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Executive summary

This dissertation is a quantitative study on observed character strengths in cadets from Company Linge, at the Norwegian Military Academy. Through descriptive statistics and a correlation analysis, it aims to answer the research question that revolves around the existence of consistency between the different sources of assessment, and what the meaning of the existence or non-existence of consistency may mean. The study is part of a larger research and development project initiated at the Norwegian Military Academy called "Character in Military Officers". The project is intended to contribute towards making the cadets' leadership education and development better. This study is valuable to the project, but also to the organization the Norwegian Armed Forces. It contributes to the project by providing an analysis and discussion of the data collected from Company Linge, which can contribute towards the progression of the project. Further it contributes to the Norwegian Armed Forces, by discussing it within the framework of securing the competency and leadership development of their future officers. The paper draws close connections between the character strengths in the data and their relevance to an officer's ability, to meet the responsibilities set by both the society and the organisation that they represent.

In this study an observational instrument called “Observation of Character in field” has been used. The observational instrument assesses the cadet's behaviour in relation to the 12 character strengths that have been established as important for a military leader to inhabit. The cadets assessed themselves, and were assessed by their peers and an instructor after having completed an extreme field exercise. The findings showed that the peers and instructor have a much higher consistency in the correlations than any of the other combinations. Further, the cadets have rated themselves higher in seven out of 12 character strengths. The four character strengths that the cadets have rated themselves highest on, are the same four found to be rated the highest in other military studies using the same character strengths. The findings support that the observational instrument has functioned well in relation to being able to observe character strengths through behaviour. As such, it could be able to contribute towards strengthening the organising of the cadet's evolvement into an officer as early as in the recruitment and selection stage.
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1 Introduction

“The most important rationale for the Norwegian Armed Forces is to defend Norway and Norwegian interests and its values against external threats and attacks...defending human rights and strengthening intergovernmental cooperation”.

(Prop. 73 S (2011-2012), p.7)

The statement above is from a proposition from the Norwegian Ministry of Defence. The proposition presented a plan for how to ensure that Norway has an armed forces that is prepared and modernised for the threats that are relevant today. According to military sociologist Guy Siebold (2001, p140) the definition of military is “a formally organised entity or set of entities responsive to the governmental leaders of a nation state...whose function concerns the use of arms to defend that nation state”. The officers of a military are given a licence by society that no other profession is given, they can order or be ordered to take lives (Forsvarets Stabsskole, 2007). The responsibility that comes with taking a life demands a great deal of discipline and a highly developed morale. It is the responsibility of those in the military profession to be prepared both physically, morally and intellectually to do what is necessary to uphold their non-negotiable contract with society (Doty & Sowden, 2009; Forsvarets Stabsskole, 2007). It is expected by society that the officer will resolve his/her tasks despite the personal strain it may have on them (Forsvarets Stabsskole, 2007, p159). Modern day officers are not only trained to be a warriors, they are also required to act as peacekeepers and builders of new relations (Moldjord, Nordvik & Gravråkmo, 2005). The level of competency that is necessary for the officer to be able to fully meet the requirements set by society is not developed over night, it is a lengthy process that is continuously in need of vigilance and renewing (Krigsskolen, 2015; Prop. 73 S (2011-2012). Recently from the Norwegian Military Academy (NMA), a focus on the development of character as a part of the cadet’s journey to becoming an officer has been heightened (Krigsskolen, 2015). An officer is required to have character and intellect in order to perform their duty to the highest standard. The previous is necessary in order to fulfill their contract with society as an officer of the Armed Forces (Boe, 2014; Doty & Sowden, 2009).
1.1 Organising the cadet’s evolvement into an officer

This dissertation looks at one aspect of the organising and development of the future officers and leaders of the Norwegian Army and Norwegian Armed Forces. This process starts with a recruitment and selection phase and continues through having the cadets partake in training, education and the shaping of desired behaviour. The organising of the future officer’s development into competent and efficient leaders is essential. In one perspective the cadets can be considered as the NMA’s output to the armed forces. Testing the cadets in as many ways as possible in order to prepare them for the challenges they may face, is in sense a strategy for testing their output. This dissertation focuses on the area of developing desired behaviour in the cadets. The data is collected from one of the tests the cadets have to endure, the combat fatigue course (CFC) (“Stridskurset”). CFC is one of the most important strategies for testing for the NMA. It is a mandatory extreme field exercise that the cadets have to pass or they will be expelled. The observation of character strengths in the field has been used in order to find how the cadets are behaving during extreme physical and psychological strain.

