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ABSTRACT

Leadership Characteristics of Military Veterans as School Administrators

Elliot F. Bolles

The Troops to Teachers (TTT) program was created in 1994 to provide funds to recruit and support former members of the military as teachers in high-poverty schools. Most of the research on TTT participants has been positive, and leadership is often mentioned as an important factor in participants’ successes. A number of these military veterans have moved from the classroom into school administrative positions. Initial research on these administrators based on the ISLLC standards has been positive. This multiple case study drew from interviews and surveys with 15 former military veterans currently administrating in K-12 schools to increase our understanding of the experiences and values that they bring to the classroom. It relied on Stake’s (YEAR) case study methodology to surface findings. The five findings, presented in order of strength of evidence, include: 1) Participants’ overarching leadership philosophy was taking care of the people. 2) The leadership that participants had witnessed in both the military and in education influenced their own leadership. 3) Not all of the participants utilized TTT. 4) Participants had classroom experiences that were consistent with previous research on new teachers. 5) The veterans’ values as they relate to trust, delegating responsibility, accountability, and beliefs in service, merit future inquiry. These values, along with “taking care of their people”, appear to be the commonality between the two seemingly incongruent cultures of the military and education. This study has implications for future research and educational leadership training both at the university and district levels.
DEDICATION

This study is dedicated to my father, Hébert W. Bolles, Chaplain Corps, Captain, US Navy. He grew up during the great depression and fought in World War II as a young ensign in the Pacific. Following the war, he became an Episcopal priest. In 1961, he returned to active duty in the Navy, but as a Chaplain. In 1966, he was assigned to a Marine Battalion and served in Vietnam from 1966-67. He retired in 1979 as a Navy Captain, with over 20 years active duty and a total of 37 years of service. While in Vietnam he wrote a series of poems, often only hours after the event, in which he described events and the relationships he witnessed. The following poem, Wherever, is one such poem. It describes the leader’s commitment to his men and how he followed through on his promise. It is an example of genuine integrity and exceptional leadership.

I gained a deep and abiding understanding of what it meant to lead from the stories he shared of Vietnam and World War II.

“WHEREVER”  
(Bolles, 1967)

The strong, quiet colonel, who led us long ago had said:  
“We’ll never leave you there;  
whatever happens, we’ll take you with us.”

And this attitude of pure self-giving had marked us still  
from that past day till this.

Nice phrase? Pat statement that? Not really.  
Of the core of life and love and coming where we are...

The way was sandy, feet slipped  
and solid ground was hard to find  
and on we passed  
Command Group Alpha pressing forward  
up towards our “objective”  
that had been set by the Division Staff.
Over the radio there came the word
that a small unit, only six,
had fallen into action with a VC group
of twenty men and automatic weapons.

The message spoke of two men KIA;
three wounded and one escaped unhurt.

“We’ll have to send some riflemen
back there to get them out.”

And so the “objective” faltered then
and back across the lately won
and still contested ground -
back thru the sniper fire upon our flank -
our colonel led us,
the whole group
spread out along the trail
to seek the other members of our band
who’d fallen or been hit.

Back again led by a steady captain
two lieutenants and the sergeant major
who all had known the bond
that exists between those who fight in war...

And back again thru sniper fire
and bursting mortar rounds
and a charge across an open field
to “come where they were”...

And covered with their blood
they picked them up and carried them
and brought them back and took them with us...

They “slept” that night along with us
in the same fields we’d marched before.

The mission faltered for some hours, I guess,
but the promise lived.

“Wherever my Lord the King shall be,„
whether for death or for life,
even there also will your servant be.” 2nd Samuel 15: 21
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Educational Leadership

Leadership has become a key component in educational reform in the 2000’s (Fullan, 2003). No significant school reform has taken place without effective leadership (Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004). In struggling schools where the needs are the greatest, the effects of leadership are the greatest (Leithwood et al., 2004). Successful leaders provide direction for a school, develop the people in that school, and reorganize the school if necessary (Leithwood et al., 2004). The principal’s leadership has been shown to have a statistically significant effect on student achievement (Marzano, Walters, & McNulty, 2005). In fact, the principal’s leadership is second only to the classroom teacher, as the most important school related factor in improving student achievement (Leithwood et al., 2004; Marzano et al., 2005; Wahlstrom, Louis, Leithwood, & Anderson, 2010).

The principal position remains the linchpin of educational leadership with its strong correlation between the principal’s leadership and student achievement (Leithwood et al., 2004, Marzano et al., 2005, Wahlstrom et al., 2010). Effective leaders are able to maintain a balance between stability and change. Principals are most effective when they feel part of a team working together toward a common goal with the district, other principals, and teachers. These successful leaders encourage and support the staff to create a positive work environment as well as redesign the organization to improve its effectiveness (Wahlstrom et al., 2010).

States, school districts, and universities continue to search for strong educational leaders. Traditionally, aspiring principals move into the leadership track as they gain experience in the
classroom. They have a variety of instructional specialties and experiences. These teachers also come from traditional undergraduate programs and from alternative certification programs (Mitgang, 2012). One such alternative program, Troops to Teachers (TTT), began assisting veterans in becoming teachers in the mid-nineties (Owings, Kaplan, Nunnery, Marzano, Myran, & Blackburn, 2006).

**Troops to Teachers in the Classroom**

As the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan wind down, a reduction in force has begun across the military services (Reilly, 2013). The TTT program was designed to support military veterans in their transition to a second career in education by providing counseling on teacher certification requirements. It also provides financial support for the veteran and the school district in this transition (Banks, 2007). The TTT program is a proven resource that is ready to assist this latest wave of veterans returning to civilian life. Much of the research has shown that, with the appropriate training and support, these veterans can become highly qualified and successful teachers (Ballard, 2005; Broe, 2007; Chaparro-Ramirez 2008; Owings et al., 2006; Nunnery, Kaplan, Owings, & Pribesh, 2009). Leadership is often identified as strength of the TTT teacher (Ballard, 2005; Broe, 2008; Chaparro-Ramirez, 2008; Owings et al., 2006; Nunnery et al., 2009). It is at least partially for this reason that the existing research suggests that TTT teachers’ military-based leadership style is worth further examination (Ballard, 2005; Broe, 2008).

**Troops to Teachers as Administrators**

A relatively small number of TTT veterans have moved into school administration. These TTT administrators have proven themselves successful and are highly rated by their superiors (Owings, Kaplan, & Chappell, 2011). Research seems to indicate that these administrators, due to their military background and training bring something unique to
education (Owings et al., 2011). Ballard (2005), Broe (2007), Nunnery et al. (2009), and Chaparro-Ramirez (2008) all noted the strong leadership of the TTT teacher. The examination of these administrators found them strong across the board using the ISLLC standards (Owings et al., 2011). Summarily, the TTT teachers are effective and their leadership skills are often noted positively (Ballard, 2005; Broe, 2008, Chaparro-Ramirez, 2008; Owings et al., 2006; Nunnery et al., 2009).

TTT teachers have also been found to be successful leaders (Owings et al., 2011). Initial research indicates that their distinctive military leadership foundation has proven successful in the educational arena (Owings et al., 2011). This study expands on that research by examining the leadership styles and characteristics of military veterans who are K-12 administrators.

**Military Leadership**

A brief introduction to military leadership training is appropriate to gain some insight into the TTT administrators’ foundation. Military leadership is often characterized as autocratic but recent research had found it more complex (Hajjar, 2013; Laurence, 2011; Taylor, Rosenbach & Rosenbach, 2009). Military leaders work in a constantly changing, unpredictable, and uncertain world. One minute they are warriors, the next they are peacemakers and diplomats analyzing motivations and intentions while building relationships (Laurence, 2011; Hajjar, 2013). Such requirements necessitate social, emotional, and cultural intelligence (Laurence, 2011) as well as physical and strategic acumen. In such an environment, the principles of military leadership are the foundation for success (U.S. Marine Corps, 2013).

Leadership is actively taught, analyzed, and demonstrated throughout all levels of the military (Broe, 2008). It is a key part of training upon entry into the officer corps and continues
through the highest levels. It is an equally significant part of the training for enlisted non-
commissioned officers, since they have the most direct contact with personnel (Laurence, 2011).

The US Army, Navy, and Marine Corps have all adopted the same 11 principles of leadership (U.S. Marine Corps, 2013). Though the U.S. Air Force principles rely on slightly different verbiage, they are similar in spirit. Hence, for the most part, 11 common principles comprise the foundation of leadership in the military. Five of the principles are directed at the leader and his or her personal requirements and goals. Another five are related to how the leader interacts and builds relationships with those being led. The last principle addresses the task assigned and its importance. The leadership principles include:

- Know yourself and seek self-improvement
- Be technically and tactically proficient.
- Develop a sense of responsibility among your subordinates
- Make sound and timely decisions
- Set the example
- Know your (Marines, Soldiers, Sailors) and look out for their welfare
- Keep your (Marines, Soldiers, Sailors) informed.
- Seek responsibility and take responsibility for your action
- Ensure assigned tasks are understood, supervised, and accomplished
- Train your (Marines, Soldiers, Sailors) as a team
- Employ your command in accordance with its capabilities (Leadership Principles, 2013; Italics added to show other service terminology.)

A complete description of these leadership principles is found in Appendix A.
These principles are military, but easily applicable to the civilian world and community life (U.S. Marine Corps, 2013). If one were to substitute the word staff, teacher, or colleague in place of marine or soldier, the principles are completely appropriate for educational leadership.

**Military Environments**

The military practices these principles day to day, in both combat and noncombat settings. The mission of the military is to “…provide the military forces needed to deter war and to protect the security of our country” (U.S. Department of Defense, 2013). On a practical level, this means being ready. A military organization’s mission is to provide the training to accomplish its tasks or prepare the necessary resources for contingencies. This mission includes building teamwork and unit cohesiveness. Most of the time, military personnel are not in direct hostile situations. They train for combat, but are not in combat. The principles of military leadership do not suddenly change when in a combat environment. The principles apply during combat, but also in an office, at an air base, during training, in a maintenance facility, in a supply warehouse, aboard ship, and in countless other noncombat situations (U.S. Marine Corps, 2013).

The military, of course, is different from business or education. To ask people to risk their lives requires dedication, training, discipline, proper equipment, and strong leadership. People need to believe in their training and equipment and have trust in their superiors. To earn that faith and trust, military leaders consciously study, discuss, and seek to improve their leadership skills throughout their careers (Broe, 2008). High stakes combat conditions may change some aspects in the application of leadership, but they do change the core nature of its principles (U.S. Marine Corps, 2013).

As noted, the principles of leadership are related to the leader as an individual, to the leader’s interaction with subordinates, and finally with the task to be accomplished. The
principles support the two basic elements of military leadership, which are the mission and the people. The mission is paramount, however, the people are necessary for the success of the mission. The people are the ones who accomplish the mission. As the former Chief Master Sergeant of the Air Force Robert D. Gaylor put it: “If a leader will take care of their people by providing support, motivation, communication and discipline, their people will take care of the mission (Minnesota Wing, Civil Air Patrol, Powerpoint slide 14, 2008).”

**Military and Educational Leadership**

When military leaders are issuing orders, it may seem incongruent with education. However, most of leadership takes place before the management or issuing orders phase. As researchers have noted time and again, leadership is a continuous process of understanding your people, training them, getting their input, encouraging initiative, and making them part of the process (Kouzes & Posner, 2012). It appears that TTT educators who are grounded in these leadership skills have been very successful (Ballard, 2005; Broe, 2008, Chaparro-Ramirez, 2008; Nunnery et al., 2009; Owings, et al., 2011; Owings et al., 2006).

While the stakes of educational leadership are not as immediately costly as those of military leadership (in a combat situation), they potentially have far reaching consequences for families and students. As one of Broe’s (2008) subject veterans noted, “Making decisions in the educational field is … very important; poor decisions may not cost anyone their life, but they can certainly affect their lives” (p. 107).

**Summary**

In this introductory chapter, leadership is identified as a significant part of education and student achievement (Leithwood et al. 2004; Marzano et al., 2005; Wahlstrom et al., 2010). Military veterans have moved into education, some with the assistance of the TTT program as
teachers and later as administrators. As educational leaders, these TTT administrators have been rated highly by their superiors (Owings et al., 2011). These veterans bring a distinctive leadership background to the educational arena. This study expands the research of Owings et al. (2011) by examining the leadership values and experiences of military veteran administrators.

Research Questions

Chapter 2 builds the conceptual framework for this study with a review of research on military veterans as teachers and administrators. It builds to the following research questions:

The study was designed to address the following research questions:

1. **Research question:** Are there consistent, foundational tenets of leadership found among military veterans in their role as school administrators?

2. **Research question:** What implications do their tenets of leadership hold in the field of educational leadership?
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

The conceptual framework for this study is built upon four sections in this literature review. This framework sets forth an examination of the leadership traits of former military personnel as school administrators. First, there is a discussion of the history and purpose of the Troops to Teachers (TTT) program. This discussion is followed by a review of research about veterans who have come to education through the TTT program. In this section, I review studies that demonstrate the strengths and shortcomings of TTT participants. The third section begins with a brief examination of the relationship between contemporary educational leadership and student learning and moves on to a review of research about veterans working in school administrative positions. The final section looks briefly at the leadership principles of the military and how they relate to education.

Examining TTT participants both as teachers and administrators begins to establish the conceptual framework for this study. Reviewing the significance of educational leadership on student performance continues to strengthen the framework. Looking at how most military leadership principles are consistent with education will firm up the conceptual framework for further study. This study is an examination of the leadership practices, styles, and philosophies of former military personnel who are school administrators. Building on the existing research, this study of military-based leadership in the educational leadership field will have implications for educational leadership.

Troops to Teachers History and Evolution

The origin of the Troops to Teachers (TTT) program dates back to the late 1980’s when...
the Department of Education began to anticipate a teacher shortage and the Department of Defense was beginning to downsize from its cold world numbers (Coupland, 2004). In 1988, the U.S. Navy had a program “teaching as a new career” which made educational classes available to service members. In 1992, the U.S. Army collaborated with the state of Texas with its Military Teacher Initiative. In addition, in 1992, Congress passed the Defense Authorization Bill, which had a provision for former service members to receive a $5000 stipend that could be used toward teacher certification. Local Education Agencies (LEA’s) could petition for grants up to $25,000 per year for two years if they hired former military members as teachers in high need schools.

J.H. “Jack” Hexter, a Yale history professor is often credited with the concept of Troops to Teachers. He was interested in finding teachers to help inner city schools and he wanted to assist military retirees find second careers (Banks, 2007). The TTT was formerly established in 1994 as a Department of Defense (DOD) program that provided financial incentives for military veterans to become teachers in high-need schools where math, science, special education, and vocational teachers were needed (Banks, 2007). The Defense Activity for Non-Traditional Educational Support (DANTES) within the DOD administered the program. The $5000 stipend for the individual service member remained; however the grant to local districts with high needs was increased to $50,000 a year for five years. High needs referred to either a high number of Title 1 students and or a large percentage of students qualifying under IDEA.

In the National Defense Authorization Act for FY2000 responsibility for the TTT program was transferred from the Department of Defense (DOD) to the Department of Education (DOE); however operationally, it remained with DANTES in the DOD. The No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001 provided for continued financial support for TTT and left the
responsibility for the program with the Department of Education. In 2013, the responsibility for TTT was transferred back to the DOD where it continues to be managed by DANTES.

The TTT program’s mission was and remains to assist veterans pursue second careers in education and to help fill difficult teaching positions in math and science in urban and Title 1 districts. The federal TTT office in DANTES and the TTT offices at the state level act as a conduit for information and opportunities for veterans. These offices do not certify nor train the veterans. Rather they provide counseling and financial assistance with teacher certification. There are a total of 65 state and regional offices throughout the country (Troops to Teachers, 2014). State requirements for veterans vary from passing content tests to completing a full alternate certification program with Masters degree, practicum, and student teaching. The funding is on a per veteran basis, similar to a grant or scholarship for the individual.

As part of the NCLB Act of 2001 that reauthorized the Troops to Teachers program, the U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO) conducted an in-depth assessment of the program and the findings were published in 2006. They found that the program has had an uneven implementation throughout the country. Seven states, California, Colorado, Texas, Arizona, Florida, Georgia, and Virginia have the majority of veterans utilizing the TTT program (GAO, 2006, March). These seven states support hundreds of veterans a year, while many others serve ten or less. Due to economy of scale, a teacher in Arkansas may only costing $167 in recruiting and counseling costs while a veteran teacher in Montana costs $22,000 in recruiting and counseling costs (GAO, 2006).

The GAO report also noted that high needs districts hired approximately 90% of the TTT teachers between 2001 and 2005. However, only about 33% taught in the priority areas of math, science, special education, or vocational. The GAO found there were inconsistent definitions of
“high need” in both schools and districts across the country. There also found a lack of specificity on what defined a large percent of students under IDEA. With this report, the GAO tasked the Department of Education to improve the management of the program. Unfortunately, there has not been a follow-up GAO report and responsibility has changed back to the DOD.

The number of veterans who have used the Troops to Teachers program is unclear (Owings et al., 2014). The DOD database appears to include personnel who have used Troops to Teachers for counseling and referral as well as those that have been financially supported by the program (Owings et al., 2014, p. 48). On the Troops to Teachers web site, they report 17,000 veterans have used the program and been hired since 1994 (2014). Reports of 17,000 or 18,000 participants have been provided; however Owings et al. (2014) noted that perhaps only 14,000 had received financial support (p. 9, footnote 1).

The total amount of TTT participants over the past 20 years, whether 14,000 or 18,000, is not particularly high when compared to the roughly 60,000 teachers that come through alternative certification programs yearly (Feistritzer, 2011). Additionally, with the U.S. commitment to the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan winding down, 2.8 million (Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America, 2011) veterans have returned home from military service. Some of these veterans have used the TTT program to transition to education.

Despite some of its limitations, TTT continues to assist veterans and help districts by providing teachers and grants (while funding permits) in hard-to-fill positions in needy schools (Banks, 2007; Schoof, 2013). The next section includes research on the TTT participant skills and dispositions.
Troops to Teachers Research

This review of Troops to Teacher (TTT) research includes veterans from Kentucky, Ohio, Virginia, Florida, and Arizona as well as a national study. It begins with the choice of becoming a teacher as well as the decision to stay. The influence of military experience for the TTT participants and its influence on their classroom instruction will be examined. Reviewing a national look at over 2,100 TTT participants and their respective supervisors provides some insight. Some contrary and data that has been called into question is also presented (Coupland, 2004; Donathan, 2007).

