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ABSTRACT

The theory of organizational culture maintains that individual behavior within an organization is not solely controlled by the formal regulations and structures of authority as supported by structural theorists. Instead, the theory postulates that cultural norms, values, beliefs, and assumptions provide unconscious guidance and direction, and consequently, the subsequent behavior of organizational members. If you want to be able to comprehend the current behavior of an organization as well as to reasonably anticipate its future actions then you must be able to understand the deep basic underlying assumptions that comprise the abstract concept of organizational culture (Schein, 1999).

Organizational culture can be found at every level of an organization, and since organizational members are multicultural entities understanding an organization’s culture is significant “because the beliefs, values, and behavior of individuals are often understood only in the context of people’s cultural identities” (Schein, 1999, p. 14). Consequently, the long-term strategic decisions made by the senior leaders of an organization are influenced by their multicultural background, but especially by the organization in which they have spent the bulk of their life, such as members of professional organizations like doctors, lawyers, and military officers. Professional organizations exist in a competitive environment where their social jurisdiction and legitimacy can only be supported or perpetuated as long as they maintain their expertise over an area of abstract knowledge that society perceives as important (Freidson, 1970, 1986; Abbott, 1988; Burk, 2002). Since organizational culture is hypothesized to have a considerable impact on organizational behavior and
because of the relative scarcity of literature discussing the impact that organizational culture may have on the development of professional leaders this study attempts to examine the congruence between organizational culture and the professional leadership and managerial skills of professional leaders. Specifically, this study examines the U.S. Army culture and its senior leaders.

This research strongly suggests that there is a lack of congruence between the U.S. Army professional culture and the professional development programs of the Army’s senior level leaders. This conclusion is based on empirical data that indicate that the future leaders of the Army profession believe that they operate on a day-to-day basis in a profession whose culture is characterized by an overarching desire for stability and control, formal rules and policies, coordination and efficiency, goal and results oriented, and hard-driving competitiveness. Emphasizing this lack of cultural congruence, the respondents of this study also indicated that the Army’s professional culture should be one that emphasizes flexibility, discretion, participation, human resource development, innovation, creativity, risk-taking, and a long-term emphasis on professional growth and the acquisition of new professional knowledge and skills, which is more aligned with the Army’s strategic external environment.

One of the principal reasons for the popular interest in the study of organizational culture is to determine the linkage between it and organizational performance (Berrio, 2003). This study has reviewed a previously assumed but unverified connection between organizational culture and professional development. It has uncovered a lack of congruence between the dominant type of organizational culture of the U.S. Army and the professional managerial / leadership skills of its
senior level leaders. This observed lack of congruence may be inhibiting performance and unconsciously perpetuating a cycle of caution and an over reliance on stability and control. The U.S. Army Crusader story, outlined in the Prologue of this study, is illustrative of an organization that emphasizes stability and control and that attempts to comprehend the ambiguity of the future through an unconscious reliance upon the successful solutions employed in the past.
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Why Organizational Culture is Important

The theory of organizational culture maintains that individual behavior within an organization is not solely controlled by the formal regulations and structures of authority as supported by structural theorists. Instead, the theory postulates that cultural norms, values, beliefs, and assumptions provide unconscious guidance and direction, and consequently, the subsequent behavior of organizational members. Accordingly, Martin, et al, emphasize that studies of organizational culture share a common objective, which is “to uncover and interpret aspects of organizational life so that we can better understand the perceptions, beliefs, and actions of organizational members” (1997, p. 3). If you want to be able to comprehend the current behavior of an organization as well as to reasonably anticipate its future actions then you must be able to understand the deep basic underlying assumptions that comprise the abstract concept of organizational culture (Schein, 1999). A strong appreciation of an organization’s culture can help explain why organizational members sometimes exhibit “mysterious, silly, or irrational” behavior (Schein, 1985, p. 21), such as the strong support for a weapon system that lacked the rapid deployment capabilities required by tomorrow’s Army as illustrated in the following case of the battle for the U.S. Army’s Crusader field artillery system.

The Battle for Crusader: Secretary Rumsfeld vs The U.S. Army

The U.S. Army’s Advanced Field Artillery System (AFAS), better known as the “Crusader,” was publicized as becoming the “world’s most fearsome mobile
howitzer” (Thompson, 2001, p. 1), and was programmed to replace the aging Paladin 155mm (millimeter) self-propelled howitzer (SPH) currently deployed by the U.S. Army. Crusader was designed to “provide soldiers with a more lethal, capable, supportable, survivable, longer range, and less manpower-intensive filed artillery system, which will meet the [Army’s] needs well into the 21st century” (FAS, 2000, p. 2). Despite having undeniably impressive capabilities, the Crusader artillery system became the focal point of what Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld believed was wrong with the U.S. Army’s culture and its senior leadership (Galloway, 2003; Graham, 2003).

Since the beginning of his tenure, Secretary Rumsfeld has been in conflict with the U.S. Army’s top leadership, the professional elite of the Army profession (Snider and Watkins, 2002). Secretary Rumsfeld has made it very clear that “he considers the Army’s senior leaders [to be] cold war dinosaurs unable to adapt to a 21st Century environment and [he] thinks the Army is too big, too heavy and too slow to respond to rapid developments abroad” (Galloway, 2003, p. 2). Not surprisingly, in an effort to bring about innovative change and to foster a more adaptive Army culture, which he believed would be more appropriate for the strategic landscape of the future, Secretary Rumsfeld terminated the Crusader AFAS program in May of 2002.

The Crusader AFAS System

The Crusader AFAS was comprised of two armored tracked vehicles with a program cost of approximately $23 million for each two-vehicle system. The U.S.
Army expected to buy 480 systems for a total program cost of $11.2 billion from the Crusader’s original inception in 1994 through the system’s full fielding in 2014. The first of the two vehicles was the actual 155mm self-propelled howitzer (SPH) itself. This unique piece of field artillery was designed to be a totally automated weapon system using advanced robotics and computers to calculate firing solutions, and to load and fire the gun, as well as being equipped with improved armor, and with nuclear, biological, and chemical (NBC) protection for the crew and internal components. Because of the advanced automation capabilities the system only required a crew of three to operate and conduct actual fire missions, which is only one-third of the personnel that it takes to operate the current U.S. Army Paladin self-propelled howitzer. The Crusader SPH vehicle was programmed to weigh 40 tons and would be capable of traveling at 29 mph cross-country and thereby being able to maintain pace with the Army’s premier M-1 Abrams main battle tank. The Crusader would carry its own basic load of 48 rounds of ammunition and it would be capable of firing these 100 lb artillery shells out to a distance of 25 miles, 6 miles further than the current Paladin system, and at a rate of 10 per minute as opposed to the 3 per minute fired by the Paladin (AUSA, 2002). The Crusader also had a very distinctive capability of being able to fire eight rounds in rapid succession at different velocities and elevations so that all eight rounds would land on the same target in a virtually simultaneous manner. Another significant aspect of the system was its programmed ability to conduct simultaneous fire missions against multiple targets. Finally, a battery of six Crusader systems would be capable of firing 15 tons of ammunition in
less than 5 minutes, which would incontrovertibly have a devastating effect on any adversary (Army Technology, 2003).

The ammunition re-supply vehicle (RSV) was programmed to be the second vehicle of the Crusader Advanced Field Artillery System. Like the Crusader SPH, the RSV was also proposed to be a tracked armored vehicle with a crew of three. The RSV’s main asset was a fully automated ammunition and fuel handling system. The RSV was programmed to weigh 36 tons and it would carry 110 rounds of 155mm ammunition and fuel for the Crusader SPH (Army Technology, 2003). The RSV would be capable of fully reloading and refueling the Crusader SPH, at the rate of 29.5 gallons of fuel per minute, in less than 12 minutes. The re-supply process would be capable of being conducted while the crews of each vehicle remained inside and thereby afforded the relative protection of their vehicle’s advanced armor and NBC defensive systems.

**Proponents and Opponents Voice Their Arguments**

As a result of these truly impressive capabilities, the Crusader AFAS received broad support from many Army stakeholders including high-ranking active duty and retired general officers as well as from a number of influential United States Senators and Representatives. Some of the strongest backing came from those industry representatives who stood to gain considerably from the lucrative contracts that would eventually be awarded to build the Crusader system (Thompson, 2001). Additionally, a wide range of individual veterans and veteran’s organizations joined
the Crusader team and actively voiced their desire to see the full implementation of the program (Thompson, 2001; Sullivan, 2002; Wolf, 2002).

Yet despite all of the support for the Crusader, many others saw the system from a very different perspective. Andrew Krepinevich, a former U.S. Army Officer and now the director of the Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments, a Washington, D.C. think tank, summarized the sentiment of the Crusader opposition, by indicating that the “Crusader seems to fit a world that is now passing from the scene much more than the one that is now emerging” (Thompson, 2001, p. 2). In a September 1999 campaign speech to the Corps of Cadets at the Citadel, Charleston, South Carolina, then Presidential Candidate George W. Bush cited the need for the U.S. military to become lighter, more agile, and capable of rapidly deploying anywhere in the world in support of U.S. national interests and national security strategy (Bush, 1999). Indicating his vision for the future and for America’s unique opportunity to spread democracy and peace, then Governor Bush emphasized that the U.S. military would need to transform to meet the challenges presented by the dramatically changing strategic environment of the 21st century. Specifically, Bush stated that:

…defending our nation is just the beginning of our challenge. My third goal is to take advantage of a tremendous opportunity, given few nations in history, to extend the current peace into the far realm of the future. A chance to project America’s peaceful influence, not just across the world, but across the years. This opportunity is created by a revolution in the technology of war. Power is increasingly defined, not by mass or size, but by mobility and swiftness. Influence is measured in information, safety is gained in stealth, and force is projected on the long arc of precision-guided weapons. This revolution perfectly matches the strengths of our country, the skill of our people and the superiority of our technology. The best way to keep the peace is to redefine war on our terms. **Yet today our military is still**
organized more for Cold War threats than for the challenges of a new century – for industrial age operations, rather than for information age battles. There is almost no relationship between our budget priorities and a strategic vision. The last seven years have been wasted in inertia and idle talk. Now we must shape the future with new concepts, new strategies, new resolve (Bush, 1999, emphasis added).

Perhaps most interestingly and ironically of all was the realization in 1999 by the U.S. Army’s newly appointed Chief of Staff, General Eric Shinseki, that the Army needed to become more capable of rapid strategic response and to be dominant throughout the full breadth of military operations ranging from humanitarian assistance and regional peacekeeping missions all the way to major theater war. General Shinseki indicated that the “Army intends to begin immediately to develop a force that is deployable, agile, versatile, lethal, survivable, sustainable and dominant at every point along the spectrum of operations” (U.S. Army, 1999, p. 1). The ultimate goal of his modernization vision has become known as the “Future Force.”

While attempting to galvanize support from influential Army constituents, General Shinseki routinely emphasized that those in the Army who were dissatisfied with his transformation plans for a lighter, more deployable, and more lethal force will be far more dissatisfied with the Army becoming an irrelevant component of the U.S. military element of national power. He also implied that without transformation, the Army may very well loose its professional “jurisdiction” as the nation’s premier land warfare professionals (Abbott, 1988). Essentially, General Shinseki believed that the Army would become irrelevant if it is unable to readily adapt to the rapidly changing external environment (Jablonsky, 2001).
Understandably, the Crusader’s opposition was directed toward the fact that the Crusader system (two vehicles – the SPH and the RSV) was exceedingly heavy, nearly 80 tons, not to mention the entire program’s astronomical cost. Consequently, only one system could be air transported at a time into a theater of combat operations in a U.S. Air Force C-5 or C-17 cargo aircraft. In order for large numbers of the Crusader system to be transported to a hot spot without tying up critical and finite aviation assets they would have to be transported to the combat zone by way of naval shipping. The primary problem with ocean-going ships is that they are slow, and unless the equipment is already loaded and pre-positioned in a likely area of potential conflict it can take as long as two weeks to embark, sail to, and disembark at the conflict location. Crusader’s considerable weight precluded it from being a rapidly deployable asset. As indicated by the comments of Krepinevich and Bush above, the Crusader AFAS appeared to be an excellent system to fight yesterday’s war, which was envisioned as a major land battle in Europe with the Soviet Union where large numbers of U.S. Army forces were permanently stationed. However, over the last 15 years, world events have dramatically changed the strategic landscape and the probability of a major land battle as was imagined between the USSR and the U.S. is now considered to be highly improbable (The White House, 2002). No matter how capable the Crusader may have eventually become, it clearly did not fit into Secretary Rumsfeld’s or General Shinseki’s espoused transformation strategy and the future world view that both of these men foresaw.
The Battle for Crusader: Rumsfeld vs the Army

General Shinseki’s concern for the future relevance of the U.S. Army was rooted in a number of events ranging from the very precarious initial defense of Saudi Arabia during the first Persian Gulf War to the unsuccessful deployment of U.S. Army AH-64 attack helicopters to Albania in 1999 (Jablonsky, 2001). There is little doubt that General Shinseki received additional motivation for his transformation plans after reviewing the comments made by Deputy Secretary of Defense John Hamre, in a speech given at the University of Chicago Law School on August 4, 1999, where Hamre stated that if “the Army holds onto nostalgic versions of its grand past, it is going to atrophy and die... [and that the Army] cannot simply be what is was, and think that it is going to be relevant for this new, complex world that is emerging” (Clark and Seffers, 1999, p. 6).

Since the United States is the sole remaining world superpower and the probability of another nation achieving superpower status within the next 25 years is remote, a radically different national security strategy was promulgated by the Bush Administration in September 2002. The 2002 National Security Strategy (NSS) stated that U.S. national security is very seriously threatened by shadowy terrorist organizations, such as al-Qaida, and a host of smaller state actors and rogue states such as Iraq, Iran, and North Korea (The White House, 2002). The strategy emphasizes that in response to the potential security threats posed by these organizations and states, a rapid and lethal preemptive military strike may very well be the order of the day. The ongoing Iraq War, Operation Iraqi Freedom, is the first employment of this preemptive policy as promulgated by the Bush Administration.
Consequently, Crusader opponents indicated that due to the necessity for a swift and lethal U.S. response to hostile actions or intentions, and the realization that military action could be concluded by the time a sufficient number of Crusaders could be deployed, the Crusader appeared to have marginal military potential. Essentially, the Crusader was considered to be little more than an “armored white elephant to the taxpayers” (Eland, 2002, p. 1).

Since 1999, when General Shinseki initiated his new “Army Vision” for a transformed Army based on a lighter and more versatile force structure, the Army has existed in a paradoxical state. This paradoxical duality is exemplified by the fact that remarkable programmatic changes have been achieved such as the unprecedented fielding of two Stryker Brigade Combat Teams (SBCTs) in less than three years and the ongoing plan to field four more over the next four years. At the same time, there was the coexistence of an underlying resistance to revolutionary change. Those who staunchly supported the Crusader AFAS, as highlighted in this prologue, represent the manifestation of what appears to be a cultural reluctance to adapt to a changing world environment (Builder, 1989; Scroggs, 1996). Additionally, there is a strong unwillingness to support the Army’s involvement in “military operations other than war (MOOTW),” such as peacekeeping, nation-building, and occupation duties, which the Army has been increasingly called upon to accomplish since the collapse of the Soviet Union and as it is now deeply involved with in Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF) in Afghanistan and Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF) in Iraq (Jablonsky, 2001). In both of these cases, the argument states that MOOTW duties detract from
the Army’s professional competence of major land warfare by inhibiting training and readiness (Jablonsky, 2001).

The apparent reluctance to abandon old strategies and doctrine has created a significant rift between Secretary Rumsfeld and the U.S. Army and, ironically, General Shinseki in specific (Graham, 2003). Secretary Rumsfeld has perceived this Army reluctance as being representative of a culture that is unable to adapt to a rapidly changing world and national security environment. The most recent ramification of this estrangement was the removal, in April 2003, of Army Secretary Thomas White, who is a retired Army brigadier general and who openly clashed with Secretary Rumsfeld over the cancellation of the Crusader AFAS. Consequently, it has been reported that “White’s successor will be someone with a clear mandate to change the culture of the Army, which some people around Rumsfeld see as excessively cautious in its war planning and resistant to innovation” (Graham, 2003, p. 2). Subsequently, Secretary Rumsfeld announced that he was nominating the current Air Force Secretary, James Roche, to become the next Secretary of the Army. What is perhaps most notable about this selection is that Roche is a retired U.S. Navy captain and a former Democratic staff director of the Senate Armed Services Committee. Roche’s selection gives a very clear signal that “Rumsfeld is determined to impose sweeping changes on the Army, which he has come to see as the most resistant of the services to his agenda of ‘transforming’ the military so it can better fight in the 21st century” (Ricks, 2003, p. 1).

The purpose of the preceding narrative discussing the Army’s Crusader AFAS program has been to underscore how an organization’s culture dramatically affects
how it responds to and attempts to manage uncertainty (Trice and Beyer, 1993; Scroggs, 1996). Schein defines organizational culture as those deeper level “basic assumptions and beliefs that are shared by members of an organization, that operate unconsciously, and that define in a basic ‘taken-for-granted’ fashion an organization’s view of itself and its environment, and that [t]hese assumptions and beliefs are learned responses to a group’s problems of survival in its external environment and its problems of internal integration” (1985, p. 6). The U.S. Army Crusader story is highly indicative of an organization that attempted to comprehend the ambiguity of the future through an unconscious reliance upon the successful solutions employed in the past. In other words, Crusader merely represented the most recent manifestation of the famous idiom that states that: the generals are designing a military to fight the last war. So the question arises, is the Crusader saga a derivation of an innovative Army culture or is it an indication of a culture that lacks the ability to quickly adapt to the changing external environment as charged by Secretary Rumsfeld? If it is the later, then, as some suggest, there is significant concern for the future Army profession (Snider and Watkins, 2002).
Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Background

“Studies of organizational culture share a common goal: to uncover and interpret aspects of organizational life so that we can better understand the perceptions, beliefs, and actions of organizational members” (Martin, et al, 1997, p. 3). An organization’s culture enables its members to work through the basic problems of survival in and adaptation to the external environment as well as to develop and maintain internal processes that perpetuate adaptability and promote the organization’s continued existence (Parsons, 1951; Merton, 1957; Schein, 1985, Martin, 2002).

Some organizational leaders and researchers might ask why the study of organizational culture and its impact on the professional development of an organization’s leaders is so important. Schein states that it is important because organizational culture is the property of a group and that:

…it is a powerful, latent, and often unconscious set of forces that determine both our individual and collective behavior, ways of perceiving, thought patterns, and values. Organizational culture in particular matters because cultural elements determine strategy, goals, and modes of operating. The values and thought patterns of leaders and senior managers are partially determined by their own cultural backgrounds and their shared experience. If we want to make organizations more efficient and effective, then we must understand the role that culture plays in organizational life (1999, p. 14).

Since organizations are groupings of human beings who have come together to achieve collectively what cannot be accomplished individually, it is understandable that organizational cultures are influenced by a variety of social processes that
gradually develop over time and in response to environmental uncertainties and conditions (Barnard, 1938). As these varying human systems attach meaning to their experiences, thereby socially constructing their own interpretation of reality (Berger and Luckmann, 1966), they give rise to cultural differences, which can be viewed as being manifested by an interrelated and differentiated series of levels or layers. Trice and Beyer describe these environmental influences of the cultural evolutionary process by stating that the:

…substance of an organization’s culture resides in its ideologies, which are emotionalized, shared sets of beliefs, values, and norms that both impel people to action and justify their actions to themselves and others. Cultures have multiple ideologies; the ideas they express sometimes complement and sometimes contradict each other…Some of the ideologies in organizations are imported from at least six levels of their environments: transnational systems, nations, regions and communities, industries, occupations, and other organizations (1993, pp. 75-76).

As indicated by Trice and Beyer above, individual behavior is routinely influenced by a number of frequently conflicting cultures and cultural values. Figure 1.1 provides a graphic representation of the layered nature of culture as well as the interrelationships between these varying levels or layers, which can be complementary or contradictory in nature depending on the communities and organizations to which an individual maintains membership. The outermost ring of Figure 1.1 depicts “Transnational” cultures, which are those cultures whose members share a set of deep basic underlying assumptions that transcend national boundaries. For example, science and religion are two typical transnational cultures. Regardless of an individual’s nationality or ethnic background, their affiliation with a given religious faith is characteristic of a particular set of beliefs, values, and norms, which readily identify
them as being Christian, Jewish, Islamic, Buddhist, and so on. Frequently, religious culture conflicts with societal or national culture, as is commonplace for individuals who live under the oppressive rule of communist regimes, such as those who lived in the former Soviet Union and those who currently live in the People’s Republic of China. Another example of transnational culture conflicting with national cultures can be observed in the ongoing effort by the Bush Administration to democratize Iraq. In this case the former Coalition Provisional Authority, which experienced intense difficulty as it was working toward establishing a representative democratic government in Iraq while dealing with Islamic culture and religious beliefs that are not supportive of such democratic values as the separation of church and state.

**Figure 1.1.** A Graphic Portrayal of the Layered and Interrelated Nature of Environmental Influences on Organizational Culture. (Adapted from Mary Jo Hatch, *Organization Theory: Modern, Symbolic, and Postmodern Perspectives*, New York: Oxford University, 1997, p. 227).
Additionally, religious organizations such as the Roman Catholic Church exert enormous global influence through their beliefs, values, and cultural norms. For example, the position taken by the Roman Catholic Church concerning the right to life and its opposition to abortion transcends international boundaries and unites many people from a wide diversity of national heritage.

The second layer of culture, as depicted in Figure 1.1, is identified as “National” culture, which is perceived as representing either national or ethnic association (Trice and Beyer, 1993; Hofstede, 2001). For example, self-reliance, personal achievement, and individualism are characteristic cultural values of American national culture, while Japanese national culture de-emphasizes individualism and personal achievement in favor of selfless cooperation, collective achievement, and consensus (Ouchi, 1981).

The third ring or layer is described by Trice and Beyer (1993) as “Regional” culture. Breton indicates that regional culture is based on identification with a specific geographical area or territory; the people, and the social institutions, whereby this physical local is transformed into a “social space” (1981, p. 58). For example, within a characteristic national culture such as the United States, there are distinctive regional cultures. Those customs and norms typical to the New England states are in many cases dramatically different than those typically found in southern states such as South Carolina, Georgia, and Alabama (Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck, 1961).

The fourth layer of culture as described by Trice and Beyer (1993) is comprised of cultures of various industries, occupations, and other organizations. In Figure 1.1, this fourth layer is depicted by three equivalent circles representing “Organizational,”
“Professional,” and “Military” cultures, which are particularly pertinent to this study. At this level the individual is intimately involved with the day to day operations, activities, norms, and ideologies of social life that guide behavior in context specific ways (Trice and Beyer, 1993). Perhaps the most common organizational setting that an individual at this level experiences is the work environment, the actual organization with whom they are employed, such as IBM or the U.S. Army. In general, organizational culture is considered to be very stable and difficult to change because it represents the collective repertoire of thinking, feeling, and perceiving that have enabled the organization to successfully adapt to and react to internal and external environmental stimulus (Schein, 1999). Organizational culture is often defined as the unconscious yet “learned, shared, tacit assumptions on which people base their daily behavior” (Schein, 1999, p. 24). With respect to professional organizations, Hughes states that “[p]rofessions are more numerous than ever before. Professional people are a larger proportion of the labor force. The professional attitude, or mood, is likewise more widespread; professional status more sought after” (1963, p. 655). Among the many occupations that are traditionally perceived as being professions such as doctors and lawyers, military officers are also distinguished as being part of a profession as identified by Janowitz, 1971; Mosher, 1982; Schon, 1983; Huntington, 1985; Abbott, 1988; and Snider and Watkins, 2002. Mosher states that the significance of professions is that they are “social mechanisms, whereby knowledge, particularly new knowledge is translated into action and service” (1982, p. 112). Of particular importance to this study, as will be discussed in greater detail later in the paper, is the level of congruence between an organization’s
culture and the professional development of its senior leaders. As outlined in the prologue of this study, many senior leaders of the U.S. Army, the officer corps’s professional elite, were highly supportive of the Crusader weapon system that appeared to be the answer for artillery support for yesterday’s wars while not necessarily providing the most effective fire support solution for the potential conflicts of the future. As indicated by Trice and Beyer (1993) and their layered nature of environmental influences as depicted in Figure 1.1, this study evaluates the possibility that an organization’s culture unconsciously guides the professional development and education of those members who will be become the senior leaders, and eventually the professional elite, of the profession in such a manner that these future leaders may be inadequately prepared to lead the profession toward future success. Schein provides an insightful analysis of this perspective by stating that the “bottom line for leaders is that if they do not become conscious of the cultures in which they are embedded, those cultures will manage them. Cultural understanding is desirable for all of us, but it is essential to leaders if they are to lead” (1992, p. 15).

The fifth and smallest ring depicted in Figure 1.1 is identified as “Sub-Cultures.” Deal and Kennedy (1982) state that within any organization there may be a variety of behavioral variations based on the extent of the differentiation of tasks performed by the organization. For example, in the Army profession, there are infantry, armor, artillery, medical, nurse, special forces, engineers, and finance officers to name just a few of the occupational branch specialties that comprise the Army officer corps. This diversity of occupational communities and their underlying technologies, training, and processes can create the:
One of the underlying objectives of this study is to determine the level of congruence between the various subcultures of the Army profession, such as officer branch, source of commission, age, sex, etc., and the basic culture and values of the overall Army profession.

Cultural Manifestation

The preceding discussion briefly outlines Trice and Beyer’s thesis of how at least six layers or levels of cultural influence can be used as models to explain and legitimate collective and individual behavior (Trice and Beyer, 1993). These next few paragraphs highlight Schein’s three levels of cultural manifestation, which is the underlying model upon which the foundation of the present study is built. Using this approach Schein emphasizes that individual and collective organizational behavior, as described above, is visible or manifested at three levels which vary from extremely overt at the artifactual level to deeply embedded unconscious assumptions, which Schein defines as being the essence of culture (1992). Briefly, Schein states that the manifestation of organizational culture occurs at three levels: “artifacts, values, and basic underlying assumptions” (1985, p. 14).

Schein indicates that “artifacts” are the most visible expression of culture. They represent the physical construct of the organization and its social environment.
products, rites and rituals, myths, uniforms or other manner of dress, the physical layout or architecture of building space, mission and value statements, organizational stories, symbols, and ceremonies. Artifacts are easily observable; however, they only provide a superficial glimpse of an organization’s culture because the true significance or meaning that lies behind their use can be difficult to decipher and interpret.

Schein indicates that the second level of cultural manifestation, “values,” provides organizational members with a sense of what ought to be as opposed to what actually is. Values are a deeper level of culture, which provide guidance in the face of ambiguity. Schein believes that organizational values are not as apparent as organizational artifacts. However, he states that they do exist at a greater level of awareness than “basic underlying assumptions,” which he identifies as his third level of cultural manifestation. For example, the U.S. Army articulates seven core values, which are assumed to represent the true cultural essence of the Army profession and they are: loyalty, duty, respect, selfless-service, honor, integrity, and personal courage. Each officer is expected to uphold these values, especially when they are confronted with ambiguous or ethically demanding situations (FM 22-100, 1999). As is discussed later in this paper, organizations sometimes espouse values that they believe are appropriate for given situations. Consequently, organizations publicly give allegiance to these values and attempt to communicate them to their members, external stakeholders, and frequently to the general public. Espoused values are often evident in organizational strategies, goals, philosophies, training programs, and published organizational value statements. However, espoused values may not be
based on prior cultural learning; therefore they may be incongruent with the organization’s actual “theories-in-use” (Argyris and Schon, 1974). Theories-in-use are those values that actually govern behavior. It is theorized that a lack of congruence between espoused values and theories-in-use can inhibit individual commitment and consequently impair organizational performance (Argyris and Schon, 1974; Schon, 1983; Schein, 1992).

Finally, the third and deepest level of organizational cultural manifestation, as defined by Schein, can be found in an organization’s “basic underlying assumptions.” These basic underlying assumptions evolve from the continuous use of a problem solution that has repeatedly been successful in the past and has unconsciously become taken for granted as the only way to solve similar problems. Therefore, organizational members instinctively perceive these basic underlying assumptions as “nonconfrontable and nondebatable” (Schein, 1985, p. 18). Argyris and Schon indicate that the incontrovertible and unconscious nature of these basic underlying assumptions can inhibit “double-loop learning.” Double-loop-learning is a process that encourages organizational members to question all organizational practices, especially successful practices, thereby promoting continuous organizational growth, adaptability, and environmental awareness to include accepting changes in beliefs, values, and assumptions (1974). As suggested in the case of the Crusader field artillery system outlined in the prologue of this paper, it appears as though cultural influence as manifested by the deep underlying assumptions of a number of key Army senior leaders may have predisposed them to instinctively support a weapon system that many others believed failed to provide the revolutionary capability

Importance of Organizational Culture Analysis

Schneider (1994) highlights the importance of organizational culture by stating that organizational culture provides consistency for the organization and its members and provides the organization’s leaders with an internally reliable system of leadership that is firmly rooted in previous success. Sathe (1983, p. 5) indicates that culture plays a “subtle but pervasive role in organizational life” and that through a better understanding of organizational culture, organizational leaders can effectively operate within it, deviate from it, and when necessary, change it. Cameron and Quinn concur with these assessments. They state that most “organizational scholars and observers now recognize that organizational culture has a powerful effect on the performance and long-term effectiveness of organizations” (1999, p. 4). Consequently, they define culture as the “taken-for-granted values, underlying assumptions, expectations, collective memories, and definitions present in an organization” (p. 14), which is very similar to the conceptual model provided by Schein as discussed in greater detail in the next section of this paper. Cameron and Quinn indicate that organizational culture is an ideology that organizational members “carry inside their heads” (p. 14). It provides them with a sense of identity and unwritten, unspoken, unconscious courses of action for how to get along in the organization while maintaining a stable social system within their organizational environment. They assert that generally speaking, each culture is comprised of
“unique language, symbols, rules, and ethnocentric feelings” (p. 15), which are reflected by what the organization values, its definitions of success and the dominant leadership styles that pervade the organization. They believe that an organization’s culture is what makes the organization unique, which is a similar assessment to that of Schneider, who states that organizational culture “parallels individual character” (1994, p. 15).

The common theme which intertwines the theses of these authors is that organizational culture is a critical factor in the long-term effectiveness and survivability of organizations. Consequently, those senior leaders who are charged with providing strategic direction and vision for their organizations must not underestimate the importance of culture and must realize that they are responsible for the analysis and management of their own organization’s culture. As such, they must be capable of developing strategies for measuring their cultures, changing them, and for implementing a process to accomplish all of the above (Cameron and Quinn, 1999; Schein, 1999).

Conceptual Model for the Study

For the purposes of this research, Schein’s conceptual model of organizational culture, as briefly outlined earlier in this paper, is used as the framework upon which this study and its subsequent analysis is constructed. Figure 1.2 uses the metaphor of an ocean-going iceberg to graphically represent Schein’s three levels of the manifestation of organizational culture.
Just like the peak of an iceberg, which is the most visible portion of the iceberg even at great distances, organizational artifacts are the most visible manifestation of an organization’s culture (Schein, 1992). However, organizational artifacts are often undecipherable and inadequately represent an organization’s culture just like the peak of an iceberg inadequately represents the true size of the iceberg, the bulk of which is hidden beneath the surface of the ocean. Organizational values can provide a greater level of awareness of an organization’s culture; however, the researcher must be able to discern the differences between espoused values and theories-in-use. As previously discussed, espoused values are those values that an organization publicly acknowledges and supports, while theories-in-use are those underlying values which are less visible and which actually govern behavior. For example, an organization may publicly state that it supports individual initiative, while concurrently refusing to promote individuals whose initiative resulted in failure. In the iceberg metaphor, organizational values, are closer to the surface and provide a more accurate assessment of the organization’s culture. However, the true scope of the culture still remains hidden beneath the surface. Finally, Schein (1992) emphasizes that the essence of an organization’s culture is its taken-for-granted basic underlying assumptions. These basic underlying assumptions provide: consistency for its members, order and structure, boundaries and ground rules, membership criteria, communication patterns, conditions for rewards, punishment, and the use of power. They define effective performance, they identify appropriate internal personnel relationships, and they limit organizational strategy (Schneider, 1994). Like the iceberg, the true depth and breadth of an organization’s culture lies beneath
the surface and is very difficult to recognize through superficial analysis. Schein (1985) underscores the importance of cultural analysis by indicating that it is through an in-depth study of an organization’s culture that one can develop a greater appreciation of “the way we do things around here” (Bower, 1966; Deal and Kennedy, 1982, p. 4).

Figure 1.2. Iceberg Conceptual Model of Schein’s (1985) Three Levels of the Manifestation of Organizational Culture.
Additionally, a robust appreciation of an organization’s culture can help to explain why organizational members sometimes exhibit “mysterious, silly, or irrational” behavior (Schein, 1985, p. 21), such as the strong support for a weapon system that lacked the rapid deployment capabilities required of tomorrow’s Army as exemplified by the case of the Crusader field artillery system.

Despite the extensive research and literature that has been conducted and written over the past twenty-five years, there is one major area of the organizational culture sub-field where a dearth of analytical data and writing exists. That gap concerns the impact that an organization’s culture has on the professional development of its senior leaders and the subsequent development of their professional managerial / leadership skills. Consequently, the purpose of this exploratory study is to help fill this gap. The study attempts to achieve this objective by examining the congruence between the U.S. Army culture and the professional managerial / leadership skills of its senior leaders.

