

Technical Report 1320

Identification of Company Command Competencies

Laura A. Ford

Human Resources Research Organization

Heather M.K. Wolters

U.S. Army Research Institute

Karen O. Moriarty

Michael J. Cullen

Don Forrest

Human Resources Research Organization

June 2013



**United States Army Research Institute
for the Behavioral and Social Sciences**

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

**U.S. Army Research Institute
for the Behavioral and Social Sciences**

**Department of the Army
Deputy Chief of Staff, G1**

Authorized and approved for distribution:



MICHELLE SAMS, Ph.D.

Director

Research accomplished under contract
for the Department of the Army by

Human Resources Research Organization

Technical review by

Sharon D. Ardison, U.S. Army Research Institute
Gregory A. Ruark, U.S. Army Research Institute

NOTICES

DISTRIBUTION: Primary distribution of this Technical Report has been made by ARI. Please address correspondence concerning distribution of reports to: U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences, ATTN: DAPE-ARI-ZXM, 6000 6th Street (Bldg. 1464 / Mail Stop: 5610), Ft. Belvoir, Virginia 22060.

FINAL DISPOSITION: Destroy this Technical Report when it is no longer needed. Do not return it to the U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.

NOTE: The findings in this Technical Report are not to be construed as an official Department of the Army position, unless so designated by other authorized documentation.

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

1. REPORT DATE (dd-mm-yy) June 2013		2. REPORT TYPE Final		3. DATES COVERED (from. . . to) June 2011 to May 2012	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Identification of Company Command Competencies				5a. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER W91WAW-09-D-0013	
				5b. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER 622785	
6. AUTHOR(S) Laura A. Ford; Heather M.K. Wolters; Karen O. Moriarty, Michael J. Cullen, Don Forrest				5c. PROJECT NUMBER A790	
				5d. TASK NUMBER 405	
				5e. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Human Resources Research Organization 66 Canal Center Plaza, Suite 700 Alexandria, Virginia 22314				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences 6000 6 th Street (Bldg. 1464 / Mail Stop 5610) Fort Belvoir, VA 22060-5610				10. MONITOR ACRONYM ARI	
				11. MONITOR REPORT NUMBER Technical Report 1320	
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Distribution Statement A: Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Heather M. K. Wolters is the Contracting Officer's Representative (COR)					
14. ABSTRACT (<i>Maximum 200 words</i>): Company command currently has responsibilities that were once at the battalion or brigade command level, but now have been pushed down to the company level. This research identified 35 company command competencies required for successful performance in the current environment. Twenty-nine focus groups with current and former Company Commanders, Battalion Commanders, Small Group Leader Instructors at Captains Career Courses, Command Sergeants Major, First Sergeants and other senior non-commissioned officers helped to draft an initial competency model. Survey results from 138 Battalion Commanders, Company Commanders, and Small Group Instructors provided additional data concerning the (a) required proficiency levels for each competency, (b) extent to which each competency differentiates superior from less effective commanders, (c) extent to which competencies should be fostered in pre-command training, and (d) level of preparedness for competency-related job responsibilities. The survey also identified optimal training methods for five competency clusters: knowledge, leadership, operational, personal, and resource management. The Company Command Competency Model delineates the command responsibilities for this command level and can be used to identify gaps in pre-command courses and assess training effectiveness.					
15. SUBJECT TERMS Company Command; Competencies; Leadership; Training					
SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF			19. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT Unlimited	20. NUMBER OF PAGES 90	21. RESPONSIBLE PERSON (Name and Telephone Number) Dorothy Young (703) 545-2378
16. REPORT Unclassified	17. ABSTRACT Unclassified	18. THIS PAGE Unclassified			

Technical Report 1320

Identification of Company Command Competencies

Laura A. Ford

Human Resources Research Organization

Heather M.K. Wolters

U.S. Army Research Institute

Karen O. Moriarty

Michael J. Cullen

Don Forrest

Human Resources Research Organization

Fort Leavenworth Research Unit

James W. Lussier, Chief

U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences

6000 6th Street, Bldg. 1464

Fort Belvoir, VA 22060

June 2013

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited

IDENTIFICATION OF COMPANY COMMAND COMPETENCIES

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Research Requirement:

The objectives of this project were to identify the competencies required of Company Commanders and determine if training gaps exist in current pre-command training. To meet these objectives, a detailed competency model was developed for company-level command along with an examination of the perceived usefulness of training methods to develop specific competency types. The results were used to make recommendations to the School for Command Preparation (SCP) regarding optimal training strategies for Company Commanders.

Procedure:

Using the Brigade Command Competency Model (Wolters et al., 2011) and a literature review of mid-level managerial and leadership competency models as a starting point, the first step in developing the Company Command Competency Model was to gather information, using focus groups, from subject matter experts (SMEs) most familiar with and knowledgeable of company command responsibilities. The SMEs included current and former Battalion Commanders, current and former Company Commanders, and Small Group Leaders (SGL, instructors from the Captains Career Courses) as well as Command Sergeants Major (CSM), Sergeants Major (SGM), and First Sergeants (1SG). A follow-up survey was created to determine the proficiency required of each competency, evaluate the extent to which each competency should be trained in pre-command training, and determine which training methods were thought to be best and worst in terms of developing five competency clusters for command (knowledge, leadership, operational, personal, and resource management). Perceptions of the preparedness level for specific, competency-based company command job responsibilities were also collected.

Findings:

The content analysis of the focus group discussions resulted in a draft Company Command Competency Model with 35 competencies. Each competency is delineated by numerous key behaviors. Further, the content analysis highlighted similarities and differences between company and brigade command. The participants made apparent the difference in responsibilities required between these command levels; however, they also indicated that there is substantial overlap. The main differences were in the details (e.g., key behaviors), especially in the realm of operational and resource management responsibilities.

The survey findings reinforced those from the focus groups in that no new competencies were identified for the draft model and results did not support dropping any competencies from the draft model. Survey participants indicated *Modeling the Army Values and Warrior Ethos*, *Taking care of Soldiers*, *Knowledge of Troop Leading Procedures*, *Maintaining discipline standards*, *Creating an ethical and positive command climate*, and *Engaging in direct leadership* required the highest level of proficiency (3.51 to 4.5 on a 5 point scale; an “advanced level”).

With regard to the extent a competency should be developed in pre-command training, the majority of competencies received ratings of either should be trained “to a considerable extent” (corresponding to a rating of 3.51 to 4.5 on a 5 point scale) or should be trained “to a moderate extent” (2.51 to 3.5 on a 5 point scale).

Survey participants with recent company command experience were also asked to rate their preparedness (on a 0 to 5 point scale) to perform a list of job responsibilities that were directly linked to specific competencies. The five highest ranked job responsibilities were working with one’s First Sergeant to set unit goals, demonstrating the value of equal opportunity and diversity, counseling subordinate leaders and NCOs, developing an effective Commander’s intent for subordinate leaders to follow, and completing the Commander’s unit status report to indicate readiness in all areas.

With respect to the perceived efficacy of 10 different training methods, no single training method was deemed the best for every competency type. Although respondents chose “Practical application assignment with coaching” as one of the top training methods for three competency clusters (leadership, operational, and resource management) it was not one of the highest rated methods for training knowledge or personal competencies. The lowest ranked training method for knowledge, operational, and resource management competency types, the “Structured self-development tool,” was one of the highest rated methods for personal competencies.

The final Company Command Competency Model was crosswalked with the *Company Commander/First Sergeant Course Proposed Common Task List* (School for Command Preparation, 2012). The results showed that approximately 40% of the competencies are not addressed on this pre-command course task list. Although all of the resource management competencies were addressed, the other competency clusters (knowledge, leadership, operational, and personal) were covered to a lesser degree.

The company command competencies were also crosswalked with the brigade command competencies (Wolters et al., 2011) to determine how the competencies relate to one another and how a company-level competency evolves into a competency or a set of competencies at brigade-level command. The results suggest that the competencies are quite stable from company to brigade command. Virtually all company command competencies crosswalk to brigade command competencies. Most differences occur at the level of the key behaviors that define each competency.

Implications:

Instructors and curriculum developers can use the Company Command Competency Model to outline new pre-command curricula or identify gaps in existing curricula. The suggested training methods for particular competency types will also be useful in presenting training material, as they are likely to be highly regarded by the pre-command students. Furthermore, the list of job responsibilities developed to assess preparedness may be a useful pre- and post-assessment tool for course instructors.

IDENTIFICATION OF COMPANY COMMAND COMPETENCIES

CONTENTS

	Page
BACKGROUND	1
COMPANY-LEVEL PRELIMINARY COMPETENCY MODEL DEVELOPMENT	2
The Nature of Company-Level Command in the United States Army.....	2
Literature Review of Middle-Management and Leadership Competencies	3
OFFICER AND SENIOR NON-COMMISSIONED OFFICER FOCUS GROUPS	4
Focus Group Methodology	4
Focus Group Sample.....	5
Focus Group Results	6
Competencies Necessary for Company Command.....	6
Reactions to the Brigade Command Competency Model.....	9
Reactions from and Comments about Training	9
Summary	12
SURVEY OF BATTALION COMMANDERS, FORMER COMPANY COMMANDERS, AND SMALL GROUP LEADERS	18
Survey Content.....	18
Data Cleaning.....	21
Demographic Summary	22
Survey Results	23
COMPANY COMMAND COMPETENCY MODEL CROSSWALKS	39
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	40
NEXT STEPS	44
REFERENCES	46

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A. CONTENT ANALYSIS OF RELEVANT STUDIES..... A-1

APPENDIX B. COMPETENCIES DERIVED FROM CONTENT ANALYSIS OF FOCUS
GROUP INTERVIEWSB-1

APPENDIX C. CROSSWALK OF COMPANY COMMAND COMPETENCIES WITH
THE COMPANY COMMANDER/FIRST SERGEANT COURSE
PROPOSED COMMON TASK LISTC-1

APPENDIX D. COMPANY COMMAND TO BRIGADE COMMAND COMPETENCY
CROSSWALK D-1

TABLES

TABLE 1. DEMOGRAPHIC DATA.....5

TABLE 2. BRANCH REPRESENTATION BY POSITION.....6

TABLE 3. COMPANY COMMAND COMPETENCIES MOST COMMONLY IDENTIFIED
BY SUBJECT MATTER EXPERTS7

TABLE 4. COMPETENCIES THAT DISTINGUISH SUCCESSFUL FROM LESS
SUCCESSFUL COMPANY COMMANDERS8

TABLE 5. SUGGESTED TRAINING METHODS FOR SPECIFIC COMPETENCIES12

TABLE 6. COMPANY COMMAND COMPETENCY MODEL13

TABLE 7. SURVEY ITEMS FOR RATING COMPANY COMMAND COMPETENCIES....19

TABLE 8. COMPANY COMMAND COMPETENCIES BY CLUSTER20

TABLE 9. BATTALION COMMANDERS BY BRANCH22

TABLE 10. FORMER COMPANY COMMANDERS BY BRANCH.....23

TABLE 11. MEAN PROFICIENCY REQUIREMENT RATINGS BY COMPETENCY25

TABLE 12. MEAN DIFFERENTIATION RATINGS BY COMPETENCY26

CONTENTS (CONTINUED)

Page

TABLE 13. MEAN RATINGS OF EXTENT THAT PRE-COMMAND COURSES SHOULD FOSTER COMPETENCY DEVELOPMENT	27
TABLE 14. PREPAREDNESS RATINGS FOR COMPANY COMMAND RESPONSIBILITIES	28
TABLE 15. TEN TOP-RATED COMPETENCIES ON THE PROFICIENCY REQUIRED, DIFFERENTIATION, AND EXTENT PRE-COMMAND COURSES SHOULD DEVELOP SCALES	30
TABLE 16. RANKINGS OF TRAINING METHODS FOR THE KNOWLEDGE COMPETENCY CLUSTER	34
TABLE 17. RANKINGS OF TRAINING METHODS FOR THE LEADERSHIP COMPETENCY CLUSTER	35
TABLE 18. RANKINGS OF TRAINING METHODS FOR THE OPERATIONAL COMPETENCY CLUSTER	36
TABLE 19. RANKINGS OF TRAINING METHODS FOR THE PERSONAL COMPETENCY CLUSTER	37
TABLE 20. RANKINGS OF TRAINING METHODS FOR RESOURCE MANAGEMENT COMPETENCY CLUSTER	38
TABLE 21. RECOMMENDED METHODS FOR TRAINING COMPETENCIES BY CLUSTER	43

IDENTIFICATION OF COMPANY COMMAND COMPETENCIES

Background

Requirements of Company Commanders continue to evolve resulting in ever greater challenges. Aside from the well-recognized need to develop more adaptive thinking in company-level decision making, company-level leaders are being asked to make the type of decisions that commanders at the battalion and even brigade levels of command have made in the past in terms of scope and type of resources available. Some of the issues current company leaders must face are allocating non-organic resources, negotiating with local authorities over resource and policy issues, collaborating with non-government organizations, and processing large amounts of information; many Company Commanders are just learning to master basic tactical combat techniques for their organization. Two Company Commanders who were frustrated with the gap between the training they had received and the challenges they were facing in theater created a website called Companycommand.com to share lessons learned (Baum, 2005). The tremendous popularity of the website is a testament to the difficulties that the Army faces when attempting to prepare officers for company-level command (note that the website was originally an open-access site, but is now CAC-enabled and located at <http://cc.army.mil/index.htm>). Identifying the competencies required to successfully command a company and the most effective training methods to develop such competencies, are critical goals for the Army.

Previous ARI research (Wolters et al., 2011) identified brigade command competencies with the School for Command Preparation (SCP). That research resulted in (a) a competency model that specifies the complex, diverse competencies required of today's Army Brigade Commanders, (b) an understanding of the extent to which such competencies are trained in officers' pre-command courses (PCCs), and (c) preferences for training methods and instructional approaches through which different types of competencies could be trained.

Similar to the brigade command research described above, the current effort identified methods and instructional approaches that the SCP and the Command Team Enterprise¹ can use to prepare Company Commanders for the challenges inherent for that command level. These approaches were rooted in and directly informed by the competencies required of Company Commanders. The Brigade Command Competency Model provided a solid starting point in the identification of company-level command competencies but many competencies were revised to reflect the different responsibilities between these command echelons. As cited in FM 7-0, *Training Units and Developing Leaders for Full Spectrum Operations* (U.S. Department of the Army, 2011), "Company Commanders personally manage their company's training. A commander at battalion level and higher manages training through the unit operations officer, who develops the unit's training plans (p. 1-2)." The current research's technical approach focused on capturing such differences with a high degree of fidelity and the list of company-level competencies reflects these differences.

The identification of company command competencies comprised multiple steps. The first step in developing the Company Command Competency Model was to conduct focus group

¹ The Command Team Enterprise (CTE) is a group of stakeholders regarding command training and development. It provides a forum for discussion about a variety of issues regarding commandership and command training.

interviews with subject matter experts (SMEs) most familiar with and knowledgeable of Company Commander responsibilities: current and former Battalion Commanders, current and former Company Commanders, and Small Group Leaders (instructors from the Captains Career Course) as well as Command Sergeants Major (CSM), Sergeants Major (SGM), and First Sergeants (1SG) – all experienced in performing as Company Commanders or interacting with them. Participants in these focus groups were also asked to provide input on the effectiveness of Company Commander training, to identify possible gaps in company-level pre-command training, and to make suggestions that could improve pre-command training.

The primary goal of the second step was to integrate the information from the first step using content analysis of the focus groups to develop a preliminary list of Company Commander competencies. For the purposes of this research, a competency is defined as a knowledge, skill, ability, or other characteristic associated with high performance as a brigade commander (Mirabile, 1997). An extensive literature review of both mid-level managerial and leadership competency models was also conducted to round out the information that could be drawn upon to build the company-level competency model.

The third step of the research was to conduct a survey. The survey generated ratings that helped quantify the proficiency required of the competencies, evaluate the extent to which each competency should be developed in pre-command training, determine which training methods were thought to be best and worst in terms of developing the competencies, and evaluate Company Commander preparedness for specific job responsibilities associated with the competencies.

The final version of the Company Command Competency Model was used for two additional analyses. The first was to crosswalk the company command competencies with the *Company Commander/First Sergeant Course Proposed Common Task List* (School for Command Preparation, 2012) to highlight possible training gaps in this pre-command curriculum by identifying which competencies were or were not addressed. In addition, the Company Command Competency Model was crosswalked with Brigade Command Competency Model. The results provide insight into the origin of early command competencies and illustrate how competencies evolve as officers rise in command echelon.

Company-Level Preliminary Competency Model Development

The Nature of Company-Level Command in the United States Army

Company-level command is a commissioned officer's first opportunity to command in the United States Army with the full responsibility and authority of command. In his book entitled *Company command: the bottom line*, Meyer (1990) remarks that "company command is the most demanding job in the Army" (p. 1). Given its importance, company-level command is a key developmental assignment for officers. The leadership competencies required for successful company-level command are much different than those required for success as a platoon leader. Allen and Burgess (2001) make the point that a large element of leadership is supported by knowledge and skill. They note, however, that there is a significant jump in leadership complexity from Platoon Leader to Company Commander. The skill and knowledge required for platoon-level leadership will not be sufficient at the company level.

On a daily basis, Company Commanders exert direct influence on Soldiers and subordinate leaders primarily through communicating intent and expectations (U.S. Department of the Army, 2006a). Company-level commanders lead by example—their actions permeate the unit. They establish the personality and climate of the unit based on their personal and leadership competence.

Transitioning from platoon-level leadership positions, the Company Commander has a broader scope of responsibilities. Besides employment of their unit, Company Commanders are responsible for training, administration, personnel management, maintenance, force protection, sustainment, and a variety of other requirements. At this level, Company Commanders must focus attention on the professional development of their subordinate leaders: non-commissioned officers (NCOs) and officers alike. Additionally, Company Commanders have authority to administer corrective or punitive actions under the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ).

Company Commanders' primary focus is on preparing their Soldiers and unit for the demands of combat. According to FM 3-21.10, regardless of branch, Company Commanders must integrate and synchronize a greater scope of capabilities and requirements as compared to their predecessors (U.S. Department of the Army, 2006b). Examples include dealing with embedded media, managing micro-loans to support economic development projects, or training host nation military forces. Often this must be done across an assigned area of operation that in the past could have been assigned to a battalion unit or larger.

Given this change in scope and complexity, it could be argued that the leadership competencies required of today's Company Commanders rival those of Battalion or Brigade Commanders of 20 years ago. In 2001, the Army Training and Leader Development Panel Officer Study concluded that because of this change in the operational environment, leader development should focus on the competencies of self-awareness and adaptability (U.S. Department of the Army, 2001).