It should be noted that the TTT program assisted most of the military veterans/teachers who were examined in this literature review. However, not all military veterans in this review, or in this study, utilized the counseling or the financial support of the program (Ballard, 2005). The TTT label is often applicable to military veterans who have moved into the classroom, but it is not comprehensive. Since the program does not train nor certify military veterans as teachers, whether a veteran used the program or not did not disqualify them from this study or review.

It is also important to note that at the time this dissertation is being completed, Owings, Kaplan, Khrabrova, and Chappell (2014) published their discovery that the TTT database which was the foundation for much of the research I am about to review included many non-TTT participants. They stated that they did not believe that impacted the quality of any of these studies. Additionally, that the research in this review may include non-TTT participants in their samples creates room for quantified speculation that veterans in education— not just TTT participants – bring great strengths to the field of education.
The Choice to Become a Teacher and Stay

This discussion of recent Troops to Teacher (TTT) research begins 10 years ago with Ballard’s (2005) study of military veterans. While this research does not exclusively focus on TTT participants, it focuses on military veterans who entered education. It provides insight into factors influencing veterans’ decision-making processes about education as a second career. He relies on surveys and interviews to collect data from 16 military veterans who had begun second careers as educators. About half of the participants had moved out of the classroom and into school administrative positions. Ballard (2005) identifies four thematic findings about factors influencing veterans’ decision to become and remain educators. They include awareness of teaching as a career option, time and resources, their practical needs, and their personal needs.

Practical Factors Influencing the Decision to Become an Educator

Ballard’s first finding suggests that veterans who choose to enter education possess a basic awareness of teaching as an option for a second career. Ballard’s subjects all had a minimum of an undergraduate degree and three of the 16 had education degrees. Two of the veterans were married to teachers, and some had received guidance and counseling from the TTT program (Ballard, 2005). Thus, while some participants had a more developed understanding of teaching than others, a basic awareness of education as a career option was sufficient to bring participants to the profession.

Notably, some participants in Ballard’s (2005) study had completed a full master’s degree program. Others needed only some additional classwork to become certified. Resources, in terms of time and money, influenced some participants’ decision to earn teacher certification. Class work required a significant time and financial commitment for Ballard’s (2005) participants, many of who were middle-aged and had families. The question of whether or not
participants were willing to commit the time and financial resources to a career change was important.

Ballard (2005) relied on Maslow’s hierarchy of needs for his third finding. The most important factor influencing participants’ decision-making process was the earning potential of the teaching profession. Based on Maslow’s assertion that safety, shelter, and food are the most basic of human needs, Ballard finds that the veteran’s personal need for security was relevant to their decisions. Some of Ballard’s (2005) participants had retired from active duty and were receiving retirement benefits, which helped with this need. Working spouses and children were two other important factors that veterans took into account as they decided to pursue teaching as a career.

**Why They Stay and the Role of Leadership for TTT Participants**

Ballard (2005) found that self-actualization, the top of Maslow’s (1987) pyramid of human needs, played a role in the participants’ decisions to enter and remain in education. Participants were concerned with whether or not teaching allowed them “to become everything that one is capable of becoming” (2005, p. 142).

**The Leadership Lens Was Important in Determining the Final Theme**

The veteran participants were very aware of the leadership they encountered in education (Ballard, 2005). They viewed themselves and their administrators through a leadership lens. Veterans enter education with the belief that better leadership skills would be valuable in the classroom (Ballard, 2005), a finding later re-substantiated by Chaparro-Ramirez (2008) and Broe (2008). Veterans believe their prior military training and experience to have been beneficial in their new careers as teachers (Chaparro-Ramirez, 2008).
Half of Ballard’s subjects had moved out of the classroom to school administration at the building or district level. Others who stayed in the classrooms had seen the need within their schools and had become teacher leaders and mentors (Ballard, 2005). The veteran’s ability to act as a leader while teaching and the quality of others’ leadership influenced the sense of reward they gleaned from their work (Ballard, 2005).

**Nationwide TTT Examination**

In the national Troops to Teachers (TTT) examination conducted by Owings and colleagues (2006) with over 2100 TTT participants, findings show that teachers believed their military experience had helped prepare them in a number of ways including: working with diverse groups; organizing time and resources; working with colleagues, and possessing motivational skills, personal discipline, and leadership skills. Comments such as “My military experience provided me with extensive people and communications skills…” (2006, p. 74) were indicative of the TTT teacher’s self-reflections. Veterans also reported such things as “My military career prepared me to teach by giving me training in leadership, teamwork and interpersonal communications skills. I learned how to work together with counterparts as a team…” (2006, p. 76). People and communication skills come up repeatedly when the TTT teachers were asked about beneficial military experiences (Ballard, 2005; Broe, 2008, Chaparro-Ramirez, 2008, Owings et al. 2006).

It is safe to say, then, that most military veterans enter education aware of themselves as leaders, regardless of their role as a teacher or administrator (Ballard, 2005; Chaparro-Ramirez, 2008; Owings et al., 2006). Moreover, Ballard’s (2005) findings imply that leadership is an important component of veteran’s sense of self. These veterans arrive with a developed understanding of quality leadership (Ballard, 2005; Owings et al., 2006). They see themselves as
leaders and believe that their military leadership background give them an advantage as a teacher when compared to their non-military peers (Ballard, 2005; Owings et al., 2006). While they see an efficiency-oriented/collaboration-oriented distinction between military school leadership (Broe, 2008), they hold their school leaders to high standards (Ballard, 2005). Indeed, veteran- come-educators perceive the quality of school leadership as a factor contributing to TTT participants’ success in the classroom (Ballard, 2005). Though half of Ballard’s (2005) participants had moved into school leadership positions, more recent research (Broe, 2008) suggests that TTT participants find the “position of principal unappealing because of the nature of school bureaucracy” (p. 304). All of these studies suggest that we continue to need more research about veterans’ experiences as school leaders (Ballard, 2005; Broe, 2008; Chaparro-Ramirez, 2008).

**Leadership and the Transition to Classroom Instruction**

Any inquiry into the experiences of educational leaders with military backgrounds will require considering the research about TTT participants’ experiences with teaching and instruction. This section explores research on TTT participants’ classroom teaching, the factors that influenced it, and other people’s perspectives on TTT participants’ approach to instruction and classroom management. Leadership, once again, emerges as a relevant theme that raises questions for additional study.

**Influences: The Many Reasons for a Traditional Classroom Approach**

Coupland (2004) conducted a study on Ohio Troops to Teacher veterans to examine their experiences in the classroom. In particular, he was interested in how their military experience influenced their teaching. He found that the veterans’ military experience was but one of many influences on these new teachers. This is a different finding than some later studies (Ballard,
2005; Broe, 2008; Chaparro-Ramirez, 2007; Owings et al. 2006), which suggest that the TTT veterans’ military experiences played an important part for their success in the classroom.

Coupland’s (2004) case study research on 10 Ohio TTT participants relies on 60 class periods of observation, over 200 pages of scripted notes, and 600 pages of artifacts to compare TTT and non veteran teachers of similar teaching experience. He finds that TTT participants rely on military experiences in the classroom, but also draw on many non-military experiences such as their teacher education work, student teaching, and their own K-12 education (Coupland, 2004).

Coupland (2004) also finds that all of the TTT participants’ classrooms had a traditional feel to them and appeared to adopt a one-size-fits-all mentality about education. He observes student desks in rows, teacher desks either in the front or back of the room, classic boards in the front of the class, and bulletin boards covered with administrative information rather than student work. There was nothing in the veterans’ classrooms that made them stand out from other classrooms (2004, p. 97).

Veterans also had similar traditional teaching styles (Coupland, 2004). They had a teacher-centered approach to instruction—teaching in the front of the room for most of the period. Students were expected to listen and take notes. Most of the TTT participants’ questioning was characterized by a low level of Bloom’s Taxonomy of Cognitive Tasks and little beyond (2004). All of the participants in Coupland’s research relied on prepackaged curriculum provided by their districts and did little supplementing to meet student needs (2004). Most of the class readings and activities came directly from classroom textbooks. It was evident that the planning of instruction relied heavily on provided materials. TTT participants’ presented with a “where are we in the textbook…” mentality, rather than coming up with original instruction
based on student needs (Coupland, 2004, p. 98). Veterans appeared to draw extensively on their own K-12 experiences as they developed their teaching and what had worked for them when students, instead of best practices in education (Coupland, 2004).

The final similarity Coupland observed was that TTT participants had a loose classroom management style. Veterans coaxed students with such statements as “come on guys, this is important…” (p. 93) and used threats involving students’ grades (Coupland, 2004). This type of management resulted in a negotiated teacher-student relationship (Coupland, 2004).

Coupland concluded that the veterans’ teaching experiences were based on many factors, including, but not limited to, their military background. His research showed that the hierarchy and structure implicit in their military background often hindered the veterans’ improvement in the classroom. Veterans had well behaved classrooms and well organized instruction; however, their organization skills may have hidden the weaknesses in instruction and differentiated needs were not being met (Coupland, 2004). Coupland goes as far as saying that the positive reputation of TTT participants is a hindrance to their receiving the necessary training.

More recent work by Chaparro-Ramirez (2008) may begin to explain Coupland’s finding. In her arts-based inquiry of six TTT teachers, six peer non-TTT teachers, and their school administrators, she relied on interviews and observations to examine the transition from military culture to school culture. TTT participants are struck by the differences between the structure of the military and school culture. They experience some dissonance, reflecting that they understood the well-structured culture of the military but perceived a lack of structure in the culture, policies, and procedures of schools (Chaparro-Ramirez, 2008).
Others’ Perspectives on TTT Teaching

Donathan’s 2007 research reinforces some of Coupland’s results and raises questions about Owings et al. findings (2006). Donathan examined the experiences of 29 TTT participants who had used Option 5 to gain certification in Kentucky. In Kentucky Option 5 required the veteran to have a bachelor’s degree in the content area and passing scores in the subject matter assessment (Donathan, 2007). Using a mixed methodology of surveys and qualitative comments, the TTT participants, their principals, and state superintendents were included. Many of the veterans believed they were as well prepared as other new teachers (Donathan, 2007), as had the participants in Ballard’s (2005) and Coupland’s (2004) research. However, their principals and superintendents did not have as positive a view of their teaching skills and abilities. Their principals found the TTT participants 22.2% much less competent; 33.3% somewhat less competent; 22.2% as competent; only 22.2% somewhat more competent; and none much more competent when compared to traditionally certified peers. The superintendents reported TTT participants 14% not qualified; 33.3% not as qualified; and 38.8% as qualified, and 12.9% had no opinion (Donathan, 2007). These results are quite different from the findings of Owings et al. (2006), Chaparro-Ramirez (2008), and Broe (2008).

Kentucky’s certification requirements prioritize military experience as a prerequisite for teaching (Donathan, 2007). As noted earlier, the state of Kentucky had a generous program to encourage veterans into education. The state did not require post-graduate coursework to teach. Donathan’s (2007) findings tend to show that military experience alone is insufficient for TTT participants to succeed in the classroom. One of Donathan’s participants had described his teaching as “…old school—‘sit down, shut up, learn method’” (2007, p. 72). Such a teaching style is counter to today’s best practices (Saphier, Haley-Specia & Gower, 2008).
Coupland’s (2004) research found that military experience has little impact on veterans’ success in the classroom and points to the more significant influences of educational training, student teaching, and participants’ own K-12 experiences. The Kentucky TTT participants, again with less training, where certainly less effective teachers in the eyes of their supervisors (Donathan, 2007). These two studies call into the question the influence of prior military experience on veterans’ classroom instruction.

Owings et al. (2006) completed the first national examination of Troops to Teachers participants nearly 10 years after the program’s inception. They surveyed over 2,100 TTT teachers and their principals from 49 states and the District of Columbia to compare the efficacy of the TTT to traditionally prepared teachers. Principals who responded to this research overwhelmingly (90%) reported the TTT teachers were more effective in instruction and classroom management than traditionally trained teachers of similar experience (Owings et al., 2006). They (89.5%) also reported that their TTT teachers had a positive impact on student achievement to a greater degree than teachers of similar experience. Additionally, the principals reported they worked well with other teachers and staff, followed school policies and regulations, and lastly kept parents informed of their student's progress. Similarly, though on a much lesser scale, Chaparro-Ramirez (2008) found that principals wanted more TTT teachers in their schools.

A follow-up study in 2014 by Owings, Kaplan, Khrabrova, and Chappell (2014, March) with almost twice as many respondents (4,157) as the Owings et al. (2006) had fairly consistent results with the 2006 and 2009 studies. They found that “Troops teachers are effective instructors, likely to work in high-minority schools, teach critical subjects, use researched based instructional and classroom management practices” (p. 1). However, they also discovered that
the TTT database from the DOD included “about 2,500 troops who did not receive DOD funding” (p. 48). The purpose was to evaluate the TTT program, and although they were unable to determine who received funding and who did not, “They did not consider this …a threat to the study’s overall validity” (p. 48).

**TTT and Student Achievement**

Previous research on Troops to Teachers has studied the teachers and their skills in the classroom. In 2009, Nunnery, Kaplan, Owings, and Pribesh examined the Florida Troops to Teachers and their impact on elementary, middle, and high school students’ academic achievement. Their study involved approximately 6,500 Florida students’ reading and math skills. The study examined how well the students of TTT teachers compared with those of students who had traditionally trained teachers. A second question was on the effect of having a TTT teacher on student achievement relative to traditionally trained teachers of comparable experience. In both these questions they controlled for school, grade level, teaching experience, subject taught, student’s prior achievement, student’s minority status, Limited English Proficiency (LEP) status, special education status, free or reduced lunch status, and sex (Nunnery et al., 2009).

The results found that the TTT teachers had a statistically significant positive influence on student reading achievement when compared with teachers of similar experience (Nunnery et al., 2009). Again, when compared with teachers of similar experience, the TTT teachers had statistically significantly higher student achievement in math. In an additional comparison of TTT teachers to teachers with substantially more experience, the TTT teachers had similar reading results, but had a greater effect size for math achievement (Nunnery et al., 2009). There were issues of the race and sex of the TTT teachers that may warrant further examination. For
example: An African American male TTT teacher may have an advantage on an equally experienced female White teacher in a high needs school that has nothing to do with his military experience (Nunnery et al., 2009).

Despite these lingering questions, the TTT teachers were proving their worth as teachers by being as effective, if not more effective, than those with similar classroom experience. This report tends to confirm what the principals of TTT teachers report, i.e., that TTT teachers are equal to or superior to their traditionally trained peers with similar experience (Nunnery et al., 2009).

**Troops to Teachers as Administrators**

A number of TTT teachers have advanced into school administration and district supervision. Though it had been more than 15 years since the inception of the TTT program, no study had been conducted on TTT participants as administrators until Owings, Kaplan, and Chappell completed their *Troops to Teachers As School Administrators: A National Study of Principal Quality* in 2011. They surveyed the 107 former TTT who had moved into school administration. This was believed to be the total number of former TTT teachers who have moved into administration at the time (Owings et al., 2011). The TTT database was deemed the most reliable in identifying this cohort of administrators. They used the Principal Quality Rubric (PQR) using the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards.

Over a six-month period, all of the 107 TTT administrators’ supervisors completed the PQR. They were asked, “Where would you rank this person compared to an administrator with similar years of administrative experience who did not enter teaching through Troops to Teachers funding?” (Owings et al., 2011, p. 221). The responses came from 99 different school districts across 33 states or territories. Findings suggest that more than 91% of supervisors rated
TTT administrators as either proficient or distinguished on each of the six ISLLC standards (2011). The first four ISLLC standards deal with vision, culture of learning, management, and community and family collaboration. The TTT administrators were often rated as Proficient on these first four standards (Owings et al., 2011). For the last two standards that focus on integrity, fairness, political, and social contexts of learning, the TTT administrators were marked Distinguished (Owings et al., 2011).

The limitations of this survey included there was no examination of “…student achievement or other leadership outcomes” (Owings et al., 2011, p. 225). These researchers also noted the supervisors were asked to compare the TTT administrators with those of similar administrative experience while the age and maturity of the retired veteran TTT administrators might have contributed to the findings. Lastly, the researchers commented that although 107 are a relatively small number of administrators, it was believed to be the “entirety of the TTT administrators” (2011). This is the only examination of TTT participants who had moved into school administration and the results were consistent with their being rated Proficient and Distinguished.

Strong Evidence of the Leadership and Questions that Remain

Ballard (2005), Chaparro-Ramirez (2008), and Broe (2008) all speak of the TTT teachers’ discipline, leadership, and their understanding of school policy and structure. Chaparro-Ramirez (2008) and Owings et al. (2006) both report the principals of TTT are positively impressed and had “…an adamant desire to hire additional TTTs” (Chaparro-Ramirez, 2008, p. 172). Nunnery et al.’s (2009) study showed a substantial and statistically significant improvement for students of TTT participants when compared to teachers of comparable experience. These studies consistently demonstrate that the TTT participants are strong teachers
in their schools, are highly recommended by their principals, and have found their military experience beneficial (Ballard 2005; Broe, 2008; Chaparro-Ramirez, 2008; Nunnery et al., 2009; Owings et al., 2006; Owings et al., 2014).

The research of Coupland (2004) and Donathan (2007) raises questions, when considered alongside the findings of Ballard (2005), Owings et al. (2006), Broe (2008), Chaparro-Ramirez (2008), and Nunnery et al. (2009). The Kentucky TTT participants lacked educational training that other TTT participants had, and the study seemed to show that military experience alone was insufficient to be successful in the classroom (Donathan, 2007). The Ohio TTT participants, whose classroom practices were examined, were found to be no better or worse than similarly experienced traditional teachers (Coupland, 2007). Their military experience was seen as one of many influences on their teaching (Coupland, 2007). As noted, Ballard (2005), Owings et al. (2006), Broe (2008), Chaparro-Ramirez (2008), Nunnery et al. (2009), and Owings et al. (2014) all had positive findings for the TTT participants.

**Educational Leadership**

In the constant quest to improve public education, leadership has become a key component in educational reform in the 2000’s (Fullan, 2003). No significant school reform has taken place without effective leadership (Leithwood et al., 2004). In struggling schools where the needs are the greatest, the effects of leadership are the greatest (Leithwood et al., 2004). Successful leaders provide direction for a school, develop the people in that school, and reorganize the school if necessary (Leithwood et al., 2004). The principal’s leadership is second only to the classroom teacher, as the most important school related factor in improving student achievement (Leithwood et al., 2004).
Contemporary Principles of Educational Leadership

Marzano, Waters, and McNulty conducted a meta-analysis of 35 years of research on the effects of principal leadership on student achievement and published, in 2005, what has become recognized as a seminal work in the field: *School leadership That Works: From Research to Results*. They found that effective principal leadership had a statistically significant effect on student achievement with an average correlation of $r = 0.25$ (Marzano et al., 2005). As part of their analysis, they identified 21 leadership responsibilities demonstrated by successful principals (see Appendix B). Most of these traits were interpersonal skills such as building and understanding relationships, positively rewarding individuals, and maintaining strong lines of communication with staff and students.