**An Overview of the Present Study**

An analysis of the extant literature concerning professional organizations, those organizations that exhibit mastery of an area of abstract knowledge, control a contested jurisdiction, and that possess social legitimacy (Abbott, 1988; Burk, 2002), indicates that these organizations are generally characterized by adaptive, innovative, flexible, risk-taking, and future-oriented behavior (Argyris and Schon, 1974; Kline, 1981; Freidson, 1970, 1986; Abbott, 1988; Schon, 1983; Senge, 1994; Davis, et al, 1997; FM 22-100, 1999; Snider and Watkins, 2002; Paparone, 2003). The essential
focus of these generic characterizations is that professions and professional organizations must continuously seek to expand their knowledge base as well as their level of expertise in order to remain relevant to society (Freidson, 1970, 1986; Argyris and Schon, 1974; Mosher, 1982; Abbott, 1988, Magee and Somervell, 1998; Burk, 2002). Argyris and Schon emphasize this point by stating that the “foundation for future professional competence seems to be the capacity to learn how to learn” (1974, p. 157). This “reflexive” thinking process is one of the hallmarks of professional practice and survival (Schon, 1983; Abbott, 1988; Snider and Watkins, 2002).

Since organizational culture can be found at every level of an organization, and since organizational members are multicultural entities, as indicated earlier, understanding an organization’s culture is significant “because the beliefs, values, and behavior of individuals are often understood only in the context of people’s cultural identities” (Schein, 1999, p. 14). Consequently, the long-term strategic decisions made by the senior leaders of an organization are influenced by their multicultural background, but especially by the organization in which they have spent the bulk of their life, such as members of professional organizations like doctors, lawyers, and military officers (Schein, 1999). Professional organizations exist in a competitive environment where their social jurisdiction and legitimacy can only be supported or perpetuated as long as they maintain their expertise over an area of abstract knowledge that society perceives as important (Freidson, 1970, 1986; Abbott, 1988; Burk, 2002). Since organizational culture is hypothesized to have a considerable impact on organizational behavior and because of the relative scarcity of literature
discussing the impact that organizational culture may have on the development of professional leaders this study attempts to examine the congruence between organizational culture and the professional leadership and managerial skills of professional leaders (Deal and Kennedy, 1982; Cameron and Freeman, 1991). Specifically, this study examines the U.S. Army culture and its senior leaders.

The Competing Values Framework

Using the “‘Competing Values Framework – CVF” (Quinn and Rohrbaugh, 1983), Cameron and Quinn (1999) have developed two quantitative survey instruments. The first instrument, the Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument (OCAI) enables researchers to identify the relative preference for four dominant CVF cultural types in any given organizational setting. The second instrument, the Management Skills Assessment Instrument (MSAI), is intended to be a tool that gives managers and leaders the ability to assess their current personal strengths, weaknesses, managerial / leadership skills, and competencies, which can then be used to guide their organization toward a preferred culture type as identified by the OCAI. Both instruments have been used in hundreds of organizational culture analyses, and their validity and reliability are well documented (Cameron and Quinn, 1999) and will be discussed in greater detail in the methodology chapter of this dissertation.

Cameron and Quinn have identified the four CVF cultural types as the “clan” culture, the “adhocracy” culture, the “hierarchy” culture, and the “market” culture (1999). The characteristics of each of these cultural types will be discussed at length in the methodology section of this study. Of particular importance to this study is that
Cameron and Quinn state that the major objective of an “adhocracy culture” is to “foster adaptability, flexibility, and creativity where uncertainty, ambiguity and/or information-overload are typical” (1999, p. 38).

As indicated at the beginning of this section and as discussed in greater detail in Chapter 2, the literature discussing professional organizations is representative of Cameron and Quinn’s adhocracy cultural type. Schon’s analysis supports this assertion concerning professional organizations by stating that:

To the extent that an institution seeks to accommodate to the reflection-in-action of its professional members, it must meet several extraordinary conditions. In contrast to the normal bureaucratic emphasis on uniform procedures, objective measures of performance, and center/periphery systems of control, a reflective institution must place a high priority on flexible procedures, differentiated responses, qualitative appreciation of complex processes, and decentralized responsibility for judgment and action (1983, p. 338).

It is important to note that the “extraordinary conditions” that professional organizations must possess, as quoted from Schon above, are almost identical to the characteristics of the adhocracy cultural type as enumerated by Cameron and Quinn.

In addition to the four dominant CVF cultural types, Cameron and Quinn also emphasize that “cultural congruence” is a key element of long-term organizational effectiveness and success. According to their definition, cultural congruence exists when all the different aspects of an organization’s culture, its strategy, leadership, reward system, and dominant characteristics emphasize the same values and the same deep-seated basic underlying assumptions. Cultural congruence eliminates many of the complications and obstacles that impede effective organizational performance (Cameron and Freeman, 1991). Conversely, cultural “incongruence inhibits the organization’s ability to perform at the highest levels of effectiveness” (1999, p. 65).
For example, if an organization exists in a turbulent environment and its future survival is dependent upon its ability to be adaptive and innovative, then it must develop its personnel to be collegial, committed, innovative, and self-regulating (Trist, 1981). Consequently, if the organization’s culture, as represented by its theories-in-use, is not supportive of innovative and collegial behavior, but is more rule oriented and competitive, then its culture is incongruent with its espoused values (Argyris, 1976; Argyris and Schon, 1974). In such cases, as indicated by Cameron and Quinn (1999), the potential for future success and effectiveness is limited.

**Purpose of the Present Study**

This study postulates that the ability of a professional organization to develop future leaders in a manner that perpetuates an enhanced organizational readiness to cope with future environmental and internal uncertainty depends on organizational culture. Specifically, **the purpose of this study is to explore the relationship between organizational culture and professional development and to extend current theory and empirical knowledge concerning this relationship.** The study attempts to achieve this purpose by examining the level of congruence between the U.S. Army’s organizational culture and the professional leadership and managerial skills of its officer corps senior leaders.

A formalized professional development program is normatively conceptualized by the U.S. Army as a process whereby the leaders of tomorrow are identified, trained, and given progressively more responsible assignments to enable
them to be capable of performing duties at the highest levels of the organization later in their careers. Specifically, the U.S. Army states that the:

…driving principle behind Army leader development is that leaders must be prepared before assuming leadership positions; they must be competent and confident in their abilities…In turn, leader development rests on a foundation of training and education, expectations and standards, and values and ethics. This foundation supports the three leader development pillars: institutional training (schooling), operational assignments, and self-development (FM 22-100, 1999, p. 5-14).

Until recently, there has been little effort to link the future development of organizational leaders with the existing culture (Reichers and Schneider, 1990). It is theorized that organizational culture, those taken-for-granted, deep basic underlying assumptions within an organization (Schein, 1992), unconsciously influences the formulation of the training and professional development that future organizational leaders are provided that is intended to enable them to promote organizational interests well into the future. The problem with current organization theory, according to this viewpoint, is that the relationship between organizational culture and professional development has been more assumed than validated.

This study seeks to begin to eliminate this theoretical gap by using the Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument (OCAI) and the Managerial Skills Assessment Instrument (MSAI) to provide empirical data indicating the level of congruence between the organizational culture of the U.S. Army and the professional development of its senior level officer corps. The senior level officer corps of the U.S. Army consists of those individuals from whom the future leaders of the Army profession will be selected. For the purposes of this study the U.S. Army senior level officer corps is defined as those lieutenant colonels and colonels who have been
selected to attend the U.S. Army War College through a rigorous evaluation board process. Hence, the primary research question of this study is: **Is the organizational culture of the U.S. Army congruent with the professional development of its senior level officer corps?**

It is anticipated that by answering this primary research question that the literature concerning organization theory will be advanced in two main areas. First, through the use of the OCAI, the study addresses the debate concerning the concept of organizational culture, which identifies organizational culture as either an organizational variable that can be manipulated (the functionalist perspective), or as a metaphor, “a lens for examining organizational life (the semiotic perspective) (Martin, 2002, p. 4; Smircich, 1983).” **Chapter 2** provides a detailed review of the functionalist and semiotic perspectives. Due to the exploratory nature of this study, it is postulated that this analysis may reveal that organizational culture is perhaps a complex construct, neither simply a variable nor a metaphor but a synthesized combination of both. Some literature indicates that as a variable, organizational culture is an attribute of an organization that can be diagnosed and changed to improve long-term organizational effectiveness and survival (Deal and Kennedy, 1982; Peters and Waterman, 1982; Schein, 1992, 1999; Porras and Collins, 1994). As a metaphor, organizational culture provides a “thick description (Geertz, 1973)” of the underlying organizational behavior giving meaning to “organizations as expressive forms, [and] manifestations of human consciousness” (Smircich, 1983, p. 347). Consequently, the present study supports the notion that the impact of cultural analysis is far greater than the socially constructed labels that we attempt to employ.
Smirich highlights this point by stating that “the idea of culture focuses attention on the expressive, nonrational qualities of the experience of organization. A cultural analysis moves us in the direction of questioning taken-for-granted assumptions, raising issues of context and meaning, and bringing to the surface underlying values (1983, p. 355).” Appropriately then, the concept of culture can be seen as providing a fertile opportunity for a variety of organizational studies regardless of the divergent ends sought either as a variable or as a metaphor. Secondly, it is believed that this study provides empirical support that the future success of a professional organization is dependent upon the congruence between an organization’s culture and the manner in which its senior leaders are prepared to manage uncertainty and ambiguity. This study evaluates the hypothesis, as enumerated in the extant literature, that if the organization’s current culture is out of synchronization with future environmental demands, then the leaders who are conditioned by this current culture will have difficulty guiding the organization toward future success.

In addition to adding to the literature concerning organizational theory, this study has a pragmatic objective, which is to assist the U.S. Army in its current attempt to transform its culture to one that truly embraces professional characteristics. The Army seeks to develop leaders whose behavior can be characterized as innovative, risk-taking, boundary spanning, demanding continuous improvement, reflective-in-action, dynamic, and adaptive. The practical importance of the Army’s cultural transformation is succinctly indicated by Cameron and Quinn when they state that “[w]ithout culture change, there is little hope of enduring improvement in organizational performance” (1999, p. 13).
Research Hypotheses

In order to answer the primary research question and to achieve the underlying objectives of this study, the following four hypotheses will be tested to construct a better understanding of the relationship between organizational culture and professional development.

**Hypothesis 1:** The current organizational culture of the U.S. Army is not consistent with an organizational culture supportive of professional development.

**Hypothesis 2:** The current organizational culture of the U.S. Army is consistent with that of a hierarchical/bureaucratic organization.

**Hypothesis 3:** The preferred culture of the U.S. Army is consistent with organizational cultures supportive of innovative, risk-taking, boundary spanning, demanding continuous improvement, reflective-in-action, dynamic, and adaptive behavior.

**Hypothesis 4:** The individual professional skills of the U.S. Army senior level officer corps are not characterized by innovative, risk-taking, boundary spanning, demanding continuous improvement, reflective-in-action, dynamic, and adaptive behavior.

The testing and validation of **Hypothesis 1** is a critical component of this study. Using the OCAI, the current culture of the U.S. Army will be identified by those senior leaders selected to attend the U.S. Army War College. This study hypothesizes that the culture of the U.S. Army is not consistent with Cameron and Quinn’s adhocracy culture, and therefore it is not a supportive organizational culture that will enhance the future effectiveness and viability of the Army profession (Snider and Watkins, 2002). Instead, it is hypothesized that the data will demonstrate that the Army’s culture falls into the hierarchical culture quadrant, whose characteristics are
diametrically opposite to those of the adhocracy culture, thereby supporting

**Hypothesis 2.**

**Hypothesis 3** tests the assumption that the U.S. Army’s preferred organizational culture is consistent with that of professional organizations. If this hypothesis is not rejected it underscores two significant factors: First, the Army’s current culture is incongruent with its preferred culture, and second, that there are underlying cultural factors that are inhibiting the Army from providing professional development programs to its future leaders which will enable them to successfully lead the Army and to confront the ambiguities of its future external environment.

The MSAI will be used to test and validate **Hypothesis 4.** Much like the OCAI, the MSAI plots 12 individual leadership skill categories that are representative of the four dominant CVF cultural types enumerated by Cameron and Quinn (1999). This hypothesis suggests that the MSAI data will indicate that the leadership skills of the Army’s senior leaders are not congruent with those skills characteristic of professional organizations such as: innovative, risk-taking, boundary spanning, demanding continuous improvement, reflective-in-action, dynamic, and adaptive behavior. If this hypothesis is not rejected, then the results provide empirical data indicating that the current culture of the U.S. Army unconsciously promotes a professional development program that is antithetical to that necessary for a professional organization.
Additional Analysis

The MSAI response data will be tested and validated using an analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedure to determine if there is consistency between all branches (infantry, armor, artillery, etc.), all components (active duty, Army National Guard, and Army Reserve), and other key demographic information (sex, rank, age, source of commission, resident student, or distance education student, etc.). For the purposes of this study, four separate classes at the U.S. Army War College have been selected for inclusion in the study, to control for the effect of the actual War College education itself, which is a significant component of the Army’s senior level professional development program. The first cohort of students is comprised of a resident U.S. Army War College Master of Strategic Studies degree class, which was within two weeks of graduation when tested. The second cohort of students is comprised of members of a U.S. Army War College Master of Strategic Studies distance education class, which was also within two weeks of graduation. The third cohort of students is comprised of members of a distance education class that was midway through their two-year U.S. Army War College Master of Strategic Studies degree program. The final group of students is taken from a resident class that had just begun their U.S. Army War College program.

One of the practical aspects of this study is to learn if a homogeneous culture exists within the senior level officer corps of the U.S. Army. This analysis has important considerations for the overall study because it evaluates whether or not the U.S. Army’s professional development program, as conceptualized by this study, generates consistent values throughout the senior level officer corps. It is also
postulated that the analysis will indicate if sub-cultural influence has an impact on a homogeneous U.S. Army culture. It is theorized that if a homogeneous culture does exist within the senior level officer corps, even if those values are not congruent with that of a professional organization, then the potential for a successful cultural intervention is favorable. This implies, as suggested from the functionalist perspective, that the U.S. Army’s culture is an attribute of the organization and can be modified, although not easily (Sathe, 1983).

Figure 1.3 identifies the research operational model to be used by the present study. The specific procedures concerning this process are outlined in detail in the methodology chapter of this dissertation.
Research Question: Is the organizational culture of the U.S. Army congruent with the professional development of its senior level officer corps?

Figure 1.3. The Operational Model for Determining the Effect that Organizational Culture has on Professional Development. Step 1 is to diagnose the overall organizational culture. Step 2 is to identify individual managerial / leadership skills. Step 3 is to identify major subcultural and demographic agreement or disagreement with the overall findings.

Significance of the Study

This exploratory study begins to fill a gap in the organizational culture and professional development literature in that no major attempts have been made to relate the professional development of an organization’s senior leaders to its organizational culture. The investigation of this relationship has significant analytical
potential. For example, if the survival of a profession is based upon its ability to readily and continuously adapt to a changing external environment (Mosher, 1982; Freidson, 1986; Abbott, 1988; Senge, 1994; Martin and McCausland, 2002; Snider, 2003, 2003a; Gordon and Sollinger 2004), can an organization’s culture inherently prevent it from successful professional competition because of the way it educates its future leaders? Essentially, does the unconscious pattern of ambiguity reduction, “the way we do things around here” (Bower, 1966; Deal and Kennedy, 1982, p. 4), create a pattern of homosocial reproduction (Kanter 1977)? Martin (2002) describes homosocial reproduction as a process whereby those who are selected and prepared to eventually become the future leaders of an organization tend to reflect the patterns of existing leaders and therefore foster a perpetuation of existing values and culture. Consequently, the continuation of a given culture may or may not support innovative, boundary spanning, risk-taking leadership that may be necessary to guarantee the future survival of the organization or profession. For example, in the case of the failed Army Crusader program, senior Army leaders continued to support a weapons system that did not conform to the evolving security environment of the 21st Century. In other words, it appeared as though the deeper level basic assumptions and beliefs of a number of senior Army leaders unconsciously guided them to rely on yesterday’s answers for tomorrow’s problems.

While this study examines the senior level leaders of the U.S. Army and is focused toward the Army as a profession, it is believed that the results of this analysis will have a beneficial impact on organizational literature as a whole, and, specifically on that which relates to the professional development of all professions. Schon states
that the “technical extension of bureaucracy, which reinforces the confinement of professional work to precisely defined channels of technical expertise, exacerbates the inherent conflict between bureaucracy and professional identity. Within highly specialized, technically administered systems of bureaucratic control, how can professionals think of themselves as autonomous practitioners” (1983, p. 337)? As indicated by Schein, at the beginning of this paper, and as indicated throughout the Army’s literature concerning leadership, “the only thing of real importance that leaders do is to create and manage culture and that unique talent of leaders is their ability to understand and work with culture. If one wishes to distinguish leadership from management or administration, one can argue that leaders create and change cultures, while managers and administrators live within them” (Schein, 1992, p. 5). The implication is that culture is both a metaphor that describes organizations as well as a variable that can be manipulated, although not easily (Smircich, 1983). Therefore, if an organization’s culture prevents it from developing its leaders to be capable of successfully posturing the organization to respond to the volatile, uncertain, complex, and ambiguous external environment, then, as Schein (1992) suggests, something must be done about the culture. Specifically, Schein states that “[o]rganizational cultures are created in part by leaders, and one of the most decisive functions of leadership is the creation, management, and sometimes even the destruction of culture” (1992, p. 5). In conclusion, this study attempts to determine if there is a level of congruence between an organization’s culture and its ability to professionally develop its future leaders. In the case of the Army profession, this
analysis relates to those senior leaders who will eventually become the stewards of the profession (Snider and Watkins, 2002).
Chapter 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE:
ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE AND PROFESSIONALISM

Organizational Culture

Rockefeller states that organizations possess a logic of their own, which grows over the years and is strengthened by the weight of tradition and inertia (1973, p. 72). Today, organization theory commonly refers to Rockefeller’s concept of organizational logic as an organization’s culture. Schein defines organizational culture as:

…a pattern of basic assumptions, invented, discovered, or developed by a given group as it learns to cope with its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems (1985, p. 9).

Particularly, Schein believes that the concept of organizational culture can help to explain why organizations grow, change, fail, and “perhaps most importantly of all – do things that don’t seem to make any sense” (1985, p. 1).

The beginnings of the scholarly writing of organizational culture can be traced to Pettigrew’s article, “On Studying Organizational Cultures,” published in Administrative Science Quarterly in 1979 (Reichers and Schneider, 1990; Hofstede, et al, 1990). However, the concept of organizational culture can trace its roots to the beginnings of the human relations movement in administration that began at the Western Electric Hawthorne Plant in the 1920s and 1930s as reported by Roethlisberger and Dickson (1939). Additionally, Barnard attempted to circumscribe
the concept of organizational culture with his discussions of “informal organizations” by stating that:

Informal organization, although comprising the processes of society which are unconscious, has two important classes of effects: (a) it establishes certain attitudes, understandings, customs, habits, institutions; and (b) it creates the condition under which formal organization may arise…The most general direct effects of informal organization are customs, mores, folklore, institutions, social norms and ideals – a field of importance in general sociology and especially in social psychology and in social anthropology (1938, p. 116).

The concept of organizational culture has been identified as one of the newest, and perhaps one of the most controversial, sub-topics of organizational theory (Reichers and Schneider, 1990; Martin, 2002). The predominant reason underlying the spirited nature of the debate surrounding the concept of organizational culture is the absence of a generally agreed upon “precise definition of the concept and its separation from other related concepts” (Cameron and Ettington, 1988, p. 357). At the root of the debate is the fact that the theory of organizational culture is comprised of many intangible concepts such as values, beliefs, assumptions, perceptions, behavioral norms, artifacts, and patterns of behavior (Reichers and Schneider, 1990). To the organizational theorist, culture “is to the organization what personality is to the individual – a hidden, yet unifying theme that provides meaning, direction, and mobilization” (Shafritz, and Ott, 1992, p. 481). Just as a dominant personality controls the actions of an individual, the organizational culture can significantly control the behavior of individuals within an organization (Schneider, 1994). In fact, Schein explains that the shared, tacit, taken-for-granted ways of thinking and reacting that circumscribe the concept of culture are the most powerful and stable forces
operating within organizations (1996). The theory of organizational culture contends that individual behavior, within an organization, is not solely controlled by the formal regulations and structures of authority, as supported by structural theorists. Instead, cultural norms, values, beliefs, and assumptions provide unconscious guidance and direction, and consequently, the subsequent behavior of organizational members.

Accordingly, Martin, et al, emphasize that studies of organizational culture share a common objective, which is “to uncover and interpret aspects of organizational life so that we can better understand the perceptions, beliefs, and actions of organizational members” (1997, p. 3). If you want to be able to comprehend the current behavior of an organization, as well as to reasonably anticipate its future actions, then you must be able to understand these abstract organizational variables (Schein, 1999). Each individual organization has a different culture, which is shaped by its technologies, markets, interests, and competition (Deal and Kennedy, 1982). However, Schein disagrees with quantitative approaches, like the one used in this study, to evaluate organizational culture. Instead, Schein emphasizes that in order to sufficiently understand this organizational phenomenon, researchers must be willing to employ a qualitative approach and to “cross real cultural boundaries” by immersing themselves within the organizational environment by becoming a participant observer, an ethnographer, within a real organizational setting (1996, p. 239). Martin echoes this point by stating that the intent of the insider approach to cultural research is “to learn enough about a culture to get inside the minds of cultural members – to think like a native” (2002, p. 37).
While the primary research methodology employed by this study is unquestionably quantitative in nature, the empirical technical rationality that this approach traditionally generates is somewhat tempered by the fact that the author is a 23 year veteran of the U.S. Army and held the rank of Colonel for five years. Consequently, in the analysis chapter of this study, the author is able to provide an “insiders” perspective as suggested by Martin (2002) above.

Organizations “are” cultures vs. Organizations “have” Cultures

Perhaps the most significant area of debate concerning the concept of organizational culture centers on the origin of its disciplinary roots. The anthropological tradition emphasizes that organizations are cultures, while the sociological tradition proposes that organizations have cultures. The anthropological tradition perceives organizational culture as a dependent variable, while the sociological tradition views organizational culture as an independent variable. Within each of these two primary disciplines two sub-approaches have evolved; the functionalist perspective and the semiotic perspective (Burrell and Morgan, 1979; Smircich, 1983; Schein, 1985; Cameron and Ettington, 1988; Cameron and Quinn, 1999; Martin, 2002). According to the functionalist perspective, organizational culture is a “component of the social system and assumes that it is manifested in organizational behaviors” (Cameron and Ettington, 1988, p. 359), which is evaluated from a researcher’s perspective and at the organization level. The semiotic perspective views culture as residing in the minds of individuals, which is evaluated from the native’s perspective and at the individual level (Cameron and Ettington,
1988; Cameron and Quinn, 1999). Essentially, the functionalist perspective assumes that cultural differences can be identified, measured, and changed (Cameron and Quinn, 1999). The semiotic perspective assumes that culture is an image of an organization (Morgan, 1986), which resides in individual interpretations and perceptions, used to facilitate “understanding and communication about the complex phenomenon of organization” (Smircich, 1983, p. 340).

The Functionalist Perspective – Organizations “have” Cultures

Studies that treat organizational culture as a variable, either independent or dependent are generally representing the functional-sociological point of view (Martin, 2002). Within this perspective, organizational culture is perceived as an attribute of the organization, which can be empirically identified, measured, evaluated, and changed, and is manifested in organizational behaviors (Ouchi, 1981; Peters and Waterman, 1982; Schein, 1985; Cameron and Ettington, 1988; Trice and Beyer, 1993; Schneider, 1994; Cameron and Quinn, 1999; Martin, 2002). The most significant issue for researchers employing the functionalist approach is the concept of causality. Specifically, functionalist studies attempt to establish a causal link to organizational control, management, and ultimately to those factors that will improve organizational performance (Schein, 1996; Martin, 2002). Whether researchers view culture as an independent variable, part of the external environment influencing behavior within the organization, or as a dependent variable, to be manipulated by organizational leadership to improve effectiveness, the common goal is to determine
the “contingent relationships that will have applicability for those trying to manage organizations (Smircich, 1983, p. 347).

The functionalist perspective is generally based upon the systems theory framework, which states that any system that conducts an exchange with its environment through the importation of the necessary materials to sustain itself and then through the exportation of converted components back into the environment is an open system. By contrast, any system in which no material enters or leaves the system is a closed system (Von Bertalanffy, 1950). Katz and Kahn (1978) perceive the open systems theory as the appropriate framework for organizational study because it enables a comprehensive integration of the analysis of the individual, the micro level, up through the total organization and its environment, the macro level. They emphasize that the open systems concept is a very effective metaphor in describing the recurring pattern of organizational behavior that is “differentiated from, but dependent on, the larger stream of life in which it occurs and recurs” (p. 752). It is interesting to note that the discussion of organizational culture as a metaphor is the topic of the next section, which discusses organizational culture as something an organization is. Pasmore (1988) indicates that the significance of the open systems concept is that it provides a solid foundation for organizational behavioralists to analyze both the internal and external interactions of organizational members and to apply some form of meaning to these actions.

Writing from the functionalist perspective, Bolman and Deal (1991) indicate that over time, every organization develops distinctive beliefs and behavior patterns that are unconscious and taken for granted. These underlying assumptions are
manifested in “myths, fairy tales, stories, rituals, ceremonies, and other symbolic forms” (p. 268) or artifacts. Consequently, managers and leaders who are able to harness the inherent power that these symbols contain stand a better chance of influencing their organizations than do those leaders who focus on other management techniques such as formal rules and regulations.

Smircich states that the primary “research agenda arising from the view that culture is an organizational variable is how to mold and shape internal culture in particular ways and how to change culture, consistent with managerial purposes” (1983, p. 346). In an effort to help organize the concept and to give practical tools to organizational theorists and leaders as they attempt to manage organizations, researchers have identified several major dimensions of organizational culture such as strength, congruence, and type, which they believe are the most critical aspects of organizational performance.

Cultural strength refers to the power to control behavior (Cameron and Ettington, 1988). It is postulated that organizations with strong cultures provide organizational members with organizational structure, standards, consistency, and a firm value system that influences the patterns of internal relationships, internal productivity, and effectiveness (Deal and Kennedy, 1982; Sathe, 1983; Schneider, 1994). Sathe (1983) indicates that organizations that have a greater level of shared beliefs and values are able to exert a greater influence on organizational behavior because there are more basic underlying assumptions that ultimately provide guidance for organizational behavior. Deal and Kennedy give support for their theory of strong
organizational cultures by stating that “a strong culture has almost always been the
driving force behind the continuing success in American business” (1982, p. 5).

Cultural congruence refers to the fit or the homogeneity of the various cultural
elements within an organization. Essentially, this implies that organizations which
have their cultural beliefs, values, and basic underlying assumptions shared by a
larger number of organizational elements and individuals have a more congruent,
consistent, and homogeneous, culture than organizations whose beliefs, values, and
assumptions are not as pervasive (Sathe, 1983). Congruence and strength are related
concepts in that cultural strength increases with cultural congruence. Nadler and
Tushman state that “other things being equal, the greater the total degree of
congruence or fit between the various components [of an organization], the more
effective will be organizational behavior at multiple levels” (1980, p. 275).

Cameron and Ettington (1988) studied the relationship between
organizational congruence, strength, type, and organizational effectiveness. They
found that organizational effectiveness was more closely associated with cultural type
than with congruence or strength. By cultural type, Cameron and Ettington refer to
the specific kind of culture that is representative of a given organization such as
innovative and risk-oriented or structured and rules-oriented. Based on the competing
values research conducted by Quinn and Rohrbaugh, (1981, 1983), Cameron and
Ettington’s study employed four ideal cultural types: clan, adhocracy, market, and
hierarchy, to evaluate the relationship between major cultural dimensions and
effectiveness. Their research has led to the development of the Organizational
Culture Assessment Instrument (OCAI) (Cameron and Quinn, 1999), which is the
model used to operationalize the concept of organizational culture employed in the present study.

In summary, a major consideration for researchers employing the functionalist perspective is to determine the type of variable that they perceive organizational culture to be. If they recognize organizational culture to be an independent variable, one that is imported into the organizational setting through the organization’s members and through other environmental factors resulting in islands of sub-cultural development, then they may utilize appropriate analyses which can generate a greater awareness of cultural differences, identify cultural constraints, allow the measurement of cultural change over time, and enable leaders and researchers to draw a cultural map of complex organizations (Hofstede, et al, 1990). The view that organizational culture is a dependent variable implies that culture is governed by an instrumentally rational process where organizational leaders and researchers can manipulate a variety of “levers,” thereby influencing the direction of their organizations (Smircich, 1983; Druckman, et al, 1997). It is interesting to note that the term “levers” is a mechanistic metaphor, which is somewhat contrary to the more complex concept of organizational culture. Despite the voluminous literature written from the functionalist perspective, many theorists debate the assertion that organizational culture can be managed at all. For example, Martin states that from a “differentiation” perspective, organizational culture is not unitary. Rather, it is the nexus of environmental influences and sub-cultural characteristics within a permeable organizational boundary where inconsistency and sub-cultural consensus are prevalent (1992, pp. 111-114). In other words, cultural consensus only occurs at
lower levels (sub-cultural levels) within the organization. Martin states that
“subcultures are like islands of clarity in a sea of ambiguity” (2002, p. 94).

Consequently, these authors indicate that the traditional “integration” perspective of
organizational culture, as represented by the functionalist perspective, discounts the
significance of organizational sub-cultures and counter-cultures (Smircich, 1983;
Martin and Frost, 1996). Additionally, other authors conform to the “fragmentation”
perspective, which places ambiguity instead of clarity and unity at the core of
organizational culture. Researchers emphasizing the fragmentation perspective
believe that the interpretations of cultural manifestations are at best ambiguously
related to each other. Thus, there is a lack of consistency and consensus within
organizations and any consensus that does exist, does so only for brief and issue-
specific periods of time (Feldman, 1991; Meyerson, 1991; Kreiner and Schultz, 1993;
Martin and Frost, 1996; Martin, 2002).

Boeker (1989) takes the functionalist perspective of organizational culture in
his study of the conditions under which strategic change occurs in organizations. His
findings show that the characteristics of an organization’s beginning provide guidance
to its initial strategy by contributing to an internal consensus around a given strategic
approach. His argument states that leaders of organizations must recognize that they
operate within constraints, many of which come from the initial founding of
structures, routines, repertories, and sub-cultural variations that have become
institutionalized over time. The initial founding philosophy creates the footing for the
organization’s culture and its subsequent symbolism, myths, and sagas that must be
understood prior to successful personnel motivation and management (House and Singh, 1987).

Finally, Weick (1979) suggests that organizational culture may actually be a much more complex construct that might be more reflective of the concept of interdependence than that of merely a variable. Weick states that in an “interdependent relationship” the designation of one event in the relationship as a “cause,” and another event as an “effect,” is the result of an arbitrary and incomplete analysis. Instead, in an interdependent relationship, events routinely cycle back and forth between being both a cause at one time and an effect at another. In other words, one event may influence others, but is then in turn influenced by the resultant action of those other events. The “interdependent relationship” is somewhat analogous to the “elaboration paradigm” where “intervening variables” modify the impact that a independent variable has on the dependent variable (Babbie, 1992). Weick’s (1979) concept of “interdependence” supports Trice and Beyer’s position that organizational cultures “incorporate contradictions, ambiguities, paradoxes, and just plain confusion,” and that as the organization goes forward, old and new organizational members discover a divergence in basic underlying assumptions which need to be resolved (1993, p. 8). In some instances individual organizational behavior is modified through the acculturation process, and in other circumstances the organizational culture itself evolves due to the vagaries of environmental influence and through the diverse interpretation of an organization’s culture by its members (Martin, 1992).
The difficulty that organizational theorists have experienced trying to circumscribe the concept of organizational culture has led many to perceive organizational culture as something other than a variable (Berger and Luckmann, 1966; Geertz, 1973, Smircich, 1983; Pondy, et al, 1983; Schultz and Hatch, 1996; Martin, 2002). Many theorists perceive organizational culture to be analogous to images of organizations, that is, “metaphors that lead us to see and understand organizations in distinctive yet partial ways” (Morgan, 1986, p. 12). This symbolic point of view is the subject of the next section of this study.

The Semiotic Perspective – Organizations “are” Cultures

Unlike the functionalist perspective, which states that organizational culture is something that an organization has, the semiotic perspective views organizational culture as something an organization is (Smircich, 1983; Schein, 1985; Morgan, 1986). Morgan states that organization “is now seen to reside in ideas, values, norms, rituals, and beliefs that sustain organizations as socially constructed realities (1986, p. 14).” Consequently, the study of organizational culture as a metaphor “promotes a view of organizations as expressive forms, manifestations of human consciousness” (Smircich, 1983, p. 347). Lakoff and Johnson (1980) emphasize that perception and knowing are interpretive processes whereby humans attempt to gain an understanding of one aspect of human experience by evaluating it in terms of another experience. The continuous analysis of human experience in light of another experience is the essence of the metaphoric process. While metaphors can lead to more in-depth scientific knowledge (Tsoukas, 1991), Morgan (1986) emphasizes that metaphoric
process does enable us to frame our understanding of experiences in distinctive but incomplete ways. In other words, metaphors can produce a one-sided perception of an experience, which may overshadow other equally as valid interpretations of a given situation or experience. Therefore, researchers and organizational leaders must enhance their ability to develop those “thick descriptions” (Geertz, 1973) of organizations, which will facilitate a more comprehensive understanding of the coexistence of complementary and paradoxical activities that comprise the complex construct of organizational culture. Jermier (1991) echoes Morgan’s caution by stating that organizations can be viewed as cultures in which human actors are carriers of broader levels of cultural expression and consequently import them into the organizational setting from society, religion, occupation, gender, age, etc. Subsequently, organizational members employ these various experiences to socially construct realities and meaning for their lives. Consequently, Jermier emphasizes that organizational culture is a contested reality (p. 231), which as a social construction can be reinterpreted over and over again. The general emphasis of integration theories, which has been underscored by most of the scholars, cited so far, view organizational culture as having mutually consistent interpretations. As mentioned earlier, these integration theories discount other perspectives such as the differentiation and fragmentation perspectives, which do not view culture as a homogeneous construct as emphasized by the integration perspective (Martin, 1992, 1997, 2002).

