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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this research was to study the relationship between completion of the West Point Leadership and Command Program (WPL&C) and the graduate's perception of his/her leadership skills subsequent to graduation. Additionally, this research sought to determine the graduate’s perception of the influence of the WPL&C Program upon his/her ability to meet leadership challenges related to the attacks of September 11, 2001. Implicit in this research were questions about how leadership may be taught and learned. Lastly, this research sought the graduate’s perception of course pedagogy and related matters. The effectiveness of the program was the prime focus of this research. Fundamentally, the program’s effectiveness was and continues to be a matter of public trust, worthy of research.

This research was designed to study a population of 70 graduates of the WPL&C Program from Morris County municipal and county law enforcement agencies who attended between 1995 - 2000. The study consisted of four research questions, a survey instrument, a Demographic Survey Form, and a qualitative interview. The survey consisted of 11 questions and the interview 6 questions.
After two mailings, 22 surveys were returned. Sixteen respondents requested to participate in an interview. Ten interviews were conducted subsequent to the random selection of respondents through the utilization of random number tables. The combination of quantitative and qualitative instruments was applied to enrich the data. The data gathered from the quantitative survey and the qualitative interviews are illustrated within numerous tables throughout the study. The interviews yielded relevant data and provided historic insight into the challenges of and subsequent to the attacks of September 11, 2001.

Recommendations for the enhancement of the program are enumerated and were derived from responses to the surveys and interviews. Recommendations for future research are articulated as is the criticality of such need. Begun in 1593, the WPL&C Program has enabled its graduates to meet the challenges of threats once unimaginined. From its origins in the Rodney King incident to the attacks of September 11, 2001, the value and effectiveness of the program remain relevant to public trust, public safety, and homeland security.
This Research Is Dedicated to the Memory of My Father

Aloysius Joseph Devine, Jr.
October 18, 1927 - April 18, 1958

"And Hey Dad
Here's a riddle for yah
Find the Answer
There's a reason for the world
You and I..."
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Tuesday, September 11, 2001, dawned temperate and nearly cloudless in the eastern United States. Millions of men and women readied themselves for work. Some made their way to the Twin Towers, the signature structures of the World Trade Center complex in New York City. Others went to Arlington, Virginia, to the Pentagon. Across the Potomac River, the United States Congress was back in session. At the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, people began to line up for a White House tour. In Sarasota, Florida, President George W. Bush went for an early morning run. For those heading to the airport, weather conditions could not have been better for a safe and pleasant journey. Among the travelers were Mohamed Atta and Abdul Aziz al Omari, who arrived at the airport in Portland, Maine. (9/11 Commission, 2004, p. 1)

America's peace was to be short lived. A dramatic attack upon its homeland would change the course of world and national history. American systems of order maintenance and law enforcement were to be thrust into their most dangerous challenge. Seventy-three law enforcement officers would die as a result of terrorist attacks at the World Trade Center and the Pentagon. “This resulted in more felonious deaths of officers than died due to adversarial action for that entire year” (Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2005, p. 1). Among these were 23 New York
City police officers and 37 police officers of the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey (Cable News Network, 2001). Additionally, 343 New York City firefighters died at the World Trade Center (Cable News Network, 2001). The response of emergency services, while heroic, would be critiqued in the media and within the 9/11 Commission Report (2004). The leadership of these organizations would be evaluated for their response on September 11, 2001, as well as their preparations for such an attack. The Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) and various intelligence agencies would be subjected to the most intense scrutiny. The mission of law enforcement had changed dramatically. Professional leadership was challenged to meet previously unimaginable demands upon professional and organizational systems. Leadership was tasked to change organizational cultures that had been stagnant for decades. The catalyst for change was external and exigent. Change permeated all levels of these organizations. At the individual level, police officers who had trained with night sticks and handguns were facing the threat of weapons of mass destruction. At the group level, teams were emerging with specializations in bio-terror, radiation, decontamination, and so forth. At the organizational level, mission and
vision statements, policies and procedures, training, command and control, incident command, and systems thinking were evolving dramatically. Across all levels, emergency management personnel were reacting with courage, dedication, fear, and a sense of loss among their ranks. Thinking globally—not locally—became the mantra as provincialized thinking gave way to system-wide thinking. These systems would involve not only local law enforcement but regional, national, and global law enforcement. Counties consisting of multiple municipal police departments were suddenly required to act and react as one organization. Combined with law enforcement would be fire, emergency medical services, public health, and, for the first time, integration with the talent and resources of corporate America. Organizations that just days before had been focused on community policing were compelled to adapt their resources to matters related to counterterrorism, weapons of mass destruction, bio-terrorism, infrastructure protection, consequence management and to do so while protecting the constitutional rights of all. The post 9/11 environment demanded transformational leadership at all levels of America’s political, cultural, social and economic systems. Law enforcement leadership was at the
fulcrum of these forces as it would be their organizations on the front line of the war on terror. As the public turned to law enforcement for protection and a sense of well being, line officers would look to their leadership for vision, character, competence and action. While managers supported the mission, leaders created, communicated, and drove the mission. Leaders analyzed the challenges tactically and strategically, keeping their focus on the changing horizon. The demand for well trained professional leaders was suddenly more critical than at any time in American history.

The evolution of professional law enforcement began in London with the Metropolitan Police Act of 1829 (NJ Police Training Commission, 2004). Social and economic changes of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were impacting the cities of Great Britain. The dawn of the industrial revolution:

was marked by a growth in population, wealth and the expansion of towns. England’s population doubled from 6 to 12 million people. Vast rural areas were suddenly turned into agglomerations of slum, mine and factory, which lacked the elementary conditions of civilized living. (NJ Police Training Commission, p. 9)
The increase in populations combined with the resultant stress upon social, cultural and economic infrastructure gave rise to an environment ripe for criminality.

The unpolicéd London streets offered opportunity for pillaging and robbery. Pickpockets, formerly content with mere filching, make no scruple to knock people down with bludgeons...forcing one to travel, even at noon, as if one were going to battle. (NJ Police Training Commission, 2004, p. 9)

It was from within the inner cities of 17th and 18th century London that models for modern law enforcement emerged.

The mission of American law enforcement would meet similar challenges through the 19th and 20th centuries. Immigration from throughout the world resulted in the "melting pot" of American culture. This mix of cultures, values, languages, race and religions was most intense with America's largest cities. These characteristics, combined with the complexity of policing a democracy, challenged law enforcement executives throughout history. From Tammany Hall controlled departments of the 19th century to August Vollmer of the 20th century, police executives have struggled to find their place in America's political,
social, cultural and economic terrain (Repetto, 1978, p. 47). Police agencies evolved in an eclectic manner, each tailored to its particular domain and mission. Professional standards regarding personnel, training, mission, and vision were virtually non-existent. Management and leadership were concepts left to the mercantile and emerging corporate sector.

America would struggle with crime and civil strife in many forms: the labor movement, economic recession and depression, social movements, anti-war movements, and mass media would act upon the law enforcement mission. The Chicago Haymarket Square Riots of 1886, (Repetto, 1978) the riots and the civil rights movement of the 1960's, the Wickersham Commission Report of 1931, the Kefauver Commission of 1950, the President's Task Force Report: The Police 1967, the Knapp Commission of the 1970's, and the Christopher Commission Report in 1991 would elucidate the demands of an increasingly complex society upon law enforcement. The 1991 arrest of Rodney King would focus media and social attention to the Los Angeles Police Department. The Los Angeles riots of 1992 would serve to further illustrate organizational and leadership challenges with the Los Angeles Police Department. The Independent
Commission on the Los Angeles Police Department, commonly known as the Christopher Commission, would investigate these and related issues. Within their report, they would recommend that, "Sergeants, lieutenants and captains are expected to be leaders as well as administrators and should therefore receive formal leadership training" (Dinse & Saeedan, 1998, p. 19). William H. Webster and Hubert Williams authored *The City in Crisis: A Report by the Special Advisor to the Board of Police Commissioners on the Civil Disorder in Los Angeles October 21, 1992*. Within this work, the authors contend that "the chief of police should make it a high priority to improve training, experience and leadership of the command staff of the department" (p. 19). Driven by the criticality of the challenge, researchers were making a case for leadership training and making a distinction between leadership and management. Although this distinction had been known within the military and business domains, it was new to law enforcement. Compelled by these reports as well as social, political, and media pressure, the Los Angeles Police Department contacted the Department of Behavioral Sciences and Leadership, United States Military Academy for guidance. Simultaneous to and independent of the actions of
the Los Angeles Police Department, the New Jersey State Association of Chiefs of Police was researching leadership training with the Department of Behavioral Sciences and Leadership at West Point. This unusual confluence of professional development would serve as the catalyst for the West Point Leadership and Command Program (WPLC). In 1993, 10 law enforcement officers were selected to attend a Faculty Development Program at West Point (Dinse & Sheehan, 1998, p. 18). These officers would be trained in leadership as it was taught at West Point. The seminal curriculum from which this course would evolve was Platoon Leadership (PL) 300. PL 300 is an undergraduate course required of all West Point cadets during their junior year at West Point. Further, they would be provided with instruction and training in West Point instruction techniques.

Upon completion of the Faculty Development Program in July 1993, these 10 command level officers returned to New Jersey and adapted to course material to the law enforcement environment. PL 300 is a case study driven course with case studies written to reflect the military mission and organizational environment. The process of writing case studies to reflect the law enforcement mission and environment became known as painting them blue. In
1994, the New Jersey Association of Chiefs of Police conducted its first session of the West Point Leadership and Command Program. The first session was conducted at the Union County Police Academy and consisted of 15 executive level officers. More than 700 officers have graduated from the program since 1994. In addition to the 700 officers from New Jersey, the program has graduated officers from six countries and five states. In 1994, the Los Angeles Police Department sent five officers to West Point along with five additional officers from New Jersey. In 1996, the Los Angeles Police Department initiated its leadership program independent of the New Jersey program (Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2005). These programs have become the model for law enforcement leadership training and education throughout the western world. The West Point Leadership and Command Program has developed a reputation for academic rigor that is unprecedented within law enforcement education.

The relevant literature and research have long debated the ability to teach leadership. The debate traditionally asks, "Are leaders born or can an individual be taught to lead?" If leadership can in fact be taught, can it be taught as a science? What is the effectiveness of case
Finally, how is the effectiveness of leadership training best assessed? The criticality of leadership within the law enforcement community necessitates leadership training that is efficient and effective. Since its inception in 1993 and its implementation in 1994, the West Point Leadership and Command Program has not been subject to academic or professional assessment. Its effectiveness is presumed, but is in fact unknown. The program has served as a catalyst for individual, organizational and professional change. The depth, context and nature of these changes are of social, professional and academic interest.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this research was to study the relationship between completion of the West Point Leadership and Command Program and the graduate’s perception of his/her leadership skills subsequent to graduation. Additionally, this research sought to determine the graduate’s perception of the influence of the West Point Leadership and Command Program upon their ability to meet leadership challenges related to the attacks of September 11, 2001. Implicit in this research were questions about how leadership may be taught and learned.
Lastly, this research sought the graduate’s perception of course pedagogy and related matters. The effectiveness of the program was the prime focus of this research. The New Jersey Association of Chiefs of Police has conducted the West Point Leadership and Command Program continuously since 1994. Since the inception of the program, the mission of New Jersey law enforcement has increased in complexity. Issues of racial profiling, use of force, community policing, changing demographics, terrorism, and homeland security have challenged police organizations. Graduates have moved through the ranks of their respective agencies profoundly affected by these changes. No formal analysis of the program’s effectiveness has been conducted at any time since 1994. The impact of the program’s curriculum upon its graduates and their organizations needs to be assessed in a manner that will measure its value to the law enforcement profession. This research shall include a review of the literature relevant to the study of leadership as well as the review of the literature pertaining to relevant teaching and assessment methodologies.

The leader’s perception of self subsequent to completion of the West Point Leadership and Command Program
is relevant to determining the effectiveness of the program. A leader's perception of enhanced skills, knowledge, and abilities gained from the curriculum is of primary interest. The impact of their skills, knowledge, and abilities as applied to the attacks of September 11, 2001, is also of interest.

A goal of PL 300 and the West Point Leadership and Command Program is to create "smart, thoughtful and reflective leaders" (New Jersey State Association of Chiefs of Police, 1994, p. 18). Determining if this goal is consistently being achieved is vital to measuring the effectiveness of the program. The leader's self perception of these dimensions and of promotion to positions of greater responsibility is a valid and reliable measure of the program's effectiveness.

Significance of the Study

This study is critical to determining if the West Point Leadership and Command Program is in fact achieving its most fundamental goals and objectives. This program is viewed a model program for developing professional leaders in America and Europe. The program is entering its 13th year, and its effectiveness has never been objectively studied. Focused research is significant to the program's
Current and future credibility. The results of this study may serve to assess the program's overall value as a developmental training curriculum. Further, results of the study will be valuable to adapting curriculum and teaching methodologies to emerging challenges. Identification of the program's strengths and weaknesses is requisite to the program's reputation and effectiveness.

Law enforcement has been at the fulcrum of social, political, and economic forces for centuries. A review of literature establishes a long line of leadership failures. Professional leadership is vital to crime control, order maintenance, and the public trust. Leadership development programs are becoming increasingly vital. Therefore, the quality and effectiveness of this program needs to be determined. If public funds are to be applied to program tuition, then the value of the program to the public needs to be determined.

Definition of Terms

The following terms are relevant to this study:

Organizational leadership. "The process of influencing human behavior to accomplish goals prescribed by the organizationally appointed leader" (Yukl, 1998, p. 7).
PL 300: (Platoon Leadership). An undergraduate course conducted by the Department of Behavioral Sciences and Leadership at the United States Military Academy, West Point, NY. This course is required for all cadets entering their junior year at the United States Military Academy. PL 300 serves as the core curriculum for the West Point Leadership and Command Program currently administered by the New Jersey Association of Chiefs of Police.

Intellectual procedure. The process by which students in the PL 300 and the WPL&C Program are required to process case studies. The process involves analysis, synthesis, diagnosis and the development of a leader action plan.

Case study. A written scenario designed to exercise a student’s knowledge of specific leadership theories. Case studies are written for each theory so as to enable the application of the intellectual procedure. PL 300 case studies were based on military situations while WPL&C case studies have been painted blue, thus adapting them to law enforcement organizations and missions.

West Point Leadership and Command (WPL&C) Program. An academic program currently administered by the New Jersey State Association of Chiefs of Police. The program is based upon the core curriculum developed by the Department
of Behavioral Sciences and Leadership for PL 300. The WPL&C Program is designed to develop leadership skills within law enforcement organizations.

Skills, knowledge, and abilities. The core task dimensions required to perform in a manner that is effective, efficient, challenging and meaningful.

Research Questions

This study applied four research questions designed to measure the effectiveness of the West Point Leadership and Command Program. Therefore, this research determined how exposure to the WPL&C program’s impacted law enforcement leadership.

1. To what extent did the WPL&C Program affect the graduate’s perception of his/her ability to learn to lead?

2. To what extent did the WPL&C Program affect the graduate’s perception of his/her enhanced leadership skills, knowledge and abilities?

3. To what extent was the application of a case study driven curriculum effective?

4. To what extent was the application of the “intellectual procedure” effective?

The following survey questions evolved from these research questions:
Question 1. To what extent did the WPL&C Program enhance your leadership skills, knowledge and abilities?

Question 2. To what extent did the utilization of a case study driven curriculum enhance your learning?

Question 3. To what extent did the utilization of the "intellectual procedure" enhance your learning?

Question 4. As a result of your completion of the WPL&C Program, do you agree that leadership can be effectively taught as a science?

Question 5. Before completing the WPL&C Program, did you believe that leaders were born, not made?

Question 6. To what extent do you believe that the WPL&C Program enabled you to effectively compete for promotions?

Question 7. To what extent do believe your leadership performance improved significantly as a result of the WPL&C Program?

Question 8. Would you have preferred a different approach to learning leadership than the WPL&C Program's case study driven curriculum? Explain.

Question 9. To what extent do you believe the quality of the instructors enhanced the effectiveness of the course?
Question 10. To what extent do you believe the assigned text, Leadership in Organizations (United States Military Academy, 1988), served to enhance the effectiveness of the WPL&C Curriculum?

Question 11. As a result of completing the WPL&C Program, to what extent do you believe you were better prepared to meet the leadership challenges affecting your agency on and arising from the attacks of September 11, 2001?

A sample of survey respondents was randomly selected for interview. Interview questions sought deeper qualitative insight into the quantitative survey responses.

Design of the Study

This study focused on the population of WPL&C graduates between 1995 and 2000. These graduates were from law enforcement agencies within Morris County, New Jersey. From 1995 to 2000, the County of Morris consisted of 39 municipal departments, the Morris County Park Police, Morris County Sheriff’s Department, and the Morris County Prosecutor’s Office. From 1995 – 2000, 70 officers from throughout Morris County graduated from the West Point Leadership and Command Program (see Table 1).
Table 1

*West Point Leadership and Command*

*Graduates, Morris County*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Detective</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sergeant</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This entire population was surveyed. A random sample of survey participants was selected for interviews. The selected population of Morris County graduates was studied across a period of 5 years. This period of time was of sufficient depth to constitute a valid and reliable study of the program’s effectiveness. This graduate population was representative of all sending agencies throughout Morris County.

The survey was mailed to all of these graduates. The survey sought to determine the graduate’s perception of enhanced leadership skills, knowledge, and abilities resulting from the *West Point Leadership and Command*
Program. Finally, the study measured the graduate's perception of a link between his/her graduation from the West Point Leadership and Command Program and promotion. The years 1995 through 2000 were chosen because they were the years of stability within the program. From 1995 through 2000 all instructors were graduates of the Faculty Development Program; that is no longer the case. There was, therefore, a direct link to the seminal curriculum and pedagogy of PL 300. There was consistency and strong leadership of the WPL&C Program throughout the state during these years. Sufficient time has passed to minimize any halo effect and allow objective reflection on the topic. Although a period of evolutionary-like change, these years were relatively tranquil compared to the period following September 11, 2001.

Limitations of the Study

This study was limited to a survey of the West Point Leadership and Command Program graduates from municipal and county agencies within Morris County for the period of 1995 through 2000. Therefore, the effect of changes made within the program since 2000 were not studied. This research did not study graduates from the 20 other counties in New Jersey. Program graduates from the New Jersey State Police
were excluded even if stationed within Morris County. Further, the research did not study graduates from other states or other nations.

The study focused upon the graduate's perception of self as related to leadership skills affected by the West Point Leadership and Command Program's curriculum. The research did not study the perceptions of the graduate's leaders or followers. Although such perceptions were of general interest, they remained beyond the scope of this study. The perception of a graduate's "followership" would be suitable for future study. Finally, this study was limited by the ability of graduates who have since retired or changed assignments to look as far back as 1995 and respond accurately.

Organization of the Study

This study consists of five chapters.

Chapter I articulates the relevance and significance of the research. Additionally, this chapter establishes the scope and parameters of this research. The statement of the problem and the enumeration of the research questions, limitations, and definitions are provided. The fundamental purpose of Chapter I is to provide for the organization of the study.
Chapter II constitutes a review of the relevant literature. This review shall include a review of the historic and professional literature. A review of literature directly related to leadership of law enforcement organizations is also included. Additionally, literature relevant to leadership curriculum and pedagogy is reviewed. The literature base for and the evolution of the West Point Leadership and Command Program will be reviewed to facilitate an understanding of links between the program and a graduate’s perception of the program’s effect.

Chapter III constitutes the research and methodology component of the research. This section serves as the organization frame for statistical and research design. It facilitates a discussion of quantitative and qualitative designs, data collection and analysis, methodology and instrument applications.

Chapter IV elucidates the findings of the study. This study discusses and illustrates the results of surveys and interviews conducted throughout this research. These findings are the sum of results from those responding to surveys and those randomly chosen from those respondents for a subsequent interview.
Chapter V serves as the summary and conclusions portion of this research. As such, this chapter summarizes the study's findings, interprets these findings and makes recommendations for further research.
Chapter II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

This chapter will review the general, philosophical, and professional literature related to the study of leadership. It will also elucidate the historic and current relevance of leadership and leadership training. Through this chapter, the very essence of leadership will be established. The core distinctions between leadership and management will be articulated so as to establish that these very distinctions require specific and distinct training programs. A review of literature relevant to the teaching of leadership will be provided. Finally, this chapter will discuss the curriculum, teaching methods and evolution of the West Point Leadership and Command Program.

In August 1982, Alfred Toffler (as cited in Tafoya & Toffler, 2005) spoke about "the Future of Policing" at the FBI Academy in Quantico, Virginia. He spoke about the evolution of law enforcement's role in an increasingly complex society. He spoke of change, opportunities,
resistance and the status quo. He also spoke of the history and the future of law enforcement. Toffler noted the complexity of law enforcement organizations and the "dogma" that inhibits organizational change. In speaking about management, Toffler stated:

The traditional managerial methods are not serving to motivate officers. One reason for this phenomenon may be traced to a decline of unquestioned obedience to authority. Until about 15 years ago, most police recruits were men who had served in the armed forces. These men were accustomed to unquestioned response to command. Today, however, few of the young men and young women entering law enforcement have such experience. They often ask questions that are unsettling to traditionalist managers, who believe that people need to be coerced, controlled, and threatened. (Tafoya & Toffler (2005), p. 3)

Alvin Toffler identified seminal challenges to police administration in the latter half of the twentieth century. In the same speech, Toffler spoke specifically about management and leadership. William Tafoya, PhD, reported that Toffler (as cited in Tafoya & Toffler, 2005) stated that:
In a more recent study, a panel of law enforcement management experts discussed the future of law enforcement. One of the issues examined was leadership styles and the phenomenon of resistance to change. 

One panelist, law enforcement executive, stated, 'The general perception is that things worked well as they are and there is no need to change.' Another panelist, who is a criminal justice scholar, admitted that 'police executives are not risk takers and police departments are getting more, not less, defensive.'

(p. 4)

As Toffler articulates the emerging leadership challenges for law enforcement, he identifies the organizational and professional inertia that resist change. He states that "unexamined are a number of visionary ideas that may be ahead of their time" (p. 5). He questions rigid organizational structures and decision making processes and contends that "rigid discipline and authoritarian fosters, rather than discourages, corruption" (p. 5).