Leithwood and The Wallace Foundation teamed up with Wahlstrom and others to continue their examination of leadership following their bold statement in that the principal’s leadership was second only to the classroom teacher in influencing student achievement (2004). Their project took over two years to complete, spanned nine states, 43 districts, and 180 schools of varied size, level, and demographics. They collected data from teachers, principals, staff members, district personnel, school board members, community members, and state-level members. They also conducted classroom visits and examined student achievement data. At the time of its publication, it was the largest study of its kind conducted in the United States (Wahlstrom et al., 2010).

During their analysis, the researchers were very cognizant that they needed to be able to differentiate between the effects of the school, district, and state leadership (Wahlstrom et al., 2010). They identified two primary leadership functions that impacted student achievement, providing directions and providing influence at all levels. As in 2004, they found that the
principal position remained the linchpin of educational leadership with a strong correlation found between the principal’s leadership and student achievement (Wahlstrom et al., 2010). They noted that effective leaders were able to maintain a balance between stability and change. Successful leaders encouraged and supported the staff to create a positive work environment as well as redesign the organization to improve its effectiveness (2010).

Effective leadership comes in a number of styles and forms. Collective, shared, and distributed leadership were all found to support student achievement. Compared to lower performing schools, higher performing schools had more people who believed they were part of the process. When the influence levels are deeper and more people feel involved, student achievement is impacted. Principals are most effective when they feel part of a team working together toward a common goal with the district, other principals, and teachers. Collective leadership had a stronger impact on student achievement than any individual source of leadership (Wahlstrom et al., 2010).

**Connecting Educational Leadership to Military Experience.**

Research over the past decade has shown repeatedly that educational leadership, at both the building and district level, has a significant impact on student achievement. As noted, the principal is second only to the classroom teacher on influencing student achievement in the building (Leithwood et al. 2004; Marzano et al., 2005; Wahlstrom et al., 2010). Educational leadership is essential for change and growth (Wahlstrom et al., 2010). The TTT participants have been shown to be effective teachers and their leadership skills are often noted positively (Ballard, 2005; Broe, 2008, Chaparro-Ramirez, 2008, Owings et al. 2006; Nunnery et al. 2009). Lastly, the TTT administrators have also been found to be successful leaders (Owings et al. 2011). However, Coupland (2004) found that the TTT participants’ military experience
Military Leadership Principles and How They Relate to Education

In Chapter 1, I provided 11 principles that form the foundation of military leadership thinking. In this section, I explore each of these principles to a greater depth, and examine how they connect to educational leadership.

Self-Reflection and Growth

The first principles, related to self-reflection and growth, task the individual personally with leadership. The leader shall work to know “yourself and seek self-improvement” (U.S. Marine Corps, 2013). In education, we all strive to be life-long learners to continually better ourselves (Kingsley, 2012). The military tells the leader to be technically and tactically proficient (U.S. Marine Corps, 2013). In schools, we look for our leaders to be administratively knowledgeable and to be skilled instructional leaders (Kowalski, 2010). These first two leadership principles are directly applicable to education.

The military tells its leaders to make good and timely decisions (U.S. Marine Corps, 2013). The time pressure may not be as great in education, but the need for sound decisions,
based on the best information available at the time is ever present (Kowalski, 2010). Many are hesitant to make decisions for fear of being second-guessed (Kouzes & Posner, 2012).

**Integrity, More Than Just a Word**

The next two principles speak to the integrity of the leader. They are qualities welcomed in any profession. The leader is to seek responsibility, take responsibility, and set the example for others (U.S. Marine Corps, 2013). This is important: as Kouzes and Posner (2012) query of educational leadership, many seek responsibility, but we must question how many stand up and take responsibility, especially when things do not go well (Kouzer & Posner, 2012)? Leaders must set personal and professional examples (Kouzer & Posner, 2012; The Wallace Foundation, 2012). Reliability, treating people fairly, and knowing and following regulations and policies are but a few of the ways leaders can do so (Kowalski, 2010). These principles are just as applicable in education as they are in the military.

**Taking Care of Your People**

The next five principles go the heart of military leadership, i.e., taking care of your people. The military is trying to build leaders all the time by developing a sense of responsibility in those they lead (U.S. Marine Corps, 2013). Educational leaders try to do the same in building teacher leaders within a staff (Kingsley, 2012; The Wallace Foundation, 2012). The services task their leaders to keep your personnel informed. In education, we speak of a “no secrets classroom” where everyone is informed (Saphier, Haley-Speca, & Gower, 2008). A no secrets central office builds confidence and encourages leadership at all levels (Fullan, 2008).

Another principle is for the leader to look out for his or her subordinates’ welfare (U.S. Marine Corps, 2013). In the military, it means food, shelter, training, equipment, family, and more. In schools, it means encouraging and supporting professional development and growth
(Johnson & Fargo, 2010) as well as providing administrative support for teachers (Tickle, Chang, & Kim, 2011) and a safe environment. Clearly, taking care of your people is emphasized as an essential part of leadership (Bolman & Deal, 2008; Fullan, 2008).

The military also needs its personnel to work as a team and to understand the task at hand (U.S. Marine Corps, 2013). Teamwork is the heart and soul of modern education and is personified in Professional Learning Communities (PLC). Educators working together as a learning community can accomplish far more than the individual (Dufour, Dufour, & Eaker, 2009). Education also strives for clarity in the classroom and school (Saphir et al., 2008). Working to ensure teachers and staff understand the goals and what is expected of them is critical to success (Fullan, 2008; Kouzes & Posner, 2012).

Mission

The last principle involves using one's organization in a manner within its capabilities (Marine Corps, 2013). Having a clear attainable mission and vision for teachers, schools, and districts is foundational for successful improvement (Kowalski, 2010; The Wallace Foundation, 2012). In the short term, this may mean something as straightforward as ensuring teachers have the necessary resources and are supported. It also might mean a much longer-term project such as implementing a reading program across all grade levels in a school. The mission, or task, asked of subordinates should be within the capabilities of the school or district.

Do These Principles Fit Education?

As I have noted, the principles of military leadership are related to the leader as an individual, to the leader’s interaction with subordinates, and, finally, to the task to be accomplished. The principles support the two basic elements of leadership, which are the mission and the people. The mission is paramount; however, the people are critical for the
success of the mission. The people are the ones who accomplish the mission. As the former
Chief Master Sergeant of the Air Force, Robert D. Gaylor, put it: “If a leader will take care of
their people by providing support, motivation, communication and discipline, their people will
take care of the mission” (Minnesota Wing, Civil Air Patrol, Powerpoint slide 14, 2008).
Leadership in the military is built around these two elements of mission and people.

Military Environments

The military practices these leadership principles day to day in noncombat settings. The
mission of the military is to “…provide the military forces needed to deter war and to protect the
security of our country” (U.S. Department of Defense, 2013). On a practical level, this means
being in the military means being ready to potentially fight and die for your country. Being an
educator means that you must keep students, but your primary focus is on teaching and learning.
However, the leadership principles apply all the time in many places in both the military (U.S.
Marine Corps, 2013) and education.

When military leaders are issuing orders, it may seem incongruent with education. An
officer ordering his unit forward in a combat situation appears far different from a principal
discussing schedules at a staff meeting. The military leaders and personnel have sworn an oath
to “…support and defend the constitution of the United States and to... Obey the orders of the
officers appointed over me…” (U.S. Army, 2013). At the heart of education is teaching and
learning. Much of leadership takes place before the issuing orders or the staff meeting. As
researchers have noted time and again, leadership is a continuous process of understanding your
people, training them, getting their input, encouraging initiative, and making them part of the
process (Kouzes & Posner, 2012). Therein lies the similarity between military leadership and
educational leadership.
Though completely different professions, most of the core tenets of the military leadership principles are applicable in other settings, including education. In the military, the goal is to be prepared to fight to defend the nation (U.S. Department of Defense, 2013). In schools, the objective is student learning to prepare citizens for the future (Virginia Department of Education, 2008). Taking care of your people, whether as the principal of a school, a military commander, or a business leader, is an integral part of the success of an organization (Bryant, 2014; Fullan, 2008;). Good leadership is good leadership.

**The TTT Administrators Have a Military Leadership Background**

The TTT administrators come to education with a military-based leadership background, and distinctive life experiences. There are few studies on subgroups of educators that move into the principalship. But as a group of school administrators, what research there is suggests that the TTT administrators have been successful (Owing et al., 2011). They bring a unique background of leadership training and experience that the traditional teacher and administrator do not have (Ballard, 2005; Broe, 2008; Chaparro-Ramirez, 2008). Leithwood et al. (2004) suggested further research was needed to “... unpack the leaders’ skills to better understand how it works...” (p. 9). Wahlstrom et al. (2010) suggested, “We need to know what successful leaders do, and we need to know how they do it” (p. 5).

**Summary**

The Troops to Teachers (TTT) program was created in 1994 to support military veterans as teachers in high-needs schools (Banks, 2007). The research on TTT participants has been positive; their military experiences have an important influence on their success in the classroom (Ballard, 2005; Broe, 2008; Chaparro-Ramirez, 2008; Owings et al., 2006). In particular, the leadership experiences of the TTT participants were considered important in their
new role as teachers. The principals of TTT participants were positively impressed by their classroom skills (Broe, 2008; Chaparro-Ramirez, 2008;). Findings suggest that TTT participants’ are comparable to similarly experienced peers (Coupland, 2004). Importantly however, the student achievement of TTT participants was found to be significantly better in one study than that of similarly experienced teachers in reading and math (Nunnery et al., 2009). This would imply that TTT administrators enter the school with the same or better instructional capacity as similarly prepared peers.

While the exact number of veterans who have used the TTT program is unclear (Owings et al., 2014), the skills of these veterans in the classroom generally have been positive. Accordingly, these data confirm that TTT teachers are performing a valuable national service as educators (Owings et al., 2014). This service is undergirded by strong leadership characteristics, as found by research (Ballard, 2005; Broe, 2008). This leadership has its foundation in the military. As reviewed earlier, Ballard (2005) and Broe (2008) recognized that the leadership of the TTT teachers was an advantage. Ballard (2005) suggested, “Schools of education should look at how the development of basic leadership skills could be incorporated into their current teacher preparation programs.” (p. 152). Broe (2008) asked, “What are the leadership experiences in the military that prepare the TTT teachers to become engaged in school leadership” (p. 172)?

The TTT administrators have been rated Proficient and Distinguished by their supervisors (Owing et al., 2011). By examining the experiences of the veteran administrators through surveys and interviews, the present study took the suggestions of Broe (2008) and Ballard (2005) to the next level and expanded on the work of Owing et al. (2011) to provide insight into TTT administrators' leadership experiences. Examining the leadership philosophies and styles of
these administrators will provide a better understanding of their experiences and will have implications for educational leadership training at both the school district and university levels.

To this end, in the next chapter I provide the methods that I used to address the research questions:

1. **Research question:** Are there consistent, foundational tenets of leadership found among military veterans in their role as school administrators?

2. **Research question:** What implications do their tenets of leadership hold in the field of educational leadership?
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

Educational leadership was discussed in Chapter 1 followed by an introduction to military veterans who moved into school administrative positions. Most had benefitted from the Troops to Teachers (TTT) program during their transition to education. Their prior service training and experiences as leaders appear to have had a positive impact both in the classroom and as school administrators (Ballard, 2005; Broe, 2008; Chaparro-Ramirez, 2008; Owings et al. 2011; Owings et al. 2006; Nunnery et al., 2009;).

Chapter 2 included a review of the research literature on TTT as well as the limited research on TTT administrators specifically (Owings et al., 2011). The TTT research has had mixed results, although leadership is repeatedly identified as a strength (Ballard, 2005; Broe, 2008; Chaparro-Ramirez, 2008; Coupland, 2004; Donaldson, 2007; Owing et al., 2011; Owings et al., 2006). Additionally, it was noted that there are inconsistencies with the TTT database (Owings et al., 2014) and that identifying non-TTTs is often a challenge. The chapter concluded with a discussion of the leadership principles of the military services and how they are related to education.

This chapter begins with the purpose of this study and provides a brief explanation of my role as the researcher. I then present the rationale for the research methodology and instruments and present a discussion of their strengths, limitations, and validity. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the participants, their selection, and a detailed explanation of the analysis process.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to determine if any consistent leadership tenets were found among military veterans who have moved into school administrative positions. Research
suggests these military veterans are successful educational leaders (Owing et al., 2011). Leadership is a key component in educational growth and student achievement (Leithwood et al., 2004; Marzano et al., 2005; Wahlstrom et al. 2010). The goal of this study is to determine if there are consistent foundational leadership characteristics found among the veterans. If there are common characteristics, what implications do they hold for educational leadership?

**Research Questions**

This study expands on the research of Owings et al. (2011) on Troops to Teacher administrators by examining the leadership styles and characteristics of former military administrators. It also seeks to expand on this body of work by potentially enlarging its focus beyond participants in the TTT program and including veteran administrators who used other methods to transition to education.

1. **Research question:** Are there consistent, foundational tenets of leadership found among military veterans in their role as school administrators?

2. **Research question:** What implications do their tenets of leadership hold in the field of educational leadership?

**Role of the Researcher**

I am a military veteran who has been an elementary principal for the past nine years. After attended college on a Navy ROTC scholarship, I was commissioned an officer in the Marine Corps where I completed 13 years active duty before transferring to the Marine Corps Reserve. Five years with the Customs Service as a drug interdiction pilot was followed by schooling and a Masters in Education from Old Dominion University (ODU) all the while continuing my Marine Corps Reserve duties. At ODU, I met a number of veterans who were receiving support from the Troops to Teachers (TTT) program. Because of my status as a
reservist, I did not qualify for TTT; however we all earned the same degree. I retired from the Marine Corps Reserve as a Lieutenant Colonel (O-5), with 20 years service and began my educational career as a seventh grade math teacher for the next 5 years. An administrative degree from Virginia Commonwealth University followed, as did three years as an elementary school assistant principal. Nine years ago, I became an elementary school principal.

As a military veteran administrator, I noticed some differences in leadership styles between myself and many of my principal peers. Some principals appeared very hesitant to advocate for their staff or teachers with central office personnel. Additionally, I noticed reluctance among some to voice concern for the difficulties faced by teachers as requirements grew and staffing was reduced, although it is possible those concerns were voiced in a less open forum. I also became aware that many principals appeared to closely manage (in my mind, micro manage) their buildings, rather than delegating. In the principals’ relationships with our superiors, I rarely saw anyone openly pursue alternatives when they “knew” what our superiors where thinking. Following conversations with other military veteran administrators and substantial personal reflection, I came to suspect that the leadership foundation I gained through my military career had a substantial impact on my leadership style. This study was designed to delve into the leadership characteristics of military veterans in their role as school administrators.

**Research Design and Rationale**

A multiple case study analysis (Stake, 2006) was chosen as the most appropriate methodology for this study. Stake (2006) defines the multiple case study as illustrating one particular subject through the examination of a number of individual instrumental case studies. Instrumental case studies are characterized by focusing on one issue with the same methodology across all participants (Creswell, 2007; Grandy, 2010; Johnson & Christensen, 2012).
In this study, each veteran participant provided data with an interview and survey to create individual case studies. These case studies identified leadership themes and qualities used by the veteran participants. A multiple case study analysis (Stake, 2006) was used to synthesize these studies. This allowed me to develop a better understanding of the leadership styles and characteristics and allow for assertions of theories and common explanations.

**Strengths**

A strength of the multiple case study analysis is that it gathers data from a number of perspectives, thus providing greater insight and allowing for generalization (Goddard, 2010; Stake, 2006;). Ten cases are common in multiple case studies (Johnson & Christensen, 2012; Stake, 2006). This analysis used in this study derives it strength from the 15 instrumental case studies and insight into the participants’ leadership styles. This multiple case study analysis produced evidence of common characteristics and generalizations that would not have been possible with a less complete study. A single case study would have provided greater understanding of an individual veteran administrator. However, the goal of this study was to identify general themes and commonalities in the leadership of former veterans. The use of multiple case studies allowed insight into numerous veterans’ leadership characteristics rather than just a single veteran. Using Stake’s (2006) multiple case study analysis provided breadth across the participants.

**Limitations**

While the multiple case study had strengths lacking in the single case study design, it nevertheless has limitations. Since only a limited number of administrators (n=15) participated, it only begins to shed light in this area.
Validity - Interview

Validity in qualitative studies is often described as trustworthiness (Johnson & Christensen, 2012). The fact that I am very close to this subject both professionally and emotionally was a concern. A number of specific steps including the choice of study methodology, a participant review, and a reflective journal were taken to improve the validity of this study.

The use of a multiple case study to synthesize the individual instrumental case studies strengthened the validity due to the scope and size of the study (Creswell, 2007; Johnson & Christensen, 2012; Patton, 2002; Stake, 2006). The 15 participants delivered unique, yet related experiences. They came from all five services and had from nine years to as many as 30 years military service. The 15 participants provided a sample size across the educational realm with all levels of K-12 administration represented. In addition, the participants had opportunities to provide feedback on the interpretations and conclusions of the study, which is a useful technique noted by Patton (2002) and Johnson & Christensen (2012).

Researcher Bias

As the lone researcher for this study, the fact that I could be one of the participants was a concern for researcher bias. Additionally, I am very close to this topic, both professionally and personally. The dedication to my father demonstrates the personal connection I have with the topic. However, my background as a veteran was an advantage in gaining access to military veteran administrators. The commonality of our service experiences was a source of trust with participants. After 20 years in the military, I am familiar with most military terminology and the participants appeared to find it easy to speak of their experiences and how they related to education. I did not notice any hesitancy to share anything negative about their military or
educational experiences. The participants might have responded differently to a more neutral researcher. The use of a reflective journal was included as a way to document bias and to stay alert for it throughout the study.

**Participants**

The participants were all former military veterans who were currently or recently retired school administrators. Specifically, the participants were:

1. Veterans who moved into public education following either a full or partial career in the military.
2. Veterans who used the Troops to Teachers (TTT) program.
3. OR Veterans who made the transition to education without the financial or counseling support of the TTT program. *Since the TTT program does not certify nor train the veteran, actual TTT usage was not a requirement for participation.*
4. Veterans who had a minimum of three years in the classroom before moving into administration. One was hired as a high school coach and administrator.
5. Veterans who are school administrators at either the building or district level.