Studies conducted from the semiotic perspective attempt to describe organizational culture by providing a “thick description,” which incorporates a rich
detail of the organizational context from the individual’s point of view or cognition, and include a full accounting of detailed observations, events, utterances, actions and situations (Morgan, 1986). The purpose of using the metaphorical process to describe organizations is to enable researchers to expose characteristics of an organization, which may be expressed as ideational or symbolic. Ideational or symbolic characteristics are those characteristics such as shared knowledge and meaning that reside in the minds of individuals who are associated with the organization. The overall intent of this perspective is to achieve a greater understanding of an organization’s culture, “not to predict other behaviors or performances based on the cultural manifestations” (Cameron and Ettington, 1988, p. 367). Organizational culture is seen as a subjective experience, and a semiotic analysis allows for the investigation of patterns of organizational behavior that make organized action within the organizational setting possible (Triandis, 1972; Smircich, 1983). For example, Mahler (1988) writing from the semiotic point of view states that the interest in organizational culture has led to a collecting and cataloging of themes in stories from many organizations. Her article compares organizational stories and accounts of organizational life to a unique, but classic, myth archetype that permeates each of these organizations. Her work suggests that the identification and analysis of these myths will enable future researchers to better understand the expressed values, feelings, motivation, and commitment of organizational members.

Morgan (1986) states that viewing organizational culture as a metaphor allows for the reinterpretation of many traditional managerial concepts and processes. Specifically, he indicates that:
The culture metaphor points towards another means of creating organized activity: by influencing the language, norms, folklore, ceremonies, and other social practices that communicate the key ideologies, values, and beliefs guiding action. Hence the current enthusiasm for the idea of managing corporate culture as the ‘normative glue’ that holds organization together. Whereas previously many managers have seen themselves as more or less rational men and women designing structures and job descriptions, coordinating activities, or developing schemes for motivating their employees, they can now see themselves as symbolic actors whose primary function is to foster and develop desirable patterns of meaning. The results of research on organizational culture show how this form of symbolic management can be used to shape the reality of organization life in a way that enhances the possibility of coordinated action (pp. 135-136).

Morgan (1986) also emphasizes that our understanding of organizational change should include the realization that effective organizational change is a result of changes in the images and values that guide action, not just changes in technology and structure. This insight is very reminiscent of the socio-technical systems perspective of organization (Trist, 1981).

In summary, Bolman and Deal emphasize that the “ideational” (Smirich, 1983) or “enacted” retrospective sense-making (Weick, 1979) that is so representative of the semiotic perspective of organizational culture is a significant departure from the traditional principles of organizational theory that espouse rationality, certainty, and linearity (1991, p. 244). The underlying perspective of the semiotic approach is the desire to utilize the concept of organizational culture as an epistemological tool for the purpose of circumscribing the study of organization as a social phenomenon and as a unique form of human expression (Smircich, 1983). Consequently, Smircich indicates that organizational behavior exists as a pattern of symbolic relationships that have been given meaning by organizational members through a consensual process, which gives the appearance of an independent “rule-like existence” (1983, p. 353).
Bolman and Deal summarize their perception of the semiotic approach by stating that the nature of organizations and human behavior is based on the following underlying unconventional assumptions:

1. What is most important about any event is not what happened, but what it means.
2. Events and meanings are loosely coupled: the same events can have very different meanings for different people because of differences in the schema that they use to interpret their experience.
3. Many of the most significant events and processes in organizations are ambiguous or uncertain – it is often difficult or impossible to know what happened, why it happened, or what will happen next.
4. The greater the ambiguity and uncertainty, the harder it is to use rational approaches to analysis, problem solving, and decision making.
5. Faced with uncertainty and ambiguity, human beings create symbols to resolve confusion, increase predictability, and provide direction. (Events themselves may remain illogical, random, fluid, and meaningless, but human symbols make them seem otherwise.)
6. Many organizational events and processes are important more for what they express than for what they produce: they are secular myths, rituals, ceremonies, and sagas that help people find meaning and order in their experience (1991, p. 244).

Martin (2002) emphasizes that the semiotic perspective looks deeper into organizational behavior so that an in-depth understanding of how organizational members interpret their experiences and manifestations to form patterns of clarity, inconsistency, and ambiguity can be achieved. In the semiotic perspective, the research focus shifts from what is accomplished and how efficiently, to how organization is accomplished and what does it mean to do so (Smircich, 1983).

The preceding section has provided a review of the literature concerning the theoretical analysis of culture, which can be summarized as a debate between the functionalists who believe that organizations have cultures and the semiotic perspective, which states that organizations are cultures. Both perspectives provide a unique insight into this complex construct. However, neither of them alone appears
to be the archetype that organizational theorists and practitioners can use to solve the complex problems of organization. However, Smircich states that despite these differences, perhaps the true significance of the concept of organizational culture is that it “focuses attention on the expressive, nonrational qualities of organization…and…it legitimates attention to the subjective, interpretive aspects of organizational life” (1983, p. 355).

The next section provides a differing perspective of the complex construct of organizational culture by briefly reviewing the arguments of yet another significant organizational culture debate. Unlike the previous debate, which highlighted the theoretical aspects of the construct, the focus of this debate is centered on research methodology. In this next section, the viewpoints of proponents and opponents of both quantitative and qualitative research approaches to the study of organizational culture are explored.

The Methodological Debate: Quantitative vs. Qualitative Analysis

Quantitative Analysis

Martin states that organizational culture researchers “face [research] methods dilemmas, whether they acknowledge them or not, each time they design or evaluate a study. What kind of study design will give answers to the questions of interest? What are the theoretical implications of that method choice” (2002, p. 207)? Additionally, practical considerations must be evaluated such as the level of research funding, the adequacy of time available to do the research, the availability of research
data, the level of scholarly interest in the proposed subject, and will the research support, add to, or extend existing knowledge (Creswell, 1994). Consequently, two dominant research methodological choices, quantitative and qualitative research methods, or a combination of the two, usually form the foundation of most research approaches.

Creswell (1994), in his book discussing methodological research techniques, states that the quantitative approach to research design underscores the necessity for the researcher to remain distant and independent from that which is being researched. The resulting analysis is characterized by an impersonal and formal format, which incorporates deductive logic in which theories and hypotheses are evaluated in a cause-and-effect order. The quantitative researcher views reality in an instrumentally rational, objective manner whereby the researcher is capable of measuring these observations through questionnaires, survey instruments, and controlled experiments. Creswell states that a quantitative study “is an inquiry into a social or human problem, based on testing a theory composed of variables, measured with numbers, and analyzed with statistical procedures, in order to determine whether the predictive generalizations of the theory hold true” (1994, p. 2). The present study takes a predominantly quantitative approach by using the Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument (OCAI) and the Management Skills Assessment Instrument (MSAI) as mentioned earlier and as outlined in greater detail in the methodology chapter of this study. However, it is important to note that when the OCAI and MSAI survey instruments were designed, they incorporated qualitative methods such as stories, incidents, and symbols to help stimulate within the respondent answers those deep
underlying assumptions that form the basis of organizational culture (Cameron and Quinn, 1999). Additionally, the analysis of the research data and findings presented in this paper is tempered by the twenty-three year U.S. Army career of the author of the present study, which provides a unique “insider” perspective.

On the other hand, many cultural researchers believe that the quantitative approach is an insufficient or ineffective method to study a complex construct such as organizational culture. For example, Rousseau (1990) indicates that the quantitative assessment of organizational culture is at best controversial and at worst totally wide of the mark. Schein (1991) concurs, and emphasizes that in the fervent attempts to measure and quantify the elusive concept of organizational culture, researchers have a priori defined dimensions that only evaluate culture at the surface level, such as artifacts and values; refer to Figure 1.2 for a graphic representation of this concept. Consequently, Schein believes that quantitative research alone merely provides a superficial analysis of the construct and fails to evaluate those deep basic underlying assumptions that truly provide a rich understanding of “the way we do things around here” (Bower, 1966).

Despite these objections, organizational studies have been dominated since the 1960s by quantitative analysis in the form of surveys, archival data analyses, and experiments (Martin, 2002). Quantitative techniques emphasize the principles of rational empiricism that underscore the positivist approach to learning and knowledge generation. The underlying premise is that all natural and social reality is comprised of unified and coherent patterns that can be measured and evaluated through sensory experience (Frederickson, 1994). However, as outlined above, the concept of
organizational culture is highly subjective in nature because it is based on those taken-for-granted basic underlying assumptions shared by organizational members. Consequently, it is understandable why many organizational theorists shun quantitative research, which is designed to summarize, compare, validate, replicate, reduce, and analyze in an objective nature, as an insufficient methodological approach for the analysis of such a complex construct as organizational culture (Cameron and Ettington, 1988; Rousseau, 1990; Schein, 1999; Martin, 2002).

However, Cameron and Ettington (1988) state that one way to use a quantitative tool, such as a survey, to assess organizational culture is to replace Likert-type questions with written descriptions or scenarios that construct reflections of cultural attributes. Cameron and Ettington indicate that this technique stimulates the respondent’s reservoir of underlying cultural assumptions, thereby enabling the respondent to reply in such a manner that organizational culture as reflected by its core values and orientations can be measured. It is postulated that this hybrid methodology incorporates the benefits of both quantitative and qualitative analysis, and subsequently led to the development of the Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument (OCAI) and the Management Skills Assessment Instrument (MSAI), which are critical components of the present study (Cameron and Quinn, 1999). Berrio provides empirical support of the efficacy of the OCAI in a study designed to identify the dominant culture type of the Ohio State University Extension. In this study, Berrio states that the “competing values framework can be used in constructing an organizational culture profile. Through the use of the OCAI, an organizational culture profile can be drawn by establishing the organization’s dominant culture type”
Finally, in their attempt to add empirical data to the methodological debate, Hofstede, et al, found that organizational culture can be measured through quantitative analysis “on the basis of answers of organizational members to written questions” (1990, p. 287). In their conclusion discussing quantitative research methods techniques, Hofstede, et al, state that:

We do not want to deny that organizational cultures are gestalts, wholes, whose flavor can only be completely experienced by insiders and which demand empathy in order to be appreciated by outsiders. However, in a world of hardware and bottom-line figures, a framework allowing one to describe the structure in these gestalts is an asset. Practitioners can use it to create awareness of cultural differences, for example, in cases allowing comparisons to be made with other organizations, it can suggest cultural constraints that strategic planners will have to respect. It allows one to measure culture change over time. Finally, it can help both managers and researchers to decide whether an organization should be considered as one single culture or as a multitude of subcultures and to draw a cultural map of complex organizations (1990, p. 313).

**Qualitative Analysis**

The qualitative approach to research design underscores the necessity for researchers to interact with those involved in the study, either through a long-term ethnographic type relationship or through actual collaboration. The resulting analysis is characterized by a personal format, which is value-laden in nature and incorporates the researcher’s values and biases. The qualitative researcher attempts to understand and discover meaning through an inductive logic where research categories emerge from the information provided by the informants instead of through an *a priori* process established by the researcher (Creswell, 1994). Merriam enumerated six axiomatic-like principles or assumptions that form the basis of the qualitative research approach. These principles are:
1. Qualitative researchers are concerned primarily with process, rather than outcomes or products.
2. Qualitative researchers are interested in meaning – how people make sense of their lives, experiences, and their structures of the world.
3. The qualitative researcher is the primary instrument for data collection and analysis. Data are mediated through this human instrument, rather than through inventories, questionnaires, or machines.
4. Qualitative research involves fieldwork. The researcher physically goes to the people, setting, site, or institution to observe or record behavior in its natural setting.
5. Qualitative research is descriptive in that the researcher is interested in process, meaning, and understanding gained through words or pictures.
6. The process of qualitative research is inductive in that the researcher builds abstractions, concepts, hypotheses, and theories from details (1988, pp. 19-20).

Proponents of the qualitative analysis approach to the study of organizational culture emphasize, that due to the highly subjective nature of organizational culture, the only technique that provides an adequate understanding of an organization’s culture is an in-depth ethnographic analysis (Geertz, 1973; Martin, 1992, Schein, 1985, 1999; Martin, 2002). An ethnographic research design attempts to develop a “holistic picture of the subject of study with emphasis on portraying the everyday experiences of individuals by observing and interviewing them and relevant others” (Creswell, 1994, p. 163). Rousseau reiterates this point by stating that the rationale for qualitative methods is “predicated on the presumed inaccessibility, depth, or unconscious quality of culture” (1990, p. 162). However, Riley indicates that one of the major shortcomings of the ethnographic approach is that it “requires complete dedication to a project, both physically and emotionally, as the researcher becomes intimately involved in the culture being studied and with the people who produce and reproduce that culture” (1991, p. 217). There is also the danger of the researcher going “native,” that is, becoming so assimilated into the observed culture as to make
any analysis suspect and of limited value. Rousseau also indicates that organizational culture is a reflection of the “social construction of reality unique to members of a social unit, and that this uniqueness makes it impossible for standardized measures to tap cultural processes” (1990, p. 161). Martin provides a concise summarization of the methodological debate between quantitative and qualitative analysis as well as a strong argument why quantitative techniques have dominated cultural research (Trice and Beyer, 1993) by stating that:

When culture is treated as a variable and used to predict other variables, such as organizational performance, it fits easily into the mainstream organizational assumptions about the superiority of quantitative methods and the importance of doing research with functional implications, such as improving productivity and performance. Culture-as-variable research is easily congruent with the managerial interest and with Habermas’s characterization of technical research. In contrast, culture-as-metaphor, posits that culture is not a variable. Instead, it is a metaphor for examining everyday organizational life. Culture-as-metaphor highlights aspects of organizational functioning that have been ignored by the field’s emphasis on variables, such as organizational size and structure, that can be measured relatively easily using quantitative methods (2002, p. 310).

Deal and Kennedy argue that qualitative analysis enables the researcher to use organizational members who are able to “go much deeper in diagnosing culture, and with much greater precision. But there are pitfalls to achieving an accurate reading of one’s own company’s culture…Objectivity is of the first importance” (1982, p. 133).

Schein disagrees that a detailed qualitative cultural analysis must be achieved solely through the traditional ethnographic process. Instead, he outlines his perception of the ethnographic process by stating that a “clinician/researcher” should conduct an “iterative clinical interview, a series of encounters and joint explorations between the investigator and various motivated informants who live in the
organization and embody its culture” (1992, p. 169). Schein (1992) indicates that an “outsider” cannot fully understand or appreciate the semantic nuances of how organizational rules apply in various situations or how they are translated into behavior. Additionally, the “outsider” by definition inevitably ascribes meaning to observed events and the degree of accuracy of these interpretations is unknown unless consultation with an “insider” is conducted. Likewise, Schein states that the “insider” is incapable of communicating to the researcher those unconscious values and assumptions that lie at the heart of an organization’s culture. Consequently, Schein states that through a series of joint action between the researcher and organizational members the final determination of the organizational culture of a subject organization can be deciphered and the underlying pattern of relationships can accurately be evaluated while avoiding subjectivity bias of the researcher and the insider’s lack of awareness (Schein, 1992).

The next section of this chapter briefly discusses the Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument (OCAI), which is used by the present study in the “clinician/researcher” perspective as described by Schein above. As is outlined in greater detail in the methodology chapter of this paper, the OCAI is a quantitative instrument that employs qualitative aspects by relying “on a process of dialogue among individuals charged with initiating and managing the [cultural] change. This usually involves managers near the top of the organization…[and by helping them to] uncover, or bring to the surface, aspects of the organization’s culture that otherwise may not be identifiable or articulated by organization members” (Cameron and Quinn, 1999, p. 72).
The Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument (OCAI)

As indicated in the preceding sections of this paper, the debate concerning the appropriate methodological process to use for the analysis of organizational culture is extremely contentious and continues to this date. Two key questions arise from the literature concerning quantitative and qualitative analysis. First, do quantitative analysis methods such as questionnaires and survey instruments provide only a superficial level of cultural understanding? Second, do qualitative approaches lack the breadth of analysis to conduct comparative studies among multiple cultures because of the excessive time and energy expended on only one organization’s culture? In reference to their methodological technique, Cameron and Quinn (1999) state that their OCAI, which is based on the Competing Values Framework – CVF, initially developed by Quinn and Rohrbaugh (1981, 1983) adequately addresses both of these methodological questions. Specifically Cameron and Quinn indicate that:

To conduct comparisons among multiple cultures, quantitative approaches must be used. It is crucial, however, that those responding to a survey instrument actually report underlying values and assumptions (culture), not just superficial attitudes or perceptions (climate). This can be accomplished best, we argue, by using a scenario analysis procedure in which respondents report the extent to which written scenarios are indicative of their own organization’s culture. These scenarios serve as cues – both emotionally and cognitively – that bring to the surface core cultural attributes…Respondents may be unaware of crucial attributes of culture until they are cued by the scenarios on the questionnaire (1999, p. 135).

The authors of this approach indicate that the OCAI has been used to identify the current and preferred cultural types in thousands of organizations and that it has been found to predict organizational performance (Cameron and Quinn, 1999). The
validity and reliability of this approach are well documented and will be discussed in greater detail in the methodology chapter of this paper. The CVF model, as operationalized by the OCAI, is believed to provide a hybrid solution to the functionalist – semiotic debate, discussed earlier in this chapter. It does so by identifying the “aspects of the organization that reflect key values and assumptions in the organization, and then give[s] individuals an opportunity to respond using their underlying archetypal framework” [basic underlying assumptions] (Cameron and Quinn, 1999, p. 137). Specifically, OCAI respondents are asked to answer questions representing six content dimensions, which Cameron and Quinn state represent “fundamental cultural values and implicit assumptions about the way the organization functions” (1999, p. 137). These six dimensions are: dominant characteristics, organizational leadership, management of employees, organizational glue, strategic emphases, and criteria for success. When combined with the four cultural types enumerated by the Competing Values Framework: clan cultural type, adhocracy cultural type, market cultural type, and hierarchy cultural type (Cameron and Ettington, 1988), which are formed by the confluence of two major dimensions of effectiveness: internal focus and integration versus external focus and differentiation; and stability and control versus flexibility and discretion, the six cultural content dimensions are able to elicit “the fundamental organizing framework used by people when they obtain, interpret, and draw conclusions about information” (Cameron and Quinn, 1999, p. 136). See Figure 2.1. Consequently, the OCAI is able to uncover the underlying organizational culture, which as indicated by the literature review provided in this chapter, portrays organizational culture as an
ambiguous, complex, and non-linear socially constructed shared meaning, difficult to observe and even more so to quantify. The OCAI enables the researcher to identify an organization’s predominant cultural type as well as the relative strength of the four basic cultural types briefly identified above. Finally, the OCAI allows the researcher to evaluate the level of cultural congruence in an organization. Cultural congruence refers to the degree to which the “various aspects of the organization’s culture are aligned. That is, the same culture types are emphasized in the various parts of the organization” (Cameron and Quinn, 1999, p. 64).

Figure 2.1. The Competing Values of Leadership, Effectiveness, and Organizational Theory (Cameron & Quinn, 1999, p. 41).
Even though the authors of the OCAI approach indicate that this cultural research technique is primarily representative of the functionalist tradition, which treats organizational culture as a variable, they also acknowledge the ambiguous and unmanageable aspects, which are representative of the semiotic perspective. Additionally, the technique combines some of the more positive aspects of both quantitative and qualitative research methodologies. The dimensions graphically portrayed in Figure 2.1, and the four cultural type quadrants which they produce, “appear to be very robust in explaining the different orientations, as well as the competing values, that characterize human behavior…That is, each quadrant represents basic assumptions, orientations, and values – the same elements that comprise an organizational culture” (Cameron and Quinn, 1999, p. 33).

Consequently, the OCAI and the underlying Competing Values Framework (CVF) approach were chosen for this study because the CVF has been empirically developed and has been found to have both face and empirical validity (Cameron and Quinn, 1999). Additionally, the OCAI is a predominantly quantitative instrument that has been developed in such a manner as to elicit subjective qualitative type responses from respondents. Therefore, the OCAI can be considered to be of a hybrid nature in that it incorporates both quantitative and qualitative aspects research design, and the instrument has been found to have a high level of documented reliability and validity.

The preceding sections have provided a glimpse of the diversity of opinion concerning what organizational theorists and authors have identified and described as organizational culture. Their insights are provided to help decipher the “patterns of interacting elements (Schein, 1999, p. xiii)” that must be understood to facilitate a
better understanding of organizational behavior. Specifically, “the patterns of meaning that link [behavioral] manifestations together, sometimes in harmony, sometimes in bitter conflicts between groups, and sometimes in webs of ambiguity, paradox, and contradiction” (Martin, 2002, p. 3).

The following sections of this chapter provide a review of the second major component of this study: professional development.

**Professionalism and Professional Development**

Despite the significant amount of ambiguity and imprecision that can be found in the extent literature concerning professions and what it means to be professional, there are some common notions of the concept, which appear to have achieved some tacit agreement among researchers and theorists (Golembiewski, 1983). Among these areas of agreement is Abbott’s position that the “tasks of professions are human problems [which are] amenable to expert service” (1988, p. 35). However, it is not the intention of this study to debate the history, the precision, the relevancy, or the future of the concepts of professional, professionalism, or professional practice. Those debates and analyses can be reviewed elsewhere (Abbott, 1988; Broadbent, et al, 1997; Brody, 1989; Burrage and Torstendahl, 1990; Freidson, 1970, 1973, 1986). Instead, this study accepts the generic proposition that professional status is based on competency whereby individuals in high status occupations translate abstract knowledge into action, and that this action is undertaken to help people confront important societal problems which they are incapable of solving for themselves (Eulau, 1973; Mosher, 1982; Huntington, 1985; Freidson, 1986; Abbott, 1988; Burk,
Gargan emphasizes that a “distinguishing characteristic of the context of professionalism, cited by essentially all observers, is autonomy, the notion that if professionals are to be held accountable for their decisions they must be allowed discretion, the right to make choices which concern both means and ends” (1998, p. 1091). Consequently, Freidson (1986) indicates that professional autonomy and special privilege are conferred upon professions by society because of the profession’s mastery or expertise in an area of formal abstract knowledge which is traditionally considered to be in the interest of society as a whole, examples include: law, medicine, engineering, teaching, the ministry, and defense. Following this line of thought, Gargan outlines seven criteria, which are generically considered to be representative of the concept of professionalism. They are:

1. The word profession is generally applied to a vocation or occupation built on a systematic body of knowledge and theory.
2. Members of a profession are assumed to be imbued with a sense of calling or mission that transcends baser, more self-seeking, less altruistic motives and goals.
3. A close relationship commonly exists between professionals and the faculty, departments, and professional schools of universities.
4. Preprofessional training is not confined to the university setting.
5. At some point in an occupation’s progression to professional status, an association is formed.
6. The strong service orientation of professionals leads them to strive constantly for ways to increase their knowledge for the betterment of those they serve.

Mosher succinctly summarizes the various theses presented so far by stating that professions are the “means whereby intellectual achievement becomes operational” (1982, p. 112). Blackwell emphasizes that professions are organized bodies of experts who apply esoteric knowledge to particular cases (2002, p. 104). In reference
to the maintenance of professional expertise, Blackwell indicates that professions have “elaborate systems of instruction and training, together with entry examinations and other formal prerequisites, and they normally possess and enforce a code of ethics or behavior” (2002, p. 104). Of particular importance to this study is how an organization’s culture affects the organization’s ability to maintain and perpetuate its professional expertise.

Schon states that professions pervade every aspect of our lives and that they have become essential to “the very functioning of society” (1983, p. 3). He indicates that specially trained professionals perform such important societal responsibilities as: providing national defense, educating our children, providing health care, operating our legal system, designing and constructing roads, bridges, and buildings, and finally, affording protection to those in society who are unable to do so for themselves. In relation to professional development and to the adequacy of professional knowledge, Schon emphasizes that:

On the whole, [the individual professional’s assessment of his field] is that professional knowledge is mismatched to the changing character of the situations of practice – the complexity, uncertainty, instability, uniqueness, and value conflicts which are increasingly perceived as central to the world of professional practice (1983, p. 14).

Brooks concurs with Schon’s assessment of the unprecedented need for professional adaptability, innovation, and creativity by stating that “both ends of the gap [that the professional] is expected to bridge with his profession are changing so rapidly” (1967, p. 89).

In his book discussing “the system of professions,” Andrew Abbott provides a succinct description of the historical definitions of professions by stating that
professions “were organized bodies of experts who applied esoteric knowledge to particular cases. They had elaborate systems of instruction and training, together with entry by examination and other formal prerequisites...[and]…They normally possessed and enforced a code of ethics or behavior” (1988, p. 4). Abbott also emphasizes that in relation to the professional development of individual professionals, “the academic knowledge system of a profession generally accomplishes three tasks – legitimation, research, and instruction – and in each it shapes the vulnerability of professional jurisdiction to outside interference” (1988, p. 57). Here, Abbott is implying that the future survival of the profession is shaped by the organizational culture of that profession; in this case, its unconscious willingness to expand the boundaries of its professional abstract knowledge. He indicates that if the profession is incapable of keeping pace with a rapidly changing external environment, then the profession will face serious competition from other professions and lose its legitimacy and socially granted professional jurisdiction. Relevant to this study, Snider and Watkins (2002) warn that the U.S. Army’s culture is preventing its senior leaders from developing the managerial and leadership skills that will enable them to guide the Army profession into the future and to ensure that it keeps pace with its rapidly changing external national security environment. For example, they state that “[m]icromanagement has become part of the Army culture, producing a growing perception that lack of trust stems from the leader’s desire to be invulnerable to criticism and blocks the opportunity for subordinates to learn through leadership experiences” (2002, p. 10).
Echoing Abbott’s analysis of the system of professions, Burk (2002) states that professions can be characterized by three important factors. The first is the mastery of abstract knowledge, which is achieved through a well-developed system of higher education. The second factor is a contested jurisdiction within which the professionals apply their abstract knowledge. The third factor outlined by Burk is legitimacy. Professions achieve legitimacy when they successfully demonstrate to their client, which is normally society, that the application of their abstract knowledge within a given jurisdiction is in the best interest of the client resulting in a certain degree of deference conferred upon the profession by the client. The concept of legitimacy can readily be observed in the self-regulating status granted to professions by society.

In reference to military professions, Huntington, in his work discussing the theory and politics of civil-military relations, identifies those technical, personal, ethical, and doctrinal skills that must be mastered to successfully wage war in support of national values and national security strategy as the abstract knowledge intrinsic to the “management of violence” (1985, p. 11). Specifically, Huntington (1985) outlines three characteristics of professionalism; expertise, responsibility, and corporateness, which he believes distinguish the professional from the amateur. He indicates that expertise refers to “specialized knowledge and skill in a significant field of human endeavor” (p. 8). He states that responsibility implies that a professional is a “practicing expert, working in a social context, and performing a service, such as the promotion of health, education, or justice, which is essential to the functioning of society” (p. 9). Finally, Huntington describes professional corporateness as the
shared “sense of organic unity and consciousness of themselves as a group apart from layman” (p. 10) that the members of a profession possess.

Abbott (1988) believes that the key aspect of professions is their ability to acquire and control various types of knowledge, and as will be discussed shortly, their ability to compete for and maintain a dominance over their specialized knowledge. Professional dominance over a given area of abstract knowledge is important because as Freidson states, “knowledge is power” (1986, p. 1), consequently, the ability of a profession to sustain its societally granted “jurisdiction” is dependent upon its ability to expand this knowledge base while concurrently maintaining the profession’s mastery of it (Abbott, 1988). Gargan concurs and indicates that when “a profession’s extant core knowledge and associated substantive, methodological, and theoretical issues are undergoing attack or rapid change, the profession as a whole must be concerned with the emergent knowledge and the mechanisms available for transmitting the new knowledge to students and to practitioners in the field” (1998, p. 1090). These foregoing statements highlight three key aspects of professionalism: expertise, legitimacy, and jurisdiction, which Abbott (1988) states represent the environment within which professions exist. Burk (2002) concurs with Abbott and states that when a given occupation can be characterized by these three prescriptive factors, then that occupation can be said to have achieved the status of a profession.

**Expertise**

As discussed above, human expertise within a given domain of abstract knowledge sets the professions apart from more traditional occupations. “More so
than occupations or organizations, professions focus on developing their expert knowledge in individual members so they can apply specific expertise in a professional practice” (Snider, 2003a). Henry states that professions “try to achieve status by refining their work content; the body of knowledge and expertise that must be learned in order to be professional grows with each passing year and becomes increasingly academic in character” (1980, p. 248). Consequently, professions can be characterized by a commitment to experimentation and innovation. Their long-term focus is directed toward the acquisition of new skills, knowledge, and resources. Professions, by their very nature, encourage individual initiative, freedom, and autonomy (Mosher, 1982; Schon, 1983; Freidson, 1986; Abbott, 1988; Brody, 1989; Brien, 1998; Martin and McCausland, 2002).

By traditional definition, professional practice is considered to be essential to the functioning of society and usually exceeds the capabilities of the average citizen because of the extensive amount of education, which frequently takes years to complete and is normally representative of a lifelong vocation (Abbott, 1988; Mosher, 1982; Freidson, 1986; Burrage and Torstendahl, 1990, Snider, 2003a). Due to the inherent requirement for individual professionals to maintain a high level of expertise, professions dedicate significant resources to the initial and recurring training of their members, especially new members (Huntington, 1985; Snider, 2003a). The continuous education which occurs over the lifetime of individual professionals is commonly referred to by the U.S. Army as professional development (FM 22-100, 1999). Professional development includes the moral obligation to generate a professional ethic and to promulgate standards of practice that are in
keeping with the public trust. If professions uphold their social responsibility and sustain the public’s trust, then “[w]estern societies generally grant a large degree of autonomy to set standards, to police their ranks, and to develop their future members” (Snider, 2003a, p. 4).

Additionally, the ability of a profession to maintain the legitimacy and autonomy to exercise its esoteric knowledge for the benefit of society is dependent upon the profession’s continuous capacity to expand the boundaries of its current knowledge base and to acquire new and more specialized skills (Mosher, 1982; Beckman, 1990). Mosher (1982) emphasizes this point by stating that professions display several common characteristics, one of which is the necessity for the professions to enhance their stature within society and to strengthen their public image as seen by society. Additionally, Mosher states that:

A prominent device for furthering this goal is the establishment of the clear and (where possible) expanding boundaries of work within which members of the profession have exclusive prerogatives to operate. Other means include: the assurance and protection of career opportunities for professionals; the establishment and continuous elevation of standards of education and entrance into the profession; the upgrading of rewards (pay) for professionals; and the improvement of their prestige before their associates and before the public in general (1982, p. 117).

Brien (1998) concurs with this assessment and emphasizes that one of the principal characteristics of professions, in addition to their esoteric knowledge, is a formal structured process to attain this knowledge through research and application. There is also an expectation to pass these new skills and knowledge on to a new generation of professionals through a variety of formalized educational programs, institutions, and professional schools. Cook highlights the importance of professional formal
education by stating that entry “into any profession is a kind of initiation into a body of knowledge primarily, if not exclusively, generated, transmitted, and built upon by fellow members of the profession” (2002, p. 345). This nearly exclusive generation and promulgation of the profession’s esoteric knowledge is of particular importance to this study. Specifically, this paper seeks to provide empirical support indicating that the future success of a professional organization is dependent upon the congruence between an organization’s culture and the manner in which its senior leaders are prepared to manage the uncertainty and ambiguity of tomorrow through formalized professional development programs.

The significance of the necessity for professions to continuously expand the boundaries of their esoteric knowledge and specialized skills lies in the concept of legitimacy, which provides justification for “what professions do and how they do it” (Abbott, 1988, p. 184). Underlying this monopoly of specialized esoteric knowledge are the interrelated concepts of trust and social responsibility. Together, legitimacy, trust, and social responsibility are the focus of the next section of this chapter.

**Legitimacy**

When society grants to a profession the privilege of exercising nearly monopolistic authority and autonomy in an area of expert knowledge such as law, medicine, and national defense, the profession is seen to be operating as a legitimate agent of society (Freidson, 1986). Trust forms the foundation upon which this symbiotic relationship is built. Consequently, the professions are afforded a high degree of autonomy, to include self-regulation, licensing, regulation of the conduct of
individual members, and the development of professional skills and a professional ethic. In return, they pledge to society that the members of the profession will act in an altruistic manner for the benefit of society (Brien, 1998). Collins and Jacobs state that all “professions worthy of the name have an explicit or implicit ethical code, a code of conduct that governs members in relation to the profession’s client system” (2002, p. 40). Snider (2003a) concurs and indicates that professions dedicate significant portions of their professional development programs to training of professional ethics and standards of practice for the explicit purpose of maintaining a high level of trust between the profession and society.