Literature Review of Middle-Management and Leadership Competencies

This section describes a review of the managerial and military competency literature. The purpose of this review was to: (a) identify critical core competencies for mid-level managers in the civilian and military sectors, and (b) ensure that the draft Company Commander Competency Model captured these managerial competencies within its framework.

Several sources of information were utilized to conduct this review. First, a computerized literature search was conducted of psychological, business, and military databases to identify leadership and management competency models reported in the scholarly and practitioner-oriented press. The computerized literature search involved three databases: PsychInfo, Business Source Premier and the Defense Technical Information Center (DTIC). Key word searches were designed to find studies that involved competency modeling for managerial positions in the civilian and military sectors. The keyword searches identified several hundred references. Titles were examined for relevance and, where it was not clear from the title whether a source was relevant or not, abstracts or the articles/periodicals were examined.

Second, available technical reports and other documentation were reviewed along with an Internet search to identify previous competency modeling and related work relevant to this analysis. Studies were selected based on three primary criteria: (a) their methodological soundness, (b) the target population of mid-level managers in the civilian or military sectors, and (c) whether the competency model was developed a single organization or multiple organizations. For competency models developed for the civilian sector, preference was given to studies that targeted as diverse an array of organizations as possible.

The search of past technical reports, the Internet, and the PsychInfo, Business Source Premier, and DTIC computerized databases yielded 21 methodologically sound, relevant, research-based managerial competency models, five military leadership frameworks, and four practitioner managerial competency models. These studies and competency models formed the basis of the review. This information informed the development of the Company Command Competency Model by allowing researchers to consider managerial competencies that might be important for company-level commanders. However, this literature review was not expected to produce a comprehensive list of command competencies.

The literature was summarized in a series of annotated bibliographies, presented in Appendix A. The content of Tables A.1-A.3 was assessed in order to detect and remedy any existing gaps in the preliminary Company Commander Competency Model. The literature review highlighted a large set of competencies common to many managerial jobs across diverse organizations, including Planning, Guiding, Directing, Organizing, Decision Making, Monitoring, Motivating, Managing Conflict, Delegating, and Influencing. Many of the competencies identified in the civilian literature were found in the military literature as well. However, there were other unique competencies identified in the military literature: Extending Influence beyond the Chain of Command, Leading Courageously, Being Technically and Tactically Proficient, and Employing Your Command in Accordance with its Capabilities. Elements of these competencies are likely relevant to company command.

Officer and Senior Non-Commissioned Officer Focus Groups

The process of developing a preliminary competency model began by asking military SMEs to review the Brigade Command Competency Model, identify how company competencies differ from brigade competencies, and identify competencies unique to company-level command. To do this, participants were asked to think about what differentiates superior from less successful Company Commanders, to identify what competencies are most important to company command, and also to provide input on pre-command training prior to company command. This section of the report describes the focus group methodology, data transcription and analysis procedures, and the themes that emerged from the analyses.

Focus Group Methodology

Each focus group session lasted approximately one hour and consisted of two to six people; six interviews were conducted with only one participant. A semi-structured approach was applied in that a common set of questions (slightly different depending on participant type) was used across all interviews. Focus group participants were asked to describe and discuss the competencies required for company command, the competencies that distinguished successful

from less successful commanders, the competencies unique to company command, and relevant pre-command training issues. In addition, follow-up probing questions were also asked, depending on given responses.

Focus group recordings were transcribed into summary notes by two separate researchers to ensure accuracy. The summary transcriptions were then carefully analyzed and independently content-coded by two researchers. Following the independent coding, individual responses were synthesized into a summary document. The following sections describe the focus group participants and content analysis results.

Focus Group Sample

In order to get a multisource or 360-degree perspective on Company Commanders' responsibilities, and hence identify underlying competencies, individuals from several vantage points were asked to participate. Twenty-nine focus groups were conducted and of those, 11 groups were composed of Battalion Commanders (former and current), 9 were groups of Captains, 6 were with NCOs, and 3 were with Small Group Leaders (SGLs). Table 1 provides the rank, position tenure, and deployment history of the focus group participants.

Table 1

Demographic Data

Participant Perspective	<i>n</i>	Years in Position	Deployed in Position	No. and Rank
Battalion Commanders	36	1994-present	22 Yes, 14 No	4 MAJ; 22 LTC; 10 COL
Small Group Leaders ^a	8	2010-present	Not applicable	5 CPT; 3 MAJ
Company Commanders	37	2001-present	17 Yes, 13 No, 7 Not reported	35 CPT; 2 MAJ
Senior NCOs	20	2001-present	9 Yes, 8 No, 3 Not reported	2 SFC; 1 MSG; 6 1SG; 3 SGM; 8 CSM

^aSmall group leaders were instructors at various Captains Career Courses.

Different sources provide different insights into company command job responsibilities. Battalion Commanders offer the view from the supervisor perspective. As such, they provided the most information about how companies fit into the battalion and how they fulfill the Battalion Commander's intent. They also have the benefit of hindsight, having been Company Commanders. Company Commanders themselves provide important input because they know what their job requires on a daily basis. The SGL instructors are a valuable source because they are most familiar with the training the career course provides. They can provide insight on what they observe as knowledge or training deficits among current students. They also interact with students and have valuable information about issues with which the Company Commanders-to-be are most concerned. Finally, senior NCOs provide the perspective of seasoned military personnel who carry out the Company Commanders intent, giving them unique insight into Company Commanders' strengths and weaknesses. As was learned in focus group discussions, a critical relationship for company command success is between the Company Commander and his/her First Sergeant. Hence, the input of senior NCOs is especially informative because many will have worked with Company Commanders during different time frames (i.e., pre- and post-Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom, or during the current war in

Afghanistan) allowing them to see how the Army, as well as company command responsibilities, have changed over the years. Potential participants were recruited through contacts at the SCP and through ARI's Research Support Request (RSR) process. The CSMs were students in the Command Sergeants Major Development Program. Table 2 provides a breakout of the participants' branches.

Table 2

Branch Representation by Position

Branch	NCO	Co Cdr	SGL	Bn Cdr	Total
Infantry		2	2	12	16
Aviation		7	1	5	13
Field Artillery	2	3	1	4	10
Medical Service Corps	1	5	1	1	8
Military Police	2	2		3	7
Logistics		2	1	3	6
Military Intelligence	1	4	1		6
Signal Corps	2	3	1		6
Engineering	1	2		2	5
Armor	1	1		2	4
Quartermaster	1	2		1	4
Missing	4				4
Adjutant General		2			2
Chemical	1			1	2
Ordnance	1	1			2
Psychological Operations	1			1	2
Air Defense				1	1
Medical Corps	1				1
Special Forces	1				1
Transportation Corps		1			1
TOTAL	20	37	8	36	101

Notes. NCO – non-commissioned officer, Co Cdr – Company Commander, SGL – Small Group Leader, Bn Cdr – Battalion Commander.

Focus Group Results

Interview questions focused on three main areas discussed earlier in this section. In addition, the discussion of the applicability of the Brigade Command Competency Model to company command probed into the similarities and differences between the two levels. Where relevant, discussions also focused on how prepared participants were (or felt they were) to assume command after pre-command training. And finally, Company Commander focus groups discussed areas they would have liked to have received training in prior to assuming command.

Competencies Necessary for Company Command

A complete list of the competencies that were derived from the content analysis of the focus group interviews is presented in Appendix B. More frequently discussed competencies, mentioned by three or more focus groups, are presented in Table 3. Company Commanders need

to possess a range of competencies. Broadly speaking, these competencies can be separated into five groups including (a) *leadership* aspects of company command such as developing subordinate leaders, engaging in direct leadership, establishing relationships, and caring for Soldiers and their families, (b) *technical knowledge* such as knowledge of the UCMJ and knowledge of battalion staff operations, (c) *resource management* such as training management, enforcing command supply discipline, and managing administrative requirements, (d) *personal abilities/qualities* such as moral fitness, physical and mental stamina, and adaptability, and (e) *operational* competencies such as critical thinking, decision making, and organizational skills.

Table 3

Company Command Competencies Most Commonly Identified by Subject Matter Experts

Competency	No. of focus groups
Develop subordinate leaders/Engage in direct leadership	10
Knowledge of all jobs in the unit	9
Communicates effectively with diverse audiences (written and verbal)	9
Interpersonal skills/establishes relationships with different types of people	8
Adapt to changing conditions	7
Manage unit training	6
Critical thinking skills	6
Take care of Soldiers	6
Maintain Comprehensive Soldier Fitness	6
Knowledge of battalion staff operations	6
Creates an ethical and positive command climate	5
Establish and enforce Command Supply Discipline	4
Manage unit time	4
Establish trust within the organization	4
Work effectively within the chain of command	4
Decision making ability	4
Models the Army Values and Warrior Ethos	4
Intelligence	4
Knowledge of the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ)	3
Knowledge of resources available to the company	3
Build effective teams	3
Organizational skills	3
Self-awareness and self-understanding	3
Manage administrative requirements	3
Moral fitness	3
Maturity	3
Models behavior after effective leaders	3

Competencies that Differentiate Successful from Less Successful Company Commanders. Competencies noted as differentiating successful from less successful Company Commanders were similarly aligned with what was indicated as necessary for company command. Table 4 presents the competencies mentioned in three or more focus groups.

Competencies that were noted as being both necessary (in Table 3) and differentiating appear in bold type in Table 4. As a whole, leadership skills and relationships with fellow officers, NCOs, and Soldiers appear to be associated with company command success as are critical thinking skills and creating an ethical and positive command climate.

Table 4

Competencies that Distinguish Successful from Less Successful Company Commanders

Competency	No. of focus groups
Accomplish mission in accordance with higher headquarters' intent	8
Decision making ability	8
Interpersonal skills/establishes relationships with different types of people	7
Work effectively within the chain of command	6
Takes care of Soldiers	5
Communicates effectively with diverse audiences (written and verbal)	5
Adapt to changing conditions	4
Develop subordinate leaders	4
Establish/maintain a command team with 1SG	4
Maturity	3
Critical thinking skills	3
Intelligence	3
Creates an ethical and positive command climate	3
Manage unit time	3

Note. Competencies highlighted in bold print also appear in Table 3. That is, they were noted as being necessary for company command.

Comparison of Competencies Necessary for Company and Brigade Command.

When asked to compare the responsibilities of company command with those of brigade command, participants noted that roles and responsibilities differed across the two levels, primarily due to differences in focus. For example, Brigade Commanders have a more strategic focus, whereas Company Commanders have a more tactical focus. Relatedly, Brigade Commanders have a more long-term or strategic outlook than do Company Commanders. With a more tactical focus than Brigade Commanders, Company Commanders must be technically proficient and have more direct contact with, and influence over, their Soldiers, which may also include a large amount of involvement with family issues. However, participants also felt there was a great deal of overlap in terms of competencies required to command at both the company and brigade levels.

Company Commanders' Relationship with Command Team. Participants provided insight into the nature of the relationship between the Company Commander and the 1SG. In general, they believed the two should work together as a team, supporting each other when together and apart. The 1SG's job is to manage the day-to-day operations of the company, while the Company Commander is responsible for accomplishing the mission that is set forth for the company. Generally, a 1SG will have approximately 15 years of experience in the Army, while a

CPT will have about 5 years of experience before taking command. Factors affecting the dynamics of the relationship include differences in age, maturity, and life experiences. In addition, many 1SGs have experience working with multiple Company Commanders, but the reverse situation is not often the case. Hence, the 1SG is in a position to mentor and train the Company Commander in the details of the company operations.

Reactions to the Brigade Command Competency Model

Focus group participants were shown the Brigade Command Competency Model (Wolters et. al., 2011) and asked questions designed to determine which brigade command competencies were relevant for company command. Most of the brigade command competencies apply to company command to some extent. In fact, of the 39 brigade command competencies, most could be applied with some modification, to company command. In some instances, it was suggested that brigade command competencies could be translated verbatim to the company command competencies. Examples are critical thinking skills and knowledge of the UCMJ. In others, the brigade command competencies were modified to reflect the different focus of company command alluded to earlier. An example of this includes rewriting the brigade competency, *Ability to engage in indirect leadership*, to one more appropriate for company-level: *Ability to engage in direct leadership*. Another change was altering the brigade competency entitled *Ability to influence inside and outside the formation* from a single competency to making it a component of a communication-related competency where its focus was narrowed to “influencing inside and outside the chain of command,” as opposed to the “formation.” In other instances, new competencies were suggested specifically for company command. Examples of these competencies include *Establishing and enforcing command supply discipline* and *Managing unit family support requirements*.

Reactions from and Comments about Training

Another discussion topic for the focus groups (for Officers with company command experience) addressed pre-command training issues: how Company Commanders are educated and trained, how effective pre-command training is, what training gaps exist in current pre-command training, how competencies in the draft Company Command Competency Model could be trained, and recommendations to improve pre-command training. Questions differed slightly depending on the experience and position of the interviewees (former and current Company Commanders, instructors in Captains Career Courses, and former and current Battalion Commanders) as to how training issues were addressed. Interview responses represent a wide range of training and practical experience.

Effectiveness of pre-command training for Company Commanders. The effectiveness of the Captains Career Course (CCC) and PCC² in preparing Captains for company command was discussed in focus groups composed of Battalion Commanders, Captains, and SGLs. Opinions about the strengths and weaknesses of the courses varied, although focus group discussions tended to focus on training needs. Areas of strength in PCCs mentioned were

² Pre-command courses offered at various garrisons where individuals take command.

coverage of the Military Decision Making Process (CPTs),³ Uniform Code of Military Justice (CPTs), Mission Essential Task Lists (SGLs), maintenance (SGLs), planning of offensive, defensive, and stability operations at company level (SGLs), and common core competencies (SGLs). One group of interviewees (CPTs) felt that CCC mostly prepared officers for garrison operations. Another group, battalion command selectees, mentioned that CCC gives officers the doctrinal, technical, and tactical base to be a Company Commander. However, interviewees in three focus groups (CPTs and battalion command selectees) noted that although the CCC did a good job of preparing one to be a staff officer, it sometimes did not provide the leadership tools necessary for command. One SGL interviewee, reflecting on his own CCC experience, said, “No one told us how to run a change-of-command inventory, run a training meeting, or how to do training management. Also, how to handle Soldier discipline issues—that is what Company Commanders spend a whole lot of time doing.” Two focus groups mentioned that there are recurring questions that students in the CCC tend to ask. These areas include questions about legal issues, change in command and authority, command supply discipline programs, writing OERs and NCOERs, counseling Soldiers, administrative issues, UCMJ issues, and doctrinal issues relating to AR 600-20,⁴ command philosophies, and Commanders’ intent.

The SGL focus groups also noted areas of training that, in retrospect, they wished they had before their own time in company command. The SGLs identified several such training areas where they provided additional training reinforcement to their CCC students:

- Supply management
- Misperceptions between races or genders
- Cultural sensitivity
- Branch-specific pre-command instruction
- Administrative and management skills such as:
 - Running a change-of-command inventory
 - Running a training meeting
 - Training management
 - Handling Soldier discipline issues

One SGL noted that the formal education he had before taking command meant that he knew Troop Leading Procedures (TLPs) very well but he needed more training on the types of concerns bulleted above.

Possible training gaps in pre-command training courses. Slightly more than half of the officers who participated in the focus groups commented on the knowledges, skills, and abilities (KSAs) and competencies that, in their opinion or experience, are not addressed in pre-command training:

- The art of leveraging the UCMJ (four focus groups: CPTs and SGLs). Specific examples from the interviews included contacting the Inspector General or the Judge Advocate

³ Parentheses in the remainder of this section note the type of interviewees in the focus group providing the information.

⁴ AR 600-20 is the Army regulation that prescribes policy and procedures regarding command, military conduct, and discipline

General and putting the UCMJ into practice (i.e., knowing how to apply the code to various situations)

- Property management (four focus groups: CPTs)
- Skills and knowledge of maintenance systems (three focus groups: CPTs, former Battalion Commanders, SGLs)
- Property accountability (three focus groups: CPTs, SGLs)
- Family Readiness Groups (three focus groups: CPTs, former Battalion Commanders, SGLs)
- Training management (three focus groups: CPTs)
- Problem-solving (two focus groups: battalion command selectees, former Battalion Commanders)
- Computer and software training (one focus group: CPTs)
- Planning a deployment (one focus group: SGLs)
- Counseling (one focus group: SGLs)
- Taking care of Soldiers (e.g., resilience training, behavioral health [one focus group: SGLs])
- Interpersonal skills (one focus group: CPTs)
- Briefing skills (one focus group: CPTs)
- Writing OERs and NCOERs (one focus group: CPTs)
- Branch-specific training (one focus group: CPTs)
- Tactical problem solving using TLPs (one focus group: former Battalion Commanders)

Suggestions for improving training. The most common suggestion (four focus groups: CPTs, SGLs) for improving training is that Company Commanders need more pre-command experience. This suggests that a great deal of training and learning takes place not in the classroom, but in the assignments one has before taking command. In two separate interview sessions, officers said that one learns to be a Company Commander from the Company and Battalion Commanders for whom one has worked. In another interview, it was suggested that the best position to prepare one for command is being an XO as a Lieutenant. Similarly, another focus group (SGLs) proposed that experiences are linked to certain competencies or skills that lead to making a person more a capable CCC student, adding; those who come out of TRADOC assignments tend to do poorly in CCC, while those who do well come out of FORSCOM assignments. The implication is that officers may need more time in supporting or developmental assignments than they are currently experiencing before assuming company command.

Regarding instructional experience, four focus groups (SGLs, CPTS, and CSMs) mentioned that the ideal instructors of PCCs are those just out of command themselves (i.e., those fresh out of command are most knowledgeable about current requirements of the Company Commander position). A more general suggestion for improving pre-command training (SGLs) was to create a separate CCC for those who are command-bound and make it mandatory prior to taking command. A similar suggestion was to develop a company command preparation course that would address specific topics such as supply inventories and training management.

Suggestions targeting how to train specific competencies. Focus group participants were also encouraged to discuss methods to train specific competencies. As shown in Table 5, the majority of suggestions came from SGLs who were currently instructing in CCC. Training

suggestions mainly targeted those competencies that they thought were not currently being trained. However, Battalion Commanders and CSMs gave input training suggestions for Family Readiness Group (FRG) knowledge and branch-specific skills. Also suggested were small group discussions, 360-evaluations, mentorship, and development of additional training blocks.

