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ABSTRACT
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Problem

This study investigated the relationships between Reservist leaders’ attitudes and Hersey and Blanchard’s Situational Leadership Theory (SLT), and Thomas’s Integrative Model of Intrinsic Motivation during a 2004 Sinai, Egypt, peacekeeping mission.

Methodology

This descriptive study provided quantitative and qualitative results. Three instruments were used with a convenience sample of leaders within one forward-deployed National Guard infantry battalion. The LEADSelf instrument determined the SLT style of unit officers and non-commissioned officers. The Thomas Empowerment
Survey profiled participants’ intrinsic motivation. A researcher-developed survey determined preferences for intrinsic versus extrinsic motivator factors.

The study centered on the following issues:

1. Are the participants satisfied with their involvement in the National Guard and the peacekeeping mission?
2. Is there a significant relationship between intrinsic levels of motivation as measured by Thomas’s model and volunteerism (or hypothetical volunteerism) in the participants?
3. Are the participants motivated by intrinsic or extrinsic factors to take part in the study peacekeeping operation?

Results

Seventy-four percent of the respondents to the SLT survey reported a high task and high relationship S2 “Selling” leadership style.

Less than 10% of the respondents felt high levels of intrinsic motivation in the areas of Choice, Competence, and Progress as measured by the Thomas scale. Similarly, 22% of the respondents reported a high sense of Meaningfulness.

Regarding the research hypotheses, no significant relationships could be established between volunteerism/hypothetical volunteerism and Thomas’s intrinsic factors using chi-square statistics. However, there was qualitative support for this relationship.

The ultimate desire of the study was to see whether intrinsic or extrinsic factors held greater sway on these Reserve soldiers in a peacekeeping environment. What motivated them? Soldiers preferred intrinsic factors over extrinsic factors. They also reported displeasure when these intrinsic factors were absent.
Conclusions

1. There was no quantitative support for the research questions studying relationships between volunteerism/hypothetical volunteerism and Thomas's intrinsic motivation factors.

2. However, qualitative support suggested that soldiers are intrinsically motivated to participate in peacekeeping operations and the National Guard in general.

3. Respondents indicated they could be both dissatisfied and satisfied in aspects of their military career and the Sinai peacekeeping mission.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The idea of citizen-soldiers dates back to the ancient Athens city-state where the very concept of citizen came to be, and then citizen and soldier were first intertwined. "Citizen participation in defense [in Athens] was deemed politically and militarily vital" (Gold & Solaro, 2003, para. 7). In this day and age the connection is no less vital, but change and challenges threaten to compromise the citizen-soldier concept in the United States.

The last decade has shown a marked increase in the number of worldwide missions in which the United States Army is involved. From Somalia in 1992 to Haiti, from Bosnia to Kosovo, from Afghanistan to Iraq in 2003, the American soldier is busier today than ever before. In the same 10 years, the size of the active force has not increased; instead it has decreased by half. Fewer soldiers do more and are deployed more often than ever before. The active force is not capable of performing all of these contingency missions and perform the primary mission of fighting this nation's wars (Carter, 2003). The Reserve Components (in the form of federal Reservists and state-based Guardsmen) have been active participants—particularly since the events of September 11, 2001. While Reserve Components have been involved in wartime missions, their role is most apparent in the increased involvement of the Reserve Components in peacekeeping-type missions.
Background of the Reserve Components

History of the Reserve Components

The Reserve Components date back to before the origins of the United States. These militia members were not “soldiers by trade. [These soldiers] were farmers, doctors, and blacksmiths who joined hands and formed units during times of common danger in the Massachusetts Bay Colony” (Army National Guard, 1998, p. 3). Under the British, these militiamen had the mission of “defending the settlement and colony in case of attack” (Hunter, Gordon, Smith, & Gordon, 2003, p. 148). Later, these ‘minutemen’ left their homes and farms to take part in the ongoing revolution and war for independence from Great Britain. Citizen-soldiers in these units have participated in every major conflict around the world over the past 360 years. “To Americans, ‘war’ meant mustering the Militia. The citizenry fought our nations – and war was about the mobilization of citizen soldiers” (Vlahos, 2004, para. 5).

The term ‘National Guard’ came into being 25 August 1824 when a New York unit of the militia adopted the honorary title of “Battalion of the National Guards.” This title became widespread after the Civil War and became an official title with the National Defense Act of 1916 (Hunter et al., 2003, p. 149). In 1933, an amendment of the National Defense Act allowed the creation of the federal component of the National Guard. This amendment also set the conditions that would allow the President of the United States to activate the National Guard in times of national emergency without concurrence of the state governors. This would set the stage for further employment of the National Guard in conflicts throughout the 20th century (Hunter et al., 2003, p. 150).
At the conclusion of World War II the Reserve Components were organized into the basic structure which still holds today:

The National Guard of the United States (NGUS), as a Reserve Component of the Army of the United States (AUS), was to be an “M-Day” (Mobilization Day) force, thoroughly trained, equipped and ready for immediate service to the nation in case of enemy aggression or a national emergency. The National Guard of the several states was to provide organizations and personnel for the Reserve (Federal) Component, and to preserve the peace, order and public safety in their states in local emergencies. The Federal Government was to supervise military instruction, furnish field training facilities, pay, uniforms, equipment, ammunition and a portion of armory facilities. (Hunter et al., 2003, p. 151)

In the 1990s, as the U.S. military focused less on war fighting and more on contingency operations, the Reserve mission also changed to support the Total Force. Reservists served in Haiti, Somalia, Bosnia, Kosovo, and many other peacekeeping and humanitarian missions. One example, which is key to this study, took place in 1995 when a battalion “which consisted of 70 percent Guard soldiers, deployed to the Middle East as part of the Multinational Force and Observers (MFO)” (Hunter et al., 2003, p. 155). This initial deployment in support of the MFO mission was studied by the Army Research Institute (ARI) and found to be a viable way in which the “Reserve Components could augment or replace Active Component (AC) soldiers and support the increased operational tempo of U.S. forces” (Phelps & Farr, 1996, p. vii).

The militia members of yesteryear became the seed of the Reserve and National Guard (collectively known as the Reserve Components [RC]) organizations that exist today. These Reserve organizations are still made up of volunteers (Duffy, 2003b).

The Reserve Components in the Present

Currently, the Army Guard and Reserves make up two-thirds of the U.S. Army’s total personnel strength (Confessore, 2003). The United States Army National Guard—
the direct subject of this study—has over 350,000 members nationwide (Army National Guard, 1998, p. 3) with “headquarters in 50 states plus Washington, D.C., Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. It has units in virtually every county in the USA” (Moniz, 2003b, para. 7).

According to Confessore (2003, para. 22) the reserves were stretched even before the events of September 11, 2001. “Since the early nineties reserve duty days tripled from 5 million to 13 million a year. Since September 11, 2001 that number has increased to between 30 and 40 million duty days per year.” Numbers vary; but some suggest between “169,000+” (Burns, 2003, para. 13) to “212,000 citizen soldiers have been mobilized—and that number fails to account for state-ordered National Guard mobilizations” (Gold & Solaro, 2003, para. 3). John Hillen, a member of the U.S. Commission on National Security Structure for the 21st century, remarks that “one of every six reserve soldiers is on active duty now, it’s hard to see how the Army can [find] more” (Kelly, 2003, para. 15).

These organizations have been very active participants in the global War on Terror (WOT). They have participated in a wide range of activities ranging from Homeland Security missions to active combat in Afghanistan and Iraq (Conan, 2003). They have also been heavily involved in relieving Active Component (AC) units of their duties in peacekeeping missions—where RC skills and experiences are well suited to contingency missions (Vest, 2003). “You will find reservists, particularly Army reservists and National Guard guys, who have served in Somalia, Haiti, Kosovo, Bosnia, Afghanistan, [and Kuwait] (Confessore, 2003, para. 22). This is not speaking in general
terms. There are in fact individual soldiers "who have been called up four or even five times in the past decade" (Kitfield, 2003a, para. 8).

In post-war Iraq, the current and most demanding peacekeeping focus area, as the total force is reduced, the trend appears that Reserve involvement as a percentage of forces on the ground will actually increase over time (Donnelly, 2003, para. 6). This has been borne out as the war effort in Iraq and Afghanistan dragged into 2007. Demand for National Guard and Reserve troops has continued at a staggering pace (Shanker & Gordon, 2006) and many soldiers are being retrained to ensure their usefulness in the war zone (Schmitt, 2004, para. 2).

Effects of High Operational Tempo

Operational tempo (OPTEMPO) is at an all-time high based on the limited number of soldiers in the United States military today. According to Boehlert (2003):

Today's high demand for the Guard stands in stark contrast to the 70's and 80's. The Guard got busy in the 90's conducting peace missions. The missions allowed active duty troops to perform other vital duties, while keeping thousands of guardsmen away from home. Guard leadership embraced the missions as a way to highlight the relevance of the units. (para. 41)

A study drawn from a 1991 survey data showed that mobilization of Reserves "could have positive or negative effects. The experience of being mobilized may well enhance unit cohesion and foster a sense of pride and belonging that may prove invaluable in improving readiness and in increasing retention" (Kirby & Naftel, 2000, p. 259).

The Kirby and Naftel study (2000) relied on data from Desert Storm, so its currency is in question. The authors added the following qualification to their conclusions:
[The enhancing effect] is likely to be heavily dependent on the circumstances, length, and frequency of mobilization (p. 259).

[Those circumstances may include] lengthy, future deployments that do not enjoy high-level public support. Those deployments may, in turn, result in unfavorable effects on employers and family attitudes and thus on recruiting and retention (p. 263).

Frequent, small scale, and perhaps unpopular deployments may have . . . adverse effects on retention. (p. 274)

As mentioned, the 1991 data used in the Kirby and Naftel study may not reflect the current reality where the Reserves are being continually deployed (Moniz, 2004a).

According to Lieutenant General H. Steven Blum, chief of the National Guard Bureau which oversees all reserve forces, “The Weekend Warrior is dead, the National Guard is and will continue to be used at a rate that is unprecedented in the 30-year history of the all-volunteer military” (Burns, 2003, para. 9).

While some may appreciate these opportunities, many other soldiers are saying, “It’s too much to ask” (Kershaw, 2003, para. 4). Repeated call-ups are “not fair to their families and not fair to their employers” (Gegax & Brant, 2003, para. 12). The heavy involvement of the Reserves has taken a commensurate toll on recruiting and retention (Duffy, 2003a). “Some of these part-time soldiers have been called up so often that they have begun to feel like draftees” according to Thomas and Barry (2003, para. 9). Gold and Solaro (2003) suggest that a subtle difference arises because Reservists are no longer being used as reinforcements for the regulars, they are being used as substitutes. As a result, “the citizen-soldiery is wearing out and getting out, and most seriously, beginning to question the whole concept [of service]” (Gold & Solaro, 2003, para. 13). “Concern about the increased Guard tempo is something that is always in the backs of [the leaderships’] minds” (Prawdzik, 2003, p. 28).
A House Armed Services Committee bipartisan commission recognizes the potential that "the strains placed on the Reserve Components may lead to retention and other problems" (Boehlert, 2003, para. 47). While many soldiers are stoic about their duty and their patriotism, asking troops "to pull even longer shifts could put serious strains on the willingness of these citizen-soldiers to volunteer in the first place" (Muller, 2002, para. 28). As Kitfield (2003b, para. 38) states, "At some point, people will start to quit."

The primary effects can be seen as experienced leaders and soldiers are departing more quickly than they can be recruited and—more importantly—trained.

The expectation is that the loss of personnel will be most devastating among [middle]-grade officers and senior noncommissioned officers. These are men and women in their 30s and 40s who have families and mortgages—least able to survive [the] maximum unpredictability and disruption on mature lives. The net result is that the military might keep its current size but become thin-waisted: lots of young people, lots of older people, not nearly enough in between. (Friedman, 2003, para. 10)

In the Reserve Component world, where leadership in traditionally younger positions, like company command, tends to be older than their active counterparts, this effect will cut deeper. The second order effects may have a greater effect. The pyramid hierarchy of the U.S. Army relies upon the lower-level leadership of today to become the senior leadership of tomorrow (Stone, 2000; Vinch, 2000).

In June 2003, when this study began, the departures had not yet manifested themselves (Duffy, 2003a). If any substantial increase in soldier departures occurs, future readiness will be in jeopardy. At that time, Lieutenant General James Helmy, chief of the Army Reserve, marked recruiting/retention as his number one source of worry (Burns, 2003, Moniz, 2003a, para. 3).
Perceptions of Peacekeeping Missions

A fundamental factor in issues of job satisfaction is an individual’s attitudes and motivation with regard to their work. The military is not unlike its civilian counterparts in industry and business. There are specific jobs and duties that appeal to different people. As Chu noted, “The worst thing you can do in terms of retention is to have square pegs stuck in a round hole” (Duffy, 2003b, para. 5).

In the case of the military, there are jobs which are combat oriented (e.g., Infantry, Armor, etc.) and there are jobs that are support-oriented (e.g., Engineer, Signal, and Military Police) and service-support related (e.g., Transportation and Finance). When an individual is trained in one area he or she may be justifiably reluctant to work in another. For instance, an infantryman who specializes in combat operations with a clearly defined enemy might be unhappy to find himself acting as a policeman directing traffic or upholding the law in a tumultuous situation. This actual phenomenon is often exactly what occurs when a trained infantryman is asked to take part in a peacekeeping operation (M. Lewis, personal communication, March 11, 2003). They sometimes view this form of duty as a “distraction” or something outside their scope of work (P. Carter, personal communication, March 9, 2003). The late Colonel (Ret.) David Hackworth (Hackworth & Mathews, 1996) spoke to this issue:

The Pentagon calls what we are seeing OOTW – operations other than war – missions. They are drawing away our combat power, dissipating it. Everybody is staying busy, but everyone is stretched to the limit doing it. It is in the nature of these missions to dull the mightiest heavyweight sluggers. Here we are taking a well-trained prizefighter and putting him on line to hand out chow at the Salvation Army. To be a good fighter you have got to work the speed bag, work the heavy bag, you have got to spar. To be a soldier you have got to train, have live-fire exercises, use your main guns, fire and maneuver, and you have to do this over and over until you do it right. . . . We have got our warrior built up to fight wars,
but he is doing missions where he has to pull his punch—and this pulls all his muscles. When that battalion comes out of Macedonia [or another peacekeeping mission], it is not ready to fight. [It has been] on a peacekeeping mission, so its marksmanship, its cohesion is loose, and its ability to maneuver and fight is rusty. (p. 283)

One study suggests that—as Hackworth remarked on ‘staying busy’—this peacekeeping phenomenon is a means by which modern citizen-soldiers, willing to sacrifice their lives for the nation and the state, are being required to [perform the impossible tasks:] justify their keep on the public purse, to bring peace to war torn countries in remote parts of the world, and also to remain neutral and out of harm’s way. (Abbott, 2001, p. 2)

In Iraq this situation is particularly jarring as warfighters attempt to transition into peacekeepers (Brown, 2004) and back to war fighters, sometimes in the span of minutes. This is especially hard for the combat arms soldiers who perceive having fought and won; “their job is done” (Myers, 2003, para. 53).

Of particular note to this study was the previous 1994-1995 Sinai study (Phelps & Farr, 1996) where members of the Multinational Force and Observers reported that “reservist’s judgments that peacekeeping assignments were appropriate for their units or good for their careers declined over time, and there appeared to be a growing disaffection with the mission” (Kirby & Naftel, 2000, p. 263). In part, one intent of this study was to see if Reservists in 2004 held the same opinions with regard to the Sinai peacekeeping mission.

Statement of the Problem

Survey information existed related to RC peacekeeping attitudes, morale and retention but no previous research specifically targeted intrinsic motivation in the unusual
demographic that exists in Reserve Component soldiers. There is also no record of investigations into SLT in this particular demographic.

This study was an analysis of the relationship between the Reserve Component leaders’ attitudes and motivation as it relates to a peacekeeping contingency operation. Specifically, the study was intended to investigate whether there is a relationship between leaders’ attitudes and the Situational Leadership theory described by Hersey and Blanchard. The study also intended to examine the relationship between leaders’ attitudes and intrinsic motivator factors.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to determine if there is a relationship between the Situational Leadership (SLT) style of RC leaders and their attitudes and motivation with respect to a contingency peacekeeping mission in the Sinai Peninsula of Egypt. Situational Leadership was selected because it is already an application that the United States military incorporates into its leadership development training.

**Overview of Methodology**

This was a descriptive study that provided both quantitative and qualitative correlational research materials. Three primary instruments were used. The first instrument was administered at the beginning of the deployment to determine the SLT style of the officers and senior non-commissioned officers within one forward-deployed National Guard infantry battalion. A second established instrument was used to profile military participants’ intrinsic motivation in a convenience sample during the field deployment. A third researcher-developed survey was concurrently administered with the second instrument in order to evaluate the participants’ preference for intrinsic versus
extrinsic motivator factors. Finally, a fourth, mostly qualitative, instrument was administered at the conclusion of the deployment to validate some of the earlier commentary.

Research Questions and Related Hypotheses

The following research questions and related hypotheses examined the overall relationship between intrinsic motivation and military peacekeeping operations. All hypotheses were tested at the $p<.05$ level of significance.

Research Question 1. Are the Reserve Component leaders involved in the study operation satisfied with their involvement in the National Guard and the peacekeeping mission? Results were evaluated with 10 Likert scale questions and descriptive statistics.

Research Question 2. Is there a significant relationship between intrinsic levels of motivation as measured by the *Choice* component of Dr. Thomas's integrated model and volunteerism in Reserve Component leaders involved in the study operation?

Hypothesis 1. There is a significant relationship between intrinsic levels of motivation as measured by the *Choice* component of Dr. Thomas's integrated model and volunteerism in Reserve Component leaders involved in the study operation.

Research Question 3. Is there a significant relationship between intrinsic levels of motivation as measured by the *Competence* component of Dr. Thomas's integrated model and volunteerism in Reserve Component leaders involved in the study operation?

Hypothesis 2. There is a significant relationship between intrinsic levels of motivation as measured by the *Competence* component of Dr. Thomas's integrated model and volunteerism in Reserve Component leaders involved in the study operation.
Research Question 4. Is there a significant relationship between intrinsic levels of motivation as measured by the *Meaningfulness* component of Dr. Thomas’s integrated model and volunteerism in Reserve Component leaders involved in the study operation?

Hypothesis 3. There is a significant relationship between intrinsic levels of motivation as measured by the *Meaningfulness* component of Dr. Thomas’s integrated model and volunteerism in Reserve Component leaders involved in the study operation.

Research Question 5. Is there a significant relationship between intrinsic levels of motivation as measured by the *Progress* component of Dr. Thomas’s integrated model and volunteerism in Reserve Component leaders involved in the study operation?

Hypothesis 4. There is a significant relationship between intrinsic levels of motivation as measured by the *Progress* component of Dr. Thomas’s integrated model and volunteerism in Reserve Component leaders involved in the study operation.

Research Question 6. Is there a significant relationship between intrinsic levels of motivation as measured by the *Choice* component of Dr. Thomas’s integrated model and hypothetical volunteerism in Reserve Component leaders involved in the study operation?

Hypothesis 5. There is a significant relationship between intrinsic levels of motivation as measured by the *Choice* component of Dr. Thomas’s integrated model and hypothetical volunteerism in Reserve Component leaders involved in the study operation.

Research Question 7. Is there a significant relationship between intrinsic levels of motivation as measured by the *Competence* component of Dr. Thomas’s integrated model and hypothetical volunteerism in Reserve Component leaders involved in the study operation?
Hypothesis 6. There is a significant relationship between intrinsic levels of motivation as measured by the *Competence* component of Dr. Thomas's integrated model and *hypothetical* volunteerism in Reserve Component leaders involved in the study operation.

Research Question 8. Is there a significant relationship between intrinsic levels of motivation as measured by the *Meaningfulness* component of Dr. Thomas's integrated model and *hypothetical* volunteerism in Reserve Component leaders involved in the study operation?

Hypothesis 7. There is a significant relationship between intrinsic levels of motivation as measured by the *Meaningfulness* component of Dr. Thomas's integrated model and *hypothetical* volunteerism in Reserve Component leaders involved in the study operation.

Research Question 9. Is there a significant relationship between intrinsic levels of motivation as measured by the *Progress* component of Dr. Thomas's integrated model and *hypothetical* volunteerism in Reserve Component leaders involved in the study operation?

Hypothesis 8. There is a significant relationship between intrinsic levels of motivation as measured by the *Progress* component of Dr. Thomas's integrated model and *hypothetical* volunteerism in Reserve Component leaders involved in the study operation.

Research Question 10. Are Reserve Component leaders involved in the study operation motivated by intrinsic or extrinsic factors to take part in the study peacekeeping
operation? Results will be evaluated with descriptive statistics derived from the researcher-designed instrument.

**Rationale for the Study**

In the Reserve community (as in the active force) there is a worry that the post-9-11 War on Terror (WOT) activations of over 212,000 reservists are having a negative effect on soldier recruiting (Duffy, 2003b). It is also having a commensurately more important effect on soldier retention (Duffy, 2003a). These departures are threatening the future leadership needs of the service. Without the proper leadership, the Army will be incapable of fielding a force that can function across a full spectrum of operations “including combating terrorism, meeting its peacekeeping commitments, and fighting a major regional war all at the same time” (Confessore, 2003, para. 26).

**Significance of the Study**

This analysis is important because understanding attitudes and motivation of the Reserve Component soldiers involved in these missions is conducive to understanding their levels of job satisfaction and addressing issues which impact soldier retention—or the propensity for them to depart the service. This is borne out by David Chu, the undersecretary of defense for personnel, who said, “Our findings show that retention is advantaged if people are doing what they love to do and are trained to do” (Duffy, 2003b, para. 6).

A profile of RC leaders benefits the Reserve Components and the military as a whole. This study offers additional answers to the question of “what motivates soldiers in the peacekeeping operational environment.” This study also defines the human resource
issues most important to retain leaders in an organization. The findings of this study may be utilized in the future, in combination with other efforts, to develop attractive measures that stem the flow of soldiers from the Guard.

**Delimitation**

The AC United States Army consists of over 450,000 soldiers worldwide. The Reserve Components of the United States Army are twice as many. At the approximate time of the study, according to Thompson and Duffy (2003), “the Army [in total] has more than 368,000 soldiers overseas in 120 countries, many of them combat troops engaged in peacekeeping” (p. 39).

The sample studied in this project represented a convenience sample limited to the leadership of the 1st Battalion of the 125th Infantry Regiment (1-125 IN). The 1-125 IN is a Reserve Component combat unit that mobilized and served in the forward-deployed peacekeeping mission in the Sinai Peninsula of Egypt from November 2003 to August 2004. The total number of Michigan Guard soldiers serving in the Sinai for this mission was 425. The study was restricted to officers and noncommissioned officers as the representative ‘leadership’ of the unit. The population of leaders of the deployed unit was approximately 160 personnel. The maximum number of those leaders in the organization received all surveys throughout the study.

All input was limited to the returned surveys and interviews. This input was incorporated into the study in accordance with the methodology in chapter 3.
Limitation

Time and the circumstance of a unit widely deployed over a 120-mile mountainous, desert frontage, and participants actively engaged in the peacekeeping operation prevented simple access to the survey population and complicated data collection.

Definition of Terms

The following definitions are provided to eliminate context questions and describe otherwise unfamiliar acronyms.

*Active Component (AC)*: Soldiers and officers who are part of the Regular Army. They typically report for duty daily.

*Advanced Non-Commissioned Officer Course (ANCOC)*: Third leadership development course for non-commissioned officers; required for promotion to senior NCO SFC positions and above.

*Army National Guard (ARNG)*: Reserve Component of the Total Army. The National Guard falls under peacetime control of the state governors. They may be federalized to serve Federal government missions and deployments, as in the case of the study unit.

*Army of the United States (AUS)*: The Total Army consisting of both Reserve and Active Components.