**Professional Military Legitimacy**

The United States military can trace its legal and ethical heritage to the Constitution. Among the many unique provisions of this amazing document, two are particularly pertinent to the topic of legitimacy. The Congress was given the power to raise and support armies and to maintain a Navy, and the President was designated as the Commander-in-Chief of the Army, Navy, and of the Militia of the several states, when called into actual service of the United States. More specifically, civilian control of the armed forces and a reliance on the citizen soldier were two uniquely American concepts and are of supreme significance (FM 100-1, 1994). The organization and structure of the military has changed dramatically since the Constitutional Convention in 1787; however, its primary purpose has remained unchanged: to provide for the common defense by fighting and winning our nations wars and protecting our way of life for us and our posterity.
Huntington (1985) and Waldo (1980) state that the modern military officer is a member of a highly trained professional vocation. The Army profession will be discussed in greater detail later in this chapter. Gabriel (1992) agrees with Huntington and Waldo and expounds on their definition by stating that the professional military vocation is unique in that its primary purpose is to direct the management of social violence, potentially sacrificing the lives of its members, in pursuit of national security. As derived from the Constitution, military officers are ultimately responsible to society, through its political agent, the state, for their professional skills, technical competence, and behavior. Military officers are constantly aware that the skills they possess must be continually renewed, expanded, and continuously mastered. Additionally, military professionals are acutely aware that the full measure of their professional skills can only be exercised, other than in training, when appropriate approbation has been received from the state. They are also cognizant of their responsibility to the military as a profession as specified in a number of regulations, customs, traditions, and the military ethos. The officer’s oath of commission, as outlined below, requires two primary commitments: First, it identifies the Constitution as the object of the officer’s allegiance. Second, it charges the officer to faithfully perform his professional duties.

I ______, (having been appointed an officer in the Army of the United States,) do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reserve or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office upon which I am about to enter; SO HELP ME GOD.
This sworn allegiance is not given to any person or geographical territory per se; instead, it is given to the principles and values delineated by our Founding Fathers in the Constitution, to include the provisions for later interpretation and modification for the protection and preservation of our American values, ideals, and our way of life. Therefore, as with all other government agencies, the people place a tremendous measure of trust in the officer corps, primarily for their safety. Society fully expects its military professionals to prepare adequately for war but to take every effort to promote peace. Society expects military leaders to be frugal with public funds and other resources, and they certainly have every right to believe that officers will use their authority to ensure that America’s servicemen and women are properly trained and cared for. America also expects its military leaders to be magnanimous in combat, respecting all human life and property. To summarize, the military profession, as do all professions, has a social responsibility that unequivocally sets it apart from other occupations (Huntington, 1985; Martin and McCausland, 2002; Mattox, 2002).

Americans have high expectations of their military professionals and consequently this social responsibility affords them with an enormous amount of authority and responsibility. Accordingly, the stress associated with frequent deployment, hazardous training, command, authoritarian and hierarchical organizational structure, and especially combat, produce peculiar moral problems and ethical dilemmas that for the most part are only experienced by military professionals. Consequently, Stayton states that “[h]aving entered into a trust relationship with society in which essential services are promised [safety and the common defense], the
[military] professional assumes a moral obligation to fulfill those promises” (1998). Therefore, as long as society continues to perceive that professions exercise their specialized skills and esoteric knowledge in a manner that benefits society, then society will continue to grant legitimate authority and autonomy to those professions (Abbott, 1988; Middlehurst and Kennie, 1997).

Professions compete for social legitimacy and professional jurisdiction in their existing fields of esoteric knowledge as well as in new fields of knowledge (Snider, 2003a). “A professional jurisdiction is defined by the boundaries of the domain within which expert knowledge is applied” (Burk, 2002, p. 29). A classic example of jurisdictional competition can be seen today in the debates between physicians and HMOs over who has the right to make patient-care decisions (Schon, 1983; Eve and Hodgkin, 1997; Snider, 2003a). Professional jurisdiction is the third key aspect of professions as outlined by Abbott (1988) and it is the subject of the next section of this paper.

**Jurisdiction**

Abbott states that “diagnosis, treatment, inference, and academic work provide the cultural machinery of jurisdiction” (1988, p. 59). What sets this professional process apart from occupations is the fact that social problems such as medical health, legal interpretation, and national defense do not have routine solutions. For example, when senior military officers are preparing a combat plan to provide to the President, they are relying on an esoteric body of knowledge that has been developed and refined for thousands of years on how to fight wars. However,
each situation requires an in-depth analysis, a “diagnosis” of all current and potentially relevant factors such as the readiness of military units, geography, logistical support, international support, local nation support, to name only a few. Operation Iraqi Freedom is an excellent case-in-point. Using this diagnostic process, which includes the vast experience of thousands of military professionals, senior military leaders develop a combat campaign plan, which in the professional vernacular is a “treatment” as described by Abbott above. Once the treatment is implemented, another analysis of the effectiveness of that treatment is initiated, and Abbott calls this analysis process “inference.” The U.S. Army refers to these analyses as “after-action-reviews,” which is a process they use to provide lessons learned to the Army profession (FM 22-100, 1999). Finally, the entire “diagnosis, treatment, inference” process becomes the basis of the formalized professional development programs of the various professions. These experiences frequently become articles in professional journals or become the content of professional training courses thereby expanding the professional body of knowledge for future professionals to learn as they progress through their initial or recurrent training programs (Schon, 1983; Abbott, 1988).

The greater the success that professions achieve in solving complex social problems the greater the probability that they have of achieving professional legitimacy as described in the previous section above (Freidson, 1986; Abbott, 1988). Professional legitimacy enables professions to claim control of a particular kind of work such as medicine, law, or national defense. Abbott states that:

In claiming jurisdiction, a profession asks society to recognize its cognitive structure through exclusive rights; jurisdiction has not only a
culture, but also a social structure. These claimed rights may include absolute monopoly of practice and of public payments, rights of self-discipline and of unconstrained employment, control of professional training, of recruitment, and of licensing, to mention only a few…This control means first and foremost a right to perform the work as it wishes, a profession normally also claims rights to exclude other workers as deemed necessary, to dominate public definitions of the tasks concerned, and indeed to impose professional definitions of the tasks on competing professions. Public jurisdiction, in short, is a claim of both social and cultural authority (1988, pp. 59 and 60).

Professions compete for jurisdictional control with other professions and with newly developing technologies, organizations, and occupations (Abbott, 1988; Collins, 1990; Broadbent, et al, 1997). Those professions that fail to successfully compete or that become overly bureaucratized “may very well die, losing their status as a profession” (Martin and McCausland, 2002, p. 429). Abbott (1988) states that abstract knowledge, the continuous expansion of that knowledge base, and the practical professional skills that grow from this system enable a profession to successfully defend its jurisdiction from encroachment by others. Senge (1994) emphasizes that the successful organizations of the future will be those that can be characterized as learning organizations. Senge defines a learning organization as:

…an organization that is continually expanding its capacity to create its future. For such an organization, it is not enough to merely survive. ‘Survival Learning’ or what is more often termed ‘adaptive learning’ is important – indeed it is necessary. But for a learning organization, ‘adaptive learning’ must be joined by ‘generative learning,’ learning that enhances our capacity to create (1994, p. 14).

As such, LeBoeuf (2002) emphasizes that professions and professional organizations must be characterized as learning organizations whose primary focus is directed toward the constant growth of their expertise, practical professional skills, and the knowledge base that underlies their expertise. Martin and McCausland (2002) agree
with LaBoeuf. They emphasize that the task of ensuring that professional
organizations stay focused on a strategy of “learning” (Senge, 1994) and “reflection-
in-action” (Schon, 1983) falls unequivocally to the senior and strategic leaders of the
organization. Specifically, Martin and McCausland state that:

Clearly one of the most vital tasks of those leading a profession at the
strategic level is to tend to the dynamic nature of change that affects
the particular tasks it is called upon to perform, as well as the
associated knowledge base…In other words, unless the strategic
leaders of the profession tend to the profession’s body of expert
knowledge and its effective application to new situations and tasks by
the members of the profession, they run the risk of competing poorly
and declining is standing, or legitimacy, with their client [society]

Additionally, Martin and McCausland emphasize that the strategic leaders of
professional organizations “must provide purpose, direction, energy, motivation,
inspiration, and a clear professional identity (2002, p. 429)” to the members of the
profession. They must do this by shaping the professional culture, and by providing a
strategic vision for the profession which underscores the necessity for expanding the
profession’s expert knowledge base and practical professional skills. Martin and
McCausland (2002) state that organizational strategic leaders must remain acutely
aware that status of the profession’s legitimacy and jurisdictional competitions will
ultimately determine the future survival of the profession as it navigates through the
ambiguity of its strategic external environment. A practical example of these
concepts can be seen in the strategic transformation plan for the U.S. Army as
envisioned by General Shinseki and as discussed in the prologue of this paper.

General Shinseki sought to convince the Army profession that it must transform itself
into a fighting force that can be characterized by flexibility and adaptability;
otherwise he believed that the U.S. Army would become irrelevant as America’s premier guarantor of freedom (Jablonsky, 2001). General Shinseki understood the concepts of professional expertise, social legitimacy, and jurisdictional competition as outlined in the previous paragraphs. Through his strategic vision for the U.S. Army, he was attempting to comply with the admonitions for professional survival as briefly discussed by Martin and McCausland (2002) above.

The preceding paragraphs have provided a brief review of the professional literature as it pertains to all professions in general. While this review highlights a number of perspectives and theories that are generally held in agreement, they are not to be considered as totally representing all theories of professionalism or necessarily all competing viewpoints. What they do provide is the starting point for the concept of professionalism and professional development which is a key component of the present analysis. Consequently, the final section of this chapter provides a more detailed review of the literature concerning the Army as a profession and why the professional characteristics of expertise, legitimacy, and jurisdiction are as important to the preservation of the Army profession as they are to any other profession. Additionally, this final section will provide a synthesis of the organizational culture and professional development literature furnishing an appreciation for why this present study was undertaken.

The Army Profession

“To call an occupation a ‘profession’ is usually to make a positive normative judgment about the work being done, and since we think that professional work is a
social good, whatever we call professional work also reveals something about what we believe is required for the well-being of society” (Burk, 2002, p. 19). When Huntington states that “[t]he modern officer corps is a professional body and the modern military officer a professional man (1985, p. 7)” he too is making this distinction and he is ascribing to the military profession those seven criteria of professionalism as identified by Gargan (1998) earlier in the previous sections of this paper. In addition to Huntington’s (1985) analysis, a great deal of the extent literature indicates that the officer corps of the U.S. military constitutes a profession (Huntington, 1985; Janowitz, 1971; Freidson, 1973; Mosher, 1982; Schon, 1983; Freidson, 1986; Abbott, 1988; Abbott, 2002; Segal and Bourg, 2002; Snider and Watkins, 2002; Snider, 2003a). Finally, the Army acknowledges its professional status by stating that the Army’s professional purpose is “to serve the American people, protect our enduring national interests, and fulfill our national military responsibilities. The Army, with the other Services, deters conflict, reassures allies, defeats enemies, and supports civil authorities” (FM 1, 2001, p. 25). Consequently, this study accepts the premise that there is an Army profession, which this author believes has been satisfactorily argued by many theorists as identified in this paper and as history has proven as well.

The Army as a profession is focused on the development and application of the esoteric knowledge and related practical professional skills of land warfare (Snider, 2003a). The U.S. Army has a social responsibility to the people of the United States of America to fight and win the nation’s wars and to preserve and protect the American way of life. In addition, the Army profession maintains a
professional ethic of selfless service that is committed to the prevention of abuse of its authority and power (FM 22-100, 1999). While it may not be obvious to the casual observer, the Army professional jurisdiction is in constant competition with other professions to include (Brinsfield, 2002): the naval (to include the Marine Corps) and air professions, foreign military services, “other government agencies, private contractors, and nongovernmental organizations, both American and international” (Snider and Watkins, 2002, p. 7).

Since the collapse of the Soviet Union the U.S. Army has been characterized as being “strategically immobile to be fully relevant to the new global situations” (Snider and Watkins, 2002, p. 7). Additionally, after outlining a number of Army successes in Operations Iraqi and Enduring Freedom, Gordon and Sollinger ask “[h]ow is it, then, that according to many reports the Army is perceived by senior defense policymakers as unimaginative, obstructionist, and wedded to concepts of warfare that are increasingly irrelevant to the geopolitical environment” (2004, p. 33)? Perhaps, the answer can be found in the professional literature outlined above, where as indicated, those professions who fail to expand their professional esoteric knowledge base and their related practical professional skills are destined to lose social legitimacy and ultimately professional jurisdiction, which are likely to result in professional atrophy and death (Martin and McCausland, 2002). In response to this apparent lethargy, Cook (2002) emphasizes that the main challenge confronting Army professionalism today is the necessity for the profession to emphatically embrace the rapidly evolving nature of the external strategic environment. Accordingly, the Army profession must encourage intellectual professional development and the
transformation of its practical professional skills in such a manner as to become adaptable, innovative, and flexible in the face of this constantly changing external environment. Cook (2002) indicates that there are benefits to analyzing the Army profession through the “expertise, legitimacy, and jurisdiction” model as explicated by Abbott. Specifically, Cook states that:

The benefit of viewing professions through Abbott’s lens is that it avoids viewing the professions statically and ahistorically. Rather, it sees the profession as evolving through time in interaction with its environment and with other claimants to the profession’s jurisdiction. At the root of the challenge to Army professionalism is the necessity to create and sustain the intellectual creativity to get ahead of environmental changes, to embrace them, and to demonstrate the intellectual flexibility to inspire the nation’s confidence that it can meet the demands of the changing security environment with enthusiasm. Such a profession transmits and extends its corporate culture and its developing intellectual engagement with a body of expert knowledge into the future (2002, p. 353).

The significance of the preceding comments lies in their admonition for the furtherance of professional intellectual skills and the necessity to pass this knowledge on to succeeding generations of professionals as well as to pass on a culture of innovation. Wong emphasizes the necessity for professional innovation by stating that the Army profession “will require a change in the way the Army approaches problems and issues. It will require changing the Army’s culture to one where subordinates are free to innovate” (2002, p. 30). The ability to fully understand the strengths and weaknesses of the Army’s culture and to inculcate into that culture a level of readiness and willingness to adapt to the rapidly changing external environment is one of the most significant challenges facing the Army’s professional strategic leaders today (LeBoeuf, 2002). “The strategic leadership of the Army must reinforce and sustain a military that promotes the evolution of professional expertise”
(LeBoeuf, 2002, p. 495), particularly that which emphasizes professional
development for its senior leaders and the attendant practical professional skills that
translate esoteric knowledge into application. However, there is reason to believe that
the strategic leaders of the Army profession either do not fully understand the
significance of the professional development process or they simply do not support it
(ATLDP, 2001; LeBoeuf, 2002). For example, LeBoeuf (2002) states that personnel
assignments that give little consideration for the professional development of junior
professionals by “simply injecting warm bodies into required slots” is an all too
frequent example of the lack of senior leader support for professional development
(2002, p. 493). Consequently, the implication of the organizational culture and
professional literature discussed so far indicates that the:

Army cannot train its way out of these problems, but must include a
substantial educational and developmental component for all of the
profession’s members. Actions must be top-down, with strategic
leaders creating conditions for change, and bottom-up, with junior
officers educated, trained, and developed in a manner more consistent
with the demands of the profession and Army transformation

Since strategic leaders are tasked with understanding the tenets of
professionalism and with fully understanding the strengths and weaknesses of the
Army’s culture (Martin and McCausland, 2002), they must be aware of the
“powerful, latent, and often unconscious set of forces… [that]…determine strategy,
goals, and modes of operating” (Schein, 1999, p. 14), such as the content,
implementation, and results of professional development programs.

The nexus of organizational culture and professional development is the
principal focus of the present study. As such, there has been little effort to link the
future development of organizational leaders with the existing culture (Reichers and Schneider, 1990). The research hypotheses outlined in Chapter 1 of this paper summarize the general theorization that organizational culture, those taken-for-granted, deep basic underlying assumptions within an organization (Schein, 1992), unconsciously influences the formulation of the training and professional development that future organizational leaders are provided to help them promote organizational interests well into the future. Until now, this relationship has been more assumed than validated.

Army Organizational Culture and Professional Development

The present study conducts an analysis of the level of congruence between the organizational culture of the U.S. Army and the professional development of its senior leaders. The purpose of this study is to determine if the organizational culture of the U.S. Army is supportive of the professional development of its officer corps in general, but more specifically, its senior level officer corps, the future leaders and protectors of the Army profession. As implied by Snider and Watkins (2002), Builder (1989), and by recent acerbic remarks from the Secretary of Defense, Donald Rumsfeld (Galloway, 2003), there is a great deal of concern that the U.S. Army officer corps is at risk of transitioning from a professional organization to that of an obedient bureaucracy (LeBoeuf, 2002). If such a transition were to occur, it is postulated that the bureaucratic form of organization will stifle the development of professional military knowledge, and practical professional skills, particularly the abstract knowledge of the management and conduct of land warfare (Janowitz, 1971;
Schon, 1983; Huntington, 1985; Snider and Watkins, 2002; Wong, 2002).

Additionally, Wong (2002) indicates that there is a concern that the ability of the Army profession to develop innovative strategies to cope with the changing national security environment will be at risk if a cultural shift was allowed to occur from that of a profession to that of a bureaucratic organization emphasizing standard operating procedures, and the “application of knowledge embedded in organizational routine and process” (Snider and Watkins, 2002, p. 8). Mattox (2002) concurs and states that if the leadership of the U.S. Army were to experience a cultural shift from that of a profession to that which is more representative of bureaucratic efficiency and routine then it is very possible that the implicit ethical internal controls on individual behavior may be lost, such as the adherence to a professional ethic and to standards of conduct. This suggests that the U.S. Army profession is currently able to minimize the potential for an extensive abuse of authority and power through a professional set of values and ethics (Mattox, 2002; Toner, 2002; Cook, 2002). Mattox underscores the significance of the Army’s professional moral obligation to society by stating that:

…the officer’s oath of office assumes a much deeper moral significance than some may suppose. Properly understood, the oath taken by Army officers to ‘support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies foreign and domestic’ comprehends not only the governmental structure itself but also all the ideals of government and the way of life (including the protection of all those beliefs and practices that make human flourishing—morality—possible) implicit in them (2002, p. 300).

The events surrounding the recent prison scandal in Abu Ghraib prison, Iraq, exemplifies the necessity for the “social control of individuals within an institution capable of terrible destruction” (Snider and Watkins, 2002, p. 11), and capable of a dreadful abuse of human rights. The hierarchical nature of the bureaucratic form of
organization and its focus on efficiency and a “do more with less” philosophy creates a psychological distance between organizational members and their work. Unlike bureaucracies, the key to professional organizations is their emphasis on the continuous development and expansion of their esoteric knowledge and on their commitment to social responsibility as manifested through a professional ethic and through the promulgation of professional standards of conduct (Cook, 2002; Mattox, 2002; Snider and Watkins, 2002; Toner, 2002). Unlike professions, organizational members of a bureaucracy strive for machine-like efficiency and survival. Consequently, these members view themselves as employees of the organization instead of actually being the organization. As a result, individual commitment, accountability, and organizational identity are minimized (Peters, 1989). Snider and Watkins emphasize that “[w]ith regard to social control, by nurturing the profession’s ethic within its members, a profession offers a better means of shaping human behavior in situations of chaotic violence, stress, and ambiguity than bureaucratic management can ever hope to achieve” (2002, p. 11). The appalling prisoner abuse at the Abu Ghraib prison in Iraq may very well be a manifestation of Snider and Watkins’ warning that “the Army profession is seriously compromised by excessive bureaucratization of major leadership and management systems” (2002, p. 11). This ominous observation has prompted a call for the Army’s strategic leaders to cultivate two vital professional characteristics: the development and adaptation of the profession’s expert knowledge, and the development of “the members of the profession in order that such expert knowledge can be applied in the form of
professional practice” (Martin and McCausland, 2002, p. 432), and practical professional skills.

In an effort to close the gap between an apparent imbalance between what the Army profession says that it is and what it appears to be in actual practice, the U.S. Army has commissioned several studies that have attempted to investigate the organizational culture of the Army. However, these studies have tended to be more focused on the concept of “organizational climate” than on organizational culture (CSIS, 2000; ATLDP, 2001; Snider and Watkins, 2002). Unlike organizational culture, organizational climate is an assessment of how individuals feel about the organization to include such things as “the physical layout and the way in which members of the organization interact with each other” (Schein, 1992, p. 9). Schneider (1990) states that because of the deep basic underlying assumptions held at the unconscious level organizational culture exists at a higher level of abstraction than that of organizational climate. He indicates that climate is a manifestation of organizational culture in that it “focuses on organization members’ perceptions of the way things are” (p. 23). However, Schneider also indicates that the concepts of culture and climate have a substantial degree of overlap, which is one of the reasons many authors use the terms interchangeably. However, being aware of and understanding these differences and similarities is necessary for a greater appreciation of the more complex construct of organizational culture.

The CSIS study commissioned by the Department of Defense has determined that the existing culture of the military is out of step with its professed values. For example, the CSIS found that “[s]ome officers and NCOs in the field and fleet have
views on the condition of the force that are at odds with those expressed by senior military leaders in Washington…[the survey] data in this [study] do not contradict the theme of mistrust between top military leaders and some officers and NCOs” (2000, p. 71). Additionally, it concluded that the psychological environment in which individual behavior occurs (organizational climate), if not modified, will result in a degradation of the U.S. Army’s professional culture over time (CSIS, 2000; Snider and Watkins, 2002). The study strongly indicates that a professional military culture does exist. However the fundamental values that underscore the professional nature of the military are coming under increasing levels of stress, particularly because of excessive deployments such as stability operations like Operation Iraqi Freedom, which may result in undesirable cultural changes, as pointed out above (CSIS, 2000).

The U.S. Army field manual discussing leadership emphasizes the importance of leader development as a keystone to professional efficacy. Specifically, the following passage extracted from the field manual underscores the criticality of adequately preparing tomorrow’s leaders today:

The nation expects military professionals as individuals and the Army as an institution to learn from the experience of others and apply that learning to understanding the present and preparing for the future. Such learning requires both individual and institutional commitments. Each military professional must be committed to self-development, part of which is studying military history and other disciplines related to military operations. The Army as an institution must be committed to conducting technical research, monitoring emerging threats, and developing leaders for the next generation. Strategic leaders, by their example and resourcing decisions, sustain the culture and policies that encourage both the individual and the Army to learn (FM 22-100, 1999, p. 7-25).

In their book discussing culture, careers, and climate in the Australian Army, Jans and Schmidtchen stress that a professional military career development program
“is the major conduit by which Army cultural values are translated into professional behavior” (2002, p. 103). Their evaluation underscores the significance of the present study by indicating that professional development is the process whereby current organizational culture is converted into future professional behavior. Jans and Schmidtchen emphasize that a formalized program of professional development produces both desirable and undesirable outcomes. For example, professional development programs reinforce the Army’s culture of professionalism and community, both of which are desirable. However, the programs also strengthen the aspects of the organization’s culture that encourage hierarchy, conservatism, and an emphasis on rules and structure, which are inimical to professionalism. Figure 2.2 provides a graphic representation of the relationship among organizational culture, professional development programs, and the resulting leadership / managerial skills that underscore professional behavior. As depicted, professional behavior rests upon a number of several key influences, the foundation of which is provided by organizational culture. As indicated throughout the organizational culture literature discussed in this paper, organizational culture permeates all aspects of organizational behavior. Consequently, it can be likened to the foundation or the primary building block upon which organizational behavior is built. In Figure 2.2 it can be seen that organizational values and ethics rest upon the foundation provided by organizational culture. In the case of the U.S. Army, the Army espouses seven institutional values and ethics: loyalty, duty, respect, selfless service, honor, integrity, and personal courage through the use of the acronym “LDRSHIP” (FM 22-100, 1999). As mentioned previously, values guide organizational members to strive toward what
ought to be as opposed to what is (Schein, 1992). Upon these key values, the Army has built its professional development program, which consists of two pillars: formal training and informal training.

![Figure 2.2. A Model Depicting the Influences on Professional Behavior. (Adapted from FM 22-100. Army Leadership: Be, Know, Do. Washington, D.C.: Headquarters, Department of the Army, 1999, p. 5-14).](image)

Formal training is comprised of institutional training such as officer basic courses, advanced leadership courses such as those provided by the U.S. Army War College, and additional skill-qualification courses. Informal training is achieved by providing officers with a career of worldwide operational assignments with ever-increasing levels of authority and responsibility, and the associated personnel policies that directly impact development such as the annual Officer Evaluation Reports. Informal training also includes individual self-development such as an officer earning
an advanced degree on his or her own time, and mentoring programs where senior officers give career guidance and counseling to junior officers. Professional development training programs are designed to impart the necessary managerial and leadership skills to the officer corps so that these Army professionals will routinely exhibit professional behavior and ultimately providing strategic guidance and leadership for the U.S. Army as a profession well into the future (FM 22-100, 1999).

Shamir, et al emphasize the necessity for Army professional development by stating that:

> The military organization of the future is likely to be much more ‘organic’ in nature. Organic organizations are characterized by a more flexible division of labor, decentralization of decision-making, low reliance on formal authority and hierarchy and on rules and regulations to coordinate work, and greater reliance on non-restricted, two-way, informal communication and coordination systems (1999, p. 27).

Consequently, the adequate and appropriate development of Army professionals is a necessity if the Army profession expects to obtain societal approbation for its legitimacy as the premier instrument of American land warfare and to maintain its jurisdiction as such (Cook, 2002). Since organizational culture pervades all that organizations do, it is logical that the Army professional managerial / leadership skills that were nurtured through the professional development program have been influenced by the Army culture (LeBoeuf, 2002). Since there is virtually no empirical evidence discussing the relationship between organizational culture and professional development, this study was initiated to begin to fill that theoretical gap. Therefore the next chapter outlines the methodological procedures employed by this study to identify the level of congruence between the Army culture and the professional managerial / leadership skills of the Army’s senior leaders.
A Review of the CVF Model and the Study Methodology

An Overview of the Competing Values Framework (CVF) Model

The Competing Values Framework (CVF) evolved from the work of Quinn and Rohrbaugh (1981, 1983) as they attempted to circumscribe the elusive definition for a generally agreed upon theoretical framework of the concept of organizational effectiveness. This framework was chosen for this study because it was experimentally derived and found to have a high degree of face and empirical validity. Additionally, the CVF was identified as having a high level of reliability matching or exceeding that of other instruments commonly used in the social and organizational sciences (Cameron and Ettington, 1988; Cameron and Quinn, 1999; Berrio, 2003). The four quadrants of the framework, representing the four major cultural types: clan, adhocracy, market, hierarchy, provide a robust explanation of the differing orientations and competing values that characterize human behavior. The richness provided by the CVF is based on its ability to identify the basic assumptions, orientations, and values of each of the four cultural types. These three elements comprise the core of organizational culture. “The OCAI, therefore, is an instrument that allows you to diagnose the dominant orientation of your own organization based on these core culture types. It also assists you in diagnosing your organization’s cultural strength, cultural type, and cultural congruence” (Cameron and Quinn, 1999, p. 33). Through the use of the OCAI and its associated MSAI, this study identifies
the cultural type of the U.S. Army, as defined by the study population, and the
managerial / leadership skills of its senior leaders, thereby establishing the level of
congruence between culture and professional development as depicted by the building
block model graphically portrayed in Figure 2.2 above.

In their research concerning organizational effectiveness, Quinn and
Rohrbaugh (1981, 1983) statistically analyzed 39 indicators of organizational
effectiveness as identified by Campbell, et al. (1974). Quinn and Rohrbaugh’s
analysis resulted in the bifurcation of the 39 effectiveness criteria between two major
dimensions. The first dimension, which is labeled the “Structure” dimension,
differentiates the organizational effectiveness criteria between those that emphasize
flexibility, discretion, and dynamism and those that emphasize stability, order, and
control. The second dimension, which is labeled the “Focus” dimension,
differentiates the organizational effectiveness criteria between those that emphasize
internal orientation, integration, and unity and those effectiveness criteria that
emphasize an external orientation, differentiation, and rivalry (Quinn and Rohrbaugh,
1981 and 1983; Cameron and Quinn, 1999). Within each of these two dimensions
there is also a third set of values, which produces an emphasis ranging from
organizational processes, such as planning and goal setting at one end of the
spectrum, to an emphasis on results, such as resource acquisition at the other end.
Quinn and Rohrbaugh (1981) labeled this third set of values as the organizational
“Means –Ends” continuum. The two primary dimensions differentiating between
organizational values emphasizing “Structure” and “Focus” produce four clusters of
effectiveness criteria as depicted in Figure 3.1. The “Structure” axis is represented
by the “Flexibility – Control” continuum, while the “Focus” axis is represented by the “People – Organization” continuum in **Figure 3.1**. Within each of these four quadrants the relevant “Means – Ends” values are enumerated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Human Relations Model</th>
<th>Open Systems Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flexibility</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Means</strong>: Cohesion; morale</td>
<td><strong>Means</strong>: Flexibility; readiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ends</strong>: Human resource development</td>
<td><strong>Ends</strong>: Growth; Resource acquisition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>People</strong></td>
<td><strong>Organization</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Means</strong>: Information management; communication</td>
<td><strong>Means</strong>: Planning; Goal setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ends</strong>: Stability; Control</td>
<td><strong>Ends</strong>: Productivity; efficiency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal Processes Model</th>
<th>Rational Goal Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 3.1.** A Summary of the Competing Value Sets and Effectiveness Models (Quinn & Rohrbaugh, 1981, p. 136).

Cameron and Quinn state that the significance of these clusters of organizational effectiveness criteria is that they “represent what people value about an organization’s performance. They define what is seen as good right and appropriate…[and they]…define the core values on which judgments about organizations are made” (1999, p. 31). Additionally, these quadrants represent opposite or competing values or assumptions. As you move, from left to right along the “Focus” (People – Organization) continuum or axis of the chart the emphasis shifts from an internal focus within the organization to that of an external focus.
outside the organization. As you move from the bottom of the chart along the “Structure” (Flexibility – Control) continuum or axis the emphasis shifts from control and stability within the organization and the environment to that of flexibility and discretion within the organization and the environment. The diagonal dimensions also produce conflicting or competing values. For example, the values in the upper right quadrant emphasize an external focus concerned with flexibility and growth, while the values in the lower left quadrant accentuate an internal focus with control and stability (Quinn and Rohrbaugh, 1983). Hence, the competing or contradictory values in each quadrant form the basis for the “Competing Values Framework” name of the conceptual model upon which the present study is based.

In their initial study, Quinn and Rohrbaugh (1981) also provided a brief review of four competing theoretical models of organizational effectiveness (Literature discussing these four models can be found elsewhere: Georgopoulos and Tannenbaum 1957; Lawrence and Lorsch 1967; Thompson, 1967; Yuchtman and Seashore, 1967; Mott, 1972; Price, 1972; Steers, 1975; Campbell, 1977; Katz and Kahn 1978; Cameron and Whetten, 1983; Pasmore, 1988; Anspach, 1991; Scott, 1992): the rational goal model, the open system model, the human relations model, and the internal process model, and they demonstrated how each of these four models was related to the four quadrants of their CVF model, see Figure 3.1. In their analyses, Quinn and Rohrbaugh (1981, 1983) illustrate the importance that the human relations model places on internal flexibility, cohesion, morale, and human resource development and correlate it to the upper left-hand quadrant of their CVF model. The upper right-hand quadrant of the CVF model is correlated with the open systems
model, which highlights the significance of external flexibility, readiness, growth, and resource acquisition. The lower left-hand quadrant of the CVF model is correlated with the internal process model, which underscores the significance of internal control, stability, information management, and communication. Finally, Quinn and Rohrbaugh state that the lower right-hand quadrant of their CVF model is correlated with the rational goal model, which underscores the importance of external control, planning, goal setting, productivity, and efficiency. **Figure 3.1** provides a summary of the competing values sets and the four organizational effectiveness models. The significance of these four quadrants is that they represent how “over time, different organizational values have become associated with different forms of organization…[and that]…each quadrant represents basic assumptions, orientations, and values—the same elements that comprise an organizational culture” (Cameron and Quinn, 1999, pp. 32-33).

**Origins of the Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument – OCAI**

In 1985, Quinn and McGrath used the CVF model of organizational effectiveness, outlined above, to develop their theory concerning the transformation of organizational cultures. They stated that their study was “interested in the contradiction, tension, and paradox that leads to transformation” (1985, p. 315). Specifically, they were attempting to develop an analytical scheme based on Janusian\(^1\) thinking (Rothenberg, 1979), which “is a complex process in which two apparently contradictory ideas or concepts are conceived to be equally operative, therefore, paradoxical. It involves the generation of a simultaneous antithesis, the
integration of opposites” (Quinn and McGrath, 1985, p. 316). This concept is analogous to “double-loop learning” as described by Argyris and Schon, who indicate that “[d]ouble-loop learning changes the governing variables (the settings) of one’s programs and causes ripples of change to fan out over one’s whole system of theories-in-use” (1974, p. 19). In other words, double-loop learning challenges an organization’s past success and the basic norms, values, and assumptions that underlie that success by continuously evaluating alternatives. As theorized by Quinn and McGrath, such a continuous evaluation of organizational processes and behaviors will eventually generate a shift (a transformation) of organizational culture. Consequently, their cultural transformation theory implies the simultaneous existence of competing values within any organization; hence, their preoccupation with contradiction and paradox (Quinn and Cameron, 1988). This perspective helps to explain why, as will be seen later, the OCAI identifies the relative preference and strength of competing cultural types within organizations. In other words, organizations have predominant cultural types, but they also exhibit at the same time characteristics of the other cultural types but to a lesser degree. Also, organizations may exhibit differing predominant cultural types depending on a given situation in which the organization finds itself.