Table 5

Suggested Training Methods for Specific Competencies

Competency	Suggested Training Method	Focus Group Perspective
Interpersonal skills	360-evaluations Develop these skills in platoon leaders	SGL Instructors from CCC
Uniform Code of Military Justice	Have small group discussions	SGL Instructors from CCC
Property accountability	Have small group discussions	SGL Instructors from CCC
Supply inventories	Develop a pre-command block of instruction	SGL Instructors from CCC
Training management	Develop a pre-command block of instruction	SGL Instructors from CCC
Family resource group (FRG) operations	Develop a pre-command block of instruction	Battalion Commanders
Branch-specific skills	More mentorship from senior leaders	Command Sergeants Major
Team building	Create a training block to train how to evaluate strengths and weaknesses of subordinate capabilities/leadership dynamics/training needs (band of excellence)	SGL Instructors from CCC
Counseling	Develop a pre-command block of instruction	SGL Instructors from CCC
Officer Evaluation Reports	Develop a pre-command block of instruction	SGL Instructors from CCC

Summary

The main purpose of the focus groups was to provide data for the development of the Company Command Competency Model. Focus group participants used the Brigade Command Competency Model (Wolters, et al., 2011) to highlight differences in responsibilities between brigade and company command while acknowledging that overlap exists in competencies at both levels. The Brigade Command Competency Model also provided higher-order clusters that were used to organize company command competencies: knowledges, operational skills, personal capabilities, and leadership. A notable difference between company and brigade models was the emergence of competencies associated with directing and controlling unit resources. The result was a new cluster for company command—resource management. A synthesis of the competencies derived from the focus group content analysis and relevant components of the Brigade Command Competency Model resulted in a comprehensive list of company command competencies. Table 6 shows the list of competencies which resulted from this qualitative phase. The model is organized by the competency cluster families: operational skills, resource

management, leadership, personal capabilities, and knowledge-base.⁵ Each competency is defined by numerous key behaviors. The key behaviors are intended to more specifically define the competency titles but are not necessarily meant to be all inclusive. In other words, there may be additional key behaviors for any given competency.

Table 6

Company Command Competency Model

Competency	Key behaviors
Operational	
Accomplish mission in accordance with higher headquarters' intent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understands combined arms tactics, focusing on all elements of combat power. • Understands the proper use of force for the situation and rules of engagement. • Applies appropriate mission variables (METT-TC) to accomplish Commander's intent. • Ensures proper items and amounts are used to accomplish a task or mission.
Assess ongoing operations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collects and analyzes information from multiple sources. • Maintains situational awareness and quickly gains situational understanding during an operation. • Identifies variations to plans as threats or opportunities to mission accomplishment. • Effectively responds to changing conditions.
Establish an effective company headquarters	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organizes the company command post/headquarters to support unit operations (e.g., information management, individual responsibilities). • Ensures information management and communication. • Enforces unit administrative and accountability procedures in a garrison or deployed headquarters.
Formulate Commander's intent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develops effective Commander's intent nested within higher headquarters' intent for subordinate leaders to follow. • Collaborates with higher, lower, and adjacent individuals during planning and assessments. • Understands the company's role within the larger organization.
Manage risk	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integrates risk management process into planning and execution of training and combat missions. • Identifies areas to assume risk. • Recognizes the priority of mission accomplishment and takes appropriate action to ensure success. • Mitigates risk to enhance mission success.

⁵ These clusters are explained in greater detail during the survey section of the report. They are listed here as a means of organizing the competencies.

Table 6

Company Command Competency Model (continued)

Competency	Key behaviors
Operational (continued)	
Critical thinking skills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questions one's own and others' assumptions. • Recognizes relevant from irrelevant information when making critical decisions. • Relates and compares information from different sources to identify potential cause-and-effect relations. • Assesses the potential for interference or resistance among parties involved in missions, assignments, and situations.
Decision making ability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Selects appropriate use of the Troop Leading Procedures for the situation. • Makes timely decisions. • Carefully considers options. • Makes choices based on logic and reasoning.
Resource Management	
Manage unit training	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implements training management process based on directed requirements and an assessment of unit readiness. • Assesses individual and collective training requirements, both short- and long-term within higher headquarters' intent. • Utilizes training management systems (Army Training Network, Digital Training Network Systems, and Combined Arms Training System). • Maintains current records of training plans and assessments. • Conducts a company training meeting.
Establish and enforce command supply discipline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensures all unit property is assigned and accounted for. • Identifies logistical problems and allows time for corrective action. • Follows procedures for lost, damaged, or destroyed property. • Accounts for tracking and record keeping of property, documents, and funds.
Manage unit time	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manages time for higher Commander's priorities. • Manages time for own priorities. • Multi-tasks to handle several concurrent priorities. • Effectively delegates tasks to capable subordinates. • Manages meetings for most effective use of time. • Protects the organization from unnecessary distractions.
Manage unit family support requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishes and leads the Family Readiness Group (FRG). • Sets Family readiness goals for unit. • Adheres to the Army Family Covenant. • Leverages local family support assets to address Families' needs. • Understands the resources available to Families of the unit supporting a wide range of issues, both military and civilian.
Manage maintenance readiness program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develops and enforces a comprehensive unit maintenance program and updates as necessary. • Determines company maintenance situation. • Maintains equipment readiness rating.

Table 6

Company Command Competency Model (continued)

Competency	Key behaviors
Resource Management (continued)	
Manage administrative requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensures the proper transfer of records for outgoing and incoming personnel. • Maintains and secures files, reports, and records. • Completes the Commander’s unit status report to indicate unit readiness in all areas (e.g., personnel, equipment on-hand, equipment readiness/serviceability, and training proficiency). • Establishes awards and recognition program. • Establishes and supervises reenlistment program. • Takes appropriate personnel action regarding Soldiers (e.g., processes separation paperwork, files judicial and non-judicial punishments). • Writes clear, concise, accurate, and timely reports.
Leadership	
Operate effectively with joint, interagency, intergovernmental, multinational (JIIM) and non-governmental agencies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Works effectively with people from other relevant agencies on common goals. • Communicates effectively with people from wide range of different organizations/agencies. • Understands how other agencies operate. • Understands the perspective of different agencies as it relates to commander’s organizational goals.
Model the Army Values and Warrior Ethos	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Displays behaviors consistent with Army Values through action, attitudes, and communications. • Leads by example. • Maintains and promotes professional appearance and physical fitness standards. • Demonstrates physical and moral courage.
Maintain discipline standards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishes and communicates clear standards. • Maintains Soldier health and fitness. • Appropriately uses subordinate leaders to promote discipline. • Assesses discipline standards in the unit and responds to deviations from standards by utilizing appropriate judicial, non-judicial, and administrative options.
Develop subordinate leaders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prepares subordinate leaders for future assignments through mentoring, encouragement, and education. • Teaches/coaches immediate subordinates. • Assigns tasks congruent with subordinates’ capabilities. • Recognizes talents of individual Soldiers. • Encourages individual development. • Writes effective OERs and NCOERs. • Completes counseling statements for subordinate officers and NCOs.
Establish trust within the organization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Empowers authority and decision making at the lowest appropriate level. • Recognizes and relies on the experience and knowledge of subordinates. • Honors commitments made. • Consistently applies standards of discipline.
Engage in direct leadership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communicates priorities and provide guidance to subordinate leaders face-to-face. • Ensures that commander’s intent is clearly understood by subordinates. • Influences subordinates one-on-one.

Table 6

Company Command Competency Model (continued)

Competency	Key behaviors
Leadership	
Build effective teams	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assembles teams with a variety of experience and expertise, and trains them to collaborate effectively. • Receives and integrates enablers into company operations. • Evaluates the strengths and weaknesses of subordinates and place them in positions that enhance the performance of the team. • Fosters cohesion by clearly communicating unit goals and encouraging and rewarding cooperation. • Effectively integrates external resources and advisors into company planning, execution, and assessment.
Establish/maintain a command team with ISG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assesses and balances ISG's strengths and weaknesses with own. • Maintains effective personal communications with the ISG. • Collaborates with the ISG on unit goals. • Defines responsibilities and authority of NCOs to staff and subordinates.
Work effectively within the chain of command	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accurately derives implied tasks from the commander's intent. • Maintains close communications with the commander. • Effectively briefs the commander on company issues and activities. • Responds to the commander's priorities. • Asks for personal and performance feedback from the commander.
Create an ethical and positive command climate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cultivates a shared understanding of ethical conduct at all levels of the formation. • Demonstrates the value of equal opportunity and encourages diversity. • Does not tolerate ethical violations regardless of who commits the violation, and takes action to address it when it occurs. • Creates an environment where asking for clarification is encouraged. • Continuously assesses unit and individual morale. • Cultivates a climate where subordinate leaders can learn from their mistakes while also being empowered to make decisions.
Take care of Soldiers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Puts Soldiers' welfare before own. • Ensures Soldiers get needed support from appropriate personal services (e.g. behavioral health, financial advisors, Chaplain, Army Substance Abuse Prevention (ASAP), Sexual Harassment/Assault Response Program (SHARP). • Maintains awareness of personal circumstances of individual Soldiers that might impact their performance.
Communicate effectively with diverse audiences, both verbally and in writing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Builds understanding using language and examples that are relevant to different groups of people (e.g., Soldiers, officers, NCOs, families, host nationals). • Influences people inside and outside of the chain of command to adopt a position or course of action. • Writes and reviews letters, e-mails, and memoranda.

Table 6

Company Command Competency Model (continued)

Competency	Key behaviors
Personal	
Adapt to changing conditions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continuously gathers and analyzes relevant information about changing situations. Anticipates threats and opportunities in the operating environment and implements adjustments as needed. Maintains the ability to assess objectively in a volatile, uncertain, complex, and ambiguous environment.
Maintain Comprehensive Soldier Fitness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintains physical fitness through exercise, nutrition, and training. Demonstrates emotional fitness by exhibiting self-control, stamina, and appropriate actions. Develops and maintains trusted relationships and friendships to share ideas, views, and experiences. Addresses own family's needs and provides them a healthy and secure environment. Identifies a set of principles or values that sustains and strengthens one's personal belief system.
Self-awareness and self-understanding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Uses critical self-observation to evaluate strengths and limitations. Learns from mistakes and makes corrections whenever possible. Seeks feedback on how one's actions affect others. Demonstrates an understanding of how one personally processes information. Assesses self-development needs and seeks opportunities to improve.
Knowledge	
Knowledge of the Uniform Code of Military Justice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Knowledge of the Company Commander's role in executing the UCMJ, including appropriate penalties and offenses to process at the company-level. Understands the UCMJ legal system to include Soldiers' rights and command authority capabilities and limitations.
Knowledge of Troop Leading Procedures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Knowledge of TLPs for planning, resourcing and executing missions as appropriate.
Knowledge of the Officer Efficiency Report (OER) and NCOER systems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Knowledge of one's role as a rater for officers and NCOs and knowledge of their appropriate key development positions.
Knowledge of Army doctrine	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Knowledge of the Army doctrine most relevant to Company and Battalion Commanders.
Knowledge of relevant cultural and geopolitical issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Understands cultural, geographic, and political differences and sensitivities of country/area of operation.
Knowledge of the resources available to the company	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Knowledge of assets and enablers available and how to best use them.
Knowledge of communication media	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Knowledge of different types of communication methods and applications to include social networking sites (written), video (visual), newsletters (written), and briefings (oral).

In addition to the competencies, a theme that emerged from the content analysis of the focus group discussions was job responsibilities (analogous to key behaviors) that officers felt unprepared to perform when they took command. Frequently mentioned were administrative responsibilities such as conducting training meetings, using training management systems, writing OERs and NCOERs, and applying the UCMJ. To address these concerns, a sampling of job responsibilities was added to the survey to investigate levels of preparedness for Company Commanders.

Lastly, participants tended to agree that pre-command training for Company Commanders had both strengths and weakness. The strengths of pre-command training are those associated with doctrinal, technical, and tactical fundamentals. However, some participants felt that pre-command training was deficient in areas such as application of UCMJ, training and administrative management, and handling of Soldier discipline issues. Although no particular training method stood out as superior, focus groups related that an important factor in developing requisite competencies was an officer's pre-command experience. In addition to command-relevant experience, supplementary instruction for competencies that currently are not addressed was recommended in the form of classroom discussions, 360-evaluations, and mentoring by senior leaders. The next step in the assessment of the Company Command Competency Model and related training issues was to collect information about the relative importance of various competencies and about ways in which they can be developed.

Survey of Battalion Commanders, Former Company Commanders, and Small Group Leaders

While the interviews and focus groups identified and defined the competencies required for company command, the purpose of the surveys was to quantitatively determine which competencies were most critical and the extent to which competencies should be fostered in pre-command training. Two additional goals of the surveys were to (a) evaluate the perceived effectiveness of various methods to train the competencies, and (b) the determine Company Commanders' perceived level of preparedness to perform specific aspects of competencies (job responsibilities) when initially taking command. The survey solicited multi-source input on the company command competencies from three different audiences: Battalion Commanders, former Company Commanders,⁶ and SGLs. Surveys were administered online via a secure military server. E-mail requests accompanied by an official link were sent to active duty and non-deployed officers.

Survey Content

Demographic Questions. The first section of the surveys consisted of several demographic questions which differed slightly for each participant group. All groups were asked to report their current rank and branch. Battalion Commanders were asked the type of battalion they commanded and the duration of their command to date. Former Company Commanders were asked the year they began their company command, the type of company they commanded,

⁶ Students in the Intermediate Level Education (ILE) course at Fort Leavenworth were asked to participate in the survey. The ILE course provided a concentrated, non-deployed population of officers with company command experience. All respondents had served as Company Commanders within the past 6 years.

and what schools or training they completed before their command. The SGLs were asked how many months they had been instructing CCC and the school in which they instructed.

Competency Ratings. The second section of the surveys was designed to provide ratings on the competencies. As detailed in Table 7, the scale content of the surveys varied depending on participant position. Participants rated each competency using two different scales. All recipients rated competencies on the proficiency required scale. Battalion Commanders also rated each competency in terms of how it distinguishes superior Company Commanders from less effective ones. In addition to the proficiency rating, SGLs and former Company Commanders rated each competency on the extent to which it should be developed in PCCs.

Table 7
Survey Items for Rating Company Command Competencies

Survey Participant Category	Scales and Anchors
	What is the proficiency level required for Company Commanders?
Battalion Commanders	1—No proficiency
Small Group Leaders	2—Basic level
Company Commanders	3—Intermediate level
	4—Advanced level
	5—Expert level
	To what extent should pre-command courses foster the development of this competency?
Small Group Leaders	1—Very little or not at all
Company Commanders	2—To some extent
	3—To a moderate extent
	4—To a considerable extent
	5—To a very great extent
	To what extent do different levels of this competency distinguish superior from less effective Company Commanders?
Battalion Commanders	1—Very little or not at all
	2—To some extent
	3—To a moderate extent
	4—To a considerable extent
	5—To a very great extent

Training Method Ratings. For Battalion Commanders and SGLs, the third section of the survey collected input on the effectiveness of various training methods for developing various competencies. The competencies were organized by the five higher-order clusters. The competencies of these clusters, as shown in Table 8, can potentially be trained using a common method.

Table 8

Company Command Competencies by Cluster

Cluster	Competency
Operational	Accomplish mission in accordance with higher headquarters' intent
	Assess ongoing operations
	Establish an effective company headquarters
	Formulate commander's intent
	Manage risk
	Critical thinking skills
	Decision making ability
Resource Management	Manage unit training
	Establish and enforce Command Supply Discipline
	Manage unit time
	Manage unit family support requirements
	Manage maintenance readiness program
Leadership	Manage administrative requirements
	Operate effectively with joint, interagency, intergovernmental, multinational (JIIM) and non-governmental agencies
	Model the Army Values and Warrior Ethos
	Maintain discipline standards
	Develop subordinate leaders
	Establish trust within the organization
	Engage in direct leadership
	Build effective teams
	Establish/maintain a command team with 1SG
	Work effectively within the chain of command
	Create an ethical and positive command climate
Take care of Soldiers	
Communicate effectively with diverse audiences, both verbally and in writing	
Personal	Adapt to changing conditions
	Maintain Comprehensive Soldier Fitness
	Self-awareness and self-understanding
Knowledge	Knowledge of the Uniform Code of Military Justice
	Knowledge of Troop Leading Procedures
	Knowledge of the Officer Efficiency Report (OER) and NCO Efficiency Report (NCOER) systems
	Knowledge of Army doctrine
	Knowledge of relevant cultural and geopolitical issues
	Knowledge of the resources available to the company
	Knowledge of communication media

Respondents also had the opportunity to add additional training methods that they thought would help students develop in a particular competency cluster.

For each of the five clusters, respondents were asked to rank 3 out of 10 training methods that, in their opinion, would be the best, second-best, and third-best way to develop the type of competencies in each cluster. They were also asked to indicate the least effective training method for developing each cluster. They were given the following choices:

- Practical application assignment with coaching
- Role-play leading subordinates or peers
- Gaming scenarios/situational exercises/command post exercises
- Structure self-development tool
- Individual coaching/mentoring/feedback sessions
- Distance learning with interactive multimedia instruction (IMI)
- Professional reading on own time
- Discussion group with peers addressing practical exercises or problems
- “Lessons learned” conversation with former Company Commanders
- Classroom presentation by qualified instructors.

Job Responsibility Preparedness Ratings. During the qualitative phase of the project, many participants identified training gaps or areas that they felt Company Commanders were not prepared for when taking command. The survey was used as an opportunity to gather more specific information about the kind of job responsibilities that Company Commanders feel ill-equipped to handle, in light of perceived gaps in competency development. A sampling of job responsibilities was done by drawing key behaviors from each competency.⁷ In some cases several job responsibilities were identified for a single competency. Note that specific job responsibilities linked to the *Knowledge* cluster were not included because knowledge underlies performance of many job responsibilities. An example of a job responsibility is “Help Soldiers access support from appropriate personal services (e.g., behavioral health, financial advisors, Chaplain, ASAP, SHARP)” which is related to the competency *Take care of Soldiers*. In the survey, former Company Commanders were asked “at the beginning of command, how prepared were you to perform the listed job responsibilities.” Each job responsibility was rated on a 1-5 scale ranging from “not at all prepared” to “very well prepared.” They were also given an option of “not applicable.”

Data Cleaning

Of the 1374 active duty and non-deployed officers who were sent a request to participate in the survey, 12.2% (N=168) logged on and at least opened the survey. A few of them did not answer any questions, so their records were immediately discarded. Within respondent type, Battalion Commanders and SGLs responded at about the same rate (12.9% and 12.5%, respectively) and former Company Commanders responded at a slightly lower rate of 11.8%. Diagnostics were computed on the ratings to identify (a) excessive missing data and (b) flat responding (e.g., responding with a rating of 3 across all competencies). A respondent’s data was flagged if more than 10% of the competency ratings for either of two rating scales was missing. Another flag was computed for respondents with flat responding rates that were far above the mean (3 to 4 standard deviations). If a respondent’s responses had either flag (missing data or flat responding), then their data was marked “unusable” for a specific scale (e.g., proficiency required) and was not included in the ratings calculations. The final sample included 140 officers

⁷ A sampling of 40 was taken from the list of more than 120 possible key behaviors (shown in Table 6) to avoid overwhelming survey respondents with an onerous number of ratings.