**Selection of Participants**

I used the snowball or chain sampling methodology (Patton, 2002) to locate participants. This method is “useful [with a] … hard-to-find population (Johnson & Christensen, 2012)” such as the military veterans as school administrators. I asked each participant if they knew similar veterans who meet the criteria for the study and might be willing to be part of the study (see Appendix C). Initially, 20 veterans were sought for the study to reduce my concerns about having a homogenous sample. However, relatively early in the research I had identified potential participants with a spread of racial diversity and had information on potential female candidates.
Additionally, Stake (2006) noted that more than 15 can lead to more “uniqueness of interactivity than the research team or readers can come to understand” (p. 22). A total of 15 participants was settled on as the goal.

As a veteran and school administrator, I knew a few potential participants in the mid Atlantic region and they served as a starting point. The snowball method took me to several school divisions ranging in size from less than 3,000 students to more than 175,000 students. Initially, the intent was to interview working administrators only and not those who had left the profession. However, two potential participants were located who had recently retired from education. They had a combined 53 years in the service followed by 39 years in education and I felt their inclusion could provide valuable perspectives. Hence, they were included in the study sample.

All participants were given a pseudonym to provide confidentiality on all documentation. References to the participants are made using the masculine his or him. No assumptions should be drawn from this, as one of the participants was female. I deliberately made this choice to protect confidentiality.

**Administrative Experience, Age, and Race**

The participants had a total of 256 years in education with an average of 10 years in administration and six years in the classroom. They held a broad range of administrative positions including: high school, middle school, elementary school principals and assistant principals, central office personnel, directors of major departments and a superintendent. Their ages ranged from the mid 40’s to over 65. There were four African American (27%), eleven white (73%) with one female veteran (7%) in the study.
Military Experience

The veterans had a wide variety of military experiences with 267 years in the service coming from the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard. There were former pilots, communication, supply, personnel, procurement, artillery, and surface warfare officers. The most senior officer had more than 30 years active duty and had retired as an O-6, just below the General/Admiral ranks. There were three enlisted personnel, two of who had retired at the highest enlisted rank of E-9. Appendices D and E show the military ranks for officers and enlisted personnel. All participants had held numerous leadership positions during their time in the service. Some transitioned to education immediately following their military careers, while others attended school or explored the business world before moving to education.

Education of Veteran Administrators

Twelve of the 15 veterans were officers during most of their time in the service, which meant by definition they had undergraduate degrees. Two of these thirteen had attended service academies while the remainder had earned their degrees at other institutions. A few had earned undergraduate degrees in education, but had joined the service after completing college. Two of the former enlisted participants earned their degrees after they left the service while the third enlisted earned his undergraduate degree during his time in the service. Nearly all of the participants (13 of 15, 87%) had pursued their educational course work following the military on their own with programs such as Career Switchers or took classes to fulfill state teaching requirements. Only two of the veterans (13%) utilized the Troops to Teacher program following their military career.
Demographic information including ethnicity/race, age, years of military service, and undergraduate degrees for the 15 participants is provided in Table 1. Information on participants' advanced degrees and education experience is included in Table 2.

Table 1

**Participant Demographic Information and Undergraduate Studies (n=15)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ethnicity/ Race</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Military Service</th>
<th>Undergraduate Degree</th>
<th>Year of Degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non-Hispanic White</td>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>20 yrs.</td>
<td>BS Analytical Management</td>
<td>1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Non-Hispanic African American</td>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>20 yrs.</td>
<td>B.S.</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Non-Hispanic White</td>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>22 yrs.</td>
<td>B.S. in Education</td>
<td>1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Non-Hispanic White</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>21 yrs.</td>
<td>B.S. in Management</td>
<td>1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Non-Hispanic African American</td>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>12 yrs.</td>
<td>B.A. Business Admin.</td>
<td>1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Non-Hispanic African American</td>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>20 yrs.</td>
<td>B.S. in Chemistry</td>
<td>1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Non-Hispanic African American</td>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>9 yrs.</td>
<td>Middle School Edn (post military)</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Non-Hispanic White</td>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>22 yrs.</td>
<td>B.S. Secondary Ed., Math</td>
<td>1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Non-Hispanic White</td>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>21 yrs.</td>
<td>B.S. Education, Biology</td>
<td>1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Non-Hispanic White</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>31 yrs.</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Non-Hispanic White</td>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>20 yrs.</td>
<td>B.S. Education</td>
<td>1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Non-Hispanic White</td>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>4 yrs.</td>
<td>Biomedical Engineering</td>
<td>1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Non-Hispanic White</td>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>22 yrs.</td>
<td>B.S. Early Childhood Education</td>
<td>1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Non-Hispanic White</td>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>22 yrs.</td>
<td>B.S. Info Man; B.S. Computer Sc; MS Computer Sys.; Man 91</td>
<td>'86,'87,'91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** 267 yrs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Education Degree</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Years CR</th>
<th>Administrative Position</th>
<th>Years Admin.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>M.Ed; Ldshp Cert</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>LA, Math History, Math</td>
<td>6, 7, 8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>AP MS</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>M.Ed; PhD</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>AP HS; AP HS</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>M.Ed; EdD</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>SpEd</td>
<td>K-12</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Tech Director</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>M.Ed</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>AP Athletics</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>M.Ed</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>ESOL/ESL</td>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>AP MS, AP HS, Principal MS</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Norfolk State Univ</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>AP MS; Acting Principal MS</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>M.Ed</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Life Sc</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>AP HS; Principal MS</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>M.Ed</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Math, Science</td>
<td>8-12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Program Coor Alt Ed, AP HS</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>MBA</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>AP HS; Principal HS</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>M.Ed</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Math/Reading</td>
<td>7-12,</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>AP MS, Accountability</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Teacher Cert</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>AP ES; Principal ES</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>M.Ed</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>SPED</td>
<td>K-8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>AP Mid/High</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>M.Ed; PhD</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Science; Physics</td>
<td>8, 11-12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>AP MS; AP HS; Dir Strat Plng; Superintendent</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>M.Ed.</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>AP ES; Principal ES</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>M.Ed; M.Ed Ed Ldshp</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Math/Sci</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>AP ES; Principal MS</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 97.5  255.5  158
Instruments

The data collection instruments used in this study included a demographic survey, individual interviews, and a reflective journal. In the following sections I describe the instruments and explain the reasons for my choice of these instruments, as well as how they were used. I then move on to describe the data analysis tools and data analysis process.

Demographic Survey

The demographic survey shown in Appendix F was used to help define the training and experiences of the veteran participants. The survey briefly examined their military careers with specifics on branch of the military, specialty, rank, and total years of service. The survey also included the transition to education, classroom years, the move to administration, and total years as an administrator.

Though the survey had only 14 questions, it provided a rough framework upon which the case studies were built. When combined with the interview data, a more complete picture of the participant was created. Additionally, the surveys provided possible data upon which further study into the veterans’ move into education might prove appropriate. Although beyond the scope of this study, there may be questions concerning the veterans’ transition to education as well as other factors that might prove to be important when examining the military veteran educator. The survey was sent to participants once a date for the individual interview was set.

Interviews

An interview guide was developed to help keep the interview focused on topic, while at the same time allowed freedom to delve more deeply as recommended by the research (Creswell, 2007; Johnson & Christensen, 2012; Patton, 2002). This study used an interview guide method protocol. The full protocol is provided in Appendix G. Most of the interviews took place in the
participant’s place of work, a few were held in my office, one in a library, and another in a participant’s home.

Before the interview began, the demographic survey and a signed Virginia Tech Consent Form (see Appendix H) were reviewed and collected. The interview was conducted using the interview protocol found in Appendix G. The interviews lasted between 45 minutes and an hour and were recorded using a small digital recorder. Three participants’ interviews were conducted via telephone due to distance and uncertain schedules,

The interviews were broken into four parts: military experiences, classroom experiences, administration, and leadership experiences. The military experience section of the interview fleshed out the demographic survey with a review of the participants’ military career and significant leadership experiences. The questions in the military experiences section included:

1. Can you tell me briefly about your military career?

   Types of leadership positions you held?

   Number of subordinates?

2. Can you tell me about any significant leadership experiences that influenced you while in the military?

The second section of the interview examined the veterans’ move to education and experiences in the classroom. The literature review in Chapter 2, noted some variation in the Troops to Teacher (TTT) classroom successes which were apparently based on their level of education training and mentoring. This section of the interview was designed to establish some indication of the participants’ teaching style. Did they have a “sit down, shut up, and learn” approach (Donaldson, 2007, p. 72) or were they more in line with current best practices (Saphier, Haley-Specia & Gower, 2008)? The questions in education and experience section included:
3. Can you tell me what made you move to education?

   Did you use the Troops to Teachers program?

   If so, can you share your thoughts on the program?

   Let’s look back to when you were a classroom teacher.

4. How do you feel your teacher education coursework prepared you for the classroom following your military career?

   School culture adjustments?

   Students?

   Peer teachers?

   Administrators?

5. Describe your favorite (subject area) lesson that you taught.

   What was it?

   What was it like to be in your class?

   How did your students respond?

6. Can you provide me with a story that exemplified your approach to classroom management when you were a teacher?

   Did our style change over time as a teacher?

   What was your classroom/behavior management style a teacher?

The third section of the interview began with the move to administrations. The questions in the educational administration section included:

7. What made you want to move up to an administrative position in schools?

   Was there a person (parent, student, administrator, teacher) who influenced you?

   Was there an event?
The fourth section moved onto leadership specific questions. This section was divided into four subdivisions: priorities, staff, style, and military influences. Much of this leadership material came out earlier during the interviews when discussing the military, the classroom, or administration. The questions in the leadership section included:

8. Let's move onto some more specific leadership questions…

**PRIORITIES:** What are your priorities as an administrator? Do you have an example that demonstrates those priorities.

People?

Students – needs, expectations, families – relationships?

Staff needs.

Instruction? Mission

Student achievement?

Core beliefs?

**STAFF:** Can you describe how you work with your staff?

Examples?

Custodial/Cafeteria staff?

Instructional/Noninstructional?

Experienced/Less experienced?

Assistant Principals/Interns?

**STYLE:** Can you share with me a story that demonstrates your leadership style?

How would you describe your style of leadership?

How hands on / hands off?

Specific instructions?
Inclusion of subordinates in decision making?
Coach?
Delegate?
How was your vision developed and shared with the school.

*MILITARY INFLUENCE ON LEADERSHIP*:
Do you believe your prior military leadership experiences/training have influenced your leadership practices as an educational administrator?
If so… how?
Core beliefs?
Principles?
Do you have an experience that exemplifies how your military leadership training influenced you?

The interview ended with the open-ended question below. It was important to give the participants time following this last question. On more than occasion, a participant had quite a bit more to share. The open-ended question in this section was:

9. Is there anything else that you would like to add?

The interview ended with an explanation of the remaining process and how they would be given a transcript of their interview to review.

The interview recordings were transferred to a personal computer and then put on a CD and mailed to a professional transcriptionist who completed the majority of transcribing. The original CD along with a second CD that held an electronic version of the transcript was returned to me via mail. Each interview resulted in a 10-15 page single spaced transcript. The CDs and computer were maintained in a secure location. The completed demographic surveys were consolidated onto an Excel spread sheet. All original paperwork including paper transcripts of
interviews, CDs, and personal computer, were maintained in a secure location with identifying information removed in accordance with the IRB.

**Reflective Journal**

Reflective journals are used to document the researcher’s perceptions and thoughts during a study and to remain alert for researcher bias (Johnson & Christensen, 2012). I used a reflective journal to document my thoughts and feelings during the study. Following each visit with a participant, I reflected in writing to help me be alert for any bias. The journal was a concrete step in being deliberately self-reflective and monitoring for potential bias. The journal also provided insight into changes in interviewer confidence, questioning, and techniques. The journal was used as an additional data source for the cases.

**Multiple Case Study**

The 15 participants’ data were collected and studied as individual case studies. The interview transcripts were reviewed and any identifying information was removed. The coding for all interviews was completed with the aide of the NVivo 10 for Mac program (QRS International version 10.0.4) that facilitates grouping and organizing codes. During the coding of interviews, 30 subject codes were identified. These codes were grouped into the following sets:

- Military experiences,
- Classroom experiences,
- Admin experiences,
- Leadership learned by…
- Leadership priorities, and
- Leadership philosophies
The interviews were reviewed numerous times to build a strong coding record. Each case study provided information about each participant’s prior military service, transition to education, classroom experiences, administrative experiences, and insight into their leadership philosophy and characteristics.

The 15 cases studies were examined using Stake’s (2006) multiple case study analysis and his Worksheets 2 through 5a. The worksheets are included in Appendix I. The analysis allowed data-based assertions to be drawn from the multiple case studies. A systematic review of how the case studies were examined is discussed in the next sections.

**Worksheet 2 (Stake, 2006)**

Worksheet 2, *Theme (research questions) of the Multiple Case Study*, is the first step in examining multiple cases. The anticipated themes, based on the literature review, were compiled on Worksheet 2. Specifically, Themes 3, 4, and 5 were drawn from the military leadership principles discussed in Chapter 1 (Appendix A). The original anticipated themes were:

- Theme 1: The level of task or directive behavior by the participant
- Theme 2: The level of relational support by the participant
- Theme 3: Self-Improvement, professional growth of participant
- Theme 4: Relationships with subordinates, taking care of your people
- Theme 5: Mission, task, priority

Quite early in the process, after three or four interviews, it was obvious that the original five themes needed to be adjusted and additional themes added to help organize the data. This process, according to Stake (2006), is often necessary. I modified themes by using the constant comparative method (Patton, 2002) moving iteratively between and amongst themes and data as I coded. By the end of the analysis, I dropped my original Theme 3, self-improvement,
professional growth of participant and combined the original Theme 2, the level of relational support by the participant and Theme 4, relationships with subordinates, taking care of your people. Lastly, I added 8 additional themes to help capture the breadth and depth of the data. Table 3 contains the final 11 themes and the rationale for their inclusion or adjustment from the original five themes.

Table 3

*Final 11 Themes and Their Rationale for Inclusion*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Final 11 Themes</th>
<th>Rational for Adjustment of Original Themes and Inclusion of Additional Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theme 1: Directive/situational/delegates Leadership</td>
<td>Original Theme 1: reworded to include levels of directive behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 2: Support of staff/taking care of people</td>
<td>Original Theme 2 and 4: Relationships with subordinates; Taking care of people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(TCOP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 3: Leadership priorities - People</td>
<td>Numerous participants specified “people” as their leadership priority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 4: Mission, task, priority</td>
<td>Original Theme 5: Mission, task, priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 5: Leadership priorities</td>
<td>Other Leadership priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 6: Leadership learned from…</td>
<td>Participants stated they learned from previous leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 7: Big picture/make a difference</td>
<td>Capture sense of service/idealism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 8: Accountability</td>
<td>Desire for accountability/not afraid of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 9: Classroom experiences</td>
<td>Initial classroom experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 10: Diversity</td>
<td>Exposure to/dealing with diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 11: Administrative experiences</td>
<td>School administrative experiences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Worksheet 3 (Stake, 2006)**

I used Worksheet 3, *Analyst’s Notes While Reading a Case Report*, to assist in organizing each interview and its coding in support of the 11 themes. I used a Worksheet 3 for each participant. The worksheet allowed me to break down the interview thematically and provide data on how the case supported or did not support the themes. Each interview had between 10
and 15 coded quotes that were supportive of some of the 11 themes. The first page of Worksheet 3 for Case C, shown in Figure 1, includes a sample of the quotations pulled from the interview on the right side of the figure. On the left side are the 11 themes resulting from the constant comparative method (Patton, 2002) at that time. The individual's service, rank, and specialty were removed to preserve anonymity. All 15 cases had a multi-page Worksheet 3. The complete Worksheet 3 for Case C is provided in Appendix J as an example.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case ID</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Synopsis of case:** XX  
Director of Technology  
EdD  
UG Educational degree  
K-12 Assistive Tech  2.5 years  
Admin 12 years | **Case Findings:**  
I.  
II.  
III.  
IV. |
| **Uniqueness of case situation**  
for program/phenomenon: | **Relevance of case for cross-case Themes:**  
Theme 1__Directive/delegates/Situational – delegates…  
Theme 2___Relational Support  
Theme 3___Self-Improvement  
Theme 4___Support/TCOP, Q1  
Theme 5__ Mission, task, priority – support student learning– Q6, 7  
Theme 6___Leadershipp priorities – Q1, 5, 8, 10  
Theme 7___Diff Mil/ed – Q9 Accountability  
Theme 8___Leadership learned from …1, 2  
Theme 9 Classr
oom exp 3, 4  
Theme 10 Accountability 9  
Theme 11 Admin experiences | Q1 You know the phrase that comes to my mind that they always used to—from OCS on, “you take care of the troops. They take care of you.” And that kind of got inculcated into the way I think about things and I think I’m kind of leaning that way anyway or my personality is.  
Q2 – Ldshp ex: You know you pick up the good things that you see, you want to emulate, and then you see the bad things and you know you’re not gonna do that. So I think from exposure to a lot of different people styles that impacted me.  
Q3 – CRM. You know, so I knew classroom management was real important and that was 90% of the battle when you go into a classroom. If you can’t get that under control you’re screwed. So I always knew that. I never lost that. Plus I was in instructional billets all through the [service] so…  
Q4 – CR. No. I – every – every child was an individual and each case was different and every parent was different. The common denominators are every time I dealt with a parent and student, the parents all put – they were always wanting what was best for their kid, |
Worksheet 4 (Stake, 2006)