Using the existing scholarly literature explicating different forms of organization, Quinn and McGrath identified four main organizational forms, which they believe correlate with key management theories concerning organizational success, leadership roles, quality, and management skills (Cameron and Quinn, 1999). Consequently, they labeled these forms based on the key characteristics of
organizational values that have over time become associated with these organizational forms, and they are: clan, adhocracy, hierarchy, and market, see Table 3.2 labeled “Four Types of Organizational Forms.” Table 3.1, labeled “Transactional Expectations or Governing Rules,” identifies the characteristics or profiles of four transactional systems or cultural biases: Rational Culture, Ideological Culture, Consensual Culture, and Hierarchical Culture, which are deeply held organizational values that determine identity, power, and satisfaction within an organizational setting. For example, in a rational culture, the organizational purpose is the pursuit of objectives. In a hierarchical culture, the organizational purpose is based on the execution of regulations. Quinn and McGrath (1985) found that these four transactional expectations were related to the four types of organizational forms, which are highlighted in Table 3.2, labeled “Four Types of Organizational Forms.” By reading down the columns, you can see for example that the “Market” organizational form is representative of a rational culture, and that the “Adhocracy” organizational form is representative of an ideological culture, and so on. Cameron and Quinn indicate that the four quadrants developed by the CVF model matched “precisely the main organizational forms that have developed in organizational science” (1999, p. 32), as identified by Quinn and McGrath in Tables 3.1 and 3.2. The resulting hybrid model has become the foundation of Cameron and Quinn’s (1999) OCAI see Figure 3.2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Purpose</th>
<th>Rational Culture</th>
<th>Ideological Culture</th>
<th>Consensual Culture</th>
<th>Hierarchical Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pursuit of objectives</td>
<td>broad purposes</td>
<td>group maintenance</td>
<td>execution of regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria of Performance</td>
<td>productivity, efficiency</td>
<td>external support, growth, resource acquisition</td>
<td>cohesion, morale</td>
<td>stability, control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of Authority</td>
<td>the boss</td>
<td>Charisma</td>
<td>membership</td>
<td>Rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base of Power</td>
<td>competence</td>
<td>Values</td>
<td>informal status</td>
<td>technical knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Making</td>
<td>decisive pronouncements</td>
<td>intuitive insights</td>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>factual analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Style</td>
<td>directive, goal oriented</td>
<td>inventive, risk oriented</td>
<td>concerned supportive</td>
<td>conservative, cautious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td>contractual agreement</td>
<td>commitment to values</td>
<td>commitment from process</td>
<td>surveillance and control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of Members</td>
<td>tangible output</td>
<td>intensity of effort</td>
<td>quality of relationship</td>
<td>formal criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate Motives</td>
<td>achievement</td>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>affiliation</td>
<td>Security</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1. Transactional Expectations or Governing Rules from Quinn and McGrath, 1985, p. 327.
### Table 3.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Four Types of Organizational Forms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Market</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technology (Perrow, 1967)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effectiveness Model (Quinn and Rohrbaugh, 1983)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Orientation (Miles and Snow, 1978)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type (Oliver, 1982)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Illustration</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2. Four Types of Organizational Forms from Quinn and McGrath, 1985, p. 327.
Cameron and Quinn (1999) emphasize that each of the four quadrants of the OCAI represents basic assumptions, orientations, and values, which as the literature review of this study has identified, represent the same elements that define organizational culture. Figure 3.3 provides a detailed organizational culture profile for each of the four dominant cultural types as identified in Figure 3.2. Therefore, Cameron and Quinn state that the OCAI “is an instrument that allows you to diagnose the dominant orientation of your own organization based on these core culture types. It also assists you in diagnosing your organization’s cultural strength, cultural type, and cultural congruence” (1999, p. 33). Using the OCAI and its associated graph as depicted in Figure 3.5 (which is discussed in the next section), cultural strength is
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Clan Culture.</th>
<th>The Adhocracy Culture.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A very friendly place to work where people share a lot of themselves. It is like an extended family. The leaders, or the heads of the organization, are considered to be mentors and perhaps even parent figures. The organization is held together by loyalty or tradition. Commitment is high. The organization emphasizes the long-term benefit of human resources development and attaches great importance to cohesion and morale. Success is defined in terms of sensitivity to customers and concern for people. The organization places a premium on teamwork, participation, and consensus.</td>
<td>A dynamic, entrepreneurial, and creative place to work. People stick their necks out and take risks. The leaders are considered innovators and risk takers. The glue that holds the organization together is commitment to experimentation and innovation. The emphasis is on being on the leading edge. The organization’s long-term emphasis is on growth and acquiring new resources. Success means gaining unique and new products or services. Being a product or service leader is important. The organization encourages individual initiative and freedom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hierarchy Culture.</td>
<td>The Market Culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A very formalized and structured place to work. Procedures govern what people do. The leaders pride themselves on being good coordinators and organizers who are efficiency-minded. Maintaining a smooth-running organization is most critical. Formal rules and policies hold the organization together. The long-term concern is on stability and performance with efficient, smooth operations. Success is defined in terms of dependable delivery, smooth scheduling, and low cost. The management of employees is concerned with secure employment and predictability.</td>
<td>A results-oriented organization whose major concern is with getting the job done. People are competitive and goal-oriented. The leaders are hard drivers, producers, and competitors. They are tough and demanding. The glue that holds the organization together is an emphasis on winning. Reputation and success are common concerns. The long-term focus is on competitive actions and achievement of measurable goals and targets. Success is defined in terms of market share and penetration. Competitive pricing and market leadership are important. The organization style is hard-driving competitiveness.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 3.3.** The Organizational Culture Profile (Cameron & Quinn, 1999, p. 58).

determined by the resulting score awarded to the four cultural types. “The higher the score, the stronger or more dominant is that particular culture” (Cameron and Quinn, 1999, p. 63). Cultural type is determined by an OCAI profile plot in the quadrant with the highest resulting score. Finally, cultural congruence is determined by an analysis of the various components of an organization. For example, if the marketing and sales divisions of an organization both produce similar OCAI profile plots then those two organizational sub-units are considered to have cultural congruence. In the case of the Army profession, this study conducts a demographic analysis to see if the
various professional sub-components, i.e. branch, sex, source of commission, type of student, etc. reflect organizational congruence or not. The significance of organizational congruence is that “[h]aving all aspects of the organization clear about and focused on the same values and sharing the same assumptions simply eliminates many of the complications, disconnects, and obstacles that can get in the way of effective performance” (Cameron and Quinn, 1999, p. 64).

The OCAI uses an ipsative rating scale that requires the respondent to “identify the trade-offs that actually exist in the organization” (Cameron and Quinn, 1999, p. 144). In other words, the ipsative scale allows the respondent to identify the simultaneous existence of the preference for different cultural types. This implies, as indicated in the literature, that a variety of cultural types (competing values) may exist in each organization, but to different degrees or strength. In short, each organization will have a unique cultural profile. The ipsative scale allows the respondent to differentiate between four different alternative responses to a given question by assigning a relative percentage to each of the alternatives. The percentages given to all four alternative responses must total 100 thereby allowing the respondent to indicate the cultural type and strength that exists within their organization. See Appendix A for copy of the OCAI used in the present study.

An Overview of the Management Skills Assessment Instrument – MSAI

As stated earlier, organizational culture is normatively defined as the deeper level basic assumptions and beliefs that are shared by organizational members (Schein, 1985). A significant aspect of this definition is the emphasis on “shared.”
Organizational behavior is manifested by individual behavior that reinforces and is consistent with the deep-level, basic underlying assumptions that constitute the organization’s culture (Schein, 1999). Consequently, any change in organizational culture will be inhibited if organizational members do not modify their individual behavior to be compatible with the new cultural values (Cameron and Quinn, 1999). Cameron and Quinn state that:

It is possible to identify a desired culture and to specify strategies and activities designed to produce change, but without the change process becoming personalized, without individuals being willing to engage in new behaviors, without an alteration in the managerial competencies demonstrated in the organization, the organization’s fundamental culture will not change (1999, p. 105).

Consequently, Cameron and Quinn developed the MSAI using the same framework as that of the OCAI in order to help managers and leaders identify the necessary skills and competencies that they must either develop or improve to facilitate an organizational culture change effort. The MSAI can also be used to enhance leadership abilities to improve organizational performance within the context of a current culture if a cultural change is not necessary. Based on an analysis of 15 studies, which researched the managerial leadership skills characteristic of a number of highly effective managers and organizations worldwide, Whetten and Cameron (1998) interviewed over 400 top executives to identify which skills were most important for individual leadership success (Cameron and Quinn, 1999). Cameron and Quinn consolidated the resulting list of successful leadership skills into a set of 12 competency categories which are mainly applicable to mid-level and upper-level managers (1999). See Figure 3.4 for the 12 competency categories and their associated primary OCAI category. Table 3.3 provides a detailed list of the 12
critical managerial competency categories and a brief description of the individual characteristics, which comprise these categories.

**Figure 3.4.** A Model of the 12 Critical Managerial Competencies and their Related CVF Cultural Types (Cameron and Quinn, 1999, p. 108).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Twelve Competency Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CLAN QUADRANT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Teams (MT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Interpersonal Relationships (MIR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing the Development of Others (MD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADHOCRACY QUADRANT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Innovation (MI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing the Future (MF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Continuous Improvement (MCI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MARKET QUADRANT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Competitiveness (MC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energizing Employees (EE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Customer Service (MCS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HIERARCHY QUADRANT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Acculturation (MA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing the Control System (MCS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Coordination (MC)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 3.3. The Twelve Critical Managerial Competency Categories and their Associated Characteristics (Cameron and Quinn, 1999, pp. 108 – 109).*
The MSAI assesses managerial behavior and actions, but it does not measure managerial style or attitudes. See Appendix B for copy of the MSAI used in the present study. The instrument itself is comprised of 87 “Likert scale” type questions with a range of 1 to 5. However, only questions 1 through 72, and 76 through 87 are used with the actual MSAI and associated with the four OCAI cultural types for a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Twelve Competency Categories</th>
<th>MSAI Question Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CLAN QUADRANT</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Teams</td>
<td>12, 18, 21, 22, 49, 61, 76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Interpersonal Relationships</td>
<td>1, 13, 23, 48, 50, 62, 77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing the Development of Others</td>
<td>5, 20, 24, 25, 47, 63, 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADHOCRACY QUADRANT</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Innovation</td>
<td>2, 8, 9, 26, 51, 64, 79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing the Future</td>
<td>14, 27, 28, 45, 46, 65, 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Continuous Improvement</td>
<td>29, 44, 52, 53, 59, 66, 81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MARKET QUANDRANT</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Competitiveness</td>
<td>15, 30, 35, 43, 60, 67, 82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energizing Employees</td>
<td>3, 6, 7, 31, 42, 68, 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Customer Service</td>
<td>32, 33, 41, 54, 55, 69, 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HIERARCHY QUADRANT</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Acculturation</td>
<td>10, 11, 34, 40, 56, 70, 85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing the Control System</td>
<td>4, 16, 19, 36, 39, 71, 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Coordination</td>
<td>17, 37, 38, 57, 58, 72, 87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.4. The Twelve Critical Managerial Competency Categories and their Associated MSAI Questions (Cameron and Quinn, 1999).
total of 84 questions, seven questions for each of the 12 critical managerial competency categories. See Table 3.4 for a breakdown of which questions are associated with each of the 12 critical managerial competency categories.

The original intent of the MSAI was for it to be used as a 360-degree evaluation instrument. This means that the MSAI was to be completed by the individual leader being evaluated as well as by a subordinate, a peer, and a supervisor of the leader in question. The primary objectives of this technique are to identify the competencies that are needed to support an organizational change process as well as to identify those competencies that will be the most useful for the preferred cultural type as identified by the OCAI (Cameron and Quinn, 1999). The 360-degree technique provides the leader with a more complete and unbiased assessment of the leader’s current skills and capabilities. However, this study only uses the self-assessment aspect of the MSAI. The will not be the first time that only the self-assessment process has been used, as indicated by personal communication between Professor Cameron and the author of this study (2003). The basic underlying theory of the MSAI evaluation process is not compromised through the use of the self-assessment portion of the process only. The only disadvantage that may be experienced by the use of the self-assessment process instead of the 360-evaluation procedure is that the relative strength of the skills cannot adequately be evaluated just by the self-assessment. However, the relative strength of these skills is not being evaluated by the present study; rather, the presence of various critical managerial competencies and the OCAI quadrant within which they lie are the crucial components of this analysis.
Methodology of the Study

As stated at the beginning of this paper, the primary research question of this study is: **Is the organizational culture of the U.S. Army congruent with the professional development of its senior level officer corps?**

The present study is based upon a quantitative evaluation of the current and preferred culture of the U.S. Army as identified by its senior level leaders. For the purpose of this study, the study population is defined as all U.S. Army lieutenant colonels and colonels who were actively enrolled as students of the U.S. Army War College Master of Strategic Studies program, Classes of 2003 and 2004 as of May 1, 2003. These individuals were chosen as the study population because they were previously identified by competitive U.S. Army evaluation boards as having highly successful command and leadership careers and as having the greatest potential for advancement. Collectively, senior service college graduates, such as these cohorts from the U.S. Army War College represent the pool of officers from which the future strategic leaders of the U.S. Army will be selected. Once selected for promotion to general officer, these officers will be charged with shaping the future culture of the U.S. Army and with adequately posturing the Army as an organization and as a profession for successful performance in a highly turbulent national security environment (Magee and Somervell, 1998).

The purpose of the present study is to explore the relationship between organizational culture and professional development and to extend current theory and empirical knowledge concerning this relationship. These objectives will be
accomplished by answering the primary research question through an analysis of four related hypotheses, which are restated below:

**Hypothesis 1:** The current organizational culture of the U.S. Army is not consistent with an organizational culture supportive of professional development.

**Hypothesis 2:** The current organizational culture of the U.S. Army is consistent with that of a hierarchical/bureaucratic organization.

**Hypothesis 3:** The preferred culture of the U.S. Army is consistent with organizational cultures supportive of innovative, risk-taking, boundary spanning, demanding continuous improvement, reflective-in-action, dynamic, and adaptive behavior.

**Hypothesis 4:** The individual professional skills of the U.S. Army senior level officer corps are not characterized by innovative, risk-taking, boundary spanning, demanding continuous improvement, reflective-in-action, dynamic, and adaptive behavior.

**Hypothesis 1:** The current organizational culture of the U.S. Army is not consistent with an organizational culture supportive of professional development.

To address the first hypothesis, a quantitative survey instrument, the OCAI, was administered to 952 U.S. Army War College students as described above. Howard (1998), in his study validating the competing values model as a representation of organizational culture, indicates that his results add empirical integrity to the model. Specifically, he states that “it appears that the competing values perspective provides a valid metric for understanding organizational cultures, comparing organizational cultures, and evaluating organizational cultures relative to other variables” (1998, p. 245). Berrio (2003) concurs, and he indicates that the OCAI was an invaluable tool in his study, which described the dominant culture type
of the Ohio State University Extension. For the purposes of this study, and in accordance with Schein’s (1992) model, the concept of organizational culture is conceptualized as having three levels: artifacts, values, and deep basic underlying assumptions, see Figure 1.2. Additionally, this study supports the Competing Values Framework (CVF) as identified and described by Quinn and Rohrbaugh (1981, 1983) earlier in this chapter. The CVF approach has been identified as being highly successful as an “underlying framework, a theoretical foundation that can narrow and focus the search for key cultural dimensions” (Cameron and Quinn, 1999, p. 29). The purpose of the CVF is “to diagnose and facilitate change in organizational culture” (Cameron and Quinn, 1999, p. 29). The Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument (OCAI), as established by Cameron and Quinn (1999) and as outlined earlier in this study, is used to operationalize the concept of organizational culture as defined by the CVF. The type of culture as identified by the respondents for both the “Now” and “Preferred” cultures will be plotted on the CVF graph as developed by Cameron and Quinn (1999) and as portrayed in the following sample plot, Figure 3.5.
Professional development is normatively conceptualized by the U.S. Army as the process whereby the leaders of tomorrow are identified, trained, developed, and assigned to increasingly responsible duty positions for the purpose of being prepared to perform duties at the highest levels of the organization. Additionally, the concept of professional development includes the advancement of those skills that support innovative, flexible, risk-taking, visionary, and entrepreneurial behavior (Argyris and Schon, 1974; Schon, 1983; Mosher, 1982; Huntington, 1985; Freidson, 1986; Senge,
Specifically, the U.S. Army states that the:

…driving principle behind Army leader development is that leaders must be prepared before assuming leadership positions; they must be competent and confident in their abilities…In turn, leader development rests on a foundation of training and education, expectations and standards, and values and ethics. This foundation supports the three leader development pillars: institutional training (schooling), operational assignments, and self-development (FM 22-100, 1999, p. 5-14).

For the purposes of this study, a culture that is supportive of professional development is operationalized as being reflective of the “adhocracy” cultural type as indicated by the results of the OCAI on either the “Now” or “Preferred” ratings. As indicated in Hypothesis 1 it is anticipated that the “Now” plot for the study population of this study will not reflect an adhocracy cultural type for the U.S. Army. Additionally, the operationalization of the concept of professional development will be accomplished through the use of Cameron and Quinn’s MSAI, which is specifically pertinent to Hypothesis 4.

Hypothesis 2: The current organizational culture of the U.S. Army is consistent with that of a hierarchical/bureaucratic organization.

Schein states that inattention “to social systems in organizations has led researchers to underestimate the importance of culture – shared norms, values, and assumptions – in how organizations function” (1996, p. 229). Concurrently, the U.S. Army’s Training and Leader Development Panel (ATLDP) concluded that the gap between the Army’s professed ideals and its actual practices in the areas of training and leader development has spread outside the officer corps’ “band of tolerance.” What this means is that the difference between the Army profession’s “espoused
values,” those that they publicly promulgate as organizational principles, and the Army profession’s “theories-in-use,” those values that actually guide behavior, (Argyris, 1976; Argyris and Schon, 1974) are no longer in agreement with each other. Snider and Watkins emphasize the significance of this discrepancy by stating that “[f]rom the members of the Army officer corps, as the commissioned agents of the American people responsible for the continued stewardship of the profession and for the development of the sons and daughters of America who serve in it, more is expected, legally and morally” (2002, p. 16). The principal thesis of their work is that since “the continual development of military expertise and effective control of an Army operationally engaged on behalf of American society are both essential to the nation’s future security, a nonprofessional Army is certainly not in America’s best interest” (2002, p. 12). Snider and Watkins also bolster General Shinseki’s desire to transform the Army by stating that to “remain relevant to the nation it serves and to effect the transformation that it plans, the Army must renew its essence as a profession” (2002, p. 12). Schon reiterates the need for professional organizations to renew their essence as a profession by being reflective-in-action and by avoiding the pitfalls of embedded organizational knowledge. In other words, successful practices from the past must be continuously challenged, evaluated, and if necessary changed, to ensure success in the future. Schon states that “the technological extension of bureaucracy, which reinforces the confinement of professional work to precisely defined channels of technical expertise, exacerbates the inherent conflict between bureaucracy and professional identity” (1983, p. 337). Hypothesis 2 suggests that the current culture of the U.S. Army as indicated by the “Now” plot on the OCAI chart
will reflect the hierarchy cultural type. If this is found to be the case, the CVF model indicates that a plot in the **Hierarchy** quadrant is the antithesis of the adhocracy cultural type, which is the theoretically preferred dominant cultural type for professional organizations as the literature review of this study has demonstrated. Review Figure 3.5 for an example of a “Now” plot on the OCAI chart.

**Hypothesis 3:** The preferred culture of the U.S. Army is consistent with organizational cultures supportive of innovative, risk-taking, boundary spanning, demanding continuous improvement, reflective-in-action, dynamic, and adaptive behavior.

A review of several significant U.S. Army leadership publications indicates that the Army is acutely aware of the type of values, practical professional skills, and behavior that are necessary for its senior and strategic level leaders to exhibit for the Army as a profession to be successful well into the future (AR 600-100, 1993; Field Manual 22-100, 1999; Magee and Somervell, 1998). Argyris and Schon (1974) state that “espoused values” are those values that individuals and organizations give allegiance to and communicate to others. Therefore, it is expected that the first two hypotheses will indicate that the U.S. Army’s culture is not consistent with that of professional organizations as operationalized by the adhocracy cultural type of the OCAI. Assuming that **Hypotheses 1** and **2** are not rejected, therefore providing empirical support indicating that the study population of Army senior leaders perceives the Army’s current culture as being indicative of a hierarchical organization, **Hypothesis 3** postulates that the study population of Army senior leaders also realizes how the culture must be transformed to achieve greater organizational performance, success, and survival (Brown and Dodd, 1998; Berrio,
Hypothesis 3 is validated through the “Preferred” plot of the OCAI, which is intended to be an instrument that enables organizational leaders to determine the direction in which cultural change efforts should be directed (Cameron and Quinn, 1999). Cameron and Quinn state that:

A common mistake in organizations desiring to improve is that they do not take the time to create a common viewpoint among employees about where the organization is starting [the “Now” cultural plot of the OCAI] and where it needs to go [the “Preferred” cultural plot of the OCAI]. Unsuccessful organizations often launch right into a new change program without considering the need to develop a consensual view of the current culture, the need to reach consensus of what change means and doesn’t mean, and the specific changes that will be started, stopped, and continued (1999, p. 92).

Consequently, it is postulated that the preferred culture of the U.S. Army, as perceived by the study population and as indicated by the “Preferred” plot on the OCAI chart, will be representative of the adhocracy cultural type, which is the antithesis of the hierarchical cultural type, and is the direction in which the Army senior leaders believe that the Army profession must be moved to guarantee future success. See Figure 3.5 for an example of a “Preferred” plot on the OCAI chart. As discussed previously, adhocracy cultures are characterized by dynamic, entrepreneurial, creative, risk taking, and innovative behavior that is dedicated to the long-term emphasis of acquiring new knowledge and practical skills (Cameron and Quinn, 1999). Hierarchical cultures are characterized as being formalized organizational structures, with an emphasis on formal rules and policies, and a long-term commitment to stability, and efficient smooth performance (Cameron and Quinn, 1999). It is anticipated that a “Preferred” plot in the adhocracy quadrant is significant for several reasons. First, it indicates that what the Army’s senior leaders
say they will do in a given situation is different than what they will actually do in practice (Argyris and Schon, 1974; Schein, 1985; CSIS, 2000; Watkins and Cohen, 2002). Second, a “Preferred” plot in the adhocracy quadrant would indicate that the study population of U.S. Army senior leaders perceives that the current culture of the U.S. Army is not consistent with the type of culture that is supportive of innovative, adaptive, dynamic, flexible, or forward-looking behavior. This would indicate that the Army’s culture is out of congruence with the national security environment of the 21st century, which is characterized by volatility, uncertainty, complexity, and ambiguity (Magee and Somervell, 1998). Finally, if this hypothesis is not rejected, it implies that the potential for a successful cultural intervention is good because the espoused values of the study population of U.S. Army senior leaders are at least consistent with the cultural type most representative of a professional organization and that there is a level of consensus among those who will be responsible in the near future to facilitate that change. “Particular types of cultures form as a result of certain values, assumptions, and priorities becoming dominant as the organization addresses challenges and adjusts to changes” (Cameron and Quinn, 1999, p. 126).

Consequently, a “Preferred” plot in the adhocracy quadrant demonstrates an appreciation for innovative behavior and a willingness on the part of the Army’s future leaders to embark upon a cultural change effort that would be meaningless without senior leader commitment.
Hypothesis 4: The individual professional skills of the U.S. Army senior level officer corps are not characterized by innovative, risk-taking, boundary spanning, demanding continuous improvement, reflective-in-action, dynamic, and adaptive behavior.

Leader development is an essential component of organizational performance and organizational survival, especially for that of a professional organization (Argyris and Schon, 1974, Schon, 1983; Huntington, 1985; Abbott, 1988; CSIS, 2000; Snider and Watkins, 2002; Martin and McCausland, 2002; Snider, 2003a; Gordon and Sollinger, 2004). As indicated above, and for the purposes of this study, professional development is a process whereby the leaders of tomorrow are identified and prepared to be capable of performing duties at the highest levels of the organization as their career progresses. Specifically, this study uses the U.S. Army’s definition of professional development as stated below:

The driving principle behind Army leader development is that leaders must be prepared before assuming leadership positions; they must be competent and confident in their abilities…In turn, leader development rests on a foundation of training and education, expectations and standards, and values and ethics. This foundation supports the three leader development pillars: institutional training (schooling), operational assignments, and self-development (FM 22-100, 1999, p. 5-14).

The operationalization of the concept of professional development will be accomplished through the use of Cameron and Quinn’s MSAI as outlined in detail beginning on page 109 of this study. The 12 critical managerial competencies for the study population of Army senior leaders, as identified by the MSAI, will be plotted on a chart similar to the OCAI, see Figure 3.6.
Hypothesis 4 suggests that the resulting data as depicted by an MSAI plot will not reflect scores that are consistent with the three critical managerial competencies associated with the Adhocracy quadrant of the OCAI: Managing Innovation, Managing the Future, and Managing Continuous Improvement, see Figure 3.6. If this hypothesis is not rejected then this analysis provides empirical data suggesting that there is a positive correlation between the Army’s existing culture and the type of professional skills that are produced by its professional development training program. It is expected that the respondent scores will be reflective of the three
critical managerial competencies associated with the hierarchical cultural type: Managing Coordination, Managing the Control System, and Managing Acculturation, because it is also hypothesized that the hierarchical cultural type will be reflected by the OCAI as the dominant cultural type as identified by the study population.

**Additional Analysis**

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedures will be used to conduct an in-depth evaluation of the survey instrument response data. Specifically, an evaluation will be conducted to determine if there are any statistically significant differences between the branches of the Army profession (infantry, armor, artillery, etc.), between the three components of the Army profession (active duty, Army National Guard, and Army Reserve), and between key demographic information (sex, rank, age, source of commission, resident student, or distance education student, etc.). [See the “Demographic Information” portion of the MSAI at Appendix B.]

This analysis will help to determine if there is a homogeneous professional Army culture. Four separate classes of students at the U.S. Army War College have been selected for the study in order to control for the effect of the actual War College education itself, which is a significant component of the Army’s senior level professional development program. The first group of students is from a resident class within two weeks of graduation. The second group of students is comprised of members of a distance education class within two weeks of graduation. The third group of students is taken from a distance education class that is midway through their two-year program. The final group of students is taken from a resident class that has just
begun their War College program. An analysis of the managerial / leadership skills of the Army’s senior leaders has important considerations for the overall study because it will evaluate whether or not the Army’s professional development program generates consistent values throughout the U.S. Army officer corps. An analysis of variance (ANOVA) of the demographic data provided by the respondents will provide some indication of the impact that sub-cultural influence may have on a homogeneous Army culture. For example, do infantry officers perceive the cultural type to be different than do medical corps officers? Do women officers perceive the cultural type to be different than do male officers? From a practical perspective it is theorized that if a homogeneous culture does exist within the senior level officer corps, even if those values are not congruent with that of a professional organization, then the potential for a successful cultural intervention is favorable. If it is determined that the Army officer corps is comprised of numerous sub-cultures whose values and basic underlying assumptions are dramatically different from one another, a cultural intervention would be far more difficult. This difficulty would arise because of the necessity to diagnose the specifics of the underlying differences and to develop a change strategy that addresses each of these differences, as opposed to changing one relatively homogeneous culture. It is interesting to note that Gailbreath, et al, in their study using the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI), concluded that “in the Army, as in some other organizations, forces toward homogeneity have created limited diversity in top management” (1997, p. 229). The negative aspect of behavioral homogeneity is that the behavioral flexibility of a profession’s senior leaders is restricted and as a result organizational effectiveness suffers (Gailbreath, et
al, 1997; Kirkpatrick and Locke, 1991). Consequently, if a homogeneous culture is desired, it is important to emphasize the development of a culture that has reflexive thinking as a core value and a basic underlying assumption. For the purposes of this study, it is hypothesized that the adhocracy cultural type, as identified by the OCAI, is a culture type that is supportive of continuous improvement and reflexive thinking and is most representative of professional organizations, to include the officer corps of the U.S. Army who represent the Army profession.

Reliability and Validity of the OCAI / MSAI Model

Reliability

“In the abstract, reliability is a matter of whether a particular technique, applied repeatedly to the same object, would yield the same result each time” (Babbie, 1992, p. 129). In other words, reliability measures are used to determine the degree to which an instrument measures what it purports to measure and does so each time the instrument is administered (Cameron and Quinn, 1999). In the case of the present study, reliability refers to the extent to which the OCAI / MSAI consistently measures organization cultural types. As a caveat, it should be understood that reliability alone does not guarantee accuracy any more than a bathroom scale whose calibration is out of adjustment. The scale may reliably indicate the same weight every time that it is used, but every time it would be wrong. Consequently, Cronbach’s alpha is one of the most commonly used reliability coefficients to determine the internal consistency of a particular instrument (Norusis, 1994).
Cronbach’s alpha “can be viewed as the correlation between this test or scale and all other possible tests or scales containing the same number of items, which could be constructed from a hypothetical universe of items that measure the characteristic of interest” (Norusis, 1994, p. 147). In relation to the OCAI / MSAI, Cronbach’s alpha is a satisfactory statistic to determine if the study population of the Army’s senior leaders rated the Army profession’s culture consistently across all of the different questions used in the survey instruments. The Cronbach’s alpha score computed for the present study will be discussed in Chapter 4, “Findings and Analysis.” However, a variety of studies have already computed Cronbach’s alpha indicating that “sufficient evidence has been produced regarding the reliability of the OCAI to create confidence that it matches or exceeds the reliability of the most commonly used instruments in the social and organizational sciences” (Cameron and Quinn, 1999, p. 140). A sampling of these studies includes Quinn and Spreitzer’s (1991) study where 796 executives from 86 different public utility firms rated their organization’s culture. The resulting coefficients were: .74 for the clan culture, .79 for the adhocracy culture, .73 for the hierarchy culture, and .71 for the market culture (Cameron and Quinn, 1999, p. 139). Each of these scores was statistically significant and compared very well to traditional standards of reliability. In the Yeung, et al (1991) study, 10,300 executives in 1,064 businesses, including many Fortune 500 companies, rated their organization’s culture with the following Cronbach’s alpha coefficients: .79 for the clan culture, .80 for the adhocracy culture, .76 for the hierarchy culture, and .77 for the market culture. Once again, the coefficients exceeded normal standards of statistical significance. In their study investigating the culture of higher education
institutions, Zammuto and Krakower (1991) had 1,300 respondents who rated the organizational culture of their academic institutions. The resulting Cronbach’s alpha coefficients were computed for their study as follows: .82 for the clan culture, .83 for the adhocracy culture, .67 for the hierarchy culture, and .78 for the market culture. Finally, in Berrio’s (2003) study evaluating the organizational culture of the Ohio State University Extension, 297 respondents completed the OCAI with the following Cronbach’s alpha scores for the current culture and they were: .80 for the clan culture, .75 for the adhocracy culture, .62 for the hierarchy culture, and .90 for the market culture. The Cronbach’s alpha scores for the preferred culture of the Ohio State University Extension were: .77 for the clan culture, .72 for the adhocracy culture, .79 for the hierarchy culture, and .84 for the market culture. In conclusion, their appears to be sufficient evidence supporting Cameron and Quinn’s claim (1999, p. 140) that the reliability of the OCAI / MSAI instruments match or exceed the reliability of the most commonly used instruments in the social and organizational sciences.

Validity

“In conventional usage, the term validity refers to the extent to which an empirical measure adequately reflects the real meaning of the concept under consideration” (Babbie, 1992, p. 132). For the purposes of the present study, validity pertains to the ability of the OCAI to truly measure the four types of organizational culture: clan, adhocracy, hierarchy, market (Cameron and Quinn, 1999). Cameron and Quinn (1999, p. 144) state that like the tests of reliability for the OCAI, numerous
studies have been accomplished providing empirical evidence that the OCAI does in fact measure what it is supposed, that is “key dimensions of organizational culture that produce a significant impact on organizational and individual behavior” (1999, p. 144). The results of several of these studies are indicated as follows. Cameron and Freeman (1991) conducted an organizational analysis of 334 institutions of higher education with a total of 3,406 respondents. Their data supported the conclusion that institutions with a dominant clan culture were characterized by high cohesion and collegiality in decision-making; organizations with a dominant adhocracy culture were characterized by innovation and initiative; organizations with a dominant market-type culture were characterized by aggressiveness and competition; and finally, organizations with a dominant hierarchy culture were characterized by tight fiscal control and efficiency. These findings are very consistent with the Competing Values Framework and with its related “Transactional Expectations or Governing Rules” as enumerated in Table 3.1 providing a degree of criterion validity to the OCAI. In another study, Quinn and Spreitzer (1991) provided evidence of both convergent and discriminant validity. Using a multitrait-multimethod analysis, Quinn and Spreitzer (1991) found that convergent validity of the OCAI was supported when diagonal correlation coefficients produced statistically significant results ($p < .001$) that produced a moderate degree of correlation between .212 and .515. Discriminant validity was supported when 23 of 24 comparisons between OCAI scales and scores with separate culture analysis instruments produced consistent expectations of organizational culture type. In a related test to determine discriminant validity, Quinn and Spreitzer (1991) report that Kendall’s coefficient was used to determine the level
of concordance between each of the independent methods used in the discriminant analysis producing a score of \(0.764 (p < 0.001)\) indicating a strong support for both convergent and discriminant validity of the OCAI.