(Bn Cdrs = 49, Former Co Cdrs = 73, and SGLs = 18) with useable data on at least one of three scales.

Demographic Summary

Battalion Commander Survey Participants. The 49 Battalion Commander respondents in the final data set included 45 Lieutenant Colonels, three Colonels, and one Major. As presented in Table 9, the branches with the highest representation in the survey sample were Infantry ($n = 9$), Armor ($n = 8$), Field Artillery ($n = 8$), and the Signal Corps ($n = 4$). These branches accounted for more than half of the sample.

Table 9

Battalion Commanders by Branch

Branch	n	%
Infantry	9	19.1
Armor	8	17.0
Field Artillery	8	17.0
Other	6	12.8
Signal Corps	4	8.5
Corps of Engineers	3	6.4
Quartermaster Corps	3	6.4
Transportation Corps	2	4.3
Aviation	1	2.1
Military Police Corps	1	2.1
Military Intelligence	1	2.1
Ordnance Corps	1	2.1
Total	47	100

Former Company Commander Survey Participants. The 73 former Company Commander respondents in the final data set included 68 Majors and five Captains. Seventy-seven percent of the survey sample reported that they had deployed during their time in company command. Table 10 indicates that the branches with the highest representation in the survey sample were from the Armor ($n = 11$) and Signal Corps ($n = 10$) followed by Infantry ($n = 9$), Field Artillery ($n = 8$), Aviation ($n = 6$) and Corps of Engineers ($n = 6$). These six branches accounted for over 68% of the sample. Almost 37% of survey participants took command in 2005 ($n = 27$) followed by 26% in 2006 ($n = 19$), 16% in 2007 ($n = 12$), 8% in 2009 ($n = 6$), and 5% in 2008 ($n = 4$). The four most-attended CCC locations (57 %) for this survey sample were Forts Benning, Leonard Wood, Knox, and Gordon.

Small Group Leader/Instructor (SGL) Survey Participants. The SGL survey sample was composed of equal numbers of Captains ($n = 9$) and Majors ($n = 9$). The average number of months the SGLs had been instructors was 11.6 months ($SD = 5.2$). The highest branch representation in the SGL sample was from Infantry ($n = 3$) and Armor ($n = 3$), followed by

Adjutant General (AG, $n = 2$), Chemical ($n = 2$), and Engineers ($n = 2$). There was one SGL from each of the following branches: Finance, Medical Corp, Medical Service Corps, and Medical Specialists Corps.⁸ Participants were also queried as to the schools where they instructed. The largest number of SGLs were from the Maneuver School ($n = 5$), followed by the Army Medical Department ($n = 4$), AG ($n = 2$), Chemical ($n = 2$), Engineer ($n = 2$), Aviation ($n = 1$), Finance ($n = 1$), and Infantry ($n = 1$) schools.

Table 10

Former Company Commanders by Branch

Branch	<i>n</i>	%
Armor	11	15.1
Signal Corps	10	13.7
Infantry	9	12.3
Field Artillery	8	11.0
Aviation	6	8.2
Corps of Engineers	6	8.2
Adjutant General Corps	5	6.8
Military Police Corps	5	6.8
Transportation Corps	3	4.1
Military Intelligence	2	2.7
Ordnance Corps	2	2.7
Air Defense Artillery	1	1.4
Chemical Corps	1	1.4
Dental Corps	1	1.4
Medical Service Corps	1	1.4
Quartermaster Corps	1	1.4
Total	72 ^a	100

^a One survey respondent did not provide branch information.

Survey Results

Three separate surveys targeted different populations of officers (Battalion Commanders, former Company Commanders, and SGLs). However, the results reported in this section are aggregated whenever the recipients were responding to identical survey questions.

Proficiency required. Table 11 presents ratings of the proficiency required to be a successful Company Commander. All officers noted above rated the 35 competencies on this scale. A total of 138 officers provided useable responses. Ranked by mean ratings,⁹ the 10 highest-rated competencies include six that are leadership-based, two that are operational in nature, one knowledge-based, and one resource management competency. Seventy-one percent

⁸ Two SGLs did not provide branch information.

⁹ Values were banded on the proficiency scale to interpret mid-point results, thus 1-1.5 = No proficiency, 1.51-2.5 = basic level, 2.51-3.5 = Intermediate level, 3.51-4.5 = Advanced level, 4.51-5 = Expert level.

(25 out of 35) of the competencies had a mean rating corresponding to an advanced level of proficiency (3.51-4.5 on a 5 point scale). An advanced level of proficiency is defined as the ability to use a competency effectively in complex and non-routine situations. Even the lowest ranked competencies such as *knowledge of relevant cultural and geopolitical issues*; *knowledge of communication media*; and *operating effectively with joint, interagency, intergovernment, multinational (JIIM) and non-governmental agencies* require at least an intermediate level of proficiency (ability to effectively use the competency in the most commonly experienced command situations). These findings confirm information collected during the qualitative phase of the research: all of the competencies are necessary. Furthermore, all of them were judged to require at least an intermediate level of proficiency and the majority of them require an advanced level of proficiency.

Differentiation. Table 12 presents ratings of the extent to which each competency distinguishes successful Company Commanders from less effective ones (referred to hereafter as the differentiation scale). Battalion Commanders were the only raters for this scale ($n = 49$). All of the top 10 competencies appear to differentiate Company Commanders to a considerable extent (3.51-4.5 on a 5 point scale).¹⁰ Seven of the ten highest rated competencies are leadership-based, two are operational, and one is resource management-related. There is little variation in overall ratings: less than a one point difference in differentiation ratings for 25 of the 35 competencies that were all reported to differentiate to a considerable extent. Four of the five lowest-rated competencies on the differentiation scale are knowledge-based competencies: *knowledge of OER and NCOER systems*, *knowledge of UCMJ*, *knowledge of relevant cultural and geopolitical issues*, and *knowledge of communication media*. Nonetheless, these competencies differentiate success to a moderate extent (2.51-3.5 on a 5 point scale).

Extent competency should be fostered in pre-command courses. Former Company Commanders and SGLs rated each competency on the extent to which it should be fostered in PCCs ($n = 88$). Table 13 shows that respondents believe that six competencies should be trained to a considerable extent (3.51-4.5 on a 5 point scale), 27 competencies should be trained to a moderate extent (2.51-3.5 on a 5 point scale), and two competencies should be trained to some extent (1.51-2.5 on a 5 point scale).¹¹ Of the six competencies that should be trained to a considerable extent, three are knowledge-based, two are resource management, and one is operational. The two that should be trained only to some extent are *Knowledge of communication media* (knowledge-based) and *Operate effectively within joint, interagency, intergovernmental, multinational (JIIM), and non-governmental agencies* (leadership). However, these findings imply that the majority of the competencies should be trained in PCCs to at least a moderate extent.

¹⁰ Values were banded on the differentiation scale to interpret mid-point results: 1-1.5 = Very little or not at all, 1.51-2.5 = To some extent, 2.51-3.5 = To a moderate extent, 3.51-4.5 = To a considerable extent, 4.51-5 = To a very great extent.

¹¹ Values were banded on the Pre-command training scale to interpret mid-point results: 1-1.5 = Very little or not at all, 1.51-2.5 = To some extent, 2.51-3.5 = To a moderate extent, 3.51-4.5 = To a considerable extent, 4.51-5 = To a very great extent.

Table 11

Mean Proficiency Requirement Ratings by Competency

Proficiency level required ^a	Cluster ^b	Competency	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Advanced	L	Model the Army Values and Warrior Ethos	4.16	0.98
	L	Take care of Soldiers	4.00	0.98
	K	Knowledge of Troop Leading Procedures	4.00	1.00
	L	Maintain discipline standards	3.96	0.87
	L	Create an ethical and positive command climate	3.93	0.91
	L	Engage in direct leadership	3.91	0.80
	L	Establish trust within the organization	3.83	0.89
	O	Accomplish mission in accordance w/ higher headquarters intent	3.83	0.85
	O	Decision making ability	3.83	0.83
	R	Manage unit training	3.78	0.90
	L	Establish/maintain a command team with 1SG	3.77	0.85
	L	Develop subordinate leaders	3.77	0.81
	L	Build effective teams	3.73	0.85
	R	Establish and enforce command supply discipline	3.72	0.92
	O	Formulate commander's intent	3.68	0.88
	K	Knowledge of the resources available to the company	3.66	0.96
	O	Critical thinking skills	3.64	0.84
	O	Assess ongoing operations	3.64	0.78
	O	Manage risk	3.62	0.90
	L	Work effectively within the chain of command	3.56	0.81
P	Maintain Comprehensive Soldier Fitness	3.56	0.97	
P	Adapt to changing conditions	3.55	0.90	
L	Communicate effectively with diverse audiences	3.54	0.81	
R	Manage unit time	3.54	0.83	
K	Knowledge of Army doctrine	3.51	0.86	
Intermediate	P	Self-awareness and self-understanding	3.49	0.91
	O	Establish and effective company headquarters	3.49	0.88
	K	Knowledge of the OER and NCOER systems	3.35	0.77
	R	Manage maintenance readiness program	3.33	0.81
	R	Manage administrative requirements	3.33	0.78
	K	Knowledge of the Uniform Code of Military Justice	3.24	0.88
	R	Manage unit family support requirements	3.00	0.90
	K	Knowledge of relevant cultural and geopolitical issues	2.96	0.84
	K	Knowledge of communication media	2.72	0.78
	L	Operate effectively with JIIM and non-governmental agencies	2.63	0.89

Note. *N* = 138. ^aAdvanced level of proficiency (3.51-4.5 on a 5 point scale) refers to a high level of proficiency; able to use the competency effectively in complex and non-routine situations. Intermediate level of proficiency (2.51-3.5 on a 5 point scale) refers to a working or functional level of proficiency; able to effectively use the competency in most commonly experienced command situations. ^bK – Knowledge, L – Leadership, P – Personal, O – Operational, R – Resource Management.

Table 12

Mean Differentiation Ratings by Competency

Extent of Differentiation ^a	Cluster ^b	Competency	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Considerable	O	Accomplish mission in accordance with higher headquarters intent	4.22	0.65
	L	Build effective teams	4.16	0.69
	O	Decision making ability	4.10	0.83
	L	Maintain discipline standards	4.08	0.76
	L	Establish trust within organization	4.02	0.80
	L	Create an ethical and positive command climate	4.00	0.79
	L	Develop subordinate leaders	3.96	0.79
	L	Establish/maintain a command team with 1SG	3.96	0.91
	L	Engage in direct leadership	3.91	0.78
	P	Adapt to changing conditions	3.88	0.83
	R	Manage unit training	3.86	0.91
	L	Model the Army Values and Warrior Ethos	3.84	1.03
	O	Critical thinking skills	3.82	0.88
	L	Communicate effectively with diverse audiences, both verbally and in writing	3.82	0.88
	R	Establish and enforce command supply discipline	3.80	0.87
	L	Take care of Soldiers	3.80	0.91
	O	Assess ongoing operations	3.76	0.83
	K	Knowledge of Troop Leading Procedures	3.73	1.00
	L	Work effectively within the chain of command	3.73	0.87
	R	Manage administrative requirements	3.69	0.87
	R	Manage unit time	3.63	0.81
	K	Knowledge of the resources available to the company	3.61	0.84
	O	Manage risk	3.57	0.84
	P	Maintain Comprehensive Soldier Fitness	3.53	1.02
	K	Knowledge of Army doctrine	3.53	0.65
	Moderate	O	Establish an effective company headquarters	3.49
O		Formulate commander's intent	3.49	0.94
P		Self-awareness and self-understanding	3.47	0.87
R		Manage maintenance readiness program	3.37	0.86
R		Manage unit family support requirements	3.16	0.75
K		Knowledge of the OER and NCOER systems	3.12	0.93
K		Knowledge of the Uniform Code of Military Justice	3.02	0.69
K		Knowledge of relevant cultural and geopolitical issues	2.98	0.97
K		Knowledge of communication media	2.73	0.88
L		Operate effectively JIIM and non-governmental agencies	2.67	0.83

Note. *n* = 49. ^aDifferentiates to a considerable extent (3.51-4.5 on a 5 point scale); differentiates to a moderate extent (2.51 – 3.5 on a 5 point scale). ^bK – Knowledge, L – Leadership, P – Personal, O – Operational, R – Resource Management.

Table 13

Mean Ratings of Extent that Pre-Command Courses Should Foster Competency Development

Amount Should Foster ^a	Cluster ^b	Competency	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Considerable	R	Manage unit training	3.72	1.06
	K	Knowledge of the resources available to the company	3.66	1.07
	K	Knowledge of Army doctrine	3.61	1.03
	K	Knowledge of Troop Leading Procedures	3.60	1.13
	R	Establish and enforce command supply discipline	3.58	1.14
	O	Formulate commander's intent	3.55	1.14
Moderate	L	Develop subordinate leaders	3.50	1.10
	O	Critical thinking skills	3.49	1.15
	O	Decision making ability	3.49	1.09
	O	Accomplish mission in accordance w/ higher headquarters intent	3.43	1.15
	L	Engage in direct leadership	3.40	1.05
	L	Manage risk	3.38	0.97
	L	Create an ethical and positive command climate	3.34	1.14
	L	Take care of Soldiers	3.34	1.19
	L	Establish/maintain a command team with 1SG	3.31	1.00
	L	Build effective teams	3.26	1.05
	L	Communicate effectively with diverse audiences	3.25	0.91
	O	Establish and effective company headquarters	3.22	1.02
	K	Knowledge of the OER and NCOER systems	3.20	1.11
	O	Assess ongoing operations	3.19	1.08
	P	Adapt to changing conditions	3.18	1.06
	L	Establish trust within organization	3.17	1.19
	L	Maintain discipline standards	3.16	1.15
	R	Manage unit time	3.16	1.02
	K	Knowledge of the Uniform Code of Military Justice	3.16	1.05
	P	Self-awareness and self-understanding	3.10	1.09
	R	Manage administrative requirements	3.09	1.04
	L	Model the Army Values and Warrior Ethos	3.07	1.28
	L	Work effectively within the chain of command	3.04	0.80
	P	Maintain Comprehensive Soldier Fitness	3.01	1.15
	R	Manage maintenance readiness program	3.00	1.01
	R	Manage unit family support requirements	2.66	1.08
	K	Knowledge of relevant cultural and geopolitical issues	2.64	1.06
Some	K	Knowledge of communication media	2.39	0.92
	L	Operate effectively with IIIM and non-governmental agencies	2.35	1.03

Note. $n = 88$. ^aTo a considerable extent (3.51-4.5 on a 5 point scale); To a moderate extent (2.51-3.5 on 5 point scale); To some extent (1.51 – 2.5 on a 5 point scale). ^bK – Knowledge, L – Leadership, P – Personal, O – Operational, R – Resource Management.

Preparedness to perform job responsibilities. Former Company Commanders ($n = 72$) rated the extent to which they felt prepared to perform specific job responsibilities at the beginning of their company command; the results are presented in Table 14. Respondents rated that they were sufficiently prepared (3.51 to 4.5 on a 5 point scale) to perform 25 of the 40 job responsibilities.¹² For the remaining 15 job responsibilities, respondents rated that they were moderately prepared (2.51 to 3.5 on a 5 point scale) to perform them. Five of the top 10 rated job responsibilities were related leadership competencies, three were related to operational competencies, one was related to resource management, and one was related to personal competencies. Because there was a particular interest in investigating possible training gaps, an extra step was taken to examine the frequency distribution of ratings for each job responsibility. It showed that for nine job responsibilities (see text highlighted in **bold** print in Table 14) at least 20% of respondents indicated that they were not sufficiently prepared or not at all prepared. Although these findings warrant further investigation (e.g., examining branch specific responses), there were individuals in this survey sample who indicated that they were not prepared for certain job responsibilities when they took command. It may be that these individuals had little or no exposure to these job responsibilities in their previous assignments or in pre-command courses.

Table 14

Preparedness Ratings for Company Command Responsibilities

Level of Preparedness ^a	Cluster ^b	Job Responsibilities	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Sufficient	L	Work with your First Sergeant to set unit goals	4.00	0.91
	L	Demonstrate the value of equal opportunity and diversity	3.79	1.05
	L	Counsel subordinate leaders and NCOs	3.78	0.89
	O	Develop an effective Commander's intent for subordinate leaders to follow	3.78	0.83
	R	Complete the Commander's unit status report to indicate readiness in all areas.	3.75	1.07
	O	Apply troop leading procedures in an operational setting	3.75	0.79
	L	Assess individual and unit morale	3.72	0.83
	O	Brief a coherent plan based on a battalion operations order	3.72	1.04
	P	Adapt to chaotic, stressful and/or ambiguous situations	3.71	1.05
	L	Fairly apply discipline standards in the unit and enforce the UCMJ	3.71	1.81
	P	Demonstrate emotional fitness such as self-control and stamina	3.69	1.15
	L	Communicate an effective Commander's intent for subordinate leaders to follow	3.67	0.84

Notes. $n = 72$. Job responsibilities highlighted in bold print are those with 20% or more respondents rating 1 or 2 (1-Not at all prepared; 2-Not sufficiently prepared). ^aSufficiently prepared (3.51-4.5 on a 5 point scale); Moderately prepared (2.51-3.5 on a 5 point scale). ^bK – Knowledge, L – Leadership, P – Personal, O – Operational, R – Resource Management.

¹² Values were banded on the preparedness scale to interpret mid-point results: 1-1.5 = Not at all prepared, 1.51-2.5 = Not sufficiently prepared, 2.51-3.5 = Moderately prepared, 3.51-4.5 = Sufficiently prepared, 4.51-5 = Very well prepared.