Once each interview was coded and analyzed using worksheet 3 to identify thematic support, I compiled the data onto Worksheet 4, *Rating of Expected Utility of Each Case for Each Theme*. This worksheet was used to begin organization of the data as a whole using the 11 themes and all 15 case studies. The completed Worksheet 4 (See Figures 2-4) shows how each case supported a theme with comments in the appropriate box. The 11 themes are listed down left side and the 15 case studies across the top. The comment indicated supportive quotes from worksheet 3. For instance, Theme 6 “Accountability” is supported by case C with the comment “Q9 – Accountability sought out”. This is referencing the ninth selected quote on worksheet 3 that discussed how the participant believed they (military veterans) sought accountability rather than avoided it. I chose to combine the quote number and a few words that remind me of the quote. This helped make Worksheet 4 more understandable since I was familiar with the material. All referenced comments on Worksheet 4 (See Figures 2-4) can be located on the 15 individual worksheet 3s.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THEMES</th>
<th>Case A</th>
<th>Case B</th>
<th>Case C</th>
<th>Case D</th>
<th>Case E</th>
<th>Case F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ordinariness of this Case’s situation:</strong></td>
<td>AP MS</td>
<td>AP HS</td>
<td>Central office support position</td>
<td>AP HS</td>
<td>P MS</td>
<td>P MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>THEMES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theme 1: Type of Leadership - delegate</strong></td>
<td>Q1 Servant leadership</td>
<td>Q1 Q2 Trust and delegation</td>
<td>Q2; Delegate/Build leaders Q11</td>
<td>Q6 Distributed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theme 2: Support/TCOP</strong></td>
<td>Q8 Training, hiring</td>
<td>Q4 Relational support for teachers</td>
<td>Q1 Training, building leaders, TCOP</td>
<td>Q5 Q9 Q10, Know, listen, help</td>
<td>Q9 Teachers no. 1 priority</td>
<td>Q5 Q8 building teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theme 3: Leadership priorities - People</strong></td>
<td>Q6 Q8Hiring, training, supporting</td>
<td>Q5 Building team, right people in right seats</td>
<td>Q3 Who they are</td>
<td>Q7 Q8 People trust</td>
<td>Q12 People and relationships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theme 4: Mission, Task, Priority</strong></td>
<td>Q6 Q8Supporting teachers</td>
<td>Q4 Relationship w teachers &amp; students</td>
<td>Q7 Support Instruction</td>
<td>Q6 Trust buses come and go…</td>
<td>Q5 Student centered AP Inst leader</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theme 5: Leadership Priorities</strong></td>
<td>Q8Supporting teachers, training</td>
<td>Q2 Q3Self Improvement; Students</td>
<td>Q6 Q7Actions not just words</td>
<td>Q1 Trust Comm</td>
<td>Q14Trust/respect: Walking around</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theme 6: Leadership learned from...</strong></td>
<td>Q2 Q5 Calm under stress; praise public, punish private</td>
<td>Q1 OCS, and CO’s</td>
<td>Q1, 3 CO’s</td>
<td>Q1 Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theme 7: Big Picture/Make a difference</strong></td>
<td>Q4 School probably more important than military</td>
<td>Q9 Accountability</td>
<td>Q3 part of something bigger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theme 8: Accountability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q9 accountability sought by</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theme 9: CR Experiences</strong></td>
<td>Q3 detailed planning. Students work together</td>
<td>Q1 Rough… 7 kids in hallway</td>
<td>Positive w/ Assisstive tech</td>
<td>Q4 Coaching</td>
<td>4,5,6, DC Skillful T like</td>
<td>Q1 Q2 Q3 Fun &amp; relevant Suicide Story</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theme 10: Diversity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q3 Learned in Navy</td>
<td>Q1 Military showed me</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theme 11: Admin Experiences</strong></td>
<td>Q13 Q8 Hiring; training, evaluating,</td>
<td>Q9 accountability sought out by military</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THEMES</th>
<th>Case G</th>
<th>Case H</th>
<th>Case I</th>
<th>Case J</th>
<th>Case K</th>
<th>Case L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ordinariness of this Case's situation:</td>
<td>P MS</td>
<td>AP HS</td>
<td>P HS</td>
<td>Central office support position</td>
<td>P ES</td>
<td>AP MSHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 1: Type of Leadership - delegate</td>
<td>Q10 Types D1, D2, D3</td>
<td>Q9 Q10 Delegate - build leaders</td>
<td>Q12 Situational leadership</td>
<td>Q13 Don't micromanage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 2: Support/TCOP</td>
<td>Q7 TCOP relationships with students support staff w actions</td>
<td>Q1Everyone is important</td>
<td>Q11 Support Schools, Summarizing quote</td>
<td>Q10 Q11 Support; encourage, protect, everyone important</td>
<td>Q3 Care for your people… they will go the extra mile for you</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 3: Leadership priorities - People</td>
<td>Q12 Quote about squad/people</td>
<td>Q7Relationships w students</td>
<td>Q1 Q2 People! Relationships</td>
<td>Q11 Support</td>
<td>Q10 Q11 Support, protect</td>
<td>Q2 Knew all staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 4: Mission, task, Priority</td>
<td>Q10 Support; ego at door</td>
<td>Q10 Support instruction</td>
<td>Q4 knew kids and parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 5: Leadership Priorities</td>
<td>Q11 Leadership by walk'g around; recognize effort</td>
<td>Q8 Relationships with staff… among staff,. Example</td>
<td>Q10 Support, protect</td>
<td>Q4 knew kids and parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 6: Leadership learned from…</td>
<td>Q1 enlisted; being ready</td>
<td>Q5 Leadership by Meandering</td>
<td>Q1 C.O. on support; red book +s -'s; former principal</td>
<td>Q13big picture lessons - trust, don't micro manage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 7: Big Picture/Make a difference</td>
<td>Q6 Left NC lack of recognition; Make a decision</td>
<td>Q6 Made a difference today example</td>
<td>Q11 bigger impact</td>
<td>Q6 Q8 Son in CG; &quot;don't have a clue…&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 8: Accountability</td>
<td>Q9 Right or wrong admit it. Delegate but responsible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>More than data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 9: CR Experiences</td>
<td>Q4 Initial parent hesitancy, recognized as leader AP</td>
<td>Q2 Issue not the person. Alt Ed. Story</td>
<td>Q3 Alt Ed story-&quot;first person who every cared about me&quot;</td>
<td>Q5 Start rough, grew</td>
<td>Q2 Q3 TTT Trust with Hispanic families</td>
<td>Q1 Created inclusion SPED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 10: Diversity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q3 Huge ESOL CR and Admin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme: 11 Admin Experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q10 Support materially and with PD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THEMES</th>
<th>Case M</th>
<th>Case N</th>
<th>Case O</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ordinariness of this Case’s situation:</strong></td>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>PES</td>
<td>PMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>THEMES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 1: Type of Leadership</td>
<td>Q3 Delegate</td>
<td>Q4 One team, One unit… common vision</td>
<td>Q2 Delegate but maintain responsibility Q3 Best Decisions with more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 2: Support/TCOP</td>
<td></td>
<td>Q5 If you need the time.. Take it, but leave it at the door when you come back</td>
<td>Q8 Integrity, Service before self; Excellence in all we do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 3: Leadership priorities - People</td>
<td>Q5 Delegate, but hold accountable</td>
<td></td>
<td>Q8 Build trust: Mission - Students parents, staff, students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 4: Mission, Task, Priority</td>
<td></td>
<td>Q3 Leave personal life at the door</td>
<td>Q7 Mission: Failure is not an option</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 5: Leadership Priorities</td>
<td>Q4 Delegate; Q10 relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td>Q6 Build Trust Students/Staff/ Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 6: Leadership learned from…</td>
<td>Q1 Leader first, Watch CO’s for +’s and -’s</td>
<td>Q2 XO in Army AP in education</td>
<td>Q4 Colin Powell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 7: Big Picture/Make a difference</td>
<td></td>
<td>Q1 Service mentality… Q7 True to yourself, true you your cause..</td>
<td>Q1 Ideals, bigger principles… greater than us.Q4 Larger impact; Sense of purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 8: Accountability</td>
<td>Q5 Delegate, but hold accountable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 9: CR Experiences</td>
<td>Q8 rough 1st year…then better</td>
<td>Q4 Multiple.. PK, Elementary</td>
<td>Q36th Math…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 10: Diversity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme: 11 Admin Experiences</td>
<td>Q11 Right people in the rights seats on bus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Worksheet 4 provided evidence of support for each of the 11 themes. I reviewed the themes, the demographic survey, and Worksheet 4 to determine the prevalence of support for the themes. From the prevalence of evidence, I developed assertions that were representative of the case studies. The initial eight assertions were:

1. “Taking Care of your People” was a prominent leadership characteristic
2. Prior leaders had “strongly” influenced the participant’s leadership philosophies
3. Most of the participants did NOT use the Troops To Teachers program
4. Classroom experiences – successes and challenges
5. Trust was major components of leadership
6. Delegating responsibility was a major component of leadership
7. Accountability was sought after and expected with leadership
8. Belief in service/Making a difference

**Worksheet 5A**

Using worksheet 5A, *A Matrix for Generating Theme-Based Assertions* (Stokes, 2006, p. 51) as a model, I analyzed the eight assertions against all cases and themes. The worksheet breaks down each case study by the eight assertions and evidence for each assertion in each of the 15 cases. On this sheet, the cases and assertions are listed down in the left column and the 11 themes are listed across the top. For instance, I found that for Case E, Assertion 2 (Taking care of your people) was supported by three of the themes. Each theme that supported Assertion 2 was marked with an “X” in the appropriate box. Figure 3 is the first page of Worksheet 5A which is shown as a partial example. The complete Worksheet 5A (see Appendix K) shows the preponderance of evidence for each of the eight assertions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASE/Assertion</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>O</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<tr>
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Summary

In this chapter, I defined the purpose of the study and shared my background. The rationale for the multiple case study analysis built upon instrumental case studies was presented. The demographic surveys and the interview protocols were reviewed. The overall strengths, limitations, and validity of the instruments and the study methodology were discussed. The demographic survey (see Tables 1 and 2) provided information on the participants and their background. This was followed by a detailed explanation of how the multiple case study was completed along with examples of Worksheet 3 (see Figure 1) and the completed Worksheet 4 (see Figures 2-4) which resulted in eight tentative assertions and their evaluation for the preponderance of evidence with Worksheet 5A (see Figure 5). In Chapter 4, I present my findings based on these methods.
CHAPTER 4: FINDINGS

Chapter 1 introduced a brief description of the military veteran working in education and the Troops to Teachers (TTT) program, which assisted in their transition to education as teachers. The leadership of these veteran teachers appears to have had a positive impact on their success in the classroom. As educational leaders, TTT administrators have been rated highly by their superiors (Owings et al., 2011). These veterans bring a distinctive leadership background to the educational arena. This study expands on the research by Owens et al. (2011) by examining the leadership characteristics of military veteran administrators. It does so through the examination of the following two research questions:

1. **Research question:** Are there consistent foundational leadership tenets found among military veterans in their role as school administrators?

2. **Research question:** What implications do these leadership tenets hold in the field of educational leadership?

Chapter 2 built the conceptual framework for this study with a review of the research on TTT veterans as teachers and administrators. The TTT teacher research came from across the country and leadership was noted positively in a number of studies (Ballard, 2005; Broe, 2008; Chaparro-Ramirez, 2008; Owing et al., 2011; Owings et al., 2006). Additionally, the literature review illustrated that as a result of data management issues, some of the research that was thought previously thought to focus exclusively on TTT teachers may have included study participants who did not participate in TTT (Owings et al., 2014), therefore allowing some room to speculate that findings about veterans who are now teachers can be generalized beyond the TTT population. The chapter concluded with a discussion of the leadership principles of the military services and how they relate to education.
In chapter 3 I defined the purpose of this study, the rationale for using a multiple case study analysis (Stake, 2006) as the methodology, the strengths and limitations, as well as the validity of the study. The chapter concluded with a detailed description of the participants, data collection instruments, and the data analysis processes.

In this chapter I present the findings that resulted from the analysis of the data from the 15 participants in this multiple case study. The evidence for the following five findings from across the participants is discussed.

**Finding I: Taking Care of Your People**

Nearly all 15 participants stressed that one of the most important aspects of their position was supporting the teachers and staff who worked for them. They spoke of building relationships with the staff and supporting them in numerous ways. The first priority was to the people. Evidence for this finding was found in three of the themes identified during the analysis: Taking care of your people (theme 2), Leadership priorities – People (theme 3), and Mission Priority (theme 4). Fullan (2008), Bolman & Deal (2011), Kouzes & Posner (2012), and the military leadership principles (U.S. Marine Corps, 2013) all speak to the issue of supporting staff. A middle school principal said it very well.

I would have to say people have been my focus here,…mostly my first year I focused really on people because without the connection to people – and by people I mean staff, students, parents, the community, it’s …hard to do all the other stuff … the management if you don’t have the people … (Case D)

A high school principal said it more succinctly. “People. Absolutely people. It’s all about relationships. It’s all about being open, being honest, being trustworthy, and building your people” (Case I). Another example came from a different principal who said. “…That’s just
what I do and those things …come from my military service where again, it’s not about me. It’s about the other people in my squad and the whole platoon, and you just keep growing from there …” (Case G).

A division-level director stated clearly his thoughts and the phrase he used “taking care of the people or troops” came up numerous times with other participants:

Basic things like taking care of the troops, they’ll take care of you. You take care of your people and you’re gonna have a good, solid organization, and good department. So whether it’s a department,… a school division, whatever it is, you take care of your folks and they’ll take care of you. (Case C)

A principal gave another example connecting taking care of your people and supporting the teachers in the building:

I think, especially coming from the [Service]… we’re always taught that the troops ate first; the troops got bedded down first. You took care of your people first… The same way with the school… If there was an event … you were there to make sure that everything was taken care of. You didn’t just disappear and leave it to the teachers. Again, the teachers didn’t appreciate being leaderless. They would work their butts off but they wanted to make sure that the administration was with them… I think …that’s … the most important premise. You take care of your people…. (Case H)

A former principal shared his belief about supporting teachers:

… If you take care of the troops... and they know you got their back – you don’t have to worry about that mission. It’ll get done. It’s the same thing in schools. If you create an environment as a principal that teachers want to work for you, and they want to be there, you don’t have to worry about [State Assessments] …. Those teachers are gonna take
care of that and they’re gonna get the job done because they want to work for you. No
doubt in my mind. (Case K)

A new principal also tied his service experience to his school leadership:

…People are the most important thing. In the Navy, the crew was the heart of the ship,
and so crew morale and teacher and faculty and staff morale is probably second on my
mind… “How they doing?” because I know happy teachers will make happy kids, and
happy kids make happy parents. (Case E)

An experienced administrator with 10 years in the same school said it very nicely, “Show
them that we truly care… and I… find that that comes back to pay dividends. They’d go to hell
and back for you if they know that you care” (Case L).

Nearly all 15 cases supported Finding I. Clearly, taking care of your people, is an
overarching foundational leadership characteristic of these veteran participants in school
administrative positions.

Finding II: Leadership Learned from…

In Chapters 1 and 2, I discussed and the principles of military leadership. It became
evident in the study that these school leaders were influenced not only by their leadership
experiences but also by the leadership they had witnessed in the service and in education. The
theme “leadership learned from…” came up numerous times. The most detailed came from a
principal who said…

[W]ell I should talk about the commanding officers that I served under. I saw all
types…and learned something from each one… From my first [Commanding Officer] CO, I learned… to be the subject matter expert in at least one area ….. [My second
CO…]It’s really important to have fun and for the troops to see you having fun because
they’ll feed off of that positive energy. …So I’ve tried to bring that to my leadership here … to bring a certain energy to it because it… does show up… across the building. [From my third CO]….I learned from him …when you take over a new position ...hit the ground listening at first and then … turn it to your own style. (Case E)

This principal was very conscious of what he witnessed and how he could use it in the future.

Another school administrator said it in a more general way. “You know you pick up the good things that you see, you want to emulate, and then you see the bad things and you know you’re not gonna do…(Case C).” One of the veterans who has come far in education shared how he observed:

… what the commanding officer [was doing] or not doing, what they say, what they don’t say, how they act, how they write, how they communicate, and always keep in the back of your mind the positive and the negatives. So that when you get in that seat, whatever that seat may be, you can then create your own kind of leadership persona that has the best of what you saw and tries to avoid the worst of what you saw (Case M).

A retired officer told how actions were more important than words:

The [two] C.O.’s … were two... completely different… the new C.O. …came in and … talked all the stuff you wanted to hear – about how families were important… and… that was all just talk. The previous guy had been … gruff,. but he… really took care of people and their families… the one guy didn’t talk much – he just did things – and he did them right. The other guy was ….all about talking …(Case J)

He recognized the good and bad from his previous superiors and learned from those experiences.

From these examples, he created his own philosophy and leadership style.
The military offers unique experiences and opportunities on a number of levels. One veteran referred to the words of General Colin Powell, “…[He].. had these principles that you never asked anyone to do something you yourself aren’t willing to do… I live by those…” (Case O).

On a less unique level, a retired officer, who served in Iraq shared he had taken leadership lessons both from a military superior and a former principal. “They had characteristics that I liked… and I’m sure I picked up and emulated pieces of [their style]” (Case N). Another veteran was more specific in describing one of his former educational leaders:

… I learned a lot from her… she… had high expectations for her teachers, the kids, staff. But she was super-approachable. You know you felt like you could talk to her about issues and problems and there wasn’t any negativity to it all… I really was impressed by her style of management and leadership (Case J).

An experienced principal shared what he learned from one of his previous principals:

…He taught me everybody has value… you can have a kid that’s selling drugs… that lies, cheats, steals, … The minute … You start letting them know that you feel that they… have value and you … want to help them, they can change. …One person can start the process but it takes a whole group of people to make it lasting. (Case I)

Just as in the service, the participants saw negative examples as well. “…it was a tremendous learning experience because I saw firsthand how you don’t treat teachers” (Case J). A veteran summed it up with, “I think your leadership experiences throughout life form the type of leader that you are” (Case I).
Finding II is important because it demonstrates the impact of others on the participants’ leadership characteristics. The leadership they had witnessed in the military service and in education influenced the leadership of these administrators.

**Finding III: Not All Veteran Administrators Utilized the Troops to Teachers Program**

This finding may seem obvious, but it is important. This study was localized, but not limited, to a region of the Mid-Atlantic States that is internationally noted for a high concentration of military personnel. It is reasonable to infer that I would have found more, rather than less, TTT participants in the course of this study. However, this was not the case. In this study, 13 of the 15 military veterans (87%) did not use the Troops to Teachers (TTT) program. This suggests that there are veterans in both teaching and administration whose perspectives remain to be seen in the research. Further, the findings suggest that their insights and perspectives bring important knowledge to our field of understanding.

Why did this study seem to miss the TTT administrator? There are a couple of possible reasons for this finding. The issue of age and the timing of the veterans’ transition may have been a factor. The TTT program did not begin until 1994 (Banks, 2007) and perhaps it was not well known by these participants at the time of their transition. It is also possible, due to the snowball sampling methodology that this preponderance of non-TTT veterans occurred. Had one of the early participants been a TTT user, I may have been sent to other TTT veterans. Finally, this study did not focus on high needs schools. The TTT program was created to assist the transition of veterans to careers in schools with a high needs designation (Troops to Teachers, 2014). The data from the demographic survey showed that there were a wide variety of ways the veterans transitioned to education. The TTT program was only one of them. The reasons may
be unclear, but 13 out of the 15 participants were non-TTT transitioners, suggesting that understanding the perspectives of non-TTT transitioners is an area for future research.