Alvin Toffler and William Tafoya examined issues pertaining to management, change, leadership and vision. It is vision that lies within the core of any successful
organizational leadership. Tafoya concludes the chapter "The Future of Policing" as follows:

Regardless of what lies ahead, law enforcement must anticipate tomorrow in an imaginative, analytical, and prescriptive manner. This means that law enforcement administrators must not be seduced by the tired and true tenets of the past. When 'experience' becomes dogma, it can be not only misleading but dangerous as well. Administrators should reflect on what has passed, not be driven by it. Law enforcement administrators of today must look ahead if they are to shape the course of tomorrow. For 45,000 years, mankind huddled in the darkness of caves, afraid to take the first step into the light of day. Will history record each law enforcement agency's contribution as Luddite or luminary? Bold leadership is essential today to prepare for the 'fourth wave' of law enforcement reform. (Tafoya & Toffler, 2005, p. 5)

While "vision" is a common and well established tenet of leadership theories, the concept of "imagination" as elucidated by Alvin Toffler and William Tafoya, is unique. In August of 1982, Tafoya and Toffler expressed that "law enforcement must anticipate tomorrow in an
imaginative manner" (Tafoya & Toffler, 2005). In relation to September 11, 2001, the term "imaginative" as articulated in 1982 would prove prophetic. The 9/11 Commission (2004) would conclude that, "We believe the 9/11 attacks revealed four kinds of failures: in imagination, policy, capabilities, and management" (p. 339). Nearly 20 years later, the failure of "imagination" would be diagnosed as a variable within the root causes of the failures within America’s law enforcement and intelligence communities. The 9/11 Commission establishes that significant intelligence regarding al Qaeda’s threat to the United States was available prior to the September 11 attacks. The Commission wrote that, "Another school saw al Qaeda as the 'point of the spear of radical Islam,' but no one forced the argument into the open by calling for a national estimate or a broader discussion of the threat. The issue was never joined as a collective debate by the US government, including Congress, before 9/11" (p. 343). The 9/11 Commission goes on to discuss "Institutionalizing Imagination" within the government’s bureaucracies (p. 334). The role of "vision" and "imagination" within leadership was critical to the US government’s failures prior to September 11, 2001. They are equally critical to
meeting current and future challenges. Mayor Rudolph W. Giuliani (2002), in his work entitled Leadership, wrote of September 11 from the perspective of a leader who was tasked with the responsibility to instill a sense of optimism, hope, and confidence. Giuliani wrote of the leadership lessons he had learned from his father, judges, sports figures, and various biographies. Giuliani wrote that on the morning of September 12, 2001, that:

I also read until about 4:30 that morning, particularly the sections about Churchill becoming prime minister in 1940, selected mostly out of desperation, with his own party still doubtful about him. That led right into the Battle of Britain and how he kept up the courage and determination of his people as they were attacked day after day, night after night. I took strength from how he handled those dark hours with optimism. (p. 295)

From the front lines of the “war on terror,” Rudolph Giuliani turned to history: to the history of war and to the history of leadership. In the words of Winston Churchill, Giuliani found strength, direction and clarity. As Giuliani speaks of the desperate situation that Great
Britain experienced in 1940, he cites a speech made by Churchill on June 4, 1940:

We shall go on to the end, we shall fight in France, we shall fight on the seas and the oceans, we shall fight with growing confidence and growing strength in the air, we shall defend our island, whatever the cost may be, we shall fight on the beaches, we shall fight on the landing grounds, we shall fight in the fields and in the streets, we shall fight in the hills; we shall never surrender, and even if, which I do not for a moment believe, this island or a large part of it were subjugated and starving, then our Empire beyond the seas, armed and guarded by the British fleet, would carry on the struggle, until, in God’s good time, the New World, with all its power and might, steps forth to the rescue and the liberation of the old. (Churchill as cited in Giuliani, 2002, p. 296)

September 11, 2001 would be a traumatic catalyst for revolutionary change. Government at the city, county, state and federal levels would be challenged to adapt to threats to the homeland. Rudolph W. Giuliani’s words express the perspective of a leader at the city level. Giuliani would respond to the emotional, social, public safety, economic,
and infrastructure needs of a city under attack. President George W. Bush would provide leadership from the national and world perspective. Several days after the September 11 attacks, President George W. Bush addressed a Joint Session of Congress and the American people:

On September the 11, enemies of freedom committed an act of war against our country. Americans have known wars—but for the past 136 years, they have been wars on foreign soil, except for one Sunday in 1941. Americans have known the casualties of war—but not at the center of a great city on a peaceful morning. Americans have known surprise attacks—but never before on thousands of civilians. All of this was brought upon us in a single day—and night fell on a different world, a world where freedom itself is under attack. (G. W. Bush, public presentation, September 20, 2001)

Within this speech, President George W. Bush would announce the creation of the Office of Homeland Security. The President added:

We will come together to give law enforcement the additional tools it needs to track down terror here at home. We will come together to strengthen our intelligence capabilities to know the plans of
terrorists before they act, and find them before they strike. (G. W. Bush, public presentation, September 26, 2001)

The law enforcement mission had changed and changed to such a degree that a president of the United States, while addressing a Joint Session of Congress, said the following:

And I will carry this: it is a police shield of a man named George Howard, who died at the World Trade Center trying to save others. It was given to me by his mom, Arlene, as a proud memorial to her son. This is my reminder of lives that ended, and a task, that does not end. (G. W. Bush, public presentation, September 20, 2001)

Such is the current demand upon law enforcement.

Within days, the law enforcement profession had encountered more change than at any time in its history. The need for "smart, thoughtful and reflective leadership" was upon organizations that were by their very nature resistant to change. The need for professional leadership training programs for law enforcement executives is critical. The West Point Leadership and Command Program serves as the model leadership training program for law enforcement. An understanding of its effectiveness and efficiency is vital.
The very amorphous nature of leadership has been a topic of discussion throughout western and eastern cultures for centuries. Leadership, as a dimension of historic, political, and philosophic discourse, has been of interest to Confucius, Lao-Tzu, Aristotle, Plato, Machiavelli, Napoleon, Cicero, and Nietzsche. Leadership has been a central theme within the Bible and a topic of Shakespeare's plays. It has been an area of great interest to government, armies, navies, and corporations throughout the world. Definitions of leadership are as diverse as the cultures and organizations they serve. Cultural and historic relativism have clearly influenced the definition. From autocratic to humanistic styles, the very concepts of leadership have evolved tediously throughout history. Leadership definitions and theories are complex and they are simple, they can be applied to the smallest of families or to the largest undertakings of mankind. The focus of this research shall be upon the narrow frame of organizational leadership. While broader definitions and theories were surveyed to establish social and historic context, this research was limited to leadership defined as:
the process of influencing human behavior so as to accomplish the goals prescribed by the organizationally appointed leader...we concentrate on one particular aspect of leadership, leadership within an organizational context. By doing so, we can separate our definition from consideration of personal charisma, where the leader emerges to a leadership position by weight of sheer personality, motivation, or demand of the group. Instead, we will concentrate on leadership derived by organizational fiat or appointment. In our definition, the leader is in a position of leadership because the organization designated him/her a leader. This qualification allows us to present a uniquely specific definition. (Yukl, 1998, p. 7)

While charisma plays a role in leadership and although it plays a role within transformational leadership, it will not be an area of interest in and of itself. Organizational leadership serves to limit the scope of this study but in so doing provides an operational definition. "Organizations are goal oriented and purposeful. They place leaders in key positions to insure the accomplishment of their goals. This goal orientation is important for our definition"
(p.7). In *Leadership in Organizations*, Yukl goes on to clarify effective leadership, management, and command. While most of these concepts are well known, it is necessary, especially in regard to law enforcement training and education, to delineate the differences in management and leadership. While the roles of managers and leaders blend together, they remain very distinctly different behaviors. Walter Bennis (1989) writes in *On Becoming a Leader* that:

I tend to think of the differences between leaders and managers as the differences between those who master the context and those who surrender to it. There are other differences, as well, and they are enormous and crucial.

The manager administers; the leader innovates.

The manager is a copy; the leader is an original.

The manager maintains; the leader develops.

The manager focuses on systems/structure; the leader focuses on people.

The manager relies on control; the leader inspires trust.

The manager has short-range view; the leader has a long-range perspective.
The manager asks how and when; the leader asks what and why.
The manager has his eye always on the bottom line; the leader has his eye on the horizon.
The manager imitates; the leader initiates.
The manager accepts the status quo; the leader challenges it.
The manager is the classic good soldier; the leader is his own person.
The manager does things right; the leader does the right thing. (p. 45)

As most law enforcement executive training programs rely upon management curriculum, it is vital to establish the difference between management and leadership.
Warren Bennis (1989) writes of John Sculley, who, according to Bennis:

Saw synthesis as the difference between management and leadership. As I see it, leadership revolves around vision, ideas, direction, and has more to do with inspiring people as to direction and goals than with day-to-day implementation...One can’t lead unless he can leverage more than his own capabilities...You have to be capable of inspiring other people to do things without
actually sitting on top of them with a checklist—which is management, not leadership. (p. 138)

Peter Drucker (as cited by Bennis, 1989) is quoted as pointing out that:

The chief object of leadership is the creation of a human community held together by the work bond for a common purpose. Organizations and their leaders inevitably deal with the nature of man, which is shy values, commitments, convictions; even passions are basic elements in any organization. Since leaders deal with people, not things, leaders without values, commitment, and conviction can only be inhumane and harmful. (p. 163)

The literature serves to articulate that leadership is about people. It is about their hearts, their minds and their souls; concepts that are generally foreign to law enforcement executives. This humanistic dimension of leadership is however well entrenched within the United States Army. General H. Norman Schwarzkopf wrote in It Doesn’t Take a Hero (Schwarzkopf & Petro, 1992) that upon assuming a new combat command, that he contemplated, “what does a division commander do?” (p. 237) General Schwarzkopf subsequently listed the following “Big Four”:
Number one was obvious; to make sure that my division was combat ready.

Number two was the principle I'd learned from Cavazos and Livsey; to take care of the soldiers.

Number three was something I'd learned on my own in Mainz: to take care of the soldiers' families.

Number four was based on what I'd learned in war: that loyalty to one another was what motivated soldiers to fight. Camaraderie and cohesion at every level of the 24th had to be encouraged. (p. 237)

It is this humanistic ability to relate and motivate followers that generates leadership. From the perspective of General H. Norman Schwarzkopf to the following from Richard Schubert, a former director of the Red Cross, this ability to deal with people is prerequisite to success.

How you attract and motivate people determines how successful you'll be as a leader. Above all, the Golden Rule applies. Whether it's an employee or a customer or a senior vice president, the leader treats people the way he would like to be treated. Ninety-six percent of our people at disaster sites are volunteers. If we don't attract the right people and
motivate them positively, we aren’t going to make it.

(as cited in Bennis, 1989, p. 140)

It is this level of interpersonal connection that enables the leadership process. John C. Maxwell (1998), in his The 21 Irrefutable Laws of Leadership, wrote, “You can’t move people to action unless you first move them with emotion. The heart comes before the head” (p. 110). To be effective, a leader needs to connect with the individuals and the groups that he trusts will follow. Of this, Maxwell wrote that, “to connect with people in a group, relate to them as individuals” (p. 142). Maxwell, like Warren Bennis and General H. Norman Schwarzkopf, affirmed that leaders need to be able to relate to, empathize and communicate with their followers. The ability to connect with people is crucial to a leader’s success. Maxwell wrote:

Connecting with people isn’t something that needs to happen only when a leader is communicating to groups of people. It needs to happen with individuals. The stronger the relationship and connection between individuals, the more likely the follower will want to help the leader. (p. 102)
These interpersonal priorities are at the very heart of leadership and constitute the greatest difference between leadership and management. This is a common distinction made throughout the relevant literature.

In *Leadership: Enhancing the Lessons of Experience*, Hughes, Ginnett and Curphy (1996) define:

leadership as the process of influencing others toward achieving goals. Leadership is both a science and an art, but because leadership is an immature science, researchers are still struggling to identity the important questions in leadership; we are far from finding conclusive answers to them. (p. 28)

Hughes et al. emphasizes the criticality of a humanistic approach to motivating followers:

Now more than ever before, understanding followers is crucial to understanding leadership. That is because the leader-follower relationship is in a period of dynamic change. One reason for this changing relationship is an increasing pressure on all kinds of organizations to function with reduced resources and company downsizing, which have limited the number of managers and increased their span of control, which in turn leaves followers to pick up many of the functions
traditionally performed by their leaders. Another reason is a trend toward greater power sharing and decentralized authority in organizations, which in turn creates greater independence among organizational subunits and increased need for collaboration among them. Furthermore, the nature of problems faced by many organizations is becoming so complex and the changes so rapid that more and more people are required to solve them. (p. 71)

Thus the trends identified by Toffler and Tafolya (1982) are being realized. The demand for leadership combined with professional management has increased. The literature continues to explore the differences between leadership and management. In so doing, the literature gives rise to an increasing need to facilitate leadership training and development. For instance, Kotter is quoted as describing "management in terms of coping with complexity and leadership in terms of coping with change" (as cited in Hughes et al., 1996, p. 75). Kotter reportedly theorized that:

Managerial practices and procedures can be traced to the twentieth century phenomenon of large organizations and the need to bring order and
consistency to their functioning. Renewed interest in leadership, on the other hand, springs from the challenge of maintaining organizational success in an increasingly dynamic world. Most US corporations today, for example, are over-managed and under-led; but that strong leadership with weak management is no better. (Kotter as cited in Hughes et al., 1996, p. 75)

In Leadership Enhancing the Lessons of Experience, Hughes et al. contend that leadership and management "are not mutually exclusive, they do refer to a person's distinctive style and approach. Even in a particular role, two people approach it differently; one more like a leader, the other more like a manager" (p. 75). The difference between leadership and management is more substantial than that of a "distinctive style." The differences are those previously enumerated by Warren Bennis as cited within this research, as well as matters of focus, prioritization, values, vision, mission, communication, transformation and followership. Hughes et al. go on to quote Fairholm (1991) as follows:

Leadership and management are different in purpose, knowledge base, required skills, and goals. We
distinguish leaders as more personal than their orientation to group members than managers. They are more global in their thinking. Leaders, we suggest, focus on values, expectations, and context. Managers, on the other hand, focus on control and results. Leaders impact followers and constituent groups in a way that allows volitional activity of followers, not through formal authority mechanisms. Managers give clear direction, make solitary assignments, and work hard for cooperation. The leader communicates indirectly, gives overlapping and ambiguous assignments and sometimes sets up employees for internecine strife to test loyalty and the leader’s personal strength. Leaders value cooperation, not just coordination. They foster ideas of unity, equality, justice, and fairness in addition to efficiency and effectiveness, the bastions of management value.

(p. 75)

The literature addresses the difference between management and leadership from the perspective of Leader-Follower-Situation Interactions and Manager-Follower-Situation Interactions. The differences as well as the influence of these differences upon followers and
organizations are well established. For instance, Hughes et al. quote Bennis in this regard:

To return to Bennis' distinctions, managers emphasize stability whereas leaders emphasize change. Managers emphasize consistency and predictability in follower behavior (doing what is expected, doing things right), whereas leaders emphasize changing followers. That may mean transforming them or getting them to do more than they thought they could or thought they would. (p. 77)

These very distinctions are relevant to theories of transactional and transformational leadership.

Ultimately, Hughes et al. conclude this discussion with the following analysis:

Fairholm (1991) argued that organizations may need two different kinds of people at the helm: good leaders and good managers. He wrote, 'We need competent, dedicated managers to provide continuity of process, to insure program production, and to control and schedule materials needed for production or service delivery. We also need people who can infuse the organization with common values that define the organization, define its character, link it to the
larger society, and insure its long-term survival.'
(p. 80)
Gary Yukl (1998) wrote in *Leadership in Organizations* that:

Leadership has been defined in different ways, but most definitions share the assumption that it involves a social process whereby intentional influence is exerted by one person over other people in an attempt to structure the activities and relationships in a group or organization. (p. 14)

Likewise, "Leadership is thus a subtle process of mutual influence fusing thought, feeling, and action to produce cooperative effort in the service of purposes and values of both the leader and the led. Single-frame managers are unlikely to understand and attend the intricacies of a holistic process" (Bolman & Deal, 1997, p. 296). Holistic is, in a sense, the very essence of leadership, as a leader deals with the organization's internal and external environments. While the fundamental tenets of leadership theories remain constant, there is an inherent risk in the perpetual evolution of "fashionable" models (Bolman & Deal, p. 317). These fashionable models may not apply to all dimensions of all organizations. It is
imperative that leaders and managers alike learn the basics of each and adapt their styles and strategies in a manner consistent with the followers, cultures, mission and vision of their respective organizations. Of this, Bolmen and Deal (1997) wrote:

Each of the frames highlights significant possibilities for leadership, but each is incomplete in capturing a holistic picture. Early in the twentieth century, implicit models of managerial leadership were narrowly rational. In the 1960s and 1970s, human resource leadership became fashionable. In recent years, symbolic leadership has moved to center stage, and the literature abounds with advice on how to become a visionary leader capable of transforming cultural patterns. Organizations need vision, but it is not their only need and not only their most important one. Ideally, managers combine multiple frames into a comprehensive approach to leadership. Still, it is unrealistic to expect everyone to be a leader for all times and for all seasons. Wise leaders understand their own strengths, work to expand them, and build teams to provide
leadership in all four models—structural, political, human resource, and symbolic. (p. 317)

In his work entitled Transforming Leadership, Terry D. Anderson (1988) quotes the following from John Thompson,

My premise is that leadership is not exceptional (some are born with it), but the natural expression of the fully functional personality. As Warren Bennis put it, 'The process of becoming a leader is much the same as becoming an integrated human being.' (p. 2)

Anderson’s work provides a discussion of the role of communication, vision, "the Leadership Organization," and "the Learning Organization" (p. 10). While Anderson’s work offers little insight into leadership, it does provide a unique qualifier to competent leadership with the caveat that, "acts of kindness are required" (p. 14). Anderson wrote that, "Without developed leaders—without a strong team at the helm—the organization will have no vision, no spirit, or will be divided against itself, and it will not as easily endure the storms of change that we are now beginning to face" (p. 8). It is this very cohesiveness, the identification with a leader and the shared vision fostered by such kindness that engenders the organization integrity to withstand internal/external forces for change.
Perhaps the need for kindness and other behaviors related to a humanitarian perspective best summarized by Gerald A. Michaelson (2001) in *Sun Tzu: The Art of War for Managers*:

Military writers also agree that an important quality of an ideal leader is concern for people. In "On the Psychology of Military Independence," Dixon points out that humanitarianism is a prerequisite for high morale and physical health. (p. 19)

It is in part this very humanitarianism that underlies the distinctions in leadership and management.

In the fifth edition of *Management* by James A. F. Stoner and R. Edward Freeman (1992), management is defined as "the process of planning, organizing, leading, and controlling the work of organization members and using all available organizational resources to reach stated organizational goals" (p. 14). Stoner and Freeman (1992) define leadership as, "the process of directing and influencing the task-related activities of group members" (p. 472). As Stoner and Freeman delineate the characteristics of management and leadership, it becomes apparent that managers lead and leaders manage. Within the inventory of the management process are functions of
organizing, leading and controlling. Leading with this specific inventory is defined as follows:

Leading involves directing, influencing, and motivating employees to perform essential tasks. While planning and organizing deal with the more abstract aspects of the management process, the activity of leading is very concrete: it involves working with people. By establishing the proper atmosphere, managers help their employees do their best. (p. 9)

Subsequently, "interpersonal roles" are enumerated as "figurehead, leader, and liaison" (p. 13).

Leader. Since managers work with and through other people, they are responsible and accountable for their subordinates' actions as well as their own. In fact, their subordinates' success or failure is a direct measure of their own success or failure. Because managers have subordinates and other resources, they are able to accomplish more than non-managers—which means, of course, that they are expected to accomplish more than other organization members. (p. 13)

Within chapter seven, entitled, "Leadership," Stoner and Freeman (1992) dissect the nature of leadership. Power
and influence are discussed as are leadership styles and functions. Power is defined as "the ability to exert influence—that is, to change the attitudes or behavior of individuals or groups" (p. 472). Influence is subsequently defined as "any actions or examples of behavior that cause a change in attitude or behavior of another person or group" (p. 472). Thus, our definitions and concepts of leadership are becoming less abstract and more tangible. As such, leadership theories become more numerous and complex.

In "Finding Your Voice," within The Leadership Challenge, James M. Kouzes and Barry Z. Posner (2002) wrote:

Don't confuse leadership with position and place.

Don't confuse leadership with skills and systems or with tools and techniques. They are not what earn you respect and commitment of your constituents. What earns you their respect in the end is whether you are you. And whether what you are embodies what they want to become. (p. 43)

Mainstream leadership theories include path-goal, contingency, situational, leader-follower exchange, transactional, and transformational. Each of these theories
is rooted within significant management and leadership research. These theories will apply to some but generally not to all organizational and environmental variables. Their application is contingent upon a fundamental understanding of human behavior, organizational structure, and process, and an understanding of the organization's mission. However, an understanding of motivational theories is prerequisite and inherent to successful leadership. The classicists in the study of motivation are Abraham Maslow, Frederick Herzberg, and David McClelland. The work of each of these researchers provides critical insight into human motivation. Although the work of these individuals was more directly related to management rather than leadership, their work provides valuable insight of a follower's perspective. Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs theory (as cited in LeDoux, 1999) enumerates "a set of needs" that every individual is striving to satisfy (p. 39). Among these needs are those of the most basic order, including the fundamental biological needs. Maslow theorized that only upon satisfaction of these needs would a gradual progression through the higher order needs of safety, belonging, ego-status, and actualization occur. Actualization is the highest level, a level where the
individual is motivated by "inherent well-being, self-fulfillment, personal growth and development, the opportunity to fulfill one's potential—to become more like one's natural self" (as cited in LeDoux, 1999, p.39). This hierarchy is theoretically relevant to the progression from transactional to transformational leadership. Satisfaction of the lower order needs is related to the exchange inherent within transactional leadership. Satisfaction of the middle and higher order needs facilitates the opportunity to fully challenge an individual. At this level, transformational leadership will encourage a follower to transcend their personal needs. It is at this level that true change and transformation are enabled.

Frederick Herzberg's Hygiene Theory (as cited in LeDoux, 1999) postulates that a given set of hygiene factors need to be satisfied by the organization prior to the development of an individual's internal motivators. John C. LeDoux (1999) wrote in Executive Leadership that, "the bottom line of what Herzberg said is intrinsic motivation. This intrinsic motivation can only come from what the individual does. The organizational setting has to satisfy the hygiene factor and let the individual, through job responsibilities, develop the intrinsic
satisfaction of job accomplishment” (p. 47). David McClelland’s Theory of Power, Achievement and Affiliation (as cited in LeDoux, 1999) further dissected this very same concept of motivation (p. 47). Based upon research conducted at Harvard and at MIT, David McClelland (as cited in LeDoux, 1999) reported that:

Effective management and organizational development efforts begin with self-knowledge and an orientation toward obtaining specific results. The intent is not to train managers to be mini-psychologists whose roles include assessing the motive profiles of their subordinates. Rather, the managers are trained to first become aware of their own motive profiles and then to encourage employees to speak for themselves regarding what they want from their jobs. (p. 48)

It is, therefore, vital that both managers and followers receive regular feedback about their performance. This feedback will serve to facilitate organizational adaptations designed so that:

Both managers and subordinates can alter aspects of their jobs to achieve a better fit. Managers who are aware of the needs of employees can create a climate that encourages subordinates to take greater control
and let managers know what will motivate them. The
fit between motives and job can also be improved by
changing the requirements of a job, by moving
individuals from one job to another, or by encouraging
individuals to change themselves so that their
motivators are more appropriate to their jobs.
(LeDoux, 1999, p. 51)

Related research by Edwin Locke (as cited in LeDoux, 1999) studied goal setting. The combination of goal setting
and feedback was found to "further enhance employee
productivity" (p. 53). Locke also identified the
limitations of financial incentives as motivators.
Intrinsic motivation, once identified, challenged and
focused upon mutually shared goals transcends the value of
money in reinforcing said goals. Of this, John LeDoux
(1999) wrote:

According to Locke's theory, then the appeal of a
specific, hard goal itself will generate increased
employee performance. That is, the intrinsic feedback
of a job well done or a goal attained will reinforce
the behavior. Hence, extrinsic rewards, such as money,
are not always necessary to reinforce performance.
However, feedback has been shown to be important in
maintaining and enhancing long-run performance in some situations. (p. 54)

However, according to John LeDoux, Victor Vroom’s Expectancy Theory somewhat contradicts this. The expectancy theory links a follower’s perception of, “the effort-performance link, the performance-based reward link, the value of rewards...The expectancy theory focuses on individuals and the rewards they expect to receive. The theory depicts the individual as striving to maximize expected pleasure and minimize pain” (LeDoux, 1999, p. 57).