The NMA has initiated a research and development project (R&D-project) called “Character in Military Officers” (Boe, 2014). This dissertation is written in collaboration with the NMA for this R&D-project. The focus is character and leadership development for the NMA’s cadets (Boe, 2014). The purpose of the project is to provide the NMA with valuable knowledge on the topic of character. Focal points of the project are: what is character, and how one can develop character and character strengths in cadets at the NMA (Boe, 2014). By learning about character and developing the necessary character strengths that the future officer needs, it can contribute towards securing the highest standard of officer competency. The latter may also help to create leaders that are equipped to face the challenges of modern day warfare. Discovering what character strengths are most apparent in the cadets and where they need to improve, may contribute towards improving the cadets’ leadership performance. From a more practical perspective, by thoroughly researching and establishing what character strengths are the most relevant for a cadet to have, it may be of use as early as in the initial selection and recruitment stage for the NMA. The former will improve their
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1This dissertation is written in accordance with UK standards for the English language, and dissertation is then used instead of Master thesis (Oxford University Press, 2016).
already high standards of recruitment. Further, this area of research can contribute to providing an evaluation of how the NMA organises the training and development of future officers.

In this paper a correlation analysis has been performed on the data gathered using the observational instrument “Observation of Character in Field” (OBSCIF, these terms will be used interchangeably) (Bang, Boe, Nilsen, & Eilertsen, 2016) collected from Company Linge at the NMA, after completing the CFC.

1.2 Background: The Norwegian Military Academy, leadership and character

The NMA educates men and women to become officers in the Army and the Norwegian Armed forces. It has been educating officers for 265 years and is the oldest institution for higher education in Norway (Forsvaret, 2016e). An officer in training at the NMA is known as a cadet, and as such the term officer in this paper is used when referring to graduated cadets (Hosar, 2000). The NMA offers a range of studies; at the NMA itself one can either achieve a BSc in engineering; study a civilian degree underlying the NMA or one can be educated within the operative field where you achieve a BSc in military studies- leadership and military power (operative degree) (Krigsskolen, 2015). Almost 100 officers graduate every year from the NMA, and about 40-50 of them belong to the operative degree (Hosar, 2000). For this dissertation the data collected is from an operative company. They perform more field exercises during their education; are given a more extensive leadership education than any of the other; and they are primarily educated to become platoon leaders (Krigsskolen, 2015).

In order for the NMA to find the most appropriate applicants they perform a relatively extensive recruitment process (Vik, 2013). The NMA states that their purpose is to recruit, educate and develop officers who lead with a sense of pride in relation to their responsibilities, and perform their societal missions with expertise (Forsvaret, 2013). In order to succeed, the initial recruitment and selection stage is very important. The NMA’s recruitment stage includes psychological tests; knowledge based tests; medical
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2 Field here is referred to as field exercises that the cadets partake in, not academic field of research.
tests and physical tests, as well as measuring personality (Vik, 2013, p5). The applicants have to be non-commissioned officers (NCO) in order to get accepted to the NMA. For most this means they have previously been through a selection phase to be accepted to the yearlong course of becoming a NCO, followed by a year in service (Forsvaret, 2016a). Alternatively one can complete the NMA's four year degree, where you become an NCO the first year (Forsvaret, 2016c). Once at the NMA the cadets are evaluated throughout their entire degree. In their third year they receive a statement of service that describes the cadet's performance throughout their education that they take with them into the branch of the army they are ordered to. Compared to a civilian education the cadets do not follow a regular educational course. The cadets have mandatory attendance every day from 08.00 to 16.00hrs, and the NMA maintains a level of discipline that is expected within most military units. Further, the cadets' performance is evaluated and observed by the instructors on a daily basis (Krigsskolen, 2015). If the instructors establish that a cadet is not progressing and not performing at the level expected, they can recommend to the school board that they are expelled. The NMA has very strict guidelines in relation to what is considered orderly conduct, and having a spotless record is a requirement (Krigsskolen, 2015).

Providing the cadets with individual leadership development as well as educating them on leadership, has throughout the history of the NMA been a crucial element (Boe, 2014). According to Boe, the officers who have attended the NMA are expected to be officers who have willpower, are robust and take responsibility. The leadership development that the cadets undergo at the NMA is meant to prepare them for the future, and the tough situations that they are likely to encounter. From a military perspective, leadership is often argued to be one of the most important factors in relation to whether or not one is successful on the battlefield (Martinsen, 2009). In the past decades there has been an extensive amount of research performed in relation to the topic of leadership, and what makes a good leader (Arnulf, 2012, p70). The research has been quite comprehensive and theories such as trait theory, situational leadership, LMX theory and many others have come to exist (Northouse, 2013). What all these theories have in common is that they have studied the leader’s personality and/or their behaviour and decisions (Høst, 2009). According to Høst (2009) in many leadership theories there is a correlation between three elements; what the leader says and does
(his/her behaviour), the subordinates’ competencies and maturity, and the subordinates’ performance. Høst believes one should have a holistic approach to recruiting leaders, and acknowledge that different leaders are likely to succeed in different organisations. An officer must be able to perform and lead in extreme situations where both his/her life and others may be at risk. They need to be able to think clearly and fast when making the right decisions. Decisions that in their most extreme form may be about taking a life (Boe, Bang, & Nilsen, 2015b). The NMA educates both young cadets with civilian backgrounds, as well as experienced soldiers that want to progress in their military career (Vik, 2013). It is up to the NMA to make sure that all officers who graduate have the competency necessary in order to face the unknown or unforeseen (Boe, 2015b). For the NMA it is then crucial to make sure that its instructors possess the knowledge necessary to secure that the future officers have this competency (Boe, 2014, p3). An officer must be able to not just withstand tough situations, he/she must also be able to get their subordinates to join them in missions that can be extremely demanding (Forsvarsstaben, 2012). The aforementioned, is one of the areas that separate military leadership from that of most civilian leadership contexts.