*Army Research Institute (ARI)*: Army proponent for research and academic studies headquartered in Alexandria, VA.

*Army Reserves (AR)*: The second half of the Reserve Component of the Total Army. Reservists fall under the Federal government at all times but they must be
activated to take part in missions and deployments. Otherwise, they participate in monthly drills and annual training periods like their National Guard counterparts.

*Basic Non-Commissioned Officer Course (BNCOC):* Second leadership development course for non-commissioned officers; required for promotion to junior NCO SSG positions and above.

*Captain (CPT or O-3):* Company grade officer position.

*Captains’ Career Course (CCC):* Required course for junior officers who have reached the grade of CPT; used interchangeably with the older term Officer Advanced Course.

*Cognitive Evaluation Theory (CET):* Leadership theory formulated by Deci and Ryan, which included task activities.

*Combined Arms and Staff Services School (CAS3):* A staff school required for CPTs.

*Command and General Staff College (CGSC):* A command and staff school required for MAJs.

*Company Grade Officer:* Enveloping term for LTs and CPTs (O-1 through O-3).

*Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel (DCSPER):* Pentagon office which supports the Chief of Staff of the Army in matters of personnel; a civilian equivalent would be the Human Resources Vice President and attached staff.

*Field Grade Officer:* Enveloping term for all MAJs, LTCs, and COLs.

*Fiscal Year (FY):* The government measures operating expenses on a fiscal calendar, October to October.
Hypothetical volunteerism: The changing nature of the study deployment (from voluntary to mandatory) necessitated using a hypothetical question “Given the choice, would you have volunteered for this peacekeeping mission?”

Job Characteristics Model (JCM): Leadership theory formulated by Hackman and Oldham.

Leader: “A person who directs a military force or unit; a person who has commanding authority or influence” (Merriam-Webster’s Collegiate Dictionary, 2002). In the context of this study, a leader is a person in a position of authority over a number of direct reports and their subordinates.

Leadership: Process in which leaders provide direction, supervise, and assist their group or team to achieve organizational goals, while seeing to the individual needs of the group membership.

Leadership position (military): A position where the leader has direct responsibility for goal attainment and supervisory responsibility for the actions of direct reports and their subordinates. Examples specific to this study include team leader, squad leader, platoon leader, specialty platoon leader, and company commander.

Leadership Effectiveness and Adaptability Description Self (LEADSelf): Self-administered test to determine one’s own Situational Leadership style.

Leadership Effectiveness and Adaptability Description Other (LEAD Other): Test administered to subordinates of a leader to determine the leader’s Situational Leadership style.
Lieutenant (LT, 2LT, 1LT, O-1, O-2): Officers are commissioned as 2nd Lieutenants and are promoted to 1st Lieutenants on a rolling time scale at their unit—usually 24 months after commissioning.

Lieutenant Colonel (LTC, O-5): Typically, officers are selected for and promoted to LTC when they have served 14-16 years on active duty. Officers typically remain LTCs until 18-20 years in service.

Major (MAJ, O-4): Typically, officers are selected for and promoted to MAJ when they have served 10-12 years on active duty. Officers typically remain MAJs until 13-16 years in service.

Master Sergeant (MSG, E-8): Senior noncommissioned officer in a staff or administrative position.

Master of Business Administration (MBA): Graduate-level degree in business.

Military Operations Other Than War (MOOTW): Outdated term for missions outside the realm of combat, replaced by Stability and Support Operations (SASO).

Multinational Force & Observers (MFO): Eleven-nation organization developed to administer the dictates of the Camp David Accords of 1978. Headquartered in Rome, the MFO runs missions from two camps in the Sinai Peninsula and offices in Cairo and Tel Aviv to ensure peace is maintained in the Sinai.

National Guard of the United States (NGUS): The component of the Reserves which is run by the individual states but reports to the Federal Government.

Non-commissioned officer (NCO): Enlisted soldier who has attained the rank of E-5 or above. These soldiers are the first-line leaders in the United States Army organization.
**Officer Advanced Course (OAC):** Required course for junior officers who have reached the grade of CPT; used interchangeably with the newer term Captains’ Career Course.

**Officer Basic Course (OBC):** Required course for recently commissioned junior officers.

**OPTEMPO:** From operational tempo; the relative amount of work performed in the forms of exercises, deployments, and real-world missions.

**Primary Leadership Development Course (PLDC):** First leadership development course for non-commissioned officers.

- **R1:** Followers’ low readiness level as measured by Situational Leadership theory.
- **R2:** Followers’ low to moderate readiness level as measured by Situational Leadership theory.
- **R3:** Followers’ moderate to high readiness level as measured by Situational Leadership theory.
- **R4:** Followers’ high readiness level as measured by Situational Leadership theory.

**Reserve Component (RC):** Soldiers and officers who are part of the Reserves or National Guard; typically report for duty one weekend a month and 2 weeks a year. They can be mobilized to meet State and Federal mission requirements.

**Sergeant (SGT, E-5):** Junior non-commissioned officer; requires PLDC for selection.

**Sergeant First Class (SFC, E-7):** Senior non-commissioned officer; requires ANCOC for selection.
Situational Leadership Theory (SLT): A leadership theory formulated by Hersey, Blanchard, and Johnson. This theory includes follower and situational aspects to the leadership model. The following leadership styles are designated within the SLT theory (these are in contrast to normal military staff positions with the same titles):

SI: Situational Leadership style characterized by ‘Telling behavior’.
S2: Situational Leadership style characterized by ‘Selling behavior’.
S3: Situational Leadership style characterized by ‘Participating behavior’.
S4: Situational Leadership style characterized by ‘Delegating behavior’.

Stability and Support Operations (SASO): Enveloping term for missions outside the realm of normal combat missions, replaced Military Operations Other Than War (MOOTW) in the military lexicon.

Staff Sergeant (SSG, E-6): Junior non-commissioned officer; requires BNCOC for selection.

Survey on Officer Careers–2000 (SOC2000): Army Research Institute survey administered biannually to measure officer career satisfaction and concerns.

Survey Participation Request (SPR): The email version of a cover letter requesting that recipients respond.

Task Force Viking (TF Viking, 1-125 IN): 1st Battalion of the 125th Infantry; study unit designated to take part in the United States’ 46th rotation through the MFO mission.

Troop Program Units (TPU): Specific Army Reserve units.

War on Terror (WOT): An undeclared global war against terrorists, which resulted from the terror attacks on 11 September 2001.
Year Group (YG): Each year generates a year group of freshly minted 2nd Lieutenants. Promotion timelines operate relative to an officer’s initial year group. OCS, ROTC, and USMA graduates all fall into the same pool for each specific year.

Organization of the Study

Chapter 1 deals with the introduction of the study. Background information is provided along with a statement of the problem. This introduction addresses the purpose of the study, an overview of methodology, and research questions. A rationale for the study was provided, and the significance of the study was also addressed. Study delimitations and limitations are also described. Finally, a glossary of terms is provided.

Chapter 2 contains a literature review of previous work on the subject of the study. The review of literature focuses on research and both current and past theory on the presented topics.

Chapter 3 details the methodology used in the study. This chapter describes the participants of the study, research questions, the study procedures, the instruments used, variables and measurement of data, and data analysis methods.

Chapter 4 deals with the treatment of data and the analysis of the data in support of the study research questions. Tables and figures describe the results of the study.

Chapter 5 contains a summary of findings, discussion, conclusions, and recommendations for further study and for improvements of this study.
CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Review of Relevant Literature

The literature review begins with an examination of the major pertinent theories of motivation. The section continues with a general review of the development of leadership theories. The review narrows the topic of leadership to the specific leadership theory targeted for study—Hersey and Blanchard’s Situational Leadership Theory and its implementation within the United States Army. Volunteerism and issues of volunteerism within the military are also addressed. Finally, military issues with contingency operations and peacekeeping missions are explored relative to both Active Component and Reserve Component soldiers.

Theories of Motivation

The root of this study was to determine the motivation that drives National Guard members to participate in peacekeeping missions. In order to understand their motives we must first understand the concepts behind motivation theory, especially modern motivation theory. While it is impossible to determine the absolute origins of our understanding of motivation, it is possible to suggest that modern motivation theory was birthed by the time studies of Frederick Winslow Taylor.
Early Theories

Taylor was renowned for his eccentricities, but his development of the concept of scientific management was designed to eek out the most perfectly efficient means of production—without thought to the executors of that production. Although Frederick Winslow Taylor increased proficiency in the organizations he studied, he did so at the expense of the human condition. His main means of motivating workers into greater productivity was simple—the threat of joblessness.

This was the means of extrinsic motivation first refined to science. Taylor often culled the ranks of organizations of some of the “most intelligent, hardest working, and most trustworthy” workers because they failed to meet his strict guidelines of ‘reaction time’. As Kangel (1997, p. 304) noted, workers under Taylor were in “little prisons in time, given over utterly to” their task, with nothing to take satisfaction in other than the fact that they were earning more money than ever before.

Taylorism resulted in a clear discrimination between the thinkers of management and the workers on the production line. He preferred the worker to work thoughtlessly, but continuously, motivated by money and money alone with no concerns for the intrinsic merits of the work beyond the creation of more product, faster. The management of the organization could pursue decision-making and intrinsic satisfaction, but the worker was expected to be like oxen driven by threat of stick and hope of the carrot (Colvin, 2000, para. 1).

Taylor’s contemporaries, Lillian and Frank Gilbreth, used the concepts of motion study to further refine scientific management to the point that workers could draw no motivation or creativity from their work. The Gilbreths saw no need to time the task;
instead they desired merely to eliminate all unnecessary motion, which would have the secondary effect of reducing the time to complete the task (Kangel, 1997, p. 415). Their methods were certainly useful in increasing the efficiencies of production, but their work also held very little regard for the people performing the work.

Those studies were further expounded upon by the behaviorists, John Broadus Watson and B.F. Skinner. Watson founded the school of behaviorism and emphasized that by using its tenets he could develop humans into anything he desired. His emphasis relied on the concept that humans and animals were indistinguishable in their response to stimuli. He based these tenets on the virtues of conditioned response and famously used Little Albert, an 11-month-old child, to demonstrate a fear of furry animals by associating the animals’ appearance with frightening sound stimuli. Needless to say, his method was based on extrinsic motivation, and was not particularly humanistic in its approach (Weiland, 2005).

Like Watson, B.F. Skinner (1971) was a behaviorist building off of Pavlov’s classical conditioning. Skinner preferred the use of operant conditioning to stimulate operant behavior when he realized that “behavior can be controlled by manipulating punishments and rewards in the environment” (Parsons, 2005). Skinner recognized that pleasure and pain were the motives influencing human behavior as a “result of feelings associated with consequences rather than actual motives” (Skinner, 1974, p. 52).

Taylor, the Gilbreths, and Watson and Skinner all laid the framework of the industrial understanding of human behavior and simple motivation as reactions to stimuli. They each set many of the conditions of motivation theory while actively avoiding or recognizing the importance of human needs. A key tenet of understanding motivation, as
a concept, is understanding the human needs which drive the motivation. This is why the theories of Maslow and Herzberg are critical to this study.

**Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs**

Abraham Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs is recognized as a framework motivation theory that describes human needs in a pyramid-like structure where lower level deficit (d-) needs must first be satisfied before one can pursue higher level motivator needs. By way of example, a person suffering a lack of food or water (a lower level physiological need) will be unable to pursue the needs for belonging or self-esteem (higher level needs and motivator needs). They simply must concern themselves with satisfying the lower level need before moving up the schema to enjoy higher level needs.

The military is a virtual test laboratory for exploring Abraham Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs (Morgan, 1997, p. 37). Figure 1 highlights these needs in both generic and workplace examples. While there are many training phases where deprivations of needs are introduced – as a learning experience – in general, soldiers are completely provided for. The active military is characterized by its all-inclusive nature; the U.S. government provides all room, board, medical, and dental care.

Physiological needs are met with dining facilities and barracks. Safety and security needs are built in. While there is some anxiety built in by the demanding environment and lingering potential for deployment, soldiers are secure in the knowledge that, if they maintain suitable performance levels, they are provided with all of the security they require. Soldiers ultimately must worry only about themselves – and their subordinates when appropriate.
The need to belong is built into the military experience as well. From the first day of an enlistment, soldiers are forced to operate as teams. Those who attempt to go solo will find themselves alienated by their peers and, more devastating, targeted by the superiors. Every unit is a built-in family that is born of privation, nurtured by teamwork, and raised together as one fraternity. All military members share a common bond of belonging.

At the next level, Maslow, as cited in Boeree (1998), notes the lower and higher levels of esteem (or ego) needs. "The lower desire is the need for the respect of others, the need for status, fame, glory, recognition, attention, reputation, appreciation, dignity, even dominance. The higher form involves the need for self-respect, including such feelings as confidence, competence, achievement, mastery, independence, and freedom" (Boeree, 1998, p. 5). Enlisted soldiers and junior officers tend to operate at this level. Since their physical needs are already provided for, they move between the needs for external and internal respect.

It is a given by the nature of their involvement in the military that soldiers and officers have their lower needs met by the government payroll or their own built-in relationships. Even the "respect of others" is built in initially by the autocratic nature of the professional military hierarchy. All things being equal, members of the military have their (initial) Maslow deficit (d-) needs satisfied (Boeree, 1998, p. 5).

It is difficult to generalize and suggest that U.S. Army soldiers are also members of the small percentage of people who operate at the self-actualization level. "Their goal is to have a fulfilling life in the military; they must have a challenging, exciting job they can identify with" (Vandergriff, 2001, p. 83). There are some built-in givens that do suggest that military soldiers and officers have the makings of self-actualizers. The old Army advertising tagline says it best, "Be all you can be!" This was an expression of self-actualization in its simplest of terms—and it was wildly successful as a recruiting tool.

Maslow’s selection of self-actualized people shares the following characteristics:

[They are] reality-centered; they can distinguish the fake and dishonest from the real and genuine. They are problem-centered; they treat life’s difficulties as problems demanding solutions rather than personal affronts to fight or surrender to. Finally, Maslow’s self-actualized figures [and military members in general]
are means-and-ends-oriented. They understand that the ends don’t necessarily justify the means, the means are sometimes ends, and sometimes means are more important than the ends. (Boeree, 1998, p. 7)

In all ways, military soldiers and officers are afforded the opportunity to operate at the esteem/ego and self-actualization levels of the Maslow hierarchy. This “need” for higher level of esteem is the crux of the remainder of this study.

Herzberg’s Two-Factor Theory of Motivation

Similar to Maslow, Frederick Herzberg focused on lower and higher level needs. He considered certain lower level needs as hygiene factors and the higher level needs as motivator factors. Herzberg found that the pre-requisite schema postulated by Maslow was not quite as rigid. In fact, you could experience hygiene and motivator factors, mutually exclusive or together.

Herzberg determined that “factors which led to job satisfaction differed from those which resulted in dissatisfaction” (Department of Behavioral Sciences & Leadership, USMA, 1988, p. 89). In particular he determined that certain ‘hygiene’ factors such as adequate pay, working hours and conditions, and coworker relationships relate only to whether a subject is dissatisfied or not. “When hygiene factors are absent, [subjects] are dissatisfied. When they are present, we are not dissatisfied (but we are not necessarily happy)” (Department of Behavioral Sciences & Leadership, USMA, 1988, p. 89).

The second type, ‘motivator’ factors, when present, does increase satisfaction:

Motivator factors are generally related to the job itself—the content of the job rather than its context. The challenging or interesting nature of the work; the opportunities for advancement, recognition, responsibility, and growth; and the individual’s sense of achievement or pride in completing the work are all
classified by Herzberg as motivator factors. (Department of Behavioral Sciences & Leadership, USMA, 1988, p. 89)

Expressed on a continuum, Herzberg’s theory shows the relative scale of these hygiene and motivator factors (Figure 2).

In some ways, Herzberg’s scale is similar to Maslow’s hierarchy. Hygiene factors correspond with the lower deficit Maslow needs, while motivator factors loosely correspond to Maslow’s higher level needs. When dissatisfied with hygiene factors, both theories suggest subjects will strive for homeostasis—a desire to reach equilibrium and satisfaction again.

Herzberg’s work emphasized, “The work itself is just as important—or perhaps even more important—as the conditions that surround that work” (Department of Behavioral Sciences & Leadership, USMA, 1988, p. 89).

Figure 2. Herzberg’s two-factor approach to motivation. From Leadership in Organizations (p. 90), by Department of Behavioral Sciences & Leadership, USMA, 1988, Garden City Park, NY: Avery Publishing Group.
Behavioral Sciences & Leadership, USMA, 1988, p. 91). A retired Army Major and expert in the field of military personnel, Don Vandergriff reinforced the point: “We [know] coming into this business that we would never be monetarily rich but would instead be enriched by our chosen lifestyle and our accomplishments” (Vandergriff, 2001, p. 84).

Friedman (2003) suggests the means of not only maintaining but increasing force strength is to offer soaring military pay increases. This is deeply contrary to the concepts outlined by Herzberg.

With respect to the Reserve soldiers, Hackworth supports the concept that Reservists’ motivation to serve is a result of motivator rather than hygiene factors. He suggests:

Minutemen are America’s original all-volunteer force, dedicated patriots who don’t join up because it’s a job offering three squares a day and perks such as college tuition after the enlistment runs out. Most already have good civilian jobs and join up for purely noble reasons; love of country and a deep-seated desire to defend the homeland. (Hackworth, 2003, para. 6)

A Reserve soldier serving in Iraq reinforces Hackworth’s statements with a plaintive plea which makes reference to both hygiene and motivator factors:

We sign up for the Reserve when we leave the Army because we want to continue to serve with people we respect. We sign up because we want to serve our country. We sign up for extra income or educational benefits. Some of us sign up to be a part of history, for the possibility of adventure. (Kimmey, 2003, para. 6)

Both Herzberg motivator and hygiene factors may be important to Reservists (Dorsey, 2004). The relevance of that importance is critical to this study.
Deci and Ryan’s Cognitive Evaluation Theory

The first, most widely known model of intrinsic motivation was developed by Deci and Ryan. This model was built on studies of experimental games with blocks and word puzzles. The studies were designed to test the subjects’ willingness to solve these puzzles. The studies also focused on how motivators, which appealed to classic Herzberg hygiene and motivator factors, affected their willingness to solve the puzzles.

As cited by Thomas (2002, p. 115), Deci and Ryan’s work built on the concept of “task activities as sources of intrinsic reward.” This pairing also suggested, “Intrinsic reward occurs when the participants experience a sense of self-determination (choice) and competence.”

The Deci model for motivation addressed reward as a result of task activities alone—he made no reference to the purposes behind those activities. Deci and Ryan also made the very controversial assessment that extrinsic rewards tend to diminish the value of intrinsic ones. They even suggested that praise as an extrinsic motivator or reward damages study subjects’ motivation to do work (Deci & Flaste, 1995, p. 67). This assessment has limited empirical support but it has caused no end of conflict and consternation in the academic community. Known as the ‘over justification effect’, Deci suggests that individuals offered extrinsic rewards for continued performance of an interesting task show decreases in intrinsic motivation to perform that same task (Maurer, 1981, para. 19). Over time Deci also suggests that there will be the following negative effects:

1. Perceived decrease in self-determination
2. Rewards seen as controlling
3. Goals shift from learning/mastery to gains in terms of rewards

4. Persistence lasts only until extrinsic motivator is gained

5. Extrinsic motivators may not always exist

6. Extrinsic motivators may not inoculate against feelings of discouragement

7. May begin seeking out easy goals.

In a purely economic model, it is possible to see the diminishing returns (Bavendam, 2000, para. 8) inherent in constant rewarding of others to stimulate behavior. If nothing else, eventually they will lose interest. Nevertheless, there was ample resistance from other sources to this suggestion. Cameron, Pierce, and Eisenberger all worked together periodically to dismiss whole portions of the Deci and Ryan model.

Ultimately, the Deci and Ryan model—known as Cognitive Evaluation Theory (CET)—has as its focus ‘task activities.’ Those task activities “provide their own feedback and rewards that in turn shape levels of experienced choice, or self-determination, and increased levels of competence.” The model is well suited to the analysis of “the context of games” in which Deci and Ryan validated their theory (Thomas & Velthouse, 1990, p. 668). This theory also “explains what makes learning interesting” (Thomas & Jansen, 1996, p. 12) but the failure to include ‘task purposes’ in the model makes the overall theory insufficient for workplace application.

Hackman and Oldham’s Job Characteristics Model

The second highly recognized model of intrinsic motivation was developed by Hackman and Oldham (Hackman & Oldham, 1980). This model—based on intrinsic process motivation—is accepted as almost a direct replacement for the Herzberg model in organizational settings (Leonard, Beauvais, & Scholl, 1999, para. 6). Hackman and
Oldham’s Job Characteristics Model (JCM) replaced the Herzberg two-factor theory because the Herzberg model failed to hold up under repeated empirical testing (Thomas & Jansen, 1996, p. 12).

The Job Characteristics Model is focused upon the task purposes which Deci and Ryan’s Cognitive Evaluation Theory failed to address. Hackman and Oldham stressed that the purpose or intended outcome of a task is the source of intrinsic rewards. As cited by Thomas (2002, p. 116), their model goes on to develop five characteristics of job design which include skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, and feedback.

In combination, these characteristics are expected to manifest themselves in three psychological states which will satisfy workers. These states include “experienced meaningfulness of the work, experienced responsibility for outcomes of the work, and knowledge of actual results of the work.” Part of the problem with this model is the fact that only meaningfulness can truly be attributed as an intrinsic reward. Knowledge of results and responsibility for those results is only a reward when those results are favorable—or when progress is occurring (Thomas, 2002, p. 116).

For their part, Hackman and Oldham stressed the importance of task purpose (unlike Deci and Ryan, who supported task activities). The Job Characteristics Model also is well supported by validating research, and it strongly indicates that the five characteristics do have favorable effects on job satisfaction and a commensurate reduction in turnover or absenteeism. But, as shall be seen, both models separately were only half as strong as they could be.
Thomas’s Integrated Theory of Intrinsic Motivation

The consolidated approach appears in the work of Thomas who has worked with both Velthouse and Tymon to further the work of both Deci and Ryan and Hackman and Oldham (Thomas & Tymon, 1994, p. 1). The Thomas, Velthouse, and Tymon proposed motivational model of empowerment focuses on intrinsic motivation (see Figure 3).

The Thomas model collapses the virtues of both of the preceding theories while discarding their inadequacies. He distills the Hackman and Oldham model by reducing the three psychological states into two intrinsically rewarding states—a sense of meaningfulness and a sense of impact—and then added the missing activity-related rewards (drawn from the Deci and Ryan model)—a sense of choice and competence (Thomas, 2002, p. 116).

**Figure 3.** Intrinsic task rewards. From *Intrinsic Motivation in the Military* (p. 10), by K. Thomas & E. Jansen, 1996, Monterey, CA: Naval Postgraduate School.
The one tenet, a sense of impact, was later modified to more properly reflect a sense of progress. This model has been called an Interpretive model of Intrinsic Task Motivation or an Integrative Model of Intrinsic Motivation (Thomas & Velthouse, 1990; Thomas & Jansen, 1996, p. 14) (see Figure 4).

This model requires that we examine intrinsic and extrinsic rewards from both tasks and nontasks. The model also incorporates all the tenets and the progenitors from Deci and Ryan and Hackman and Oldham into one truly integrated model.

![Figure 4. An integrative model of intrinsic task motivation. From Intrinsic Motivation in the Military (p. 9), by K. Thomas & E. Jansen, 1996, Monterey, CA: Naval Postgraduate School.]

Described in detail, each of the tenets proposed by Thomas, Velthouse, and Tymon appears sound and logical:

**Choice** is the opportunity you feel to select task activities that make sense to you and perform them in ways that seem appropriate. The feeling of choice is the
feeling of being free to choose—of being able to use your own judgment and act out of your understanding of the task.

**Competence** is the accomplishment you feel in skillfully performing task activities you have chosen. The feeling of competence involves the sense that you are doing good, quality work on the task.