Thus expectancy theory has a simpler and more casual view of motivation that suggests that, “managers need to determine what types of outcomes individual’s value, or they should use relatively universally desired outcomes, such as money” (p. 57).

J. Stacy Adams (as cited in LeDoux, 1999) researched the influence of an individual’s perception of equity. Adams’ Equity Theory theorizes that individuals will compare themselves to other workers and that their subsequent perception of equity or inequity can serve as an incentive or disincentive. This is perhaps the simplest, most fundamental and most universal leadership theory. People naturally compare themselves to their siblings,
their neighbors, and their co-workers. According to Adams (as cited in LeDoux, 1999), "Outcomes from a job (e.g. pay, prestige, and fringe benefits) and inputs to a job (e.g. effort, educational level, and experience) form a ratio for each individual" (p. 57). If these ratios are unbalanced, an impediment is likely. If these ratios are balanced, motivation is likely to be maximized. It is critical for managers and leaders to understand that this ratio is based upon the perception of the worker. If the worker perceives inequity, there are specific strategies to facilitate equity or to otherwise refocus the worker. Of this, LeDoux wrote that, "the equity theory, like the expectancy theory, suggests that managers provide outcomes that individuals perceive as relevant. Different groups and individuals value different things" (LeDoux, 1999, p. 59).

Feedback, communication, empathy and knowledge of the organization and its mission are prerequisite to the application of equity and related theories. Organizational behavior modification, as researched by B. F. Skinner (as cited in LeDoux, 1999), is an additional management and leadership strategy. Simply defined, "Behavior is a function of its consequences...people behave in ways that help them avoid unpleasant outcomes (punishment) and attain
pleasant ends (reinforcement)” (p. 60). LeDoux (1999) also wrote that organizational behavior management is relevant to the enhancement of employee productivity and applicable only to observable behaviors. Related research by Fred Luthans (as cited in LeDoux, 1999) led to the development of “a five step organizational development program.” These five steps serve to “identify crucial behaviors,” measure “the rate at which these critical behaviors are occurring” so as to establish a “baseline frequency” and to identify the “trigger” for said behaviors (p. 60). Subsequent steps are predicated upon the development of an “intervention strategy” and the evaluation of the effects of said strategy (p. 61). While seeming to provide a systemic analysis and intervention, organizational behavior management has several inherent limitations. Of these John LeDoux (1999) wrote:

Organizational Behavior Modification’s emphasis on measurable behavior is both its greatest strength and weakness. On one hand, the theory frees the manager from the need to assess subordinate need states or cognition. In a straightforward manner, it suggests that behavior can be changed solely through the manipulation of reinforcement contingencies. But, on
the other hand, OBM relevance for improving managerial performance may be limited because its emphasis on precisely measured performance. The theory may be most applicable to lower-level jobs where tasks are relatively simple and reinforcements can be easily controlled to increase desired behaviors. (p. 62)

Inherent within the application of this theory is a variety of ethical concerns as well as the need to identify and control attributional biases of the observer.

Each of the afore-cited theories has strengths and weaknesses. Each is a synthesis of many management and leadership researchers. While managers and leaders should have a fundamental intellectual understanding of these theories, that alone will not make them effective leaders. Leadership training requires more than a survey course, as leadership must begin with the transformation of self.

Tracy Goss (1996) wrote in *The Last Word on Power* that, "If you are going to re-invent your organization, then in order to succeed, you must first re-invent yourself" (p. 11). Goss disputes the concept of transformational leadership as oxymoronic and writes:

In reality, the concept of 'transformational change' is an oxymoron. Transformation and change are
different phenomena. Change is a function of altering what you are doing—to improve something that is already possible in your reality (better, different, or more). Transformation is a function of altering the way you are being—to create something that is not possible in your reality. (p. 15)

It is, therefore, evident that a leader must be introspective and aware of his inherent biases. It is from such introspection, that transformation of the leader and subsequently change of and within the organization can be initiated.

Such is the essence of true leadership. The ultimate leadership achievements are followers who can stand alone while working ethically, effectively and efficiently towards organizational goals. These achievements are the essence of a leader’s legacy. Max DePree (1989) expressed this as follows, “But to be a leader means having the opportunity to make a meaningful difference in the lives of those who permit leaders to lead” (p. 11).

In Leadership is an Art, Max DePree (1989) described leadership as follows, “The first responsibility of a leader is to define reality. The last is to say thank you.
In between the two, the leaders must become a servant and a debtor. That sums up the progress of an artful leader" (p. 11). DePree substantiates the humanistic dimension of leadership. While he does so from a philosophical perspective, his thesis is logical and akin to common sense. The concepts of trust, empowerment and transformation are summed up by DePree as follows:

Most of the time, when we consider ourselves and others, we are looking at only parts of people. The measure of individuals—and so of corporations—is the extent to which we struggle to complete ourselves, the energy we devote to living up to our potential. An elegant company frees its members to be their best. Elegant leaders free the people they lead to do the same. (p. 142)

Writing of The Human Factor, within their book entitled The Art of Happiness at Work, the Dalai Lama and Howard C. Cutler, MD, (2003) discussed employee satisfaction and dissatisfaction within the workplace. Although the authors do not mention leadership, they write about organizational culture and environment. The authors wrote of these organizational dimensions from the most basic of perspectives:
I think on a basic level we are all human beings, we have the capacity to relate to one another with warmth, with affection, with friendship. So, if we are discussing happiness and satisfaction at work, like all human activities, the human factor—how we relate to those around us, our co-workers, our customers, our boss—is of prime importance. And I think if we make an effort to cultivate good relationships with people at work, get to know the other people, and bring basic human qualities to the workplace, that can make a tremendous difference. (p. 39)

If DePree’s (1989) contention that it is the leader’s “responsibility to define reality,” then the “effort to cultivate good relationships” and “to bring basic human qualities to the workplace” are inherent responsibilities of the leader (p. ).

Kouzes and Posner (2002) write of the distinction between leadership and management in The Leadership Challenge. Using metaphors of a journey to describe leadership, they write:

Throughout this book, we use the metaphor of the journey when discussing the work of leaders. We find it to be the most appropriate metaphor, because the
word lead, at its root, means 'go, travel, guide.' Leadership has about it a kinesthetic feel, a sense of movement. Leaders 'go first.' They're pioneers. They begin the quest for new order. They venture into unexplored territory and guide us to new and unfamiliar destinations. In contrast, the origin of manage is a word meaning 'hand.' At its core, managing is about 'handling' things, about maintaining order, about organization and control. The critical difference between management and leadership is reflected in the root meanings of the two words—the difference between what it means to handle things and what it means to go places. The unique role of leaders is to take us to places we've never been before. (p. 36)

A Review of the Literature Relevant to the Leadership of Law Enforcement Organizations

The history of law enforcement leadership within the United States is less than glorious. As law enforcement sought to meet the challenges of America’s pluralistic culture it failed to develop a uniform or professional cadre of leaders. The Task Force Report: The Police (The
President’s Commission on Law Enforcement & Administration of Justice, 1967) reported that:

As long ago as 1921, there was recognition that the uneven development of American police organizations appeared to be caused, more than by any other factor, by the lack of trained and intelligent leadership. Ten years later the Wickersham Commission concurred, noting that uninformed and unimaginative leadership was a major contributing cause to existing weaknesses in police organization and management. The Wickersham Committee report said: "Not infrequently the chief is wholly incompetent to discharge the onerous duties of his position. He may lack experience, executive ability, character, integrity, or the confidence of his force, or all of them put together." (p.44)

The President’s Commission (1967) sought to identify the likely causes of the systematic leadership failure. Among the reasons cited were the lack of minimum training or educational standards, the lack of management training programs over reliance on promotion within an organization, and the lack of lateral mobility. In other words, the system lacked catalysts for leadership development. In regards to training and education the President’s
Commission quoted The Committee for Economic Development as pointing out that:

Beyond training for new employees, there is a pressing need for continuous development of persons in responsible positions. A program of continuing education and mid-career development—with universities and professional associations—is crucial to effective administration in all local governments. Universities should also develop or strengthen schools of public administration to play positive roles in training students for technical and managerial responsibility in government. (p. 45)

The Task Force Report reflected the political and cultural pressures of the 1960’s. Additionally its authors articulated the history of American law enforcement and its leadership. The conclusions in the Task Force Report were mirrored by other authors through the 1960’s and 1970’s. Among these was Herman Goldstein (1977) who authored Policing a Free Society within which he wrote extensively about the challenges to law enforcement leadership. In addition to comparing the American system to various European systems, Goldstein compared and contrasted various leadership training programs and suggested a “West Point
for police" (p. 238). Goldstein explained his rationale as follows:

Among the most common suggestions that have been made for supplying effective leadership in the police field are: increased reliance on higher education; in-service training in management techniques; career-development programs; restructuring the promotion system; a West Point for police; exchange programs; and greater lateral movement. Any one of these programs, by itself, is probably inadequate. And many of them, as proposed, are much too modest given the magnitude of the need. Indeed, the need is so great and so critical that a full scale master plan to fill it might well incorporate all of these suggestions in one form or another. (p. 238)

Goldstein's words, while prophetic, would not be realized until 1993 when the United States Military Academy at West Point became directly involved. In the intervening years law enforcement remained dependent on several institutions to provide relevant training. As Goldstein wrote:

In the absence of effective programs, many agencies have sent selected members of their staffs to one or more of the established police training schools, such
as the FBI National Academy, the Northwestern Traffic Institute, and the Southern Police Institute. The FBI National Academy, for example, used to dwell on subject matter, that in the opinion of many was more suitable for recruit training. (p. 236)

Thus the very institutions that law enforcement relied on during these years were failing to provide for leadership development. Goldstein articulated several clear priorities to resolve this challenge. Among them was the following:

In contemplating the form that a comprehensive program for developing leadership might take, the tendency is to turn first to educational programs—the creation of a Bramshill or a West Point or the requirement of college education for police personnel. (p. 241)

...tremendous magnitude of the need, perhaps all of these approaches should be tried simultaneously; the further development of such existing institutions such as the FBI Academy; the establishment of a new national academy to specialize in the development of leadership for municipal police agencies; and the creation of specialized centers for the same purpose.
in well established institutions of higher learning.

(p. 245)

The West Point Leadership and Command Program would be the fulfillment and the test of these hypotheses of the 1960’s and 1970’s. "The Rodney King incident in 1991 and the Los Angeles riots in 1992" (Dirse & Sheehan, 1998, p. 19) would be the final catalyst for West Point’s involvement in 1993. The challenges of post September 11, 2001 law enforcement serve only to stress the importance of leadership as American law enforcement faces terrorism in the homeland. These challenges to law enforcement organizations and officers are discussed in "The future of law enforcement safety training in the face of terrorism":

On September 11, 2001, a group of terrorists not only deliberately caused death and destruction at the World Trade Center, the Pentagon, and in the skies above the United States but also killed 73 of this nation’s law enforcement officers. This resulted in more felonious deaths of officers than died due to adversarial action for that entire year. This tragedy caused a reexamination of training philosophies concerning law enforcement safety. Future training programs, while incorporating traditional safety methods to combat
criminal assaults, also must focus on the possibility of additional terrorist attacks. (Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2005, p. 1)

Leadership is fundamental to meeting the challenges of terrorism. Jeff Green (2006) in The Leadership Paradox, wrote:

Organizational success depends on many complex and dynamic influences, such as customer needs and demands, internal and external politics, economics, and certainly the inner culture of an organization. The most important influence, however, appears to be effective leadership. Leadership, quite simply, is the ability to influence others. Leadership is about influencing subordinates, but it also is about influencing peers and bosses. Successful organizations continuously nurture an environment where positive leadership is systemically valued at all ranks throughout the department. With rapidly advancing technologies, post 9/11 concerns of domestic and international terrorism, the globalization of policing as well as criminal efforts, the increasing multiculturalism of communities, and ever-shrinking budgets, there never has been a greater need for
effective leadership in law enforcement organizations.

(p.13)

Pedagogy

Inherent within the WPLC Program is the tenet that leadership can be taught and thus learned. The study of leadership has evolved from Thomas Carlyle's "Great Man Theory of Leadership" in 1841 through modern "situationist" and "interactionist" approaches (Yukl, 1998, p. 6). The evolution of leadership theory is demonstrably relative to the mainstream culture of its time. In the late 1800s Marx and Engels "expanding the words of German philosopher Hegel, proposed that it is not dynamic and charismatic persons who turn the course of history. Rather, it is history which thrusts certain people into power" (Yukl, 1998, p. 6). Marx and Engels were among the first to identify the environmental, situational variables inherent within the study of leadership. Subsequent to the writings of the 1800s "Max Weber a German sociologist, proposed in the early 1900s an impersonal, bureaucratic type of leadership—not leadership by attribute, characteristics, or loyalty, but leadership by legitimate authority based on established rule" (p. 6). Through the theories of 19th and 20th centuries, it becomes apparent that leadership ability
is not simply a matter of traits but of behavior within specific situational parameters. Therefore, if leadership is a matter of identifiable behaviors relevant to a specific situation, then it is logical to assume that these behaviors can be learned. The evolution of this approach to leadership ultimately holds that, "aspects of the situation determine the effectiveness of leaders and the organizations they lead. The position of the situationist is that virtually any person can be a leader in an appropriate set of circumstances" (Yukl, 1998, p.6).

The ability to teach and learn leadership remains a topic of academic debate. While the requisite skills can be taught, the attributes of intellect and personality are generally beyond the scope of academics.

Defining leadership seems straightforward, but explaining how leaders lead, and more importantly, what skills they use to lead, is a much more complicated and complex issue. Presumably, the designers of leadership development training programs have an underlying concept or set of concepts explaining what leadership means and how leaders can be developed. The first fundamental assumption is that leaders can be developed. Long a fiercely debated
topic, it is now accepted as true. Modern leadership training is firmly based on the belief that individuals can be educated, trained, and developed to be leaders. (Mason & Wetherbee, 2004, p. 187)

Although the topic is complex with many inherent variables, leadership can be studied, reduced to its basic elements and be taught. Mason and Wetherbee quote Bennis as follows, "There is no simple formula, no rigorous science, no cookbook that leads inexorably to successful leadership" (p. 187). Within the Journal of Property Management, Thomas Cohn (2002) writes:

In the past, leadership has been defined in terms of individual traits rather than institutional ones and as a role reserved for those who were born to lead. However, Warren G. Bennis, author and leadership guru cautioned, "The most dangerous leadership myth is leaders are born—that there is a genetic factor to leadership. This myth asserts people simply either have certain charismatic qualities or not. That's nonsense; in fact, the opposite is true. Leaders are made rather than born. (p. 30)

Kouzes and Pozner (2002) succinctly ask and answer this question, "Can leadership be taught? Our answer is an
unequivocal ‘yes.’ Isn’t it amazing we have never been asked the question ‘Can management be taught?’” (p. ix)

Kouzes and Posner articulate their reasoning through comparison to management training paradigm:

The caliber of managers has been raised by assuming people can learn attitudes, skills, and knowledge associated with good management practice. The same can be done with leadership. Viewing leadership as a nonlearnable set of character traits dooms societies, and their organizations, to having only a few good leaders. It is far healthier and more productive to start with the assumption that it is possible for everyone to lead. (p. vii)

From that philosophical perspective Kouzes and Posner conclude that leadership can be taught as, “We believe leadership is a set of skills. Like any skill, with the proper motivation and desire, with practice and feedback, through role models and coaching, this skill can be strengthened, honed and enhanced” (p. ix). Thus, leadership skills are viewed as learnable. Beyond the basic skills, however, a leader:

should seek to learn as much as possible about the forces-political, economic, social moral, or artistic-
that affect the organization. Honest answers tell you that to be as effective as possible you must improve your understanding of others and build your skills to mobilize people's energies toward higher purposes. To be a leader, you must be inter-personally competent, and you must be able to develop the trust and respect of others. (p. 393)

It is, therefore, apparent that although leadership skills can be learned, that a leader's ability to manage his/her inter-personal and organizational affairs is beyond the scope of still based training. Challenges involving stakeholders within the internal or the external environment are probably best learned through experience. It is this leadership dynamic that Jim Collins (2005) described as "legislative" leadership, where "persuasion, political currency, and shared interests" are synthesized in a manner that yields to common goals and objectives (p. 11). Experience and mentoring are the only true learning catalysts to the transmission of this knowledge.

Leadership within the social sector, whether law enforcement or another dimension of public administration, has unique and complex challenges. Unlike business sector leaders, social sector leaders do not possess the same
scope of authority and power. Therefore, they must learn to exercise their power and thus their leadership in more complex ways. In Good to Great and the Social Sectors, Jim Collins (2205) writes, "Social sector leaders are not less decisive than business leaders as a general rule; they only appear that way to those who fail to grasp the complex governance and diffuse power structures common to social sectors" (p. 10). This leads Collins to write that:

The complex governance and diffuse power structures common in nonbusiness lead me to hypothesize that there are two types of leadership skill: executive and legislative. In executive leadership, the individual leader has enough concentrated power to simply make the right decisions. In legislative leadership, on the other hand, no individual leader—not even the nominal chief executive—has enough structural power to make the most important decisions by himself or herself. Legislative leadership relies more upon persuasion, political currency, and shared interests to create the conditions for the right decisions to happen. (p. 11)

It is evident that Collins perceives social sector leadership as particularly complex and challenging. This
complexity increases exponentially when the social sector in issue is law enforcement. Collins writes about the leadership of New York City Police Commissioner William Bratton who acted upon the entrenched organizational culture of the NYPD. Collins writes of:

the psychological shift when Police Commissioner William J. Bratton inverted the focus from inputs to outputs. Prior to Bratton, the NYPD assessed itself primarily on input variables—such as arrests made, reports taken, cases closed, budgets met—rather than on the output variable of reducing crime. Bratton set audacious output goals, such as attaining double-digit annual declines in felony crime rates, and implemented a catalytic mechanism called Compstat (short for ‘computer comparison statistics’). (p. 4)

It was the ability to separate “inputs from outputs and the discipline to hold their organizations accountable for achievement in the outputs” (Collins, 2005, p. 4) that enabled Bratton and the NYPD to succeed. William J. Bratton serves to illustrate that a strong and competent leader can initiate and sustain positive organizational change within the complex environment of social sector
leadership, Collins (2005) explains his perception of the social sector leadership complexities as follows:

Social sector organizations increasingly look to business for leadership models and talent, yet I suspect we will find more true leadership in the social sectors than the business sector. How can I say that? Because, as George MacGregor Burns taught in his classic 1978 text, Leadership, ‘the practice of leadership is not the same as the exercise of power. If I put a loaded gun to your head, I can get you to do things you might not otherwise do, but I’ve not practiced leadership; I’ve exercised power. True leadership only exists if people follow when they have the freedom not to. If people follow you because they have no choice, then you are not leading.’ (p. 13)

It is clear, according to Collins, that although social sector leaders such as Bratton do not hold the “concentrated decision power of a business CEO” (p. 10), they are still able to exercise true leadership to effect change. Collins writes that:

leaders are ambitious first and foremost for the cause, the organization, the work—not themselves—and they have the fierce resolve to do whatever it takes
to make good on ambition. A leader displays a paradoxical blend of personal humility and professional will. (p. 34)

Collins concludes with an expression of leadership legacy that:

Truly great organizations prosper through multiple generations of leaders, the exact opposite of being built around a single great leader, great idea or specific program. Leaders in great organizations build catalytic mechanisms to stimulate progress, and do not depend upon having a charismatic personality to get things done; indeed, many had a 'charisma bypass.' (p. 35)

One must deduce from the criticality and complexity of social sector leadership that leadership training and education for leaders within these sectors is vital to their success.

In a similar fashion, Bolman and Deal (1997) write of transactional leadership as Collins wrote of legislative leadership.

Burns (1978) was mindful of leaders such as Franklin Roosevelt, Mohandas Gandhi, and Martin Luther King Jr. when he drew a distinction between 'transforming' and
'transactional' leaders. According to Burns, transactional leaders 'approach their followers with an eye to trading one thing for another: jobs for votes, subsidies for campaign contributions.' (p. 4) Transforming leaders are rarer. As Burns describes them, they evoke their constituents' better nature and move them toward higher and more universal needs and purposes. They are visionary leaders, and visionary leadership is inherently symbolic. Symbolic leaders follow a consistent set of practices and rules. (pp. 314-315)

The nuances of transactional leadership, the essence of quid pro quo, would be seemingly easier to teach or to learn than would transformational leadership. The essence of transactional leadership is most likely learned through life experience, professional experience, and a minimum of skill based training. However, transformational leadership is innately more complex. The dimensions of vision, the ability to communicate that vision, innovative strategies, the role of environment, and the followers are exponentially more complex. While more complex, transformational leadership can be taught and is taught within the WFLC Program. Although the ability to judge the
environmental variables, the ability of followers and the
ability to communicate are beyond the scope of most
training; the ability to recognize the opportunity to
exercise these established transformational tactics are
within the scope.

In Leader to Leader: Enduring Insights on Leadership
from the Drucker Foundation's Award-Winning Journal,
Frances Hesselbein and Paul M. Cohen (1999) wrote of the
complexity of learning leadership, "Yes, you can learn to
lead, but don't confuse leadership with skills and systems
or with tools and techniques. They are not what earn you
the respect and commitment of your constituents" (p.42).
Previously within this work the authors use a metaphor of
painting to articulate the synthesis of leadership learning
and development:

When first learning to lead, we paint what we see
outside ourselves—the exterior landscape. We read
biographies and autobiographies of famous leaders,
attend speeches by decorated military officers, listen
to tapes by motivational speakers and participate in
classes led by skilled facilitators. We do all this
to master the fundamental tools, and the techniques.
We're clumsy at first, failing more than succeeding,
but soon we give a speech with ease, conduct a meeting with grace, and praise an employee with style. It's an essential period; an aspiring leader can no more skip the fundamentals than can an aspiring painter.

(p. 41)

Thus, like painting, the fundamental skills must be learned and mastered. Then with time and experience a manager can become a leader.

Leadership training programs have existed and prospered within the private sector for decades. Most large companies have management development programs of one kind or another, and many organizations send their managers to outside seminars and workshops. Training programs are widely used to develop leadership skills in private sector organizations. Most leadership training programs are designed to increase generic skills and behaviors relevant for managerial effectiveness and advancement.