**Finding IV: Veteran Classroom Experiences**

Though no specific classroom experience was identified as common to all, the participants shared some of their early experiences which were part of their journey to administrative leadership. Much of the research on veterans in education dealt with their classroom experiences and was reviewed in Chapter 2 (Coupland, 2004; Ballard, 2005; Broe, 2008; Chaparro-Ramirez, 2008; Donathan, 2007; Nunnery et al. 2009, Owings et al. 2014, March; Owings et al. 2006). The participants varied classroom experiences showed consistencies with previous research. These include skill-related challenges and assets in the classroom environment which mirrored those of non-veteran teachers.

**Challenges**

A few of the participants had challenges during their first years that sounded very similar to veterans in the work of both Coupland (2004) and Donathan (2007). A former assistant principal shared his struggles:

The first year …it probably wasn’t much fun cause I definitely was …, coming from being a [service member] and being in charge…– kind of going lockstep… I’m not sure if I was a principal if I’d have rehired me after the first year. (Case J)

Another veteran described his initial experiences:

Well …it would have been awful to be in my classroom. I learned early on …even though I had led young sailors – 18-19 year olds – these middle school kids were a completely different dynamic …so my classroom management was pretty awful… that first year. (Case M)
A third told of his early experiences. “…First year, ...I’d say I was like any other first year teacher, and the kids …weren’t paying attention and…. I was like “Man, … how did I get into this?” (Case B).

These three veterans came to education through alternate means and all would eventually earn a master's degree in education or higher. However, when they were hired, none of them had completed a student teaching program. This tends to support Donathan’s (2007) work with veterans who came to education with less than a complete certification program. All of the participants grew into capable teachers, although some experienced struggles with student management and instruction that Donathan (2007) and Coupland (2004) noted.

Successes

Some participants had early positive experiences. One shared that his principal had come into his classroom asking…“What’s your classroom management style? ….because I’ve never gotten a referral from you in two years. I need you to share that with the teachers” (Case F). The veteran said his room was “… fun yet serious….It was more student centered than teacher centered” (Case F). Another administrator shared how he “planned… every minute…. I do a lot of team building the first two days and I’m a huge fan of cooperative learning, using Kagan strategies” (Case A). These experiences are similar to some of experiences that Chaparro-Ramirez (2008) and Broe (2006) found.

A couple participants taught in an alternative education setting. One shared a brief exchange with a student that demonstrated the relationships he built with his students. He asked:

Why is it that you failed so miserably in a normal school setting, but when you went into an alternative setting you were scoring…[advanced on the state tests]….And she just
looked me in the eye and she said “You’re the first person that ever cared about me.”

That hits you hard. (Case I)

A high school assistant principal shared his advice to fellow teachers. “…Figure out a way to connect with them and show them that you’re sincere. Don’t tell them what you’re gonna do. Show them what you’re gonna do…” (Case B). A middle school principal spoke of his first year as a DC schoolteacher. “…It was [my] best year …in education. It’s …where I learned how to teach and I learned the power of … being there for kids and really connecting with kids…” (Case E). Again, these participants all mirrored the work of Chaparro-Ramirez (2008), Broe (2008) and Owings et al. (2006).

“100% pass rate…” (Case B) was the result shared by another veteran supporting the work of Nunnery et al. (2009) on TTT and student achievement.

**Finding V: The Veterans’ Values**

The demonstrated values were drawn from the last four assertions created during the analysis. These four lacked the prominence across the 15 case studies to stand individually as findings, but together they provide insight into the military veteran administrator. Participants from all the services and across experience levels commented on the values of trust, delegating responsibility, accountability, and belief in service.

A new principal spoke of “… the importance of trust…. if you haven’t taken time to build the trust you won’t have the political capital to do all the other stuff… so… I’ve taken it to heart…. Still building trust….” (Case E). A more seasoned administrator noted, “…I go back to the trust thing because the trust thing is very true in education….The busses came and went. But that’ll never change…” (Case D). “You gotta trust these people to be able to do their job…. [Let them know they are] an important part of the team…” (Case K).
A principal believed his military background “teaches you how to delegate, and you don’t delegate accountability. You delegate the responsibility and you give them the power to do that, and if you’re empowering your people you become much more effective as a leader…” (Case I).

An administrator noted that he believed the military gave him a different perspective on accountability. “…We are not afraid of being accountable. We’re not afraid and we actually kind of want to be accountable. …being honest, forthright with your assessments, ….we see it as a duty and a responsibility…” (Case C). An experienced school administrator shared how he did not like being micro managed. He said, “I tend to give people a lot of trust and a lot of responsibility…” (Case M).

Lastly, this comment sums up this leader’s philosophy on supporting and delegating: “Give your people the tools, give your people the responsibility, give them the mission and give them the time. If you do that, …you’ll be able to do more with less.” Trust was the value demonstrated by delegating and understanding accountability. These three are linked in that the leader must trust those he delegates responsibility to and, at the same time, understand that the accountability stays with the leader.

The final aspect of this finding is a belief in service and making a difference. Ballard (2005) found that self-actualization in Maslow’s hierarchy of needs was an important factor in the veterans’ move to education. Ballard’s participants asked whether education allow them “to become everything that one is capable of becoming” (2005, p. 142). Theme 7, Big Picture/Making a Difference, captured this theme.

The nature of military service indicates a certain level of giving. This was clearly shared by a veteran who said, “…I knew I wanted to serve somewhere… [in the] Peace Corps..[or] Military. This was my give back” (Case N). A participant told how when he was in business he
“… miss[ed] the sense of mission, the sense of something larger than yourself that I had in the [service]” (Case E). A seasoned middle school assistant principal said, “I view my 18 years in schools as contributing to our country every bit as much as I did in uniform for 20 years – probably more…” (Case A). A veteran with over 20 years service shared that the military taught him to have a… “sense of purpose… I see myself as a tool to accomplish something bigger… the mission, the student success.. staff.. being ready work toward something bigger than myself…” (Case O). These veterans internalized the leadership principles and values of the military.

**Summary**

This multiple case study analysis of 15 instrumental case studies resulted in five findings. The findings had a preponderance of evidentiary support gleaned from the interview transcripts. Together they begin to create a picture of the military veteran administrators and their leadership characteristics. The findings include:

- **Finding I:** Taking care of your people, is an overarching foundational leadership characteristic of the military veteran in school administrative positions.
- **Finding II:** The leadership they had witnessed in the service and in education influenced the leadership of these administrators.
- **Finding III:** Not all veteran administrators utilized the Troops to Teachers program.
- **Finding IV:** These veterans had both successes and challenges in the classroom that were consistent with previous research.
- **Finding V:** The veterans’ values as they relate to trust, delegating responsibility, accountability, and beliefs in service, merit future inquiry.

The participants provided a wealth of information and insight into their military and educational careers along with their leadership philosophies and beliefs. The overarching
leadership characteristic of the veteran administrator is taking care of your people. The leadership they witnessed both in the service and in education influenced their own leadership. The classroom experiences demonstrated the universality of challenges and successes many had in the classroom and were consistent with the research. The values of the veterans related to trust, delegating, accountability, and belief in a service were an integral part of the leadership demonstrated by the participants.

Taking care of your people (Finding I) and the values of these military veterans (Finding V) are consistent with the caring values inherent in education. The values the veteran brings to education appear to be an integral part of the connection upon which these participants have successfully integrated the cultures of the military and education.
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION

Chapter one introduced the military veterans and their transition to education with the Troops to Teacher (TTT) program. Their leadership experiences appear to have had a positive impact. As educational leaders, TTT administrators have been rated highly by their superiors (Owings et al., 2011). These veterans bring a distinctive leadership background to the educational arena. This study expands on the research of Owens et al. (2011) research by examining the leadership characteristics of military veteran administrators.

The conceptual framework for this study was established in chapter 2 with a review of the research on military veterans in education, both as teachers and administrators. The recent research reviewed regarding teachers in the TTT program spanned nine years and leadership is often noted (Ballard, 2005; Broe, 2008; Coupland, 2004; Chaparro-Ramirez, 2008; Donaldson, 2007; Owing et al., 2011; Owings et al., 2006). Additionally, there are inconsistencies with the TTT database (Owings et al., 2014) that potentially confuses the identification of veterans’ status.

Chapter 3 presented the rationale for using a multiple case study (Stake, 2006) as the chosen methodology along with the study’s strengths, limitations, and validity. The chapter concluded with a detailed explanation of the process of analysis. In Chapter 4 the five findings of the study are defined along with an explanation of their support across the data.

In this chapter, I discuss the five findings and their implications for educational leadership. I conclude with renewing the call, based upon the research, to increase the number of veterans in education.
Five Findings

This multiple case study (Stake, 2006) of 15 military veterans in educational leadership positions highlighted the background and leadership characteristics of these leaders and resulted in the following five findings.

- **Finding I**: Taking care of your people, is an overarching foundational leadership characteristic of the military veteran in school administrative positions.
- **Finding II**: The leadership they had witnessed in the service and in education influenced participants’ leadership.
- **Finding III**: Not all veteran administrators utilized the Troops to Teachers program.
- **Finding IV**: These veterans had both successes and challenges in the classroom that were consistent with previous research.
- **Finding V**: The veterans’ values as they relate to trust, delegating responsibility, accountability, and beliefs in service, merit future inquiry.

**Finding I: Taking Care of Your People**

The theme of taking care of your people is a foundation of the military leadership principles (see Appendix A) as discussed in Chapter 1 and is supported strongly by this study. Aspects of this concept are also found in Kouzes and Posner (2012), Fullan (2008), and Bolman and Deal (2011). Fullan (2008) suggests that leadership is “creating conditions for them to succeed” (p. 250). It is about “foster[ing] collaboration by building trust and facilitating relationships” (Kouzes & Posner, 2012, p. 21).

The military administrators were very conscious of their role as leaders. Like the subjects in the research of Kouzes and Posner (2012), they stressed that actions were more important than words alone. They also supported many of the strategies in Fullan’s work (2008),
in particular “love your people.” As discussed earlier, “If a leader will take care of their people by providing support, motivation, communication and discipline, their people will take care of the mission” (Minnesota Wing, Civil Air Patrol, 2008, slide 14). Leadership in the military is built around these two elements of mission and people.

This finding has implications for educational leadership training in that many of leadership principles these veterans bring with them are appropriate for contemporary educators. The emphasis of veteran administrators on people recognizes an understanding that it takes the people to accomplish the mission. This may seem obvious, but taking care of your people includes building leaders, providing training and support, and building teams through clear communication. All are key components of these veterans’ leadership. This finding is a first step in developing a better understanding of the foundation and the universality of military leadership principles and the inclusion of those principles into educational leadership training.

**Finding II: The Leadership They Witnessed**

The concept that these administrators learned from observing the leadership of their superiors is important and has implications for educational leadership development. This study supports leadership training at the university or school district level, but it also supports exposing young administrators to multiple styles of leadership on their journey from the classroom to the principalship. In the military, a service member moves multiple times and works for a number of leaders on his or her journey toward command as evidenced by the participants’ comments. This movement provides the young leader with many leadership examples to learn from, both good and bad.

The implication in education is to encourage districts to allow young administrators to be exposed to a variety of leadership styles on their journey to the principalship. In some districts,
it is possible for teachers to move from the classroom to assistant principalship and possibly to principalship—all in the same building. This may give a myopic view of leadership upon which the administrator would build his or her own style. This research supports moving administrators periodically during their administrative career to allow them to witness a range of leadership styles from different professions. It may be appropriate for young administrators to have additional time and exposure on their journey in educational leadership.

**Finding III: Not All Veterans Used Troops to Teachers**

This study suggests that research on TTT veterans is not inclusive of all military veterans in education. This was drawn from the demographic survey and the interviews with participants. A majority (13 of 15) of the participants had *not* utilized the TTT program to assist in their transition to education. Nearly all the research reviewed in Chapters 1 and 2 on military veterans as teachers and or administrators had utilized the TTT database to assist in locating participants. However, there are more former military veterans in public education as both teachers and administrators than just those who participated in the TTT program. This research also found that many of the experiences of non-TTT program participants mirrored those of TTT program participants. This study, when combined with the comments of Owings et al. (2014) on the TTT database, shows there are a number of veterans moving into education without TTT support. This study did not examine why the veteran chose the method they did to transition to education, nor did it seek to focus on the TTT program as a unit of analysis. Additional research on this question seems appropriate with the large numbers of veterans returning to civilian life following the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan (Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America, 2011).
Finding IV: Veterans’ Classroom Experiences

Although no specific experience from the classroom was identified as common to all, the participants shared early experiences that were part of their journey to administrative leadership. Both successes and challenges were described in these early years. Much of the research on veterans in education dealt with their classroom experiences and was reviewed in Chapter 2 (Ballard, 2005; Broe, 2008; Chaparro-Ramirez, 2008; Coupland, 2004; Donaldson, 2007; Owings et al. 2006; Nunnery et al. 2009). Their variety of classroom experiences showed consistencies with previous research.

The implication for this finding includes emphasizing that the military veteran administrator was often challenged, like most new teachers, during their early years. But as Owings et al. (2014) noted “with a few years experience, the differences in teacher effectiveness between … preparation programs fade[d]” (p. 78). The military veterans faced many of the same challenges that all teachers faced.

Finding V: Veterans’ Values

The military veteran and public school teacher, upon first blush, seem to come from two very distinct and different cultures. In military service, men and women swear an oath to support and defend the constitution of the United States. This means, quite literally, they are prepared to make the ultimate sacrifice for their country. In education the goal is student learning and preparing them for the future. But at the core, both cultures are deeply dedicated to their mission. Lest one thinks one group is more dedicated to their cause than the other, just remember the staff of Sandy Hook and their response to the horror of that infamous day in December 2012.
The overarching leadership characteristic of the veteran administrators shown in this study is taking care of your people. When combined with the trust and belief in service, taking care of your people defines the values that the veteran brings to education. The values realized and demonstrated by the military veterans as school administrators are the same caring values inherent in education. The values the veteran brings to education appear to be the commonality upon which the successful integration of the two cultures is built.

The first finding, “taking care of your people,” demonstrates a value for the individual and is foundational in the veteran administrator’s leadership. The roots of this value are woven throughout the 11 leadership principles shared in Chapter 1 and provided in Appendix A. Five of these leadership principles relate directly to some aspect of “taking care of your people” and are consistent with education. The five leadership principles include:

- Develop a sense of responsibility among your subordinates
- Know your (Marines, Soldiers, Sailors) and look out for their welfare
- Keep your (Marines, Soldiers, Sailors) informed
- Ensure assigned tasks are understood, supervised, and accomplished
- Train your (Marines, Soldiers, Sailors) as a team

The veteran administrators in this study embodied these principles in their leadership philosophies and characteristics. The values they represent appear to be the connection, the commonality, between these two seemingly incongruent cultures. The participant in Case L said, “They’d go to hell and back for you if they know that you care.” He used the word “know” that you care, not “think” that you care. A participant stated he lived by the values of “…integrity, service before self, and excellence in all you do…” (Case O). The leadership values were not simply nice sayings; they were embodied in these veteran administrators' actions and words.
The 11 leadership principles (U.S. Marine Corps, 2013) (Appendix A) that are foundational to the military have many consistencies with the 21 Responsibilities for School Leadership that Work as defined by Marzano et al. (2005) (Appendix B). A number of Marzano et al.’s (2005) responsibilities are related to the sixth military principle “know your staff and lookout for their welfare.” Knowing your staff and looking out for their welfare is one of the most important leadership principles (U.S. Marine Corps, 2013). It includes knowing your subordinates, understanding them, ensuring they have the necessary equipment and training, fair and equal distribution of awards, and encouraging individual development. In Table 4, the 21 responsibilities (Marzano et al., 2005) are aligned with the related military principles (U.S. Marine Corps, 2013). The 21 Responsibilities for School Leadership that Work are listed on the left. The comparable or related military leadership principles are on the right. When comparing these two lists it becomes obvious numerous traits, responsibilities, and characteristics appear in both leadership domains.
Table 4

*Comparison of Marzano, Waters, and McNulty's 21 Responsibilities and the U.S. Marine Corps' Leadership Principles*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>21 Responsibilities of School Leadership that Work*</th>
<th>Related Military Leadership Principles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Affirmation</td>
<td>Know your staff and lookout for their welfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Change Agent</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Contingent rewards</td>
<td>Know your staff and lookout for their welfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Communication</td>
<td>Keep your staff informed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Cultured</td>
<td>Train your staff as a team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Discipline</td>
<td>Know your staff and lookout for their welfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Flexibility</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Focus</td>
<td>Employ your command in accordance with its capabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Ideals/Beliefs</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Input</td>
<td>Develop sense of responsibility among subordinates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Intellectual Stimulation</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Involvement in Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment (CIA)</td>
<td>Be technically and tactically proficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Knowledge of CIA</td>
<td>Be technically and tactically proficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Monitoring/Evaluating</td>
<td>Ensure assigned tasks are understood, supervised and accomplished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Optimizer</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Order</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Outreach</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Relationship</td>
<td>Know your staff and lookout for their welfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Resources</td>
<td>Know your staff and lookout for their welfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Situational Awareness</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Visibility</td>
<td>Set the example</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Marzano et al., 2005; **U.S. Marine Corps Leadership, 2013

Finding V, which speaks to the values these participants bring to their leadership, is a key component of their success. The values of trust and belief in delegating, along with a strong sense of service and being part of something larger than themselves were foundational to these veteran administrators. These values undergird all of the actions of these leaders and they are in
line with the responsibilities enumerated by Marzano et al. (2005). These values, along with the foundational principles the participants brought with them, appear to be what have allowed them to successfully cross the bridge between the military and education.

This connection between the leadership principles of education and the military strengthens the implications that Findings I and V have for educational leadership training both at the university and district levels. The combination of well-established educational leadership training along with the military leadership foundation that the veteran administrators bring with them might create a successful combination of pedagogically sound professional leadership. This study is an early step in developing a better understanding of the foundation and the universality of military leadership principles and the potential inclusion into educational leadership training. These veteran participants have demonstrated it is beneficial to both veterans and educators to constantly develop their relationships with colleagues. Relationships are the foundation of organizational cultures. And as Nilofer Merchant (2011, March 22) said, “culture will trump strategy, every time”.