**Meaningfulness** is the opportunity you feel to pursue a worthy task purpose. The feeling of meaningfulness is the feeling that you are on a path that is worth your time and energy—that you are on a valuable mission, that your purpose matters in the larger scheme of things.

**Progress** is the accomplishment you feel in achieving the task purpose. The feeling of progress involves the sense that the task is moving forward, that your activities are really accomplishing something. (Thomas & Jansen, 1996, p. 14)

Perhaps the most interesting thing about the Thomas model is that it does not stop with only a definition of the model and its merits. The Thomas model’s virtue is that it also comes with a detailed means of implementation. If one operates with the tenets in Figure 5 in mind with respect to one’s self and one’s work team, Thomas suggests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHOICE</th>
<th>COMPETENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delegated authority</td>
<td>Knowledge Models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust in workers</td>
<td>Positive Feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security (no punishment for honest mistakes)</td>
<td>Skill recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A clear purpose</td>
<td>Challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>High, non-comparative standards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEANINGFULNESS</th>
<th>PROGRESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A non-cynical climate</td>
<td>A collaborative climate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearly identified passions</td>
<td>Milestones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An exciting vision</td>
<td>Celebrations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant task purposes</td>
<td>Access to customers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole tasks</td>
<td>Measurement of improvement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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that intrinsic motivation will become an integrated part of the organization.

Fundamentally, the Thomas Model is an attempt to do away with the industrial-age paradigm of command and control in the workplace that was instituted in the early 1900s. This is a counterpoint to the Frederick Taylor era of "Scientific Management" (Thomas, 2002, p. 116). No longer is compliance the focus; no longer are extrinsic carrots and sticks the only means to motivate workers. This is transactional leadership at its most grievous (Burns, 1978). The industrial model is often regarded as a "dehumanizing environment where the leadership philosophy espoused is to neglect human relations in the workplace" (Kline, 2003, para. 6). Instead of this harmful, mechanical atmosphere, Thomas suggests that an egalitarian, collegial atmosphere must be fostered where leadership and coaching are the order of the day. In the new environment, intrinsic motivation and getting internal rewards through self-management are desirable.

To do otherwise in today's environment is to risk alienation and the loss of the necessary element of organizational success—the people. By way of example, the Army has attempted to deal with a lack of officer retention by promoting young Captains faster (Lewis, 2001). Unfortunately, this extrinsic appeal to a hygiene factor fails to grasp the importance of intrinsic motivation. It also fails to account for the fact that insufficiently seasoned officers may well find themselves in over their head (Chief of Staff of the Army, n.d.).

According to Major (Ret.) Donald Vandergriff, the concept of promoting to maintain "essentially amounts to bribing people to stay, buying their loyalty, patriotism
and moral strength to go in harm’s way, based on the dehumanizing assumption that our
officers and noncommissioned officers are mindless, undifferentiated, replaceable cogs in
a machine” (Vest, 2003, para. 11). This methodology shows a deep lack of consideration
and refers directly back to the outdated industrial model fostered by Frederick Taylor
himself. With regard to the tenets of intrinsic motivation previously described, this
industrial approach rarely succeeds and often has a requisite backlash effect—in the form
of Deci’s overjustification effect—that may actually drive attrition, rather than quell it.

Intrinsic Motivation in the Military

A number of studies have targeted intrinsic motivation in the military. In fact, the
work that Thomas and his contemporaries do is mostly developed with the military in
mind.

Most of Thomas’s work was done through the Naval Postgraduate School in
support of military programs in all the various services. Development of the Integrated
Model was in support of studies of motivation in the military. Thomas was also able to
draw connections between his motivation model and the effects on the leadership and the
retention in the Reserve Troop Program Units (TPU) which he studied (Thomas, 1995;
Thomas & Barrios-Choplin, 1996).

Part of Thomas’s study focus was on the unprogrammed loss of Reservists—who
failed to honor their enlistment commitment. Many losses were due to performance
issues, medical problems or hardships; but many others were manageable or preventable
losses (Thomas, 1995, p. 9). Thomas attributed a lot of these TPU retention issues to
calculative or reinforcement psychological issues. In short, he found that Reservists
experienced intrinsic psychological satisfaction—or rewards—from their involvement in
duty and training (Thomas, 1995, p. 11).

Thomas suggests that “intrinsic rewards from work tasks are important predictors
of employee turnover in civilian organizations. Job design interventions that enrich those
jobs are often effective at reducing turnover” (Thomas, 1995, p. 18). In the military this
attrition concept is the same, but it is the training (which makes up most of a soldier’s
experience in the military) which has a positive—or negative—effect on intrinsic
motivation.

Dissatisfaction with the training often results in overall dissatisfaction. It is
important to note that dissatisfaction with the training has a secondary effect of
undermining a soldier’s faith in his ability to do his job—and therefore a directly related
lack of faith in the probability of survival in combat. This desire for Competence had an
overwhelming effect on the units in the Thomas study. This was recently substantiated
when soldiers in Iraq reported their dissatisfaction in their mission, and more specifically,
the dissatisfaction with their preparations and proficiency in executing that mission.
Soldiers were most disappointed when reporting that their job “had little or nothing to do
with their training” (Graham & Milbank, 2003, para. 2).

It is also important to note that Thomas built an effective model of leadership and
retention interaction in a separate study. This model is important because it accounts for
much of the subject matter of this study. Thomas drew a connection between Leadership
behavior (like the behavioral studies), situational factors (like Hersey and Blanchard’s
work), unit conditions affecting training (including the 4 tenets of Choice, Competence,
Meaningfulness, and Progress which Thomas espouses), the soldiers’ decision process
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(incorporating the impact of intrinsic rewards) which all result in an enlisted retention rate. This retention rate is either positively or negatively impacted by the calculus of the equation (Thomas, 1995, p. 8).

Others have also done substantial work in the area of intrinsic motivation in the militaries around the globe with similar results. One Romanian study, by Claudiu (2002), saw a similar desire for the leaders of the organization (officers and non-commissioned officers) to find satisfaction in either job- or task-oriented motivation or relationship oriented motivation—not unlike the task and relationship components of Situational Leadership theory. Claudiu found both the intrinsic and extrinsic aspects of motivation at work in his study.

Interestingly enough, Claudiu (2002) suggests that response between officers and non-commissioned officers tends to be homogeneous, which supports the sample that was selected in this study.

Claudiu also found that “the dilemma to be efficient [at tasks] or to make people happy is still current and it is up to the institution to intervene in order to encourage the behaviors and orientation that produce maximum efficiency for itself and maximum satisfaction for its constituents” (Claudiu, 2002, para. 20).

An Australian study bore out similar results. Pascoe, Ali, and Warne (2002) studied the leaders of multiple Australian headquarters through field, quantitative, and qualitative studies. They found that job satisfaction and motivation to perform well was dependent on both extrinsic factors (conditions of service, recognition and rewards, organizational loyalty to workers, workplace design, and performance management) and intrinsic factors (worker loyalty to organization and most importantly job significance).
(Pascoe et al., 2002, p. 1247). These factors tie directly back to the ideas offered in Hackman and Oldham's Job Characteristics Model, which in turn tied into Thomas's Integrated Model.

A third study, this one from the Greek Navy, supports the concept that an intrinsically motivated military adds a dimension of meaningfulness in their view of their position as not just a job or vocation, but as a profession. Papadopoulos (2001) states that "we are purposive beings, we must find some sense of meaningfulness" (p. 3). We can treat our work as a job—where only pay is desired for work given. In contrast the work can be viewed as a profession. "Officers and non-commissioned officers qualify as professionals because their skill involves expertise, responsibility, and corporateness in fashion similar to respected professions of medicine and law" (Papadopoulos, 2001, p. 4).

The connection to the military as a profession is an entirely appropriate one. A profession is typically separated from normal careers by its attention to competence, encouragement on progress, and its inculcating of meaningfulness. Needless to say, choice is also an important element in becoming and remaining a professional—in this case a professional soldier. This global perspective supports the overall importance of an intrinsically motivated military force.

A final note on intrinsic motivation in the military comes from Bainbridge (1999). Bainbridge makes reference to Deci's Cognitive Evaluation Theory when he suggests that competence and capability and a sense of self-determination are necessary to a sense of intrinsic motivation. Bainbridge argues that self-determination in the military is difficult to assess. He recognizes that modern soldiers are inherently initial volunteers—short of a wartime draft. But soldiers "are often compelled to perform a specific mission
in a certain way when neither the assignment nor the method is what they might have chosen” (Bainbridge, 1999, para. 16). This comment will be of importance in addressing the issues of volunteerism – separating volunteering for service in the military and volunteering for a specific mission.

**Background to Leadership**

**Theories of Leadership**

During the last century the study of Leadership has sprung from non-existence, to cottage industry, to a powerhouse, big business. In the early 1900s research began into what made a ‘good’ leader. The first popular approach was that leaders were gifted with an innate ability or trait. This trait approach became what is now recognized as the Great Man theory—that individuals are ‘born to be a leader’ or are ‘natural leader[s]’ (Northouse, 2001, p. 15).

This uncanny and somewhat illogical mind-set survived for nearly 40 years before academia began to take a hard look at the subject. Although other concepts came to light after the 1940s, traits theory still exists today in some fashion. In fact, an argument can be made that most leadership theory distills back to traits theory as one suitable persona rules as a controlling leader over those who are less ‘gifted.’ Sadly, much of the literature today still resorts to what great things a leader might do to the detriment or discrimination against their subordinates (Dubrin, 2001).

While traits theory still lives on and remains a subject of study today, the 1940s brought a renewed interest in the other options available. Behavior or style approach became the new leadership style, the latest thing in controlling one’s contemporaries. In this case the concept relied upon the behaviors of the leader rather than the personality
characteristics of the leader (Northouse, 2001, p. 35). Style approach seemed very much in line with the traits concept but it did give birth to the idea that leadership is generally composed of two forms of behavior: task and relationship behavior.

Although the style approach did forward new and important ideas, it still focused on the leader alone. It was not until the 1960s with the rise of two other theories that the 'situational aspects' and 'the followers' entered into the leadership equation. Those major subgroups of theory are known as contingency theory and situational leadership theory.

Contingency theory attempted to match leaders with appropriate situations, whereas the situational approach was the first step into incorporation of the follower or the subordinate into the leadership process (Northouse, 2001, p. 75). These theories and situational leadership in particular are key subjects of this dissertation.

Situational Leadership Theory

If it is accepted that leaders are made and not born—or at least leaders are accepted to not have a hypothetical inborn potential for leadership—then an appropriately essential and exhaustive leadership theory must accommodate the opportunity to grow and learn as a leader. They should be able to learn or train to adapt their style of leadership behavior to accommodate varying situations. If it is further accepted that the follower is as much a part of the leadership equation as the leader, then leadership theory must evolve to incorporate both collaborators (Hersey, Blanchard, & Johnson, 2001, p. 107) in the leadership relationship.

The situational approaches to leadership were the first such leadership theories which accommodated both tenets in the previous paragraph. They emphasized “the
importance of contextual factors that influence leadership processes” (Yukl, 2001, p. 13).

Collectively, they were also the first approaches to recognize that:

Empirical studies tend to show that there is no normative (best) style of leadership. Effective leaders adapt their leader behavior to meet the needs of their followers and the particular environment [or situation]. If their followers are different, they must be treated differently. Therefore effectiveness depends on the leader, the followers, and other situational variables. Behavioral and environmental considerations must be incorporated into the leader actions. (Hersey et al., 2001, p. 120)

Tannenbaum and Schmidt’s development of a leadership pattern was one of the initial and most significant situational approaches to leadership (Bass, 1990). Their Continuum of Leader Behavior focused on relationship-oriented and task-oriented behaviors and how a leader should react in those terms. Their approach offered seven choices from democratic to authoritative that accounted for the freedom of leaders and followers in their interaction (Hersey et al., 2001, p. 108).

Fiedler’s Contingency model built upon these task-oriented and relationship-oriented interactions between leaders and followers (Hersey et al., 2001, p. 110). House-Mitchell Path-Goal theory also builds upon the situational aspects of the administration of rewards in accordance with specific situations. In Path-Goal theory for each situation there is an appropriate leader behavior which in turn will have a specific reaction from the follower which results in a specific outcome (Hersey et al., 2001, p. 113). Finally, in Vroom and Yetton’s Contingency Model, “the assumption that situational variables interacting with personal attributes or characteristics of the leader result[s] in leader behavior that can affect organizational effectiveness.” This organizational change results in a new situation that, in turn, will affect the next leadership intervention (Hersey et al., 2001, pp. 113-114).
Each of these situational models contributed aspects to the Hersey-Blanchard Tri-dimensional Leader Effectiveness Model that has since become synonymous with Situational Leadership Theory (SLT). “Paul Hersey and Ken Blanchard developed this leadership model, that has gained a strong following among management development specialists [at 400 of the Fortune 500 companies]” (Contingency Leadership Theories, 2000, p. 1).

This SLT model focuses on task behavior and relationship behavior. Task behavior is defined as the extent to which leaders define duties and responsibilities with respect to telling followers what, how, when, where and why to do a task. Relationship behavior is defined as the extent to which the leader engages in multi-directional communication including listening, facilitating, and supportive behaviors (Hersey et al., 2001, p. 173). SLT is “based on a relationship between task behavior and relationship behavior and [follower] maturity” visible in Figure 6 (Graeff, 1997, p. 154).

A leader’s use of varying degrees of task- or relationship-oriented behavior results in one of four specific leadership styles – in the respective quadrants (see Figure 6).

S1 is characterized by above average amounts of task behavior and below-average amounts of relationship behavior. This is “Telling behavior”—“the leader defines roles and tells people what, how, when and where to do various tasks. “Emphasizes directive behavior.”

S2 is characterized by above average amounts of both task and relationship behavior. This is “Selling behavior”—“the leader provides both directive and supportive behavior.”

S3 is characterized by above average amounts of relationship behavior and below-average amounts of task behavior. This is “Participating behavior”—where leader and follower share decision making with the leader focused on facilitating and communicating.”

S4 is characterized by below average amounts of both task and relationship behavior. This is “Delegating behavior”—where the leader provides little direction or support. (Hersey et al., 2001, p. 174)
The virtue of the Hersey-Blanchard model is the third dimension (which can be seen in the lower part of Figure 6). The Situational Leadership Theory model takes into account the readiness of the followers to execute what their leadership in a specific situation is asking of them. "The emphasis on followers in leadership effectiveness is reflective of the reality that it is the follower who accepts or rejects the leader" (Contingency Leadership Theories, 2000, p. 1). Readiness is determined by the follower's ability to perform the task and their willingness to do so. Ability is defined as the knowledge, experience, or skill an individual brings to a specific task. Willingness is defined as the extent to which an individual or group has the confidence, commitment, or motivation to accomplish a task (Hersey et al., 2001, p. 202). A follower may have
varying degrees of competence, and varying willingness or confidence in their ability to perform a task.

The SLT conjecture is, if a leader is capable of recognizing where he or she commonly operates with respect to the task and relationship behavior matrix and then can account for the readiness of their followers to execute the task, the leader may then make modifications to their leadership behavior to accommodate the specific situation and follower preparedness.

An argument can be made that varying leadership styles to account for situations is inconsistent or Machiavellian. Instead the reverse is true. If a leader uses the same style in every situation—no matter how appropriate—inconsistency arises. For example, if a leader uses a supportive high relationship/low task style with a follower who is doing well and the same style when the follower is performing poorly, that leader is acting inconsistently. To be consistent the leader must behave the same way in similar situations for all followers concerned. Consistency must occur regardless of situation — not merely when it is convenient. To do otherwise is to open oneself up to opportunities for animosity from one’s followers (Hersey et al., 2001, p. 121).

In order to develop and test their Situational Leadership Theory, Hersey and Blanchard developed and administered the LEADSelf and LEAD Other instruments—where LEAD stands for Leadership Effectiveness and Adaptability Description (Center for Creative Leadership, 1973). These tools were designed to allow self-evaluation (LEADSelf) and evaluation of one’s superiors’ (LEAD Other) leadership style with respect to task and relationship behavior and ability to adapt to situational circumstances while leading followers. The LEAD Other instrument is not addressed in this study.
The LEADSelf instrument has been used to “provide leadership style effectiveness feedback for nearly four decades. The instrument is a product of user input” (Center for Leadership Studies, 2002c). This instrument provides the survey respondent with information on aspects of their situational leadership styles that they use when attempting to influence others. LEADSelf specifically describes “which leadership behaviors [a participant] uses and the extent to which they match those behaviors to the needs of others” (Center for Leadership Studies, 2002b, para. 2).

The virtue of the LEADSelf instrument is that its focus relates to both the leader and the follower. The instrument determines the leadership style of the survey respondent with respect to the willingness and competence of the followers in the fictitious scenarios. The 12 questions in the survey are differentiated in the following manner:

1. Three situations involve groups of low readiness (R1).
2. Three situations involve groups of low to moderate readiness (R2).
3. Three situations involve groups of moderate to high readiness (R3).
4. Three situations involve groups of high readiness (R4).

“The instrument provides a wealth of information about the current leadership strengths and where—specifically—there is room for further development” (Center for Leadership Studies, 2002a, para. 4).

Situational Leadership Theory has an “intuitive appeal. It acknowledges the importance of followers and builds on the logic that leaders can compensate for ability and motivational limitations in their followers. Unfortunately, some research efforts have returned disappointing results which suggest internal ambiguities or inconsistencies in the model” (Contingency Leadership Theories, 2000, p. 2). Graeff suggests that the
“theoretical robustness and pragmatic utility are challenged because of internal logic
problems, conceptual ambiguity, incompleteness, and confusion associated with the
multiple models which Hersey and Blanchard have continuously developed and refined
over time” (Graeff, 1997, p. 153). Others suggest that because of the work-related
scenarios in the test it is inappropriately leading to apply in non-work-related situations

Nevertheless, the loose connections to both classic theories on motivation and the
military affinity for Situational Leadership Theory make Hersey and Blanchard’s model
well suited to this study.

**Situational Leadership Theory and Classic Motivation**

The authors of Situational Leadership Theory made ample efforts to connect their
theory to ‘classic’ theories of leadership and motivation. In an attempt to synthesize their
theory with Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs and Herzberg’s Two-Factor Theory of
Motivation, Hersey and Blanchard integrated the motivation theories into their
curvilinear model (see Figure 7).

Hersey and Blanchard suggest, “Motives directed toward goals results in
behavior” (Hersey et al., 2001, p. 451). Those behaviors are task or relationship based in
accordance with their Situational Leadership Theory model. “Goals that tend to satisfy
high-strength (Maslow) motive needs can be described by Herzberg’s hygiene and
motivator factors” (Hersey et al., 2001, p. 452). In turn these frameworks can be
integrated into Situational Leadership in terms of their relation to various readiness levels
and appropriate leadership styles that have a high probability of satisfying needs or
providing goals.
They overlaid the Maslow and Herzberg models with their own in Figure 7.

Hersey and Blanchard are quick to note that this relationship between Maslow’s and
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Herzberg’s theories and their own is not necessarily a direct correlation. Instead they imply that it is an integrative benchmark with which one may infer more information about appropriate leadership styles to use when leading individuals who seek fulfillment of Maslow higher order needs or Herzberg motivator factors (Hersey et al., 2001, p. 453).

They provide no support for this implied relationship between their model and the classic motivation models of Maslow and Herzberg. One goal of this study was to determine if support existed for this theory within the study sample.

**Situational Leadership Theory in the Military**

Situational Leadership was selected as a key tenet of this study because it remains a key part of the United States military leadership development and instruction (S. G. Ruth, personal communication, November 6, 2004).

While students of leadership within the U.S. military are exposed to a broad base of leadership theory and instruction, Situational Leadership is one of the key theories that the military advocates. This is largely because of the previously emphasized tenets—the focus or involvement of followers in the leadership equation, and the emphasis on building upon one’s leadership and learning new methods by which one can motivate one’s followers.

The final key connection between the military and Situational Leadership Theory is the importance placed on the idea “that the relationship between leader behavior and effectiveness cannot be treated in a vacuum. Numerous situational variables must be taken into account to assess the leadership process” (Department of Behavioral Sciences and Leadership, 1988, p. 240).
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The text referenced here is actually the text used in the United States Military Academy’s junior year class on Military Leadership. The United States Military Academy is the premier source of commissioned officers for the United States Army and is a recognized leader in Leadership studies. The class on Military Leadership is a required class for all Academy cadets.

In this class, cadets learn the theory and application of many separate leadership styles, but Situational Leadership Theory receives extra emphasis through practical application. Students learn the value of assessing ‘situational variables’ like ‘group maturity,’ then developing a ‘leader behavior’ that relies upon the ‘task and relationship behavior of the leader.’ In conjunction with one another, the ‘situational variable’ and the ‘leader behavior’ result in ‘organizational outcomes’ which are a function of ‘leader effectiveness’ (Department of Behavioral Sciences and Leadership, 1988, p. 233). These cadets use an analytical approach that incorporates assessment of the situation and the causal relationship that created the situation, and an assessment of the followers’ readiness (by diagnosing their ability and willingness) to develop multiple courses of action. These courses of action take the form of potential leadership behaviors that may be taken to create or attain a desired organizational outcome. In effect, these leaders are asked to “adapt their leadership styles so they directly match their style to the development level of subordinates” and the significance of the specific situation (Northouse, 2001, p. 59).

This situational approach is carried by the graduated cadets of the Military Academy into the Army populace as a whole. Students from the other officer commissioning sources, OCS and ROTC, also learn portions of this method based on the
military’s endorsement of Hersey and Blanchard’s Situational Leadership Theory (Wade, 2001, pp. 449-454). Finally, while not directly identified as SLT, the situational, directing, participating, and delegating tenets of SLT are all espoused in the most current edition of the Army’s guide to leadership FM 22-100 Army Leadership (Department of the Army, 1999, pp. 3-15-3-16).

It is important to recall that because situational leadership stresses adapting to followers, it is ideal for followers whose commitment and competence change over the course of a project [or mission]. Given the breadth of the situational approach, it is applicable in virtually any type of organization, at any level for nearly all types of tasks. It is an encompassing model with a wide range of applications. (Northouse, 2001, p. 64)

All of these tenets make Situational Leadership Theory equally well suited for the military environment and therefore an ideal subject for this study (Yeakey, 2002).

**Background to the 21st Century United States Army**

**Theories of Volunteerism**

Part of the model of intrinsic motivation, which Thomas discusses, is the importance of choice. A certain level of inherent autonomy must exist before that ability to choose comes to fruition. Volunteerism is not synonymous with choice—but it requires choice to exist.

Volunteerism lacks sufficient research. Ziemeck (2002, para. 2) suggests that the construct for ‘volunteer motivation’ has to be captured and classification of volunteers into specific motivational groups must be verified to have worthwhile empirical information on volunteerism. Some suggest that volunteerism exists as “service for service’s sake.” One source notes that volunteerism is service done primarily with agencies’ and clients’ needs in mind. This university site also suggests that in
volunteerism, volunteer temperament and abilities are matched with service tasks and the server might reflect on impact of service to enhance appreciation of service but it is not required (Marquette University, 2003, Table).

Certainly, volunteerism may have an element of altruism; but as Thomas or Deci might suggest, intrinsic motivation is its own reward. Deci and Flaste (1995) note that intrinsic motivation provides an almost spiritual self-satisfaction. Certainly volunteering, which is ‘choice’ manifested in its clearest form, can feed intrinsic motivation. Contrary to the Marquette assessment, we may well volunteer, but we do not volunteer for blatant extrinsic rewards. That would not be volunteering; instead, we volunteer for the opportunity to enjoy some of the heady “heightened awareness, or satori” which Deci (Deci & Flaste, 1995, p. 45) speaks of.

Individuals may believe that their volunteerism is “service for service’s sake” but the reality is more likely that the overwhelming feeling of well-being driven by intrinsic motivation is what drives people to volunteer in the first place. If what drives volunteerism is the appeal to something we find meaningful, or to that which builds progress, or reinforces our competence, its connection to motivation (and the Thomas model in particular) appears much stronger.