Finally, Collett and Mora (1996) conducted a psychometric analysis of the MSAI to answer the following research question: “Does the MSAI measure management skills that match the Competing Values Framework” (Cameron and Quinn, 1999, p. 146)? In this study, Collett and Mora implemented a new statistical technique called the “Within-Person Deviation Score or D-Score” (Collett and Mora, 1996). The results of their analyses demonstrated strong OCAI / MSAI quadrant correlation with the Competing Values Framework. As expected, there were high negative correlations between diagonal quadrants; for example, between the Adhocracy and Hierarchy quadrants, and between the Clan and Market quadrants. Additionally, as expected, there were smaller but negative correlations between adjacent quadrants; for example, between Adhocracy and Market, Market and Hierarchy, Hierarchy and Clan, and Clan and Adhocracy. Finally, the study produced strong positive correlation coefficients within quadrants. For example, the three competencies that form the Clan quadrant; managing teams, managing interpersonal relations, and managing the development of others (see Table 3.3 and Figure 3.4) had strong “D-Score” correlations among themselves. Consequently, Cameron and Quinn state that:

In sum, these analyses provide strong support for the MSAI as an instrument that can assist the culture change process. It maps very well the relationships among quadrants and competency dimensions theorized by the Competing Values Framework. The critical management skills being assessed by the instrument possess the same theorized relationships to one another as to the culture quadrants. It
[the MSAI] may be used with some confidence, then, in assisting managers to develop competencies that will foster culture change in desired directions (1999, p. 152).

In conclusion, if the OCAI and MSAI are to be useful tools in an organizational culture change effort, then these instruments must be able to measure organizational culture and managerial leadership skills (validity) and they must be able to do so reliably (reliability). The evidence provided in this chapter supports the assertion that there is a high level of confidence that the OCAI is both a reliable and a valid measure of organizational culture type, strength, and congruence, and that the MSAI is a reliable and valid measure of the management skills that match the Competing Values Framework, which underscores the quadrant development behind the OCAI model.
Timeline of the Study
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Figure 3.7. Research Timeline and Data Collection Plan
Chapter 4

FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

While the preceding chapters provided the background, the research questions, the literature review, and the methodology for the present study, the purpose of this chapter is to report the findings of the present research and to provide an analysis of the results as they pertain to the research questions and hypotheses.

As indicated in the introduction and methodology chapters of this paper, four classes of U.S. Army War College\(^1\), Master of Strategic Studies degree program students were given an anonymous opportunity to complete the Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument (OCAI) and the Management (Leadership) Skills Assessment Instrument (MSAI). The study population of U.S. Army officers in these four classes consisted of 952 students (N=952). From this study population a total of 533 (n=533) survey instruments were returned for a response rate of 56%. There were no unusable survey responses returned. The demographics of the respondent population (n=533) are virtually identical to the study population (N=952). This finding is not surprising due to the relatively high response rate of 56%. For example, males comprise 93% of the study population and 87.8% of the respondent population. Infantry officers comprise 13.2% of the study population and 13.1% of the respondent population, and for a final example, Caucasian officers comprise 84.6% of the study population and 87.6% of the respondent population. Table 4.1 provides a detailed demographic summary of the parameters of the 952 students in the study population and the statistics of the 533 survey respondents. A close
inspection of this data reveals that in all categories the respondent population is nearly identical to that of the study population.

Table 4.1
Demographics of the Study and Respondent Populations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>Study Population</th>
<th>Percent of Study Population</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Percent of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>87.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 &amp; Under</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 – 35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 – 38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 – 41</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 – 44</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 – 47</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 – 50</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 50</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COL</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTC</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>63.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Defense</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjutant General</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army Nurse</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armor</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aviation</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Affairs</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaplain</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineers</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Artillery</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infantry</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge Advocate</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Corps</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Intelligence</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Police</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Services</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordnance</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quartermaster</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Forces</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographics Continued</td>
<td>Study Population</td>
<td>Percent of Study Population</td>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>Percent of Respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Branch Continued</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of Commission</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Academy</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROTC</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>58.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCS</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Commission</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>87.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Pacific Islander</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Component</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Army</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>42.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAR</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAR Title 10</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARNG</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARNG Title 10 &amp; 32</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>USAWC Class</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>44.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>55.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of USAWC Student</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance Education</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>61.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>65.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4.1.** Demographics of the Study and Respondent Populations

Since it is the intention of this study to generalize its findings to that of the larger study population, the representativeness of the respondents, as reflected by the
demographic data provided above, is noteworthy. However, it is important to state at this time that the findings of this study are not intended to be representative of all U.S. Army lieutenant colonels and colonels. As indicated in Chapters 1 and 3, these lieutenant colonels and colonels were chosen as the study population because they were previously identified by competitive U.S. Army evaluation boards as having highly successful command and leadership careers and as having the greatest potential for advancement. Consequently, they have already been distinguished as not being representative of all U.S. Army lieutenant colonels and colonels.

Collectively, senior service college graduates, such as these cohorts from the U.S. Army War College represent the pool of officers from which the future strategic leaders, general officers, of the U.S. Army will be selected. By definition then, these 533 respondents can be considered representative of the future leaders of the U.S. Army. That is why their collective perceptions of the Army’s professional culture and of their own managerial / leadership skills are of such significance to this study.

Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument (OCAI): Findings and Analysis

OCAI / MSAI Reliability Tests

Data supporting the validity and reliability of the OCAI and MSAI survey instruments are well established (Berrio, 2003) and were documented in Chapter 3 of this paper. However, this study also conducted reliability tests using Cronbach’s alpha, which is a satisfactory statistic to determine if the respondents of the study population of the Army’s senior leaders rated the Army profession’s culture
consistently across all of the different questions used by the two survey instruments.

The results of these tests demonstrate strong internal reliability and are very consistent with previous results. The reliability coefficients for the OCAI are summarized in Table 4.2 and in Table 4.3 for the MSAI.

### Table 4.2

**OCAI Reliability Coefficients Using Cronbach’s Alpha Methodology**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Culture Type</th>
<th>Reliability Coefficients “Now”</th>
<th>Reliability Coefficients “Preferred”</th>
<th>Comparison Reliability Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*1 *2 *3 *4 *5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clan</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.74 .79 .82 .80 .77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adhocracy</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.79 .80 .83 .75 .72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.71 .77 .78 .90 .84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchy</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.73 .76 .67 .62 .79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Table 4.3

**MSAI Reliability Coefficients Using Cronbach’s Alpha Methodology**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Culture Type</th>
<th>MSAI Reliability Coefficients for the 12 Competency Categories (See Table 3.3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M T MI M D MI M F MC EE M CS M A M CS M C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clan</td>
<td>.73 .72 .78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adhocracy</td>
<td>.79 .83 .79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market</td>
<td>.82 .73 .81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

.73 .78 .76
As indicated in Table 4.2, Cronbach’s alpha was used to determine the reliability coefficients for both the OCAI “Now” and “Preferred” series of questions, and these reliability scores are listed for each cultural type in their respective column. Additionally, Table 4.2 also provides comparative reliability coefficients from five previous studies. The results of this study are very consistent with the previous data and provide strong support for Cameron and Quinn’s (1999) assertion that the OCAI is a reliable instrument that measures culture types consistently.

Table 4.3 provides Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficients for the 12 MSAI competency categories as reported in the Methodology chapter of this paper. As a review, the three competency categories for the Clan culture type are: Managing Teams (MT), Managing Interpersonal Relationships (MIR), and Managing the Development of Others (MD). The three competency categories for the Adhocracy culture type are: Managing Innovation (MI), Managing the Future (MF), and Managing Continuous Improvement (MCI). The three competency categories for the Market culture type are: Managing Competitiveness (MC), Energizing Employees (EE), and Managing Customer Service (MCS). Finally, the three competency categories for the Hierarchy culture type are: Managing Acculturation (MA), Managing the Control System (MCS), and Managing Coordination (MC). Just like the results for the OCAI, the MSAI reliability coefficients strongly support Cameron and Quinn’s (1999) contention that the MSAI is a reliable instrument that measures the strength and weakness of managerial/leadership skills within the four predominant culture types consistently. In conclusion, we can reasonably assume that the questions that comprise the OCAI and the MSAI are, to at least some strong
degree, measuring what each purports to measure, that is, culture type and managerial and leadership skills respectively.

Analysis of the Research Hypotheses

The principal purpose for this study was to answer the following primary research question: **Is the organizational culture of the U.S. Army congruent with the professional development of its senior level officer corps?** In order to answer this question, four research hypotheses were outlined in Chapters 1 and 3 and again below, to empirically test the degree of congruence between the U.S. Army culture and the professional development of its senior leaders. The four research hypotheses are:

**Hypothesis 1:** The current organizational culture of the U.S. Army is not consistent with an organizational culture supportive of professional development.

**Hypothesis 2:** The current organizational culture of the U.S. Army is consistent with that of a hierarchical/bureaucratic organization.

**Hypothesis 3:** The preferred culture of the U.S. Army is consistent with organizational cultures supportive of innovative, risk-taking, boundary spanning, demanding continuous improvement, reflective-in-action, dynamic, and adaptive behavior.

**Hypothesis 4:** The individual professional skills of the U.S. Army senior level officer corps are not characterized by innovative, risk-taking, boundary spanning, demanding continuous improvement, reflective-in-action, dynamic, and adaptive behavior.

**Testing of Hypothesis 1:**

Hypothesis 1 postulates that the current culture of the U.S. Army is not consistent with organizational cultures supportive of professional development. The
data provided in the literature review of Chapter 2 strongly suggests that the “adhocracy” culture type is the culture type, as identified by the Competing Values Framework (CVF) (Quinn and Rohrbaugh, 1983), that is representative of organizational cultures supportive of professional behavior, and that such professional behavior can be characterized as adaptive, innovative, flexible, dynamic, and entrepreneurial. Consequently, Hypothesis 1 assumes that when the OCAI data values for the current culture of the U.S. Army are plotted on an OCAI profile chart that the predominant culture type will not be plotted in the Adhocracy quadrant.

Figure 4.1 depicts the U.S. Army’s current (“Now”) organizational culture archetype, as identified by the 533 (n=533) respondents to this study, as clearly falling into the Market quadrant; the solid lines forming a diamond shape in the graph. The mean scores for each quadrant are: 37.95 for the Market quadrant, 28.84 for the Hierarchy quadrant, 21.17 for the Clan quadrant, and 11.77 for the Adhocracy quadrant. Therefore, Hypothesis 1 is not rejected because the current U.S. Army culture profile did not fall into the Adhocracy quadrant. This is a significant finding because organization’s whose organizational culture can be characterized as “market” cultures are defined as being results-oriented, competitive, goal-oriented, tough and demanding, with an emphasis on winning (Cameron and Quinn, 1999). “The organizational style is hard-driving competitiveness (Cameron and Quinn, 1999, p. 122).” During the initial analysis this finding was somewhat of a surprise. Based on the present researcher’s 23 year career as an Army officer and extensive research with this subject matter the expectation was that the current U.S. Army culture would fall into the Hierarchy quadrant, which is the assumption of
Hypothesis 2. Hierarchical cultures are characterized as being formalized and structured, with an emphasis on formal rules and policies that hold the organization together (Cameron and Quinn, 1999). Hierarchical leaders are proud of being efficient coordinators and organizers. It is no surprise to most organizational theorists that the military has been described as being the model of a rigid hierarchical organization (White, 1997). It is interesting to note that the second highest score

![OCAI Profile Chart for the “Now” U.S. Army Culture](image-url)
given by the U.S. Army respondents for the U.S. Army’s current culture was plotted in the **Hierarchy** quadrant, with the third highest score being plotted in the **Clan** quadrant and the lowest score in the **Adhocracy** quadrant. The magnitude of the ratings in the **Hierarchy** and **Market** quadrants is quite large and indicates the relative cultural strength. The “market” rating is nearly four times greater than the “adhocracy” rating and the “hierarchy” rating is nearly three times greater than the “adhocracy” rating. What the data tell us is that the future senior leaders of the U.S. Army profession clearly perceive that the deep-seated underlying assumptions that comprise the Army culture are focused on organizational stability and control as opposed to innovation, flexibility, and long-term growth.

An analysis of variance procedure (ANOVA) was conducted across all demographic categories to determine if there were any statistically significant differences in the mean scores of these various demographics. There were no statistically significant differences (p≤.05) between respondent’s rank, branch, source of commission, ethnicity, War College class, and type of War College student [See **Appendix D** – ANOVA Tables]. There was a statistically significant finding (p≤.05) that females rated the current culture as lower in the **Clan** and **Adhocracy** quadrants and higher in the **Market** quadrant than did male officers. There was also a statistically significant finding (p≤.05) that officers over 50 years of age found the current culture as being less competitive than did younger officers. Additionally, there was a statistically significant finding (p≤.05) that active duty Army officers perceived the Army culture as being more competitive than did reserve component officers. Finally, there was a statistically significant finding (p≤.05) that Army
officers with a doctoral degree perceived the Army culture as being more hierarchical than did other officers.

It is not surprising those female U.S. Army officers who participated in this study do not find the current U.S. Army culture as friendly and as entrepreneurial as do their male counterparts. Females still experience some degree of gender discrimination in the U.S. Army, and in the military in general, as they do throughout society. Additionally, the U.S. military still prohibits women from entering into a number of military occupational specialties which involve direct ground combat, and which are perceived as being the technical core of the Army profession. Consequently, women perceive a greater level of competition with their male counterparts and they also believe that they must work harder than do their male counterparts to earn the same level of respect. These perceptions are consistent with the findings of the CSIS report on *American Military Culture in the Twenty-First Century* (2000).

The finding that officers over 50 years of age perceive the current culture as being less competitive than do younger officers is also not particularly surprising. Most of these officers are in the twilight of their military careers and are nearing the 30 year mandatory retirement limitation for active duty officers, and the mandatory retirement date for reserve officers. Consequently, it is assumed that they realize that there are few promotion opportunities ahead of them and that they have probably attained the highest rank that they will achieve.

It is postulated that the active duty officers perceive the Army culture as being more competitive because of the demanding “up or out” policy employed by all of the
military services since 1947 (Crawley, 2004). Active duty Army officers are constantly competing with their peers for career enhancing schools, duty assignments such as being a unit commander, and secondary career specialties, all of which are normally required to be accomplished by specified time periods during which various cohorts of officers are considered for promotion. While the standards for promotion are essentially the same for reserve officers the time period constraint as exemplified by active duty promotion boards is not the same or as critical for reserve officers and therefore a reserve officer can be retained in their current rank for much longer periods of time between promotions. Additionally, reserve officers tend to be assigned to a specific unit, usually in the community for which they are a native, for many years as opposed to the months or year or two that active duty officers are assigned. Consequently, the underlying culture of competitiveness, as indicated by this study, is not as prevalent for reserve officers as it is for their active duty counterparts. It is interesting to note that the Department of Defense has just recently approved a limited test for a new officer personnel management policy that would eliminate the “up or out” strategy and change it to a “perform or out” policy (Crawley, 2004). While this is a test program, it addresses the promotion time period issue and allows military professionals to focus on their own individual performance instead of constantly jockeying and competing for the right duty assignment or school “that serve as promotion and command qualification gates rather than opportunities to complete significant developmental experiences based on articulated standards” (LeBoeuf, 2002, p. 495).
The final statistically significant difference indicated by the ANOVA procedures for Hypothesis 1, which indicated that Ph.D.s perceive the Army culture as being more hierarchical than did the remaining officers, is not surprising. Berrio (2003) reported that the prevailing culture of the Ohio State University Extension was a Clan type culture, and Paparone (2003) reported that the dominant culture of the research institute of military senior service college was an Adhocracy type culture. Both of these institutions are predominantly populated by Ph.D.s who value an emphasis on flexibility and discretion and who direct their energies toward the expansion of their esoteric professional knowledge base. Due to their extensive level of education and autonomous research capabilities and preferences, the formalized competitive structure of the U.S. Army is considered to be overly restrictive by the Army professionals with Ph.D.s. It is not surprising that they are more opposed to the bureaucratic desire for stability and control of hierarchical cultures than are the remainder of their officer peers (Paparone, 2003).

In summary, this study found that the dominant organizational culture type and strength, as indicated by the direction and magnitude of the various quadrant scores, of the U.S. Army profession is strongly supportive of stability and control. The Army professional culture can be characterized by an emphasis on hard-driving competitiveness situated in a very formalized and structured place of work.

*Testing of Hypothesis 2:*

Hypothesis 2 is essentially an extension of Hypothesis 1. To some extent the results have already been discussed in the review of the findings for Hypothesis 1.
Hypothesis 2 takes Hypothesis 1 one step further by postulating that the current dominant culture of the Army profession, as perceived by the 533 respondents (n=533) will fall into the **Hierarchy** quadrant. As indicated above, this hypothesis should be rejected, at least on a superficial level, since the score obtained for the **Hierarchy** quadrant was the second highest score and not the highest score.

However, as indicated in the Competing Values Framework (CVF) (Quinn and Rohrbaugh, 1983) organizations can possess competing cultural values at various times or in various sub-units of the organization. The ANOVA procedures outlined in the previous section indicate that there is a clear belief among all ten demographic categories of the Army senior leaders in this study that the dominant Army cultural type falls in the **Market** quadrant with the **Hierarchy** culture type coming in a strong second. The reason that this hypothesis should not be categorically dismissed even though the data do not directly support its premise is that both the “market” and the “hierarchy” cultural types fall below the “internal – external focus” axis which indicates that the Army profession is strongly supportive of stability and control and can be characterized by an emphasis on hard-driving competitiveness and as a very formalized and structured place to work. The combined ipsative score for the **Market** and **Hierarchy** quadrants is 66.79, which is double the combined score of 32.94 for the **Clan** and **Adhocracy** quadrants. Consequently, the total OCAI results are highly informative in that they provide a strong indication that the characteristics of the Army professional culture are not supportive of professional behavior or long-term environmental adaptability, flexibility, and innovation (Freidson, 1970, 1986; Mosher, 1982; Burk, 2002; Martin and McCausland, 2002; Snider 2003, 2003a).
In summary, the results of the data provided in Hypothesis 2 support previous research (ATLDP, 2001; Snider and Watkins, 2002; Wong, 2002) which indicates that the current culture of the U.S. Army profession is out of balance with the future requirements of the Army profession. Additionally, the Army profession’s cultural focus on stability and control are resulting in “[t]op-down training directives and strategies combined with brief leader development experiences for junior officers [which] leads to a perception that micromanagement is pervasive [and that] [p]ersonnel management requirements drive operational [duty] assignments at the expense of quality developmental experiences” (ATLDP, 2001, p. 193). This is unfortunate. A review of Figure 2.2 in Chapter 2 provides a graphic illustration that professional behavior rests upon two pillars: formal training and informal training. The latter is accomplished by providing officers with a career of worldwide operational assignments with ever-increasing levels of authority and responsibility. Informal training also includes individual self-development such as an officer earning an advanced degree on his or her own time, and mentoring programs where senior officers give career guidance and counseling to junior officers. The cultural focus on stability and control fosters micromanagement because senior leaders believe that their career is directly dependent upon the success of their subordinates; therefore, these senior leaders take direct action that will not allow their subordinates to fail; they micromanage, which destroys, the “diagnosis – treatment – inference” cycle of professional behavior, which is a critical component of professional development of these junior professionals (Freidson, 1970, 1986; Abbott, 1988; Snider and Watkins, 2002).
Even though the OCAI plot for the current culture of the U.S. Army profession did not fall into the **Hierarchy** quadrant as predicted by Hypothesis 2, the resulting plot is highly informative and equally disappointing for the Army profession.

*Testing Hypothesis 3:*

Hypothesis 3 tests the assumption that even if the current (“Now”) culture of the U.S. Army profession cannot be characterized as a culture type that is supportive of professional behavior, that the “Preferred” culture type of the U.S. Army profession, as identified by the survey respondents, can be identified as a type of culture that is supportive of professional behavior. As operationalized in this study, cultures that are supportive of professional behavior can be characterized as adaptive, flexible, innovative, and boundary-spanning, which the literature review of Chapter 2 indicates that the **Ahocracy** quadrant represents.

*Figure 4.2* depicts the U.S. Army’s “Preferred” organizational culture archetype, as identified by the 533 (n=533) respondents to this study, as falling into the **Clan** quadrant; the dashed lines forming a diamond shape on the graph. The mean scores for each quadrant are: 28.97 for the **Clan** quadrant, 27.08 for the **Market** quadrant, 24.55 for the **Adhocracy** quadrant, and 19.34 for the **Hierarchy** quadrant. Therefore, like Hypothesis 2, Hypothesis 3 should, on the surface, be rejected since the resulting OCAI plot did not fall dominantly into the **Adhocracy** quadrant. However, the results of this plot are as suggestive as are the results of Hypothesis 2. A close analysis of these results indicates a significant shift from the
respondents’ perception of the current (“Now”) dominant culture of the U.S. Army profession and the culture that they would prefer (“Preferred”) to see as the dominant culture.

Figure 4.2
OCAI Profile Chart for the “Preferred” U.S. Army Culture
**Figure 4.3** provides a graphic representation of both the “Now” and the “Preferred” plots (Figures 4.1 and 4.2) superimposed on one chart for ease of comparison.

**Figure 4.3**

OCAI Profile Chart for the “Now” and “Preferred” U.S. Army Culture

Using a Paired Samples T-Test, the differences between each quadrant’s “Now” and “Preferred” scores were determined to be statistically significant ($p \leq .01$).
Perhaps more important than the statistically significant difference in the paired scores is the change in magnitude from a combined score that fell below the “internal – external focus” axis, as was identified in the discussion of Hypothesis 2, to a composite score that falls above the “internal – external focus” axis. A review of the discussion of Hypothesis 2 reveals that the combined score for the Hierarchy and Market quadrants for the current “Now” Army culture was 66.79. However, the data for Hypothesis 3 demonstrates that the combined score for these Hierarchy and Market quadrants using the “Preferred” scores is 46.42, which is a 30 percent reduction in the respondents’ preferences for stability and control. By contrast, the combined scores for the Clan and Adhocracy quadrants increased from 32.94 for the “Now” plot to 53.52, which is a 62 percent increase, and this increase suggests the respondents’ desire to be part of an organizational culture that can be characterized by flexibility and discretion – the hallmarks of professionalism. Additionally, the greatest change in individual quadrant scores occurred in the Adhocracy quadrant which saw a dramatic increase of 109 percent followed by a 37 percent increase in the Clan quadrant score, a 33 percent decrease for the Hierarchy quadrant, and a 29 percent decrease for the Market quadrant. Therefore, to some extent, it would be difficult to outright reject Hypothesis 3 in light of these findings.

As outlined in Chapter 1 these findings are significant for two reasons. First, the data provide empirical validation that the Army’s current culture is incongruent with its preferred culture, and second, that there appear to be underlying cultural factors that are inhibiting the Army from either providing appropriate professional development programs or that these cultural factors are preventing the exercise of the
professional skills being taught in current professional development programs. In either case, the resulting professional behavior of the Army profession’s future leaders does not appear to be congruent with the type of professional development that should enable them to successfully lead the Army and to confront the ambiguities of its future external environment.

As was accomplished for Hypothesis 1, an analysis of variance procedure (ANOVA) was conducted across all demographic categories to determine if there were any statistically significant differences in the mean scores of these various demographic categories. There were no statistically significant differences \( (p \leq 0.05) \) between respondent’s sex, age, rank, source of commission, component, type of War College student, and level of education. There was a very interesting and statistically significant finding \( (p \leq 0.05) \) that certain Army branch officers preferred the “adhocracy” culture type more so than did other officers. These branches included: Special Forces (Green Beret), Military Intelligence, Dental Corps, and Veterinary Corps. This finding is not surprising since each of these specialties traditionally operate with a significant degree of autonomy and flexibility. Consequently, it is understandable that these officers, who already operate in, and are comfortable with flexibility and discretion, would prefer that the entire organizational culture reflect these deep-seated basic underlying assumptions. There was also a statistically significant finding \( (p \leq 0.05) \) that African–American officers had a higher preference for a “clan” culture than did all other officers. Once again, this finding is not particularly surprising. African-Americans still experience a significant amount of racial discrimination in the United States, although not as much in the Armed Forces (Segal
and Bourg, 2002). Consequently, it is understandable that any minority group would prefer to belong to an organization whose culture could be characterized as a “very friendly place to work where people share a lot of themselves…The organization is held together by loyalty and tradition…[and]…The organization emphasizes the long-term benefit of human resources development and attaches great importance to cohesion and morale” (Cameron and Quinn, 1999, p. 96). Finally, officers in the Class of 2003 reported a statistically significant finding ($p \leq 0.05$) that they preferred an “adhocracy” culture more so than did the officers in the Class of 2004. However, the actual mean difference was only 1.38 points, and this research was unable to uncover any practical significance or cause for this difference. In either case, both classes preferred a statistically significant reduction in the “hierarchy” and “market” cultures and a statistically significant increase in the “clan” and “adhocracy” cultures. All of these preferences have practical significance as well, which are discussed in greater detail in Chapter 5.

In summary, this study found that the “Preferred” dominant organizational culture type and strength of the U.S. Army profession is strongly supportive of flexibility and discretion and can be characterized by a concern for people and teamwork, as well as a strong interest in innovation, initiative, creativity, and a long-term emphasis on growth and the acquisition of new resources.

Testing Hypothesis 4:

The final hypothesis of this study suggests that the individual professional skills of the U.S. Army senior level officer corps are not characterized by innovative,
risk-taking, boundary spanning, demanding continuous improvement, reflective-in-action, dynamic, or adaptive behavior. Essentially, this implies that an MSAI plot of the 12 competency categories, as outlined in Chapter 3, the methodology chapter of this study, will not result in a dominant plot in the Adhocracy quadrant of the MSAI profile. The underlying assumption is that the current organizational culture of the U.S. Army profession inhibits formal and informal professional development programs and professional experiences from providing the educational opportunities that will foster professional growth, as well as innovative, flexible, and adaptive behaviors that will enhance future survival of the Army profession (ATLDP, 2001, Snider and Watkins, 2002). Instead of constantly challenging the current professional knowledge base and esoteric professional skills, Hypothesis 4 assumes that the current professional development program of the U.S. Army profession results in “homosocial reproduction” (Martin, 2002). Kanter (1977) indicates that homosocial reproduction is a process whereby those who are selected and prepared to become the future leaders of an organization tend to reflect the patterns of existing leaders, thereby fostering a perpetuation of existing values and culture as opposed to encouraging a culture that challenges the status quo.

Figure 4.4 depicts the U.S. Army senior level officer corps’ self evaluation of their management / leadership skills assessment, as identified by the 533 (n=533) respondents to this study, as predominantly falling into the Clan quadrant. Unlike the OCAI which had only one score for each quadrant, the MSAI is comprised of 12 competency categories with three categories in each quadrant. See Table 3.3 for a detailed review of the 12 MSAI competency categories. The mean scores for each
quadrant are as follows. The three competency categories for the **Clan** culture type are: Managing Teams (**MT**) – 4.16, Managing Interpersonal Relationships (**MIR**) – 4.16, and Managing the Development of Others (**MD**) – 4.16 for a composite quadrant score of 4.16. The three competency categories for the **Adhocracy** culture type are: Managing Innovation (**MI**) – 3.99; Managing the Future (**MF**) – 3.86; and Managing Continuous Improvement (**MCI**) – 4.01 for a composite quadrant score of 3.95. The three competency categories for the **Market** culture type are: Managing Competitiveness (**MC**) – 3.50, Energizing Employees (**EE**) – 3.94, and Managing Customer Service (**MCS**) – 3.78 for a composite quadrant score of 3.74. Finally, the three competency categories for the **Hierarchy** culture type are: Managing Acculturation (**MA**) – 3.98, Managing the Control System (**MCS**) – 3.69, and Managing Coordination (**MC**) – 3.83 for a composite quadrant score of 3.83.
Therefore, like Hypotheses 2 and 3, Hypothesis 4 should, on the surface, be rejected since the resulting MSAI plot did not fall primarily into the Adhocracy quadrant. However, the results of this plot are as equally informative as the results of Hypotheses 2 and 3. A close analysis of these results indicates that the respondents perceive that their strongest skills are supportive of the “clan” type culture, with the second highest composite score being supportive of the “adhocracy” type culture, the
third highest MSAI composite score being supportive of the “hierarchy” culture type and the lowest composite MSAI score being supportive of the “market” culture type. These scores, similar to the OCAI scores for Hypothesis 3, indicate that these officers perceive that their strongest skills fall above the “internal – external focus” axis which indicates their perceived skills can be characterized by flexibility and discretion which are the hallmarks of professionalism.

Like Hypotheses 1 and 3 an analysis of variance procedure (ANOVA) was conducted across all demographic categories to determine if there were any statistically significant differences in the mean scores of these various demographic categories. There were no statistically significant differences ($p \leq .05$) between respondents’ rank, branch, component, and War College class. There was a statistically significant finding ($p \leq .05$) that female officers rated themselves higher in all 12 MSAI competency categories than did the male officers. Since women are generally perceived as having greater interpersonal skills than do men this finding is not surprising for the six MSAI categories that are related to interpersonal skills. However, the higher scores in the remaining six MSAI categories could be a result of the greater level of competition that women experience as indicated earlier in the analysis of Hypothesis 1. Consequently, since women believe that they must work harder to gain the same level of respect, these scores may be a reflection of that perception. However, for the purposes of this study, this finding does not have much practical significance, since the overall trend for both men and women is consistent with the results indicated in Figure 4.4. There was also a statistically significant finding ($p \leq .05$) that officers over the age of 50 rated themselves as having higher
“adhocracy” skills then did younger officers. Since officers of this age tend to be near the end of their military careers and at the rank of colonel it is very possible that they do exercise a greater degree of autonomy and a willingness to take risks. There was a statistically significant finding ($p \leq .05$) that officers who received their commissions through “Officer Candidate School – (OCS)” perceived themselves as having greater “clan” competencies than did other officers. This finding may be a result of the fact that these officers normally were enlisted soldiers prior to entering OCS and consequently they had prior leadership and interpersonal skills experience. Because of their prior enlisted experience, these officers tend to feel a well deserved kinship with enlisted soldiers and a higher than average ability to relate to them on a personal and professional level. Therefore, this finding is not particularly surprising. There was also a statistically significant finding ($p \leq .05$) that African-American officers rated themselves higher in the “clan” MSAI competencies than did the other officers. Considering that the African-American officers demonstrated a statistically significant higher preference for the Clan quadrant than did other officers, it is not surprising that they perceive their own “clan” competencies as higher than average. Also, like the finding for women, this finding does not have much practical significance, since all officers rated their own personal managerial / leadership skills higher in this quadrant than the other three quadrants. There was also an interesting and statistically significant finding ($p \leq .05$) that officers in the Distance Education program rated their “clan” and “adhocracy” MSAI competencies higher than did the officers in the resident program. Since the majority of these officers are reserve component officers it could naturally be assumed that their civilian careers and
training have a significant and concurrent effect on their managerial / leadership competencies. However, the data indicate that there were no statistically significant differences between reserve component and active duty officers. Consequently, it is possible that the officers selected for the resident program, which traditionally has more prestige, have been selected because their skills are more congruent with the current Army culture, which can be seen as a manifestation of the concept of homosocial reproduction (Martin, 2002). Finally, there was a statistically significant finding ($p \leq .05$) that officers with a Ph.D. scored themselves lower in the “market” competencies than did the other officers. This finding is consistent with the previous findings that indicted that Ph.D.s had a higher preference for the Adhocracy quadrant. It is not surprising that officers with Ph.D.s perceive themselves as being more innovative, adaptive, and entrepreneurial and consequently less competitive, goal-oriented, and demanding as is typified by the “market” MSAI competencies.

It is interesting to note that the basic shape of the MSAI plot and the OCAI “Preferred” plot are very similar, especially with the “clan” culture type receiving the highest score in both survey instruments. It is highly probable that in their responses to Hypothesis 3 that the 533 Army respondents identified a “Preferred” organizational culture type that is more congruent with the type of managerial / leadership skills which they believe that they currently possess. It is also interesting to note that in both cases the “Preferred” culture and the MSAI managerial / leadership skills are diametrically opposite to the “market” culture type, which as you may recall was identified in Hypothesis 2 as the dominant Army professional culture type. The Competing Values Framework (CVF) indicates that the diagonal relationships
between the four quadrants are negative (Quinn and Rohrbaugh, 1983; Cameron and Quinn, 1999). This data provides strong support for the contention that the Army professional culture is “out of balance,” as indicated by the ATLDP (2001) and is not congruent with the professional skills necessary to support professional growth and survival (Freidson, 1970, 1986; Mosher, 1982; Abbott, 1988; Snider and Watkins, 2002).

