	1.00	5.69	1.09
Inner Harmony	4.82	1.50	5.49	1.18	5.55	1.20
Mature Love	5.20	1.31	5.64	1.08	5.78	1.17
National Security	6.12	1.14	5.69	1.21	5.75	1.13
Physical Fitness	6.01	1.02	5.53	1.08	5.51	1.05
Pleasure	3.74	1.25	4.65	1.28	4.35	1.35
Salvation	4.82	2.13	4.51	2.03	4.62	2.16
Self-Respect	6.69	0.73	6.01	0.98	5.97	0.83
Social Recognition	5.25	1.03	4.84	1.16	4.55	1.33
True Friendship	4.69	1.35	5.27	1.15	5.66	1.05
Wisdom	5.39	1.45	5.54	1.18	5.78	1.14

* Significant differences in value ratings between groups are described in text.

Table 4

Means, Standard Deviations and Composite Rank Orders for Infantry Groups on Instrumental Values*

Value	AMC		IOLC		IOBC	
	\bar{X}	S.d.	\bar{X}	S.d.	\bar{X}	S.d.
Active	5.54	1.01	5.48	0.97	5.46	1.01
Ambitious	5.84	0.79	5.63	1.01	5.65	1.00
Broadminded	5.27	1.06	5.41	1.12	5.51	1.01
Capable	6.49	0.70	6.09	0.88	5.94	0.89
Cheerful	4.41	1.06	4.95	1.04	5.04	1.21
Clean	4.53	1.33	4.96	1.25	4.94	1.19
Courageous	6.54	0.68	6.16	0.94	6.01	0.94
Ferocious	5.00	0.81	5.04	1.19	5.17	1.24
Helpful	5.05	1.06	5.05	1.13	5.15	1.26
Honest	6.81	1.06	6.32	0.90	6.02	0.89
Imaginative	5.65	0.87	5.24	1.13	5.28	1.10
Independent	5.95	0.76	5.97	1.04	5.81	1.01
Intellectual	5.24	1.22	5.32	1.09	5.50	1.03
Logical	5.92	0.93	5.78	0.99	5.43	1.09
Loving	4.41	1.29	5.31	1.17	5.46	1.11
Obedient	4.81	1.42	4.97	1.22	5.15	1.20
Polite	4.73	1.30	5.05	1.19	5.27	1.06
Responsible	6.73	0.56	6.24	0.86	6.06	0.79
Self-Controlled	5.89	0.94	5.79	1.12	5.88	0.93

* Significant differences in value ratings between groups are described in text.

Table 5

Correlations Among Composite Rank Orders for the Two National Sample Subgroups and the Three Infantry Groups
(Terminal Values Above Diagonal--Instrumental Values Below)

	National Sample (Males)	National Sample (College-Educated Males & Females)	AWC	IOAC	IOBC
National Sample (Males)	--	.79	.36	.44	.46
National Sample (College-Educated Males & Females)	.81	--	.40	.48	.60
AWC	.47	.71	--	.75	.79
IOAC	.49	.79	.90	--	.94
IOBC	.50	.76	.82	.96	--

* Triangles represent the correlations between the composite rank orders for the Infantry groups only.

Rectangles represent the correlations between the composite rank orders for the Infantry groups and the national sample subgroups.

Social Recognition significantly higher in importance than either IOAC or IOBC students. The same was true for the value National Security except that the difference between AWC and IOBC only approached significance ($p < .10$). The Army War College students rated the values A World of Beauty, Inner Harmony, Mature Love, Pleasure and True Friendship significantly lower in importance than they were rated by the IOAC and IOBC students. The AWC students rated a Comfortable Life significantly lower in importance than the IOAC group but the difference between AWC and IOBC was not significant for this value.

The following differences in ratings appeared between IOBC and IOAC for the terminal values. IOAC students rated A Comfortable Life, Pleasure and Social Recognition significantly higher in importance than they were rated by IOBC students. On the other hand, IOBC students rated True Friendship and Wisdom significantly higher than IOAC students.