(Yukl, p. 467)

The life, leadership and presidency of Lyndon Johnson serve to illustrate the complexity of identifying the source of leadership. In an interview in the Harvard Business Review, biographer Robert A. Caro (2006) was
asked, "Do you think that leaders like Johnson are born or made?" His response undulates through Lyndon Johnson's physical traits, through his psychological and social development, and concludes with:

When I started my earlier biography on Robert Moses, I didn't believe in heredity. But it became impossible to ignore hereditary factors in the case of Lyndon Johnson. Johnson was six foot three. He had this huge nose; he had this big chin, huge ears, very pale white skin; and he had this absolute need to dominate people and to lead. He came from a long line of men, a dozen of them, who were well over six feet tall, who all had huge ears, huge noses, pale skin, and who also had this great need to lead and dominate. They were all the same. They were all frontiersmen who had to lead the raids against the Indians. In Lyndon Johnson's case the desire for power was particularly strong, even as a four year old. At school one day, he went to the blackboard, wrote his name on it in huge letters, and started telling the class that he would one day be president of the United States. With some kids, you'd dismiss that kind of thing as overactive imagination at work. I have to believe that heredity
had something to do with it. On the other hand, leaders are not just born, they are also made, and we have to look at the circumstances of Johnson's burning ambition. When he was an adolescent, Johnson's parents went bankrupt. So Johnson lived his life in poverty. More to the point, he spent his boyhood in humiliation. To be a Johnson was to be a figure of ridicule in the Texas Hill Country. He lived in this little town in the middle of nowhere, and that was his whole world. His father was a laughingstock, a quixotic bankrupt rancher, ridiculed by one and all. His brother, Sam, once said to me that 'the most important thing for Lyndon was not to be like Daddy.' When you hear that, then you understand an awful lot about Lyndon Johnson. He did some wonderful things and he did some terrible things, and they all came out of the same place. He was driven by demons and those demons were real. It wasn't just the poverty he grew up in. It was the loneliness, the terrible loneliness of his youth. When it comes to a great leader like Lyndon Johnson, I would have to say that heredity and humiliation combined to produce his extraordinary drive to succeed. Out of that came the civil rights
program. We got the War on Poverty and the Great Society. We also got Vietnam. (p. 52)

The West Point Leadership and Command Curriculum and Pedagogy

As the West Point Leadership and Command Program is an innovative educational program within law enforcement, there is little literature related to its curriculum or teaching methodologies. The program is designed to "teach individuals how to think more systematically about leadership challenges and situations. The course comprises behavioral science and adult education theories compiled from the top universities in the nation" (Dinse & Sheehan, 1998, p. 19). The academic origins of the curriculum are unique within law enforcement as are the teaching methods inherent within the course. As developed at West Point and taught within the Los Angeles Police Department and New Jersey law enforcement, the program is designed to help students retain the material and apply it daily in leadership situations. The LAPD instructors use a textbook, course guide, supplemental readings, computer-assisted instruction, a feature movie ("Glory"), numerous film clips, leadership inventory assessments, realistic case studies, and essay
examinations. Other critical elements of the learning process include group exercises, a journal in which students record relevant, real-life events, and class discussions of students' life experiences" (p. 2).

The curriculum is designed to present theory in a manner that is relevant and tangible. The case studies reflect a series of specific leadership theories in schemata that requires the student to diagnose the root cause of an organizational challenge. The diagnosis is arrived at through the application of a structured thought process through which students logically and objectively apply a rational process known as The Intellectual Procedure. The Intellectual Procedure decision making model is the first element of the program. It teaches managers to identify what is happening in a specific situation, account for it, and devise actions that respond to the situation or anticipate what will occur next. Students then use this decision making model throughout the course (p. 2)." While unique to training and education programs within law enforcement, the Intellectual Procedure is based upon well established theory and practice. In this higher order thinking process, "Meaning (the formation of schemata) is the key to problem solving, including the
ability to learn a new task (McNeil, p. 154)." Thus, this procedure requires the student to logically deduce what is happening, diagnose a root cause, and apply a relevant theory and synthesize a leader action plan. McNeil (1996) cites that:

Walter Doyle defines higher level academic tasks as tasks that require understanding rather than memory, routine, or opinion tasks. Understanding tasks are often not reduced to a predictable algorithm. For example, writing a descriptive paragraph isn’t simply following steps but using complex procedures and a high level executive process to generate a product. The student must not understand only the procedures but why they work and where they apply" (McNeil, p. 154).

It is the application of the schemata inherent within the intellectual procedure to case studies that develops the requisite problem solving and leadership skills. Thus, it is the learning of the specific leadership theories and skills combined with the learning of the higher order thinking skills that transforms the student’s knowledge of leadership. Of this McNeil wrote:
we ask questions about the best ways to teach thinking, such as "Is it better to develop within or without a domain of conventional subject matter?" At present, we will consider general guidelines for developing learning activities for problem solving and creative thinking, emphasizing processes for generating meaning rather than routine skills. We also attend to the conditions of learning that are necessary is student beliefs are to change in more fruitful directions. Transfer occurs whenever a previous learning influences the acquisition of a second learning. (p. 154)

This would seem to be particularly appropriate to adult learners, especially those with demonstrable management and leadership experience.

The course curriculum is consistent with that "developed by West Point faculty called the Model of Organizational Leadership. The four levels of analysis in this model constitute the four major study areas in the WPL&C Program: the individual, group, leadership and organizational systems." (Dinse & Sheehan, 1998, p. 2)

The utilization of "realistic case studies" is the basis for the transfer of knowledge of relevant theories
(Dinse & Sheehan, 1998, p. 2). The case studies further serve to provide the stage upon which the schemata of the intellectual procedure are processed. The development and application of case studies is well established within training and education. Robert Adlam (1998) of the Police Staff College, Bramshill, United Kingdom, writes in *Educational Action Research:*

'Developing Ethics Education for Police Leaders and Managers: Action Research and Critical Reflection for curriculum and Personal Development' referred to the value of case studies as, 'The play’s the thing'...a design making reference to the device used by Shakespeare in *Hamlet*(where there is a play within the play). Plays can reveal truths but in a way that is slightly distanced from actual threatening reality. (p. 144)

A case study is in essence a play upon which the theories, the situational variable and the students act. In the same article, Adlam writes of the use of “active rather than the passive” process of teaching and learning (p. 137). He quotes Freire as follows:

Indeed the content—its quality as cognoscible object to be recognized by the educator while teaching it to
the educand, who in turn comprehends it only, by apprehending it—cannot simply be transferred from the educator to the educand, simply deposited in the educand by the educator. (p. 137)

Adlam has established that the transfer of knowledge is best facilitated through the application of active methodologies. Among the active methods discussed by Adlam are the utilization of movies such as "Bridge on the River Kwai" or "A Man for All Seasons" or even "Mutiny on the Bounty" (p. 141)." These movies which are utilized with the WPLC Program serve as case studies that Adlam views as "satisfying," 'pleasing' or 'placating' to the participants" (p. 141).

Thus, "A case study emphasis—looking dispassionately at what is 'going on' (p.118)" whether it be in written, video or other form—serves to enhance a "positive learning" experience (p. 142).

Adlam's writing was specific about the utilization of case studies within the narrow frame of law enforcement training and education. Therefore, it is appropriate to review more mainstream literature relevant to this teaching methodology. Gary Dessler (2003) wrote in the ninth edition of Human Resource Management that the case study
method is simply, "A development method in which the manager is presented with a written description of an organizational problem to diagnose and solve (p. 206)." He further writes:

the case study method presents a trainee with a written description of an organizational problem. The person then analyzes the case, diagnoses the problem, and presents his or her findings and solutions in a discussion with other trainees. Integrated case scenarios expand the case analysis concept by creating comprehensive case situations. (p. 207)

The "integrated case scenarios" are utilized within the WPLC Program. The scope and depth of the case studies increase through each topical area. The final case studies, known as "Putting It All Together," as well as the final exam are cumulative "integrated case studies" designed to challenge the student's integrative knowledge.

The use of case studies specifically relevant to leadership development and education is discussed by Cary Yuki (1998) in Leadership in Organizations where he writes that:

Cases are descriptions of events in an organization. There are many types of cases, ranging from long,
detailed descriptions of events that occurred over a period of several years in an organization to brief descriptions of specific incidents in the life of a leader. Most cases are based on actual events, although sometimes a case is modified to make it more useful for teaching. (p. 477)

Although Yukl writes of the effectiveness of case studies for management and leadership training he clarifies that:

Research on the effectiveness of using cases for leadership training is still very limited. The following guidelines for trainers summarize prevailing opinions about conditions likely to facilitate learning.

Clarify expectations for trainees. Explain the purpose of the case, how it will be used, and what trainees are expected to do.

Ask questions to encourage and facilitate participation in the discussion. Be receptive to alternative viewpoints, and avoid dominating the discussion.

Emphasize the complexity of problems and the desirability of identifying alternative remedies. Use
different diagnoses as an opportunity to demonstrate how people approach a problem with different assumptions, biases, and priorities. Have trainees relate the case to their work experience. Discussing examples of similar situations they have experienced reduces dependence on the case to provide insight and provoke thought. Vary the composition of discussion groups to expose trainees to different points of view. (p. 472)

The WPLAC Program's designed and intended utilization of case studies is consistent with these guidelines. Case studies are initially processed as homework followed by group discussion and review within class. This is subsequently followed with a discussion by the entire class. Through the instructor's facilitation of this process, a group synthesis evolves. From a similar perspective, case studies are discussed relative to leadership training programs as focusing on:

developing supervisory skills such as training, monitoring, giving feedback, and conducting performance reviews with subordinates. Generally, these programs use lectures, case studies, and role playing exercises to improve leadership skills. Case
studies consist of descriptions of various leadership situations and are used as a vehicle for leadership discussion. (McNeil, 1996, pp. 152-153)

Theories relevant to each of the four systems are taught through readings and lecture. Each theory is reinforced through the theory's application within a case study. The Individual System is prefaced upon the course goal of teaching that:

leadership is the process of influencing human behavior so as to accomplish organizational goals. Inherent in this definition is a leader's responsibility to be mindful of the emotional and human needs of subordinates. The course reminds students that each person who joins a law enforcement organization brings a unique set of talents, skills, needs, and limitations. (Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2005, p. 2)

In a speech to the West Point Corps of Cadets, General H. Norman Schwarzkopf (as cited in Dinse & Sheehan, 1998) spoke of the importance of the individual system:

I have seen competent leaders who stood in front of a platoon and all they saw was a platoon. But great leaders stand in front of a platoon and see 44
individuals, each of whom has aspirations, each of whom wants to live, each of whom wants to do good.

(p. 20)

The Group System is designed to equip students with knowledge relevant to cohesion, socialization of subordinates, group development, group decision making and inter-group conflict. This section builds upon the theories discussed within the individual system. Group dynamics are critical within law enforcement organizations as it is the cohesion with these very units that will determine an organization's success or failure. The socialization into the organization and its inherent groups will likely determine the ethics and culture of the organizational system. This section, like the Individual System, will equip the leader with skills that will enable him/her to better comprehend follower needs and behaviors.

Within the Leadership System, students will study leader behaviors and performance. They will also learn to assess the dynamics that develop between leaders and followers. The nature of the task, the ability of the subordinates to complete that task and leader's choice of leadership style are discussed. Transformational leadership theory is the culminating theory of this section. This
theory is perhaps the most critical and dramatic of the course as:

transformational leadership, reveals how and when leaders can get subordinates to transcend their self-interest for the sake of the leader, the team or the organization. This powerful theory shows how exceptional performance can stem from the workers' internalization of organizational goals, rather than from the mere appeal of rewards or fear of punishment.

(Dinse & Sheehan, 1998, p.20)

It is from the application of transformational leadership theories that true organizational change will arise.

Within the Organizational System, students are taught to understand the global system within which they lead.

Within this section:

Instructors describe the police department as a complex set of structural, technical, psychosocial, and other components that contribute to the overall environment. These components include, for example, the equipment and tools of the trade, the knowledge needed to provide professional service, and the relationships between supervisors and first-line employees. Students discover the interdependence of
various aspects of the department. They learn that changes in any of the components will affect every person and group in the agency, as well as the ways leaders interact with them. Next, the students discuss the LAPD’s organizational environment. This new perspective provides them with skills and strategies for using and valuing the suggestions of concerned stakeholders, such as politicians, employee organizations, and community activists, without surrendering the department’s basic mission. (Dinse & Sheehan, 1998, p. 22)

It is through the progression of these systems that WPL&G students learn to lead their respective organizations or organizational components. The exposure to theory and the application of the Intellectual Procedure serve to transform the students’ understanding of leadership. The application of leadership training and education is an appropriate method for developing organizational leaders. Accordingly, in a major review of the effectiveness of managerial training programs, Burkó and Day (1986) found that “educational programs generally had a positive effect on leadership development. Thus, formal education and training programs can help one become a better leader”
Gary Yukl (1998) wrote in *Leadership in Organizations* that, "the field of leadership is still in a state of ferment, with many continuing controversies about conceptual and methodological issues" (p. xi). Yukl’s perception of "ferment" is evident within the literature base particularly as that base is narrowed to the evaluation of the effectiveness of a specific program. Instructional techniques are as varied as the programs themselves.

A large variety of training methods have been used successfully for leadership training (Bass, 1990; Burke & Day, 1986; Latham, 1988; Tetrault, Schriesheim, & Neider, 1988). Lectures, demonstrations, procedural manuals, videotapes, equipment simulators, and interactive computer tutorials are used to learn technical skills. Lectures, case discussion, videotapes, role playing, and group exercises are used to learn interpersonal skills. Three techniques widely used for leadership training are behavioral role modeling, cases, and large-scale simulations. (p. 470)
In *Primal Leadership: Realizing the Power of Emotional Intelligence*, Soreman, Boyatzis, and McKeen (2002) write that:

Although it may seem that leaders in our examples were "born" because they acquired leadership strengths tacitly and mostly invisibly, neither was born knowing how to lead a team or develop strengths in others. They learned how. Great leaders, the research shows, are made as they gradually acquire, in the course of their lives and careers, the competencies that make them so effective. The competencies can be learned by any leader at any point. The challenge of mastering leadership is a skill like any other, such as improving your golf or learning to play slide guitar. Anyone who has the will and motivation can get better at leading, once he understands the steps. (p. 101)

Thus, it becomes apparent that leadership is not an inherent trait, that it can develop and that it can be learned. While the emotional characteristics of leaders and leadership may not be directly influenced by training or education, it is clear that "mastering leadership is a skill" (p. 101). The skills identified through research and
through historic writing are therefore teachable and learnable. Warren Bennis, in *On Becoming a Leader* (1989), wrote “that leaders are made, not born and made more by themselves than by external means” (p. 5). Later within this same work, Warren Bennis articulated the manner in which leaders evolve as:

I would argue that more leaders have been made by accident, circumstance, sheer grit, or will than have been made by all the leadership classes put together. Leadership courses can only teach skills. They can’t teach character or vision—and indeed they don’t even try. (p. 42)

While the requisite skills can be taught, matters of character and emotional intelligence are beyond the scope of leadership training. Thus while leadership training and education may have inherent limits regarding matters of character, life experience and emotional intelligence, they remain effective for matters of skill development. It is the synthesis of life experience, intellect and emotional intelligence combined with education and training that will shape leaders. As Bennis (1989) wrote:

Managerial skills can, of course, be taught. And they are useful skills for leaders to have. The ingredients
of leadership cannot be taught; however, they can be learned. As CalFed CEO Robert Dockson put it, "The things that matter cannot be taught in a formal setting. Walter Wriston at Citicorp and A.P. Giannini at the Bank of America weren't technicians. They were men of vision. They knew what they wanted to do and where they wanted to take their companies." Since by definition each leader is unique, what he learns and how he uses it to shape the future is unique to him, too. (p. 73)

In his 1992 Message to the Corps (as cited in New Jersey Association of Chiefs of Police, 1994), Schwarzkopf corroborated:

Competence and character. That's what you must have. That's what you are going to carry with you from West Point. Those of you who really believe what you are learning here. To hell with the cynics. Believe it! Believe it! Believe it! You must believe it if you are going to be a leader of the 21st century military. You must believe it. (p. 113)
Chapter III

DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this research was to study the relationship between completion of the West Point Leadership and Command Program (WPL&C) and the graduate’s perception of his/her leadership skills subsequent to graduation. Additionally, this research sought to determine the graduate’s perception of the influence of the West Point Leadership and Command Program upon their ability to meet leadership challenges related to the attacks of September 11, 2001. Implicit in this research were questions about how leadership may be taught and learned. Lastly, this research sought the graduate’s perception of course pedagogy and related matters. The effectiveness of the program was the prime focus of this research. A review of the relevant literature and the West Point Leadership and Command curriculum was provided in Chapter II of this research.
This research was significant since opportunities and threats have challenged public sector leadership in ways unparalleled within American history. The evolution of law enforcement leadership and the demands of a post September 11 environment have placed law enforcement at the fulcrum of international events. Leadership was required to change the course of organizations, their missions and their cultures. Leaders of police organizations were required to adapt their mission statements, policies, training and priorities. It was these leaders who were required to make their communities safer as they must protect the constitutional rights of all. This very delicate balancing act required that these leaders were well trained in the science of leadership. Additionally, the effectiveness of the West Point Leadership and Command Program needed to be measured as tax dollars were used to fund the training program. Fundamentally, the program's effectiveness was and continues to be a matter of public trust, and thus, worthy of research.

This chapter discusses a variety of dimensions relative to the design and methodologies applied. Among these dimensions were the study's subjects, sources, conduct of and data collection techniques. The primary
research focus of this study was a survey instrument designed to capture quantitative data. The survey was applied to the entire population of 70 graduates. The survey was composed of six questions with a Likert Scale for respondent’s answers. The survey included a Demographic Survey Form designed to capture relevant characteristic based information about the respondents. Subsequent to the application, return, and analysis of the completed survey, 10 respondents who expressed a willingness to participate in an interview were interviewed. The interview was designed to capture qualitative data that enhanced the depth and richness of the respondent’s experience. The utilization of a hybrid design comprised of quantitative and qualitative instruments was an optimal means to measure the graduates’ perceptions of their exposure to the WPL&C curriculum.

Subjects of the Study

This study focused upon and was limited to the population of WPL&C graduates who completed the program in or between the years 1994 and 2000. This population was further limited to those graduates attending during those years who were members of municipal or county law enforcement organizations within Morris County. Through
the years of 1994 and 2000 Morris County had 39 municipal police departments as well as the Morris County Sheriff’s Department, Morris County Park Police, and the Morris County Prosecutor’s Office. Between 1994 and 2000, 70 officers from these various agencies throughout Morris County graduated from the WPL&C Program. The graduates’ departments represented a cross section of organizational missions, organization size and organizational structure within Morris County. Rank distribution was as follows: detective - 1, Sergeant - 31, Lieutenant - 20, Captain - 3, and chief - 15 (see Table 1).

Selection for attendance to the WPL&C Program varied among agencies. Each agency nominated personnel, facilitated departmental approval of the application and submitted it to the New Jersey State Association of Chiefs of Police (NJSACP). The NJSACP reviewed applications and selected nominees in an equitable manner. There were no set minimum educational standards for prospective students. The New Jersey State Police selected personnel to attend by means specific to their organizational needs and policies. As the New Jersey State Police entry requirement differed from that applied to the general student population, their candidates were excluded from the study.
The population of graduates within these temporal parameters (1994-2000) and geographic jurisdiction (Morris County) was 70 (N=70). Due to the quantity of this population, there was no random sampling as the entire population was invited to participate in the quantitative portion of this study. However, only 10 of the respondents who expressed a willingness to participate in the qualitative portion of the study were interviewed.

From 1994 through 2000 the graduates of the WPL&C Program as conducted within the north region experienced the original core curriculum and schemata as developed within the United States Military Academy Department of Behavioral Science and Leadership (1998) at West Point. Additionally, through this time period these graduates were exposed only to those instructors chosen and trained at West Point in the Behavioral Science and Leadership Faculty Development Programs in 1993 and 1994. Subsequent to this time period various changes in curriculum, schemata, and faculty evolved away from the core program. The mission of the sending organizations from throughout Morris County was reasonably homogenous and consistent through these years. Through the 1990s all of these organizations were experiencing a cultural shift towards community policing.
These years were relatively copasetic for law enforcement organizations throughout Morris County. Many of these organizations shared relatively similar organizational culture, history, mission, and leadership. The attacks of September 11th 2001 changed these organizational missions and impacted many of them in different ways. The years of 1994 through 2000 provided a relatively stable "snapshot" of life within Morris County law enforcement. It was within this stable, pre-September 11 environment that this study sought to measure the effectiveness of the WPL&C Program independent of the multiplicity of variables arising in a post September 11th environment.

From 1994 through 2000 the WPL&C Program was administered each spring and fall. Through these years most of the north section classes were held at the Morris County Police Academy. One session was conducted at the Bergen County Police Academy and one at the Union County Police Academy. While these sessions drew students from throughout northern New Jersey, most of the students attending each session were from law enforcement organizations in Morris County. Although members of the New Jersey State Police attended these sessions they were excluded from the survey population as they were beyond the scope of this research,
Additionally, the organizational culture, mission, and leadership of the New Jersey State Police were substantially different from that of Morris County law enforcement. Each class was comprised of 15 students who attended the 14 week program. The program met each Wednesday from 0830 through 1630 hours. Four case study based examinations, including the final exam were held on Fridays. The students within these sessions were exposed to the same curriculum, teaching methodologies, and examinations. Their experience with the program was therefore reasonably uniform, thus minimizing variables.

Materials

Due to the hybrid nature of the research design, both quantitative and qualitative instruments were utilized through this research. Quantitative surveys were applied to collect data relevant to the demographic characteristics of the respondents. Subsequently, a quantitative survey was mailed to the departmental addresses of each graduate as defined by the temporal and jurisdictional parameters. A qualitative instrument, in the form of an in person interview, was applied to 10 of the respondents who responded affirmatively to an opportunity for an interview. An audio tape recording was made of each interview.
subsequent to obtaining the interviewees' permission to record the interview. Each recording was transcribed and is contained within Chapter IV of this research. Additionally, copies of the Demographic Survey Form (DSF), the quantitative survey and the qualitative interview questions are provided within Appendices A, B, and C, respectively. The survey and interviews were conducted in a manner approved by the Seton Hall Institutional Review Board.

Design of the Study

The subject population was informed of this research project by a formal letter of introduction mailed to their department of record. The letter of introduction invited their voluntary participation and served to explain the nature of the research and to orient the subjects to the subsequent application of quantitative and qualitative instruments. A copy of the letter of introduction is contained in Appendix D. Along with letter of introduction, the packet contained a Demographic Survey Form (see Appendix A), an Interview Interest Form (see Appendix D), and an addressed, postage-paid return envelope. Also included was the quantitative survey instrument composed of 11 questions. Respondents who were interested in
participating were provided with the opportunity to simply return the Interview Interest Form in the envelope provided separately. Of those graduates who returned the Interview Interest Form, 10 were randomly selected and scheduled for an interview.

The data and finding of the quantitative survey and the qualitative interviews are discussed, described, and summarized within Chapter IV of this research. As discussed previously within this research, the qualitative research was designed and intended to enhance the quantitative survey. Consistent with the hybrid design, neither the quantitative nor the qualitative dimensions of this research were intended to stand alone. Each of the interviews was recorded and conducted at a public or professional location chosen by the interviewee. To ensure objective responses, each interview subject’s identity is known only to the researcher. Further, the interview subjects were not aware of the identity of others participating in the study.