Final Analysis

The principal purpose for this study was to answer the following primary research question: Is the organizational culture of the U.S. Army congruent with the professional development of its senior level officer corps? This paper outlined four research hypotheses which were employed to provide empirical data to help answer the primary research question. In light of the resulting data which has been enumerated and analyzed in this chapter there is strong support indicating that the U.S. Army professional culture is not congruent with the professional development of its senior level officer corps. Hypotheses 1 and 2 provided strong empirical data, a combined OCAI score of 66.79 for the Market and Hierarchy quadrants, indicating that the dominant organizational culture type and strength of the U.S. Army profession is highly reflective of stability and control and can be characterized by an emphasis on hard-driving competitiveness within a very formalized and structured place to work, as opposed to being distinguished by innovation, flexibility, and long-term growth, which are the characteristics that most clearly represent the hallmarks of professional cultures (Freidson, 1970, 1986; Argyris and Schon, 1974; Mosher, 1982;

Hypothesis 3 demonstrated that the future leaders of the Army profession strongly preferred an organizational culture which is dramatically different from the one that they believe currently exists in the Army profession. The OCAI data plot found that the “Preferred” dominant organizational culture type and strength of the U.S. Army profession is strongly supportive of flexibility and discretion and can be characterized by a concern for people and teamwork, as well as a strong interest in innovation, initiative, creativity, and a long-term emphasis on growth and the acquisition of new resources, as indicated by a dominant plot in the Clan quadrant. Additionally, it is important to note that the greatest change in individual quadrant scores occurred in the Adhocracy quadrant which saw a dramatic increase of 109 percent followed by a 37 percent increase in the Clan quadrant score, a 33 percent decrease for the Hierarchy quadrant, and a 29 percent decrease for the Market quadrant. Consequently, this study data indicates that the Army’s current professional culture is incongruent with its preferred culture, and that there appears to be underlying cultural factors that are inhibiting the Army from either providing appropriate professional development programs. Or that these cultural factors are preventing the exercise of the professional skills that are being taught in current professional development programs.

Hypothesis 4 provided empirical data that indicates that the respondents perceive that their strongest skills are supportive of the “clan” type culture, with the second highest composite score being supportive of the “adhocracy” type culture, the
third highest MSAI composite score being supportive of the “hierarchy” culture type and the lowest composite MSAI score being supportive of the “market” culture type. These data provide strong support for the contention that the Army professional culture is “out of balance,” as indicated by the ATLD (2001) and is not congruent with the professional skills necessary to support professional growth and survival (Freidson, 1970, 1986; Mosher, 1982; Abbott, 1988; Snider and Watkins, 2002).

Finally, the study provided empirical data strongly suggesting that a homogeneous culture exists within the senior level officer corps of the U.S. Army. The various ANOVA procedures indicated that there were virtually no statistically significant differences between the 10 demographic categories employed by this study that would change or modify the overall results obtained by this study. The few small differences that were observed supported the overall finding of the hypothesis but usually to a stronger degree. This finding has important considerations for the overall study because it indicates that the U.S. Army’s professional development program, as conceptualized by this study, generates consistent values throughout the senior level officer corps. This finding is also important because it indicates that there is little if any sub-cultural influence on the larger homogeneous U.S. Army culture. As indicated in the literature review of Chapter 2 it was theorized that if a homogeneous culture does exist within the senior level officer corps, even if those values are not congruent with that of a professional organization, then the potential for a successful cultural intervention is favorable. This implies, as suggested from the functionalist perspective, that the U.S. Army’s culture is an attribute of the organization and can be modified, although not easily (Sathe, 1983). Consequently,
the data suggest that to some extent the professional development program is
instilling moderately professional values and skills as indicated by the “Preferred”
OCAI organizational culture plot in the **Clan** quadrant and the MSAI managerial /
leadership skills plot also in the **Clan** quadrant. The question that should be raised at
this point and will be discussed in the next chapter is why do these senior level Army
professionals perceive the current Army professional culture to be primarily in the
**Market** quadrant and secondarily in the **Hierarchy** quadrant, which are essentially
the antitheses of the **Clan** and **Adhocracy** quadrants?
Chapter 5

IMPLICATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

Overview

This research strongly suggests that there is a lack of congruence between the U.S. Army professional culture and the professional development programs of the Army’s senior level leaders. This conclusion is based on the empirical data provided in Chapter 4 that indicate that the future leaders of the Army profession believe that they operate on a day-to-day basis in a profession whose culture is characterized by an overarching desire for stability, control, formal rules and policies, coordination and efficiency, goal and results oriented, and hard-driving competitiveness. However, the respondents of this study also indicated that the Army’s professional culture should be one that emphasizes flexibility, discretion, participation, human resource development, innovation, creativity, risk-taking, and a long-term emphasis on professional growth and the acquisition of new professional knowledge and skills. These characteristics have been identified in the literature review chapter of this paper as being representative of professional cultures (Argyris and Schon, 1974; Kline, 1981; Freidson, 1970, 1986; Abbott, 1988; Schon, 1983; Senge, 1994; Davis, et al, 1997; FM 22-100, 1999; Snider and Watkins, 2002; Paparone, 2003). The purpose of this chapter is to discuss the implications of the research findings on organizational theory and practice and to relate these findings to future research opportunities.
Implications of the Research Findings

Implications for the Army Profession

As discussed in Chapter 1, it is theorized that organizational culture, those taken-for-granted, deep basic underlying assumptions within an organization (Schein, 1992), unconsciously influences the formulation of the training and professional development that future organizational leaders are given to enable them to promote organizational interests well into the future. You may recall that it was proposed that the investigation of this relationship would have significant analytical potential. For example, if the survival of a profession is based upon its ability to readily and continuously adapt to a changing external environment (Mosher, 1982; Freidson, 1986; Abbott, 1988; Senge, 1994; Martin and McCausland, 2002; Snider, 2003, 2003a; Gordon and Sollinger 2004), can an organization’s culture inherently prevent it from successful professional survival because of the way it educates its future leaders? Does the unconscious pattern of ambiguity reduction, “the way we do things around here” (Bower, 1966; Deal and Kennedy, 1982, p. 4), create a pattern of homosocial reproduction (Kanter, 1977)? The data provided by this study strongly support the assertion that organizational culture can inhibit the professional development of the profession’s future leaders by influencing the professional development program, particularly the formal and informal training aspects of professional development program.

The study data powerfully indicate that there is a lack of congruence between the current culture (as indicated by the “Now” OCAI plot) of the Army profession
and the type of culture which the future senior Army leaders would prefer to see in place (as indicated by the “Preferred” OCAI plot). In addition, there is a lack of congruence between the current Army professional culture and the individual professional skills of those future Army leaders (as indicated by the MSAI plots). What the lack of congruence suggests is that there may be a paradoxical relationship between the managerial / leadership skills that are taught in the formal training programs1 (such as senior service war colleges) and those informal professional development aspects of the program such as personnel policies and the Officer Evaluation System. In other words, the managerial / leadership theory taught in the formal professional education process can be considered to be analogous to the “espoused values” of the Army profession, while the informal professional development program, which includes operational assignments and personnel policies, reflects the operant or “theories-in-use” of the Army profession (Argyris and Schon, 1974). A review of the definition of “espoused values” indicates that organizations publicly give allegiance to these values and attempt to communicate them to their members, external stakeholders, and frequently to the general public. Espoused values are often evident in organizational strategies, goals, philosophies, training programs, and published organizational value statements. However, espoused values may not be based on prior cultural learning. Therefore, they may be incongruent with the organization’s actual “theories-in-use” (Argyris and Schon, 1974). Theories-in-use is defined as those values that actually govern behavior. It is theorized that a lack of congruence between espoused values and theories-in-use can inhibit individual commitment and subsequently impair organizational performance
(Argyris and Schon, 1974; Schon, 1983; Schein, 1992). What these findings imply is that those in the Army profession are reasonably aware of the type of professional managerial / leadership skills that should be imparted to new generations of senior leaders of the professional officer corps as reflected by the “Preferred” OCAI organizational culture plot, and the MSAI plots in the Clan and Adhocracy quadrants. However, the current Army professional culture, “the way we do things around here” (Bower, 1966; Deal and Kennedy, 1982, p. 4), demonstrates that deep underlying assumptions result in behavior that is diametrically opposite to that which is espoused in the Army profession’s formal professional development process. Other research supports this finding by indicating that the Army profession more reflexively rewards stability and control and encourages excessively structured supervision by severely punishing innovation and risk-taking that results in failure (ATLDP, 2001; LeBouef, 2002; Wong, 2002). Wong supports this assessment by stating that the “current situation of over-control reflects the [Army’s] culture…The Army now has a culture where the obsession with minimizing risk and uncertainty has pervaded not just the leadership, but also the way the entire institution thinks and works” (2002, p. 28). LeBoeuf concurs by stating that “the ATLDAP [2001] assessed Army culture as ‘out of balance’ and failing to provide the conditions necessary to preserve the Army’s professional standing…In other words, the professed principles of officers do not always coincide with their actual practices. Army culture must reflect a set of conditions that embody a mutually supportive and trustworthy relationship between individual professionals within the organization and the Army as a profession” (2002, p. 491). Numerous other studies have also indicated that Army
profession’s emphasis on stability and control is contrary to the long-term survival of
the Army profession (Builder, 1989; Scroggs, 1996; ATLDP, 2001; Snider and
Watkins, 2002; Wong, 2002). Schein states that organizational leaders must learn
“how to enhance elements of the culture that are congruent with new environmental
realities while changing dysfunctional elements of the culture (1999, p. 144).” The
empirical data provided by this study indicate that the leadership of the Army
profession should seriously consider embarking upon an organizational culture
change effort as described by Bolman and Deal (1991); Cameron and Quinn (1999);
Schein (1999); and Watkins and Snider (2002).

The data also demonstrate that there is a relatively homogeneous Army
culture. Despite the diversity of the respondents, the data suggest that these Army
senior level professionals have been acculturated in such a manner as to view the
Army profession in a fairly consistent way. To reiterate this point, Jans and
Schmidtchen (2002) emphasize that a formalized program of professional
development produces both desirable and undesirable outcomes. For example, the
research data from the “Preferred” OCAI and MSAI plots suggests that the Army’s
professional development program reinforces the Army’s culture of professionalism
and community, both of which are desirable. However, portions of the professional
development program also strengthen the aspects of the organization’s culture that
encourage hierarchy, conservatism, and an emphasis on rules and structure, which are
inimical to professionalism. Consequently, the current lack of congruence between
the Army professional culture and the professional development program indicates
that this obvious example of homosocial reproduction (Kanter, 1977) is detrimental to
the long-term survival of the Army profession. There is, however, a silver lining to this apparent cloud. Since the current professional development process is capable of producing such strong uniformity in the behavior and values of the Army profession’s future leaders, it is postulated that changes to the professional development process, such as the experimental “produce or out” career system discussed earlier (Crawley, 2004), have the potential to produce a beneficial uniformity among the future Army professionals. For example, the “produce or out” system may very well encourage initiative and innovation by rewarding risk-taking instead of punishing it.

In conclusion, the research data provide empirical support to the findings of the ATLDP (2001), which suggests that the training and leader development programs of the Army profession are not adequately linked and integrated within the Army culture (LeBoeuf, 2002). The future strategic environment which confronts the Army profession can be characterized by ambiguity and uncertainty. The literature review of Chapter 2 has demonstrated that professional organizations whose organizational culture can be characterized as emphasizing flexibility, discretion, and innovation have the greatest potential to operate within ambiguous and uncertain environments. The research data strongly suggest that the Army’s culture is preventing the individual exercise of the excellent professional skills that are being taught in the Army’s formalized professional development program. Consequently, as suggested by Schein, “[o]rganizational cultures are created in part by leaders, and one of the most decisive functions of leadership is the creation, management, and sometimes even the destruction of culture” (1992, p. 5). If the Army profession expects to maintain its social legitimacy and professional jurisdiction, which are
focused on the development and application of the esoteric knowledge and related practical professional skills of land warfare (Snider, 2003a), then the Army profession must take steps bring its professional culture and particularly the informal professional development program into congruency and pointed in the direction that favors flexibility, discretion, and innovation.

Until now, the relationship between organizational culture and professional development has been more assumed and theorized than validated. The data provided by this study begin to fill that empirical gap and provide strong evidence that a lack of congruence between the two can create long-term detrimental impacts on organizational performance, resulting in a lack of commitment from organizational members (Schein, 1999).

Implications for Organizational Theory

The primary emphasis of this study was directed toward the examination of the senior level leaders of the U.S. Army by having them identify the type of culture that they perceive the Army profession to have and should have. However, it is also thought that the results of this analysis will have a beneficial impact on organizational literature as a whole, specifically on that portion that relates to the professional development of individual professionals within the universe of professions.

In relation to organizational theory, the literature review of this study outlined two major battles concerning the concept of organizational culture: the functionalist vs. semiotic perspectives, and the quantitative vs. qualitative research methods debate. The data provided by this study through the incorporation of the OCAI and
MSAI survey instruments predominantly support the functionalist and quantitative approaches to the study of organizational culture. As such, these methods strongly support the belief that organizational culture can be perceived as an attribute of the organization, which can be empirically identified, measured, evaluated, and changed, and is manifested in organizational behaviors (Ouchi, 1981; Peters and Waterman, 1982; Schein, 1985; Cameron and Ettington, 1988; Trice and Beyer, 1993; Schneider, 1994; Cameron and Quinn, 1999; Martin, 2002). To emphasize this point, it was recommended above that the leaders of the Army profession initiate an organizational culture change effort to eliminate the lack of perceived congruence between the Army’s professional culture and its professional development program. However, within this perspective, the data appear to support the contention that organizational culture may actually be a much more complex construct, one that is more reflective of the concept of interdependence than that of simply a dependent or an independent variable. For example, Weick (1979) states that in an “interdependent relationship,” the designation of one event as a “cause” and another event as an “effect” is the result of an arbitrary and incomplete analysis. Instead, Weick (1979) indicates that in an interdependent relationship, events routinely cycle back and forth, being a cause at one time and an effect at another. In other words, one event may influence others, but is then in turn influenced by the resultant action of those other events. In the case of the Army profession’s culture, the more informal aspects of the professional development program, such as “up or out” personnel policy may be creating an underlying value and deep assumption that failure will not be tolerated regardless of the circumstances. Consequently, senior leaders may be exercising an excessive
degree of structured supervision which reinforces the culture of stability and control despite the formal education system which attempts to teach the opposite. Therefore, it is not surprising that junior professionals learn to distrust their senior leaders and to then subsequently perpetuate the cycle of over-control (Wong, 2002).

The preceding discussion is not intended to suggest that the semiotic perspective of organization culture is of little value; quite the contrary. The semiotic perspective, you may recall, assumes that culture is an image of an organization (Morgan, 1986), which resides in individual interpretations and perceptions, used to facilitate “understanding and communication about the complex phenomenon of organization” (Smircich, 1983, p. 340). The purpose of using the metaphorical process to describe organizations is to enable researchers to expose characteristics of an organization, which may be expressed as ideational or symbolic. Ideational or symbolic characteristics are those characteristics such as shared knowledge and meaning that reside in the minds of individuals who are associated with the organization. The overall intent of this perspective is to achieve a greater understanding of an organization’s culture (Cameron and Ettington, 1988). Metaphorical analysis is a highly effective method to help circumscribe the extremely ambiguous, complex, and paradoxical world of organizational existence. Metaphorical analysis “is basic to our way of thinking generally – we have a means of enhancing our capacity for creative yet disciplined thought, in a way that allows us to grasp and deal with the many-sided character of organizational life” (Morgan, 1986, p. 17). Using this approach to study organizational culture analysis, the Competing Values Framework (CVF) and the OCAI were intended to provide a
socially constructed order, a definitional language, of organizational culture types since no common perspective exists (Quinn and Rohrbaugh, 1983; Cameron and Quinn, 1999). It should be understood that the four cultural types emphasized by the CVF and OCAI do not represent the universe of all possible culture types. However, as suggested by Morgan (1986) they give us the capacity to conduct disciplined but creative analysis for an exceedingly complex concept such as organizational culture.

Related to this discussion is the debate between quantitative and qualitative analysis. It is believed that the quasi-combined research method employed by this study, (unquestionably incorporating a predominantly quantitative survey instrument in conjunction with an informed insider – the author) allowed for an in-depth analysis that perhaps each research method alone may not have achieved. An in-depth analysis of an organization’s culture must include a deep understanding of the symbolic, expressive, and interpretive aspects of organizational behavior. Organizational culture as viewed from the semiotic perspective helps to maintain the continuity of organizational behavior and helps to provide meaning and structure for organizational life (Beyer and Trice, 1987). Consequently, some researchers indicate that a quantitative analysis of organizational culture can only result in a superficial understanding of organizational behavior. The use of the OCAI and MSAI analytical instruments in combination with an informed organizational insider appear to provide an adequate comprise between a long-term qualitative ethnographic study and a short-term quantitative analysis. Cameron and Quinn summarize the importance of conducting organizational culture analysis by stating that:

The need to diagnose and manage organizational culture is growing in importance partly because of an increasing need to merge and mold
different organizations’ cultures as structural changes have occurred (for instance, when units are consolidated, when downsizing and outsourcing eliminate parts of the organization, or when entire organizations merge). The escalating importance of culture is also partly a result of the increasing turbulence, complexity, and unpredictability faced by organizations in their external environments (1999, p. 131).

Echoing the remarks of Cameron and Quinn above, this study has demonstrated the practical significance of an organizational culture analysis for the Army profession. Not only is the Army profession’s survival as a profession of particular importance, but its ability to maintain its superiority over the esoteric knowledge of land warfare is an absolutely crucial social responsibility for the preservation of the American way of life.

In summary, this study supports the premise that organizational culture is a complex construct that is more than just a variable and more than just a “thick description” of organizational behavior. Additionally, the study also supports the assertion that a strong cultural analysis can be accomplished through the use of a highly valid and reliable assessment instrument such as the OCAI and MSAI survey instruments. However, an even richer and deeper analysis can be achieved through the use of qualitative methods such as an informed insider.

In relation to professions in general, it is postulated that the results of this study indicate that the research technique used here may prove to be useful for the analysis of other professions. One comparable example may be the medical profession, whose professional jurisdiction is being challenged by managed healthcare programs (Eve, and Hodgkin, 1997). Schon emphasizes this point by stating that:
Wherever professionals operate within the context of an established bureaucracy, they are embedded in an organizational knowledge structure and a related network of institutional systems of control, authority, information, maintenance, and reward, all of which are tied to prevailing images of technical experience. The technical extension of bureaucracy, which reinforces the confinement of professional work to precisely defined channels of technical expertise, exacerbates the inherent conflict between bureaucracy and professional identity. Within highly specialized, technically administered systems of bureaucratic control, how can professionals think of themselves as autonomous practitioners (1983, p. 337)?

One of the most important benefits of the concept and practice of professionalism in general is the “self-generation and regeneration of professional knowledge and practice in the light of change...” Developing ‘the reflective practitioner’ (Schon, 1983, 1987) through continuing professional development both at work and through further study should continue to focus on the skills of problem-solving, critical evaluation and innovation which are essential features for the survival and development of flexible and responsive practitioners” (Middlehurst and Kennie, 1997, p. 65). Consequently, this study has attempted to demonstrate that the future survival of important professional practices and skills is to some extent dependent upon the impact that organizational culture, within which a profession is lodged, has upon the continuing professional development of that profession as outlined by Middlehurst and Kennie (1997) above. In conclusion, the significance of identifying the type of organizational culture that exists within a given profession and the relative lack of congruence that may be present between the organizational culture and the professional development of its individual professionals is succinctly summarized by Middlehurst and Kennie:

Professionals need to be both entrepreneurs and intrapreneurs, developing their practice externally and their organizations internally.
in response to change...Creating responsive professional
organizations, peopled by creative, multi-skilled and enterprising
professionals, requires imaginative and sensitive leadership which
places value not only on financial performance, but also on ethical
practice, investment in people, and the development of long-term

**Implications for Future Research**

The results of this study support the argument that the OCAI and MSAI
survey instruments, which are based on the Competing Values Framework (CVF)
(Quinn and Rohrbaugh, 1983), are valid and reliable organizational culture
assessment tools that can be used effectively as part of an organizational culture
change effort. The data support the contention that the “usefulness of this framework
is that it serves as a way to diagnose and initiate change in the underlying
organizational culture that organizations develop as they progress through their life
cycles and as they cope with the pressures of their external environments” (Cameron
and Quinn, 1999, p. 72). Of course, this perspective allies itself with the
functionalist and integrationist perspectives of organizational culture, which assume
that culture is an attribute of an organization that individual organization members
share and one that helps to bind them together (Martin, 2002). Not all researchers
agree with this perspective, and some do not agree that organizational culture can
ever adequately be assessed or changed (Fitzgerald, 1988). Consequently, it is
understood that this analysis has undoubtedly created analytical “blind spots” because
of its a priori designation of research hypotheses and related assumptions (Martin,
2002). For example, the literature review of this study supports the research
assumption that the predominant cultural type of professions is represented by OCAI plots in the Adhocrac...y quadrant of the Competing Values Framework. However, there is no empirical data supporting this assumption. For this reason, a future research project which explores a variety of professional cultures with the objective of determining if they are appropriately represented by innovative, flexible, risk-taking and entrepreneurial behavior, as suggested by the Adhocracy quadrant, would be quite informative.

Additionally, this research project has not taken a longitudinal perspective. That is, repeatedly administering the survey instruments over a number of years to develop trend data and to determine if the deep-seated underlying assumptions that comprise culture are enduring. However, several related studies that were completed previously have been reviewed and they do provide some support for the contention that there is a homogeneous Army culture. Additionally, these other studies also provide a slight degree of “triangulation” of the resulting research data and were highlighted in Chapter 4. Finally, although the researcher is a 23 year organizational member of the Army profession and as such can certainly be considered an informed insider as well as to some extent providing an ethnographic analysis, this study was not completed under those guidelines. Therefore, a future research opportunity may be directed toward a more traditional long-term ethnographic analysis supported by the quantitative tools used by this study. It is postulated that such an analysis may be able to provide more than just a snapshot of where the organization currently is and where it may want to go. Instead, such an analysis may be able to more adequately explain some of the highly subjective ideational aspects of “the way we do things.
around here” (Bower, 1966; Triandis, 1972; Deal and Kennedy, 1982, p. 4). Such an analysis may be able to support the symbolic constructs of the semiotic perspective which encourages different ways of thinking and subsequently influencing different aspects of organizational phenomena (Tsoukas, 1991). Srivastva and Barrett support this perspective by stating that:

> The process of giving language to experience is more than just sense-making. Naming also directs actions toward the object you have named because it promotes activity consistent with the related attribution it carries. To change the name of an object connotes changing your relationship to the object and how one will behave in relationship to it because when we name something, we direct anticipations, expectations, and evaluations towards it (1988, pp. 34-35).

Additionally, it would be beneficial for such a long-term analysis to track the actual organizational culture change efforts, for example, if the Army profession was able to transition its culture from predominantly a Market culture to an Adhocracy culture, would there be a resulting increase in organizational performance and effectiveness?

Another future research opportunity lies in the replication of this current analysis for other more traditional professions. While this analysis found that there is a relatively homogeneous Army professional culture, this finding may be a result of the unique situation of this particular profession. Virtually all of the Army professionals belong to one organization, the U.S. Army. Other professions such as doctors, lawyers, accountants, etc, are distributed throughout society in virtually thousands of organizations. Additionally, an analysis of Mosher’s (1982) concepts of governmental professions versus societal professions might be of interest to this type of study. Consequently, professional leadership and professional development programs may be dramatically affected by sub-cultural influences and the profession
itself may not share such a homogeneous “medical” or “accounting” professional culture. A byproduct of the distributed nature of most professions is that professional leadership and the professional development programs of these professions will be exercised and developed more by professional associations and academia than by the organizations within which most of these individual professionals find themselves practicing their skills. Therefore, many “individuals and groups will need to exercise initiative, take risks, be innovative and creative in their own spheres of activity as well as in the service of the whole enterprise” [profession] (Middlehurst and Kennie, 1997, p. 64).

In conclusion, “[s]tudies of organizational culture share a common goal: to uncover and interpret aspects of organizational life so that we can better understand the perceptions, beliefs, and actions of organizational members” (Martin, et al, 1997, p. 3). An organization’s culture enables its members to work through the basic problems of survival in and adaptation to the external environment as well as to develop and maintain internal processes that perpetuate adaptability and promote the organization’s continued existence (Parsons, 1951; Merton, 1957; Schein, 1985, Martin, 2002). Schein emphasizes that the study of organizational culture is important because organizational culture is the property of a group and that:

…it is a powerful, latent, and often unconscious set of forces that determine both our individual and collective behavior, ways of perceiving, thought patterns, and values. Organizational culture in particular matters because cultural elements determine strategy, goals, and modes of operating. The values and thought patterns of leaders and senior managers are partially determined by their own cultural backgrounds and their shared experience. If we want to make organizations more efficient and effective, then we must understand the role that culture plays in organizational life (1999, p. 14).
Consequently, one of the principal reasons for the popular interest in the study of organizational culture is to determine the linkage between it and organizational performance (Berrio, 2003). This study has reviewed a previously assumed but unverified connection between organizational culture and professional development. It has uncovered a lack of congruence between the dominant type of organizational culture of the U.S. Army and the professional managerial/leadership skills of its senior level leaders. This observed lack of congruence may be inhibiting performance and unconsciously perpetuating a cycle of caution and an over reliance on stability and control. The U.S. Army Crusader story, outlined in the Prologue of this study, is illustrative of an organization that emphasizes stability and control and that attempts to comprehend the ambiguity of the future through an unconscious reliance upon the successful solutions employed in the past. While the present study appears to be significant for the U.S. Army in particular and for organizational theory in general, it should be understood that the findings of this study may not readily lend themselves to widespread generalization. The techniques employed by this study for organizational cultural assessment have a strong intellectual foundation. However, these results as with any analysis must not be overstated, for as Wilkins admonishes:

…we should note that culture audits are not infallible. It is something of an art to uncover basic assumptions that are buried in an organization’s rich collection of observations, stories, language, and customs. Because people have the natural tendency to cove up some assumptions, observers must be careful to take broad enough samples to determine how representative their findings are. Hence managers must spend enough time and be open enough both to understand the cultural data and to determine its validity. Otherwise, they may miss the advantage of understanding and the opportunity to influence the taken-for-granted assumptions (1983, p. 37).
Organizational culture is an exciting and highly rewarding sub-field of organizational theory. It is hoped that this study has provided additional insight into this enigmatic area and will stimulate further research and discussion.
Prologue

1. Field artillery, more commonly known as cannon or howitzer, provides indirect (usually non-line of sight) fire support for military forces. Individual howitzers are either towed by a vehicle like a truck, or they are self-propelled, like the Paladin and Crusader systems. The self-propelled howitzers (SPH) resemble tanks because of their armor protection however the mission and capabilities of the tank and the SPH are totally different. The type of artillery projectile fired by howitzers is usually designated by its diameter and usually in millimeters (mm). For example, the Crusader and Paladin systems fire a 155mm projectile which is approximately 6.1 inches in diameter.

Chapter 1

1. “Social Construction of Reality” theory implies that “there is no reality apart from social meanings, but that we can know reality only by categorizing it, naming it, and giving it meaning…Categories are human mental constructs in a world that has only continua” (Stone, 1988, p. 307). In other words, the intellectual boundaries that we employ to circumscribe experiences and social knowledge help us to comprehend the meaning of these experiences and to provide order to what would otherwise be a chaotic existence. Therefore, reality is a socially constructed phenomena that is the product of human activity (Berger and Luckmann, 1966).

2. Cameron and Quinn (1999) state that “cultural congruence means that various aspects of an organization’s culture are aligned. That is, the same culture types are emphasized in various parts of the organization. For example, in a congruent culture the strategy, leadership style, reward system, approach to managing employees, and dominant characteristics, all tend to emphasize the same set of cultural values (1999, p. 64).” This study employs the Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument (OCAI) to diagnose the U.S. Army’s culture as identified by selected U.S. Army senior leaders. Then, the study evaluates the level of congruence between the identified U.S. Army cultural types to the managerial / leadership competencies of these selected senior leaders as identified through the use of the Managerial Skills Assessment Instrument (MSAI). The ostensible objective is to determine if professional development programs support or inhibit the promotion of senior leadership skills which will sustain future professional growth, and survival. This is important because as Cameron and Quinn emphasize, cultural incongruence leads to differences in perspectives, goals, and strategies which drain organizational energy and prevent the organization from operating at the highest level of effectiveness (1999, pp. 64-65).
3. Mosher states that “the professions are social mechanisms, whereby knowledge, particularly new knowledge, is translated into action and service. They provide the means whereby intellectual achievement becomes operational (1982, p. 112).” In describing professional work, Abbott states that the “tasks of professions are human problems amenable to expert service. They may be problems for individuals, like sickness and salvation, or for groups, like fundraising and auditing. They may be disturbing problems to be cured, like vandalism or neurosis, or they may be creative problems to be solved, like a building design or a legislative program. The degree of resort to experts varies from problem to problem, from society to society, and from time to time (1988, p. 35).” Schon indicates that professional knowledge, and therefore individual professionals and professional organizations, must continuously expand their knowledge and practitioner base because of the “changing character of the situations of practice – the complexity, uncertainty, instability, uniqueness, and value conflicts which are increasingly perceived as central to the world of professional practice (1983, p. 14)” Consequently, professional organizations must be characterized by reflective, innovative, flexible, and risk-taking thinking and behavior. “In contrast to normal bureaucratic emphasis on uniform procedures, objective measures of performance, and center/periphery systems of control, a reflective institution must place a high priority on flexible procedures, differentiated response, qualitative appreciation of complex processes, and decentralized responsibility for judgment and action (Schon, 1983, p. 338). Argyris and Schon indicate that “professional practice requires practitioners to have the special competences related to diagnosis, to the generation and testing of solutions, and to the experience of personal causality in implementing solutions (1974, p. 172).” In summary, these authors indicate that professional organizations are characterized by dynamic, innovative, entrepreneurial, creative, and risk-taking behavior. This perspective of professional organizations is that is incorporated throughout this study.

4. Senior leader skills which are characteristic of professional organizations include: innovative, risk-taking, boundary spanning, adaptive, and reflective-in-action. What these concepts mean is that individual professionals must be trained to challenge the status quo. They must question previous success and the procedures that fostered that success. Professionals must be willing to constantly strive to find new answers to old questions and new questions that have yet to be asked. They must seek constant improvement and the expansion of their professional knowledge base. They must be willing to stick their necks out and take risks for the betterment of society and their profession. They must be willing to experiment and they must be willing to accept failure and to learn from failure. Finally, professionals must be willing to span boundaries, that is, they must be willing to go beyond their own organizational and professional boundaries in the search of new knowledge, techniques and procedures, that can be imported into their professional knowledge base, and used in their own practical professional skills, as well as to potentially identify new areas for professional growth (Argyris and Schon, 1974; Aldrich and Herker, 1977; Weick, 1979; Mosher, 1982; Schon, 1983; Freidman, 1986; Senge, 1994; Cameron and Quinn, 1999; Wong, 2002; Snider, 2003a; Gordon and Sollinger, 2004).
Chapter 2

1. The “insider” vs “outsider” cultural research distinction is based on the perspective in which the researcher obtains the relevant data upon which to base his research findings. For example, Martin states that outsider “cultural research includes any study, quantitative or qualitative, in which the conceptual categories are imposed by the researcher rather than initiated by the cultural member who is being studied. The key, for an etic [outsider] study, is to explain cogently why these particular concepts and operationalizations were chosen, usually with reference to both reliability and validity…Usually, in etic [outsider] research, categories are deduced from prior theory and research, not from material gathered from a study (2002, p. 36).” The present study primarily uses the outsider approach, that is, the research questions have been developed prior to the beginning of the study, however, the development of the research questions was based on the author’s “insider” experience as a career U.S. Army professional.

The “insider” perspective is adopted from social anthropologists who argued that cultural researchers must endeavor to observe and understand cultural behavior as if the researcher was a member of the culture being observed. In other words, the cultural researcher must attempt “to grasp the native’s point of view, his relation to life, to realize his vision of the world (Malinowski, 1961, p. 25).” Schein states that the “most efficient and possibly valid way to decipher cultural assumptions is for an outsider to work directly with a group of motivated insiders on a model of artifacts, values, and assumptions. This works best when the group has some purpose for conducting the cultural analysis and when there are no special communication barriers in the group that would prevent a free flow of communication…The main purpose of the resulting cultural description is to provide insight to the organization so that it can figure out how different cultural assumptions aid or hinder what members are trying to do (1992, p. 168, emphasis added).”

Chapter 3

1. Janusian thinking derives its name from the Roman god Janus who was described as being able to look in opposite directions at the same time. In his study on creativity, Rothenberg (1979) found that the ability to embrace paradox, which is the simultaneous existence of contradictory but interrelated concepts, is what leads to the significant advances in art and science. Further emphasizing the importance of this concept for organizational transformation, Quinn and McGrath state that “Einstein’s observation that a falling object could be simultaneously moving and at rest is a Janusian idea. In sum, Janusian thinking offers the resolution of psychological contradiction in such a way that the resolution generates great productive energy. In the mind, new theories and insights emerge. In organizations, a new culture evolves in which leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of motivation and morality” (1985, pp. 316-317).
Chapter 4

1. The mission of the U.S. Army War College is to “prepare selected military, civilian, and international leaders for the responsibilities of strategic leadership; educate current and future leaders on the development and employment of landpower in a joint, multinational and interagency environment; conduct research and publish on national security and military strategy; and engage in activities in support of the Army’s strategic communication efforts” (U.S. Army War College Home Page, 2004, www.carlisle.army.mil).

Chapter 5

1. It is interesting to note that during the research for this study, the author conducted a content review of the professional leadership literature promulgated by the U.S. Army in a wide variety of Army Regulations, Field Manuals, textbooks, supplemental readings, and monographs, and found this literature to be comprised of some of the finest leadership and organizational theory available today.
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APPENDIX A

Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument - OCAI
ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT (OCAI)

In this survey, “the organization” means **THE U.S. ARMY,** not subordinate organizations or branches in the U.S. Army such as a battalion, brigade, division, or infantry or armor branch, etc. Rate each of the statements by dividing 100 points between A, B, C, and D depending on how similar the description is to “THE U.S. ARMY” (100 is very similar and 0 is not at all similar to “THE U.S. ARMY”). The total points for each question must equal 100. Repeat this for how you feel “THE ARMY” is now (NOW) and how you think it should be (PREFERRED).