Caracciolo (2003) speaks to the importance of understanding volunteers’ motivations. “When individuals are not fulfilled at their workplace, some volunteer opportunities. Altruism and a concern for a social cause can be motivating factors [as can] a different self-satisfying source of motivation.” Caracciolo sums up some of the volunteerism theories by identifying motivations concerned with reward (extrinsic), relating to others, accomplishment, and power.
Caracciolo goes on to suggest that volunteering can aid [people] by building their business or career, satisfying a desire to help others, or to gain recognition and stature. [These positions] can enhance future commitment and promote a more positive self. . . . The concept of return value is a worthy by-product of volunteering. [He suggests] that volunteering is especially meaningful to those without a normal outlet or those accustomed to a less altruistic exchange of services. (Caracciolo, 2003, para. 14)

Caracciolo’s point seems to be that volunteerism is supposed to be an altruistic effort; but if we accept the tenets of intrinsic motivation—in particular the Thomas model—it is easily seen that there is very little in the world that is truly altruistic. This may be for the best. The pay that true volunteers receive is in fact “benefits of achievement, affiliation, and recognition” (Caracciolo, 2003, para. 17).

Tatsuki (2000) reinforces this concept by speaking to the issues of Japanese students who volunteered in the aftermath of the Kobe earthquake of 1995. After these volunteers built a rapport, they repeatedly returned to the same shelters to help (2000, p. 187). They sought the affiliation and recognition that Caracciolo spoke of. Sadly, Tatsuki misses the point when he says, “Rather than pursuing narrow self-interests, people [in Kobe] became motivated to solve community issues by forming a collation and pursuing a collective action” (Tatsuki, 2000, p. 195).

Furchtgott-Roth (1998) recognizes that the only true altruistic volunteerism is the anonymous variety—but, even then, the ‘volunteer’ may earn the self-satisfaction, which is desired.

Volunteerism in the Military

Caracciolo’s (2003, para. 1) first reference to volunteerism in his paper notes the importance of the “Minutemen” who fought for American independence. Certainly the
United States military of the Revolutionary War was a ‘volunteer force’ in the classic sense just as it is today. But this volunteerism has its limitations.

Furchtgott-Roth’s (1998) work on volunteerism is especially prescient when he suggests that

volunteerism in the military is not a two way street. When you volunteer to join the military, you oblige yourself to service for which you cannot simply walk away tomorrow. Once in the military, volunteering means binding obligation. He also suggests that volunteerism is non-compulsory. Compulsory behavior is the opposite of voluntary. Compulsory is neither moral, nor aspirational, nor selfless, nor anonymous. (para. 15)

There is a conflict that exists here. Military volunteerism extends only to the point of enlistment or commissioning, and then members of the military are subject to compulsion. They are both volunteers and subjects without choice. If we investigate further one might suggest that all of us are subject to similar rules. A civilian who chooses to go to work one day is exercising choice, but the moment they enter the building they have made an implicit agreement that they will abide by the group norms of that organization. However, only the military has a work environment where death may result and failure to abide by your voluntary obligation may result in imprisonment or worse.

The key point here is that although subject to otherwise draconian rules, military personnel value their initial volunteer status as a badge of recognition, affiliation, and achievement. They also value any other opportunity they do have to exercise choice because they are intrinsically motivated to succeed like any other.

The subject unit for this study started this mobilization as a volunteer mission to Bosnia. Circumstance and the needs of the Army forced a change; the mission moved to Sinai, Egypt, and the opportunity to volunteer disappeared. All the soldiers in the
deployment were compelled by duty, and the orders of those appointed over them, to execute this mission. But they each volunteered to join the military, in their own fashion, for their own reasons/motivations. They exercised choice and they had reasons for wanting to participate in the military—even if they could not choose the manner of their support in this peacekeeping mission.

Peacekeeping Missions

The chaotic nature of the world today is best seen in the nature of the constabulary missions that are ongoing worldwide on a daily basis. For every country that lives in peace, there are many others that are in the beginning, middle, or ending stages of some sort of internal or external hostilities. The opportunity for intervention exceeds the number of troops capable of doing so.

As a result of these unstable global conditions, modern military missions are more likely to be constabulary in nature than what was previously accepted. These missions generally fall into three categories: peacemaking, peace enforcement, and peacekeeping. Peacemaking is characterized by an intervention into a fight where neither party wishes the hostilities to end. An analogy is a referee sending two boxers to their corners. Peace enforcement is different in that at least one of the opponents agrees with the peace tenets while the others may not. Finally, peacekeeping involves peacekeepers inserting themselves into a situation to provide stability between two former opponents which have agreed completely to the tenets of a peace accord.

4). Nevertheless, U.S. soldiers (as peacekeepers) have manned each of those missions in
the last two decades.

Active Component Soldiers’ Perceptions
of Peacekeeping

One of the important issues involved in this study is the relationship between AC
soldiers’ perceptions of peacekeeping missions vs. the perceptions held by RC soldiers.
Chu (Duffy, 2003b) noted the relevance of having soldiers doing the jobs which they are
best suited for. “The guy or gal who doesn’t get to do what he or she signed up to do is
the most dissatisfied soldier” (Thompson & Duffy, 2003, p. 41).

Recent experience has shown the negative impact experienced by soldiers who
perceive that their training and skills are mismatched with the mission that they are
performing. With regard to Iraq:

Peacekeeping is not what the U.S. troops trained to do. Soldiers whose combat
dge has been honed inside an M-1 tank are not well equipped to provide a war’s
victims with food and water. And the longer soldiers spend as occupiers, the less
ready they feel for pure combat and the unhappier they become. (Thompson &
Duffy, 2003, p. 40)

This is a long-standing issue that extends beyond the current conflicts in
Afghanistan and Iraq. Pfaff (2000) mentions “soldiers [perceive their mission is to]
protect the nation from external threats, while police protect it from internal ones.
Soldiers traditionally fight wars; police traditionally protect the peace” (p. 12). Retired
General Clark mentions with respect to the Bosnia peacekeeping mission that “we should
never look to our military to do police work” (Clark, 2001, p. 55). The focus in preparing
for the Bosnia mission at that time was “on military tasks, not just presence, and certainly
not on police activities” (Clark, 2001, p. 53).
There is a legitimate concern when dealing with these obscure missions that the terms under which our forces will operate tend to shift over time. This is a phenomenon seen in the ‘mission creep’ of Vietnam and Somalia where conditions for entering a country—and the mission that the forces were dedicated to—morph over time to the unfamiliar and undesirable conditions. These newly created conditions often drive our unsuccessful departure. According to Clark (2001, p. 59), this mission creep occurs when the mission tends to “expand its responsibilities beyond approved limits and available capabilities and cause the mission to fail.” This is analogous to a ‘tar baby’: once in, you do not get out (Johnson, 1999, p. 1). Somalia started as a humanitarian mission, which became a police action, which in turn disintegrated into one spectacular, pyrrhic battle (as illustrated in the book and follow-on movie “Black Hawk Down”) and a diplomatic meltdown; it is a textbook example of mission creep in action (Bowden, 1999). Analyzed at the individual level, it is not hard to assume that when soldiers are asked to operate beyond their own limits and available capabilities, their likelihood for success is equally low.

Soldiers in active duty combat forces tend to complain when their work is ill suited for their job description. Some of their responses are melancholy, some humorous. According to Hackworth and Mathews (1996, p. 130), one soldier tired of contingency missions remarked “that he joined up to do combat stuff only to wind up on mercy missions to Florida after Hurricane Andrews and now to Somalia.”

Regardless of soldier perceptions, all missions (directed by our National Command Authority) simply must be performed. When genocide occurs in the world or tyrannical regimes detain and torture their own citizens, these missions become very
necessary. Former Secretary of State Albright commented on Bosnia, saying, “What’s the point of having this superb military . . . if we can’t use it?” (Priest, 2003, p. 52). This military was no longer charged only with fighting national wars. “Vague objectives couched in grander terms; including freedom from tyranny, and the moral obligation to stop starvation and genocide—all enveloped in the awkward but accurate term “Military Operations Other than War (MOOTW)”’ (Priest, 2003, p. 56). This term has morphed several times since the mid-90s but now is commonly known as Stability and Support Operations (SASO) (Department of the Army, 1997, pp. 1-143).

Regardless of the terminology, SASO operations still lack a certain respect within the core combat troops of the active military. Retired General Shalikashvili mockingly spoke of the military reluctance to take part in peacekeeping and relief operations by saying “Real men don’t do MOOTW” (Priest, 2003, p. 56). Again, whether the combat troops wanted to take part in these missions or not, they were greatly involved—in as many as 10 such missions around the world each day (Priest, 2003, p. 56).

Abbott extends this line of thinking with regard to the Canadian Armed Forces but it could easily be extended to U.S. forces:

Whatever the forces may choose to think of itself, its warrior mystique, its war fighting purpose, it is before and after everything else, subordinate to the civilian government of the state. This subordination is essential to democratic governance. [The forces] are told to do a job and they willingly (for the most part) do it, hoping that the base requirements of job satisfaction are met. (Abbott, 2001, p. 5)

This final line is the key concern. Abbott assumed that lower ranking soldiers of the Canadian Forces are motivated by very basic job satisfaction requirements. According to Abbott those requirements are “adequate equipment to do their job and the support and appreciation of average [civilians]” (Abbot, 2001, pp. 2-3). She further assumed that
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members of the armed forces “having spent years of training to perform a unique and
highly skilled job, are more than willing to earn their pay” even if that entails
involvement in a peacekeeping mission (Abbott, 2001, p. 5). Abbott fails to provide
supporting evidence to her assumptions.

Research on Peacekeeping Attitudes

In contrast to Abbott, the authors of a number of Armed Forces & Society journal
articles have supported their hypotheses with solid research. One analysis of soldiers’
attitudes toward peacekeeping operations and multiple deployments anticipated that
“combat soldiers would have negative attitudes toward peacekeeping and would not
accept non-martial peacekeeping norms” (Reed & Segal, 2000, p. 63). Their results spoke
to most soldiers’ acceptance of peacekeeping norms, yet 52.9% of the respondents
disagreed with the appropriateness of peacekeeping for their unit. For 42.8% of the
soldiers, peacekeeping duty was boring, and 44.8% did not feel peacekeeping experience
would be beneficial to their overall career. Most enlightening was the fact that as the
number of deployments increased among survey respondents, the more morale dropped
and the less willing soldiers were to perform these missions. As the number of
deployments increased, soldiers also were more likely to feel military police or civilians
were better suited to perform these missions. Interestingly enough, Reed and Segal failed
to find a significant relationship between the number of deployments and soldier’s
intentions to stay on active duty (i.e., reenlist), but they did note that ‘multiple
deployments’ is only one factor in a soldier’s retention decision.

A second Armed Forces & Society study reflected on active duty leaders’
(officers’) attitudes towards post-Cold War missions. These missions included traditional
war fighting and counter-insurgency missions as well as newer contingency and humanitarian missions such as: peace enforcement, peacekeeping, humanitarian assistance, and anti-terrorism. Avant and Lebovic (2000) noted that these contingency missions were previously “less valued, less enthusiastically endorsed, and less successful” (p. 37). Their research noted that, while the respondents showed support for both old and new (contingency) missions, on average, they “exhibited their strongest support for traditional Cold War [war fighting] missions” (p. 52).

**Research on Peacekeeping Mission Dissatisfiers**

One study by the ARI on attitudes and opinions of soldiers deployed for contingency operations identified recurring issues which impact on soldier morale and motivation. The Steinberg and Foley study (1998, 1999) produced a *Leaders’ Guide for Contingency Operations: The Human Dimension*. These trend data were collected from surveys and interviews of soldiers involved in missions in Somalia, Haiti, and Bosnia. “The objective of the guide is to provide Army leaders with a succinct guide of leadership lessons learned and recommendations based on feedback from those recent contingency missions” (Steinberg & Foley, 1998, p. iii). This study proposed 13 recurring issues which impact soldier effectiveness when they are involved in contingency operations and how to address those areas:

1. *Mission Clarity*
2. *Situation Stability*
3. *Amount of Threat/Lethality*
4. *Complexity of the Force*
5. *Complexity of the Environment*
6. Specificity of Advanced Preparation

7. Duration of Deployment

8. Media Visibility

9. Range of Job Tasks

10. Quality of Leadership

11. Quality of Life

12. Amount of Family Support

13. Quality of Rear Detachment.

Not all of these subject areas have a direct connection to the subject of this study. Those items that are italicized have been identified as having at least a cursory connection to the subject of intrinsic motivation. Thomas’s Integrated Model makes reference to meaningfulness, competence, choice, and progress. The italicized dimensions have indirect or direct connections to the four tenets of Thomas’s model that have been previously discussed in detail.

Mission clarity refers to “difficulty in seeing how the tasks they carry out during the deployment contributes to the overall mission. It also refers to public understanding and support for the mission, the absence of mission creep, and the clarity of purpose (Steinberg & Foley, 1998, p. 4). This suggests soldiers value meaningfulness. This is perhaps the most significant of the ARI tenets. As Silverberg (1995, p. 24) notes, “Mission, mission, mission—if the mission is unclear, or the goals unattainable, the mission will fail. It is as simple, yet as complicated as that.”

Situation stability refers to whether soldiers feel they have the equipment they need, public and family acceptance, favorable media exposure, and a sense of a well-
planned mission and preparedness (Steinberg & Foley, 1998, p. 6). This tenet also seems to refer to meaningfulness of the mission.

Complexity of the force refers to soldiers’ comfort with the various units they must work with in these unfamiliar environments. Elements of ‘we vs. they’ increase feelings of unease (Steinberg & Foley, 1998, p. 10). Soldiers are not comfortable working with what they perceive as unknown quantities. In this case they seem to desire competence and equity on the part of their coworkers and peers.

Complexity of environment is similar to complexity of the force. Complexity of the environment differs from operation to operation (Steinberg & Foley, 1998, p. 12). If the soldiers perceive that they are ill prepared for the unfamiliar tasks and environments, they may also perceive that they lack the necessary competence to deal with the environment.

Specificity of advanced preparation also refers to the feelings of competence a soldier experiences. If they feel their training was specific and realistic for the new, unfamiliar environment, their feelings of competence and progress will increase (Steinberg & Foley, 1998, p. 14).

Duration of deployment impacts soldier satisfaction a great deal. Over time soldiers are likely to lose a sense of progress particularly if the deployment begins to stretch. As deployments unpredictably grow in length, perceptions of choice will also decrease and feelings of meaningfulness may also decline if the mission is perceived complete—and yet the soldiers remain. If endpoints and accomplishments remain certain, soldiers’ perceptions of progress also remain strong (Steinberg & Foley, 1998, p. 16).
Interestingly enough, a 1996 article regarding the Bosnia deployment makes reference to deployment length:

All but a small contingent of [soldiers who entered Bosnia in January of 1996] might be at their home stations by [December 1996]... but anyone who thinks that the members of that follow-on US contingent will have a better idea of when the [Bosnia mission] will end is sorely mistaken. (Roos, 1996, para. 2)

In late 1995, then President Bill Clinton said that American soldiers would be out of Bosnia in a year (Pilgrim & Jensen, 2000). That article was written in 1996 and small contingents of U.S. soldiers still serve in Bosnia in 2007. Clearly in this example, durations of missions and deployments and ‘mission creep’ likely have an impact on soldier motivation.

Finally, if a soldier has a range of job tasks that are consistent with the mission, consistent with their job skills (competence), and consistent with the need (meaningfulness), soldiers tend to remain on task (Steinberg & Foley, 1998, p. 20).

Steinberg and Foley’s work meshes well with the Thomas model for intrinsic motivation. In the case of the ARI study, it is clear that extrinsic factors can affect the soldiers’ ability to remain intrinsically motivated.

**Combat Arms and Peacekeeping**

There is a concern that blanket statements with respect to peacekeeping missions are inappropriate. Certainly there are some branches of the Army that are well suited to the specialized task set required in constabulary missions, whereas others are not (Williams & Chandrasekaran, 2003). As Carter says in a personal communication:

There is a community of [jobs] that sees peacekeeping operations as their bread and butter. This includes Military Police, Civil Affairs, Judge Advocate General and a few others. Then there’s a community of [jobs] that sees peacekeeping as a better form of training than anything the Army can offer. These include
construction engineers, medical personnel, logistical folks, and a few others. Then there are the trigger pullers [combat arms soldiers], who rightfully see it as a distraction. I’ve thought for some time that the right way to do peacekeeping would be to build more military police units for the mission, rather than converting combat arms units at the temporary cost of their combat readiness. (Carter, 2003)

Reed and Segal (2000) seem to support this line of thinking. As noted before, their study found that as many combat soldiers disagreed with the appropriateness of peacekeeping missions for their unit as agreed (p. 70). Combat arms soldiers were more likely to agree that peacekeeping missions should be performed by military police than infantry (significant at $p<.01$). Combat arms soldiers also disagreed with the value of a peacekeeping assignment on the career (significant at $p<.05$) (Reed & Segal, 2000, p. 73).

In another personal communication, current Senior Aide to the Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee Chairman, Mark Lewis brings to mind the equally important question:

It begs the question that if some infantrymen chafed under peacekeeping operations and found it a distraction from [their] calling (reasonable or not) then one wonders if a new generation seeking to enter the military because they are attracted to the idea of peacekeeping operations will find high-intensity conflict a distraction from their own calling. What organizational dynamics will this cause? (M. Lewis, personal communication, March 11, 2003)

If we accept the tenets of job satisfaction and recognize that as long as there are disconnects between expectations and reality, satisfaction levels will trend downward, then an answer is assumed (Kohn, 1999). In the environment described by Lewis, those seeking to do peacekeeping missions may be disappointed and dissatisfied to be involved in high-intensity combat.

Avant and Lebovic (2000) noted that “the functions that individuals perform affect their attitudes; officers who serve in a combat role have long been believed to be
less supportive of low intensity [contingency] missions than those who serve in a non-combat role” (p. 39). The researchers suggest this may be a result of service culture, combat status, careerism, or affiliation. Their research supports their initial hypotheses. Combat arms soldiers invariably expressed lower levels of support for contingency or nontraditional (i.e., war fighting) missions than their non-combat counterparts. Peacekeeping was nearly the least supported mission (in terms of appropriateness) by both combat and non-combat arms officers. Only drug interdiction missions received less support (Avant & Lebovic, 2000, p. 51). The researchers suggest that support for new [contingency] missions does seem to be linked with an officer’s job specialty [i.e. combat or non-combat status], and the career rewards they see tied to it. Those officers with a combat specialty tend to be more committed to traditional [war fighting] missions while non-combat officers see more importance for contingency missions. (p. 52)

This study focuses on combat arms soldiers. Those combat soldiers are what the primary focus of entire military service is about—fighting wars. Because peacekeeping and war fighting are naturally divergent and diametrically opposed, conflicts in soldier motivation and jobs satisfaction are to be expected as a result.

This issue becomes important when levels of negative job satisfaction manifest themselves as retention problems. If the disconnect between what is desired and what is achieved grows disproportionate, the U.S. soldier, like any other job-holder, tends to vote with their feet. The unit in this study was a combat arms unit assigned to an international peacekeeping mission. It is incumbent on the research to determine whether they were motivated in that environment—and whether long-term retention problems may result.
Retention Issues and Peacekeeping

The Reed and Segal (2000) study on peacekeeping attitudes found morale decreased as the frequency of deployments increased. However the same study failed to find statistical support for the relationship between numbers of peacekeeping deployments and reenlistment intentions (p. 75).

In contrast, Graham and Milbank (2003) report the results of a Pentagon funded convenience sample of soldiers serving in post-war Iraq. Forty percent of the 1900+ soldiers polled expressed that "the jobs they were doing had little or nothing to do with their training" (para. 2). This is a typical response when soldiers who are accustomed to performing war fighting tasks and missions are driven to perform peacekeeping operations. What is slightly more disturbing is the perceived impact of this job task and motivation disconnect on future retention. Although no retention issue has presented itself thus far, a spike in departures is an expected result of the increased demands of the GWOT. In the same survey, as reported by Graham and Milbank (2003, para. 16), a total of 49% of respondents suggested that they were 'very unlikely' or 'not likely' to remain in the military beyond their current obligation.

This is typical of most post-conflict departures but in this case there is increased worry that a historically high departure rate will ensue (Graham & Milbank, 2003). In the time between the proposal and completion of this study, these retention problems have manifested themselves in both the active (Schmitt & Shanker, 2004) and reserve forces (Moniz, 2004a). The problem continues into 2007.
Reserve Component Soldiers’ Perceptions of Peacekeeping

Given the increased OPTEMPO for the entire military, it is natural that the Reserves will necessarily supply a great deal of manpower in the future (Jaffe, 2004). George Pickerell suggested, prior to the attacks of September 11, 2001, that the manpower-centric needs of peacekeeping missions would force the Reserves (with 58% of the total force combat manpower, 37% of support, and 33% of service support troops in the Guard alone) into greater involvement (Vandergriff, 2001, p. 259). A portion of this study is dedicated to further determining the Reserve Component perspective on peacekeeping missions.

The Reed and Segal (2000) study found that active duty soldiers were in agreement that reservists could perform peacekeeping operations as well as their regular military counterparts (p. 74).

Again Pickerell suggested, ahead of his time, that the Reserves might be better suited to the peacekeeping mission profile due to the mind-set that Reserve soldiers bring to their job. “Active-Component troops and their leaders are trained for high-intensity combat and their approach to [contingency operations] reflects this orientation, to the extent that their activities can [sometimes] be ineffective or even counter-productive” (Vandergriff, 2001, p. 259). Pickerell suggests, “Reserve-Component soldiers and their commanders are characterized by flexibility in dealing with contingencies that reflects their civilian experience” (Vandergriff, 2001, p. 260).

In part, this study was intended to confirm or deny Pickerell’s assessment.
MFO-Specific Perceptions

The MFO mission, in particular, is a mission that can be characterized by stressful periods of uncertainty and other periods of boredom in a demanding, hot, and remote climate. Soldiers of the study unit served on their 12 separate observation posts and check points for 21 days at a time, scanning the desert and waters of the Sinai region 24 hours a day in temperatures that oscillated between extremes from 20 to 130 degrees Fahrenheit. In over 6 months of duty, these 425 soldiers reported a combined total of only three reportable potential violations of the peace treaty. Nevertheless, the soldiers have an opportunity to make a difference in maintaining a long but still tenuous peace in the Sinai (Fattig, 2002).

As mentioned before, previous research—specifically Phelps and Farr (1996)—on Reservists in the Sinai reported that perceptions on peacekeeping assignment appropriateness for their units or their career development decreased over time. The study participants also expressed increased dissatisfaction with the mission over time (Kirby & Naftel, 2000, p. 263). This study was intended to confirm or deny some of the previous research on the Sinai-specific peacekeeping mission.

Summary of Literature Review

This review of literature has addressed a wide span of information pertinent to this study. The review highlights where researchers have gone before and some of the vacancies in the previous research, which may be supported by this study. Each section directly relates to and supports the instruments that were designed and used for this study.
Theories of Motivation

This subchapter included a chronological review of the major theories of motivation which form the foundation of this study. The review begins with the developments of Gilbreth, Taylor, and Skinner. The review also includes the work of Abraham Maslow and Frederick Herzberg toward greater understanding of human needs and the modes by which they have those needs satisfied. Key to the study is the transition from a focus on the Herzberg hygiene and motivator factors, which appeal to Maslow’s lower and higher order needs, to a focus on the intrinsic motivation needs that we all share.

The review continues by describing how Deci and Ryan and Hackman and Oldham sequentially built upon this intrinsic motivation theory and supplanted Maslow and Herzberg in the pantheon of organizational behavior theory.

As the history continues, the study concentrates on the building that Thomas and his main contemporaries Velthouse and Tymon created on the foundation constructed by Deci, Ryan, Hackman, and Oldham. Thomas was able to redesign and reincorporate the elements of the separate Deci, Ryan, Hackman, and Oldham theories. By doing so he created an integrated model that corrects the errors of his predecessors and develops a coherent and satisfying theory.