For instrumental values, the Army War College students rated Capable, Courageous, Honest, Imaginative and Responsible significantly higher in importance than either IOBC or IOAC students. The IOAC and IOBC students both rated Cheerful, Clean, Loving and Polite higher in importance than they were rated by the Army War College group. IOAC and IOBC differed in their ratings with IOAC rating Honest, Logical and Responsible higher in importance and IOBC rating Polite higher in importance.

DISCUSSION

The senior-level AWC Infantry officers and most of the junior Infantry officers showed striking differences in value rankings from Rotundo's National Sample of U.S. Males and also from a college-educated subset of his total National Sample. The much higher commitment of these AWC officers to the values An Exciting Life, National Security and Courageous would have been readily predicted. However, their higher rankings than the male sample on A Sense of Accomplishment, Self-Respect, Capable, Honest, Imaginative, Logical and Responsible, plus their much lower rankings of a Comfortable Life and Pleasure illustrate a commitment to high-quality hard work and to self-sacrifice which might not fit as readily with stereotypes of an officer in the Combat Arms.

The values A Sense of Accomplishment, A Comfortable Life and Pleasure did not differ between AWC students and the college-educated sample indicating that some of the value differences between the AWC students and the total male National Sample were probably associated with the higher education levels of the AWC students. Other changes for the AWC-college-educated-sample comparison were that the values Social Recognition and Obedient now were ranked significantly higher in importance by the AWC students. Wisdom, on the other hand, was ranked higher by the college-educated National Sample subgroup. None of these three values had differed between the AWC students and the all male sample.

Although the major differences of all three Infantry groups from the civilian comparison groups are more striking, real differences did occur among the three Infantry groups. The AWC students rated the values National Security, Physical Fitness, Self Respect, Social Recognition, Capable, Courageous, Honest, Imaginative and Responsible significantly higher in importance than they were rated by either the IOAC or IOBC students. AWC students rated the values

A World of Beauty, Inner Harmony, Mature Love, Pleasure, True Friendship, Cheerful, Clean, Loving and Polite lower in importance than they were rated by either the IOAC or IOBC students. It is interesting that these AWC student differences from the other Infantry groups are quite similar to the differences of all three Infantry groups from the National Sample subgroups.

Many factors could account for the differences between the AWC Infantry Branch students and the two Infantry junior officer groups. One possible explanation is that those officers who did not consider National Security, Physical Fitness, Self-Respect, etc., as highly important throughout their careers, never achieved the important career milestone of attendance at the Army War College. Age and experience differences among the three groups are other possible explanations, but these would predict monotonic changes in value ratings going from IOBC, through IOAC, to AWC. Such changes occurred for 21 of 38 values but this does not differ significantly from the 19 monotonic relationships that would be expected by chance.

Additional research is underway which will bear on this question of whether individual differences in value ratings are a factor in success of Infantry leaders. Value ratings of IOBC students are being correlated with a number of success indices from the IOBC (e.g., Expert Infantry Badge attainment). Value ratings will also be correlated with leadership performance ratings made after their first year as Platoon Leaders. In addition, those IOBC students who demonstrate large discrepancies from the AWC students (and from most of their IOBC colleagues) on the key values of National Security, a Sense of Accomplishment, and Physical Fitness are being randomly assigned to a feedback or a no-feedback group to test whether value ratings will change as a result of this feedback. Of more importance, will be the test of whether performance during IOBC and after are also modified by the feedback. Rokeach (1973) has consistently demonstrated changes in values and behavior as a result of feedback to a person about value discrepancies between the person and his reference group. If we successfully improve leadership performance of new Infantry officers by the simple administration of a pencil-and-paper value scale and by comparing an individual's results to those of successful Infantry leaders, we may have demonstrated the most cost-effective leadership training ever.

REFERENCES

- England, G. W. and Lee, R. The relationship between managerial values and managerial success in the United States, Japan, India, and Australia. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1974, 59, 411-419.
- Feather, N. T. Values in Education and Society, The Free Press, New York, 1975.
- Hollander, N. and Wolfe, D. A. Nonparametric Statistical Methods, Wiley, New York, 1972.
- Rokeach, M. The Nature of Human Values. The Free Press, New York, 1973.
- Rokeach, M. Understanding Human Values. The Free Press, New York, 1979.