For example, in question 1, assume that you gave 75 points to A, 10 points to B, 15 points to C, and 0 points to D. Your responses would be written as indicated in the following sample response. This would indicate that the organization is predominantly a personal place and not at all a controlled and structured place. If you gave 25 points to each one, it would mean that each of the characteristics are exactly equal. Once you have completed the “NOW” column indicating how things are done in “THE U.S. ARMY” now, complete the “PREFERRED” column for how you believe things should be done in “THE U.S. ARMY.” You may use only four numbers that total to 100.

**Please note: Fill in a number in each column even if that number is 0. Thank you!**

**SAMPLE RESPONSE**

**1. DOMINANT CHARACTERISTICS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOW</th>
<th>PREFERRED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 75</td>
<td>A 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 10</td>
<td>B 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 15</td>
<td>C 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 0</td>
<td>D 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total  100  100
2. **ORGANIZATIONAL LEADERSHIP**

   **NOW**  |  **PREFERRED**
   --- | ---
   A. The leadership in the organization is generally considered to exemplify **mentoring**, **facilitating**, or **nurturing**.  
   A | A  
   B. The leadership in the organization is generally considered to exemplify **entrepreneurship**, **innovating**, or **risk taking**.  
   B | B  
   C. The leadership in the organization is generally considered to exemplify a **no-nonsense, aggressive, results-oriented focus**.  
   C | C  
   D. The leadership in the organization is generally considered to exemplify **coordinating**, **organizing**, or **smooth-running efficiency**.  
   D | D  

   Total 100 100

3. **MANAGEMENT OF EMPLOYEES**

   **NOW**  |  **PREFERRED**
   --- | ---
   A. The management style in the organization is characterized by **teamwork**, **consensus**, and **participation**.  
   A | A  
   B. The management style in the organization is characterized by **individual risk-taking**, **innovation**, **freedom**, and **uniqueness**.  
   B | B  
   C. The management style in the organization is characterized by **hard-driving competitiveness**, **high demands**, and **achievement**.  
   C | C  
   D. The management style in the organization is characterized by **security of employment**, **conformity**, **predictability**, and **stability in relationships**.  
   D | D  

   Total 100 100
4. **ORGANIZATIONAL GLUE**

A. The glue that holds the organization together is **loyalty** and **mutual trust**. Commitment to this organization runs high.  
   NOW: A  _____  PREFERRED: A  _____

B. The glue that holds the organization together is commitment to **innovation** and **development**. There is an emphasis on being on the cutting edge.  
   NOW: B  _____  PREFERRED: B  _____

C. The glue that holds the organization together is the emphasis on **achievement** and **goal accomplishment**. Aggressiveness and winning are common themes.  
   NOW: C  _____  PREFERRED: C  _____

D. The glue that holds the organization together is formal **rules** and **policies**. Maintaining a smooth-running organization is important.  
   NOW: D  _____  PREFERRED: D  _____

   **Total**: 100  100

5. **STRATEGIC EMPHASES**

A. The organization emphasizes **human development**. High trust, openness, and participation persist.  
   NOW: A  _____  PREFERRED: A  _____

B. The organization emphasizes acquiring **new resources** and creating **new challenges**. Trying new things and prospecting for opportunities are valued.  
   NOW: B  _____  PREFERRED: B  _____

C. The organization emphasizes **competitive actions** and **achievement**. Hitting stretch targets and winning in the marketplace are dominant.  
   NOW: C  _____  PREFERRED: C  _____

D. The organization emphasizes **permanence** and **stability**. Efficiency, control and smooth operations are important.  
   NOW: D  _____  PREFERRED: D  _____

   **Total**: 100  100
6. **CRITERIA OF SUCCESS**

   A. The organization defines success on the basis of the development of human resources, teamwork, employee commitment, and concern for people.

   B. The organization defines success on the basis of having the most unique or the newest products. It is a product leader and innovator.

   C. The organization defines success on the basis of winning in the marketplace and outpacing the competition. Competitive market leadership is key.

   D. The organization defines success on the basis of efficiency. Dependable delivery, smooth scheduling, and low cost production are critical.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NOW</th>
<th>PREFERRED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 100 100

You have completed the OCAI, please continue with the Management Skills Assessment Instrument (MSAI)
APPENDIX B

Management Skills Assessment Instrument - MSAI
Management (Leadership) Skills Assessment Instrument (MSAI)

SELF-RATING FORM

Describe your behavior as a manager/leader. Respond to the items as you actually behave most of the time, not as you would like to behave. If you are unsure of an answer, make your best guess. Please circle your response in the following columns as appropriate. The following scale is used for your ratings:

5 - Strongly Agree  
4 - Moderately Agree  
3 - Slightly Agree and/or Slightly Disagree  
2 - Moderately Disagree  
1 - Strongly Disagree

For Example:

1. I communicate in a supportive way when people in my unit share their problems with me. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Moderately Agree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Moderately Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I communicate in a supportive way when people in my unit share their problems with me. 5 4 3 2 1

2. I encourage others in my unit to generate new ideas and methods. 5 4 3 2 1

3. I motivate and energize others to do a better job. 5 4 3 2 1

4. I keep close track of how my unit is performing. 5 4 3 2 1

5. I regularly coach subordinates to improve their management skills so they can achieve higher levels of performance. 5 4 3 2 1

6. I insist on intense hard work and high productivity from my subordinates. 5 4 3 2 1

7. I establish ambitious goals that challenge subordinates to achieve performance levels above the standard. 5 4 3 2 1

8. I generate, or help others obtain, the resources necessary to implement their innovative ideas. 5 4 3 2 1

9. When someone comes up with a new idea, I help sponsor them to follow through on it. 5 4 3 2 1

10. I make certain that all employees are clear about our policies, values, and objectives. 5 4 3 2 1

Management Skills Assessment Instrument (MSAI)
11. I make certain that others have a clear picture of how their job fits with others in the organization.  5 4 3 2 1
12. I build cohesive, committed teams of people.   5 4 3 2 1
13. I give my subordinates regular feedback about how I think they’re doing. 5 4 3 2 1
14. I articulate a clear vision of what can be accomplished in the future. 5 4 3 2 1
15. I foster a sense of competitiveness that helps members of my work group perform at higher levels than members of other units. 5 4 3 2 1
16. I assure that regular reports and assessments occur in my unit. 5 4 3 2 1
17. I interpret and simplify complex information so that it makes sense to others and can be shared throughout the organization. 5 4 3 2 1
18. I facilitate effective information sharing and problem solving in my group. 5 4 3 2 1
19. I foster rational, systematic decision analysis in my unit (e.g., logically analyzing component parts of problems) to reduce the complexity of important issues. 5 4 3 2 1
20. I make sure that others in my unit are provided with opportunities for personal growth and development. 5 4 3 2 1
21. I create an environment where involvement and participation in decisions are encouraged and rewarded. 5 4 3 2 1
22. In groups I lead, I make sure that sufficient attention is given to both task accomplishment and to interpersonal relationships. 5 4 3 2 1
23. When giving negative feedback to others, I foster their self-improvement rather than defensiveness or anger. 5 4 3 2 1
24. I give others assignments and responsibilities that provide opportunities for their personal growth and development. 5 4 3 2 1
25. I actively help prepare others to move up in the organization. 5 4 3 2 1
26. I regularly come up with new, creative ideas regarding processes, products or procedures for my organization. 5 4 3 2 1
27. I constantly restate and reinforce my vision of the future to members of my unit. 5 4 3 2 1
<p>| 28. | I help others visualize a new kind of future that includes possibilities as well as probabilities. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 29. | I am always working to improve the processes we use to achieve our desired output. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 30. | I push my unit to achieve world-class competitive performance in service and/or products. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 31. | By empowering others in my unit, I foster a motivational climate that energizes everyone involved. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 32. | I have consistent and frequent personal contact with my internal and my external customers. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 33. | I make sure that we assess how well we are meeting our customers’ expectations. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 34. | I provide experiences for employees that help them become socialized and integrated into the culture of our organization. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 35. | I increase the competitiveness of my unit by encouraging others to provide services and/or products that surprise and delight customers by exceeding their expectations. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 36. | I have established a control system that assures consistency in quality, service, cost and productivity in my unit. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 37. | I coordinate regularly with managers in other units in my organization. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 38. | I routinely share information across functional boundaries in my organization to facilitate coordination. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 39. | I use a measurement system that consistently monitors both work processes and outcomes. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 40. | I clarify for members of my unit exactly what is expected of them. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 41. | I assure that everything we do is focused on better serving our customers. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 42. | I facilitate a climate of aggressiveness and intensity in my unit. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 43. | I constantly monitor the strengths and weaknesses of our best competition and provide my unit with information on how we measure up. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Moderately Agree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree/Disagree</th>
<th>Moderately Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>I facilitate a climate of continuous improvement in my unit.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>I have developed a clear strategy for helping my unit successfully accomplish my vision of the future.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>I capture the imagination and emotional commitment of others when I talk about my vision of the future.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>I facilitate a work environment where peers as well as subordinates learn from and help develop one another.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>I listen openly and attentively to others who give me their ideas, even when I disagree.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>When leading a group, I ensure collaboration and positive conflict resolution among group members.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>I foster trust and openness by showing understanding for the point of view of individuals who come to me with problems or concerns.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>I create an environment where experimentation and creativity are rewarded and recognized.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>I encourage everyone in my unit to constantly improve and update everything they do.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>I encourage all employees to make small improvements continuously in the way they do their jobs.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>I make sure that my unit continually gathers information on our customers' needs and preferences.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>I involve customers in my unit's planning and evaluations.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>I establish ceremonies and rewards in my unit that reinforce the values and culture of our organization.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>I maintain a formal system for gathering and responding to information that originates in other units outside my own.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>I initiate cross-functional teams or task forces that focus on important organizational issues.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>I help my employees strive for improvement in all aspects of their lives, not just in job related activities.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>I create a climate where individuals in my unit want to achieve higher levels of performance than the competition.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### MANAGERIAL (LEADERSHIP) EFFECTIVENESS SELF-RATING FORM

For questions 61-73 please rate your effectiveness in performing these skills. Use the following scale in your rating:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Outstanding</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Marginal</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Skill Description</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>Managing teams (building effective, cohesive, smooth functioning teams)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td>Managing interpersonal relationships (listening to and providing supportive feedback to others)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.</td>
<td>Managing the development of others (helping others improve their performance and obtain personal development opportunities)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.</td>
<td>Fostering innovation (encourage others to innovate and generate new ideas)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.</td>
<td>Managing the future (communicating a clear vision of the future and facilitating its accomplishment)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.</td>
<td>Managing continuous improvement (fostering an orientation toward continuous improvement among employees in everything they do)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.</td>
<td>Managing competitiveness (fostering an aggressive orientation toward exceeding competitors' performance)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68.</td>
<td>Energizing employees (motivating others to put forth extra effort and to work aggressively)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69.</td>
<td>Managing customer service (fostering a focus on service and involvement with customers)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.</td>
<td>Managing acculturation (helping others become clear about what is expected of them and about organizational culture and standards)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
71. **Managing the control system** (having measurement and monitoring systems in place to keep close track of processes and performance)  
   Outstanding: 5, Very Good: 4, Average: 3, Marginal: 2, Poor: 1

72. **Managing coordination** (sharing information across functional boundaries and fostering coordination with other units)  
   Outstanding: 5, Very Good: 4, Average: 3, Marginal: 2, Poor: 1

73. **Overall management competency** (general level of managerial ability)  
   Outstanding: 5, Very Good: 4, Average: 3, Marginal: 2, Poor: 1

74. On the basis of your level of management competency, how high in the organization do you expect to go in your career? (CHECK ONLY ONE ALTERNATIVE)

   5 ______ To the very top of the organization.
   4 ______ Near the top -- just below the CEO.
   3 ______ To a senior position -- e.g., a member of the executive committee.
   2 ______ One level above where you are now.
   1 ______ No higher than the current position.

75. Compared to all other managers/leaders you've known, how would you rate your own competency as a manager/leader of managers/leaders?

   5 ______ Top 5%
   4 ______ Top 10%
   3 ______ Top 25%
   2 ______ Top 50 %
   1 ______ In the bottom half
IMPORTANCE INFORMATION

NOTE: The scale changes for question 76-87. Please read carefully.

In order to succeed in your current position, how important is each of the following skills? Use the following scale in your rating:

5 - Critically Important
4 - Very Important
3 - Moderately Important
2 - Of Some Importance
1 - Little Importance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Skill Description</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>76.</td>
<td>Managing teams (building effective, cohesive, smooth functioning teams)</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77.</td>
<td>Managing interpersonal relationships (listening to and providing supportive feedback to others)</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78.</td>
<td>Managing the development of others (helping others improve their performance and obtain personal development opportunities)</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79.</td>
<td>Fostering innovation (encourage others to innovate and generate new ideas)</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.</td>
<td>Managing the future (communicating a clear vision of the future and facilitating its accomplishment)</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81.</td>
<td>Managing continuous improvement (fostering an orientation toward continuous improvement among employees in everything they do)</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82.</td>
<td>Managing competitiveness (fostering an aggressive orientation toward exceeding competitors’ performance)</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83.</td>
<td>Energizing employees (motivating others to put forth extra effort and to work aggressively)</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.</td>
<td>Managing customer service (fostering a focus on service and involvement with customers)</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85.</td>
<td>Managing acculturation (helping others become clear about what is expected of them and about organizational culture and standards)</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86.</td>
<td>Managing the control system (having measurement and monitoring systems in place to keep close track of processes and performance)</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87.</td>
<td>Managing coordination (sharing information across functional boundaries and fostering coordination with other units)</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Please write the appropriate response in the space provided next to the item number.

1. ____  Sex
   (1) Female
   (2) Male

2. ____  Age (At Last Birthday)
   (1) 30 & under  (5) 42-44
   (2) 31-35      (6) 45-47
   (3) 36-38      (7) 48-50
   (4) 39-41      (8) over 50

3. ____  Rank (Current – Not Promotable to Rank)
   (1) Colonel
   (2) Lieutenant Colonel

4. ____  Branch (Not Functional Area) of the Army (Write in the 2 Letter Identifier, for example “Infantry – IN”)

5. ____  Source of Commission
   (1) Military Academy
   (2) ROTC
   (3) OCS
   (4) Direct Commission
   (5) Other

6. ____  Ethnicity
   (1) Caucasian
   (2) African American
   (3) Latino
   (4) South Pacific Islander
   (5) Asian
   (6) Other

7. ____  Component
   (1) Active Army
   (2) USAR
   (3) USAR Title 10 and Title 32
   (4) ARNG
   (5) ARNG Title 10 and Title 32
8. _____ USAWC Class of
   (1) 2003
   (2) 2004

9. _____ Type of USAWC Student
   (1) Resident
   (2) Department of Distance Education

10. _____ Level of Education
    (1) Bachelors Degree
     (2) Masters Degree
      (3) Doctoral Degree

You have completed the MSAI, please return the survey by placing the completed survey in a box labeled: “Completed OCAI / MSAI Surveys – COL Jim Pierce.” This box will be located near the book return cart next to the student mailboxes on the 3rd floor of Root Hall.
APPENDIX C

Documentation
INFORMED CONSENT FORM FOR
BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH
The Pennsylvania State University

Title of Project: “Organizational Culture and Professionalism: An Assessment of the Professional Culture of the U.S. Army Senior Level Officer Corps”

Principal Investigator: James G. Pierce
5766 Catherine St., Harrisburg, PA 17112.
Telephone: (717) 657-0686 email: jgp604@aol.com

Advisor: Dr. Rupert F. Chisholm,
School of Public Affairs, Department of Public Administration
The Pennsylvania State University – Harrisburg
777 W. Harrisburg Pike, Middletown, PA 17057
(717) 948-6050

1. Purpose of this study:

The objective of this research is to add to the scholarly literature concerning organization theory and specifically, the sub-field of organizational culture. While the impact of culture on organizations has become a popular research topic over the last 20 years, the current body of knowledge is lacking in its analysis of the relationship between organizational culture and professionalism and professional development. Consequently, this study is being undertaken to address this dearth of literature and to satisfy the research requirements for the completion of principal researcher’s Ph.D. in Public Administration.

The purpose of this study is to determine if the organizational culture of the U.S. Army is supportive of the professional development of its officer corps in general, but specifically, its senior level officer corps. There is a great deal of concern that the U.S. Army officer corps is at risk of transitioning from a professional organization to that of an obedient bureaucracy.

The intent of this study is to determine if such a professional organizational culture actually does in fact exist.

2. Procedures to be followed:

You are asked to complete six (6) item areas on the Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument (OCAI) and the 87 questions on the Managerial Skills Assessment Instrument (MSAI).

3. Discomforts and Risks:

None beyond those experienced in everyday life.

ORP USE ONLY:
The Pennsylvania State University
Office for Research Protections
Approval Date: 05/07/03 T. Kahler
Expiration Date: 05/06/04 T. Kahler
Social Science Institutional Review Board
Informed Consent Form
Principal Investigator: James G. Pierce

4. Benefits:

While this study examines the senior level leaders of the U.S. Army it is believed that the results of this analysis will have a significant impact on organizational literature and of that relating to professional development of all professions.

5. Duration: Completion of both the OCAI and MSAI survey instruments will take between 30 and 45 minutes.

6. Statement of Confidentiality:

This is a totally anonymous and voluntary survey. No one, including the principal investigator, will be able to identify your responses on the survey; so DO NOT write your name or any other identifying marks on the survey sheets. You are to complete the OCAI and the MSAI survey instruments by writing your answers in the appropriate answer locations. The survey does not have any identifying markings on it. Since this is an anonymous survey, completion and return of the survey is considered implied consent.

7. Right to Ask Questions:

You can ask any questions about the research. If you have questions, please contact James G. Pierce at (717) 657-0686 (email: jgp604@aol.com)

You may call or email The Pennsylvania State University Office for Research Protections (814-865-1775 or ORProtections@psu.edu) if you need further information about your rights as a research participants.

8. Voluntary Participation:

You do not have to participate in this research project. You do not have to answer any questions that you do not want to answer. The completion and return of the survey indicates that you have given the principal investigator your consent to be included in this research project.

9. Age:

You must be 18 years of age or older to participate in this research study.
Date: April 30, 2004

From: Tracie L. Kahler, IRB Administrator

To: James G. Pierce

Subject: Results of Review of Continuing Progress Report - Exemption (IRB #15865)

Approval Expiration Date: April 29, 2005

"Organizational Culture and Professionalism: An Assessment of the Professional Culture of the U.S. Army Senior Level Officer Corps"

The Continuing Progress Report for your project was reviewed and approved by the Office for Research Protections. If your study will extend beyond the approval expiration date, you must contact this office to initiate a continuing review of this research.

COMMENT: You have indicated in your Continuing Review form that no additional participants will be enrolled in your study. Therefore, the informed consent form has not been reviewed for currency. However, if you wish to enroll additional participants in the future, the informed consent form must be submitted for IRB review and approval prior to being distributed to participants.

By accepting this decision you agree to notify the Research Protections Office of (1) any additions or changes in procedures for your study that modify the participants' risks or the consent form(s) in any way and (2) any events that affect the safety or well-being of participants.

Please Note: If you are interested in subscribing to or being removed from ORP listserv, send an email to: L-ORP-Research-L-subscribe-request@lists.psu.edu to subscribe or L-ORP-Research-L-unsubscribe-request@lists.psu.edu to unsubscribe. There is no need to add any text in the subject line or in the message body of the email.

Thank you for your efforts to maintain compliance with the federal regulations for the protection of human participants.

TLK/mbc

cc: Rupert F. Chisholm
    Robert F. Munzenrider
MEMORANDUM FOR COL James G. Pierce

SUBJECT: Use of USAWC students as subjects in “Organizational Culture and Professionalism: An Assessment of the Professional Culture of the U.S. Army Senior Level Officer Corps”

1. References: Your proposal dated 9 April 2003

2. The scope and responsibilities outlined in the reference are acknowledged.

3. Approval is granted to administer subject study to USAWC students from Dr. William Johnsen, Acting Dean of Academics, and the Office of Institutional Assessment, U.S. Army War College.

4. The Chairman of Department of Distance Education, Dr. Rich Yarger, will receive a copy of your proposal and a copy of this approval in order for you to include the DDE Classes of 2003 and 2004 during the First Resident Course and the Second Resident Course.

5. POC for this approval action is the undersigned.

ANNAS T. WAGGENER, Ph.D.
Director, Institutional Assessment
Dear Jim:

I'm sorry I forgot to mention MSAI. Of course you're welcome to use it as well.

Best wishes.

Kim

-----Original Message-----
From: Pierce, James G. COL
To: 'Cameron, Kim'
Sent: 4/6/03 10:57 AM
Subject: RE: Potential Use of the OCAI

Professor Cameron,

Thank you once again so very much for your assistance. Since you did not specifically mention the MSAI I just want to confirm that it is ok for me to use that instrument as well.

Sincerely,

Jim Pierce

-----Original Message-----
From: Cameron, Kim
To: 'Pierce, James G. COL'
Cc: 'Sherry.Slade@b-d-s.com'
Sent: 4/3/03 1:55 PM
Subject: RE: Potential Use of the OCAI

Dear Jim:

Thanks very much for your note. You have my permission to reproduce the OCAI for your dissertation research, and you may contact Sherry Slade (Sherry.Slade@b-d-s.com) to make arrangements for comparison data analyses using professionals as well as for on-line admnistration of the survey.

Best wishes in your project!

Kim

-----Original Message-----
From: Pierce, James G. COL
To: 'Cameron, Kim'
Sent: 4/2/03 11:49 AM
Subject: RE: Potential Use of the OCAI

Dear Professor Cameron,

Please accept this email message as my official copyright request to use your Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument (OCAI) and the Management Skills Assessment Instrument (MSAI) for the purpose of conducting
scholarly research in support of my Ph.D. dissertation, from Penn State University, titled: "Organizational Culture and Professionalism: An Assessment of the Professional Culture of the U.S. Army's Senior Level Officer Corps," I intend to issue these two instruments to approximately 750 to 1,000 U.S. Army officers at the rank of lieutenant colonel and colonel.

I have sent an email message to Ms. Slade to see if she will be able to extract the OCAI and MSAI data for "professional" respondents. If she is unable to obtain this information from the database, then I would like your approval to administer the OCAI and MSAI to approximately 100 total "professionals," such as doctors and lawyers and to use their responses for the purposes of discriminate analysis with the military respondents identified above.

If you are willing to grant copyright approval to me, is there a website, or can you send to me an original copy of each instrument that I may use as a master for reproduction?

Thank you for all of your help and assistance.

Sincerely,

Jim Pierce

COL James G. Pierce
Director, Strategic Leadership Studies
Department of Distance Education
U.S. Army War College, Box 441
122 Forbes Avenue
Carlisle Barracks, PA 17013-5050
717-245-3577
James.Pierce@carlisle.army.mil

-----Original Message-----
From: Cameron, Kim [mailto:cameronk@bus.umich.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, March 19, 2003 8:59 PM
To: 'Pierce, James G. COL'
Cc: 'Sherry.Slade@b-d-s.com'
Subject: RE: Potential Use of the OCAI

Dear Jim:

Thanks very much for your note and description of your dissertation. It sounds very intriguing. We do have lots of data on people from various professions in the OCAI and MSAI database, so it would be possible to make the information you need available to you. The keeper of the data set is Sherry Slade at Behavioral Data Services. She has been administering the data for about 15 years. I'm not sure, however, if she could find the individual professions of respondents since we usually don't ask for that data... only the organization type. However, if you communicate with her, she may be able to tell you what she can do. You will need to pay her for her time and analyses, but I suspect you could find a way to do...
that.

Best wishes in your work, Jim.

Kim

------Original Message------
From: Pierce, James G. COL [mailto:James.Pierce@carlisle.army.mil]
Sent: Wednesday, March 19, 2003 1:21 PM
To: 'cameronk@umich.edu'
Subject: Potential Use of the OCAI

Professor Cameron,

My name is Jim Pierce and I am an ABD Ph.D. student in Public Administration from Penn State. I also work with Chris Paparone with whom I believe you have already communicated concerning your OCAI. I am writing because I am in the incipient stage of my dissertation which I have tentatively titled "Organizational Culture and Professionalism: An Assessment of the Professional Culture of the U.S. Army Officer Corps." My primary research question is as follows: "Does the organizational culture of the U.S. Army restrict the professional development of its Officer Corps?" In your book, "Diagnosing Organizational Culture," on page 68 you list average culture profiles for different industry groups. Do you have statistics for the professions such as doctors, lawyers, engineers, etc? My initial thought for the methodology of my study is to administer the OCAI, with of course your copyright approval, to approximately 750 Army Senior Service College students to determine both the current and preferred organizational culture as perceived by this select group of individuals, who will become the next generation of Army senior leaders, and then compare their data to an established response database of civilian professionals. Additionally, I also thought about administering the MSQAI to the students in order to validate the overall OCAI, but also to determine if the management competencies of this senior group of officers correlate with the leadership roles and competencies outlined in the literature on professionalism. My thought is that is that their scores will indicate if their managerial skills are representative of what is expected of a professional. My initial perception is that the professions will score high in the adhocracy quadrant and that the officer corps will score high in the hierarchy quadrant.

I sincerely appreciate any guidance that you may have concerning my thoughts.

Jim Pierce

COL James G. Pierce
Director, Strategic Leadership Studies
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANOVA - OCAI Comparisons</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th><strong>(p ≤ .05)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLANNOW</td>
<td>3.943</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADHOCNOW</td>
<td>6.083</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRKTNOW</td>
<td>4.208</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIERNOW</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>.520</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLANPREF</td>
<td>1.249</td>
<td>.264</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADHOCPREF</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>.401</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRKTPREF</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>.987</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIERPREF</td>
<td>0.147</td>
<td>.519</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLANNOW</td>
<td>0.614</td>
<td>.653</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADHOCNOW</td>
<td>0.271</td>
<td>.897</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRKTNOW</td>
<td>3.259</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIERNOW</td>
<td>2.097</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLANPREF</td>
<td>1.615</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADHOCPREF</td>
<td>0.719</td>
<td>.579</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRKTPREF</td>
<td>1.403</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIERPREF</td>
<td>1.695</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rank</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLANNOW</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>.747</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADHOCNOW</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>.790</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRKTNOW</td>
<td>2.768</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIERNOW</td>
<td>1.187</td>
<td>.276</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLANPREF</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>.780</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADHOCPREF</td>
<td>3.637</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRKTPREF</td>
<td>1.140</td>
<td>.286</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIERPREF</td>
<td>0.177</td>
<td>.674</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Branch</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLANNOW</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.464</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADHOCNOW</td>
<td>0.842</td>
<td>.678</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRKTNOW</td>
<td>0.869</td>
<td>.642</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIERNOW</td>
<td>1.041</td>
<td>.411</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLANPREF</td>
<td>0.952</td>
<td>.528</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADHOCPREF</td>
<td>1.726</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRKTPREF</td>
<td>0.775</td>
<td>.764</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIERPREF</td>
<td>0.928</td>
<td>.560</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of Commission</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLANNOW</td>
<td>0.464</td>
<td>.762</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADHOCNOW</td>
<td>1.185</td>
<td>.316</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRKTNOW</td>
<td>1.811</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIERNOW</td>
<td>0.942</td>
<td>.439</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLANPREF</td>
<td>0.625</td>
<td>.745</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADHOCPREF</td>
<td>0.717</td>
<td>.581</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRKTPREF</td>
<td>2.235</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIERPREF</td>
<td>0.478</td>
<td>.752</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# ANOVA - OCAI Comparisons

## Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLANNOW</td>
<td>0.684</td>
<td>0.603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADHOCNOW</td>
<td>1.619</td>
<td>0.168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRKTNOW</td>
<td>1.854</td>
<td>0.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIERNOW</td>
<td>2.157</td>
<td>0.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLANPREF</td>
<td>3.784</td>
<td><strong>0.005</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADHOCPREF</td>
<td>1.811</td>
<td>0.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRKTPREF</td>
<td>1.768</td>
<td>0.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIERPREF</td>
<td>1.242</td>
<td>0.292</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Component

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLANNOW</td>
<td>1.943</td>
<td>0.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADHOCNOW</td>
<td>2.075</td>
<td>0.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRKTNOW</td>
<td>4.221</td>
<td><strong>0.002</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIERNOW</td>
<td>0.713</td>
<td>0.583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLANPREF</td>
<td>1.183</td>
<td>0.317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADHOCPREF</td>
<td>0.663</td>
<td>0.583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRKTPREF</td>
<td>0.975</td>
<td>0.421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIERPREF</td>
<td>1.020</td>
<td>0.396</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## USAWC Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLANNOW</td>
<td>0.753</td>
<td>0.386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADHOCNOW</td>
<td>0.794</td>
<td>0.373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRKTNOW</td>
<td>3.686</td>
<td>0.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIERNOW</td>
<td>1.499</td>
<td>0.221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLANPREF</td>
<td>0.954</td>
<td>0.329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADHOCPREF</td>
<td>4.350</td>
<td><strong>0.037</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRKTPREF</td>
<td>2.247</td>
<td>0.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIERPREF</td>
<td>2.763</td>
<td>0.097</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Type of USAWC Student

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLANNOW</td>
<td>1.705</td>
<td>0.192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADHOCNOW</td>
<td>1.820</td>
<td>0.178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRKTNOW</td>
<td>0.734</td>
<td>0.392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIERNOW</td>
<td>1.450</td>
<td>0.229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLANPREF</td>
<td>0.468</td>
<td>0.494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADHOCPREF</td>
<td>0.216</td>
<td>0.643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRKTPREF</td>
<td>0.097</td>
<td>0.755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIERPREF</td>
<td>0.752</td>
<td>0.386</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Level of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLANNOW</td>
<td>1.830</td>
<td>0.161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADHOCNOW</td>
<td>0.684</td>
<td>0.505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRKTNOW</td>
<td>2.742</td>
<td>0.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIERNOW</td>
<td>9.495</td>
<td><strong>0.000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLANPREF</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADHOCPREF</td>
<td>0.195</td>
<td>0.823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRKTPREF</td>
<td>0.207</td>
<td>0.813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIERPREF</td>
<td>0.742</td>
<td>0.477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANOVA - MSAI Comparisons</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAN COMPETENCIES</td>
<td>10.229</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADHOCRACY COMPETENCIES</td>
<td>2.855</td>
<td>.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARKET COMPETENCIES</td>
<td>8.384</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIERARCHY COMPETENCIES</td>
<td>5.164</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAN COMPETENCIES</td>
<td>2.017</td>
<td>.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADHOCRACY COMPETENCIES</td>
<td>2.670</td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARKET COMPETENCIES</td>
<td>2.236</td>
<td>.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIERARCHY COMPETENCIES</td>
<td>1.200</td>
<td>.310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rank</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAN COMPETENCIES</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADHOCRACY COMPETENCIES</td>
<td>.497</td>
<td>.481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARKET COMPETENCIES</td>
<td>.773</td>
<td>.380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIERARCHY COMPETENCIES</td>
<td>1.419</td>
<td>.234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Branch</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAN COMPETENCIES</td>
<td>1.064</td>
<td>.382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADHOCRACY COMPETENCIES</td>
<td>.773</td>
<td>.766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARKET COMPETENCIES</td>
<td>.917</td>
<td>.575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIERARCHY COMPETENCIES</td>
<td>.553</td>
<td>.956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of Commission</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAN COMPETENCIES</td>
<td>2.712</td>
<td>.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADHOCRACY COMPETENCIES</td>
<td>2.209</td>
<td>.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARKET COMPETENCIES</td>
<td>1.371</td>
<td>.251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIERARCHY COMPETENCIES</td>
<td>1.112</td>
<td>.344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAN COMPETENCIES</td>
<td>11.003</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADHOCRACY COMPETENCIES</td>
<td>4.982</td>
<td>.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARKET COMPETENCIES</td>
<td>2.755</td>
<td>.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIERARCHY COMPETENCIES</td>
<td>5.750</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Component</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAN COMPETENCIES</td>
<td>1.391</td>
<td>.236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADHOCRACY COMPETENCIES</td>
<td>1.532</td>
<td>.192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARKET COMPETENCIES</td>
<td>.501</td>
<td>.735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIERARCHY COMPETENCIES</td>
<td>.325</td>
<td>.861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>USAWC Class</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAN COMPETENCIES</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>.679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADHOCRACY COMPETENCIES</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>.736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARKET COMPETENCIES</td>
<td>2.126</td>
<td>.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIERARCHY COMPETENCIES</td>
<td>.981</td>
<td>.322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of USAWC Student</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAN COMPETENCIES</td>
<td>4.990</td>
<td>.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADHOCRACY COMPETENCIES</td>
<td>4.203</td>
<td>.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARKET COMPETENCIES</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIERARCHY COMPETENCIES</td>
<td>.800</td>
<td>.371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAN COMPETENCIES</td>
<td>2.346</td>
<td>.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADHOCRACY COMPETENCIES</td>
<td>1.865</td>
<td>.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARKET COMPETENCIES</td>
<td>4.939</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIERARCHY COMPETENCIES</td>
<td>1.492</td>
<td>.226</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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