An important point of the Thomas theory is its effort to steer away from the old command and control modes of leadership and suggest a new collegial environment and method of motivating one another and motivating one’s self.

The review of literature then explores the previous work done relative to intrinsic motivation and the military. Thomas’s efforts are revisited since most of his work
involved the military. Other military studies show that military units worldwide have explored the subject of intrinsic motivation and found similar results.

Background to Leadership

The review of literature continues with a review of how leadership theory has grown and developed over the past century. The goal was to describe how leadership studies morphed and changed over time into the subject theory of Situational Leadership as developed by Hersey, Blanchard, and Johnson.

Situational Leadership Theory is described in great detail. SLT's loose associations with classic research such as Maslow and Herzberg's theories were also explored. Finally, the subject of Situational Leadership and its longstanding relationship to the United States military were also explored.

Background to the 21st Century United States Army

The next section of the review of literature deals with the subject of the current United States Army. A section is devoted to issues of volunteerism and its relationship to the theories of intrinsic motivation and Situational Leadership previously described. Further connections between volunteerism and the military-specific issues of volunteerism were also covered.

This section continues with an overview of peacekeeping missions. The unfavorable perceptions of peacekeeping missions by Active Component and Reserve Component soldiers in the current global environment reflect a tension between war fighting and the current status quo of multiple ongoing peacekeeping missions. Attitudes and dissatisfiers were described to provide a framework of issues which act upon the modern soldier. Issues relating to combat arms soldiers specifically relate to the
disconnects that exist between their perceived jobs and the jobs they are being asked to perform.

Issues of retention, and the connection between retention problems and peacekeeping missions were also explored. Finally, the issues that affect Reserve Component soldiers are addressed with emphasis on the intended convenience sample for the Sinai mission.

The review of literature provides a broadbase theoretical framework with enough detail and justification for further study through quantitative and qualitative instruments. The foundation was built to accept and analyze data and form new conclusions with respect to intrinsic motivation, Situational Leadership, and their connections to the United States military forces.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This study sought to determine the relationships between intrinsic motivation, Situational Leadership theory, and the willingness of National Guard soldiers to participate in peacekeeping operations. This study also provides useful information on why National Guard leaders are involved in their units and these sorts of missions. This chapter describes the design of the study, the research questions pursued, the study participants, procedures used in conducting the study, the surveys, the methods of data collection, and the data analysis methods used.

Design of the Study

This study employs both quantitative and qualitative research approaches. The design of the study centered on analyzing the responses to survey items developed on the following issues:

1. Situational Leadership style as measured by LEADSelf instrument
2. Intrinsic motivation factors as measured by the Empowerment Inventory
3. Volunteerism, attitudes on peacekeeping missions, preferences for extrinsic and/or intrinsic motivator factors, and qualitative response in a researcher-developed survey
4. A reference Command Climate survey used to survey the entire 1-125 IN Guard unit. Likert scale questions and qualitative responses were used. Because this survey exceeded the leader-centric scope of the study, this survey was used only to validate the previous researcher-designed survey.

**Research Questions and Related Hypotheses**

The following research questions and related hypotheses examined the overall relationship between intrinsic motivation and military peacekeeping operations. All hypotheses are tested at the level of significance of $p<.05$.

Research Question 1. Are the soldiers involved in the research sample satisfied with their involvement in the National Guard and the peacekeeping mission? Results were evaluated with 10 Likert scale questions and descriptive statistics.

Research Question 2. Is there a significant relationship between intrinsic levels of motivation as measured by the *Choice* component of Dr. Thomas's integrated model and volunteerism in Reserve Component leaders involved in the study operation?

Hypotheses 1. There is a significant relationship between intrinsic levels of motivation as measured by the *Choice* component of Dr. Thomas's integrated model and volunteerism in Reserve Component leaders involved in the study operation.

Research Question 3. Is there a significant relationship between intrinsic levels of motivation as measured by the *Competence* component of Dr. Thomas's integrated model and volunteerism in Reserve Component leaders involved in the study operation?

Hypotheses 2. There is a significant relationship between intrinsic levels of motivation as measured by the *Competence* component of Dr. Thomas's integrated model and volunteerism in Reserve Component leaders involved in the study operation.
Research Question 4. Is there a significant relationship between intrinsic levels of motivation as measured by the *Meaningfulness* component of Dr. Thomas's integrated model and volunteerism in Reserve Component leaders involved in the study operation?

Hypotheses 3. There is a significant relationship between intrinsic levels of motivation as measured by the *Meaningfulness* component of Dr. Thomas's integrated model and volunteerism in Reserve Component leaders involved in the study operation.

Research Question 5. Is there a significant relationship between intrinsic levels of motivation as measured by the *Progress* component of Dr. Thomas's integrated model and volunteerism in Reserve Component leaders involved in the study operation?

Hypotheses 4. There is a significant relationship between intrinsic levels of motivation as measured by the *Progress* component of Dr. Thomas's integrated model and volunteerism in Reserve Component leaders involved in the study operation.

Research Question 6. Is there a significant relationship between intrinsic levels of motivation as measured by the *Choice* component of Dr. Thomas's integrated model and hypothetical volunteerism in Reserve Component leaders involved in the study operation?

Hypotheses 5. There is a significant relationship between intrinsic levels of motivation as measured by the *Choice* component of Dr. Thomas's integrated model and hypothetical volunteerism in Reserve Component leaders involved in the study operation.

Research Question 7. Is there a significant relationship between intrinsic levels of motivation as measured by the *Competence* component of Dr. Thomas's integrated model and hypothetical volunteerism in Reserve Component leaders involved in the study operation?
Hypotheses 6. There is a significant relationship between intrinsic levels of motivation as measured by the *Competence* component of Dr. Thomas's integrated model and hypothetical volunteerism in Reserve Component leaders involved in the study operation.

Research Question 8. Is there a significant relationship between intrinsic levels of motivation as measured by the *Meaningfulness* component of Dr. Thomas's integrated model and hypothetical volunteerism in Reserve Component leaders involved in the study operation?

Hypotheses 7. There is a significant relationship between intrinsic levels of motivation as measured by the *Meaningfulness* component of Dr. Thomas's integrated model and hypothetical volunteerism in Reserve Component leaders involved in the study operation.

Research Question 9. Is there a significant relationship between intrinsic levels of motivation as measured by the *Progress* component of Dr. Thomas's integrated model and hypothetical volunteerism in Reserve Component leaders involved in the study operation?

Hypotheses 8. There is a significant relationship between intrinsic levels of motivation as measured by the *Progress* component of Dr. Thomas's integrated model and hypothetical volunteerism in Reserve Component leaders involved in the study operation.

Research Question 10. Are Reserve Component leaders involved in the study operation motivated by intrinsic or extrinsic factors to take part in the study peacekeeping operation? Results were evaluated with descriptive statistics derived from the researcher-designed instrument.
Study Participants

A purposive sample was used in this study. The study participants were members of Task Force Viking which was made up of soldiers from the 1st Battalion of the 125th Infantry Regiment headquartered in Flint, Michigan (Ernst, 2003). A number of augmentees from other units within the Michigan Army National Guard are also members of Task Force Viking for the purposes of the 46th Sinai Multinational Force and Observers mission. They were also potential participants in this study.

There were 425 members of the unit to be deployed to the MFO mission. This study focuses only on the leadership of the organization; so approximately 160 personnel of rank SGT or above could have participated in the study.

Soldiers in the rank of SGT (E-5) or above typically have a number of years of experience in the organization and generally hold positions of leadership where they are responsible for soldiers other than themselves. They were well suited to the study—they understand leadership, as both actors and reactors in the leadership relationship. These leaders also understand issues of motivation. While many of them had not participated in a peacekeeping mission of this sort, they did understand the differences between this peacekeeping mission and their normal war fighting role.

Procedures

The multiple instruments involved in this study were administered over time during the overseas deployment of the subject unit. All surveys were administered during the deployed period of January through July 2004.

Each separate instrument was administered on multiple occasions over time in order to accommodate the mission tempo of the region and to maximize participation. The
survey was administered largely in a classroom environment. The use of a proctor was desirable but unavailable.

I disseminated all surveys, provided instructions, and allowed the respondents as much time as necessary to respond. Generally, the respondents took between 15 to 40 minutes to complete the surveys. A volunteer participant then returned the surveys to me. Surveys were numbered and dated prior to distribution to track the number of surveys disseminated versus those actually filled out.

All questionnaires were completed on a completely voluntary and confidential basis. A cover letter (Appendix E) accompanied each survey explaining the purpose of the study and that participation was completely voluntary. An additional cover letter (Appendix A, B, C) accompanied each separate survey instrument that describes the nature of the survey, expectations, and the time required to complete the survey.

Advanced permission (Appendix F) from the Task Force Viking Battalion Commander was obtained prior to the completion of this dissertation proposal.

The LEADSelf instrument was administered during the beginning phase of the operation. Because LEADSelf responses are dependent upon the respondents and not the situational aspects of the respondents’ current environment, administration of the test could take place at any time. The LEADSelf survey was used as the opening instrument in January 2004.

During the February-March 2004 timeframe, the Thomas Empowerment Inventory was administered. This afforded the participants time to become accustomed to their peacekeeping mission role and comment on their intrinsic motivation to perform that mission.
The researcher-designed survey was administered during April-May 2004. This survey included a qualitative response section for short answers. Those questions targeted the best and worst things about the National Guard and the peacekeeping deployment. This was important because these qualitative questions provided the respondents with a way to expound on their experiences and concerns.

Near the conclusion of the deployment, the chain of command determined it would be useful to administer a Command Climate Survey (Appendix D). This survey targeted the entire 425 person task force; officers, non-commissioned officers and enlisted soldiers were all included. This survey’s qualitative elements mirrored the qualitative questions in the researcher-designed instrument. Because this fourth instrument was unplanned, the Command Climate Survey results would be used to only support and validate the qualitative response from the third instrument.

Surveys

The LEADSelf instrument was the first of four instruments to be administered (Appendix A, Dissertation Instrument #1). This tool measures leader behaviors in terms of Situational Leadership Theory. Greene (1980) provides an excellent synopsis of the statistical merits of the LEADSelf test:

This tool yields four ipsative scores and one normative adaptability (effectiveness) score. The original intent of the tool was as a training instrument. The LEADSelf tool was standardized from the responses of 264 North American managers. These managers ranged in age from 21-64 with 30% in entry level management, 55% in middle management, and the remainder in upper management. (Greene, 1980, para. 3)
These demographics should correlate well with the leadership of an RC infantry battalion made up of similar ages and professional responsibilities in entry level, mid-level and upper management:

The item validities for the 12 questions for the adaptability score ranged from .11 to .52 with 10 of 12 coefficients at .25 or higher. Eleven of twelve coefficients were significant beyond the .01 levels and one was significant at the .05 levels. Each response option met the operationally defined criterion of less than 80% with respect to selection frequency. The LEADSelf test was found to have moderately strong stability with 75% of respondents maintaining a dominant style and 71% maintaining their alternative style over a six-week period. The LEADSelf provides relatively consistent measures over time. Logical validity was clearly established. Face validity was based on review of the items and content validity emanated from the procedures employed to create the original set of items. Empirical validity [sic] studies were conducted and found relative independence of the scales with respect to variables of sex, age, years of experience, degree and management level. (Greene, 1980, para. 5)

These and other satisfactory results suggest that the LEADSelf was deemed to be an empirically sound instrument, which is well suited to this study.

The second of the four instruments used in this study is the Empowerment inventory developed by Thomas and Tymon (1993; see Appendix B, Dissertation Instrument #2). The Empowerment Inventory consists of 24 questions that refer back to the four tenets of Thomas’s Integrated Model of intrinsic motivation: meaningfulness, choice, competence, and progress. The tool “indicates how strongly the survey participant experiences these four empowering feelings” (Thomas & Tymon, 1993, p. 5).

In developing this instrument Thomas and Tymon (1993) surveyed a group of 384 performing managers. The sample consisted of employed managers who were attending evening MBA classes on the East Coast of the United States. The comparison group of managers tended to score moderately high on feelings of empowerment. The results of the Empowerment Inventory compare the survey participant with the relatively empowered
group of people in the original comparison group. Scores are graphed in relation to scores of practicing managers who rated their entire jobs (p. 7). For example, a score above the 80% line in the meaningfulness category means that the respondent has scored higher than 80% of the managers who have taken the Empowerment Inventory (p. 5).

Psychometric data on the Empowerment Inventory used 384 cases in the factor analysis. This factor analysis returned a rotated factor matrix with factor loadings that varied from a low of .637 for the sixth ‘meaningfulness’ iteration, to a high of .908 for the first ‘choice’ iteration. Reliability analysis returned the following values (Table 1).

Table 1
Reliability Analysis of the Empowerment Inventory (Thomas, 1994)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ALPHA</th>
<th>N Cases</th>
<th>N Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMPETENCE</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHOICE</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEANINGFULNESS</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROGRESS</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The third instrument (Appendix C) is researcher developed. The instrument consists of 25 questions. The survey consisted almost entirely of multiple choice and Likert scale responses. Eight questions were strictly demographic in nature. Ten Likert questions provided quantitative information for further analysis. Four qualitative questions provided the respondents an opportunity to enunciate their feelings in greater detail in four narrative fields. Although there were 25 questions total, many were for demographic and
convenience data. There were only three questions that are critical to the research questions. One such question related directly to the volunteerism of the survey respondent. The second question also referred to volunteerism using a hypothetical. This hypothetical volunteerism question was necessary because, in the midst of preparations for the deployment, the mission transitioned from a voluntary mission to a mandatory mission. The last key question related to the extrinsic or intrinsic reasons the respondent might choose to pursue in participating in the peacekeeping deployment.

Most of the survey questions were developed using modified questions from Phelps and Farr (1996), Kirby and Naftel (2000), and Reed and Segal (2000). These questions targeted the soldiers' feelings on peacekeeping missions and their appropriateness for Reserve Component soldiers. Many of the survey demographic and Likert questions were developed using the Survey on Officer Careers (U.S. Army Research Institute, 2000).

Because this instrument referred largely to previous instruments many of the questions can be assumed to be pre-tested by their multiple users (U.S. Army Research Institute, 2001a, 2001b). Nevertheless, given my modifications, two additional pre-tests for clarity and understanding were conducted.

The survey study questions were validated in a pre-test by a small focus group. The first pre-test consisted of a representative convenience sample of 10 leaders from the study unit. These individuals volunteered to take part in the pre-test. These respondents used draft copies of the survey. This pre-test group provided valuable feedback on question clarity for the researcher-designed survey. The focus group was used to validate the relevance and language of the draft survey questions and offered suggestions for
improvement. These suggestions were incorporated into a second version of the survey questions.

A second pre-test followed with similar methodology. Ten volunteers used the improved survey and provided their final validation of the survey. Only typographical errors were corrected after the second pre-test.

Both pre-tests results were discarded. Pre-test volunteers were allowed to participate in later data collection. There was no means to determine whether they responded or not.

Variables and Measurement of Data

The LEADSelf and Empowerment Inventory were administered and evaluated based on their developers' instructions.

For the purposes of the researcher-developed survey, eight demographic questions were intended to provide background information on the respondents. Descriptive statistics were utilized in the development of tables and figures (found in chapters 4 and 5) related to the demographic background questions in the survey.

Ten additional quantitative survey questions were designed using a 5-point Likert scale. The Likert scale indicates Strongly Agree through Strongly Disagree. Likert proved that the use of the Likert scale effectively turned qualitative questions of varying agreement into data that can be evaluated in quantitative terms (1 through 5) as interval data. Additional descriptive statistics were derived using these Likert scale survey questions. These areas will be addressed with respect to the respondents' satisfaction with: Duty position (Q9), Guard participation (Q10), Morale (Q11), Guard Job (Q12)—a repeat
of Q9 for the purposes of verifying reliability—Peacekeeping affect (Q13), AC vs. RC (Q14), Appropriateness (Q15), Importance (Q16), Effort (Q17), and Learning (Q18).

The four qualitative questions were received in short answer form on the researcher-designed survey.

Table 2 provides a breakdown of questions and the means by which each question was assessed.

Data Analysis Methods

Analysis of the LEADSelf and Empowerment Inventory was in accordance with their developer's instructions (Center for Leadership Studies, 2002a; Thomas & Tymon, 1993).

Quantitative (Chi-square tests for relationship) and qualitative analyses (Grouping by response) were used in the researcher-developed instrument and the study as a whole. Pearson's r two-tailed reliability tests of two sets of questions—#9 and #12 and questions #6 and the sums of questions #4 and #5—determined if the respondents responded reliably (Siegle, 2003).

The Likert scale questions in the researcher-designed survey were analyzed by examining the means and standard deviations of the response. A mean of 3.5 or above indicated agreement with a particular statement.
Table 2

Statistical Analysis Used in This Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question No.</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Question Type</th>
<th>Response Type</th>
<th>Hypo. Type</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Current rank</td>
<td>Background</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>Descriptive Statistics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Civilian education</td>
<td>Background</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>Descriptive Statistics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Military education</td>
<td>Background</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>Descriptive Statistics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Years of Active service</td>
<td>Background</td>
<td>Interval</td>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>Descriptive Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Years of Guard service</td>
<td>Background</td>
<td>Interval</td>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>Descriptive Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Years of service</td>
<td>Background</td>
<td>Interval</td>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>Descriptive Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Years in duty position</td>
<td>Background</td>
<td>Interval</td>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>Descriptive Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Career intentions</td>
<td>Background</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>Descriptive Statistics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Satisfaction with duty position</td>
<td>Background</td>
<td>Interval</td>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>Descriptive Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Satisfaction with Guard</td>
<td>Background</td>
<td>Interval</td>
<td>RQ1</td>
<td>Descriptive Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Satisfaction with morale</td>
<td>Background</td>
<td>Interval</td>
<td>RQ1</td>
<td>Descriptive Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Satisfaction with Guard job</td>
<td>Background</td>
<td>Interval</td>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>Descriptive Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>affect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RQ1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Satisfaction with peacekeeping</td>
<td>Background</td>
<td>Interval</td>
<td>RQ1</td>
<td>Descriptive Statistics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 2—Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question No.</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Question Type</th>
<th>Response Hypo. Type</th>
<th>Treatment No.</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Satisfaction with AC vs. RC</td>
<td>Background</td>
<td>Interval</td>
<td>RQ1</td>
<td>Narrative w/Descriptive Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Satisfaction with appropriateness</td>
<td>Background</td>
<td>Interval</td>
<td>RQ1</td>
<td>Narrative w/Descriptive Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Satisfaction with importance</td>
<td>Background</td>
<td>Interval</td>
<td>RQ1</td>
<td>Narrative w/Descriptive Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Satisfaction with effort</td>
<td>Background</td>
<td>Interval</td>
<td>RQ1</td>
<td>Narrative w/Descriptive Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Satisfaction with learning</td>
<td>Background</td>
<td>Interval</td>
<td>RQ1</td>
<td>Narrative w/Figure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Volunteerism</td>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>RQ2-</td>
<td>Narrative w/Figure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inferential</td>
<td></td>
<td>RQ5</td>
<td>Chi Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Volunteerism (Hypothetical)</td>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>H1-H4</td>
<td>Narrative w/Figure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inferential</td>
<td></td>
<td>RQ6-</td>
<td>Chi Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RQ9</td>
<td>Chi Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Motivator factors</td>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>H5-H8</td>
<td>Narrative w/Figure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inferential</td>
<td></td>
<td>RQ10</td>
<td>Chi Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>What do you most enjoy, National Guard</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Coding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>What do you least enjoy, National Guard</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Coding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>What do you most enjoy, Peacekeeping</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Coding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>What do you least enjoy, Peacekeeping</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Coding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Research Question (RQ); Hypothesis (H).
In the researcher-designed instrument and the case study interviews, the concluding narrative questions were used to allow respondents to elaborate in their own words their feelings on the issues of peacekeeping missions. Respondents with valuable opinions were afforded the opportunity to be heard. These qualitative open-ended responses were evaluated by grouping of responses with respect to the intrinsic and extrinsic motivator factors highlighted in Q21.

The hypotheses associated with the primary research questions were designed to find relationships between the multiple survey instruments. Inferential statistics (Chi-square tests for association) were used in testing the research questions.

The SLT LEADSelf surveys were used to determine a primary and secondary leadership style (the highest and second highest ranked quadrants on the curvilinear model).

The Empowerment Inventory returned values for the sense of meaningfulness, sense of choice, sense of competence, and sense of progress each respondent experienced in their peacekeeping duties. The Thomas model uses three levels of motivation: high, medium, and low. In order to perform the (Chi-square tests for relationship) statistical testing for the study, these three stratifications were modified into two. In this case intrinsically motivated leaders were identified if their scores in any or all categories of the Empowerment Inventory were greater than the 50th percentile (as compared to Thomas’s initial study group of managers) in each respective category. Those individuals scoring high were denoted as H for High (intrinsic motivation), whereas those who fail to meet the 50th percentile in any category were denoted as an L for Low (intrinsic motivation) in each category of Choice, Competence, Meaningfulness, and Progress.
The qualitative items that generated open-ended comments were analyzed and compared to the results of the quantitative aspect of the study. These comments were grouped and evaluated to check validity and add legitimacy to the traditional survey responses.

The Command Climate Survey was not a part of the original study methodology. It is included only to lend further credence to the researcher-developed survey and its qualitative questions.

Summary of Methodology

This chapter describes the design of the study and the three primary instruments, research questions, participants of the study, procedures used to conduct the study, the surveys, variables, and measurement of data, and data analysis methods.
CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Results

This study examined the intrinsic and extrinsic factors that motivate National Guard leaders to participate in overseas peacekeeping missions. The intent was to determine whether these leaders are intrinsically motivated and whether intrinsic or extrinsic factors are more important to these National Guard members.

A secondary purpose was to examine the relevance of volunteerism on the motivation of the National Guard leadership and whether there is a relationship between volunteerism and their desire for intrinsic or extrinsic motivator factors.

A tertiary purpose was to determine the Situational Leadership Theory leadership styles of this unit's officers and noncommissioned officers. Using these SLT leadership styles, it is desirable to further determine if there is a relationship between these SLT leadership styles and the Herzberg and Maslow motivator factors as described by Hersey, Blanchard, and Johnson.

Description of the Sample

Four instruments were used in the conduct of this study. The SLT instrument was administered on January 6th, 16th and 26th of 2004. Ninety-eight complete SLT survey responses were returned over those three dates. Both the Empowerment Inventory and
the researcher-developed instrument were administered at the same time—due to mission constraints—on March 7th, April 12th, May 5th, and June 17th of 2004. The total response for these two bundled surveys was 65 usable surveys (Krecjie & Morgan, 1970). The fourth instrument, the Command Climate survey (Appendix D), was required of all members of the taskforce. It was completed in June. As a result, there were 423 complete surveys. (All survey instruments can be found in the Appendices.)

Survey Analysis Instrument #1

The SLT instrument consisted of the 12 standard questions used in the LEADSelf instrument. Each of those questions presents a leadership scenario and the respondent selects from the four choices (A-D) which best fits how they would have responded in that scenario. Using the SLT LEADSelf instrument, one can determine the respondents’ primary and secondary SLT leadership style.

The results of the LEADSelf analysis are found in Figures 8 and 9. For the primary leadership style, it was determined that 73 of 98 total respondents fell into the S2 category (selling style). These respondents were focused on high task and high relationship behaviors. Eight respondents were determined to be in the S3 quadrant, and 8 others were determined to be in the S1 quadrant. All remaining respondents showed ties between multiple quadrants. Ties are reflected in the numbers that are abridging two or more quadrants of the SLT matrix. Interestingly, none responded primarily in the S4 quadrant.

For the secondary leadership style, respondents generally reflected S3 and S1 secondary leadership styles. The S2 style was much less representative as a secondary style, given that it was a primary for most of the respondents. Again, few respondents fell into the S4 quadrant as a secondary SLT leadership style.
**Figure 8.** Respondents' LEADSelf primary leadership styles results.