The Data Collection Process

The application of the quantitative instrument and the subsequent collection of data began on January 11, 2007 and were completed on February 12, 2007. On January 12, 2007,
each member of the identified population of 70 was mailed a letter of introduction, an Interview Interest Form, a Demographic Survey Form, and a quantitative survey instrument. These materials were mailed to each graduate’s departmental address of record as it was memorialized at the time of their attendance. Departmental addresses rather than home addresses were utilized to ensure the privacy and security of this information. The utilization and dissemination of residential information is always a sensitive issue within the law enforcement community, and, as such, was an issue best avoided. To facilitate the timely return of the information, two self-addressed, stamped envelopes were provided. The return envelopes were addressed to this researcher at a post office box in Rockaway, New Jersey.

A list of graduates has been maintained by this researcher since 1994. This list served as the source from which graduates of the program from Morris County law enforcement organizations attending between 1994 and 2000 were identified. A master list of the 70 graduates identified as relevant to this study was created. The master list, as well as returned Interview Interest Forms and Demographic Survey Forms, were secured and filed in
this researcher's private office. Surveys that were completed and returned were reviewed, processed and secured separately within the same office.

The total number of respondents to the mailings equaled 22, or 31% of the 70 surveys mailed. Therefore, n=22 served as the base number of respondents participating in the research. Additionally n=22 served as the basis for all subsequent calculations throughout this research.

Selection of Subjects For Interview

The random selection of subjects for the interview was conducted from those respondents who expressed a willingness to participate in the qualitative interviews. The entire population of seventy (N=70) was afforded equal opportunity to indicate a willingness to participate in the qualitative interviews. Of those respondents who indicated such willingness (16), 10 were interviewed. Thus, 62.5% of those willing to participate in the qualitative interviews were interviewed. Ultimately, 10 subjects were interviewed.

It should be noted that 100% of the subject population were subjected to the quantitative surveys, and 62.5% of those willing to participate in the qualitative portion of the research were, in fact, interviewed.
Interview Procedures

Within 1 week of receipt and analysis of returned surveys from the second mailing, 10 respondents indicating an affirmative response to the opportunity for an interview were randomly selected and contacted. Each was provided with the opportunity to chose a time and place for the interview that was most convenient and comfortable for him. The only limitation was that all interviews were conducted within a public or professional environment during the normal business hours. Privacy was ensured and was a major consideration in site selection. Interview participants were advised that the interview was to be recorded and each granted permission for recording. An audio tape recorder was utilized.

Immediately prior to the start of the interview, each participant signed the Informed Consent Form. Additionally, the respondent was asked if he were comfortable and if he had any questions about the process. All indicated that they were and that they were willing to continue. Present for the individual's review, to refresh his memory, was a copy of the WPL&C Student Handbook (New Jersey State Association of Chiefs of Police, 1994) and the text Leadership in Organizations (United States Military
Academy Department of Behavioral Science and Leadership, 1998). These also ensured an understanding of common terms and course content. The respondents were provided with a copy of the interview questions. Each respondent was provided with time to review these questions prior to initiation of the taped interview.

The interview procedure began with this researcher stating that the tape was on, followed by the date, time, place, and purpose. Prior to the application of the first substantive question, the respondent was presented with his original Informed Consent Form. The form was reviewed with each respondent, and each acknowledged that the signature was in fact his own and each acknowledged understanding and agreement with the form’s content. Each respondent was advised that if he so desired, he would be provided with a digital copy or a transcribed copy of his interview.

**Interview Questions**

Each question was designed to capture qualitative dimensions of the respondent’s perception of his WFL&C experience. Each was designed to ensure understanding, comfort and clarity for the respondent.
Six open-ended questions were presented, several of which had subsidiary questions. The original interview questions are contained within Appendix C.

Upon conclusion of these questions, this researcher asked if there were anything else that he would like to discuss, clarify or ask.

Data Analysis

Each interview was professionally transcribed. Each transcription was reviewed by this researcher and analyzed for content. Each transcript was also assessed for dimensions and characteristics beyond those elucidated through analysis. The synthesis of the responses that were memorialized within the transcripts yielded patterns of perceptions beyond those obtained through the quantitative instrument. This synthesis served to better frame the respondents' perceptions of their WPL&C Program experience.

The responses obtained through the quantitative and qualitative instruments served to provide meaningful scientific feedback on the strengths and weaknesses of the program. This feedback being historic, if not longitudinal, served to measure the true impact of the WPL&C Program across years and, more important, through the unique organizational stressors of the attacks of September
11, 2001. As such, this research may facilitate adjustments to course design, curriculum, and pedagogy. It also served to assess the course's value to public sector leadership and the justification for the expenditure of public funds.

Quantitative data gathered through this research is presented in Table 2 through Table 27 within Chapter IV of this research. Qualitative data is presented within Chapter IV, and responses are linked to relevant research questions.

Summary

All of the subjects surveyed were graduates of the WPL6C Program who attended the program from Morris County law enforcement agencies between 1994 - 2000. The entire population of those conforming to this criteria (N=70) were mailed a quantitative survey instrument. Each graduate receiving a survey was afforded an opportunity to indicate willingness to participate in a subsequent qualitative interview. Sixty-three percent of those who expressed an interest in participating in an interview were interviewed. Of a survey return of 22, 16 indicated an interest in being interviewed; of these, 10 were interviewed. Materials that were utilized through this application were those surveys and interview questions previously enumerated, the
Demographic Survey Form (DSF), copies of Informed Consent Forms, copies of the WPL&C Student Handbook and an audio tape recorder.
Chapter IV

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

Introduction

The purpose of this research was to study the relationship between completion of the West Point Leadership and Command Program and the graduate’s perception of his/her leadership skills subsequent to graduation. Additionally, this research sought to determine the graduate’s perception of the influence of the West Point Leadership and Command Program upon their ability to meet leadership challenges related to the attacks of September 11, 2001. Implicit in this research were questions about how leadership may be taught and learned. Lastly, this research sought the graduate’s perception of course pedagogy and related matters. The effectiveness of the program was the prime focus of this research. This chapter shall serve to articulate the implications of this study’s finding. Additionally qualitative findings will be summarized. Of an original population of 70, 22 respondents agreed to participate in the study. Subsequent to 2
mailings, the total of 22 responses, including returned surveys and Demographic Survey Forms, became the study population, n=22. Within these returns were 16 completed Interview Interest Forms. Ten of these were selected through the use of random number tables for interviews. The interview population was, therefore, n=10.

The analysis of collected data was conducted through a variety of traditional statistical instruments. Quantitative data were subjected to analysis of simple statistics, Pearson Correlation Coefficients, Cronbach Coefficient Alpha and Factor Analysis with Deleted Variable. Qualitative data were subsequently analyzed and linked to quantitative findings. Quantitative and qualitative findings are summarized throughout this chapter. Transcribed interviews are also included within this Chapter.
## Table 2

**Frequency Distribution of Respondents' Age**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent Age</th>
<th>Observed Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 22*
### Table 3

**Frequency Distribution of Respondents’ Age Intervals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent Age</th>
<th>Observed Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38-42</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43-47</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48-52</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53-56</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(n = 22\)

\(\text{range} = 18\)

\(M = 46.63\)

\(Md = 46\)

Modal interval = 43 - 47

---

**Note.** Table 2 and Table 3 represent the age data of the quantitative survey respondents as gathered by the DSF instrument. Mean, median and modal interval values deviate slightly indicating a balanced distribution resembling the standard normal curve.
Table 4

Frequency of Respondents' Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White/Caucasian</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 22 One hundred percent of the respondents identified themselves as White or Caucasian.

Table 5

Frequency of Respondents' Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 22. All respondents of the sample population were male. One member of the original study population (70 graduates) was female (0.01%), who chose not to participate.
Table 6

Frequency of Respondents' Agency Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Size</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.  N = 22
### Table 7

**Frequency of Respondents’ Agency Type**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Type</th>
<th>Observed Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Municipal</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>86.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Police</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheriff’s Office</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosecutor’s Office</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** 86.4% of the participants in this study were employed by municipal police agencies; 13.6% were employed by county agencies.

### Table 8

**Frequency of Respondents’ Rank at Time of WPL& C Program**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Observed Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sergeant</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>57.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detective</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** *N = 21.* Of the twenty-two possible responses, one was missing.
Table 9

Frequency of Respondents’ Current Rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Frequency Observed</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>47.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sergeant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detective</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 21. Data collected from each respondent as to "active service or retired" is presented in Table 10. However, one respondent indicated "retired" in reference to his present rank.

Table 10

Frequency of Respondents’ Service Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Frequency Observed</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>76.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 21
Table 11

Frequency of Respondents' Years in Law Enforcement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Frequency Observed</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 22. 54.55% of the respondents reported 25 years or less of service; the remaining respondents indicated 27 years of more.
Table 12

Frequency of Respondents' Years of Supervisory Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Frequency Observed</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 22.
Table 13

*Frequency of Respondents’ Level of Education*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Frequency Observed</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA/AS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA/BS</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA/MS/MAAS</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. 50% of respondents reported possession of a Master’s degree; 31.82% received a Bachelor’s; 13.64% attended college or received an Associate’s degree; 4.55% reported Certified Public Manager (other).
Table 14

Frequency Distribution of Responses to Question 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Observed Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>40.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>54.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Question one was "The WPL&C Program enhanced my leadership skills, knowledge and abilities." None of the respondents disagreed with this statement; 95.45% agreed with statement, and of that group, 54.55% strongly agreed.
Table 15

Frequency Distribution of Responses to Question 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Observed Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>54.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The utilization of a case study driven curriculum enhanced my ability to learn leadership. 90.91% agreed with the statement, and of that group, 54.55% strongly agreed; 9.09% were neutral.
Table 16

Frequency Distribution of Responses to Question 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Observed Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>59.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The application of the "Intellectual Procedure" to leadership case studies aided my learning of leadership theories. One person (4.55%) disagreed; 9.09% were neutral; 86.36% (27.27% strongly) agreed.
Table 17

Frequency Distribution of Responses to Question 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Observed Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>40.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>40.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. As a result of completing the WPLAC Program, I believe that leadership can be effectively taught as a science. While 4.55% strongly disagreed and another 4.55% disagreed, 9.09% responded neutrally; the remaining 81.82% was equally split between "agree" and "strongly agree."
Table 18

**Frequency Distribution of Responses to Question 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Observed Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Prior to completing the WPL&C Program, I believed that leaders were born not made. 18.18% strongly disagreed; 22.73% disagreed; 27.27% responded neutrally; 13.04% agreed; 18.18% strongly agreed. This statement invoked the greatest variance among the participants.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Observed Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** The WPL&C program enabled me to more effectively compete for promotions. 13.64% of the respondents disagreed; 72.72% agreed (27.27 strongly); 27.27% remained neutral.
Table 20

Frequency Distribution of Responses to Question 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Observed Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>40.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: My leadership performance improved significantly as a result of leadership lessons learned in the WPLAC Program. One participant (4.55%) disagreed; 18.18% reported "neutral." 77.27% (36.36% strongly) agreed their leadership performance improved as a result of the WPLAC Program.
Table 21

Frequency Distribution of Responses to Question 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Observed Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 20. Two respondents skipped this question. The original statement was "I would have preferred a different approach to learning leadership than the WPL&C Program's case study driven curriculum. If applicable, please explain." Responses were reversed to reflect consistency of presentation of the data. 80% agreed with the WPL&C Program's case study driven curriculum approach; of that group, 50% strongly agreed; 20% were neutral.
Table 22

*Frequency Distribution of Responses to Question 9*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Observed Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The quality of the instructional staff enhanced the effectiveness of the course.

Table 23

*Frequency Distribution of Responses to Question 10*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Observed Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The assigned text, *Leadership in Organizations*, served to enhance the effectiveness of the WPL&C curriculum.
Table 24

*Frequency Distribution of Responses to Question 11*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Observed Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* As a result my completion of the WPL&C Program, I was better able to meet the leadership challenges affecting my agency on and arising from the attacks of September 11, 2001.
Table 25

Pearson Correlation Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.47502</td>
<td>0.42487</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.6255</td>
<td>0.0487</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.7981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>0.47502</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.48161</td>
<td>0.33925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0255</td>
<td>0.0232</td>
<td>0.0232</td>
<td>0.1225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>0.42487</td>
<td>0.48161</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.34670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0487</td>
<td>0.0232</td>
<td>0.1138</td>
<td>0.1138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>0.00600</td>
<td>0.33925</td>
<td>0.34670</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.0060</td>
<td>0.1225</td>
<td>0.1138</td>
<td>0.5825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>-0.05787</td>
<td>-0.31392</td>
<td>0.00638</td>
<td>-0.12398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.7981</td>
<td>0.1548</td>
<td>0.9705</td>
<td>0.5825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6</td>
<td>-0.12070</td>
<td>-0.26062</td>
<td>0.29980</td>
<td>0.32840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.5926</td>
<td>0.2414</td>
<td>0.3487</td>
<td>0.1357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7</td>
<td>0.18362</td>
<td>0.17098</td>
<td>0.49867</td>
<td>0.66886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.4134</td>
<td>0.4466</td>
<td>0.0182</td>
<td>0.0026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8</td>
<td>0.14118</td>
<td>0.25093</td>
<td>-0.02596</td>
<td>-0.01793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.5527</td>
<td>0.2859</td>
<td>0.9135</td>
<td>0.9402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>0.06000</td>
<td>0.23982</td>
<td>0.19951</td>
<td>0.32441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.0600</td>
<td>0.0314</td>
<td>0.3758</td>
<td>0.1403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Q4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10</td>
<td>0.94093</td>
<td>-0.23822</td>
<td>-0.19886</td>
<td>-0.14608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.3284</td>
<td>0.2857</td>
<td>0.3750</td>
<td>0.5341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11</td>
<td>0.03841</td>
<td>0.16173</td>
<td>0.44510</td>
<td>0.61530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.8652</td>
<td>0.4721</td>
<td>0.0379</td>
<td>0.0379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q5</th>
<th>Q6</th>
<th>Q7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>-0.05787</td>
<td>-0.12070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.7981</td>
<td>0.5926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>-0.31392</td>
<td>-0.26062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.1548</td>
<td>0.2414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>0.00838</td>
<td>0.20989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.9705</td>
<td>0.3487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>-0.12398</td>
<td>0.32840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.5825</td>
<td>0.1357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.16509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.4628</td>
<td>0.1967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6</td>
<td>0.16509</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.4628</td>
<td>0.0057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7</td>
<td>0.28616</td>
<td>0.56921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.1967</td>
<td>0.0057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8</td>
<td>-0.06296</td>
<td>-0.25894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.7920</td>
<td>0.2703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>Q6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>0.22495</td>
<td>0.07219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.3142</td>
<td>0.7495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10</td>
<td>0.32115</td>
<td>0.25558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.1450</td>
<td>0.2510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11</td>
<td>0.19096</td>
<td>0.53742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.3946</td>
<td>0.0099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q8</th>
<th>Q9</th>
<th>Q10</th>
<th>Q11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>0.14118</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.04903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.5527</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.1284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>0.25993</td>
<td>0.23082</td>
<td>-0.23822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.2859</td>
<td>0.3014</td>
<td>0.2857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>-0.02596</td>
<td>0.19851</td>
<td>-0.1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.9235</td>
<td>0.3758</td>
<td>0.3750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>-0.01733</td>
<td>0.32441</td>
<td>-0.14008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.9402</td>
<td>0.1408</td>
<td>0.5341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>-0.06296</td>
<td>0.22495</td>
<td>0.32115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.7920</td>
<td>0.3142</td>
<td>0.1450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6</td>
<td>-0.25894</td>
<td>0.07219</td>
<td>0.25558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.2703</td>
<td>0.7495</td>
<td>0.2510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7</td>
<td>0.05193</td>
<td>0.69609</td>
<td>0.09822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.8282</td>
<td>0.6706</td>
<td>0.6637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8</td>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>Q10</td>
<td>Q11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.16747</td>
<td>-0.09696</td>
<td>0.01244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.4863</td>
<td>0.6841</td>
<td>0.0365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>0.16747</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.22727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.4863</td>
<td>0.3091</td>
<td>0.5612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10</td>
<td>-0.09696</td>
<td>0.22727</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.6843</td>
<td>0.3091</td>
<td>0.5612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11</td>
<td>0.01244</td>
<td>0.44797</td>
<td>0.13099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.9585</td>
<td>0.9585</td>
<td>0.0365</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Significant correlation is indicated by $|r|<0.05$.

Therefore, significant correlation is indicated in
questions 1 and 2; questions 1 and 3; questions 2 and 3;
questions 3 and 7; questions 3 and 11; questions 4 and 7;
questions 4 and 11; questions 6 and 7; questions 6 and 11;
questions 7 and 11; questions 9 and 11. The greatest
significance ($p<0.0001$) is observed in the correlation
between questions 7 and 11. The participants strongly
perceived a direct link between the WPLAC Program’s
effectiveness in improving their leadership performance and
their ability to meet the leadership challenges of and
Table 26

Factor Procedure: Eigenvalues of the Correlation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.37558558</td>
<td>1.27685589</td>
<td>0.3069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.09872969</td>
<td>0.80316898</td>
<td>0.1908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.29550671</td>
<td>0.1175156</td>
<td>0.1178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.17796915</td>
<td>0.31758598</td>
<td>0.1071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.86038317</td>
<td>0.0289625</td>
<td>0.0892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.83128693</td>
<td>0.33292014</td>
<td>0.0756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.49836677</td>
<td>0.16262161</td>
<td>0.0453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.33574517</td>
<td>0.08795801</td>
<td>0.0305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.24778716</td>
<td>0.04168481</td>
<td>0.0225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.20610235</td>
<td>0.13361903</td>
<td>0.0187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.07248333</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 27

Factor Pattern

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.17613</td>
<td>0.55276</td>
<td>0.63412</td>
<td>0.34664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.25444</td>
<td>0.85797</td>
<td>-0.03736</td>
<td>0.04315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.60754</td>
<td>0.44792</td>
<td>0.08772</td>
<td>0.34962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.69799</td>
<td>0.17381</td>
<td>-0.53139</td>
<td>-0.02850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.36675</td>
<td>-0.38055</td>
<td>0.56023</td>
<td>-0.20085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.61365</td>
<td>-0.53402</td>
<td>-0.13921</td>
<td>0.27001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.86919</td>
<td>-0.38600</td>
<td>0.02742</td>
<td>0.16407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.00446</td>
<td>-0.45145</td>
<td>-0.14316</td>
<td>0.56930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.50842</td>
<td>0.14145</td>
<td>0.02007</td>
<td>-0.66032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.31295</td>
<td>-0.40120</td>
<td>0.54874</td>
<td>-0.09233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.89473</td>
<td>-0.12255</td>
<td>-0.09806</td>
<td>-0.15379</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NOTE. Factor analysis was conducted to breakdown the results of the correlation table. This data reduction technique reduced the set of 11 variables to 4 factors. The four factors were retained by the MINEIGEN criterion which produced results for eigenvalues greater than 1.0. Tables 26 and 27 numerically report the results of the factor analysis.

For each factor, the responses for the highest loading questions were analyzed and interpreted for better understanding of the complete correlation matrix (see Tables 26 & 27). Factor one most strongly tapped questions 3, 4, 6, 7 and 11, respectively. These questions centered on the learning through Intellectual Procedure, learning leadership, leadership learning as a science, increase of promotions, improved leadership performance and preparedness for September 11, 2001. This response pattern directly relates to hypotheses a, b, and d: their exposure to the WFLG C curriculum has affected their perception of the ability to learn to lead, has affected the graduate's perception of his enhanced leadership skills, knowledge and abilities, and the application of the “intellectual procedure” was effective. This first factor can best be
described as "learned leadership and application of the WPL&C Program." Note the factor loadings for these items and see how the loadings for these items are the highest in the Factor 1 set.

Factor 2 most strongly tapped questions 1, 2, and 3. These questions centered on the graduates' perception of the WPL&C Program enhancing their leadership skills, knowledge and abilities and the utilization of the case study driven curriculum and the Intellectual Procedure, respectively, enhancing their learning. The second factor can best be described as "the WPL&C Program's curriculum." Note the factor loadings for these items and see how the loadings for these items are the highest in the Factor 2 set.

Factor 3 tapped questions 1, 5, and 10: graduates responded affirmatively that their exposure to the WPL&C Program enhanced their leadership skills and abilities; prior to the program, they believed leaders were born not made; the use of the textbook Leadership in Organizations enhanced the effectiveness of the Program. Factor 3 can best be described as "the transformation of leaders through the Program." Note the factor loadings for these items are the highest in the Factor 3 set.
Factor 4 tapped questions 1, 3, and 9. These questions centered on the graduates' perception of the WPL&C Program enhancing their leadership skills, knowledge and abilities; the effectiveness of the utilization of the Intellectual Procedure and the quality of the instructional staff as enhancing the course. Factor 4 can best be described as "the program's methodology and presentation." Note the factor loadings for these items are the highest in the Factor 4 set.

The factor analysis directly links the respondents' perception of the positive impact of the WPL&C Program on their leadership skills and abilities: that the program's case study driven curriculum and the Intellectual Procedure enhanced its effectiveness; that the graduates were better prepared to meet the leadership challenges of a post September 11 world.

Synopsis of Non-Demographic Survey Results

1. "The WPL&C Program enhanced my leadership skills, knowledge and abilities." None of the respondents disagreed with this statement; 95.45% agreed with the statement, and of that group, 54.55% strongly agreed.

2. The utilization of a case study driven curriculum enhanced my ability to learn leadership. 90.91% agreed with
the statement, and of that group, 54.55% strongly agreed; 9.09% were neutral.

3. The application of the Intellectual Procedure to leadership case studies aided my learning of leadership theories. One person (4.55%) disagreed; 9.09% were neutral; 96.36% (27.27% strongly) agreed.

4. As a result of completing the WPL&C Program, I believe that leadership can be effectively taught as a science. While 4.55% strongly disagreed and another 4.55% disagreed, 9.09% responded neutrally; the remaining 81.82% was equally split between "agree" and "strongly agree."

5. Prior to completing the WPL&C Program, I believed that leaders were born not made. 18.19% strongly disagreed; 22.73% disagreed; 27.27% responded neutrally; 13.64% agreed; 18.18% strongly agreed. This statement invoked the greatest variance among the participants.

6. The WPL&C Program enabled me to more effectively compete for promotions. 13.64% of the respondents disagreed; 72.72% agreed (27.27 strongly); 27.27% remained neutral.

7. My leadership performance improved significantly as a result of leadership lessons learned in the WPL&C Program. One participant (4.55%) disagreed; 18.18%
reported "neutral;" 77.27% (36.36% strongly) agreed their leadership performance improved as a result of the WPL&C Program.

8. The original statement was "I would have preferred a different approach to learning leadership than the WPL&C Program's case study driven curriculum. If applicable, please explain." N=20; two respondents skipped this question. Responses were reversed to reflect consistency of presentation of the data. Eighty percent agreed with the WPL&C Program's case study driven curriculum approach; of that group, 50% strongly agreed; 20% were neutral.

9. The quality of the instructional staff enhanced the effectiveness of the course. While 13.64% remained neutral, 86.36% agreed; of that number, 50% strongly agreed.