**Recommendations for Future Study**

This study has raised a number of issues that warrant further examination. It begs the question: how does the military veteran administrator compare with the non-veteran administrator? Additionally, this study just begins to examine female veteran administrators as well as minority veteran administrators. Further, study on both these groups is important in improving our understanding of their experiences. The study also begins to examine the non-TTT veteran. Are these veterans different from the TTT veterans reviewed in the research? How many of these non-TTT veterans are there? Indeed, how many veterans, overall, are in education?
Comparative Study with Non-Veteran Administrators

A comparative study with veteran and non-veteran administrators would be useful in building a more complete picture of leadership priorities in education. What are the primary leadership philosophies of non-veteran administrators? What are the comparable values of the non-veteran administrator?

Defining the influential factors on the leadership characteristics of the non-veterans is another appropriate aspect of a comparative study. How many leaders did they work with in their journey to administration? How did their exposure to various styles of school leadership influence and shape their own leadership characteristics? The results of such a study would strengthen the implication discussed in Finding II of exposing young administrators to a variety of leadership styles in their careers.

Female and Minority Veteran Administrators

This study had only one female participant and four of the 15 (27%) participants were minority veterans. Though, generally speaking, their data were consistent with the responses of the majority, further research is appropriate. Inclusion of additional female veterans and minority participants in future research would be useful in building a more complete picture of the military veteran administrator.

How Many Veterans Are in Public Education?

Further research on the numbers of veterans in the public education, both in the classroom and in administrative positions, is suggested. This study indicates more veterans are in public education than the TTT database implies. The study also supports research to gain a better understanding of the number of veterans in education and to gather data on how veterans are transitioning to education. Such a study might have implications for the TTT program.
Additional research on this question seems appropriate with the influx of veterans returning to civilian life following the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan.

**Summary**

This study on the leadership of military veterans as school administrators provides a unique perspective on school leadership. A foundational characteristic of the veteran administrators’ leadership is taking care of their teachers and staff. They were influenced in their leadership by their experiences in the service and in education. Most of the participants (87%) in this study did not use the TTT program to assist in their transition to education. This suggests there may be more veteran administrators working successfully in our schools today than previously thought. These participants are leaders who build trust, delegate responsibility, and understand and seek accountability. They believe in service and being part of something bigger than themselves. The values these participants have demonstrated through their words and actions have implications for educational leadership training at both universities and school districts.

**Final Thought**

As the U.S. commitment to the conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan wind down, over 2.8 million veterans are returning to civilian life (Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America, 2011). When trained, these veterans have something to offer in the classroom (Ballard, 2005; Broe, 2008, Chaparro-Ramirez, 2008; Nunnery et al. 2009; Owings et al., 2014; Owings et al. 2006). This study, when combined with results from the Owings et al. (2011) study, shows that military veteran administrators bring a strong leadership component with them and can have a positive impact on public education. The values and desire to serve demonstrated by the veteran administrator appear to be an essential element of commonality between the military and
education cultures. Our veterans have demonstrated their commitment to our country with their military service and on the battlefield. This research, built upon previous studies, only strengthens the call to encourage more veterans into our schools. As a veteran participant put it: “We’re gonna have a lot of young captains and majors getting out of the military…. We, as a society, need to figure out how to get those people into education…” (Case A).
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Appendix A  U.S. Marine Corps Leadership Principles

Know yourself and seek improvement

This principle of leadership should be developed by the use of leadership traits. Evaluate yourself by using the leadership traits and determine your strengths and weaknesses. Work to improve your weaknesses and utilize your strengths. With a knowledge of yourself, and your experience and knowledge of group behavior, you can determine the best way to deal with any given situation. With some Marines, and in certain situations, the firm, hard stand may be most effective; however, in other situations, the "big brother" approach may work better. You can improve yourself in many ways. Self-improvement can be achieved by reading and observing. Ask your friends and seniors for an honest evaluation of your leadership ability. This will help you to identify your weaknesses and strengths.

1. Make an honest evaluation of yourself to determine your strong and weak personal qualities. Strive to overcome the weak ones and further strengthen those in which you are strong.

2. Seek the honest opinions of your friends or superiors to show you how to improve your leadership ability.

3. Learn by studying the causes for the success or the failure of other leaders.

4. Develop a genuine interest in people; acquire an understanding of human nature.

5. Master the art of effective writing and speech.

6. Have a definite goal and a definite plan to attain your goal.

Be technically and tactically proficient

Before you can lead, you must be able to do the job. The first principle is to know your job. As a Marine, you must demonstrate your ability to accomplish the mission, and to do this you must be capable of answering questions and demonstrating competence in your MOS. Respect is the reward of the Marine who shows competence. Tactical and technical competence can be learned from books and from on the job training.

1. Seek a well rounded military education by attending service schools; doing daily independent reading and research; taking correspondence courses from MCI, colleges, or correspondence schools; and seeking off-duty education.

2. Seek out and associate with capable leaders. Observe and study their actions.

3. Broaden your knowledge through association with members of other branches of the U. S. armed services.
4. Seek opportunities to apply knowledge through the exercise of command. Good leadership is acquired only through practice.

5. Prepare yourself for the job of leader at the next higher rank.

**Know your Marines and look out for their welfare**

This is one of the most important of the principles. You should know your Marines and how they react to different situations. This knowledge can save lives. A Marine who is nervous and lacks self confidence should never be put in a situation where an important, instant decision must be made. Knowledge of your Marines' personalities will enable you, as the leader, to decide how to best handle each Marine and determine when close supervision is needed.

1. Put your Marines' welfare before your own--correct grievances and remove discontent.

2. See the members of your unit and let them see you so that every Marine may know you and feel that you know them. Be approachable.

3. Get to know and understand the Marines under your command.

4. Let them see that you are determined that they be fully prepared for battle.

5. Concern yourself with the living conditions of the members of your unit.

6. Help your Marines get needed support from available personal services.

7. Protect the health of your unit by active supervision of hygiene and sanitation.

8. Determine what your unit’s mental attitude is; keep in touch with their thoughts.

9. Ensure fair and equal distribution of rewards.

10. Encourage individual development.

11. Provide sufficient recreational time and insist on participation.

12. Share the hardships of your Marines so you can better understand their reactions.

**Keep your Marines informed**

Marines by nature are inquisitive. To promote efficiency and morale, a leader should inform the Marines in his unit of all happenings and give reasons why things are to be done. This, of course, is done when time and security permit. Informing your Marines of the situation makes them feel that they are a part of the team and not just a cog in a wheel. Informed Marines perform better and, if knowledgeable of the situation, can carry on without your personal supervision. The key
to giving out information is to be sure that the Marines have enough information to do their job intelligently and to inspire their initiative, enthusiasm, loyalty, and convictions.

1. Whenever possible, explain why tasks must be done and how you intend to do them.

2. Assure yourself, by frequent inspections, that immediate subordinates are passing on necessary information.

3. Be alert to detect the spread of rumors. Stop rumors by replacing them with the truth.

4. Build morale and esprit de corps by publicizing information concerning successes of your unit.

5. Keep your unit informed about current legislation and regulations affecting their pay, promotion, privileges, and other benefits.

**Set the example**

As a Marine progresses through the ranks by promotion, all too often he/she takes on the attitude of "do as I say, not as I do." Nothing turns Marines off faster! As a Marine leader your duty is to set the standards for your Marines by personal example. Your appearance, attitude, physical fitness, and personal example are all watched by the Marines in your unit. If your personal standards are high, then you can rightfully demand the same of your Marines. If your personal standards are not high you are setting a double standard for your Marines, and you will rapidly lose their respect and confidence. Remember your Marines reflect your image! Leadership is taught by example.

1. Show your Marines that you are willing to do the same things you ask them to do.

2. Be physically fit, well groomed, and correctly dressed.

3. Maintain an optimistic outlook. Develop the will to win by capitalizing on your unit's abilities. The more difficult the situation is, the better your chance is to display an attitude of calmness and confidence.

4. Conduct yourself so that your personal habits are not open to criticism.

5. Exercise initiative and promote the spirit of initiative in your Marines.

6. Avoid showing favoritism to any subordinate.

7. Share danger and hardship with your Marines to demonstrate your willingness to assume your share of the difficulties.

8. By your performance, develop the thought within your Marines that you are the best Marine for the position you hold.
9. Delegate authority and avoid over-supervision in order to develop leadership among subordinates.

   **Ensure the task is understood, supervised, and accomplished**

This principle is necessary in the exercise of command. Before you can expect your Marines to perform, they must know first what is expected of them. You must communicate your instructions in a clear, concise manner. Talk at a level that your Marines are sure to understand, but not at a level so low that would insult their intelligence. Before your Marines start a task, allow them a chance to ask questions or seek advice. Supervision is essential. Without supervision you cannot know if the assigned task is being properly accomplished. Over supervision is viewed by subordinates as harassment and effectively stops their initiative. Allow subordinates to use their own techniques, and then periodically check their progress.

1. Ensure that the need for an order exists before issuing the order.

2. Use the established chain of command.

3. Through study and practice, issue clear, concise, and positive orders.

4. Encourage subordinates to ask questions concerning any point in your orders or directives they do not understand.

5. Question your Marines to determine if there is any doubt or misunderstanding in regard to the task to be accomplished.

6. Supervise the execution of your orders.

7. Make sure your Marines have the resources needed to accomplish the mission.

8. Vary your supervisory routine and the points which you emphasize during inspections.

9. Exercise care and thought in supervision. Over supervision hurts initiative and creates resentment; under supervision will not get the job done.

   **Train your Marines as a team**

Every waking hour Marines should be trained and schooled, challenged and tested, corrected and encouraged with perfection and teamwork as a goal. When not at war, Marines are judged in peacetime roles: perfection in drill, dress, bearing and demeanor; shooting; self-improvement; and most importantly, performance. No excuse can be made for the failure of leaders to train their Marines to the highest state of physical condition and to instruct them to be the very best in the profession of arms. Train with a purpose and emphasize the essential element of teamwork.

The sharing of hardships, dangers, and hard work strengthens a unit and reduces problems, it develops teamwork, improves morale and esprit and molds a feeling of unbounded loyalty and
this is the basis for what makes men fight in combat; it is the foundation for bravery, for advancing under fire. Troops don't complain of tough training; they seek it and brag about it.

Teamwork is the key to successful operations. Teamwork is essential from the smallest unit to the entire Marine Corps. As a Marine officer, you must insist on teamwork from your Marines. Train, play, and operate as a team. Be sure that each Marine knows his/her position and responsibilities within the team framework.

When team spirit is in evidence, the most difficult tasks become much easier to accomplish. Teamwork is a two-way street. Individual Marines give their best, and in return the team provides the Marine with security, recognition, and a sense of accomplishment.

1. Train, study and train, prepare, and train thoroughly, endlessly.

2. Strive to maintain individual stability and unit integrity; keep the same squad leader and fire team leaders as long as possible if they're getting the job done. Needless transfers disrupt teamwork.

3. Emphasize use of the "buddy" system.

4. Encourage unit participation in recreational and military events.

5. Never publicly blame an individual for the team's failure nor praise one individual for the team's success.

6. Provide the best available facilities for unit training and make maximum use of teamwork.

7. Ensure that all training is meaningful, and that its purpose is clear to all members of the command.

8. Acquaint each Marine of your unit with the capabilities and limitations of all other units, thereby developing mutual trust and understanding.

9. Ensure that each junior leader understands the mechanics of tactical control for the unit.

10. Base team training on realistic, current, and probable conditions.

11. Insist that every Marine understands the functions of the other members of the team and how the team functions as a part of the unit.

12. Seek opportunities to train with other units.

13. Whenever possible, train competitively.
Make sound and timely decisions

The leader must be able to rapidly estimate a situation and make a sound decision based on that estimation. Hesitation or a reluctance to make a decision leads subordinates to lose confidence in your abilities as a leader. Loss of confidence in turn creates confusion and hesitation within the unit.

Once you make a decision and discover it is the wrong one, don't hesitate to revise your decision. Marines respect the leader who corrects mistakes immediately instead of trying to bluff through a poor decision.

1. Develop a logical and orderly thought process by practicing objective estimates of the situation.

2. When time and situation permit, plan for every possible event that can reasonably be foreseen.

3. Consider the advice and suggestions of your subordinates whenever possible before making decisions.

4. Announce decisions in time to allow subordinates to make necessary plans.

5. Encourage subordinates to estimate and make plans at the same time you do.

6. Make sure your Marines are familiar with your policies and plans.

7. Consider the effects of your decisions on all members of your unit.

Develop a sense of responsibility among your subordinates

Another way to show your Marines that you are interested in their welfare is to give them the opportunity for professional development. Assigning tasks and delegating the authority to accomplish tasks promotes mutual confidence and respect between the leader and subordinates. It also encourages the subordinates to exercise initiative and to give wholehearted cooperation in the accomplishment of unit tasks. When you properly delegate authority, you demonstrate faith in your Marines and increase their desire for greater responsibilities. If you fail to delegate authority, you indicate a lack of leadership, and your subordinates may take it to be a lack of trust in their abilities.

1. Operate through the chain of command.

2. Provide clear, well thought directions. Tell your subordinates what to do, not how to do it. Hold them responsible for results, although overall responsibility remains yours. Delegate enough authority to them to enable them to accomplish the task.

3. Give your Marines frequent opportunities to perform duties usually performed by the next higher ranks.
4. Be quick to recognize your subordinates' accomplishments when they demonstrate initiative and resourcefulness.

5. Correct errors in judgment and initiative in a way which will encourage the Marine to try harder. Avoid public criticism or condemnation.

6. Give advice and assistance freely when it is requested by your subordinates.

7. Let your Marines know that you will accept honest errors without punishment in return; teach from these mistakes by critique and constructive guidance.

8. Resist the urge to micro-manage; don't give restrictive guidance which destroys initiative, drive, innovation, enthusiasm; creates boredom; and increases workload of seniors.

9. Assign your Marines to positions in accordance with demonstrated or potential ability.

10. Be prompt and fair in backing subordinates. Until convinced otherwise, have faith in each subordinate.

11. Accept responsibility willingly and insist that your subordinates live by the same standard.

**Employ your command in accordance with its capabilities**

Successful completion of a task depends upon how well you know your unit's capabilities. If the task assigned is one that your unit has not been trained to do, failure is very likely to result. Failures lower your unit's morale and self esteem. You wouldn't send a cook section to "PM" a vehicle nor would you send three Marines to do the job of ten. Seek out challenging tasks for your unit, but be sure that your unit is prepared for and has the ability to successfully complete the mission.

1. Do not volunteer your unit for tasks it is not capable of completing. Not only will the unit fail, but your Marines will think you are seeking personal glory.

2. Keep yourself informed as to the operational effectiveness of your command.

3. Be sure that tasks assigned to subordinates are reasonable. Do not hesitate to demand their utmost in an emergency.

4. Analyze all assigned tasks. If the means at your disposal are inadequate, inform your immediate supervisor and request the necessary support.

5. Assign tasks equally among your Marines.

6. Use the full capabilities of your unit before requesting assistance.
Seek responsibility and take responsibility for your actions

For professional development, you must actively seek out challenging assignments. You must use initiative and sound judgment when trying to accomplish jobs that are not required by your grade. Seeking responsibilities also means that you take responsibility for your actions. You are responsible for all your unit does or fails to do. Regardless of the actions of your subordinates, the responsibility for decisions and their application falls on you. You must issue all orders in your name. Stick by your convictions and do what you think is right, but accept justified and constructive criticism. Never remove or demote a subordinate for a failure that is the result of your own mistake.

1. Learn the duties of your immediate senior, and be prepared to accept the responsibilities of these duties.

2. Seek different leadership positions that will give you experience in accepting responsibility in different fields.

3. Take every opportunity that offers increased responsibility.

4. Perform every act, large or small, to the best of your ability. Your reward will be increased opportunity to perform bigger and more important tasks.

5. Stand up for what you think is right; have the courage of your convictions.

6. Carefully evaluate a subordinate's failure before taking action. Make sure the apparent shortcomings are not due to an error on your part. Consider the Marines that are available, salvage a Marine if possible, and replace a Marine when necessary.

7. In the absence of orders, take the initiative to perform the actions you believe your senior would direct you to perform if he/she were present.

Appendix B  21 Responsibilities for School Leadership That Work

Taken from: Twenty-one responsibilities identified from *School leadership that works – From research to results* 2005. (Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005, p. 42-43).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Affirmation</td>
<td>Recognizes and celebrates the accomplishment and acknowledges failures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Change Agent</td>
<td>Is willing to challenge and actively challenge the status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Contingent Rewards</td>
<td>Recognizes and rewards individual accomplishments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Communication</td>
<td>Establishes strong lines of communications with and among teachers and students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Culture</td>
<td>Fosters shared beliefs and sense of community and cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Discipline</td>
<td>Protects teachers from issues and influences that would distract from their teaching time and focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Flexibility</td>
<td>Adapts this her leadership behavior the needs of the current situation and is comfortable with dissent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Focus</td>
<td>Establishes clear goals and keeps those goals in the forefront of the school’s attention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Ideals/Beliefs</td>
<td>Communicates and operates from strong ideals and beliefs about schooling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Input</td>
<td>Involves teachers in the design and implementation of important decisions and policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Intellectual Stimulation</td>
<td>Ensures faculty and staff are aware of the most current theories and practices and makes the discussion of these a regular aspect of the school’s culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Involvement in Curriculum,</td>
<td>Is directly involved in the design and implementation of curriculum, instruction, and assessment practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction, and Assessment (CIA)</td>
<td>Is knowledgeable about current curriculum, instruction, and assessment practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Knowledge of CIA</td>
<td>Monitors the effectiveness of school practices and their impact on student learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Optimizer</td>
<td>Inspires and leads new and challenging innovations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Order</td>
<td>Establishes a set of standard operating procedures and routines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Outreach</td>
<td>Is an advocate and spokes person for the school to all stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Relationship</td>
<td>Demonstrates of the personal aspects of teachers and staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Resources</td>
<td>Provides teachers with materials and professional development necessary for the successful execution of their jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Situational Awareness</td>
<td>Is aware of the details and undercurrent in the running of the school and uses this information to address current and potential problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Visibility</td>
<td>Has quality contact and interactions with teachers and students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C  Letter of Introduction to Potential Participant

Elliot F. Bolles

Participant name
Address

Dear (Name of participant),

Your name was given to me by __________________________ as a possible candidate for a study I am conducting on the leadership styles of military veterans who have moved into educational administrative positions. This study is part of my dissertation, which is partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education in Educational Leadership and Policy Studies at Virginia Tech.