**Figure 9.** Respondents' LEADSelf secondary leadership styles results.
Survey Analysis Instrument #2

The Thomas Empowerment Inventory was used to determine how much intrinsic value the respondents placed on their current job at the time of the survey. The Thomas inventory measures feelings of meaningfulness, choice, progress, and competence.

Respondents were asked to rate their agreement with the 24 statements in the Empowerment Inventory from 1 to 7 on a Likert scale where 1 indicates Strongly Disagree (SD) and 7 indicates Strongly Agree (SA).

In this case there were a total of 65 usable surveys. The surveys were based on the Thomas criteria of what constituted high, medium, and low levels of intrinsic motivation and the study criteria (which was the 50th percentile) for high and low levels of intrinsic motivation. The results can be found in Tables 3 and 4.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thomas criteria</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Competence</th>
<th>Meaningfulness</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>49.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using both the Thomas criteria (Table 3) and the study criteria (Table 4) it is clear that few respondents reported experiencing high levels of intrinsic motivation.
Table 4

**Empowerment Inventory Results Using Study Criteria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study criteria</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Competence</th>
<th>Meaningfulness</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>72.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using the study criteria (Table 4), generally only one quarter of respondents reported intrinsic motivation in the areas of choice, competence, and progress. In the area of feelings of meaningfulness, just over one third of the respondents reported high levels of intrinsic motivation.

**Survey Analysis Instrument #3**

The third survey instrument was intended to determine the demographics of the survey respondents, ask the formative quantitative Likert scale questions and intrinsic motivation questions, and allow the survey participants to add qualitative comments.

For the purposes of the researcher-developed survey, eight demographic questions provided background information on the respondents. Descriptive statistics were utilized to develop charts and figures related to the demographic background survey questions.

Ten additional quantitative survey questions were designed using a 5-point Likert scale. The Likert scale indicates *Strongly Agree* through *Strongly Disagree*. On a Likert-type scale ranging from *Strongly Disagree* (SD), with a value of 1, to *Strongly Agree* (SA, with a value of 5, Likert asserted that the use of the Likert scale effectively turned qualitative questions of varying agreement into data that can be evaluated in quantitative
terms as interval data. Additional descriptive statistics were derived using these Likert scale survey questions. These areas will be addressed with respect to the respondents' satisfaction with: Duty position (Q9), Guard participation (Q10), Morale (Q11), Guard Job (Q12)—a repeat of Q9 for the purposes of verifying reliability—Peacekeeping affect (Q13), AC vs. RC (Q14), Appropriateness (Q15), Importance (Q16), Effort (Q17), and Learning (Q18).

The four qualitative questions were received in short-answer form. These questions were open-ended with grouping used for measurement.

**Demographic Analysis**

The demographic questions were Q1 through Q8. Tables 5–8 and Figures 10-15 describe the demographic background data.

### Table 5

*Composition of Sample by Rank (N=65)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E5 or E6</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>72.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-7 or above</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-1 or O-2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-3 or above</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The sample respondents for Instrument #3 were predominately non-commissioned officers in the ranks of Sergeant and Staff Sergeant (E5-E6) with 72% of the population reporting those ranks, where \( n = 65 \).

Table 6

*Composition of Sample by Civilian Education (N=65)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civilian Education</th>
<th>( N )</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some High School</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>52.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's Degree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Graduate School</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's Degree or Above</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 65 respondents, 52% reported having some college credits completed. This is in line with the concept that many of the respondents were non-commissioned officers.

Table 7 shows that it is clear that the dominant number (45%) of the 64 respondents had completed the Basic Non-Commissioned Officers' Course with regard to their highest level of military education. This is also in keeping with the rank of the respondents in the grades of E5-E6. In fact, many of the surveys were given at the
conclusion of the two BNCOC courses held while in country, as part of their end-of-course surveys.

Table 7

*Composition of Sample by Military Education (N=64)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Military Education</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLDC</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNCOC</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>45.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANCOC</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAC/CCC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS3 or above</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Primary Leadership Development Course (PLDC); Basic Non-Commissioned Officer Course (BNCOC); Advanced Non-Commissioned Officer Course (ANCOC); Officer Basic Course (OBC); Officer Advanced Course/Captain Career Course (OAC/CCC); Combined Arms Staff Services School (CAS3).*

Figures 10-12 reflect the years of Active, Guard, or Reserve, and total number of years of service each of the survey respondents had served. In these histograms the figures represent each respondent who answered that particular year. Figure 13 combines the values of Figures 10-12 to show the relationship between active duty and Guard/Reserve service with total service. Ideally, the Active and the Guard/Reserve numbers should equal the total. Unfortunately rounding and respondent error contributed
to differences between the sum totals of Questions 4 and 5 summing to equal the value in Question 6. These questions were intended for use in a reliability test.

Figure 10. Question #4. How many years of Active military service have you completed? Round up to the nearest year.

Figure 11. Question #5. How many years of Guard/Reserve military service have you completed? Round up to the nearest year.

The average number of years served on active duty was 4.4 years. The average number of years served in Guard/Reserve service was 9.1 years.
Figure 12. Question #6. How many years of total military service have you completed? Round up to the nearest year.

Figure 13. Combined years of service.

The average number of years served in total of Active and Guard/Reserve service was 12.7 years total. Clearly the respondents had a wide spread of experience in both the Active force and the Guard force, with total years served varying from 3–22 years of total service and an average total years of service of 12.7 years. The sample demonstrated significant amount of experience, which should return some representative information.

As shown in Figure 14, most (60%) of the respondents had been serving in their positions for 1-2 years. This is consistent with rapid growth and movement within the
force, especially among the junior non-commissioned officers who dominated the sample.

![Bar chart showing years in position](chart.png)

*Figure 14. Question #7. How many years have you served in your current duty position? Round up to the nearest year.*

Table 8 clearly shows that nearly 63% of the 65 respondents intended to stay in the Guard until at least 20 years of service when they could depart with some form of retirement. If we return to Figures 12 and 13, it may be noteworthy that for some respondents, 20 years had already been surpassed, or was drawing near.

In summary, the demographic details described the study sample as predominately (72%) made up of junior non-commissioned officers (E5-E6) who had completed BNCOC (45%) and some college (52%). Many had served on active duty with an average of more than 4 years of active service. They complemented their active service with Guard service, which averaged over 9 years and an average total service in uniform of nearly 13 years. Most (60%) of the respondents had been in their current...
Table 8

Composition of Sample by Current National Guard Career Intentions (N=65)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career Intentions</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stay beyond 20 years</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>44.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stay until 20 years</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stay beyond my obligation, undecided about retirement</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided about staying past current obligation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably leave upon end of obligation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely leave upon end of obligation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

positions less than 2 years, and 63% fully intend to remain in the service until they are eligible for retirement at 20 years of service.

Research Questions and Related Null Hypotheses

This section presents the results related to research questions 1 through 9.

Research question 1 is answered using descriptive statistics. Research questions 2 through 9 are accompanied by their corresponding null hypotheses that are tested using chi-square at the .05 level of significance.

Research Question #1

Research question 1 asked: Are the Reserve Component leaders involved in the study operation satisfied with their involvement in the National Guard and the
peacekeeping mission? Questions 9 through 18 were Likert questions which supported research question 1. A reliability test of Questions 9 and 12 is in the reliability section.

Table 9 presents the means and standard deviations of the respondents’ views on 10 critical items on the researcher-developed instrument that measured their level of agreement on a Likert scale where 1 = *Strongly Disagree*, to 5 = *Strongly Agree*. The threshold mean for agreement with each statement was set as 3.50 and $n = 65$ responses.

Table 9

*Respondents’ Views on National Guard and Peacekeeping Involvement (N=65)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. I am satisfied with my current duty position.</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I am satisfied with my National Guard participation.</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I rate my current level of morale as high.</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I am satisfied with my current National Guard job.</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. The Army’s involvement in multinational contingency missions (e.g. peacekeeping) has negatively affected my National Guard career intention.</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Guard members/Reservists can perform peacekeeping missions as well as Regular Army military personnel.</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Peacekeeping operations are appropriate missions for my unit.</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. It really matters to me that we do well on our MFO mission.</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I am willing to put in extra effort to accomplish our assignments during this MFO rotation.</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I am learning a lot during this MFO rotation.</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
With respect to Question 9, the mean of 3.37 failed to meet the 3.5 threshold, so in this case respondents generally disagreed with the question. They were not satisfied with their current duty position.

In Question 10, the mean of results was 3.80, which indicated that generally the respondents were satisfied with their National Guard participation.

With respect to Question 11, respondents reported a mean value of 3.11 (less than the 3.5 threshold); in this case the respondents disagreed with the statement “I rate my current level of morale as high.”

In Question 12 the survey response to the question “I am satisfied with my current National Guard job” reported a mean value of 3.26, which also failed to meet the threshold of agreement of 3.5. This is particularly interesting since this question (Q12) and the question regarding current position (Q9) were designed as reliability questions to determine the reliability of the study.

For Question 13, the respondents disagreed with the comment that “peacekeeping negatively affects my career intentions.” In this case the mean was 2.55, but in this negatively structured question, a low mean would be a favorable condition. Nevertheless, the mean would have to be lower than 2.5 to highlight strong disagreement with the survey question. In this case the question still fails to meet the study threshold for a strong response.

With respect to Question 14, respondents strongly agreed that “Guard members and Reserve forces can perform peacekeeping missions as well as” their Regular Army counterparts. In fact, with a mean result of 4.12, the survey respondents expressed the strongest agreement to this Likert question.
For Question 15, the respondents barely failed to meet the threshold of 3.5. They disagreed with the statement that “Peacekeeping missions are appropriate for my unit” with a mean value of 3.49.

For Question 16, respondents produced a mean value of 3.94 showing strong agreement with the statement “It really matters to me that we do well on our MFO mission.”

In Question 17, the respondents strongly agreed, where the mean value was 3.91, with the statement “I am willing to put in extra effort to accomplish our assignments during this MFO rotation.”

Finally, in Question 18, the respondents strongly agreed (mean = 3.63) with the Likert question “I am learning a lot during this MFO rotation.”

Summarizing the Likert questions, we see that the survey respondents’ opinions were split. In many cases they expressed agreement but failed to meet the threshold of 3.5. In 5 of 10 questions they expressed strong agreement by exceeding the 3.5 threshold. They expressed the most favorable response (mean = 4.12) when questioned on their agreement with the statement “Guard members/Reservists can perform peacekeeping missions as well as Regular Army military personnel.” The lowest rating relative to the study threshold was 3.11 with respect to Question 11, “I rate my current level of morale as high.” Finally, with regard to the negatively constructed question, respondents disagreed that “The Army’s involvement in multinational contingency missions (e.g. peacekeeping) has negatively affected my National Guard career intentions.” In this case the mean of 2.55 indicated they disagreed with the statement but
it was not strong enough to meet the study threshold (in this case only it was 2.5) for a strong response.

Given the split, it is not clear whether the Research Question #1 “Are the Reserve Component leaders involved in the study operation satisfied with their involvement in the National Guard and the peacekeeping mission?” is true. Responses regarding the MFO mission were generally more favorable than those responses about the National Guard in general.

**Descriptive Statistics in Support of Research Questions #2-#9**

Questions 19 and 20 were the critical questions in Survey Instrument #3. These questions were necessary to establish the volunteerism or hypothetical volunteerism for the remaining Research Questions 2-9 and the hypotheses testing. Because the mission transitioned from a volunteer mission to a mandatory one in the midst of planning both the mission and this study, it was necessary to include two questions relating to volunteerism—one of which was a hypothetical. The intention was to measure results versus the volunteer question “Did you volunteer for this peacekeeping mission?” and the hypothetical “Given the choice, would you have volunteered for this peacekeeping mission?” For this reason it was necessary to repeat hypothesis testing for both the volunteer question and the hypothetical volunteer question. Tables 10 and 11 describe the raw data results for survey questions 19 and 20.

In Table 10 it is clear that the dominant percentage (82%) of the respondents (n=65) felt they had volunteered for the mission.
Table 10

Volunteered for This Mission (N=65)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volunteered for This Mission</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>81.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Likewise in Table 11, the respondents (n= 65) suggested that given the opportunity, 77% reported they would have volunteered for the mission.

Table 11

Would Have Volunteered for This Mission (N=65)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would Have Volunteered for This Mission</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>76.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question #2

Research Question 2: Is there a significant relationship between intrinsic levels of motivation as measured by the Choice component of Dr. Thomas’s integrated model and volunteerism in Reserve Component leaders involved in the study operation?
Null Hypothesis 1: There is no relationship between intrinsic levels of motivation as measured by the Choice component of Dr. Thomas’s integrated model and volunteerism in Reserve Component leaders involved in the study operation.

The null hypothesis was retained ($\chi^2 = 1.14, df = 1, p = .285$). The above relationship was not supported. Table 12 presents a contingency table of Choice by Volunteerism. There was no significant relationship between Choice as measured by the Thomas model and Volunteerism.

Table 12

Contingency Table of Choice by Volunteerism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volunteerism</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$f$</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>$f$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categorical/High</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categorical/Low</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question #3

Research Question 3: Is there a significant relationship between intrinsic levels of motivation as measured by the Competence component of Dr. Thomas’s integrated model and volunteerism in Reserve Component leaders involved in the study operation?
Null Hypothesis 2: There is no relationship between intrinsic levels of motivation as measured by the Competence component of Dr. Thomas’s integrated model and volunteerism in Reserve Component leaders involved in the study operation.

The null hypothesis was retained ($\chi^2 = .005, df = 1, p = .945$). The above relationship was not supported. Table 13 presents a contingency table of Competence by Volunteerism. There was no significant relationship between Competence as measured by the Thomas model and Volunteerism.

Table 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volunteerism</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$f$</td>
<td>$%$</td>
<td>$f$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categorical/High</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categorical/Low</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question #4

Research Question 4: Is there a significant relationship between intrinsic levels of motivation as measured by the Meaningfulness component of Dr. Thomas’s integrated model and volunteerism in Reserve Component leaders involved in the study operation?
Null Hypothesis 3: There is no relationship between intrinsic levels of motivation as measured by the Meaningfulness component of Dr. Thomas’s integrated model and volunteerism in Reserve Component leaders involved in the study operation.

The null hypothesis was retained ($\chi^2 = 3.194$, $df = 1, p = .074$). The above relationship was not supported. Table 14 presents a contingency table of Meaningfulness by Volunteerism. Again there was no significant relationship between Meaningfulness as measured by the Thomas model and Volunteerism.

Table 14

Contingency Table of Meaningfulness by Volunteerism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volunteerism</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$f$</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categorical/High</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>41.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categorical/Low</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>81.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question #5

Research Question 5: Is there a significant relationship between intrinsic levels of motivation as measured by the Progress component of Dr. Thomas’s integrated model and volunteerism in Reserve Component leaders involved in the study operation?
Null Hypothesis 4: There is no relationship between intrinsic levels of motivation as measured by the Progress component of Dr. Thomas’s integrated model and volunteerism in Reserve Component leaders involved in the study operation.

The null hypothesis was retained ($\chi^2 = .005, df = 1, p = .945$). The above relationship was not supported. Table 15 presents a contingency table of Progress by Volunteerism. Finally, there was no significant relationship between Progress as measured by the Thomas model and Volunteerism.

Table 15

*Contingency Table of Progress by Volunteerism*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volunteerism</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categorical/High</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categorical/Low</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.77</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>69.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question #6

Research Question 6: Is there a significant relationship between intrinsic levels of motivation as measured by the Choice component of Dr. Thomas’s integrated model and hypothetical volunteerism in Reserve Component leaders involved in the study operation?
Null Hypothesis 5: There is no relationship between intrinsic levels of motivation as measured by the Choice component of Dr. Thomas's integrated model and hypothetical volunteerism in Reserve Component leaders involved in the study operation.

The null hypothesis was retained ($\chi^2 = .618, df = 1, p = .432$). The above relationship was not supported. Table 16 presents a contingency table of Choice by Hypothetical Volunteerism. There was no significant relationship between Choice as measured by the Thomas model and Hypothetical Volunteerism.

Table 16

Contingency Table of Choice by Hypothetical Volunteerism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volunteerism</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$f$</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categorical/High</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categorical/Low</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>49.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>78.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question #7

Research Question 7: Is there a significant relationship between intrinsic levels of motivation as measured by the Competence component of Dr. Thomas’s integrated model and hypothetical volunteerism in Reserve Component leaders involved in the study operation?
Null Hypothesis 6: There is no relationship between intrinsic levels of motivation as measured by the Competence component of Dr. Thomas's integrated model and hypothetical volunteerism in Reserve Component leaders involved in the study operation.

The null hypothesis was retained ($\chi^2 = .832, df = 1, p = .362$). The above relationship was not supported. Table 17 presents a contingency table of Competence by Hypothetical Volunteerism. There was no significant relationship between Competence as measured by the Thomas model and Hypothetical Volunteerism.

Table 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competence</th>
<th>Volunteerism</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Categorical/High</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categorical/Low</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>78.2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question #8

Research Question 8: Is there a significant relationship between intrinsic levels of motivation as measured by the Meaningfulness component of Dr. Thomas's integrated model and hypothetical volunteerism in Reserve Component leaders involved in the study operation?
Null Hypothesis 7: There is no relationship between intrinsic levels of motivation as measured by the Meaningfulness component of Dr. Thomas’s integrated model and hypothetical volunteerism in Reserve Component leaders involved in the study operation.

The null hypothesis was retained ($\chi^2 = .910, df = 1, p = .340$). The above relationship was not supported. Table 18 presents a contingency table of Meaningfulness by Hypothetical Volunteerism. There was no significant relationship between Meaningfulness as measured by the Thomas model and Hypothetical Volunteerism.

Table 18

Contingency Table of Meaningfulness by Hypothetical Volunteerism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volunteerism</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$f$</td>
<td>$%$</td>
<td>$f$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categorical/High</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categorical/Low</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>78.2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question #9

Research Question 9: Is there a significant relationship between intrinsic levels of motivation as measured by the Progress component of Dr. Thomas’s integrated model and hypothetical volunteerism in Reserve Component leaders involved in the study operation?
Null Hypothesis 8: There is no relationship between intrinsic levels of motivation as measured by the Progress component of Dr. Thomas's integrated model and hypothetical volunteerism in Reserve Component leaders involved in the study operation.

The null hypothesis was retained ($\chi^2 = .042, df = 1, p = .837$). The above relationship was not supported. Table 19 presents a contingency table of Progress by Hypothetical Volunteerism. There was no significant relationship between Progress as measured by the Thomas model and Hypothetical Volunteerism.

Table 19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volunteerism</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$f$</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>$f$</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>$f$</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categorical/High</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categorical/Low</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>69.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>78.2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reliability Statistics

Instrument reliability was calculated to measure the consistency of the respondents' answers. Two sets of questions were used to determine instrument reliability. In the first set, Questions 4 and 5 were written in a manner that when summed should equal the response in...
Question 6 to determine if respondents were answering consistently about their time in service. By way of example, respondents indicating they had 5 years of active service in question 4 and 6 years of Guard service in question 5 should answer 11 years in question 6 regarding total years of service.

**Null Hypothesis 9:** There is no relationship between the sum of responses to Question 4 and 5 and the responses to Question 6.

Table 20 shows the Pearson Reliability Coefficients to test this null hypothesis, where \( n = 65 \) responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Satisfaction with Duty position</th>
<th>Satisfaction with Guard job</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with Duty position</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with Guard job</td>
<td>.583**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01.**

In this case the null hypothesis was rejected. There was a relationship between the sum of responses to Question 4 and 5 and the responses to Question 6.

In the second set of reliability questions, a comparison was made between similar questions 9 and 12. For the purposes of this test a question about current duty position (Q9) and current Guard job (Q12) should return the same answer.
Null Hypothesis 10: There is no relationship between the responses to Question 9 and Question 12.

Table 21 shows the Pearson $r$ test of this null hypothesis, where $n=65$ responses.

Table 21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation of Satisfaction with Duty Position (Q9) and Guard Job (Q12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sum of Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 4 &amp; 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum of Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 4 &amp; 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01.

Null hypothesis 10 was rejected. There was a relationship between responses to Question 9 and Question 12 for respondents.

Since both checks for reliability of the data returned very strong correlations, the data from the researcher-designed instrument were deemed reliable.

Research Question #10

Research Question 10: Are Reserve Component leaders involved in the study operation motivated by intrinsic or extrinsic factors to take part in the study peacekeeping operation?

Question 21 was also critical to the analysis of the intrinsic versus extrinsic motivators involved in soldiers’ decisions to participate in a mission akin to the MFO
mission. In this case I present two graphs to highlight the rank-ordered response to Question 21 which asks “What are the most important reasons for your participation in this deployment? Rank order all choices from 1-15 where 1 is the most important factor and 15 is the least important factor.” Figure 15 describes the 15 factors and which received the most number 1 rated rankings by respondents.

In this case ‘Serve country/serve Army’ was the clear top ranked reason, followed by ‘Adventure/Travel’ and ‘Military career advancement/promotion’.

![Bar chart showing top ranked reasons for deployment participation](image)

*Figure 15. Question #21: Top ranked reasons for deployment participation.*

In Figure 16, I used a weighted Pareto—where the values being plotted are arranged in descending order—of the top seven factors ranked to determine which of the intrinsic factors or extrinsic factors were most often represented in the respondents’ top seven choices. It is worth noting that intrinsic factors dominated the top six respondent choices. This will be of value during the further analysis.
Category Analysis for Qualitative Questions

Respondents had an opportunity to add qualitative comments to their surveys in the four concluding short answer questions. The questions were "What do you like most about the National Guard?" "What do you like least about the National Guard?" "What do you like most about the Multinational Force & Observers (MFO) mission?" and "What do you like least about the Multinational Force & Observers (MFO) mission?" The survey responses were coded with respect to the same intrinsic and extrinsic factors previously defined. The factors are listed below and denoted as either I for intrinsic motivator or E for extrinsic motivator.

1. I—Adventure/Travel
2. E—Take timeout from school/job
3. E—Pay/Needed more money
4. I—Military career advancement/promotion
5. E—Educational opportunities/benefits
6. E—Medical/Dental benefits
7. E—Earn retirement points
8. I—Serve country/serve Army
9. I—Leadership opportunities
10. I—Challenging work/learn new skills
11. E—Was unemployed
12. I—Opportunities for job satisfaction
13. E—Family pressures/problems
14. I—Quality of co-workers

N/A. I was ordered to participate.

When coding the responses, consideration was made for survey responses making references to multiple intrinsic or extrinsic factors. If multiple factors were identified, then each factor would receive a point indicating it had been referenced. Likewise if a factor was repeated it would receive more than one point commensurate with the number of references made to that intrinsic or extrinsic factor.

Some respondents responded negatively to positive based questions (e.g., When asked “What do you most like about the National Guard?” the response was “Nothing!”). These negative responses were not included in the total count of coded items for that response. In other words, there was no provision for subtracting for negative comments, as it would be assumed that the same comment would be repeated and accounted for in the opposing question (i.e. “What do you least like about the National Guard?”)
When consolidated and reviewed, there were no references made to four of the available factors, specifically "Earn retirement points," "Was unemployed," "Family pressures/problems," or "N/A. I was ordered to participate." For the purposes of further analysis, these four factors were removed.

With respect to the question "What do you enjoy most about being in the National Guard?" (Figure 17), the following responses were most popular: "Quality of coworkers (35 references)," "Serve country/serve Army (22 references)," "Leadership opportunities (9 references)." In general most references emphasized intrinsic over extrinsic factors.

![Qualitative Comments - Most National Guard Pareto](image)

*Figure 17. Pareto of qualitative comments "What do you enjoy most about being in the National Guard?" Intrinsic factor (I), Extrinsic factor (E).*

With respect to the question "What do you enjoy least about being in the National Guard?" (Figure 18), the following responses were most often repeated: "Leadership opportunities" (51 references)," "Challenging work/learn new skills" (12 references)," "Military career advancement/promotion (8 references)." In this case only intrinsic factors were mentioned.
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Figure 18. Pareto of qualitative comments "What do you enjoy least about being in the National Guard?" Intrinsic factor (I), Extrinsic factor (E).