10. The assigned text, *Leadership in Organizations* (United States Military Academy Department of Behavioral Science and Leadership, 1988), served to enhance the effectiveness of the WPL&C Curriculum. Participants who agreed numbered 63.63% (of that number 18.18% strongly); 31.82% remained neutral; only 4.55% disagreed.

11. As a result my completion of the WPL&C Program, I was better able to meet the leadership challenges affecting my agency on and arising from the attacks of September 11,
2001. One respondent strongly disagreed (4.55%); an additional respondent disagreed (4.55%); neutral totaled 18.18%; 72.72% agreed (27.27% strongly) that the WPL&C Program enabled them to better meet the challenges of 9/11 and thereafter.

Presentation of Interviews

Respondent A

1. Prior to your completion of the WPL&C Program did you think that leadership could be learned in a classroom? On a very limited basis. I didn't think it could not, but then again, but like a lot of other people, I am a student of history. I always thought the Dwight Eisenhowers, General Pattons, General Schwarzkopf, all these people that are very successful leaders—so forth, what everybody refers to as a born leader—that's more so after attending this, completing this program that that is not the case. Some people have qualities that make them better leaders but a leader needs to be developed through training and education and work.

2. Subsequent to your completion of the WPL&C Program do you feel differently about how leadership can be learned?
Absolutely. Again, even after completing that, it gave me and others like me, the desire to even study more on our own on leadership. I started reading more books. Again, as I said before, I've always been a student of history, but I started choosing my topics a little bit more going back through the history of not only our country but the world, more so American history. I started reading biographies; I started reading books from Rudy Giuliani, his Leadership book, some of Bill Bennett's books, Colin Powell's books. I started taking people that I admire and that were proven to me, who I thought in the past, were born leaders and studied them to realize, again, how through trial and error and making mistakes, they became better leaders. Not only did I learn a great deal at the WP Program, it taught me to further educate myself.

3. Did the WPLAC Program serve to make you a better leader than you were prior to your exposure to the program's curriculum? Please explain and provide an example.

Yes, in more ways than one. I was a lieutenant, an administrator in the department when I completed the program and of all the formal education and police training I've had over my career, I think the one
program itself help me become a chief of police and to make that transition to be the leader of the organization, more than any other thing. All the other things certainly—the combination of everything certainly-helped me to make that transition to a chief.

4. What is your perception of the effectiveness of each of the following dimensions of the WPL&C Program? First one, regarding the course content: specifically the individual, group and organizational theories that were presented.

They all individually were helpful to me, but collectively, I realized even more that you can’t be a leader by yourself. You have to employ the whole organization around you, both internal and external, and what I mean by that, when you are the one dealing with other agencies, both law enforcement and non-law enforcement, you are dealing with governing bodies, politics, all different things and everyone has a different outlook and perception on how things should be done. More so, toward me the negative people have some good ideas. Just because you’re the chief or you’re the boss make all your decisions, the best decisions. Really, you employ all your resources.
Then you have to learn and this program taught you to do is to analyze and get rid of some things and keep some things and modify some things. It just taught me that the success of the leader is balance on whomever—your staff and your subordinates.

b. The next section is the "Intelectual Procedure."

It was complex when we first starting learning it. As you recall, as an instructor, everyone used to tell us that the light bulb will come on. But the first couple of weeks, it was like a foreign language. And then when the light bulb does come on, we analyze very complex situations and problems. And, just to look at, we have a problem here. It taught us, the students, to break down, to dissect, into areas of interest, problems, per se, and then prioritize those problems and even some that may on the surface look like problems, are just excess. There's nothing really to concern itself with and then break down the problem into different groups and then come up with the solution by putting the puzzle together. You have all the little pieces and when you put it all together, you have a finished product, hopefully with no little pieces left over. That's how I view it.
c. Next section of the same question: what is your perception of the effectiveness of the use of case studies in the program?

I think that was the best because case studies are real life situations, things that we deal with as leaders, things that we have dealt with or will deal with. They are not theories or somebody's personal philosophy. They're actual real problems, and even if you get a problem. I came from a rather small agency, when you look at problems that face law enforcement—whether it's a small agency or a large agency, the core problems, the core dimensions of the problem, are pretty much are genetic to everyone. It really taught you to look at the total picture is certainly important, but little latent things or things that don't hit you in the face when you first confront it, it taught you to look at things more aggressively and just try to try, to improve, in my mind, the decision making process, identify problems, diagnosis and solutions, and the good and the bad, and this just enhances, in my mind, your decision making ability, using all your available resources, meaning other people. Again, you're responsible for the final product, but there are people around you have
some ideas and thoughts that you may not have. Just because you're boss, doesn't mean your ideas are right.

5. What was the WPL4C Program's greatest strength?

I think the strength is that the classes were small, but they were people from different size agencies, a little bit different backgrounds, suburban, rural areas, and the same with the instructors. You had instructors from all different areas and environments.

I think that the greatest strength, because we didn't work as individuals, we worked as teams. The greatest strength in the whole program is to teach you that. You might sit there and you might think you're the smartest guy there, but by the end of the day, you find out you're not. We did it in small groups and then as the program advanced, the whole class advanced. You found yourself calling other students up during the week—not even from your group—and asking them, what do you think? I think the greatest strength of that program was the team effort and teaching you to really dissect things, better than a war microscopic—and the quality of the instructors—some came from city police agencies, others came from small. Again, it just wasn't one brand of instructors with one background.
6. What was the program's greatest weakness?

I don't know if this will apply for what you are trying to do, but it was very tiresome, really. And after, when I sent my subordinates, I told them you have to put other things on the back burner, in your personal life and your professional life, and that is hard to do. Little kids at home or you're in charge of a unit. I was lucky when I went, I was commander at the bureau but I had a real good deal, and I told them, I gotta throw some of this other stuff away—not that I'm not gonna do my job—but I had people pick up the weight for me. But if you are a one-man bureau or a one-man, you're a chief, then that's tough. I'd say the biggest weakness of the course is the kind of personal stress it puts on the students.

7. Now, were you in law enforcement or did you retire prior to September 11?

I was still active.

b. Now, being that you were still on the job on and immediately subsequent to September 11, 2001, do you feel that the WPL&C Program enhanced your ability to lead your organization through the phases of first
response, consequence management, and the
organizational adaptation that followed?
Absolutely, in more ways than one. I knew, as did
every other police administrator at that time knew at
that point, that our life as law enforcement officials
changed. I sent not just people in that day but a
special response, training squad operation, things of
that nature to help, but at the same time maintain the
level necessary to protect our town. There's a hospital
in town, prosecutor's office, the FBI. For a small
agency, we became actively involved. I realize and my
staff realized at that point that there were soft
targets in our town—hospital, airport, different
things, schools, that from this point on our life that
we'd known as law enforcement was going to change. We
started adapting to that change right away by assisting
other agencies, training with different resources,
being more tactical, things of that nature.

8. What recommendations would you make to enhance the
quality and effectiveness of the WPL&C Program?
That's difficult, because I went through—I was only the
second class-1994, I know the program has changed—
academics, more towards to homeland security. I like
the way the program was designed. I think it was a
good learning vehicle. From what I understand, it
still is, but to give you a definitive answer on that
is difficult. Things have changed so much since 9/11.

9. Is there is anything else that you would like to add,
ask or clarify?

No, the only thing I would like to add is that I got
promoted to police chief. I finished the course in
December 1994, I had a pretty good resume; I didn’t go
to the National Academy for FBI, but I did go for
Certified Public Manager. I had a bachelor’s and a
master’s degree and countless in-service programs, but
when I went for the oral interview, the way the
interview was structured by the State’s Chiefs
Association, I was the only one who had completed the
program. I breezed through that interview.

Respondent B

1. Prior to your completion of the WPLAC Program did you
think that leadership could be learned in a classroom?
Yes, I did. I mean I do think that some people have
born leadership skills in them, but I do think you have
to be taught. Even if you have born leadership skills,
you have to learn how to manage people. You have to
have a vision of where things are going. WP taught you how to think things out and tackle a project or a problem and just look at that and then work your way out.

2. Subsequent to your completion of the WPL&C Program do you feel differently about how leadership can be learned?

Yes. It gave me much more thought about thinking out problem, and once you are successful with that, the people who are following you can see that you can figure it out, and that gives you respect for your leadership and then people begin to follow you.

3. Did the WPL&C Program serve to make you a better leader than you were prior to your exposure to the program's curriculum? Please explain and provide an example.

When you went in cold to the class, the teaching/the not knowing what you were going to do, and then came back into the class, you learned how to do it. So when you get a problem in real life, it's not on paper how to do it, so that gave me an experience on how to do that.

4. What is your perception of the effectiveness of each of the following dimensions of the WPL&C Program? First
one, regarding the course content: specifically the individual, group and organizational theories that were presented.

I thought it showed you how to work on (a good base on how to) problems with individual people. It showed you how to work out problems with groups. Then it showed you how to work out the whole organization and you had to think about it. It really helped. It opened your eyes. You are not just looking at individual problem, and how one little domino affects the whole process of everything that you do.

b. The next section is the "Intellectual Procedure."

Yeah. I thought that they gave you a way to work out a problem and it gave you a format so that even in real life when you have a problem, you can take it and say, this is what I have, this is what I gotta do. This is the problem. It gave you a basis on how to work through your problems in life.

c. Next section of the same question: what is your perception of the effectiveness of the use of case studies in the program?

Yes, I did. I felt that you would almost read similar studies of things that would happen at work, and then
you would be able to pick them apart to tell what kind
of problem you had. Then you would deal your action
plan after that. It would also tell you where you
missed the domino and where your plan would fail
because you missed one part of it.

5. What was the WPL&C Program's greatest strength?
I think it was making you take a problem, think about
it and deal with it and then when you came back to
class, you would see the different ways to address it.
It gave you a bigger thought process. It made you think
about options, instead of one right or wrong answer
like in academic courses. It was the combination of
case studies and procedures. No "this is right and this
is wrong."

6. What was the Program's greatest weakness?
I'd say, probably the textbook reading was very hard.
It was better when it was presented with the case
studies and gone over in class. If you were just to
read the textbook and just take a test, you wouldn't
have gotten as much out of it without the case studies
and the intellectual part of it.
7. As I recall, you were you in a law enforcement leadership role on and immediately subsequent to the attacks of September 11, 2001, correct?
Yeah.

8. Do you feel that the WPL&C Program enhanced your ability to lead your organization through the phases of first response, consequence management, and the organizational adaptation that followed?
A lot of towns just went right into NYC, but we had to think about if the thing spread out further, we had to protect our town, our citizens. Whatever we had left over, we would share. We had to put our citizens first. After 9/11, some officers weren’t ready for all the training that was needed. It wasn’t an extra any more, it was necessary. There was some resistance to change.

8. What recommendations would you make to enhance the quality and effectiveness of the WPL&C Program?
I thought it was a pretty good program all together. I might look at the texts, maybe, as far as something more for cops, or maybe an orientation phase and read the book ahead of time.
9. Is there is anything else that you would like to add, ask or clarify?
   It was a very good program and it did help me through my career, promotion-wise.

Respondent C

1. Prior to your completion of the WPL&C Program did you think that leadership could be learned in a classroom? When I read the first...I'm 50/50 on that. I think a good part of that is the way you were raised, how you were raised, what your pecking order in life was all through school and everything and through your family. I am a firm believer, firm believer in that, and I think you had to have it in you prior to being taught. But definitely you fine tuned it with the education and the people that you were affiliated with after you started moving in those different circles.

2. Subsequent to your completion of the WPL&C Program do you feel differently about how leadership can be learned? I think they can be taught. I think they can be fine tuned. Taught, yes. Being put into practice, 30% out of 100. I think 70% comes from internal, the internal drive. But once you have the knowledge, you can put it
into play. The putting it in play is the important part, but the knowledge is... If you can’t get this out, you are not going to get it across. If you’re not sincere, it doesn’t come from inside, you’re not going to sell it. You’re not going to sell your product. Oh yeah. I’ve learned a tremendous amount from the program. There’s no doubt about that. What I remembered from the program, I remembered stuff six months later, so it took me a long time to digest it and try to bring it back again. I have to say I use it everyday. I can’t specifically point to what it is, but I know it’s coming from those weeks at West Point.

3. Did the WPL&C Program serve to make you a better leader than you were prior to your exposure to the program’s curriculum? Please explain and provide an example.

Oh yeah, oh yeah, definitely. Definitely, it brought a lot of new things to light that I didn’t know. I’m big on education, there’s new ways of doing things and new ways of looking at things. This was an experience. It was definitely an experience.

4. What is your perception of the effectiveness of each of the following dimensions of the WPL&C Program? First one, regarding the course content: specifically the
individual, group and organizational theories that were presented.  
Well...you've seen a lot of that with the union, with the shifts themselves, with the platoons. The guys gravitate to each other. The detective bureau; they're their own little entity. Services and patrol division, they don't mix. It was trying to get them to mix together. It was interesting how people in the know handle that and then trying to apply it. 

b. The next section is the "Intellectual Procedure."
Yeah, it was effective, but it was brutal. 
c. Next section of the same question: what is your perception of the effectiveness of the use of case studies in the program?  
The case studies were a piece of cake. They were about what happens. They applied to the military, but we applied them to the department. You saw yourself and the people in your department in those positions. They were relatively easy to understand.  

5. What was the WPLC Program's greatest strength?  
I like the fact that we were three different tables with 5 or 6 different guys, all from different backgrounds, and we were all trying to work together
with this and getting different opinions from everybody on how they would have handled the problems and the range of different answers we got. Guys who you knew were good, solid commanders coming up with off the wall answers to these problems and you thinking you're wrong, and you're actually right and they're wrong. Finally, seeing how everything flowed together and eventually everyone was on the same page. How abstract everybody's answers were in the beginning and how they all came together. Everybody started to see how everything mixed. I use the breaking down of problems everyday. As a matter of fact, I got the guys coming in, in a little while for our Monday morning meeting. I know that I don't have all the answers. I'm a fool if I do. And these guys see things from different perspectives and we work it out that way. What I was impressed with, in West Point was it was obvious; guys seem to take control at different levels in different problems. When we first started out, we had one guy who was very vocal and he always had an answer and he was. He had a master's at the time, and this was twelve years ago, he had all the answers. Then we found out he didn't. His answers were wrong. It's the guy with
the high school education who came up through the ranks, who just had common sense and he was hitting on certain things that were right, and it was the quiet guy who was pulling out other answers. We all got the answer, but from different people. It was really effective.

6. What was the Program’s greatest weakness?

That intellectual procedure. That was brutal. Trying to put the parts into the process, the steps of the process. Yeah, it was like being in grade school where you had to have the correct answer to who won the Civil War? How much is this equation? What are your verbs and adjectives in this sentence? There was too much structure and not enough "well this is where we are going with it." That troubled me a lot because I was trying to do textbook answers and it was difficult after being away all those years from studies to come up with answers like that. When we got to the problem, the case studies, it was easy because you do that every day, but the intellectual procedure was a real bear. That was difficult.
7. **Now were you in a law enforcement leadership role on or immediately subsequent to the attacks of September 11, 2001?**

Yes, I was chief of police.

b. **Now, being that you were still on the job on and immediately subsequent to September 11, 2001, do you feel that the WPL&C Program enhanced your ability to lead your organization through the phases of first response, consequence management, and the organizational adaptation that followed?**

I’d love to give you an answer and say, “yes” to that, but I really can’t be specific as to whether West Point affected it or not. When 9/11 hit, I was in the building here. People were upset. They didn’t know; they were confused; they didn’t know what happened. There really wasn’t a leadership role, we all stood there and acted pretty much as a group. After we realized what happened, everybody started running, not us, not the police, we found the ambulances and the fire trucks running out of town, trying to help out. I think it was more the county who pulled everything together and pulled in the reins and then we had to back off and get everybody together and pull things
tight. I would say the leadership, just the fact I was the chief, played a role, you could start controlling people. People listened to you at that point. Whether West Point helped with that, I don't know, but afterwards, the response phase and the rebuilding phase, I didn't have many problems here. I didn't have the towns that were directly affected by 9/11. I didn't have anybody from town killed by 9/11. I had a friend killed in 9/11, but I didn't have anybody from town killed in 9/11, so it didn't really affect anybody that closely in town.

3. What recommendations would you make to enhance the quality and effectiveness of the WPL&C Program? Well, I have to say that the Intellectual Procedure would need to be revamped somehow. I don't have an answer for it. I don't know how you would do it. I'm still amazed that you guys went through two weeks of that training and it took us two months to try to understand what you guys did in two weeks. It's a very complicated task, and there was a tremendous amount of work involved in that program that if that could be scaled down to work you have to do at home, after putting in a full day. There's no doubt I was putting
in three, four hours a night after work trying to understand. If it wasn't so damned complicated, it could be simplified where you could absorb it quicker, easier. It would have been a heck of a lot easier and a lot less time consuming. When you do go to this course, you are usually in the upper ranks and you're fairly intelligent. Trying to teach somebody a new language so speak, as some of this stuff was, it was definitely a new language. It was so complicated; it took all your energy away from everything else you did. It took away from your family, your work; it really was difficult. I had to give up part time work and everything. It was a struggle getting through this. I'm very proud that I got through it. It was difficult though. When I went through, it was new, it was brand new. I was the second class you guys offered. The bugs hadn't been worked out. It was just incredibly difficult. If we could get that first part down, break that down to a system where... It's easier to comprehend the rest of the program, because once you get past that, the rest of the program, it flows, but trying to apply the remainder of the program to the beginning, was a difficult task. I don't know. Maybe you could
change the terminology, make it more police-friendly, for lack of a better word. That was the difficult part.

9. Is there is anything else that you would like to add, ask or clarify?

Not at this time, my man. It was a great experience. I’m really proud I went through that. I’m glad the program’s still going strong. I did like the movies, when they showed the movie clips, how leaders through history applied different theories and how they look at things. Right now I think what they should show is “The Sopranos.” I find myself still analyzing movies and looking at leadership roles, saying this is good, this is bad.

Respondent D

1. Prior to your completion of the WPLIC Program did you think that leadership could be learned in a classroom?

No, I thought you’d have to be in the situations and live them in order for you to try and fail at being a leader. I did think leaders were born not made. It was something in the genes or something that actually was in a family situation that would come out in high pressure situations and critical incidents.
2. Subsequent to you: completion of the WPL&C Program do you feel differently about how leadership can be learned?
As a result of the class, that's changed: I really feel it can be learned. It has to be learned, has to be.
Probably some that have the propensity to be a leader would really learn how to be better by taking a class like this. If you look at somebody like a Dwight Eisenhower or General Bradley or a Patton, they probably have a predisposition to be in charge or to take control, maybe they are more likely to take control, but in order for them to climb up to be a better leader, I think this class in the classroom, they go from like 6 to 100.

3. Did the WPL&C Program serve to make you a better leader than you were prior to your exposure to the program's curriculum? Please explain and provide an example.

Definitely. I think I dealt prior to the class in a more emotional way and it came out in one part of the case studies when we were talking through a disciplinary procedure. I remember you were in the class. I was going too far with it and I should have just dealt with it from the office prospective. I
should have just taken a more legalistic approach than a human relations one. That cuts out the emotional part, and this type of job, that has to be put on the back burner.

4. What is your perception of the effectiveness of each of the following dimensions of the WPL&C program? a. First one, regarding the course content: specifically the individual, group and organizational theories that were presented.

I think it was very effective. We dealt with the individual theories. I didn’t see that I could go any further till I could understand myself first. I think by doing that, it was just a logical progression. You understand yourself; you understand people, and then understanding the situation and then understanding everyone together. I don’t see how you could lead an organization—whether it be small, medium or large—and without these types of tools. If you’re not comfortable in your own skin, how on earth are you going to deal with groups of people?

b. The next section is the Intellectual Procedure. Yeah, I’d say the AOI’s: I still use that today whenever I go into a meeting or whenever we have an
issue occurs. You'll see lieutenants or sergeants might be struggling with something, even the town administration. They end up coming down here a lot, not because I have any other effect on what they do, but it doesn't seem like they can really take issues and break them down into their components. I do that to this day. I go to meetings and I'll write what the issues are, I'll actually write, "AOI" and I'll start number one. We recently had a problem with the fire department where I actually wrote it out—the AOI's, what the town was faced with, what the fire department was going through and how that would affect us. The only way I did that was to blend it all together was identifying it all and then dealing with each situation and then you could see the individual theories. It was like some people had their own agenda and that actually came out. At the end, I wrote—I didn't write synthesis—I just wrote things to do, one, two, three and handed it off to the business administrator and just said these are some things you might want to look at. I never would have been able to do that without the class.
c. Next section of the same question: what is your perception of the effectiveness of the use of case studies in the program?
I think so, because you have to have a real life incident in which to really dissect and take points out of. I think the frustrating thing for me though was when we would go over them in class, I'd always be like, damn I missed that part, I missed that, what am I going to be like when I get back here? What am I going to miss? But I guess it is a practice.

5. What was the WPL&C Program's greatest strength?
I would say just learning how to make a proper decision, not shooting from the hip. We recently had a business administrator come and go within a year. I knew she was going to fail, because it was constant making decisions by shooting from the hip without really taking an issue, sitting down and working through it. It's frustrating to see because she had all the credentials, she was great, but you could see it coming unraveled and failing. If only you could provide this training to all other government entities, I think would work out taking the emotion out of it.

6. What was the Program's greatest weakness?
Probably it was only once a week. I thought it would be better if it were offered at least two times per week. There was a big lag time, I think I went on Wednesdays. You really looked forward to being in the class. It would have been better if it was run more like a college program, a couple of days a week. It was tough because there was a lot lost with waiting a week, but everybody has schedules.

7. Were you in a law enforcement leadership role on or immediately subsequent to the attacks of September 11, 2001?

Yes, I was police chief.

Do you feel that the WPLC Program enhanced your ability to lead your organization through the phases of first response, consequence management, and the organizational adaptation that followed? Please explain.

Definitely, because what occurred on September 11 is my lieutenant, his daughter worked at the Trade Center in the complex. She's a Secret Service agent. She worked there. He basically fell apart at that point. He was on the phone, trying to run around. We lost about 7 people in town and their families were really, you
know, needed help. At the school, a lot of issues were coming to light. Our officers all wanted to go over. Our fire department was getting calls. The mayor came in and he said, "What do I do? I don't know what to do." I think based on a lot of, we started to chart a course; we actually had short-term, mid-range goals and long term goals. Our short term goals were let's get up to the school first. Let's get the school secure. We had a problem where everyone was responding to the school to take their kids out. We had parents just running into classrooms, trying to get their kids out, which is kind of bizarre. See, a lot of people work in New York that live here. We had to hold the guys back. We were reaching out, and we wanted to know what the county had to say. It would have to be a county response. It worked out. I helped them get things in order. I think the WPL&C Program helped out. It really did, especially when we got to family members in town who had nothing. How was our department going to handle that? We had one person, one point of contact. We contacted an attorney in town who worked with the families. It definitely helped.
8. What recommendations would you make to enhance the quality and effectiveness of the WPLAC Program?
I don't really see it as enhancing the program, but enhancing our police departments. It would be a requirement that people go to it. You take a small department like this; everybody should be required to go. I could probably do that here. I think there should be more of a component like with the chiefs association. Everybody should be on the same page.