Table 14

Preparedness Ratings for Company Command Responsibilities (continued)

Level of Preparedness ^a	Cluster ^b	Job Responsibilities	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Sufficient	R	Develop and utilize a command supply discipline program for property accountability	3.65	1.02
	O	Apply METT-TC factors to accomplish Commander's intent	3.65	0.98
	L	Assign subordinates to positions in the unit based on their strengths and weaknesses	3.63	0.94
	P	Seek advice from experts in specialized fields (e.g., legal, counseling, cultural, spiritual)	3.63	0.90
	L	Communicate and negotiate with diverse audiences (Soldiers, commanders, Families, host nationals, NCOs, Army civilians)	3.63	1.09
	R	Delegate tasks to capable subordinates	3.61	1.01
	R	Provide timely and accurate unit status reports	3.60	1.12
	P	Control your emotions in challenging or stressful situations	3.58	1.06
	R	Multi-task concurrent priorities	3.58	0.92
	L	Empower your subordinate leaders to make decisions	3.58	0.87
	O	Train your unit on use of force	3.58	1.13
	R	Protect the unit from unnecessary distractions	3.56	1.00
	R	Enforce a unit maintenance program	3.52	1.03
	Moderate	R	Conduct a company training meeting	3.47
L		Lead physical fitness activities	3.47	1.28
O		Recognize relevant from irrelevant information when making critical decisions	3.46	1.78
O		Organize a command post or headquarters to support unit operations	3.43	1.00
R		Assess short- and long-term individual and collective training requirements	3.40	0.93
L		Communicate effectively up and down the chain of command	3.40	1.15
P		Critically evaluate your own strengths and weaknesses	3.39	0.96
L		Request performance feedback from your Commander	3.38	1.13
L		Write effective OERS and NCOERs	3.36	1.79
R		Write clear, concise, and timely reports	3.36	0.97
L		Establish and run a recognition and awards program	3.28	1.09
R		Lead the Family Readiness Group (FRG)	3.21	1.06
L		Operate with joint, interagency, intergovernmental, multinational (JIIM) or other relevant agencies	3.17	1.19
L		Help Soldiers access support from appropriate personal services (e.g. behavioral health, financial advisors, Chaplain, ASAP, SHARP)	3.17	1.08
O	Apply risk management processes into planning, preparation, and mission execution	3.05	1.10	

Notes. n = 72. Job responsibilities highlighted in bold print are those with 20% or more respondents rating 1 or 2 (1-Not at all prepared; 2-Not sufficiently prepared). ^aSufficiently prepared (3.51-4.5 on a 5 point scale); Moderately prepared (2.51-3.5 on a 5 point scale). ^bK – Knowledge, L – Leadership, P – Personal, O – Operational, R – Resource Management.

Comparisons among competency rating scales. Comparing the top-rated competencies between the proficiency required and differentiation scales (Tables 11 and 12), six of the competencies were the same (shown in columns one and two of Table 15) implying some degree of alignment between the level of proficiency required and differentiation. Further, not just the top 10, but most of the 35 competencies between the two scales are ranked similarly. Only four competencies differ by 12 positions or more (approximately one-third of the ranking range). *Take care of Soldiers* is ranked second (based on mean ratings) on the proficiency required scale and 16th on the differentiation scale and *Knowledge of TLPs* is ranked third on proficiency required and 18th on differentiation meaning they require almost the highest level of proficiency of all Company Command Competencies and differentiate to a considerable extent, but other competencies differentiate more. *Formulate Commander's intent* is ranked 15th on proficiency required and 27th on differentiation meaning, although it requires an advanced level of proficiency, most other competencies differentiate to a greater extent than it. *Adapt to changing conditions* is ranked 22nd on proficiency required and 10th on differentiation meaning, although it requires an advanced level of proficiency and differentiates to a considerable extent, relative to other competencies, the significance of this competency is in the ability to differentiate between successful and less successful commanders.

Table 15

Ten Top-Rated Competencies on the Proficiency Required, Differentiation, and Extent Pre-Command Courses Should Develop Scales

Proficiency Required	Differentiation	Extent Should Develop in Pre-Command Courses
Accomplish mission in accordance w/ higher headquarters intent ^{†*}	Accomplish mission in accordance w/ higher headquarters intent ^{†*}	Accomplish mission in accordance w/ higher headquarters intent*
Decision making ability ^{†*}	Decision making ability ^{†*}	Decision making ability*
Maintain discipline standards [†]	Maintain discipline standards [†]	Manage unit training
Establish trust within the organization [†]	Establish trust within organization [†]	Knowledge of the resources available to the company
Create an ethical and positive command climate [†]	Create an ethical and positive command climate [†]	Knowledge of Army doctrine
Engage in direct leadership [†]	Engage in direct leadership [†]	Knowledge of Troop Leading Procedures
Manage unit training	Establish/maintain a command team with ISG	Establish and enforce command supply discipline
Model the Army Values and Warrior Ethos	Develop subordinate leaders	Formulate commander's intent
Take care of Soldiers	Adapt to changing conditions	Develop subordinate leaders
Knowledge of Troop Leading Procedures	Build effective teams	Critical thinking skills

Note. [†]Competencies are among the top 10 rated on both the proficiency required and differentiation scales.

*Competencies are among the top 10 rated across all three scales.

Table 15 shows less congruence among the top-rated competencies on proficiency required, differentiation, and the extent-should-be-trained scales than between proficiency required and differentiation scales. Only two of the top-rated competencies are the same across

all three scales: *Accomplish mission in accordance with higher headquarters intent* and *Decision making ability*. These two competencies require a high level of proficiency and differentiate to a considerable extent, so it is not surprising that respondents also felt they should be developed during training. Perhaps respondents felt that these competencies are more conducive to classroom training than some of the other competencies requiring an advanced level of proficiency and/or differentiate considerably. Or, maybe respondents felt that some competencies (those not in the top 10 on the extent-should-be-trained scale), such as *Maintain discipline standards*, *Create and ethical and positive command climate*, *Engage in direct leadership*, and *Establish trust within the organization*, cannot be adequately developed during training courses and are better learned on the job.

Additional Competencies. At the end of the second portion of the survey, respondents were asked to record and describe additional competencies required for company command that were not included in the survey. One third of the respondents provided input to the open-response question ($n = 45$). When their comments were analyzed, most of the responses referred to competencies that were already included in the company command model. Some comments referred to facets or components of extant competencies such “common sense” (related to *Decision making ability*), or calmness (related to *Maintain Comprehensive Soldier Fitness*). Other comments were more specific than those competencies listed in the existing model. For example, one Battalion Commander suggested “...command referrals to Army Substance Abuse Program, Behavioral Health, and all other installation support agencies,” which seems to be a more granular representation of the *Take care of Soldiers* competency. Based on these determinations, no changes were made to the competency model (shown in Table 6).

Perceptions of training effectiveness. In the last section of the survey Battalion Commanders and SGLs ($n = 65$) were asked to evaluate the extent to which various training methods would help Company Commanders develop different types of competencies. For each of the five competency clusters (knowledge, leadership, operational, personal, and resource management) respondents reviewed and ranked 10 different training methods. They were asked to rank the top three ways to train a particular competency type and also pick the worst training method for that competency cluster. For each of 10 training methods, Tables 16 through 20 present the percentage of all survey respondents who included the method (a) within their top three choices, (b) as their top or best choice, (c) as their second choice, (d) as their third choice, and (e) as the method that they viewed as the worst way to train that specific type of competency.

Table 16 shows the results for perceived effectiveness of the 10 training methods for knowledge competencies. Knowledge is defined as the depth of one’s information or understanding. This relatively diverse cluster contains competencies such as *Knowledge of the UCMJ*, *Knowledge of TLPs*, and *Knowledge of Army doctrine*. Approximately one third of respondents listed “Classroom presentation by qualified instructors” as their top choice. In addition, 59.1% of respondents rated the method within their top three, and only one respondent rated it as the worst method. The second highest rated method for knowledge-based competencies was “Discussion group with peers,” with 53% of respondents rating it in their top three. None of the respondents rated “Discussion group with peers” as the worst training method. “Structured self-development tool” was the lowest rated training method with no one choosing it

in their top three and 19.7% choosing it as the worst method for training knowledge-based competencies.

Table 17 presents the perceptions of effectiveness of the 10 methods for leadership competencies. The leadership includes competencies such as maintaining discipline standards, building effective teams, working effectively within the chain of command, and taking care of Soldiers. “Practical application assignment with coaching” was the highest rated training method, as 51.5% of respondents selected it within their top three. None of the respondents rated “Practical application assignment with coaching” as the worst method. The second highest rated training method for leadership competencies was “Role-play leading subordinates or peers,” with 48.5% of respondents rating it in their top three while one rated it as the worst method for training leadership skills. “Distance learning with Interactive Multimedia Instruction (IMI)” was the lowest rated training method; no one chose it in their top three and 31.8% chose it as the worst method for training leadership competencies.

Table 18 shows the results for perceived effectiveness of the 10 training methods for operational competencies. The operational cluster—defined as the ability to plan, organize and coordinate the activities of a company-level unit in accordance with doctrine to accomplish mission objectives—contains competencies such as accomplishing the mission in accordance with higher headquarters’ intent, formulating commander’s intent, managing risk, and critical thinking skills. Similar to leadership competencies, “Practical application assignment with coaching” was the highest rated training type: nearly 70% of respondents selected it as one of the top three methods, while only one respondent rated it as the worst method. The second highest rated method for operational-based competencies was “Gaming scenarios, situational exercises, command post exercises,” with 54.6% of respondents rating it in their top three. Two respondents rated “Gaming scenarios, situational exercises, command post exercises” as the worst training method. “Structured self-development tool” was the lowest rated training method with no one choosing it in their top three and 13.6% choosing it as the worst method for training knowledge competencies.

Table 19 presents the perceptions of effectiveness of the 10 training methods for personal capabilities. The personal capabilities are those that allow one to understand and manage one’s self, manage change, learn, and maintain both physical and mental fitness, and uphold personal responsibilities. This cluster is comprised of three competencies: *Adapting to changing conditions*, *Maintaining Comprehensive Soldier Fitness*, and *Self-awareness and self-understanding*. “Individual coaching/mentoring/feedback sessions” was tied with “Structured self-development tool” as the highest rated training method, both with 53% of respondents rating them as one of their top three methods. While none of the respondents rated “Individual coaching/mentoring/feedback sessions” as the worst method, three respondents rated “Structured self-development tool” as the worst method. The next highest rated method for training personal-based competencies was “Discussion group with peers;” 43.9% of respondents rated it in their top three while only one rated it as the worst method. “Classroom presentation by qualified instructors” was the lowest rated training method; 1.5% chose it in their top three and 13.6% chose it as the worst method for training personal competencies.

Finally, Table 20 presents the perceptions of effectiveness of the 10 training methods for resource management competencies. Resource management refers to the abilities necessary to direct and control unit resources and includes competencies such as managing unit training, unit time, unit family support requirements and administrative requirements. “Practical application assignment with coaching” was the highest rated training method, as 60% of respondents rated it as either the first, second, or third most effective method and only two respondents rated it as the worst method. The second highest rated method for resource management competencies was “Classroom presentation by qualified instructors,” with 58.5% of respondents rating it in their top three, while two rated it was the worst method. “Structured self-development tool” was the lowest rated training method with one respondent choosing it in their top three and 12.3% choosing it as the worst method for training resource management competencies.

Table 16

Rankings of Training Methods for the Knowledge Competency Cluster

Type of Training	Top 3			Best Method		Second Best		Third Best		Worst Method	
	%	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>
1. Classroom presentation by qualified instructors	59.1	30.3	26	13.6	9	15.2	10	1.5	1		
2. Discussion group with peers addressing practical exercises or problems	53.0	15.2	10	19.7	13	18.2	12	0.0	0		
3. Practical application assignment with coaching	45.5	27.3	18	7.6	5	10.6	7	3.0	2		
4. Lessons learned conversation with former Company Commanders	36.4	3.0	2	24.2	16	9.1	6	1.5	1		
5. Role-play leading subordinates or peers	31.8	3.0	2	15.2	10	13.6	9	3.0	2		
6. Professional reading on own time	24.3	9.1	6	4.6	3	10.6	7	9.1	6		
7. Gaming scenarios, situational exercises, command post exercises	24.3	7.6	5	7.6	5	9.1	6	7.6	5		
8. Individual coaching/mentoring/feedback sessions	15.2	3.0	2	3.0	2	9.1	6	3.0	2		
9. Distance learning with Interactive Multimedia Instruction	10.6	1.5	1	4.6	3	4.6	3	28.8	19		
10. Structured self-development tool	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	19.7	13		

Notes. Percentages are based on 65 participants. Top 3 = the percentage of participants who included the training type in either the first-, second- or third-ranked position (the sum is rounded).

Table 17

Rankings of Training Methods for the Leadership Competency Cluster

Type of Training	Top 3			Best Method		Second Best		Third Best		Worst Method	
	%	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>		
1. Practical application assignment with coaching	51.5	27.3	18	6.1	4	18.2	12	0.0	0		
2. Role-play leading subordinates or peers	48.5	16.7	11	24.2	16	7.6	5	1.5	1		
3. Individual coaching/mentoring/feedback sessions	45.5	18.2	12	7.6	5	19.7	13	1.5	1		
4. Discussion group with peers addressing practical exercises or problems	42.4	12.1	8	13.6	9	16.7	11	3.0	2		
5. Lessons learned conversation with former Company Commanders	40.9	16.7	11	16.7	11	7.6	5	0.0	0		
6. Gaming scenarios, situational exercises, command post exercises	25.8	4.6	3	7.6	5	13.6	9	13.6	9		
7. Professional reading on own time	18.2	1.5	1	9.1	6	7.6	5	7.6	5		
8. Structured self-development tool	18.2	0	0	12.1	8	6.1	4	4.6	3		
9. Classroom presentation by qualified instructors	9.1	3.0	2	3.0	2	3.0	2	10.6	7		
10. Distance learning with Interactive Multimedia Instruction (IMI)	0.0	0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	31.8	21		

Notes. Percentages are based on 65 participants. Top 3 = the percentage of participants who included the training type in either the first-, second- or third-ranked position (the sum is rounded).

Table 18

Rankings of Training Methods for the Operational Competency Cluster

Type of Training	Top 3		Best Method		Second Best		Third Best		Worst Method	
	%		%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>
1. Practical application assignment with coaching	69.7		27.3	18	18.2	12	24.2	16	1.5	1
2. Gaming scenarios, situational exercises, command post exercises	54.6		30.3	20	13.6	9	10.6	7	3.0	2
3. Role-play leading subordinates or peers	48.5		15.2	10	22.7	15	10.6	7	1.5	1
4. Lessons learned conversation with former Company Commanders	34.9		7.6	5	13.6	9	13.6	9	0.0	0
5. Classroom presentation by qualified instructors	28.8		9.1	6	7.6	5	12.1	8	7.58	5
6. Individual coaching/mentoring/feedback sessions	27.3		3.0	2	12.1	8	12.1	8	3.0	2
7. Discussion group with peers addressing practical exercises or problems	19.7		4.6	3	6.1	4	9.1	6	1.5	1
8. Professional reading on own time	12.1		3.0	2	3.0	2	6.1	4	12.1	8
9. Distance learning with Interactive Multimedia Instruction (IMI)	4.6		0.0	0	3.0	2	1.5	1	31.8	21
10. Structured self-development tool	0.0		0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	13.6	9

Notes. Percentages are based on 65 participants. Top 3 = the percentage of participants who included the training type in either the first-, second- or third-ranked position (the sum is rounded).

Table 19

Rankings of Training Methods for the Personal Competency Cluster

Type of Training	Top 3		Best Method		Second Best		Third Best		Worst Method	
	%		%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>
1. Individual coaching/mentoring/feedback sessions	53.0		28.8	19	24.2	16	0.0	0	0.0	0
2. Structured self-development tool	53.0		21.2	14	13.6	9	18.2	12	4.6	3
3. Discussion group with peers addressing practical exercises or problems	43.9		19.7	13	12.1	8	12.1	8	1.5	1
4. Practical application assignment with coaching	40.9		12.1	8	12.1	8	16.7	11	3.0	2
5. Role-play leading subordinates or peers	27.3		3.0	2	15.2	10	9.1	6	4.6	3
6. Professional reading on own time	22.7		1.5	1	7.6	5	13.6	9	6.1	4
7. Lessons learned conversation with former Company Commanders	22.7		9.1	6	6.1	4	7.6	5	6.1	4
8. Gaming scenarios, situational exercises, command post exercises	13.6		3.0	2	3.0	2	7.6	5	6.1	1
9. Distance learning with Interactive Multimedia Instruction (IMI)	4.6		0	0	3.0	2	1.5	1	28.8	19
10. Classroom presentation by qualified instructors	1.5		0	0	1.5	1	0.0	0	13.6	9

Notes. Percentages are based on 65 participants. Top 3 = the percentage of participants who included the training type in either the first-, second- or third-ranked position (the sum is rounded).

Table 20

Rankings of Training Methods for Resource Management Competency Cluster

Type of Training	Top 3		Best Method		Second Best		Third Best		Worst Method	
	%		%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>
1. Practical application assignment with coaching	60.0		24.6	16	9.2	6	26.2	17	3.1	2
2. Classroom presentation by qualified instructors	58.5		27.7	18	16.9	11	13.9	9	3.1	2
3. Lessons learned conversation with former Company Commanders	58.5		23.1	15	27.7	18	7.7	5	0.0	0
4. Discussion group with peers addressing practical exercises or problems	38.5		7.7	5	16.9	11	13.9	9	1.5	1
5. Individual coaching/mentoring/feedback sessions	27.7		6.2	4	4.6	3	16.9	11	1.5	1
6. Gaming scenarios, situational exercises, command post exercises	16.9		7.7	5	1.5	1	7.7	5	9.2	6
7. Role-play leading subordinates or peers	15.4		0.0	0	13.9	9	1.5	1	4.6	3
8. Professional reading on own time	12.3		1.5	1	4.6	3	6.2	4	12.3	8
9. Distance learning with Interactive Multimedia Instruction (IMI)	10.8		0.0	0	4.6	3	6.2	4	27.7	18
10. Structured self-development tool	1.5		1.5	1	0.0	0	0.0	0	12.3	8

Notes. Percentages are based on 65 participants. Top 3 = the percentage of participants who included the training type in either the first-, second- or third-ranked position (the sum is rounded).

No single training method was deemed the best method for every competency cluster. Although respondents chose “Practical application assignment with coaching” as one of the top training methods for three competency clusters (leadership, operational, and resource management) it was not one of the highest rated methods for training knowledge or personal competencies. In fact, the lowest ranked training method (“Structured self-development tool”) for knowledge, operational, and resource management competency cluster was one of the highest ranked methods for personal competencies. “Classroom presentation by qualified instructors” was ranked first for training knowledge-based competencies and second for training resource management competencies. But for training leadership and personal competencies, “Classroom presentation by qualified instructors” was ranked second to last and last, respectively. One training method that consistently was ranked low was “Distance learning with IMI;” it was ranked last or second to last for all the competency clusters.

These findings indicate that the survey respondents (Battalion Commanders and SGLs from CCCs) perceive some training methods to be more effective than others, depending on the type of competency to be trained. Therefore, incorporating a variety of methods into training company command-level competencies is necessary if the goal is to use the best training method for various types of competencies. It appears that an interactive method such as practical application assignment with coaching is perceived to be the best way to train resource management, operational, and leadership competencies, while a different interactive method such individual coaching/mentoring/feedback sessions is viewed as best for training personal competencies. Finally, for knowledge-related competencies, the traditional method of classroom presentation by qualified instructors was deemed to be best.