In the question "What do you most enjoy about this MFO peacekeeping mission?" (Figure 19), qualitative comments focused on the following top three areas:

"Adventure/Travel" (43 references), "Quality of coworkers" (16 references), and "Opportunities for job satisfaction" (9 references). Again most of the references emphasized intrinsic over extrinsic factors.

Figure 19. Pareto of qualitative comments "What do you enjoy most about this MFO peacekeeping mission?" Intrinsic factor (I), Extrinsic factor (E).
The last qualitative question “What do you enjoy least about this MFO peacekeeping mission?” (Figure 20) focused highly on “Leadership opportunities” (56 references), “Challenging work/learn new skills” (15 references), and “Opportunities for job satisfaction” (13 references). Again intrinsic factors seemed to play a greater role.

![Qualitative Comments - Least MFO Pareto](image)

*Figure 20. Pareto of qualitative comments “What do you enjoy least about this MFO peacekeeping mission?” Intrinsic factor (I), Extrinsic factor (E).*

A holistic view of the qualitative response shows all four graphs in combination (Figure 21) referencing the 11 (of 14 possible) factors that had responses. Questions referencing what respondents most enjoyed about the National Guard and MFO peacekeeping mission are on the positive side of the X axis, whereas responses about what was least enjoyed about the National Guard or MFO peacekeeping mission are on the negative side of the X axis.
Figure 21. Qualitative comments, combined coded response. Intrinsic factor (I), Extrinsic factor (E).
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS,
AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

The data collection for this study was completed in 2004. Since then the Army, both Active and Reserve Components, has been continually stretched further and further by the nature of the Global War on Terror (Freedberg, 2004). In this environment, concerns about recruiting and retention of personnel in the armed services have grown to be an enormous problem (Moniz, 2004a; Shanker, 2004; Shanker & Gordon, 2006).

Units have been asked to contribute forces to the conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan repeatedly. Some soldiers are on the third combat tours. This is an unprecedented fact in the history of the United States Army. It is also the first time a completely volunteer force has been asked to supply troops for a conflict that has now outlasted World War II in calendar length.

By way of example, the unit in this study, 1st Battalion, 125th Infantry Regiment has contributed to two additional missions since its return from the Sinai. The Sinai mission involved 425 soldiers. The two missions since then, both in Iraq, required an additional 150 soldiers each. Many of the soldiers serving in the Sinai have taken part in these two other operations in Iraq since then. In April 2007, the 125th Infantry and their sister unit the 1-126 CAV which I now command were alerted for duty in the Iraq theater.
of operations. The study unit is expected to supply as many as 800 soldiers for the upcoming mission. Again many of the soldiers involved have taken part in the previous operations in the Sinai or Iraq. Needless to say, maintaining the motivation of the volunteer force remains a huge concern for the civilian and military leadership in the Pentagon.

**Statement of the Problem**

This study was an analysis of the relationship between the Reserve Component leaders' attitudes and motivation during a peacekeeping mission in Sinai, Egypt. The study was intended to investigate relationships between leaders' attitudes and the Situational Leadership theory described by Hersey and Blanchard. The study also examined the relationship between leaders' attitudes and intrinsic motivator factors.

This analysis is increasingly important as the Reserve Component soldiers remain more and more active in Active Army missions around the world. Understanding attitudes and motivation of the Reserve Component soldiers allows the Army to understand impacts to soldier retention and develop means to counter or mitigate issues that negatively affect retention.

The military relies on a linear plan of training and leadership growth to build its future leaders. There is no lateral means of entry from civilian to military to accept leaders from outside the organization. You simply cannot hire a new replacement leader from the civilian community when one of the officers or noncommissioned officers leaves the force. Retaining the force to grow the future leaders is critical to maintaining personnel strength and mission accomplishment.
Widespread departures are threatening the future leadership needs of the service. Without the proper leadership, the Army will be incapable of fielding a force which can function across a full spectrum of operations “including combating terrorism, meeting its peacekeeping commitments, and fighting a major regional war all at the same time” (Confessore, 2003, para. 26). In 2005 the Chief of the Army Reserve, LTG James Helmly, warned the Army Chief of Staff of the Army GEN Schoomaker that the Reserve Components were “rapidly degenerating into a 'broken' force," incapable of continuing at their breakneck pace (Bowman, 2005). Interestingly, even the local needs of state governments have been compromised due to a lack of soldiers and equipment. In May of 2007, the Kansas government was hard-pressed to deal with the fallout of a string of tornadoes. The Kansas National Guard, who would normally be responsible for providing disaster assistance, was unable to assist because their equipment and soldiers were committed to Iraq (Gillam, 2007).

Unfortunately, most of the motivational appeals offered to soldiers today consist of extrinsic motivators in the form of enlistment monetary bonuses. CPTs are being offered $20,000 sums to remain on duty, and soldiers with low-density (highly skilled, low numbers of specially trained troops) can regularly command re-enlistment bonuses well into six figures (Tice, 2007).

The findings of this study may be utilized in the future to means that stem the flow of soldiers and leaders within the National Guard without resorting to brazen extrinsic appeals.
Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine relationships between the Situational Leadership (SLT) style of RC leaders and their motivation levels with respect to their mission in the Sinai, Egypt. Situational Leadership was used due to its regular usage within the United States military in practice and its leadership development training. This descriptive study provided both quantitative and qualitative correlation research materials.

This study examined the study sample through the use of three survey instruments. The first instrument, administered at the beginning of the mission, determined the SLT style of the leadership in a deployed National Guard infantry battalion. The second instrument was used to profile military participants’ intrinsic motivation in a convenience sample. The third, researcher-developed survey was used to evaluate the participants’ preference for intrinsic versus extrinsic motivator factors. This last survey had an additional qualitative component that allowed survey respondents to validate some of the earlier survey material through the use of their qualitative comments. Finally, an impromptu Command Climate survey created by and administered by the unit (rather than myself) was incorporated to corroborate the other survey results.

The specific focus of the survey was to determine the predominate situational leadership styles within the unit, determine if there is a relationship between the classical motivation theory of Maslow and Herzberg and Situational Leadership theory, as proposed by Hersey et al. (2001, p. 452). A second focus was to determine whether the soldiers involved were intrinsically motivated, as measured by the Thomas Empowerment Inventory, and whether their motivation was rooted in intrinsic or extrinsic motivator factors. The third and final focus was to make a determination as to
whether there was a connection between the respondents' levels of intrinsic motivation and their status as volunteers (or not).

**Importance of the Study**

A profile of RC leaders benefits the Reserve Components and the military as a whole. This study offers additional answers to the question of "What motivates soldiers in peacekeeping operational environment and in a more generalized sense, what motivates soldiers on the whole?"

From a study perspective, this was a first attempt to see if there is any validity to the Maslow/Herzberg–Situational Leadership Theory connection proposed by Hersey et al. (2001, p. 452). This study was not the first usage of the Thomas Empowerment Inventory with the military, but it was the first instance of use with a forward deployed unit and the first attempt to correlate the Thomas intrinsic motivators to the idea of volunteerism.

As soldiers and leaders depart the military in large numbers, this study also defined the human resource issues most important to retain leaders in an organization. The military could use the results to fundamentally change the means, method, and mix of benefits, compensation, and intrinsic motivator factors it uses to convince soldiers to join and stay in the military force. The results could save countless amounts of misspent money and still maintain a larger, more determined soldier population.

**Summary of Literature Review**

A review of the literature determined that there was a significant amount of research applied to the many divergent subjects of this study. The review highlighted
what some researchers have done prior as it relates to theories of motivation, leadership
type (specifically Situational Leadership Theory), and the modern United States
military forces in peacekeeping operations. Some gaps in the previous research were also
identified with the intent to determine if the sample response from this population could
be applied to the whole of the military. Each section directly related to and supported the
instruments that were designed and used for this study.

Theories of Motivation

This portion of the literature review consisted of a chronological review of the
major theories of motivation which form the foundation of this study. The review began
with the developments of Gilbreth, Taylor, and Skinner and the means by which they first
refined extrinsic motivation into science through time-motion studies and scientific
management (Kangel, 1997; Weiland, 2005). The review also includes Maslow and
Herzberg and their work toward greater understanding of human needs and the modes by
which they have those needs satisfied through the Hierarchy of Needs and the Two-
Factor Theory of Motivation, respectively (Boeree, 1998). Critical to the study is the
transition from a focus on the Herzberg hygiene and motivator factors, which appeal to
the Maslow’s lower and higher order needs, to a focus on the intrinsic motivation needs
that we all share.

The review continued by investigating the work of Deci and Ryan who focused
on the concept of “task activities as sources of intrinsic reward” (Thomas, 2002). They
also proposed that an “overjustification effect” exists which suggests that individuals
offered extrinsic rewards for continued performance of an interesting task show decreases
in intrinsic motivation to perform that same task (Kohn, 1999). Hackman and Oldham
(1980) built upon Deci and Ryan with their Job Characteristics Model which placed an emphasis on task purposes, which Deci and Ryan’s Cognitive Evaluation Theory failed to address. The literature review further describes how both sets of researchers sequentially built upon and supplanted Maslow and Herzberg’s efforts on intrinsic motivation theory.

The literature review continued chronologically with a focus on Thomas and his main contemporaries Velthouse and Tymon and their efforts to build upon the intrinsic motivation theory formulated by Deci, Ryan, Hackman, and Oldham (Thomas & Velthouse, 1990; Thomas & Tymon, 1994). Thomas and his contemporaries were able to incorporate and redesign the elements of the separate Deci, Ryan, Hackman, and Oldham theories. Thomas’s model addresses both task activities and task purposes and builds on both the CET and JCM models to create Thomas’s integrated model (Thomas, 2002). The Thomas model corrected the errors of his predecessors and developed a coherent and satisfying motivation theory that relies upon building a sense of choice, competence, meaningfulness, and progress into work activities.

This subchapter of the review of literature then explored the previous work done relative to intrinsic motivation and the military. Thomas’s work was revisited since most of his study involved the military. Other military studies showed that military units worldwide have explored the subject of intrinsic motivation within their forces and found similar results (Claudiu, 2002; Pascoe et al., 2002; Papadopoulos, 2001).

Background to Leadership

The review of literature continued with a review of how leadership theory has grown and developed over the past century. The goal was to describe how leadership
studies morphed and changed over time into the subject of contingency theory with a focus on Situational Leadership as developed by Hersey, Blanchard, and Johnson (2001).

Situational Leadership was described in great detail. SLT's associations with classical motivation research such as Maslow and Herzberg's theories were also explored (Hersey et al., 2001, p. 452). Finally a significant effort was made to highlight the subject of Situational Leadership and its long standing relationship within the United States military as an academic theory and a leadership practice were explored and described.

Background to the 21st Century United States Army

The final portion of the literature review dealt with the subject of the current United States Army. One section was devoted to issues of volunteerism and its relationship to the theories of intrinsic motivation and Situational Leadership. A second section explored the relationship between volunteerism and the military-specific issues of volunteerism.

This subchapter continued with a focus on peacekeeping missions and the uncomfortable tensions regarding peacekeeping missions felt by Active Component and Reserve Component soldiers. In the current global environment, war fighting and peacekeeping missions exist inharmoniously. Attitudes and dissatisfiers were described to provide a framework of issues which act upon the modern soldier, especially combat soldiers, who feel uncomfortable with the requirements of peacekeeping missions.

Retention issues and the connection between retention problems and peacekeeping missions were also explored. Finally, specific retention issues that affect Reserve Component soldiers were addressed with emphasis on the specific Sinai mission, which was the subject of the study.
The complete literature review provided an overarching theoretical framework with enough detail and justification to build a study with both quantitative and qualitative elements. The framework was built to accept and analyze this qualitative and quantitative data and form new conclusions.

This study specifically addresses intrinsic motivation, Situational Leadership, and their connections to the United States military forces as a whole.

**Methodology**

In this study, both quantitative and qualitative methods were used in four separate instruments. The first instrument was a strict quantitative analysis using the Situational Leadership theory instrument. The second instrument was also a strict quantitative analysis using the Thomas Empowerment Inventory. The third instrument was researcher designed and incorporated both quantitative and qualitative analysis to assess the perceptions of the sample population. Qualitative questions were open ended. The fourth instrument, a Command Climate survey, was informally included. This last instrument also had both quantitative and qualitative aspects.

**Overview of Findings**

Using demographic questions the study sample was determined to be predominately (72%) made up of junior non-commissioned officers (E5-E6) who had completed BNCOC (45%) and some college (52%). Many had served on active duty with an average of more than 4 years of active service. They served in the Guard on average over 9 years and had an average total service in uniform of nearly 13 years. Most (60%)
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respondents’ had been in their current duty positions less than 2 years, and almost 45% fully intended to remain in the service until eligible for retirement at 20 years of service.

A number of Likert questions were used to learn more about the survey respondents’ feelings on the MFO mission and peacekeeping in general. Reviewing the Likert questions the survey respondents generally demonstrated strong agreement. In 7 of 10 questions they expressed strong agreement. The response was most favorable (mean = 4.1) when questioned on their agreement with the statement “Guard members/Reservists can perform peacekeeping missions as well as Regular Army military personnel.” Respondents expressed lower levels of agreement with 2 of 10 Likert questions (regarding morale, mean = 3.1; and National Guard job, mean = 3.3) but these failed to meet the threshold of 3.5 for strong agreement for this study. These soldiers disagreed that “The Army’s involvement in multinational contingency missions (e.g. peacekeeping) has negatively affected my National Guard career intentions.” In this case the mean of 2.6 indicated they disagreed with the statement but it was not strong enough disagreement to meet the study threshold for a strong response (in this case, mean <=2.5).

Quantitative Findings

The data were checked for reliability using two sets of questions which returned similar results. A Pearson’s R test for correlation found the data in both cases to have a significant level of correlation, therefore the researcher-designed instrument was deemed reliable.

The quantitative analysis of the two research questions—and the eight supporting sub-questions—relating the Thomas Integrated Model of Intrinsic Motivation to volunteerism or hypothetical volunteerism failed to show a significant correlation
between any of the responses. This lack of correlation could have been the result of a lack of discrimination between the responses to the volunteerism/hypothetical volunteerism questions.

Another research question designed to determine if there was a significant relationship between SLT style as determined in Instrument #1 and the responses to the Thomas model in Instrument #2 could not be pursued because of a data collection error.

Qualitative Findings

Instrument #3 offered respondents the opportunity to offer qualitative support to their responses in the form of four questions. By and large the responses to these questions heavily emphasized intrinsic over extrinsic factors. By way of example one question asked “What do you enjoy most about being in the National Guard?” The following responses were most popular: “Quality of coworkers (35 references),” “Serve country/serve Army (22 references),” “Leadership opportunities (9 references).” In general, most of the references emphasized intrinsic over extrinsic factors.

Interestingly enough counterpoint questions emphasizing negative aspects of the National Guard and/or the MFO mission also returned a higher incidence of intrinsic rather than extrinsic points. The response is clear, given the voice the soldiers of the study unit chose to focus on intrinsic factors: They were pleased when they were present, and displeased when they deemed those factors were absent or neglected.

The quantitative response was very descriptive and it is worth noting that the soldiers were very candid in highlighting their concerns. At least one soldier made the extra effort to ask me “What is going to be done with these results?” I did not understand his question. My initial response spoke to the research questions and the relevance to my
academic studies and pursuits. I did not initially recognize the question for what it really was, a cry for help to counteract the negative aspects of what was not going well during the mission. Once I read the initial responses I recognized what was being asked of me as a leader, of some importance, in the organization. The following day I returned to the subgroup and told them of my error from the day prior and made a promise to address their concerns. Issues brought to my attention in 2004 could not wait until the completion of the study for redress; these concerns had to be acted upon immediately.

The Command Climate survey, which became the informal instrument #4, repeated and validated much of the commentary in the qualitative response from instrument #3. Taken together, the two qualitative data sources highlighted a unit functionally operating to accomplish their mission, but at risk for a major failure in soldier morale. In short, the troops were doing their job, but they were not enjoying it. Many of the issues were small and easily correctable, if only someone would take interest in hearing the issues and working towards a resolution.

Conscientious Army leaders would do well to inspect and analyze these soldier responses for keys to better understanding soldiers’ needs and ensure that when errors are made, efforts to correct those errors are swift and effective.

Data Analysis for Research Questions

Research Question #1

Research Question 1: Are the Reserve Component leaders involved in the study operation satisfied with their involvement in the National Guard and the peacekeeping mission? Questions 9 through 18 were Likert scale questions which supported research question 1.
Summarizing the Likert questions, we see that the survey respondents' opinions were split. In many cases they expressed agreement but failed to meet the threshold of 3.5. In 5 of 10 questions they expressed strong agreement by exceeding the 3.5 threshold. They expressed the most favorable response (mean = 4.12) when questioned on their agreement with the statement “Guard members/Reservists can perform peacekeeping missions as well as Regular Army military personnel.” The lowest rating relative to the study threshold was 3.11 with respect to Question 11, “I rate my current level of morale as high.” Finally, with regard to the negatively constructed question, respondents disagreed that “The Army’s involvement in multinational contingency missions (e.g. peacekeeping) has negatively affected my National Guard career intentions.” In this case the mean of 2.55 indicated they disagreed with the statement but it was not strong enough to meet the study threshold (in this case only it was 2.5) for a strong response.

Given the split, it is not clear whether the Research Question #1 “Are the Reserve Component leaders involved in the study operation satisfied with their involvement in the National Guard and the peacekeeping mission?” is true. Responses regarding the MFO mission were generally more favorable than those responses about the National Guard in general.

Research Question #2

Research Question 2: Is there a significant relationship between intrinsic levels of motivation as measured by the Choice component of Dr. Thomas’s integrated model and volunteerism in Reserve Component leaders involved in the study operation?
**Null Hypothesis 1:** There is no relationship between intrinsic levels of motivation as measured by the Choice component of Dr. Thomas's integrated model and volunteerism in Reserve Component leaders involved in the study operation.

The null hypothesis was retained ($\chi^2 = 1.14, df = 1, p = .285$).

**Research Question #3**

**Research Question 3:** Is there a significant relationship between intrinsic levels of motivation as measured by the Competence component of Dr. Thomas's integrated model and volunteerism in Reserve Component leaders involved in the study operation?

**Null Hypothesis 2:** There is no relationship between intrinsic levels of motivation as measured by the Competence component of Dr. Thomas's integrated model and volunteerism in Reserve Component leaders involved in the study operation.

The null hypothesis was retained ($\chi^2 = .005, df = 1, p = .945$).

**Research Question #4**

**Research Question 4:** Is there a significant relationship between intrinsic levels of motivation as measured by the Meaningfulness component of Dr. Thomas's integrated model and volunteerism in Reserve Component leaders involved in the study operation?

**Null Hypothesis 3:** There is no relationship between intrinsic levels of motivation as measured by the Meaningfulness component of Dr. Thomas's integrated model and volunteerism in Reserve Component leaders involved in the study operation.

The null hypothesis was retained ($\chi^2 = 3.194, df = 1, p = .074$).
Research Question #5

**Research Question 5:** Is there a significant relationship between intrinsic levels of motivation as measured by the Progress component of Dr. Thomas's integrated model and volunteerism in Reserve Component leaders involved in the study operation?

**Null Hypothesis 4:** There is no relationship between intrinsic levels of motivation as measured by the Progress component of Dr. Thomas's integrated model and volunteerism in Reserve Component leaders involved in the study operation.

The null hypothesis was retained ($\chi^2 = .005$, $df = 1$, $p = .945$).

Research Question #6

**Research Question 6:** Is there a significant relationship between intrinsic levels of motivation as measured by the Choice component of Dr. Thomas's integrated model and hypothetical volunteerism in Reserve Component leaders involved in the study operation?

**Null Hypothesis 5:** There is no relationship between intrinsic levels of motivation as measured by the Choice component of Dr. Thomas's integrated model and hypothetical volunteerism in Reserve Component leaders involved in the study operation.

The null hypothesis was retained ($\chi^2 = .618$, $df = 1$, $p = .432$).

Research Question #7

**Research Question 7:** Is there a significant relationship between intrinsic levels of motivation as measured by the Competence component of Dr. Thomas's integrated model and hypothetical volunteerism in Reserve Component leaders involved in the study operation?
Null Hypothesis 6: There is no relationship between intrinsic levels of motivation as measured by the Competence component of Dr. Thomas’s integrated model and hypothetical volunteerism in Reserve Component leaders involved in the study operation.

The null hypothesis was retained ($\chi^2 = .832, df = 1, p = .362$).

Research Question #8

Research Question 8: Is there a significant relationship between intrinsic levels of motivation as measured by the Meaningfulness component of Dr. Thomas’s integrated model and hypothetical volunteerism in Reserve Component leaders involved in the study operation?

Null Hypothesis 7: There is no relationship between intrinsic levels of motivation as measured by the Meaningfulness component of Dr. Thomas’s integrated model and hypothetical volunteerism in Reserve Component leaders involved in the study operation.

The null hypothesis was retained ($\chi^2 = .910, df = 1, p = .340$).

Research Question #9

Research Question 9: Is there a significant relationship between intrinsic levels of motivation as measured by the Progress component of Dr. Thomas’s integrated model and hypothetical volunteerism in Reserve Component leaders involved in the study operation?

Null Hypothesis 8: There is no relationship between intrinsic levels of motivation as measured by the Progress component of Dr. Thomas’s integrated model
and hypothetical volunteerism in Reserve Component leaders involved in the study operation.

The null hypothesis was retained ($\chi^2 = .042, df = 1, p = .837$).

Research Question #10

**Research Question 10**: Are Reserve Component leaders involved in the study operation motivated by intrinsic or extrinsic factors to take part in the study peacekeeping operation?

A weighted Pareto of the top seven factors ranked to determine which of the intrinsic factors or extrinsic factors were most often represented in the respondents’ top seven choices. It is worth noting that intrinsic factors dominated the top six respondent choices.

**Discussion**

While there were issues with the data collection that compromised the full intent of the study, there are still some significant findings that resulted.

First, the respondents to the SLT survey demonstrated an overwhelming response toward the S2 Selling Situational Leadership Theory leadership style. Nearly 74% had a primary leadership style of S2 high task and high relationship.

With regard to the Thomas Empowerment Survey, very few respondents demonstrated high levels of empowerment as measured by the Thomas scale. Generally, fewer then 10% of the respondents felt high levels of intrinsic motivation in the areas of Choice, Competence, and Progress. The lone exception was the area of Meaningfulness.
In this category 22% of the respondents had a sense of Meaningfulness in the context of their work in the MFO mission.

With regard to the primary research questions, no significant relationships could be derived from the inferential statistics.

While no significant relationship was found through the quantitative analysis there was a great deal of qualitative support for the crux of the study behind the research questions. The ultimate desire of the study was to see if intrinsic or extrinsic factors held the greater sway on these Reserve soldiers in a peacekeeping environment. What motivated them to the mission?

Soldiers repeatedly made reference to intrinsic factors over extrinsic factors when asked what was important to them during their National Guard career and during the conduct of this MFO peacekeeping mission. Perhaps more significantly they also reported displeasure when they perceived that these intrinsic factors were absent. This notion seems very much in line with the concepts that Frederick Herzberg elaborated on in his Two Factor theory. The soldiers in this sample repeatedly demonstrated that they could be both dissatisfied and satisfied in different aspects of their military career and the MFO mission in particular.

Overall, there appeared to be a consensus in the survey respondents' preference for intrinsic over extrinsic factors.

Some interesting questions remain. The soldiers were overwhelmingly identified as S2 Selling leadership style according to the LeadSelf instrument. By and large the Empowerment inventory showed that levels of empowerment as defined by Choice, Competence, Meaningfulness, and Progress were reported as predominately low.
(according to the study criteria). Yet the key question in the third instrument Q21 returned a heavy favoring of intrinsic motivation factors. When directly asked (Q21) why they wanted to take part in the mission, the response was overwhelmingly intrinsic in nature.