Research suggests these military veterans are successful educational leaders and leadership is a key component in educational growth and student achievement. The goal of this study is to determine if there are consistent foundational leadership characteristics found among the veterans that were helpful in their success. On the other hand, were some of the challenges they faced partially due to those foundational characteristics? The aim of the study is to involve twenty (20) military veterans who have been in the classroom and have moved into administrative positions.

Participants will be asked to complete a brief paper and pen survey reviewing their military and educational history. Following the survey, we will conduct a one on one interview. This interview will be recorded and will take approximately one hour. The interview will review your military leadership experiences, your classroom experiences, and your experiences as an educational leader. Total time commitment for the interview and the survey should be no more than one and a half hours.

If you have questions relating to this research, please do not hesitate to contact me at 540-226-2180 (cell) or 540-658-6400 (work) or via email at ebolles@staffordschools.net.

If you agree to be part of this study, please respond via email. My email is ebolles@staffordschools.net. If you agree, your time, commitment, and contribution to this research are appreciated.

Sincerely,

Elliot F. Bolles

Elliot F. Bolles
Appendix D  Military Officer Insignia
Appendix F  Demographic Survey

Leadership Characteristics of Military Veterans as School Administrators

Assigned Pseudonym: ________________________________

Date: ________________________________

1. Gender (Circle)
   . Male
   . Female

2. Ethnicity: Are you Hispanic or Latino? Yes No (circle)
   Racial Category: (Circle)
   American Indian/Alaska Native
   Asian
   Black or African American
   Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
   White

3. Age (Circle)
   30-34  35-39  40-44  45-49  50-54  60-64  65+

4. Service (Circle)
   Army  Marine Corp  Navy  Air Force  Coast Guard

5. Source of commissioning (if applicable) IE Service Academy, ROTC, OCS:
   __________________________________________________________

6. Undergraduate Degree and year: _________________________________

7. Total years military service: _________________________________

Pseudonym: ________________________________
8. Highest Rank achieved: ___________________________________________

9. Military specialty: IE Infantry, Pilot, Surface Line Officer:
   ________________________________________________________________

10. Educational Degree(s) – (Degree, University, Year):
    _______________________________________________________________

11. Subject(s) and Grade Level(s) taught:
    _______________________________________________________________

12. Total years as classroom teacher: _________________________________

13. Administrative position(s):
    ___________________________________________________________________

14. Total years in administration: ________
Appendix G  
Interview Protocol Guide

Leadership Characteristics of Military Veterans as School Administrators

Participants Name: (pseudonym)_________________________________________________
Military background: __________________________________________________________________
Administrative position: __________________________________________________________________

Script – with recorder running.
I am sitting with _(Pseudonym)____________________ in (location) ______________for our interview today. It is approximately ______ (time) on ______(date).

I want to thank you for participating in this study. My name is Elliot Bolles and I am a doctoral student at Virginia Tech and this study is for my dissertation which is partial fulfillment of the requirements for the a Doctorate in Education. Thank you for completing the two earlier surveys, the demographic and LEAD-Self questionnaires. This interview will take approximately one hour and I would like to have your permission to record it so that I may accurately document the information you share. All your responses are confidential. They will be used to develop a better understanding of the leadership characteristics of military veterans now in school administrative positions.

At this time, I would like to remind you of your written consent to participate in this study. I am the responsible investigator, but the researcher of record is the chair of my dissertation committee, Dr. Kami Patrizio. You and I have both signed and dated the consent form, certifying that you consent with this interview. You will receive a copy of the consent form and I will keep the other under lock and key.

Your participation in this interview is completely voluntary. If at any time you need to stop or take a break, please let me know. You may also withdraw your participation at any time without consequence.

Do you have any questions or concerns before we begin?

Again, I want to thank you for your participation in this study. I believe your input will be valuable for this study on leadership characteristics of veteran administrators.

Then with your permission, we will begin the interview.
1. Can you tell me briefly about your military career?
   Types of leadership positions you held? Number of subordinates?

2. Can you tell me about any significant leadership experiences that influenced you while in the military?

Moving on to your educational career…

3. Can you tell me what made you move to education. 
   Did you use the Troops to Teacher program?
   If so, can you share your thoughts on the program?

   •  Let's look back to when you were a classroom teacher…

4. How do you feel your teacher education coursework prepared you for the classroom following your military career?
   School Culture adjustments?
   Students?
   Peer teachers?
   Administrators?

5. Describe your favorite (subject area) lesson that you taught.
   What was it?
   What was it like to be in your class?
How did your students respond?

6. Can you provide me with a story that exemplifies your approach to classroom management when you were a teacher?

Did your style change over time as a teacher?

What is your classroom/behavior management style as an administrator?

Has your style changed?

About your experiences in administrations…

What made you want to move up to an administrative position in schools?

Was there a person (parent, student, administrator, teacher) who influenced you?

Was there an event?

8. Lets move onto some more specific leadership questions….

PRIORITIES: What are your priorities as an administrator? Do you have an example that demonstrates those priorities.

People?

Students – needs, expectations, families – relationships?

Staff needs..

Instruction? Mission

Student achievement?

Core beliefs?
STAFF: Can you describe how you work with your staff?

Examples?

Custodial/Cafeteria staff?

Instructional/Noninstructional?

Experienced/Less experienced?

Assistant Principals/Interns?

STYLE: Can you share with me a story that demonstrates your leadership style?

How would you describe your style of leadership?

How hands on / hands off?
Specific instructions?
Inclusion of subordinates in decision making?
Coach?
Delegate?

How was your vision developed and shared with the school.

MILITARY INFLUENCE on Leadership:

Do you believe your prior military leadership experiences/training have influenced your leadership practices as an educational administrator?

If so… how?

Core beliefs?
Principles?

Do you have an experience that exemplifies how your military leadership training influenced you.

9. Is there anything else that you would like to add?

Pause… Wait…

Conclusion:

This concludes our interview today. I will be sending you a transcript of this interview within the next few weeks. Please review it and be sure it states your opinions or thoughts accurately. I may find the need to speak with again for clarification or other reason…

May I contact you if that is required?

Again, I want you to know that once I have good written transcript of the interview, the recording will be erased/destroyed. I also want to remind you that your name will never be associated with this interview. The surveys and this interview will all be identified by a pseudonym.

Upon completion of the analysis and writing the dissertation, I will send you a copy of the final study for you to review.

Thank you again for your time.

I will now turn off the recorder.
Appendix H  Virginia Polytechnic Consent Letter

VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY

INFORMED CONSENT FOR PARTICIPANTS
IN RESEARCH PROJECTS INVOLVING HUMAN SUBJECTS

Title of Project: Leadership Characteristics of Military Veterans as School Administrators

Investigator: Elliot F. Bolles

VT Sponsor: Kami Patrizio, Ed.D  kpatrizi@vt.edu  703-538-8477

I. Purpose of this Research Project

This study is part of my dissertation, which is partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education in Educational Leadership and Policy Studies at Virginia Tech. The purpose of this study is to determine if any consistent leadership characteristics or leadership challenges are found among military veterans who have moved into school administrative positions. Research suggests these military veterans are successful educational leaders and leadership is a key component in educational growth and student achievement. The goal of this study is to determine if there are consistent foundational leadership characteristics found among the veterans that were helpful in their success. On the other hand, were some of the challenges they faced partially due to those foundational characteristics? Both these questions have implications for educational leadership. The results of this study will be published as part of dissertation. Follow on publication, as a journal article is a possibility. The aim of the study is to involve twenty (20) participants. All are military veterans who have been in the classroom and have moved into administrative positions.

II. Procedures

If you agree to participate, you will be asked to complete a short questionnaire and a one-on-one interview. The questionnaire is a demographic survey reviewing your military and educational history. This survey should take no more than five minutes to complete. The interview will be audio-recorded and will take approximately one hour. The interview will deal review your military leadership experiences, your classroom experiences, and your experiences as an educational leader. Total time commitment should be no more than one and a half (1 ½ ) hours.

Following the short survey, we will meet in your office, if that is available and agreeable. If not, we can meet somewhere else where interruptions will be limited. There may be a need for telephone contact for follow-on questions after the interview.
III. Risks

This study will involve minimal risk and discomfort. The probability of harm and discomfort will not be greater than your daily life encounters. Risks may include emotional discomfort from answering questionnaires or interview questions.

IV. Benefits

You will not benefit from participation in this study. No promise or guarantee of benefits has been made to encourage you to participate.

V. Extent of Anonymity and Confidentiality

All data collected on the demographic survey and the interview will be using pseudonyms to avoid any identifying information. The interview will be recorded digitally and will be transcribed soon after. Upon receipt of the transcript, the original recording will be erased/destroyed. A professional transcriber will transcribe the interview from a digital recording to a word document. At no time will the researcher release identifiable results of the study to anyone without your written consent.

The Virginia Tech (VT) Institutional Review Board (IRB) may view the study’s data for auditing purposes. The IRB is responsible for the oversight of the protection of human subjects involved in research.

VI. Compensation

There will be no compensation for your participation in this study.

VII. Subject's Consent

I have read the Consent Form and conditions of this project. I have had all my questions answered. I hereby acknowledge the above and give my voluntary consent:

_______________________________________________ Date__________
Subject signature

_______________________________________________
Subject printed name
VIII. Freedom to Withdraw

It is important for you to know that you are free to withdraw from this study at any time without penalty. You are free not to answer any questions that you choose or respond to what is being asked of you without penalty.

Please note that there may be circumstances under which the investigator may determine that a subject should not continue as a subject.

IX. Questions or Concerns

Should you have any questions about this study, you may contact one of the research investigators whose contact information is included at the beginning of this document.

Should you have any questions or concerns about the study’s conduct or your rights as a research subject, or need to report a research-related injury or event, you may contact the VT IRB Chair, Dr. David M. Moore at moored@vt.edu or (540) 231-4991.

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
(Note: each subject must be provided a copy of this form. In addition, the IRB office may stamp its approval on the consent document(s) you submit and return the stamped version to you for use in consenting subjects; therefore, ensure each consent document you submit is ready to be read and signed by subjects.)
Worksheet 2. The research questions or Themes of the multi case study

| Theme 1: The level of task or directive behavior by the participant. |
| Theme 2: The level of relational support by the participant: |
| Theme 3: Self-Improvement, professional growth of participant. |
| Theme 4: Relationships with subordinates, taking care of your people. |
| Theme 5: Mission, Task, priority |
| Theme 6: |

(Stake, 2010)
Worksheet 3. Analyst’s Notes while reading a case report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case ID __________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Synopsis of case:</th>
<th>Case Findings:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uniqueness of case situation for program/phenomenon:</th>
<th>IV.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevance of case for cross-case Themes:</th>
<th>Possible excerpts for cross-case report:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theme 1_____  Theme 2_____  Theme 3_____</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 4_____  Theme 5_____  Theme 6_____</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

L: Low importance
M: Medium Importance
H: High Importance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors (optional):</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commentary:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(Stake, 2010)
Worksheet 4. Estimates of Ordinariness of the Situation of Each Case and Estimates of Manifestation of Multicase Themes in Each Case

$W =$ highly unusual situation,   $u =$ somewhat unusual situation,   blank = ordinary situation
$M =$ high manifestation,   $m =$ some manifestation,   blank = almost no manifestation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ordinariness of this Case’s situation:</th>
<th>Case A</th>
<th>Case B</th>
<th>Case C</th>
<th>Case D</th>
<th>Case E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Original Multicase Themes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Added Multicase Themes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

High manifestation means that the Theme is prominent in this particular case study.
A highly unusual situation (far from ordinary) is one that is expected to challenge the generality of themes.
As indicated, the original themes can be augmented by additional themes even as late as the beginning of the cross-case analysis. The paragraphs on each Theme should be attached to the matrix so that the basis for estimates can be readily examined.

(Stake, 2010)
Worksheet 5. A Map on which to make Assertions for the Final Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case A</td>
<td>Finding I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finding II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finding III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finding IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case B</td>
<td>Finding I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finding II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finding III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case C</td>
<td>Finding I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finding II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finding III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finding IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finding V</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A High mark means that the Theme is an important part of this particular case study and relevant to the theme.

(Stake, 2010)
Appendix J  Sample Completed Worksheet 3 C

Case ID ____C____

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Synopsis of case:</th>
<th>Case Findings:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx</td>
<td>I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Technology EdD</td>
<td>II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG Educational degree</td>
<td>III.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-12 Assistive Tech 2.5 years Admin 12 years</td>
<td>IV.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uniqueness of case situation for program/phenomenon:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevance of case for cross-case Themes:</th>
<th>Q1 You know the phrase that comes to my mind that they always used to—from OCS on, “you take care of the troops. They take care of you.” And that kind of got inculcated into the way I think about things and I think I’m kind of leaning that way anyway or my personality is.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theme 1 ___ Directive/delegates/Situational – delegates…</td>
<td>Q2 – Ldshp ex: You know you pick up the good things that you see, you want to emulate, and then you see the bad things and you know you’re not gonna do that. So I think from exposure to a lot of different people styles that impacted me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 2 ___ Relational Support</td>
<td>Q3 – CRM : You know, so I knew classroom management was real important and that was 90% of the battle when you go into a classroom. If you can’t get that under control you’re screwed. So I always knew that. I never lost that. Plus I was in instructional billets all through the Marine Corp so…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 3 ___ Self-Improvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 4 ___ Support/TCOP, Q1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 5 ___ Mission, task, priority – support student learning. Q6, 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 6 ___ Ldshp priorities – Q1, 5, 8, 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 7 ___ Diff Mil/ed – Q9 Accountability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 8 ___ Leadership learned from …1, 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 9 … Classroom exp 3, 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 10 ___ Accountability 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 11 – Admin Experiences 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q4 – CR - No. I – every – every child was an individual and each case was different and every parent was different. The common denominators are every time I dealt with a parent and student, the parents all put – they were always wanting what was best for their kid, and if you looked at it like that it was kind of easy to deal with maybe some of the requests that were a little off the page.

Q5 - OK leadership is about leading people…. So those were my top priorities coming into the job. Get the right people in the right seats on the bus and then develop a plan that was going to meet the needs of the division for at least the next five years.

Q6 – Priority Mission I knew we needed to really have an instructional focus and that’s where the instructional technology supervisor idea came in and then around the same time I knew that you know this catchphrase “data driven decision making” was popular.

Q7 – Mission - They’re a support. It’s a supporting arm, you know, the main mission is teaching and learning.

Q8 – Ldshp - Your actions speak, you know? You go to a kid’s soccer game.

Q9 – Diff Mil/Ed - I think the things that make us kind of stand out are we are not afraid of being accountable. We’re not afraid and we actually kind of want to be accountable. So – so that stands out to people, I think, being honest, forthright with your assessments, and dutifully disagreeing when you need to and then knowing when to stop that, you know tactfully, and being forceful enough about it, is something that I see – we see as a duty and a responsibility.
| Q10 – Ldshp – qualities - You know I mean the basic things about personal attributes, punctuality, you know, meetings with a purpose, organization, and the ability to I’d say plan and get input. |
| Q11 - The things come so naturally to us that it makes our job like almost not like a job. I don’t know how to explain it. It feels like you’re – or I’m self fulfilling or self actualizing and helping others along the way. I mean I haven’t had a lot of turnover here, except forced turnover. |

Factors (optional):

- Safety school trained
- 20+ years
- VT EdD

Commentary:
## Appendix K  Completed Worksheet 5A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>O</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Assertions developed from Themes found in instrumental case studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. &quot;Taking Care of your People&quot; was a prominent leadership characteristic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Prior leaders had &quot;strongly&quot; influenced the participant’s leadership philosophies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Most of the participants did NOT use the Troops To Teachers program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Classroom experiences – positive and negative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Trust and communication were major components of leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Delegating responsibility was a major component of leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. Accountability was sought after and expected with leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8. Belief in service/Making a difference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>CASE/Assertion</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>T1</td>
<td>T2</td>
<td>T3</td>
<td>T4</td>
<td>T5</td>
<td>T6</td>
<td>T7</td>
<td>T8</td>
<td>T9</td>
<td>T10</td>
<td>T11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>A Assertion 1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>A Assertion 2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>A Assertion 3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>A Assertion 4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>A Assertion 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>A Assertion 6</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>A Assertion 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>A Assertion 8</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>B Assertion 1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>B Assertion 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>B Assertion 3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>B Assertion 4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>B Assertion 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>B Assertion 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>B Assertion 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td>B Assertion 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>C Assertion 1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td>C Assertion 2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>C Assertion 3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td>C Assertion 4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td>C Assertion 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td>C Assertion 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td>C Assertion 7</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>C Assertion 8</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td>D Assertion 1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td>D Assertion 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td>D Assertion 3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td>D Assertion 4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td>D Assertion 5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td>D Assertion 6</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td>D Assertion 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td>D Assertion 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td>E Assertion 1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td>E Assertion 2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td>E Assertion 3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td>E Assertion 4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td>E Assertion 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td>E Assertion 6</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td>E Assertion 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td>E Assertion 8</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td>F Assertion 1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td>F Assertion 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td>F Assertion 3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASE/Assertion</td>
<td>DS</td>
<td>T1</td>
<td>T2</td>
<td>T3</td>
<td>T4</td>
<td>T5</td>
<td>T6</td>
<td>T7</td>
<td>T8</td>
<td>T9</td>
<td>T10</td>
<td>T11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Assertion 4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Assertion 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Assertion 6</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Assertion 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Assertion 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Assertion 1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Assertion 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Assertion 3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Assertion 4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Assertion 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Assertion 6</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Assertion 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Assertion 8</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H Assertion 1</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H Assertion 2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H Assertion 3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H Assertion 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H Assertion 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H Assertion 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H Assertion 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Assertion 1</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Assertion 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Assertion 3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Assertion 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Assertion 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Assertion 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Assertion 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Assertion 8</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Assertion 1</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Assertion 2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Assertion 3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Assertion 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Assertion 5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Assertion 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Assertion 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Assertion 8</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K Assertion 1</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K Assertion 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K Assertion 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K Assertion 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K Assertion 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K Assertion 6</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K Assertion 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K Assertion 8</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASE/Assertion</td>
<td>DS</td>
<td>T1</td>
<td>T2</td>
<td>T3</td>
<td>T4</td>
<td>T5</td>
<td>T6</td>
<td>T7</td>
<td>T8</td>
<td>T9</td>
<td>T10</td>
<td>T11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Assertion 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Assertion 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Assertion 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Assertion 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Assertion 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Assertion 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Assertion 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Assertion 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Assertion 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Assertion 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Assertion 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Assertion 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Assertion 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Assertion 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Assertion 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Assertion 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Assertion 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Assertion 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Assertion 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Assertion 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Assertion 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Assertion 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Assertion 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Assertion 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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