An open-ended question followed the ranking question for each competency cluster. Respondents were asked to list other training methods that would help students develop competencies in a particular cluster. Combat Training Center (CTC) rotations were recommended for training three different competency clusters: operational, leadership, and personal. One respondent commented that the CTC experience trains “self-awareness through highly stressful and realistic training.” A similar recommendation, “high stress scenario training (Ranger School is a perfect example, but too large scale for this environment),” was made for training leadership competencies. Another comment addressing the resource management cluster was that pre-command students should “shadow actual Company Commanders for a period of time during their training. See the process as an external observer before being consumed by the process when in command.” In a similar vein, another respondent wrote “any training that gets students out of the classroom and allows them to apply lessons to real physical or human terrain” is useful for training knowledge competencies.

Company Command Competency Model Crosswalks

The Company Commander/First Sergeant Course Proposed Common Task List (SCP, 2012) was crosswalked with the final Company Command Competency Model (Table 6). This exercise identified which competencies that are included¹³ on the task list as well as those that are not. The results are presented in Appendix C. The crosswalk shows that approximately 60% of the company command competencies are covered by this course task list. All of the

¹³ The degree or depth of coverage for each competency was not determined.

competencies in the resource management cluster were addressed by tasks on the list. For the remaining clusters the percentage of coverage by the task list was—Personal Capabilities (67%), Leadership (58%), Knowledge (43%), and Operational (29%). A similar approach could be utilized to estimate competency coverage for other PCCs.

Additionally, company command competencies were crosswalked with the Brigade Command Competency Model (Wolters et al., 2011) to determine how they relate to one another and how a company-level competency evolves into a competency or a set of competencies at brigade-level command. Recall that the Brigade Command Competency Model was used as a launch point for creating the draft Company Command Competency Model, so it was expected that the models would be at least somewhat similar. The results, presented graphically, are shown in Appendix D along with a short description of the crosswalk process and results. The results suggest that competencies are very stable from company to brigade command, as virtually all of the Company Commander competencies were linked to Brigade Commander competencies. The main differences occur in the (a) key behaviors (detailed descriptions of how a competency is performed) and (b) proficiency requirements for company versus brigade competencies.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The purpose of this research project was to (a) identify the competencies required to successfully command a company in the COE, (b) evaluate the extent to which the competencies are being addressed and developed in PCCs offered to Company Commanders, and (c) identify training and leadership development methodologies that can help resolve existing training gaps. One method used to describe and delineate the competencies was focus group interviews with officers experienced at company command, either as incumbents, supervisors (e.g., Brigade and Battalion Commanders), or trainers (SGLs), as well as senior NCOs. Multi-source surveys were also employed as a means of addressing these objectives.

Thirty-five competencies were identified for Company Commanders to successfully perform their duties. The research team and SCP representatives, further grouped the competencies into higher-order competency clusters as follows: knowledge, leadership, operational, personal, and resource management. The results suggest that these competencies do differentiate more from less successful Company Commanders.

Perhaps more informative to curriculum designers are those competencies that were rated high on both the proficiency required and extent-should-be-trained scales. These competencies warrant prominent coverage in PCCs and include:

- *Knowledge of Troop Leading Procedures*
- *Engage in direct leadership*
- *Accomplish the mission in accordance with higher headquarters intent*
- *Decision making ability*
- *Manage unit training*
- *Develop subordinate leaders.*

It would be useful to determine which PCCs target these competencies (e.g., CCC or post PCCs). For instance, competencies trained in CCC may not need to be addressed again in PCC, if Captains take both courses before taking company command. Eliminating redundancies between these two courses, if they exist, could open up instructional time to fill training gaps.

Other competencies had high proficiency required ratings but had lower ratings on the extent-should-be-trained scale. The following competencies were rated as being particularly important, but had lower ratings in terms of the extent that they should be trained:

- *Model the Army Values and Warrior Ethos*
- *Maintain discipline standards*
- *Establish trust within the organization.*

These findings suggest that these competencies are developed (or should be developed) through channels other than formal training courses, such as experience in previous assignments or on-the-job learning. However, careful thought should be given before removing or reducing extant training coverage of these competencies because officers come to PCCs with varying degrees of experience. Pre-training assessment of officers' competency proficiency is required to determine the types of experiences that develop these competencies so that courses can be designed accordingly. In fact, the highest variability among competency ratings of all the survey scales was the on the extent-should-be-trained scale (the mean standard deviation was 1.07, versus .85 for proficiency required and .87 for differentiation). This may reflect the variation of rates' experience and assignments held prior to company command. Support for this explanation came from focus group interviews as the most frequent suggestion for improving pre-command training was to have more pre-command experience (such as serving as a company executive officer or as a battalion staff officer). Another explanation for the amount of variability in the extent-should-be-trained in a PCC may be due to differing requirements among officer branches. For instance, a SGL commented on the survey that "company command is not required for an Adjutant General Captain, therefore, the focus of the Adjutant General Captain's Career Course is not command, but battalion personnel officer (S1) (although we still cover the common core command tasks)." The survey sample size did not permit disaggregation by officer branch, but it is reasonable to assume that coverage of company command competencies likely varies among different CCCs and across pre-command training courses depending on officer branch and command location, respectively. The SCP and Command Team Enterprise (CTE) should consider evaluating the relationship between officers' previous experience and competency proficiency.

Accordingly, another objective of this project was to identify potential training gaps in current PCCs. Former Company Commanders were presented job responsibilities (with each job responsibility corresponding to a competency) and asked how prepared they were at the beginning of their company command to accomplish them. Although most respondents indicated they were at least moderately prepared to perform each job responsibility, for nine of the responsibilities at least 20% of the former Company Commanders reported being not at all prepared or not sufficiently prepared. These nine job responsibilities came from all of the competency clusters assessed: *Demonstrate emotional fitness such as self-control and stamina* (Personal), *Lead the Family Readiness Group* (Resource Management), *Train your unit on use of*

force (Operational), Apply risk management processes into planning, preparation, and mission execution (Operational), Lead physical fitness activities (Leadership), Communicate effectively up and down the chain of command (Leadership), Establish and run a recognition and awards program (Leadership), Operate with JIIM or other relevant agencies (Leadership), and Help Soldiers access support from appropriate personal services (Leadership). Curriculum designers of pre-command courses should examine these responsibilities and determine ways to incorporate education and training to improve commanders' ability to perform the job responsibilities. However, it is noteworthy that even though 20% of the respondents indicated not being sufficiently prepared to perform these responsibilities, on two of the responsibilities (*Demonstrate emotional fitness such as self-control and stamina* and *Train your unit on use of force*) the sample, overall, reported being sufficiently prepared. This disparity suggests that Company Commanders have a variety of experiences and even training prior to command and that differentially impacts their preparedness to perform some job responsibilities. It is also noteworthy that only Company Commanders were asked about their level of preparedness to perform the job responsibilities. Other perspectives (i.e. supervisors and subordinates) could have provided additional insight as to the preparedness of Company Commanders. Non-commissioned officers working closely with Company Commanders (i.e. First Sergeants) could provide a uniquely important perspective because of their extensive experience in the military.

An alternate method utilized to identify potential training gaps was a crosswalk of the Company Command Competency Model with the Company Commander/First Sergeant Proposed Common Task List (SCP, 2012). This exercise showed that 15 out of 35 (43%) competencies are not covered in task list. Competency clusters were addressed to varying degrees. The operational cluster had the least coverage by the task list (29%), while knowledge competencies were 43% covered, leadership competencies were 58% covered, personal competencies were 67% covered, and all of the competencies in the resource management cluster were covered. The crosswalk is a useful tool for identifying training gaps (i.e., competencies that were not matched to any tasks) in the course. In fact, the SCP and CTE should consider cross-walking tasks from other pre-command training courses, such as the CCC common core, with the Company Command Competency Model to determine if the competencies are addressed or if new training needs to be developed. Of special interest are those competencies that the Company Commander/First Sergeant Proposed Common Task List did not address (see Appendix C).

Another crosswalk exercise in this project was to compare competencies from company to brigade level. The comparison of the Company Command Competency Model to the Brigade Command Competency Model showed competencies, in general, do not change dramatically from company to brigade command, although there are differences in the representation of some competencies at different levels. First, brigade command competencies tend to require more strategic-level capabilities and more nuanced leadership skills than company command competencies. There are many instances where one company-level leadership competency was linked to three or more brigade-level competencies. Conversely, many company command competencies emphasize mid-managerial responsibilities more than brigade ones do, so much so that a new cluster was identified for company command—resource management.¹⁴ Although

¹⁴ The other competency clusters are identical across both models: operational, leadership, personal capabilities, and knowledge.

Brigade Commanders have resource management responsibilities, their role is from more of a supervisory perspective (e.g., of the brigade staff) as opposed to Company Commanders, who are directly responsible for performing many resource management tasks themselves (e.g., ensuring unit property is assigned and accounted for or leading the Family Readiness Group). Secondly, a comparison of proficiency required rankings between brigade and company command illustrates that the priorities of competencies change from company to brigade. For instance, the second highest ranked company command competencies, *Knowledge of TLPs*, was matched to applicable competencies at brigade level (*Decision making ability* and *Knowledge of Army doctrine*), which were ranked 4th and 36th, respectively. *Knowledge of TLPs* seems to be more critical at the company command level than the related competency, *Knowledge of Army doctrine*, is at brigade command level. Overall, brigade level competencies (Wolters, et al., 2011) had higher proficiency required ratings (based on mean proficiency required ratings) than company command competencies. A possible inference is that Brigade Commanders require a higher level of proficiency to perform command competencies than do Company Commanders.¹⁵ The next logical step for ARI is to identify the competencies relevant to battalion command to evaluate competency progression from company to battalion and battalion to brigade.

An additional objective of the project was to ascertain training methods that are most appropriate for training different types of competencies. Survey participants responded regarding their preferences for PCC training methods to develop specific competency clusters (knowledge, leadership, operational, personal, and resource management). As shown in Table 21, training methods that emphasize interaction between students and instructors or peers is the most preferred way to train competencies associated with leadership, operational capabilities, and resource management applications. However, the most preferred method to develop personal competencies (such as *Self-awareness and self-understanding* or *Adapt to changing conditions*) is through individual coaching, mentoring and feedback sessions. Distance learning with interactive multimedia instruction was one of the two least preferred methods for training all five competency clusters. In summary, SCP and CTE should note that although these training method recommendations are informative, they are subjective preferences that may or may not produce optimal performance. Practicality and cost as well as more objective training evaluations must also be considered when implementing new or different training methods.

Table 21
Recommended Methods for Training Competencies by Cluster

Competency Cluster	Most Preferred Methods ^a
Knowledge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Classroom presentation by qualified instructor • Discussion group with peers • Practical application
Leadership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Practical application assignment with coaching • Role-play leading subordinates or peers • Individual coaching/mentoring/feedback sessions

^aIn order of preference.

¹⁵However, ratings from the brigade command survey and company command survey are from different samples. Therefore, it is possible that higher proficiency required ratings are an artifact of the brigade survey respondents.

Table 21

Recommended Methods for Training Competencies by Cluster (continued)

Competency Cluster	Most Preferred Methods ^a
Operational	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Practical application assignment with coaching • Gaming scenarios, situational exercises, command post exercises • Role-play leading subordinates or peers
Personal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individual coaching/mentoring/feedback sessions • Structured self-development tool • Discussion group with peers
Resource Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Practical application assignment with coaching • Classroom presentation by qualified instructors • Lessons learned conversation with former Company Commanders

^aIn order of preference.

Next Steps

A key factor in training competencies is having the ability to assess individuals' standing on a particular competency, either as a result of training or through previous experience. Follow-on research efforts for improving training should focus on the development of such assessments. A starting place is the list of job responsibilities prepared for this project (Table 16). Using the preparedness scale, instructors/trainers can quickly assess student preparedness on these job responsibilities, and additional job responsibilities can be added at their discretion.

When deciding *how* to assess the competencies relevant to company-level command, it is important to consider the use of both self-report and observational assessment methods. Self-report methods include self- and other-report tools such as 360-degree feedback surveys, where the assessment user is aware of the competency or competencies that they are being asked to rate. The benefits of self- and other-report assessments is that they are often (though not always) relatively straightforward to design and score. However, self-enhancement concerns are relevant in cases where important decisions are made on the basis of the assessment scores, such as decisions about selection into a training program or evaluations of competency development following a training intervention. In addition, these assessments may not be particularly engaging for users.

The use of observational assessments may mitigate some of these concerns. While challenging, costly, and time-consuming to design, observational assessments such as simulations and role-plays are often very engaging for end users, and self-enhancement concerns are lessened because users are not directly aware of what competencies are targeted by the assessment. Specifically, assessment simulations are designed to resemble a job-related situation in which participants are presented with information from various sources, and are then expected to analyze that information and take action on the basis of their analysis. Through this process, simulations *evoke* their targeted competencies rather than assessing them by soliciting opinions.

Virtual role plays (VRPs) could be used to measure many of the company command competencies identified in this project. In a VRP, the user could play the role of a Company Commander who must deal with myriad crises, challenges, and potential opportunities. In a web-enabled VRP, the user could select (and be assessed on) who they want to interact with, what actions they decide to take. Moreover, the assessment can be designed to present users with challenges that are specifically designed to draw out the targeted competency, and can measure what information the user attends to or asks to see, what they prioritize versus decide to put off until later, and what they view as a problem as opposed to an issue that they don't need to be concerned about. Future research should create VRPs or other engaging assessments to determine proficiency levels on the identified company command competencies.

Delineation of the Company Command Competency Model along with training recommendations can provide curriculum designers the information to maximize pre-command education and training. In addition to refining pre-command curricula to explicitly highlight important command competencies, this research provided the foundation from which to build assessments into curricula, for command selection, and for individual professional self-development. The Company Command Competency Model provides a common framework to understand and discuss the knowledge, skills, and abilities required for company command in the U.S. Army.

References

- Air Force Leadership Development Model (n.d.). Retrieved from Strategic Leadership Studies website: <http://leadership.au.af.mil/sls-skil.htm>.
- Allredge, M. E., & Nilan, K. J. (2000). 3M's leadership competency model: An internally developed solution. *Human Resource Management, 39*, 133-145.
- Allen, N., & Burgess, T. (2001). *Taking the guidon: Exceptional leadership at the company level*. Delaware, MD: Center for Company-level Leadership.
- Avkiran, N. (2000). Interpersonal skills and emotional maturity influence entrepreneurial style of bank managers. *Personnel Review, 20*, 654-675.
- Baum, D. (2005, January 17). Annals of war: Battle lessons—what the Generals don't know. *The New Yorker*, 42-48.
- Borman, W. C., & Brush, D. H. (1993). More progress toward a taxonomy of managerial performance requirements. *Human Performance, 6*, 1-21.
- Borman, W. C., Schneider, R. J., Goff, M., Buck, D. E., Hanson, M. A., & Motowidlo, S. J. (2001, April). *Computerized Adaptive Rating Scales II: Scale development for management jobs*. Paper presented at the 16th Annual Conference, Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, San Diego, CA.
- Campbell, J. P. (in press). Behavior, performance, and effectiveness – in the 21st century. In S. Kozlowski (Ed), *The Oxford Handbook of Organizational Psychology*. New York: Oxford Press.
- Campbell, J. P., & Knapp, D. (2001). *Exploring the limits of personnel selection and classification*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Campbell, J. P., McCloy, R. A., Oppler, S. H., & Sager, C. E. (1993). A theory of performance. In N. Schmitt & W. C. Borman (Eds.), *Personnel selection in organizations* (pp. 35-70). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Coast Guard Leadership Competencies (n.d.). Retrieved from Coast Guard Leadership and Professional Development website: <http://www.uscg.mil/leadership/resources/competencies.asp>.
- Hemphill, J. K. (1959). Job descriptions for executives. *Harvard Business Review, 37*, 55-67.
- Horey, J., Fallesen, J.J., Morath, R., Cronin, B., Cassella, R., Franks, W., & Smith, J. (2004). *Competency based future leadership requirements* (Technical Report 1148). Arlington, VA: U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.
- Kurz, R., & Bartram, D. (2002). Competency and individual performance: Modeling the world of work. In I. T. Robertson, M. Callinan, & D. Bartram (Eds.), *Organizational effectiveness: The role of psychology* (pp. 227-255). Chichester, UK: Wiley.

- Marine Corps Leadership Competencies (n.d.). Retrieved from Strategic Leadership Studies website: <http://leadership.au.af.mil/sls-skil.htm>.
- Meyer, J.G. (1990). *Company command: The bottom line*. Washington, DC: National Defense University Press.
- Mirabile, R.J. (1997, August). Everything you wanted to know about competency modeling. *Training and Development*, 73-77.
- Navy Leadership Competency Model (n.d.). Retrieved from Strategic Leadership Studies website: <http://leadership.au.af.mil/sls-skil.htm>.
- Olson, A. M. (2000). *A theory and taxonomy of individual team member performance*. Ph.D. Dissertation. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.
- Tett, R. P., Guterman, H. A., Bleier, A., & Murphy, P. J. (2000). Development and content validation of “hyperdimensional” taxonomy of managerial competence. *Human Performance*, 13, 205–251.
- U.S. Department of the Army. (2001). *The Army training and leader development panel officer study report to the Army*. Combined Arms Center. Fort Leavenworth, KS: Author.
- U.S. Department of the Army. (2006). *Army Leadership*. (Field Manual 6-22). Washington, DC: Author.
- U.S. Department of the Army. (2006b). *The infantry rifle company* (Field Manual 3-21.10). Washington, DC: Author.
- U.S. Department of the Army. (2011). *Training units and developing leaders for full spectrum operations* (Field Manual 7-0). Washington, DC: Author.
- U.S. Department of the Army. (2012). *Company Commander First Sergeant Course Proposed Common Task List*. School for Command Preparation. Fort Leavenworth, KS: Author.
- Wolters, H.M.K., O’Shea, P.G., Ford, L.A., Fleisher, M.S., Adeniyi, M.A., Conzelman, C.E., & Webster, R.J. (2011). *Identification of Brigade Command Competencies* (Study Report 2011-02). Arlington, VA: U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.
- Wong, L., Gerras, S., Kidd, W., Pricone, R., & Swengros (2003). *Strategic Leadership Competencies* (Strategic Studies Institute). Retrieved from Strategic Leadership Studies website: <http://leadership.au.af.mil/sls-skil.htm>.
- Yukl, G. A. (1993). *Leadership in organizations* (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Yukl, G. A. (2010). *Leadership in organizations* (7th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Appendix A. Content Analysis of Relevant Studies

Appendix A displays the results of the literature review for the research-based competency models. Not all models use the same definition of competency and not all frameworks are presented at the same level of specificity as the Company Command Competency Model. However, they were still useful to consider when building the model. Analysis of relevant studies began by extracting the following information:

- The job(s) included in the study
- The purpose(s) of the study
- The methodology(ies) used to develop the competency model
- The core competency dimensions included in the study's competency model

Table A.1 indicates that a wide variety of jobs were represented in the studies reviewed. These jobs included supervisors, managers, and executives at a diverse array of organizations, community leaders, civilian executives in the Army, Army entry-level enlisted positions and NCOs, Army officers with strategic responsibilities, and a variety of other Army leaders.