9. Is there anything else that you would like to add, ask or clarify?
More refreshers, maybe. I would love to go through another class. That would be great.

Respondent E

1. Prior to your completion of the WPLAC Program did you think that leadership could be learned in a classroom?
It never really occurred to me. I read about all these military leaders, all the heroes in history and as far as I'm concerned, it never really occurred to me personally whether these people were born that way or something turned them into that.
2. Subsequent to your completion of the WPL&C Program do you feel differently about how leadership can be learned? Yes. I believe with the proper training, you're allowed to utilize what you're taught, that you can transform average people into effective leaders.

3. Did the WPL&C Program serve to make you a better leader than you were prior to your exposure to the program's curriculum? Please explain and provide an example. That's a tough question to answer. I've always had the philosophy that no matter where you go in life, don't forget where you came from. If it was good, why was it good. If it was bad, why was it bad, what made it bad? I always treat people fair. West Point gave me the tools to do that properly.

4. What is your perception of the effectiveness of each of the following dimensions of the WPL&C Program? First one, regarding the course content: specifically the individual, group and organizational theories that were presented.

   It was very effective, doing it in increments. The one thing I really liked was when you progressed to another section, you didn't forget the first section. It was
incorporated. Sometimes when you take courses, you get one thing done and it goes away; you never see it again. But what this you had to keep compounding and not forgetting what you learned. Now you have two weeks' worth of work to do. Then, three weeks and four till you get to the final week, incorporating everything.

b. The next section is the "Intellectual Procedure." I think you wouldn't have this course if you didn't have that. That's what put everything you read about and you started to learn and put it into action. If A doesn't happen, you can't have B. If B doesn't happen, you can't have C. You have to look at the whole picture and not just one aspect of it.

c. Next section of the same question: what is your perception of the effectiveness of the use of case studies in the program? Absolutely. Without the case studies, you couldn't do any of the AOI's or analyze anything else.

5. What was the WPL&C Program's greatest strength?
I have 28 years in, a 32 page résumé, ? to 8 schools on each page, I was honor roll all through high school, I finished number one academically in my class at the
academy, I came out number one on the sergeants’ test, three on the lieutenants’ test, this was the toughest course I ever took in my life. I had to struggle just to keep my head above water just to keep up with this course. As far as I’m concerned, I wouldn’t change anything with it. It really made me work, 20 to 30 hours a week just to get by. It challenged me fully.

6. What was the Program’s greatest weakness?
   Personally, one of the books, the air force book (maybe?), the reading was so dry. I would have rather watch paint dry. It had its benefits, but it was tough.

7. Were you in a law enforcement leadership role on or immediately subsequent to the attacks of September 11, 2001?
   Yes. I responded to NYC on 9/11 with my canine bomb squad.

Do you feel that the WFC Program enhanced your ability to lead your organization through the phases of first response, consequence management, and the organizational adaptation that followed?
   Absolutely. I was also a member of the Morris County Bioterrorism Task Force, which was in effect a couple
of years before 9/11 in planning for small pox outbreaks and whatnot. I was chosen more or less when we did scenarios; we were going to do mass immunization at four sites within the county. I was in charge of security of the sites, and that involved having other law enforcement agencies come in. We were taking care of security on the inside, we were taking care of security on the outside, assigning people. Certain people were just staying with the small pox vaccine, no matter what happened. They couldn’t leave that incase somebody wanted to take that to the black market or whatever. I believe that helped me quite a bit in being able to coordinate incident command. I don’t know how many different agencies. Being in charge of that was I don’t want to say it was a feather in my cap, but I was very proud to be chosen to do that.

8. What recommendations would you make to enhance the quality and effectiveness of the WPL&C Program?
I think agency heads should be required to attend West Point before they send the people under them to it. If you are going to send a subordinate to school to become a leader and then not allow them to use what they learned because you haven’t gone to the course, then
you have no idea of the proper way things should be done.

9. Is there is anything else that you would like to add, ask or clarify?
It was the most challenging class I ever took in my life and I would do it again in a heart beat.

Respondent F

1. Prior to your completion of the WPL&C Program did you think that leadership could be learned in a classroom?
Yes and no. Somewhat from some of the previous teachings that I had, never went into the dept that WPL&C Program did. You really had a foundation for learning some of those things. You would have some inklings that some parts of leadership can be taught, but once you complete the WP program and see how the theories actually work and the motivation, when the whole thing is put together, it does work. It can be taught in the classroom.

2. Subsequent to your completion of the WPL&C Program do you feel differently about how leadership can be learned?
Absolutely. I think what happens is after learning about these skills and the way that the theories work,
you go back and see how all those things in your life previously fit into the various templates and the various theories. There is no doubt that leadership skills do encompass some of your own experiences and life outside of the classroom. I think when you have a program like AP that concentrates on formula, theory, and intertwines that with personal experience and various lessons from significant battles and historical events that have happened, it just ties the whole program together. I think it makes the experience personal. It is something then you can embody and see yourself doing.

3. Did the WPL&C Program serve to make you a better leader than you were prior to your exposure to the program's curriculum? Please explain and provide an example.

Yes, absolutely. It's a set of tools that go in that toolbox for when you're a leader or in that position of leadership. It helps you deal much more efficiently with the day to day stuff that goes on in your police department or whatever organization you're doing.

Motivation, from an organizational perspective, one of our most important roles, and this program helps you learn how to keep people motivated. You can't keep
people happy 100% of the time, but it does help you recognize why various people will feel the way they do and it gives you the tools that you need to keep them motivated and keep them going in the direction that the organization needs to go in and keep everybody on the team.

4. What is your perception of the effectiveness of each of the following dimensions of the WFLAC Program? First one, regarding the course content: specifically the individual, group and organizational theories that were presented.

Yes. Absolutely. They are all so different and they all have their own pitfalls. I think you need to start with the basics first and that's the way the class was presented. First, the individual, the group, and by the time you're done, you see how each one fits in and ties together. It was well thought out. The next section is the "Intellectual Procedure."

I think it is very effective because it teaches you a set process to deal with each and every one of the motivational theories, templates, and it becomes habit. It's like anything else that you learn. It's like teaching someone how to play football from the very
beginning, how to be quarterback, how to be any position in the organization, but it gives you a way to look at the problems from start to finish and it's the same way each and every time. All you have to do is plug in the different formula, and it works each and every time. It helps you to synthesize and get to the root cause. It affords you a consistent way to do that, each and every time. It helps you see through these things faster. Like anything else, once you've practiced, once you've used it, you're able to process the information quicker and more efficiently and you find that after a while, you're already on the third or fourth step and you don't even realize it. You're just processing this information, consistently.

c. Next section of the same question: what is your perception of the effectiveness of the use of case studies in the program?

Again, it's great practice. You get to take the theories that you're learning and put them to use. You do it in a classroom setting. We were broken down into four groups and, as in any of these classes, you tend to learn more from each other, your interaction with the different groups, when you process and analyze the
case studies than you do from the actual teaching. The lecture is good and the teaching is good, but when you do the case studies it gives you an opportunity to tie it all together. You see how it all fits together. It gives you an opportunity to interact with each other, bounce ideas off of one another. I absorb information better that way rather than straight lecture. To have that group interaction, I learn more that way. You are learning from your peers. For me, a lot of it is visual and observational and I tend to internalize those things better than if someone is just standing up there talking.

5. What was the WPLC Program’s greatest strength?
   The case studies. It was the most important part.

6. What was the Program’s greatest weakness?
   There is one flaw in the way it’s taught. You’re given the assignment before you’re given the lecture, and the group gets together to try to figure out exactly what the hell they are supposed to be doing. Invariably, it is wrong. You waste how many hours that week. You realize you have done this whole thing wrong, and now you are going to learn the right way to do it. It would seem to me that the groups would learn better if they
gave you the information first, then gave you a week to
do the case study, then have it reviewed the next week.
Frustration was obvious and visible. There still is.
The first few weeks are very frustrating. It creates
stress. Some people make incredible sacrifices to go to
this program for sixteen weeks.

7. Were you in a law enforcement leadership role on or
immediately subsequent to the attacks of September 11,
2001?

Yes

Do you feel that the WPL&C Program enhanced your
ability to lead your organization through the phases of
first response, consequence management, and the
organizational adaptation that followed?
Absolutely. I was able to see on September 11th, that
very day, the level of frustration that people were
feeling, the fat that Port Authority was calling for
help from anywhere, and I made up my mind that we were
going to do whatever we could. We went. We went into
the city. We helped set up a few first aid stations.
"We did something at Ground Zero that day and again on
Thursday of that same week. Before that, I probably
would have been more hesitant to do that. I think the
class definitely makes you see yourself as a leader in a leadership position. It makes you aware that you are responsible for the people looking up to you for leadership and I was a captain at the time. People were wandering around here, saying we had to do something, but what are we going to do? They were frustrated in the hour it took us to get everything together just to go let alone if we hadn’t done anything. People wanted to do something and they were looking at me for leadership. Our chief wasn’t around at the time. I just called up one of our commissioners and said we were going. We did. I think everybody who went was very appreciative that we went, made an effort, did something. In the ensuing years, law enforcement has changed dramatically, especially around here. I think it’s helped me to bring our department into every initiative, into everything. It’s my job to lead and motivate them as one team. It’s definitely helped since then.

8. What recommendations would you make to enhance the quality and effectiveness of the WPL&C Program?

I think the program is great. Almost all my command staff has gone. That’s my goal. There are only two
left. We need to all work the same way. People want to know that the leadership is dealing with them fairly and consistently. It makes everything the same.

3. Is there anything else that you would like to add, ask or clarify?

Lecture should precede the reading and the exercises.

Respondent G

1. Prior to your completion of the WPL&C Program did you think that leadership could be learned in a classroom?

I’d known there were courses on leadership, but prior to taking this course, I really didn’t put that into play. I didn’t think that as well as leadership was taught with this course that it could be taught. I think your upbringing has some bearing on...in the way of discipline and education what the future will bring.

There are some inherent leadership qualities that some people are raised with.

2. Subsequent to your completion of the WPL&C Program do you feel differently about how leadership can be learned?

I think now that after going through the leadership program, I believe now that there are much more aspects of leadership that can be learned. Just the fact that
the leadership is broken down into different theories and how they are applicable to my daily dealings as police chief, I can definitely see a correlation.

3. Did the WPL&C Program serve to make you a better leader than you were prior to your exposure to the program’s curriculum? Please explain and provide an example. I would say yes to that in that my dealings with my peers and my subordinates now by applying what I learned from the leadership theories, I see more of what happens with certain situations and how to improve different situations.

4. What is your perception of the effectiveness of each of the following dimensions of the WPL&C Program? First one, regarding the course content: specifically the individual, group and organizational theories that were presented.

I think that to start with the individual theories and to go in a progression to the other theories was good in that you learn how to think along those theory lines. The simplest, I don’t know if simplest is the right word, but the individual theories led into theories that were a bit bit more involved which led into the final theories, which were a little more
involved. In that way, it was good that it got you thinking along those lines. It helped as the course progressed.

b. The next section is the "Intellectual Procedure." I think there with taking a situation and pulling it apart to its individual components allowed for a better analysis and allowed for ultimately a better solution of any problem or incident. I think by breaking things up like that, areas of interest and actually listing them and then going from there really...again, the progression really helped.

c. Next section of the same question: what is your perception of the effectiveness of the use of case studies in the program?

That was positively, absolutely effective. They went from green to blue. A lot of the case studies were very commonplace to most of our police departments in Morris County. In that way, I could look at a case study and say yes, I've actually had that particular experience. They were definitely true to life.

5. What was the WPL6C Program's greatest strength?

The greatest strength was taking the case studies, which were very true to life, and applying them to all
these different theories. Now, breaking down the case studies and breaking them down was very effective.

6. What was the Program's greatest weakness?

I don't really see a whole lot of weaknesses. If I had to pick out a weakness, I'd say it was just the consumption of time, while you are trying to stay at work and do all your work functions. I had a huge advantage there that my chief went through it and at the time I was assigned to the detective bureau, he said if you have to sit there all day and work on it, work on it. There were also a lot of things going on at home, the whole time management thing. It was rough. My chief was very accommodating in regards to my work time.

7. Were you in a law enforcement leadership role on or immediately subsequent to the attacks of September 11, 2001?

I was the operations officer at the time and I was on duty.

Do you feel that the WFLC Program enhanced your ability to lead your organization through the phases of first response, consequence management, and the organizational adaptation that followed?
To tell you the truth, it happened so fast that when we deployed our people from here. We had about five or six guys from here that went. After it was over, then I saw a little bit of that. Personally, I wasn't that involved that day. Now that the RDT and the MCReds and group deployment, I can see a lot of that. I'm a little more prepared now.

8. What recommendations would you make to enhance the quality and effectiveness of the WPL&C Program?
Really, the only thing wrong with the program was the time issue, the time it took to dive into this stuff. If there was something like a sleep away camp, like the National Academy, it would be more effective. That kind of setting would have made it more embedded, better learned.

9. Is there is anything else that you would like to add, ask or clarify?
No. I think this is probably the hardest particular course I've ever taken, even through my master's program. This was much harder than that.

Respondent H

1. Prior to your completion of the WPL&C Program did you think that leadership could be learned in a classroom?
I didn’t think leadership could be learned as opposed to the skills as opposed to it being a science, traditionally that’s what people talk about. It is more of an art that is instilled in a person as they grow up from their first leader of their parents growing up. Personally, my father was very stern, very straightforward and very structured. That’s where I learned to grow up the way I am. Having gone through the police academy, that gave me another structure, but it didn’t give me the leadership skills that I had already learned, to know what I want to do and how I want to do it. When I got hired here, the first thing I ever did was write summonses, wrote summonses, wrote summonses. I could have cared less what anybody thought about. Nobody was going to take that away from me, because it was instilled in me that I am doing the right thing so it was something I got from when I was younger. The program, in my opinion, teaches you the skills to better manage and better lead a department in the varying aspects, but I don’t think it’s something you can actually learn—to be a leader. You can learn the skills to be a leader, but you can’t learn to be the leader.
2. Subsequent to your completion of the WPL&G Program do you feel differently about how leadership can be learned? Prior to the course, I didn’t really think about leadership. It was just my life, the way I led my life, but after the class, I though more of other people, per se. Having gone through the class, it made me think about the motivation of other people, what I do ultimately returns on what they are going to do. What the people with me, underneath me, or even above me, may do.

3. Did the WPL&C Program serve to make you a better leader than you were prior to your exposure to the program’s curriculum? Please explain and provide an example. At the level when I went through the class, I was just a road supervisor, only managed 3 people and a civilian dispatcher. At that point, I had already been a supervisor for 7 years before going to that class. I think I had a certain level of leadership instilled in me. How the WPL&C Program helped was the little nuances on bettering my leadership to more effectively run my shift: the PDL, the equity theory, being more democratic with my guys, and really being an employee-
person as opposed to a self-generated one. It helped me there at that point. I am more focused on the needs of my followers.

4. What is your perception of the effectiveness of each of the following dimensions of the WPL&C Program? First one, regarding the course content: specifically the individual, group and organizational theories that were presented.

For the course, it was very helpful. I don’t think it was problematic by any means. Just the idea of learning the individual progressing through the different levels to the organization was a better way of doing it than possibly jumping around, backward, the other way. Going through it that way was like a stepping stone.

The next section is the "Intellectual Procedure."

It was effective to a certain extent. There were some cases or some different levels within the different teaching structures that it could have probably been streamlined, maybe remove some of it or add some to it. There were parts where you were actually, in my opinion although I can’t think of a specific, there were certain things we discussed that one or more portions of the Intellectual Procedure may not have any
relevance that you could have streamlined and did a little bit differently. The program didn’t allow for you to streamline it. The Intellectual Procedure helped me whenever there was a problem within my shift even now as a lieutenant in my squad, how to address the problem. It gave me a foundation instead of jumping to conclusions and stuff like that, actually to look at the facts, break it down and work through to the final end, which is ultimately the most effectiveness working of a squad or a shift.

Next section of the same question: what is your perception of the effectiveness of the use of case studies in the program? The case studies were sufficient.

5. What was the WPL&C Program’s greatest strength?

The program’s greatest strength, the material was fine. The book was a little tough to read. The strengths in my opinion were the people teaching the courses that were very in tune with the instruction. The people teaching it, they weren’t from academia, they were our peers teaching us what we needed to learn. They could relate to the issues we had to deal with.

6. What was the Program’s greatest weakness?
Not so much the text. The text was tough reading. The biggest weakness in my opinion was there was so much information in the time period we had to do. If I went through it now, I would have a desk that I could do my work at. I was working shift work and having to do all that, and with the family being there, it was not an undergraduate course; it was a high level course. Could it be extended in more weeks to spread the work over a longer period of time? Possibly. I think it was a lot of information crammed into the short amount of time we had.

7. Were you in a law enforcement leadership role on or immediately subsequent to the attacks of September 11, 2001?

I was a sergeant in the patrol division so I wasn’t in a leadership position, per se.

Do you feel that the WPL&C Program enhanced your ability to lead your organization through the phases of first response, consequence management, and the organizational adaptation that followed?

I would say it was not applicable immediately after. Since being promoted to the position I am in now, I’ve assumed a lot of responsibility. Out of 31 guys, I
supervise 26 guys. It keeps me in a structured environment, in the training, the requirements, and the constant updates we have to do. I don’t think it’s helped me, but it’s assisted me in understanding that this is something that is going to be a lifelong term thing of how we deal with things in law enforcement. We are going to have to change our ways to conduct our business on a daily basis now.

8. What recommendations would you make to enhance the quality and effectiveness of the WPL&C Program?

I think the program could be split possibly for the lower end, for supervisors; there should be next step whether it should be a refresher or a next level up; it would be nice to have something for higher in the department. There should be two sections: one for supervisors and one for administrators. In a perfect world, you train everybody. The administrators would have already had that level. A statewide or regional area; try to do something to that effect; we didn’t discuss moving outside the organization in the WPL&C Program. When you get to an administrative level, you well know, you’re not dealing only with your organization any more. You are dealing with every
organization around you—and the higher ends. Try to incorporate that into it.

9. Is there is anything else that you would like to add, ask or clarify?
   No. I was very happy with the program. I hope somebody else can go through it.

Respondent 1

1. Prior to your completion of the WPL&C Program did you think that leadership could be learned in a classroom?
   Yeah. Yes, just because with all the college and everything; they’ve always taught leadership. I think there are leadership skills that you have to have that you have to learn.

2. Subsequent to your completion of the WPL&C Program do you feel differently about how leadership can be learned?
   Yeah, definitely. It encompasses so much more than just going out and following me. You have to understand people, the way the organization works, all the other variables. You have to have some skills and some training to actually effectively go out and lead.
3. Did the WPLAC Program serve to make you a better leader than you were prior to your exposure to the program’s curriculum? Please explain and provide an example.

Yeah, definitely. Basically, I had the tools, it just redefined the tools in my workbox, and now I know I can look at things differently. I can see causes and effects and more analytically I can look at things and find solutions to problems. Right now with my position, one of my things is deciding where guys go everyday. Part of letting them grow, I let them make the decisions. because eventually they are going to have to make decisions when nobody else is around.

4. What is your perception of the effectiveness of each of the following dimensions of the WPLAC Program? First one, regarding the course content: specifically the individual, group and organizational theories that were presented.

I think it did, but I would rather see Area 3 put first. I’d rather see the leadership skills before you get into everything else. It’s hard to go into something without the background to deal with problems. The next section is the “Intellectual Procedure.”
I think it was good because it gave you a critical base that you could take things in small steps and start to figure out where the problems were, break it down, without emotions, and give you solutions from there. Next section of the same question: what is your perception of the effectiveness of the use of case studies in the program?

I think you need case studies, because it brings it out to the real world; it’s stuff that we see every single day. It gives it a West Point view, but it is common stuff that you see everyday. It just gives it a name that helps you name and identify things. I think they are relevant to a department of any size.

5. **What was the WPL&C Program’s greatest strength?**

I think going through the case studies, because it’s stuff that we’ve seen every single day. You learn how to process through it and figure out the solutions. That is the most valuable learning tool that was there. You’re seen it and now you have a handle on it. It was hands-on.

6. **What was the Program’s greatest weakness?**

I think the lack of follow up after you are done. After graduation, you don’t get any reinforcement. A lot of
guys have forgotten a lot of the stuff. I would like to see a follow up, maybe yearly.

7. Were you in a law enforcement leadership role on or immediately subsequent to the attacks of September 11, 2001?

Yes.

Do you feel that the WPL&C Program enhanced your ability to lead your organization through the phases of first response, consequence management, and the organizational adaptation that followed?

Yeah, I think so. On September 11, it was a dramatic day, but the guys I had working—we got out, we did what we had to do. There was no ifs ands or buts. Our world was going to change forever. My guys did a great job that day. As far as the changes, there have been so many since then. We have to deal with the change. We can't fight for the status quo. It's helped me bring a lot of the changes into my department.

8. What recommendations would you make to enhance the quality and effectiveness of the WPL&C Program?

I know right now we are talking about adding another portion of the emotional intelligence. I think that's being reworked right now. I'd put the leadership
behaviors first. Other than that, I think it’s a great program.

9. Is there anything else that you would like to add, ask or clarify?
No, that’s it.

Respondent J

1. Prior to your completion of the WPL&C Program did you think that leadership could be learned in a classroom? Partially, then 100%. After I started my class at WPL&C, I learned the value of the course and the instructors were phenomenal; they taught me to learn the process of leadership. I understand that a lot times leaders are born not learned, as the saying goes, but I found that a little different. By being in that classroom, I inherited a lot of important information which definitely helped me in my career as a police officer and retiring as chief of police.

2. Subsequent to your completion of the WPL&C Program do you feel differently about how leadership can be learned?
Absolutely. I felt by organizing the way we did the way we were taught, it gave me a better aspect and a better level of learning the aspects of leadership. Prior to
this class, I did a hit and miss type leadership. But learning the organizational skills that were taught in the class, in my opinion, made me feel like I had more confidence in myself and the ability to do my job better. When I did have some difficulty after graduating from the class, I pulled out my handy dandy notes and I reviewed them. I talked to many other people who were in my class and we would brainstorm things together. I always seemed to work out any issues or potential issues I thought I might have had. Without doing that I would have had issues.

3. Did the WPLC Program serve to make you a better leader than you were prior to your exposure to the program’s curriculum? Please explain and provide an example.

Again, I’d have to go absolutely with that, too, and the reason for that was a lot of that took me out of a sort of, not lazy mode, but made me focus more and made me realize there was more potential out there to do a better job. I’ve always been very serious about my work and I’ve always tried to do the best job I possibly could, but this kind of put me over that edge to do an even better job and to focus more, and just to say this situation can be handled in a different manner, but I
can still get real good results without anybody saying well this guy gave me the wrong end of the stick. I looked at all viewpoints and I was able to manage and focus my response accordingly. It just felt that by having done this course, it made me a better person to do that. Prior to that, I wouldn't have thought of many aspects that I apparently used in my end result.

4. What is your perception of the effectiveness of each of the following dimensions of the WPL&C Program? First one, regarding the course content: specifically the individual, group and organizational theories that were presented.