Based on instrument #2 (The Thomas Empowerment Survey) the soldiers were not highly motivated intrinsically. Based on the researcher-designed instrument #3 and qualitative response, it seems they were more focused on intrinsic factors. In either case the disconnect between the idea of intrinsic motivation and the notion that those who are motivated by motivator (intrinsic) factors are operating as S4 situational leadership style according to the Hersey et al. (2001, p. 452) assertion, must be pursued further.

The ultimate question remains, Who is best suited for these types of missions? According to one journalist, "War fighting is the Army’s core mission; stability operations like [counterinsurgency] have been traditionally considered jobs for the National Guard and other peripheral sorts, disdained by real warriors" (Klein, 2006, para. 5). As long as misnomers such as this persist, the Active Army may remain incapable of doing the tough stability operations correctly and the Reserve Components will remain ill-prepared to do the core mission of war fighting. In truth, the nature of war today requires proficient full-spectrum warriors, and the less separation between Active and Reserve forces, the better off the total force will be. The Army must build an adaptive Total Force to accomplish all such missions (Vandergriff, 2002).

Conclusions

1. Soldiers in the study sample overwhelmingly returned results as demonstrating the S2 high task, high relationship leadership style. Results indicated that 74% of the
respondents demonstrated the S2 Selling leadership style as their primary leadership style.

2. Fewer then 10% of the respondents felt high levels of intrinsic motivation in the areas of Choice, Competence, and Progress as measured by the Thomas Empowerment Survey. In the area of Meaningfulness, 22% of the respondents reported a sense of Meaningfulness as measured by the Thomas Empowerment Survey.

3. According to the researcher-designed survey intrinsic factors were more important than extrinsic factors in the respondents’ reasons for participating in this peacekeeping operation.

4. Chi-square analysis was performed to determine if there is a significant relationship between the four criteria in Thomas’s Intrinsic Motivation model and soldier volunteerism. When measuring the soldiers’ reported sense of Choice, Competence, Meaningfulness, and Progress versus volunteerism using four null hypotheses, no significant relationship was found through the quantitative analysis.

5. The same Chi-square analysis was performed to determine if there is a significant relationship between the four criteria in Thomas’s Intrinsic Motivation model and hypothetical soldier volunteerism (i.e., Given the opportunity would you have volunteered for this mission?) When measuring the soldiers’ reported sense of Choice, Competence, Meaningfulness, and Progress versus hypothetical volunteerism using four null hypotheses, again no significant relationship was found through the quantitative analysis.

6. There was qualitative support to suggest that soldiers are intrinsically motivated to participate in peacekeeping operations and the National Guard in general. The survey
respondents repeatedly referred to intrinsic factors as being more important than extrinsic factors in relationship to their peacekeeping and Guard service.

7. Soldiers in this sample repeatedly demonstrated the Herzberg Two-Factor Theory. These respondents answered through quantitative and qualitative means that they could be both dissatisfied and satisfied in different aspects of their military career and the Sinai peacekeeping mission.

Recommendations

1. It is very difficult to survey a sample of which you are an integral part. In efforts to gain and maintain anonymity the connections between the first SLT survey and the subsequent surveys were broken. This necessitated the abandonment of some of the key research questions. Any future surveys of this sort should be administered by an unbiased proctor whose sole function is to ensure each participant completes each survey and the surveys remain tied to one another. Use of survey numbers associated with the respondents is one means to correct this problem, but extra steps must be taken to ensure respondent anonymity.

2. The key question of whether there is any relationship between the Situational Leadership Theory and classical motivation theories of Maslow and Herzberg remains—in no small part because of the flaw mentioned in point 1. It is recommended that a single focused survey be built and executed to ascertain if the relationship between SLT and the motivator factors (see Figure 7) which Hersey et al. (2001, p. 452) postulate in their book has any merit.

3. Further studies should be conducted in order to determine why the S2 selling style, according to Situational Leadership Theory, is so prevalent within this sample. I
wonder whether there is a predisposition of military leaders—within the military as a whole—towards a high task, high relationship “selling” leadership style. This is certainly worth investigating further.

4. Senior leaders within the National Guard should study the results and qualitative commentary of these soldiers as a means to understanding their concerns and preventing similar concerns in future mobilizations and deployments of any kind.

5. As noted in points 1 and 4, it is difficult to conduct a survey in an organization where one has a vested interest. One must be prepared to be disappointed in the content of the responses, or one must avoid surveying organizations of which they are a part. As a leader within the organization it was disturbing to see the qualitative responses of the study participants. Although I made efforts to address their issues, I was still unable to influence corrective measures to address all of their concerns. This is where academic pursuits of leadership theory must give way to humanistic application of leadership practice. This is also a place where the Thomas idea of leadership, as a collegial relationship process, becomes more important than leadership as a command and control position (Thomas, 2002).

6. The leadership within the United States Army as a whole should consider the factors of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation in their means of recruiting and retention. Thomas provides a useful framework (Figure 5) to build the sense of choice, competence, meaningfulness, and progress within the members of an organization. Thomas (2002) describes in great detail how to use these four criteria to build and maintain intrinsic motivation. Utilizing Thomas’s model is one practical step to improving soldier retention.
If one is searching for a military antecedent to Thomas’s model, the Leaders’ Guide for Contingency Operations: The Human Dimension presents a number of areas which directly compare with Thomas’s model (Steinberg & Foley, 1998, p. iii). As described on pp. 64-65 of this manuscript, focusing on mission clarity and situation stability can build a sense of meaningfulness. Complexity of the force, complexity of environment, specificity of advanced preparation, and range of job tasks are all related to a sense of competence. Finally, duration of the deployment is related to a sense of progress. Using Thomas’s tenets in conjunction with the research derived by Steinberg and Foley may result in an improved level of soldier motivation based on intrinsic rather than extrinsic factors.

The current focus on big monetary bonuses and appeals to extrinsic factors seems to be misplaced (Moniz, 2004b; Katzenbach, 2003). The overjustification effect postulated by Deci has its place in the modern world, and Army retention efforts which rely solely on extrinsic factors may be doomed to fail in the long term (Deci & Flaste, 1995, p. 51).

Epilogue

By way of example, a story in early 2007 highlighted the heroism of a man who risked his life to save another man who had accidentally fallen onto the subway tracks of New York City. It seemed somewhat sad when the man was later rewarded $10,000 by a wealthy benefactor for his Samaritan deed. As one author noted, “Can we, as a society, really think of no other way to express our admiration and appreciation other than money? And if not, shouldn’t we be worried about that?” (Colin, 2007, para. 6). It is argued instead that “what distinguishes those organizations that are able to attract the best
and retain the best and motivate the best is simply that they seek to be the best [self-
actualization at work]. And they seek to have a mission that's even more noble than the
mission of the work per se” (Head, 2001, p. 11). Instead of money, perhaps by providing
for the intrinsic factors which soldiers appear to value so highly (especially when they are
absent) the Army could establish and maintain a more highly motivated workforce that
seeks “optimum challenges that relate to what they value” (Klien, Robak, Seidel, &
Tishhouse, 1999, para. 1).

Finally, I must compliment the soldiers of the Michigan Army National Guard. They go about their lives balancing their civilian and military commitments, always
working beyond their humble means to accomplish the mission and take care of one
another in the most austere of environments and the bleakest of conditions. My final
recommendation is to thank a soldier today for their efforts. The efforts of them and their
forebears make these comparatively insignificant academic pursuits possible. I am
reminded of the commentary on the military citizenry of another Greek city-state:
“Agesilaus answers a man who asks why Sparta has no walls by pointing to the army and
saying, ‘There are Sparta’s walls’” (Krumm, 2004, p. 40).
APPENDIX A

DISERTATION INSTRUMENT #1: LEAD EFFECTIVENESS & ADAPTABILITY

DESCRIPTION

INSTRUCTIONS

This questionnaire measures how you react to certain leadership situations. It is used to determine leadership styles in specific situations.

On the following 4 pages are 12 statements describing fictional situations you might experience. Each situation has four alternative actions to take when dealing with each specific situation. Please select the 1 alternative action which best describes how you might deal with each situation. Circle the correct letter.

This is not a test. There are no correct answers. If you feel that your desired alternative action is not represented, please select the alternative action that is closest to your preferred solution. Please do not skip any of the items. Although some of the statements appear to be similar your answer to each of them is important.

This survey should take approximately 15 minutes to complete. Thank you for your response.

TEST DATE: DAY__MONTH__YEAR 2004

SR#__________
SITUATION 1
1. Your subordinates are not responding lately to your friendly conversation and obvious concern for their welfare. Their performance is declining rapidly.

ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS
A. Emphasize the use of uniform procedures and the necessity for task accomplishment.

B. Make yourself available for discussion but don’t push your involvement.

C. Talk with your subordinates and then set goals.

D. Intentionally do not intervene.

SITUATION 2
2. The observable performance of your group is increasing. You have been making sure that all members were aware of their responsibilities and expected standards of performance.

ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS
A. Engage in friendly interaction, but continue to make sure that all members are aware of their responsibilities and expected standards of performance.

B. Take no definite action.

C. Do what you can to make the group feel important and involved.

D. Emphasize the importance of deadlines and tasks.

SITUATION 3
3. Members of your group are unable to solve problems themselves. You have normally left them alone. Group performance and interpersonal relations have been good.

ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS
A. Work with the group and together engage in problem solving.

B. Let the group work it out.

C. Act quickly and firmly to correct and redirect.

D. Encourage group to work on problem and be supportive of their efforts.
SITUATION 4
4. You are considering a change. Your subordinates have a fine record of accomplishment. They respect the need for change.

ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS
A. Allow group involvement in developing the change, but don’t be too directive.

B. Announce changes and then implement with close supervision.

C. Allow group to formulate its own direction.

D. Incorporate group recommendations, but you direct the change.

SITUATION 5
5. The performance of your group has been dropping during the past few months. Members have been unconcerned with meeting objectives. Redefining roles and responsibilities has helped in the past. They have continually needed reminding to have their tasks done on time.

ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS
A. Allow group to formulate its own direction.

B. Incorporate group recommendations, but see that objectives are met.

C. Redefine roles and responsibilities and supervise carefully.

D. Allow group involvement in determining roles and responsibilities but don’t be too directive.

SITUATION 6
6. You stepped into an efficiently run organization. The previous administrator tightly controlled the situation. You want to maintain a productive situation, but would like to begin humanizing the environment.

ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS
A. Do what you can to make group feel important and involved.

B. Emphasize the importance of deadlines and tasks.

C. Intentionally do not intervene.

D. Get group involved in decision-making, but see that objectives are met.
SITUATION 7
7. You are considering changing to a structure that will be new to your group. Members of the group have made suggestions about needed change. The group has been productive and demonstrated flexibility in its operations.

ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS
A. Define the change and supervise carefully.

B. Participate with the group in developing the change but allow members to organize the implementation.

C. Be willing to make changes as recommended, but maintain control of implementation.

D. Avoid confrontation, leave things alone.

SITUATION 8
8. Group performance and interpersonal relations are good. You feel somewhat unsure about your lack of direction of the group.

ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS
A. Leave the group alone.

B. Discuss the situation with the group and then you initiate necessary changes.

C. Take steps to direct subordinates toward working in a well-defined manner.

D. Be supportive in discussing the situation with the group but not too directive.

SITUATION 9
9. Your superior has appointed you to head a task force that is far overdue in making requested recommendations for change. The group is not clear on its goals. Attendance at sessions has been poor. Their meetings have turned into social gatherings. Potentially they have the talent necessary to help.

ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS
A. Let the group work out its problems.

B. Incorporate group recommendations, but see that objectives are met.

C. Redefine goals and supervise carefully.

D. Allow group involvement in setting goals, but don’t push.
SITUATION 10
10. Your subordinates, usually able to take responsibility, are not responding to your recent redefining of standards.

ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS
A. Allow group involvement in redefining standards, but don't take control.
B. Redefine standards and supervise carefully.
C. Avoid confrontation by not applying pressure; leave situation alone.
D. Incorporate group recommendations, but see that new standards are met.

SITUATION 11
11. You have been promoted to a new position. The previous supervisor was uninvolved in the affairs of the group. The group has adequately handled its tasks and direction. Group inter-relations are good.

ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS
A. Take steps to direct subordinates toward working in a well-defined manner.
B. Involve subordinates in decision-making and reinforce good contributions.
C. Discuss past performance with group and then you examine the need for new practices.
D. Continue to leave the group alone.

SITUATION 12
12. Recent information indicates some internal difficulties among subordinates. The group has a remarkable record of accomplishment. Members have effectively maintained long-range goals. They have worked in harmony for the past year. All are well qualified for the task.

ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS
A. Try out your solution with subordinates and examine the need for new practices.
B. Allow group members to work it out for themselves.
C. Act quickly and firmly to correct and redirect.
D. Participate in problem discussion while providing support for subordinates.
APPENDIX B

DISSERTATION INSTRUMENT #2: EMPOWERMENT INVENTORY

INSTRUCTIONS

This questionnaire measures some of your feelings you have about the tasks you are performing, during this MFO peacekeeping operation. It is used most often to measure feelings about one's entire job, but can also be used to focus on a part of your job, your role as a team member, or your role as a leader.

On the following pages are several statements describing different feelings you might have about your tasks. For each statement circle the number, from 1 to 7, that best describes how strongly you disagree or agree with that statement.

Please do not skip any of the items. Although some of the statements appear to be similar your answer to each of them is important.

This survey should take approximately 10 minutes to complete. Thank you for your response.

TEST DATE: DAY__MONTH__YEAR 2004

SR#_________
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I am making good progress on my projects.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I am good at my job.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I care about what I am doing.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I feel free to select different paths of approaches in my work.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I am proficient at what I am doing.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I have a sense that things are moving along well.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. My work serves a valuable purpose.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. How I go about doing things is up to me.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. My projects are going well.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. My projects are significant to me.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I am performing competently.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I have a sense of freedom in what I am doing.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. The work I am doing is important.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I am doing my work capably.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I am accomplishing my objectives.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I am determining what I do on my job.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I am skillful in my work.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. What I am trying to accomplish is meaningful to me.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I feel I have a lot of latitude in what I am doing.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. My tasks are moving forward.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I am doing worthwhile things.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I am exercising a lot of choice in what I do.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I am doing things well.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. My work is proceeding nicely.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

DISertation Instrument #3: Motivation Inventory

Instructions

This questionnaire measures some of your feelings you have about the tasks you are performing during this MFO peacekeeping operation.

On the following pages are 10 demographic questions. Answer by circling the appropriate response or inserting the appropriate number. There are also 13 statements describing different feelings you might have about your tasks. For each statement circle the answer that best describes how strongly you agree/disagree with each statement. Finally, please feel free to add comments in the final 4 narrative questions.

Please do not skip any of the items. Although some of the statements appear to be similar your answer to each of them is important.

This survey should take approximately 15 minutes to complete. Thank you for your response.
1. What is your current rank? Circle One.
   a. E-5 or E-6  
   b. E-7 or above  
   c. O-1 or O-2  
   d. O-3 or above  

2. What is the highest level of civilian education you have completed? Circle One.
   a. Some High School  
   b. High School  
   c. Some College  
   d. Bachelor's Degree  
   e. Some Graduate school  
   f. Master's degree or above  

3. What is the highest level of military education you have completed? Circle One.
   a. Primary Leadership Development Course (PLDC)  
   b. Basic Non-commissioned Officer's Course (BNCOC)  
   c. Advanced Non-commissioned Officer's Course (ANCOC)  
   d. Officer Basic Course (OBC)  
   e. Officer Advanced Course (OAC) or Captains' Career Course (CCC)  
   f. Combined Arms and Staff Services School (CAS3) or above  

4. How many years of Active military service have you completed? Round up to the nearest year.  
   ____ Year(s)  

5. How many years of Guard/Reserve service have you completed? Round up to the nearest year.  
   ____ Year(s)  

6. How many years of total military service have you completed? Round up to the nearest year.  
   ____ Year(s)  

7. How many years have you served in your current duty position? Round up to the nearest year.  
   ____ Year(s)  

8. Which of the following best describes your current National Guard career intentions? Circle One.
   a. I plan to stay in the Guard beyond 20 years.  
   b. I plan to stay in the Guard (only) until 20 years.  
   c. I plan to stay in the Guard beyond my obligation, but am undecided about staying until retirement.  
   d. I am undecided whether I will stay in the Guard upon completion of my obligation.  
   e. I will probably leave the Guard upon completion of my obligation.  
   f. I will definitely leave the Guard upon completion of my obligation.  

9. I am satisfied with my current duty position. Circle One.  
   Strongly   Disagree   Neutral   Agree   Strongly   Agree  
   Disagree   Agree
10. I am satisfied with my National Guard participation. Circle One.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutrul</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutrul</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

11. I rate my current level of morale as high. Circle One.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutrul</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutrul</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

12. I am satisfied with my current National Guard job. Circle One.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutrul</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutrul</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

13. The Army’s involvement in multinational contingency missions (e.g. peacekeeping) has negatively affected my National Guard career intentions. Circle One.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutrul</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutrul</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

14. Guard members/Reservists can perform peacekeeping missions as well as Regular Army military personnel. Circle One.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutrul</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutrul</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

15. Peacekeeping operations are appropriate missions for my unit. Circle One.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutrul</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutrul</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

16. It really matters to me that we do well on our MFO mission. Circle One.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutrul</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutrul</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

17. I am willing to put in extra effort to accomplish our assignments during this MFO rotation. Circle One.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutrul</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutrul</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

18. I am learning a lot during this MFO rotation. Circle One.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutrul</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutrul</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

19. Did you volunteer for this peacekeeping mission?

a. Yes
b. No
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20. Given the choice, would you have volunteered for this peacekeeping mission?
   a. Yes
   b. No

21. What are the most important reasons for your participation in this deployment? Rank order all choices from 1-15 where 1 is the most important factor and 15 is the least important factor.
   
   ____ Adventure/Travel  
   ____ Take timeout from school/job  
   ____ Pay/Needed more money  
   ____ Military career advancement/promotion  
   ____ Educational opportunities/benefits  
   ____ Medical/Dental benefits  
   ____ Earn retirement points  
   ____ Serve country/serve Army  
   ____ Leadership opportunities  
   ____ Challenging work/learn new skills  
   ____ Was unemployed  
   ____ Opportunities for job satisfaction  
   ____ Family pressures/problems  
   ____ Quality of co-workers  
   ____ N/A. I was ordered to participate.

22. What do you enjoy most about being in the National Guard?

23. What do you enjoy least about being in the National Guard?
24. What do you enjoy most about this MFO peacekeeping mission?


25. What do you enjoy least about this MFO peacekeeping mission?


If you would like to make any additional comments about this survey please write them in the space below. If applicable please indicate the question number to which your comment is related.


APPENDIX D

DISSERTATION INSTRUMENT #4: COMMAND CLIMATE SURVEY
1. The BN CDR and CSM care about what happens to their soldiers. Circle One.

   Strongly Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

2. Officers in my company care about what happens to their soldiers. Circle One.

   Strongly Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

3. NCOs in my company care about what happens to their soldiers. Circle One.

   Strongly Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

4. Junior enlisted members in my company care about what happens to each other. Circle One.

   Strongly Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

5. I can raise concerns through my chain of command without fear of retribution. Circle One.

   Strongly Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

6. Members in my company work well together as a team. Circle One.

   Strongly Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

7. In terms of work habits and on-the-job behavior, my immediate leadership sets the right example by his/her actions. Circle One.

   Strongly Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

8. I receive the counseling and coaching needed to advance in my career. Circle One.

   Strongly Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

9. I receive the training needed to perform my duty well. Circle One.

   Strongly Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly Agree

10. Are racist material(s) and/or behavior(s) displayed by members of your company? Circle One.

    No Yes, once in a while Yes, frequently Yes, very frequently

11. Are sexually offensive material(s) and/or behavior(s) displayed by members of your company? Circle One.

    No Yes, once in a while Yes, frequently Yes, very frequently
12. What level of conflict/stress are you experiencing in your company/platoon? Circle One.

None  Slight  Moderate  High  Very high

13. Usually, how far in advance do you know the company training schedule; that is, where YOU will be and what YOU will be doing? Circle One.

1-3 days  4-7 days  8-10 days  11-13 days  14 or more days

14. To what extent do the persons in your chain of command treat you with respect? Circle One.

Not at all  Slight extent  Moderate extent  Great extent  Very great extent

15. To what extent do the leaders in your company show a real interest in the welfare of families? Circle One.

Not at all  Slight extent  Moderate extent  Great extent  Very great extent

16. To what extent do the leaders in your company show a real interest in the welfare of single soldiers? Circle One.

Not at all  Slight extent  Moderate extent  Great extent  Very great extent

17. How would you rate YOUR current level of morale? Circle One.

Very low  Low  Moderate  High  Very high

18. What is your racial/ethnic background? Circle One.

White  Black  Hispanic  Other

19. During the last 9 months, have YOU been subject to discrimination in your battalion? MARK ALL THAT APPLY.

No  Racial  Gender  Religion  Nationality

20. During the last 9 months, have YOU been sexually harassed by someone in this battalion? MARK ALL THAT APPLY.

No  Yes, but it really didn’t bother me  Yes, and it did bother me

21. Would you report any incident of sexual harassment or discrimination to your chain of command? Circle One.

No  Yes

22. Please list ONE thing that is going very well in your company.
23. Please list ONE thing that is going very well in this battalion.


24. Please list ONE thing that most needs improvement in your company.


25. Please list ONE thing that most needs improvement in this battalion.


26. To which organizational element are you currently assigned? Circle One.

Alpha Co.  Charlie Co.  Delta Co.  HHC
APPENDIX E

PARTICIPANT LETTER

Dear Participant:

My name is Clark Barrett and I am a doctoral student at Andrews University, in the School of Education, Program in Leadership. As part of my research, I am examining the attitudes, perceptions, and beliefs that participants hold regarding the peacekeeping operational environment.

The following survey will require approximately fifteen minutes or less to complete. There is no compensation for responding, nor is there any known risk. In order to insure that all information will remain confidential, any potential identifying links will be eliminated upon completion of the survey. Copies of the project will be provided to Andrews University as well as the Army Research Institute and the Naval Postgraduate School. If you choose to participate in this project, please answer all questions as honestly as possible and return the completed questionnaire promptly to the survey administrator. Participation is strictly voluntary and you may refuse to participate at any time.

Thank you for taking the time to assist me in my educational endeavors. The data collected will provide useful information regarding Army missions and hopefully assist in the manning and support issues in future contingency operations. Completion and return of the questionnaire will indicate your willingness to participate in this study. If you require additional information or have questions, please contact me at the telephone number below.

Sincerely,

Clark Barrett (xXXXXX)
APPENDIX F

PERMISSION STATEMENT

MICHIGAN ARMY NATIONAL GUARD
Headquarters, 1st Battalion, 125th Infantry (M)
1101 Cesar Chavez Drive
Flint, Michigan 48503-4898

MIAR-46I-125I-CDR

1 October 2003

MEMORANDUM FOR Andrews University Faculty and Staff

SUBJECT: MAJ Clark C. Barrett’s Doctoral Dissertation

1. MAJ Clark C. Barrett has requested my permission to administer surveys and instruments to the officer’s and non-commissioned officers of the forward-deployed 1st Battalion 125th Infantry Regiment while deployed in the Sinai Peninsula. I understand the concept of his study “An Evaluation Of Reserve Component Leaders’ Attitudes And Motivation As They Relate To Situational Leadership Theory In A Peacekeeping Operational Environment”, and fully support his efforts.

2. MAJ Barrett has my permission to conduct this study. His efforts will be beneficial to the unit, the National Guard and the United States Army as a whole. I look forward to the results of his work.

3. For questions concerning this memorandum contact the undersigned at (810) 239-4303.

<original signed>
PHILLIP S. OWENS
LTC, IN, MIARNG
Commanding
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