Table A.1 also shows the purposes for which the reviewed competency models were developed. The majority of the competency models were developed for multiple uses or to determine the dimensions of managerial competence across occupations. In addition, several competency models were developed for selection, performance appraisal, or research purposes.

The majority of the studies involved quantitative analysis of survey ratings, although several studies were qualitative in nature. The quantitative studies typically involved use of qualitative methods to develop a survey and confirmation of the qualitative research through quantitative analysis of the survey ratings. For example, in an early study by Hemphill (1959), 93 executives in five companies were given the Executive Position Description Questionnaire containing 575 possible job elements. Subsequently, subject matter experts (SMEs) rated the importance of the job elements to managerial dimensions in upper management, middle management, and beginning management. Results were then factor analyzed to obtain managerial dimensions. On occasion, more qualitative methods were used to create the competency model. For instance, Yukl (1993) developed a set of 12 leadership-management performance dimensions by reviewing all available measures of management-leadership performance, and rationally categorizing them into twelve factors. It should be noted that the fact that a study is purely qualitative does not necessarily mean that it is methodologically weak. Rather, quantitative and qualitative approaches should be viewed as complementary methodologies.

The final column in Table A.1 lists all of the competencies that were reported by the study author(s). Due to vast differences in the way these competencies were defined across studies, a formal content analysis was not conducted to identify the core competencies common to all studies. However, Table A.1 reveals that there is a large set of competencies common to many managerial jobs across diverse organizations, including Planning, Guiding, Directing, Organizing, Decision Making, Monitoring, Motivating, Managing Conflict, Delegating, and Influencing.

Table A.2 lists the managerial competencies contained in five key military leadership frameworks, including the Army Core Leader Competencies (FM 6-22), the Navy Leadership Competency Model, the Air Force Leadership Development Model, the Marine Corps Leadership Principles, and the Coast Guard Leadership Competencies. Table A.2 reveals that many of the managerial competencies identified in the research-based competency models are found in these leadership frameworks as well. In addition, Table A.2 identifies some managerial competencies that are unique to the military, including Extends Influence Beyond the Chain of Command, Leading Courageously, Being Technically and Tactically Proficient, and Employ Your Command in Accordance with its Capabilities.

Table A.3 lists the managerial competencies contained in four sample practitioner competency models. Not surprisingly, there is substantial overlap between the competencies identified in Table A.3 and those identified in Tables A.1 and A.2. Interestingly, SHL's practitioner model lists managerial competencies at a very fine level of detail, and includes over 100 sub-competencies. This level of detail may be required for practitioners who use this model for a diverse array of purposes, including selection, promotion, credentialing, training development, and performance appraisal. Notwithstanding this high level of detail, however, the central managerial competencies captured in the SHL model, such as Leading and Deciding, Supporting and Cooperating, Interacting and Presenting, Analyzing and Interpreting, Creating and Conceptualizing, Organizing and Executing, Adapting and Coping, and Enterprising and Performing, are captured in many of the competency models in Tables A.1 and A.2.

As mentioned earlier, the ultimate purpose of this literature review was to ensure that the draft Company Commander Competency Model was complete and comprehensive. To that end, Tables A.1, A.2, and A.3 were reviewed in order to detect and remedy any gaps that existed in the draft Company Commander Competency Model. The review was most useful in terms of shaping the resource management competency cluster for Company Commanders, a cluster that was not part of the Brigade Command Competency Model.

Table A.1

Research-Based Managerial Competency Models

Source	Job(s)	Purpose	How developed?	Competencies
Campbell, McCloy, Oppler, & Sager (1993)	All jobs	Research	Theoretically-derived, and based on (a) a review of the extant literature and (b) the results of the long-term Selection and Classification project sponsored by the U.S. Army	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Job-specific Task Proficiency • Non-job specific Task Proficiency • Written and Oral Communication Task Proficiency • Demonstrating Effort • Maintaining Personal Discipline • Facilitating Peer and Team Performance • Supervision/Leadership • Management/Administration
Borman & Brush (1993)	Managers from diverse organizations	Derivation of a taxonomy of managerial performance requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analyzed results from seven published and 19 unpublished critical incident studies of management performance • Aggregated distinct dimensions identified in each study and asked a sample of 30 I/O psychologists to sort the 187 dimensions into homogenous categories • The resulting matrix of similarities was factor analyzed, resulting in an 18-factor solution 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning and Organizing • Guiding, Directing, and Motivating Subordinates and Providing Feedback • Training, Coaching, and Developing Subordinates • Communicating Effectively and Keeping Others Informed • Representing the Organization to Customers and the Public • Technical Proficiency • Administration and Paperwork • Maintaining Good Working Relationships • Coordinating Subordinates and Others' Resources to Get the Job Done • Decision Making/Problem Solving • Staffing • Persisting to Reach Goals • Handling Crises and Stress • Organizational Commitment • Monitoring and Controlling Resources • Delegating • Selling/Influencing • Collecting and Interpreting Data

Table A.1

Research-Based Managerial Competency Models (continued)

Source	Job(s)	Purpose	How developed?	Competencies
Tett, Guterman, Bleier, & Murphy (2000)	Managers in all occupations	Creation of a diverse set of managerial competencies that, collectively, would allow meaningful and relatively precise distinctions among diverse jobs representing all managerial functions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assembled a master list of observable managerial dimensions from 12 previously published managerial performance taxonomies • Identified non-overlapping list of 47 managerial competencies • Modified taxonomy following survey of 660 Academy of Management members 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Problem Awareness • Decision Making • Directing • Decision Delegation • Short-Term Planning • Strategic Planning • Coordinating • Goal Setting • Monitoring • Motivating by Authority • Motivating by Persuasion • Team Building • Productivity • Initiative • Task Focus • Urgency • Decisiveness • Compassion • Cooperation • Sociability • Politeness • Political Astuteness • Assertiveness • Seeking Input • Customer Focus • Orderliness • Rule Orientation • Personal Responsibility • Trustworthiness • Timeliness • Professionalism • Loyalty

Table A.1

Research-Based Managerial Competency Models (continued)

Source	Job(s)	Purpose	How developed?	Competencies
Tett, Guterman, Bleier, & Murphy (continued) (2000)	Managers in all occupations	Create a diverse set of managerial competencies that, collectively, would allow meaningful and relatively precise distinctions among diverse jobs representing all managerial functions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assembled a master list of observable managerial dimensions from 12 previously published managerial performance taxonomies • Identified non-overlapping list of 47 managerial competencies • Modified taxonomy following survey of 660 Academy of Management members 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tolerance • Adaptability • Creative Thinking • Resilience • Stress Management • Cultural Appreciation • Listening • Oral Communication • Public Presentation • Written Communication • Developmental Goal Setting • Performance Assessment • Developmental Feedback • Job Enrichment • Self-Development • Technical Proficiency • Organizational Awareness • Quantity Concern • Quality Concern • Financial Concern • Safety Concern

Table A.1

Research-Based Managerial Competency Models (continued)

Source	Job(s)	Purpose	How developed?	Competencies
Aldredge and Nilan (2000)	Top Executives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Selection • Development • Placement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Held initial meetings with VPs to identify competencies • Literature reviewed on leadership competencies and development to refine list • 3M's earlier work on general manager competencies compared to existing corporate models of leadership competencies • Individual and group meetings with executive human resources (HR) staff to refine provisional competency list • Global HR team formulated framework for organizing competencies • Developed behavioral anchors for competencies by conducting critical incident interviews with executives (job experts) • Pilot tested competency model by having top executives use it to rate/discuss the leadership behaviors of their direct reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic/Creative/Critical Thinking • Problem Solving/Decision-Making • Integrity/Professionalism • Interpersonal/Teamwork Skills • Customer Focus • Leading/Mentoring • Technical/industry/Organizational Knowledge

Table A.1

Research-Based Managerial Competency Models (continued)

Source	Job(s)	Purpose	How developed?	Competencies
Avkiran (2000)	Bank Managers	Research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Literature reviewed to develop preliminary competency model Feedback from job experts on competencies identified in literature review Questionnaire ratings of competencies in model factor analyzed to refine competency list 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strategic/Creative/Critical Thinking Problem Analysis/Decision-Making Communication Motivation Integrity/Professionalism Interpersonal/Teamwork Skills Customer Focus Planning/Organizing
Borman et al. (2001)	Managers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Performance Appraisal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Previous managerial competency models and listing of competencies reviewed Conducted focus groups with job experts and stakeholders to develop company's managerial performance taxonomy Content analyzed competencies using company's managerial performance taxonomy as an organizing structure Revised managerial performance taxonomy reviewed by company stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strategic/Creative/Critical Thinking Communication Motivation Integrity/Professionalism Interpersonal/Teamwork skills Customer Focus Leading/Mentoring Technical/Industry/Organizational Knowledge

Table A.1

Research-Based Managerial Competency Models (continued)

Source	Job(s)	Purpose	How developed?	Competencies
Campbell & Knapp (2001)	Army entry-level enlisted positions and NCOs	Develop a general model of performance for entry-level skilled jobs and for NCO jobs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conducted comprehensive literature review, developed criterion measures based on a job analysis, administered instruments to a sample of incumbents, and used expert judgment, exploratory factor analysis, cluster analysis and confirmatory factor analysis to arrive at dimensions of performance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Core Technical Proficiency General Soldiering Proficiency Effort and Leadership Maintaining Personal Discipline Physical Fitness and Military Bearing
Olson (2000)	High performance work teams	Determine the dimensions of individual performance as a team member	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Several hundred critical incidents were collected from four high-performance work teams (two were project teams in engineering firms, and two were advisory/planning teams in medical centers) Individuals were asked to describe examples they had observed of both effective and ineffective performance as a team member A random sample of 200 incidents was sorted into categories by SMEs, retranslated, and subjected to principal components analysis to derive the dimensions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Facilitating Team-Related Task Responsibilities Peer Leadership: Initiating Structure Peer Leadership: Consideration Training Team Members/Sharing Task Information Team Member Helping/Backup Relief Monitoring Performance Monitoring Team Effectiveness Individual Contributions to Problem Solving Individual Contributions to Workload Distribution/Coordination

Table A.1

Research-Based Managerial Competency Models (continued)

Source	Job(s)	Purpose	How developed?	Competencies
Kurz & Bartram (2002)	Managers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research • Performance Appraisal • Training • Compensation • Personnel development • Management succession planning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reviewed relevant literature to obtain competencies • Conducted factor analysis on non-overlapping competencies to derive managerial dimensions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deciding and Taking Action • Leading and Supervising • Working with People • Adhering to Principles and Values • Relating and Networking • Persuading and Influencing • Presenting and Communicating Information • Writing and Reporting • Applying Expertise and Technology • Analyzing • Learning and Researching • Creating and Innovating • Formulating Strategies and Concepts • Planning and Organizing • Delivering Results and Meeting Customer Expectations • Following Instructions and Procedures • Adapting and Responding to Change • Coping with Pressure and Setbacks • Achieving Personal Work Goals and Objectives • Entrepreneurial and Commercial Thinking
Wong, Gerras, Kidd, Pricone, Swengros (2003)	Army Officers with strategic responsibilities	Brigade Level commanders and above	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reviewed previous literature on strategic leadership and rationally integrated findings into six mega-competencies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identity • Mental Agility • Cross-Cultural Savvy • Interpersonal Maturity • World-class Warrior • Professional Astuteness

Table A.1

Research-Based Managerial Competency Models (continued)

Source	Job(s)	Purpose	How developed?	Competencies
Horey, Fallesen, Cronin, Cassella, Franks & Smith (2004)	Army leaders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop leadership requirements for the future Army • Align training, development and performance processes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analytically derived competencies by comparing competency frameworks from other U.S. military services and reviewing past leadership models in the academic and civilian literature • Tentative competencies reviewed by SMEs in military leadership • Modifications made based on recommended revisions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leading Others to Success • Exemplifying Sound Values and Behaviors • Vitalizing a Positive Climate • Ensuring Shared Understanding • Reinforcing Growth in Others • Arming Self to Lead • Guiding Successful Operations • Extending Influence
Yukl, 2010	Managers	Determine managerial dimensions applicable to all managerial jobs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developed a set of 12 leadership-management performance dimensions by reviewing all available measures of management-leadership performance, and rationally categorizing them into twelve factors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarifying Roles • Monitoring Operations • Short-Term Planning • Consulting • Supporting • Recognizing • Developing • Empowering • Envisioning Change • Taking Risks for Change • Encouraging Innovative Thinking • External Monitoring

Table A.1.

Research-Based Managerial Competency Models (continued)

Source	Job(s)	Purpose	How developed?	Competencies
Campbell (in press)	Managers	Determine managerial dimensions applicable to all managerial jobs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reviewed previous models of managerial performance and distilled commonalities into eight managerial dimensions applicable to all jobs or occupations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Goal Setting, Planning, Organizing, and Budgeting Coordination Monitoring Unit Effectiveness External Representation Staffing Decision Making, Problem Solving, and Strategic Innovation Administration Commitment and Compliance

Table A.2
Military Leadership Frameworks

Framework	Competencies		
Army Core Leader Competencies (FM 6-22)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leads Others • Extends Influence Beyond the Chain of Command • Leads by Example • Communicates 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creates a Positive Environment • Prepares Self • Develops Others • Get Results 	
Navy Leadership Competency Model	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accomplishing Mission • Leading People • Leading Change • Working with People • Resource Stewardship 		
Marine Corps Leadership Principles	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure Task is Understood, Supervised, and Accomplished • Keep Your Marines Informed • Make Sound and Timely Decisions • Train Your Marines as a Team 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Know Your Marines and Look out for their Welfare • Know Yourself and Seek Improvement • Be Technically and Tactically Proficient • Set the Example • Develop a Sense of Responsibility Among Your Subordinates 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employ Your Command in Accordance with its Capabilities • Seek Responsibility and Take Responsibility for Your Actions

Table A.2

Military Leadership Frameworks (continued)

Framework	Competencies		
Air Force Leadership Development Model	<p>Personal Leadership</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exercising Sound Judgment • Adapting • Inspiring Trust • Leading Courageously • Demonstrating Tenacity • Leading by Example • Assessing Self 	<p>Leading People/Teams</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inspiring, Empowering, and Exercising Authority • Influencing and Negotiating • Attracting, Developing and Retaining Talent • Fostering Effective Communication • Fostering Teamwork and Collaboration • Mentoring, Coaching, Counseling • Building Relationships 	<p>Leading the Institution</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shaping Strategy • Translating Strategy • Thinking/Working Across Boundaries • Applying Resource Stewardship • Driving Execution • Commanding • Creating and Demonstrating Vision • Driving Transformation • Driving Continuous Improvement • Integrating Systems
Coast Guard Leadership Competencies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accountability & Responsibility • Followership • Self-Awareness & Learning • Aligning Values • Health & Well-Being • Personal Conduct • Technical Proficiency • Effective Communications • Influencing Others • Team Building 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respect for Others & Diversity Management • Taking Care of People • Mentoring • Customer Focus • Management and Process Improvement • Decision Making & Problem Solving • Conflict Management • Creativity and Innovation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vision Development and Implementation • Stewardship • Technology Management • Financial Management • Human Resource Management • Partnering • External Awareness • Entrepreneurship • Political Savvy • Strategic Thinking

Table A.3

Sample Practitioner Managerial Performance Dimensions

Framework	Competencies		
Personnel Decisions, Inc	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Think Strategically • Analyze Issues • Use Sound Judgment • Innovate • Establish Plans • Structure and Staff • Develop Systems & Processes • Manage Execution • Work Efficiently • Provide Direction • Lead Courageously • Influence Others • Foster Teamwork • Motivate Others 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coach and Develop • Champion Change • Build Relationships • Display Organizational Savvy • Leverage Networks • Value Diversity • Manage Disagreements • Speak Effectively • Foster Open Communication • Listen to Others • Deliver Presentations • Drive for Results • Show Work Commitment • Act with Integrity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrate Adaptability • Develop Oneself • Use Financial and Quantitative Data • Use Technical/Functional Expertise • Know the Business • Manage Profitability • Commit to Quality • Focus on Customer Needs • Promote Corporate Citizenship • Recognize Global Implications
Jeanneret & Associates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical Knowledge • Business Knowledge • Procedural Knowledge • Planning, Prioritizing and Scheduling • Task Supervision • Administrative Organization • Decision Making • Instructing • Alignment with Organization 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Persuasion and Influence • Coaching • Strategic Planning • Promoting Teamwork • Teaming with Customers • Leading Teams • Oral Communication • Listening • Written Communication • Negotiating 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initiative • Perseverance • Stress Tolerance • Integrity • Objectivity • Adaptability • General Reasoning • Ability • Organizational Commitment

Table A.3

Sample Practitioner Managerial Performance Dimensions (continued)

Framework	Competencies		
Lominger Limited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Action Oriented • Dealing with Ambiguity • Approachability • Boss Relationships • Business Acumen • Career Ambition • Caring About Direct Reports • Comfort Around Higher Management • Command Skills • Compassion • Composure • Conflict Management 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confronting Direct Reports • Creativity • Customer Focus • Timely Decision Making • Decision Quality • Delegation • Developing Direct Reports • Directing Others • Managing Diversity • Ethics and Values • Fairness to Direct Reports • Functional/Technical Skills • Hiring and Staffing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Humor • Informing • Innovation Management • Integrity and Trust • Intellectual Horsepower • Interpersonal Savvy • Learning on the Fly • Listening • Managerial Courage • Managing and Measuring Work • Motivating Others • Negotiating

Table A.3

Sample Practitioner Managerial Performance Dimensions (continued)