Prior to actually going to the class, when we just received our books, I thought it was going to be a little bit too complex, a little bit over my head. Initially, when we started learning our areas of interest, our AOIs, everyone kind of looked at each other and just said, "What is this?" But after a time, I'd say a minimum of two weeks into the course, then I felt it meant something. Could it have been done a little bit differently? I don't think so, because I think the end result really paid off. In the beginning, it was painstaking and I, me amongst several of my
peers, we didn’t think we were going to be able to do this, but we stuck it out and because of the instructors advising us to take smaller steps and then go into it, don’t jump into it head first, you’re going to learn. I would have to definitely say the way it was structured, I won’t change that portion. Everyone is going to have a little bit of a hard time, I can attest to that, right in the beginning, but as you went through it, gradually and I emphasize gradually, and put a lot of time of your own to accept this and digest it, it was okay. I would definitely stick with the curriculum they had, no question about it.

The next section is the “Intellectual Procedure.” I’m going to have to go ineffective for that part, and the reason for that, I felt that was extremely confusing. I did during the course and even after the course and even speaking to you on this current date, I thought that was a little too much for a person with an associate’s and a bachelor’s degree to really comprehend and analyze in a reality situation. It sounds good on paper, but to utilize in reality, it wasn’t going to happen, to be honest. I thought that was a little bit too complex. I felt some of the areas
could have been removed or modified or explained differently or portrayed in the book a little differently. I know using the book as a guide, the instructors would focus more on how they would bring that point across to the student body, but sitting down from a student point, I'd say that part made that course a little bit confusing for me and that needs to be modified to some degree. There was no way to take smaller steps. I felt you had to dive into the whole thing at once and if you didn't, you didn't get the whole gamete of it.

Next section of the same question: what is your perception of the effectiveness of the use of case studies in the program?

Some of them were relevant to my agency. I came from a small agency, 15 police officers. Some of them absolutely helped me out, some of them I wouldn't have used in a million years because they were really geared—at least the case studies I was familiar with—to a larger department. Some of them did help me out. I can think of a perfect example. I had a disciplinary action after graduation and I was really dumbfounded on how to handle it, and I didn't even have to call
anybody, although I might have called the professor on it, but I looked through my case studies and I was able to rectify the situation without having anyone closing the door on me and saying, "He really gave me the shaft." They were comfortable with my decision. I was comfortable with my decision. So, yes, it did help me. One hundred percent, no, but I did get about 85% use out of the case studies.

5. What was the WPL&C Program's greatest strength?

The greatest strength I would have to say is I was very impressed with being taught from the Academy and the army standpoint and being put into the blue perspective for the police department, how they correlated everything together. It made me feel like I was a part of something. By taking the WPL&C into law enforcement area, I just felt like I was going by a structured way of doing things. It was a proven structure of doing things. United States Army and Military has been around for how many years and I just think by modeling ourselves after them, it enforced, it enhanced that course 100%. It made me feel honored to be a part of that, especially being one of the first classes.

6. What was the Program's greatest weakness?
The greatest weakness I would say was there was a little too much complexity when it came to the final exams; it was a lot to remember. I think when we wrote our AOI's and our different theories on the board and we presented to the instructors on that particular date, I think each person should have probably had one day a piece on just showing their perspective and showing how they would do something. Then we could have been corrected at that point; it felt as if when we came down to test, there were 5 - 6 hours of writing on that exam if I remember correctly. I knew what I wanted to say, but I couldn't write fast enough. Then going back again and starting to read from the beginning and going down to the analysis part, I'm thinking twice now I can do this but now is it really going to work at the end? My part about the weakness of the course, I felt as if you didn't completely understand each portion of that, it wouldn't have brought the end result to the proper manner that you wanted to see it. When I used it in real life, I use it every day in real life believe it or not, I'm sold on it. It's like when you want to go out and buy a car, if you really want that car, you're sold before you even go into that dealership. I
was sold on this program from what I heard. I was sold on it when I took my course. I don’t have any that negative to say about that course other than the final exams were very complex, and maybe a little bit more time on the board to explain their issues. There was so much to comprehend. That was my only drawback. I thought it was a phenomenal course.

7. Were you in a law enforcement leadership role on or immediately subsequent to the attacks of September 11, 2001?

I was police chief.

Do you feel that the WPL&C Program enhanced your ability to lead your organization through the phases of first response, consequence management, and the organizational adaptation that followed?

Yes, that WPL&C class actually enhanced my ability to make certain decisions, effectively, when it came time to explain to my officers, men and women who were working there, whether reservists or regular officers, that this was an issue that the whole country was involved in. We needed to get together, have team work here, no one was going to go one way, go the other. I had officers call me up at home after I was at
headquarters for 21 hours on my day off—September 11th was my day off—one of my officers says well I'm have myself and a couple of the guys go down to the Meadowlands as a staging area. I said absolutely not and I explained to him why. Well, the whole country is being attacked? Well, I realize that but everybody goes his own way, we're going to have issues. We need to band together and this is how we are going to do things. My response to him was right out of the book. Teamwork was the main focus here. We can't forget about our own jurisdiction that we're responsible for because something happened in New York and Washington. We can't be sure nothing is going to happen here. We have to make sure we have all our resources in the proper perspective, all our command staff needs to know where we are going: we can't go off on tangents on this. It definitely helped me out prior to and after 9/11. Consequent management more than anything else, because we are still paying for that more than anything else at this time, I believe that the decisions that were made, at least at my agency, the answers were appropriate. This is a long term situation.
8. What recommendations would you make to enhance the quality and effectiveness of the WPL&C Program?

Probably not going to want to hear this. I know it’s a long course, but make it a bit longer—2 weeks—because during the initial phase, in the beginning, it was so overwhelming, I don’t think the opportunity to review it was enough time. Another two weeks would give the candidates another opportunity to say, you did a good job, now do it again. Only one day a week was tough. If we met two days a week, we could have done some of the homework in class; we could have done some of it with the instructors. I met with my group on the weekends. My feeling is a little bit more time to explain it, it would have been better. Also, the program should be open to anyone who has at least 4 years on the job as a patrolman.

9. Is there anything else that you would like to add, ask or clarify?

I recommend it to anyone who becomes a police officer. It can’t hurt. Everyone should be required to go, especially when you make rank. It is only helping us as police officers. We should have a one-day refresher course. You don’t forget it, but you need to practice
it. It made me a better person. Again, the WPL&C is a phenomenal course and it should be mandated for sergeants and above.

Summary

This study was prefaced upon four research questions designed to measure the effectiveness of the WPL&C Program curriculum. A quantitative and a qualitative instrument were utilized. Seventy mailings consisting of appropriate documentation, a Demographic Survey Form, the survey instrument and an Interview Interest Form were mailed to the original population of N=70. Of the 70 questionnaires distributed, 22 were completed and returned. Of these, 16 requested the opportunity to participate in a qualitative interview. Ten of these were randomly selected through the utilization of random numbers tables.
Chapter V
SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Introduction
The purpose of this research was to study the relationship between completion of the West Point Leadership and Command Program and the graduate's perception of their leadership skills subsequent to graduation. Additionally, this research sought to determine the graduate's perception of the influence of the West Point Leadership and Command Program upon their ability to meet leadership challenges related to the attacks of September 11, 2001. Implicit in this research were questions about how leadership may be taught and learned. Lastly, this research sought the graduate's perception of course pedagogy and related matters. The effectiveness of the program was the prime focus of this research. This chapter shall serve to articulate the findings of the study. Additionally, qualitative findings will be summarized. Of an original population of 70, 22 respondents agreed to participate in the study. Subsequent to two
Mailings the total of 22 responses, including returned surveys and Demographic Survey Forms became to study population, N=22. Within these returns were 16 completed Interview Interest Forms. Ten of these were selected through the use of random number tables for interviews. The interview population was 10.

Chapter Summaries

Chapter I served to establish the relevancy and significance of the research. Additionally, this chapter served to establish the scope and parameters of the research. The Statement of the Problem, identification of research questions, and inherent limitations were established within this first chapter. The essence of this chapter was to provide for the organization of the study while articulating the philosophical premise of the studies significance.

Chapter II served to review relevant historic and professional literature. Additionally, literature related to leadership curriculum and pedagogy was explored. The research base for and literature related to the evolution of the West Point Leadership and Command Program were reviewed so as to facilitate an understanding of the program.
Chapter III constituted the research and methodology dimension of this research. It served as the organizational frame for the statistical and research design of this study. As such, Chapter III was the paradigm for the study’s quantitative and qualitative designs, data collection and analysis, methodology and the application of instruments. Included were the discussions of the population, surveys and interview instruments, random selection of respondents for interviews, and demographic survey forms.

Chapter IV served to report the findings of the study. Quantitative data collected through the application of mailed survey instruments and the DSF were reported and summarized in various forms through this chapter. The quantitative data is based upon the final study population of 22. Of the study population of 22, 16 respondents volunteered to participate in the interview portion of the study. Ten of these were randomly selected through the application of random number tables for an interview. Audio recordings were made of these interviews and were subsequently transcribed. The combination of quantitative surveys and qualitative interviews served to enrich the depth and breadth of the research. Finally, these
interviews served to memorialize relevant leadership perceptions and experiences of September 11, 2001.

Chapter V serves to summarize the research, synthesize findings, and evaluate related dimensions worthy of future exploration. As the research began with a discussion of the significance of the study, it shall conclude by restating its philosophical premise and relevance to professional integrity, public safety and homeland security.

Recommendations for Enhancement of the WPL&C Program

The following recommendations are based upon interviewee responses to question six of the interview. Question six was: "What recommendations would you make to enhance the quality and effectiveness of the WPL&C Program?"

Respondent 1 answered, "That's difficult, because I went through—I was only the second class—1994, I know the program has changed—academics, more towards to homeland security. I like the way the program was designed. I think it was a good learning vehicle. From what I understand, it still is, but to give you a definitive answer on that is difficult. Things have changed so much since 9/11."

Respondent 2 answered, "I thought it was a pretty good program all together. I might look at the texts, maybe, as
far as something more for cops, or maybe an orientation phase and read the book ahead of time."

Respondent 3 answered:
Well, I have to say that the Intellectual Procedure would need to be revamped somehow. I don’t have an answer for it. I don’t know how you would do it. I’m still amazed that you guys went through two weeks of that training and it took us two months to try to understand what you guys did in two weeks. It’s a very complicated task, and there was a tremendous amount of work involved in that program that if that could be scaled down to work you have to do at home, after putting in a full day. There’s no doubt I was putting in three, four hours a night after work trying to understand. If it wasn’t so damned complicated, it could be simplified where you could absorb it quicker, easier. It would have been a heck of a lot easier and a lot less time consuming. When you do go to this course, you are usually in the upper ranks and you’re fairly intelligent. Trying to teach somebody a new language so speak, as some of this stuff was, it was definitely a new language. It was so complicated; it took all your energy away from everything else you
did. It took away from your family, your work; it really was difficult. I had to give up part time work and everything. It was a struggle getting through this. I'm very proud that I got through it. It was difficult though. When I went through, it was new, it was brand new. I was the second class you guys offered. The bugs hadn't been worked out. It was just incredibly difficult. If we could get that first part down, break that down to a system where... It's easier to comprehend the rest of the program, because once you get past that, the rest of the program, it flows, but trying to apply the remainder of the program to the beginning, was a difficult task. I don't know. Maybe you could change the terminology, make it more police-friendly, for lack of a better word. That was the difficult part.

Respondent 4 answered, "I don't really see it as enhancing the program, but enhancing our police departments. It would be a requirement that people go to it. You take a small department like this; everybody should be required to go. I could probably do that here. I think there should be more of a component like with the chiefs association. Everybody should be on the same page."
Respondent 5 said, "I think agency heads should be required to attend West Point before they send the people under them to it. If you are going to send a subordinate to school to become a leader and then not allow them to use what they learned because you haven’t gone to the course, then you have no idea of the proper way things should be done."

Respondent 6 answered, "I think the program is great. Almost all my command staff has gone. That’s my goal. There are only two left. We need to all work the same way. People want to know that the leadership is dealing with them fairly and consistently. It makes everything the same."

Respondent 7 answered, "Really, the only thing wrong with the program was the time issue, the time it took to dive into this stuff. If there was something like a sleep away camp, like the National Academy, it would be more effective. That kind of setting would have made it more embedded, better learned."

Respondent 8 answered:

I think the program could be split possibly for the lower end, for supervisors; there should be next step whether it should be a refresher or a next level up;
it would be nicer to have something for higher in the department. There should be two sections: one for supervisors and one for administrators. In a perfect world, you train everybody. The administrators would have already had that level. A statewide or regional area; try to do something to that effect. We didn’t discuss moving outside the organization in the KPL&C Program. When you get to an administrative level, you well know, you’re not dealing only with your organization any more. You are dealing with every organization around you—and the higher ends. Try to incorporate that into it.

Respondent 9 answered, "I know right now we are talking about adding another portion of the emotional intelligence. I think that’s being reworked right now. I’d put the leadership behaviors first. Other than that, I think it’s a great program."

Respondent 10 answered:

Probably not going to want to hear this. I know it’s a long course, but make it a bit longer—2 weeks—because during the initial phase, in the beginning, it was so overwhelming, I don’t think the opportunity to review it was enough time. Another two weeks would give the
candidates another opportunity to say, you did a good job, now do it again. Only one day a week was tough.
If we met two days a week, we could have done some of the homework in class; we could have done some of it with the instructors. I met with my group on the weekends. My feeling is a little bit more time to explain it, it would have been better. Also, the program should be open to anyone who has at least 4 years on the job as a patrolman.

These responses serve to provide a focus for future change and prioritization of planned change. Probably the most significant of these recommendations are that "agency heads should be required to attend" and that "a small department like this; everybody should be required to go."
These recommendations serve to clarify the value that these graduates place upon the program. While responses about the intellectual procedure and case studies suggest how pedagogy could be improved, these responses express the internalization of the program’s value to the profession.
Likewise, responses to question 5 of the interview reflect the dramatic impact that the WPLAC Program had upon its graduates on and subsequent to September 11, 2001.
Question 5 was "Do you feel that the WPLAC Program enhanced
your ability to lead your organization through the phases of first response, consequence management, and the organizational adaptation that followed? Eight of 10 interviews respondents stated that the program did positively and directly influence their leadership abilities on and subsequent to the attacks of September 11, 2001. Respondent 3 stated that he wasn’t certain if the "WPL&C affected it or not...I didn’t have any problems here. I didn’t have the towns that were directly affected by 9/11." Respondent 7 stated that "I wasn’t that involved that day. Now that RDT and McReds and group deployment, I can see a lot of that. I’m a little more prepared now."

Thus, 80 percent of those interviewed express a direct, positive and at times dramatic correlation between the program and their leadership abilities as related to the attacks of September 11th. These interviews are contained within the appendices and are worthy of additional study from leadership and historic perspectives.

Recommendations for Future Study

The findings of this study are worthy of additional research. The justifications for additional research are premised upon the nature of the leadership mission in a post September 11, 2001 environment, traditional matters of
public trust, the utilization of public funding and the fundamental right of followers to be led by "smart, thoughtful and reflective leaders" (New Jersey State Association of Chiefs of Police, 1994, p. 18). The need to continually study the efficiency and effectiveness of the program is critical to the program's success. Further study will serve to adapt the program to changes within the academic field as well as to changing organizational or global demands.

The findings of this study need to be validated through subsequent research involving a larger sample comprised of more jurisdictional entities and a greater representation of graduates from the mid-nineties through the present.

Additionally, further research should seek to determine the program's impact upon urban, suburban and rural agencies as well as its impact upon the New Jersey State Police.

Further research of the program's impact upon graduates from Europol would be of particular interest. These graduates represent multiple national and cultural variables. This research would serve to measure the
program's effectiveness across national, continental and cultural barriers.

Research involving the follower's perception of graduate leadership behaviors, skills, and abilities prior to and subsequent to completion of the program would, similar to a "360 degree evaluation," serve to eliminate any inherent self-serving bias from the graduate.

Explore the correlation of scores on the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) (Briggs & Myers, 1998) before and after completion of this course.

Research focused upon the program's impact across graduate generational demographics such as generation X, Y, Z.

Continued research designed to measure the program's impact upon promotions of graduates subsequent to graduation and the graduate's perception of the program's relevance to promotions.

Research any correlation between graduation and the subsequent pursuit of higher education.

Research to measure changes in a jurisdictional community's (municipal, county, etc.) perception of a graduate's leadership skills subsequent to graduation.
This is relevant to the most fundamental tenets of community policing.

Research seeking to measure a graduate's perception of the applicability of skills learned within the WPLC Program to post-retirement, non-law enforcement organizational leadership positions.

A longitudinal study designed to measure the WPLC Program's perceived effectiveness over time.

These proposals serve to provide a multidimensional model for future research of the WPLC Program's impact. To remain effective, efficient, and relevant the program's leadership must be focused upon internal and external challenges and opportunities. Future scholarly research will serve to ensure the program's effectiveness in attaining goals and objectives that are relevant to current organizational challenges.

Reflections

As established within the review of the relevant literature, law enforcement has sought and struggled for applicable models of professional leadership since the Metropolitan Police Act of 1829. This need became critical on and after September 11, 2001. Social, cultural, legal and organizational pressures demanded dynamic and
transformational leadership. Post September 11th challenges including the threat of terror attacks, the war in Iraq and Afghanistan, homeland security and infra-structure protection initiatives require a caliber of leadership not common within the ranks of law enforcement. Since 2001 the federal government reorganized a multitude of agencies under the Department of Homeland Security. This reorganization sought to facilitate a more efficient organizational structure with enhanced information sharing, effective command and control, and a more effective response to national emergencies. The Department of Homeland Security's first post September 11, 2001 challenge was Hurricane Katrina. The department's preliminary, secondary and consequence management response to the gulf coast demonstrated a lack of leadership at the local, county, state and federal levels. Although law enforcement agencies from throughout the nation rose to the need by sending personnel and equipment, many did so in spite of the organizational, legal and jurisdictional obstacles created by various levels of government. Katrina serves to illustrate that although organizational structure and process are crucial, leadership at all levels of government is prerequisite to success. The Federal Response to
Hurricane Katrina: Lessons Learned (Katrina Lessons Learned Review Group, 2006) reiterates the need for trained leaders:

An Effective National Preparedness System requires that management and response personnel, especially those in the field, are well versed in their missions. At all levels of government, we must build a leadership corps that is fully educated, trained, and exercised in our plans and doctrine. Training is not nearly as costly as the mistakes made in a crisis. Equally important, this corps must be populated by leaders who are prepared exhibit innovation and take the initiative during extremely trying circumstances. (p.72)

This study has established that leadership can be taught and that the West Point Leadership and Command Program is an effective model for meeting current and future challenges.

Arising from the Christopher Commission Report (Independent Commission of the Los Angeles Police Department, 1991) the West Point Leadership and Command Program and its graduates are challenged by a world and a profession transformed by global terrorism. As one
interview respondent stated about the program's impact upon his leadership abilities on and subsequent to the attacks of September 11, 2001, "Absolutely, in more ways than one. I knew, as did every other administrator at that time knew at that point, that our life as law enforcement officials changed."
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Appendix A

Demographic Survey Form
DEMOGRAPHIC SURVEY FORM

Age: ___________________

Race: ________________

Gender: ______________

Agency Size/Quantity of sworn personnel: _______________________

Agency Type: [ ] Municipal Police Department
[ ] County Park Police
[ ] County Sheriff's Department
[ ] County Prosecutor's Office

Rank at time of graduation from WPL&C: ______________________

Current Rank: __________________

Active Service or Retired at this time: _______________________

Years of law enforcement experience: ___________

Years of law enforcement supervisory experience: ___________

Your highest level of completed education:
[ ] High School/GED
[ ] Some college: _____ credits
[ ] AA/AS Degree
[ ] BA/BS Degree
[ ] MA/MS/MA Degree
[ ] Other; please specify______________________________

Please return this form with the survey in the blue postage paid envelope.

Thank you for your cooperation.
Joseph A. Devine
Appendix B

Quantitative Survey Questions
An Analysis of the West Point leadership and Command Program's Impact upon Law Enforcement Leadership

by Joseph A. Devine

Quantitative Survey Questions

On a scale of 5 (Strongly Agree) to 1 (Strongly Disagree), please respond to each of the following statements:

1) The WPL&C Program enhanced my leadership skills, knowledge and abilities.

5 4 3 2 1

2) The utilization of a case study driven curriculum enhanced my ability to learn leadership.

5 4 3 2 1

3) The application of the "intellectual Procedure" to leadership case studies aided my learning of leadership theories.

5 4 3 2 1

4) As a result of completing the WPL&C Program, I believe that leadership can be effectively taught as a science.

5 4 3 2 1
5) Prior to completing the WPL&C Program, I believed that leaders were born not made.

5 4 3 2 1

6) The WPL&C Program enabled me to more effectively compete for promotions.

5 4 3 2 1

7) My leadership performance improved significantly as a result of leadership lessons learned in the WPL&C Program.

5 4 3 2 1

8) I would have preferred a different approach to learning leadership than the WPL&C Program's case study driven curriculum. If applicable, please explain.__________________________

5 4 3 2 1

9) The quality of the instructional staff enhanced the effectiveness of the course.

5 4 3 2 1
10) The assigned text, *Leadership in Organizations*, served to enhance the effectiveness of the WPL&C Curriculum.

11) As a result my completion of the WPL&C Program, I was better able to meet the leadership challenges affecting my agency on and arising from the attacks of September 11, 2001.
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Interview Questions
INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Question 1

Prior to your completion of the WPL&C Program did you think that leadership could be learned in a classroom?

Question 1a

Subsequent to your completion of the WPL&C Program do you feel differently about how leadership can be learned?

Question 2

Did the WPL&C Program serve to make you a better leader than you were prior to your exposure to the program's curriculum? Please explain and provide an example.

Question 3

What is your perception of the effectiveness of each of the following dimensions of the WPL&C Program?

Question 3a

The course content: specifically the individual, group and organizational theories presented.

Question 3b

The "Intellectual Procedure."

Question 3c

The case studies.
Question 4
What was the WPL&C Program's greatest strength?

Question 4a
What was the WPL&C Program's greatest weakness?

Question 5
Were you in a law enforcement leadership role on or immediately subsequent to the attacks of September 11, 2001? If so, do you feel that the WPL&C Program enhanced your ability to lead your organization through the phases of first response, consequence management, and the organizational adaptation that followed? Please explain.

Question 6
What recommendations would you make to enhance the quality and effectiveness of the WPL&C Program?

Upon conclusion of the afore-cited questions, this researcher will ask if there is anything else that the respondent would like to discuss, clarify or ask.
Appendix D

Interview Interest Form
INTERVIEW INTEREST FORM

PLEASE RETURN THIS FORM ONLY IF YOU ARE INTERESTED IN THE INTERVIEW PORTION OF THE STUDY.

By my signature on this form, ___________________________________________, indicate my willingness to participate in the interview portion of the Analysis of the West Point Leadership and Command Program’s Impact upon Law Enforcement Leadership study. I understand that my interest in the interview does not guarantee that I will be interviewed. I also understand that I may withdraw my interest at any time without penalty or loss.

_________________________________________  __________________________
Signature                                      Date

Contact Information: Address: ___________________________________________

Phone: ___________________________________________

Email: ___________________________________________

Please return this form in the white postage paid envelope.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Joseph A. Devine
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