Framework	Competencies		
SHL	1 Leading and Deciding	2.1.4 Recognizing and Rewarding Contributions	3.2 Persuading and Influencing
	1.1 Deciding & Initiating Action	2.1.5 Listening	3.2.1 Making an Impact
	1.1.1 Making Decisions	2.1.6 Consulting Others	3.2.2 Shaping Conversations
	1.1.2 Taking Responsibility	2.1.7 Communicating Proactively	3.2.3 Appealing to Emotions
	1.1.3 Acting with Confidence	2.1.8 Showing Tolerance and Consideration	3.2.4 Promoting Ideas
	1.1.4 Acting on Own Initiative	2.1.9 Showing Empathy	3.2.5 Negotiating
	1.1.5 Taking Action	2.1.10 Supporting Others	3.2.6 Gaining Agreement
	1.1.6 Taking Calculated Risks	2.1.11 Caring for Others	3.2.7 Dealing with Political Issues
	1.2 Leading and Supervising	2.1.12 Developing and Communicating Self-knowledge and Insight	3.3 Presenting and Communicating Information
	1.2.1 Providing Direction and Coordinating Action	2.2 Adhering to Principles and Values	3.3.1 Speaking Fluently
	1.2.2 Supervising and Monitoring Behavior	2.2.1 Upholding Ethics and Values	3.3.2 Explaining Concepts and Opinions
	1.2.3 Coaching	2.2.2 Acting with Integrity	3.3.3 Articulating Key Points of an Argument
	1.2.4 Delegating	2.2.3 Utilizing Diversity	3.3.4 Presenting and Public Speaking
	1.2.5 Empowering Staff	2.2.4 Showing Social and Environmental Responsibility	3.3.5 Projecting Credibility
	1.2.6 Motivating Others	3 Interacting and Presenting	3.3.6 Responding to an Audience
	1.2.7 Developing Staff	3.1 Relating & Networking	4 Analyzing and Interpreting
	1.2.8 Identifying and Recruiting Talent	3.1.1 Building Rapport	4.1 Writing and Reporting
	2 Supporting and Cooperating	3.1.2 Networking	4.1.1 Writing Correctly
	2.1 Working with People	3.1.3 Relating Across Levels	4.1.2 Writing Clearly and Fluently
	2.1.1 Understanding Others	3.1.4 Managing Conflict	4.1.3 Writing in an Expressive and Engaging Style
	2.1.2 Adapting to the Team	3.1.5 Using Humor	4.1.4 Targeting Communication
	2.1.3 Building Team Spirit		

Table A.3

Sample Practitioner Managerial Performance Dimensions (continued)

Framework	Competencies		
SHL	4.2 Applying Expertise and Technology	5.2 Creating and Innovating	6.3 Following Instructions and Procedures
	4.2.1 Applying Technical Expertise	5.2.1 Innovating	6.3.1 Following Directions
	4.2.2 Building Technical Expertise	5.2.2 Seeking and Introducing Change	6.3.2 Following Procedures
	4.2.3 Sharing Expertise	5.3 Formulating Strategies and Concepts	6.3.3 Time Keeping and Attending
	4.2.4 Using Technology Resources	5.3.1 Thinking Broadly	6.3.4 Demonstrating Commitment
	4.2.5 Demonstrating Physical and Manual Skills	5.3.2 Approaching Work Strategically	6.3.5 Showing Awareness of Safety Issues
	4.2.6 Demonstrating Cross Functional Awareness	5.3.3 Setting and Developing Strategy	6.3.6 Complying with Legal Obligations
	4.2.7 Demonstrating Spatial Awareness	5.3.4 Visioning 6 Organizing and Executing	7 Adapting and Coping
	4.3 Analyzing	6.1 Planning and Organizing	7.1 Adapting and Responding to Change
	4.3.1 Analyzing and Evaluating Information	6.1.1 Setting Objectives	7.1.1 Adapting
	4.3.2 Testing Assumptions and Investigating	6.1.2 Planning	7.1.2 Accepting New Ideas
	4.3.3 Producing Solutions	6.1.3 Managing Time	7.1.3 Adapting Interpersonal Style
	4.3.4 Making Judgments	6.1.4 Managing Resources	7.1.4 Showing Cross-cultural Awareness
	4.3.5 Demonstrating Systems Thinking	6.1.5 Monitoring Progress	7.1.5 Dealing with Ambiguity
	5 Creating and Conceptualizing	6.2 Delivering Results and Meeting Customer Expectations	
	5.1 Learning and Researching	6.2.1 Focusing on Customer Needs and Satisfaction	
	5.1.1 Learning Quickly	6.2.2 Setting High Standards for Quality	
	5.1.2 Gathering Information	6.2.3 Monitoring and Maintaining Quality	
	5.1.3 Thinking Quickly	6.2.4 Working Systematically	
	5.1.4 Encouraging and Supporting Organizational Learning	6.2.5 Maintaining Quality Processes	
	5.1.5 Managing Knowledge	6.2.6 Maintaining Productivity Levels	
		6.2.7 Driving Projects to Results	

Appendix B. Competencies Derived from Content Analysis of Focus Group Interviews

Table B.1

Preliminary Company Command Competencies

Competencies
Accomplish mission in accordance with higher headquarters' intent
Adapt to changing conditions
Assess ongoing operations
Build effective teams
Communicate effectively with diverse audiences (written and verbal)
Conduct effective counseling
Create an ethical and positive command climate
Critical thinking skills
Decision making ability
Develop positive command climate and presence
Develop subordinate leaders
Engage in direct leadership
Establish and enforce command supply discipline
Establish trust within the organization
Formulate commander's intent
Intelligence
Knowledge of all jobs in the unit
Knowledge of Army organization and how companies, battalions, and brigades fit together
Knowledge of battalion staff operations
Knowledge of the resources available to the company
Knowledge of the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ)
Knowledge of Troop Leading Procedures
Listening skills
Maintain discipline standards
Maintain Comprehensive Soldier Fitness
Manage administrative requirements
Manage maintenance readiness program
Manage risk
Manage unit family support requirements
Manage unit time
Manage unit training
Manage awards and evaluations
Maturity
Model behavior after effective leaders
Model the Army Values and Warrior Ethos

Table B.1

Preliminary Company Command Competencies (continued)

Competencies
Operate effectively with joint, interagency, intergovernmental, multinational (JIIM) and non-governmental agencies
Organizational skills
Possess drive, willpower, and shows courage and initiative
Prepare an officer evaluation report (OER)
Self-awareness and self-understanding
Strategic thinking skills
Take care of Soldiers
Work effectively within the chain of command

Appendix C. Crosswalk of Company Command Competencies with the Company Commander/First Sergeant Course Proposed Common Task List

From Table C.1 it is possible to discern that 20 out of the 35 of the competencies (57%) are addressed by the Company Commander/First Sergeant Proposed Common Task List. Fifteen of these competencies require an advanced level of proficiency¹ and five of them require an intermediate level of proficiency. However, 15 competencies (43%) are not addressed on the task list. Listed below are the competencies that are not covered—ten require an advanced level of proficiency and five require an intermediate level of proficiency.

Knowledges

- Knowledge of Troop Leading Procedures (Advanced)
- Knowledge of the OER and NCOER systems (Intermediate)
- Knowledge of communication media (Intermediate)
- Knowledge of resources available to the company (Advanced)

Leadership

- Engage in direct leadership (Advanced)
- Establish/maintain a command team with 1SG (Advanced)
- Build effective teams (Advanced)
- Work effectively within the chain of command (Advanced)
- Operate effectively with JIIM and non-governmental agencies (Intermediate)

Operational

- Decision making ability (Advanced)
- Formulate Commander's intent (Advanced)
- Critical thinking skills (Advanced)
- Assess ongoing operations (Advanced)
- Establish an effective company headquarters (Intermediate)

Personal

- Self-awareness and self-understanding (Intermediate)

¹ The proficiency scale was 1 – No proficiency required, 2 – Basic level, 3 – Intermediate level, 4 – Advanced level, and 5 – Expert level.

Table C.1

Crosswalk of Company Command Competencies with the Company Commander First Sergeant Course Proposed Common Task List

Proficiency Level Required	Competency Ranking (Proficiency)*	Company Command Competency	Company Commander 1SG Course Proposed Common Task List
Advanced ¹	1	Model the Army Values and Warrior Ethos	12. Comprehensive Soldier Fitness Program 16. Know and execute command responsibilities to be stewards for the Profession of Arms
	2	Take care of Soldiers	3. Execute command responsibilities within the Army Campaign Plan for Health Promotion Programs
			4. Execute command responsibilities within the Army Campaign Plan for Suicide Prevention Programs
			5. Know Army and command's policy and programs on Sexual Harassment/Assault Response Prevention
			6. Know Army and command's policy and programs on Substance Abuse Program
			12. Comprehensive Soldier Fitness Program
	2	Take care of Soldiers	14. Know and execute command responsibilities for Soldier medical readiness
			17. Understand concussion/mTBI effects on Soldiers and unit and available resources to assist command teams
	3	Knowledge of TLPs	None
	4	Maintain discipline standards	2. Execute command responsibilities to maintain good order and discipline within unit
5	Create an ethical and positive command climate	1. Establish and maintain a positive command climate.	
		5. Know Army and command's policy and programs on Sexual Harassment/Assault Response Prevention 7. Know Army and command's policy and programs on Equal Opportunity	

Table C.1

Crosswalk of Company Command Competencies with the Company Commander First Sergeant Course Proposed Common Task List (continued)

Proficiency Level Required	Competency Ranking (Proficiency)*	Company Command Competency	Company Commander 1SG Course Proposed Common Task List
Advanced ¹	6	Engage in direct leadership	None
	7	Establish trust within the organization	1. Establish and maintain a positive command climate.
	8	Accomplish mission in accordance with higher headquarters' intent	16. Know and execute command responsibilities to be stewards for the Profession of Arms
	9	Decision making ability	None
	10	Manage unit training	9. Plan, prepare and execute individual and collective training
	11	Establish/maintain a command team with 1SG	None
	12	Develop subordinate leaders	8. Establish and maintain unit leader development program
			15. Know and execute command responsibilities for Army's Retention Program
			18. Protection of Classified and Sensitive Information
	13	Build effective teams	None
	14	Establish and enforce command supply discipline	11. Execute command responsibilities for Command Supply Discipline, unit maintenance and Organizational Inspection Programs
	15	Formulate Commander's intent	None
	16	Knowledge of resources available to the company	None
	17	Critical thinking skills	None
18	Assess ongoing operations	None	

Table C.1

Crosswalk of Company Command Competencies with the Company Commander First Sergeant Course Proposed Common Task List (continued)

Proficiency Level Required	Competency Ranking (Proficiency)*	Company Command Competency	Company Commander 1SG Course Proposed Common Task List
Advanced¹	19	Manage risk	19. Manage Unit Safety and Risk Management
	20	Work effectively within the chain of command	None
	21	Maintain Comprehensive Soldier Fitness	12. Comprehensive Soldier Fitness Program
	22	Adapt to changing conditions	3. Execute command responsibilities within the Army Campaign Plan for Health Promotion Programs
	23	Communicate effectively with diverse audiences, both verbally and in writing	1. Establish and maintain a positive command climate.
			13. Unit Family Readiness Group Programs
	24	Manage unit time	16. Know and execute command responsibilities to be stewards for the Profession of Arms
19. Manage Unit Safety and Risk Management			
25	Knowledge of Army doctrine	16. Know and execute command responsibilities to be stewards for the Profession of Arms	
Intermediate²	26	Self-awareness and self-understanding	None
	27	Establish an effective company headquarters	None
	28	Knowledge of the OER and NCOER systems	None
	29	Manage maintenance readiness program	11. Execute command responsibilities for Command Supply Discipline, unit maintenance and Organizational Inspection Programs

Table C.1

Crosswalk of Company Command Competencies with the Company Commander First Sergeant Course Proposed Common Task List (continued)

Proficiency Level Required	Competency Ranking (Proficiency)*	Company Command Competency	Company Commander 1SG Course Proposed Common Task List
Intermediate²	30	Manage administrative requirements	10. Execute command responsibilities for administrative policies and processes
			12. Comprehensive Soldier Fitness Program
			14. Know and execute command responsibilities for Soldier medical readiness
			18. Protection of Classified and Sensitive Information
	31	Knowledge of the UCMJ	2. Execute command responsibilities to maintain good order and discipline within unit
	32	Manage unit family support requirements	13. Unit Family Readiness Group Programs
	33	Knowledge of relevant cultural and geopolitical issues	16. Know and execute command responsibilities to be stewards for the Profession of Arms
34	Knowledge of communication media	None	
35	Operate effectively with joint, interagency, intergovernmental, multinational (JIIM) and non-governmental agencies	None	

Note: * The proficiency ranking is based on mean proficiency ratings. Battalion Commanders, former Company Commanders, and Captains Career Course Small Group Leaders (N=138) rated each competency on “the level of proficiency required to be a fully successful Company Commander.” The scale was 1 – No proficiency required, 2 – Basic level, 3 – Intermediate level, 4 – Advanced level, and 5 – Expert level. The ranking of 1 had the highest mean ($M=4.16$) and the ranking of 35 had the lowest mean ($M=2.63$).

¹ High level of proficiency; able to use it effectively in complex and non-routine situations.

² Working or functional level of proficiency; able to effectively use the competency in most commonly experienced command situations.

Appendix D. Company Command to Brigade Command Competency Crosswalk

Appendix D presents the results of the Company-Brigade competency crosswalk. The exercise was completed by four team members. Specifically two military SMEs, both retired Army officers with extensive experience in training development and evaluation, and two research psychologists individually matched the company command competency list to the brigade competency list. In this initial judgment task, 77% of the linkages were the same or very similar. The team met to resolve the links that were not the same.

Listed side-by-side, the company command competency on the left is linked to the brigade command competency(ies) on the right. Rankings from the proficiency ratings for Company Commanders and those for Brigade Commanders (Wolters, et al., 2011) are presented in parentheses next to each competency title. For example, the “1” parentheses listed along with the company command competency *Model Army Values and Warrior Ethos* indicates that this competency had the highest mean rating of proficiency required.

Virtually all of the company command competencies were matched to one or more brigade command competencies. The implication is that command competencies are developed early in one’s career, develop over time, and yet are still relevant albeit more detailed and complex at a higher echelon. The company to brigade crosswalk illustrates this, in that two or more brigade level competencies were often linked to a single company competency. For example, one company command competency, *establish an effective company headquarters*, was linked to two brigade competencies: (a) *ability to command a battle staff/integrate capabilities*, and (b) *ability to gather and interpret necessary information*. Competencies tend to be defined in more detail at brigade level, perhaps illustrating that this aspect of knowledge, skill or ability must be more highly developed at the brigade level than at the company level. Supporting this is the fact that brigade command competencies had higher proficiency requirements (based on mean proficiency ratings) than did company command competencies.

Although most competencies were matched between company and brigade, there were a few competencies that were unique at each echelon:

Company command—

- o Establish and enforce command supply discipline
- o Manage maintenance readiness program

Brigade command—

- o Ability to manage funds/maintain a budget
- o Knowledge of the ARFORGEN process

Table D.1

Crosswalk of Company Command Competencies with the Brigade Command Competency Model

Company Command Competency	Related Brigade Command Competency(ies)
Model Army Values and Warrior Ethos (1)	Model Army Values and Warrior Ethos (3)
Knowledge of TLPs (2)	Decision making ability (4)
	Knowledge of Army Doctrine (36)
Take care of Soldiers (3)	Ability to manage personnel issues/actions (28)
	Ability to take another person’s perspective (29)
Maintain discipline standards (4)	Ability to develop a positive command climate (1)
	Ability to create an ethical climate (2)
	Ability to engage in indirect leadership (11)
Create an ethical and positive command climate (5)	Ability to develop a positive command climate (1)
	Ability to create an ethical climate (2)
	Ability to create a culture of open communication (17)
Engage in direct leadership (6)	Ability to command a battle staff/integrate capabilities (25)
	Ability influence inside and outside the formation (9)
	Ability to engage in indirect leadership (11)
Establish trust within the organization (7)	Ability to trust others within the formation (23)
Decision making ability (9)	Decision making ability (4)
Manage unit training (10)	Ability to establish training priorities/plans for the formation (32)
	Ability to develop a positive command climate (1)
Establish/maintain a command team with 1SG (11)	Ability to trust others within the formation (23)
	Ability to create a culture of open communication (17)
	Ability to develop subordinate leaders (15)
Develop subordinate leaders (12)	Ability to create a learning organization (22)
Establish and enforce command supply discipline (14)	
Formulate Commander’s intent (15)	Ability to formulate Commander’s intent/vision (10)

Note: Numbers in parentheses represent the proficiency rankings from this research and Wolters, et al., 2011

Table D.1

*Crosswalk of Company Command Competencies with the Brigade Command Competency Model
(continued)*

Company Command Competency	Related Brigade Command Competency(ies)
Knowledge of the resources available to the company (16)	Knowledge of the resources available to the brigade (27)
Critical thinking skills (17)	Critical thinking skills (6)
Assess ongoing operations (18)	Ability to gather & interpret necessary information (7)
Manage risk (19)	Ability to manage risk (5)
Maintain Comprehensive Soldier Fitness (20)	Ability to regulate and monitor own emotions (16)
	Engages in self-development activities (34)
Work effectively within the chain of command (21)	Ability to influence inside and outside the formation (9)
	Ability to engage in indirect leadership (11)
Communicate effectively with diverse audiences (22)	Ability to build consensus (19)
	Ability to influence inside and outside the formation (9)
	Ability to communicate vision to diverse audiences (14)
Adapt to changing conditions (23)	Ability to thrive in change (12)
Manage unit time (24)	Ability to engage in indirect leadership (11)
	Ability to influence inside and outside the formation (9)
	Ability to leverage the strengths of your team (24)
	Ability to establish training priorities/plans for the formation (32)
Knowledge of Army doctrine (25)	Knowledge of Army doctrine (36)
Self-awareness and self-understanding (26)	Self-awareness and self-understanding (26)
	Engages in self-development activities (34)
Establish an effective company headquarters (27)	Ability to command a battle staff/integrate capabilities (25)
	Ability to gather and interpret necessary information (7)
Knowledge of the OER and NCOER systems (28)	Knowledge of the OER system (31)
Manage maintenance readiness program (29)	
Manage administrative requirements (30)	Ability to manage personnel issues/actions (28)

Note: Numbers in parentheses represent the proficiency rankings from this research and Wolters, et al., 2011

Table D.1

*Crosswalk of Company Command Competencies with the Brigade Command Competency Model
(continued)*

Company Command Competency	Related Brigade Command Competency(ies)
Knowledge of the UCMJ (31)	Knowledge of the UCMJ (35)
Manage unit family support requirements (32)	Ability to manage personnel issues/actions (28)
Knowledge of relevant cultural & geopolitical issues (33)	Knowledge of the Contemporary Operational Environment (37)
Knowledge of communication media (34)	Ability to communicate vision to diverse audiences (14)
Operate effectively with JIIM and non-governmental agencies (35)	Ability to engage in JIIM operations (33)
	Ability to articulate decisions to diverse audiences (20)
	Ability to manage funds/maintain a budget (30)
	Knowledge of the ARFORGEN process (39)

Note: Numbers in parentheses represent the proficiency rankings from this research and Wolters, et al., 2011