“It is about being able to stick with it and do your duty even when it is uncomfortable, being able to overcome the feeling of powerlessness and avoid falling apart emotionally. 

(Forsvarsstaben, 2012, p11). (My translation³).

According to Clausewitz (1976) character can play a strong role in moments that are extreme and highly demanding; where one might become unbalanced because there are so many strong emotions to deal with. A strong character will be able to maintain stable and balanced despite these emotions. On the other hand, an officer must also be able to lead and act during times of peace, they cannot simply be prepared for times of war, and they must have the qualities to manage both (Heiskel & Grande, 2015). Matthews (2014, p. 15) states that the “Our military personnel need to be of high character, to be fair and honest in dealing with others”. Matthews believes that character and character strengths are important for an officer, and so does the NMA (Boe et al., 2014). However, what the NMA has struggled to do is to establish exactly what it is that they mean by character

³This quote is my own translation from the original source: Forsvarsstaben, 2012, p11.
and what is the meaning of the character strengths that they require their officers to develop (Størkersen, 2014). In the report “Officer Development: the NMA’s concept for leadership development” (Boe, Eldal, Hjortmo, Jensen, Holth, Kjørstad & Nilsen, 2014b), the NMA emphasises different parts of character at different times. The lack of consistency shows that a need for clarification is necessary. By implementing the ongoing R&D-project “Character in Military Officers”, the NMA has addressed a need for more knowledge about how to develop character strengths in their cadets, It has been determined that an officer requires certain character strengths in order to be able to successfully lead their platoon; they must be willing and able to persist when it gets really tough (Matthews, 2014). However, the challenge lies in identifying what these character strengths are. One cannot simple change how people behave or respond. Therefore, being able to identify the best applicants from the beginning of the selection process is important. Selecting the applicants whom potentially already possess the desired character strengths or some of them, could be very beneficial (Boe, 2014a).

There is also a need to better comprehend how one can develop or introduce certain character strengths in the cadets’ and the officers’ (Boe, 2014a).

Two different tools have been used in order to measure the cadets’ character strengths (Boe, Bang & Nilsen, 2015b):

1. The worldwide known tool developed by Peterson and Seligman (2004) called Values in Action Inventory of Strengths (VIA-IS).
2. OBSCIF used for self- and other assessment that can quantitatively measure the cadet’s observed character strengths in the field. This observational instrument was developed by the NMA in collaboration with Professor II Henning Bang (Bang, Boe, Nilsen, & Eilertsen, 2016).

1.3 The scope of this dissertation and research question

There are many interesting angles that could be approached in relation to the data that exists, but due to the current time frame it was necessary to narrow the scope. What this dissertation is aiming to do is to evaluate and discuss the data that has already been collected from Company Linge in connection with the CFC (undertaken during the end of their 4th semester). A lot of data was collected on these cadets from before and after the CFC. A limitation for this dissertation is the fact that not all the data has been used. The cadets have assessed themselves before the CFC, this data could have been
included in order to show how the cadets assessed themselves before and after the course. Further that data could then have been compared to the instructors and peers-assessments, seeing if there was a higher or lower correlation with the cadets’ first or second self-assessments. The cadets also completed the VIA-IS questionnaire beforehand, so a comparison between the VIA-IS answers and the OBSCIF observations is another angle that could have been approached. There were two instructors and they assessed the cadets twice: once during the course and once after. The data collected during the course could have shown very different results than those collected after. However, I chose the assessments made after the CFC because then the instructors had a larger bulk of observations to choose from. As it was not feasible to include all the assessments from before and after the CFC, the decision was made to include only the assessments collected from all three sources after the CFC. As such, the assessments from the cadets as well as the peers, and one of the instructors’ assessments has been included.

**Research question:**
To what extent is there consistency between the cadet’s self-assessment and the observed behaviour? What does this consistency or lack thereof mean?

The research question in this dissertation is mostly referred to the topic of self-assessment versus observed behaviour, but it also connects to the concept of officer competency. The cadet’s that the data is based on were 2nd year cadets at the time, and they have undergone a lot of training with regards to evaluating their own behaviour. They are constantly provided with feedback from their peers and instructors throughout their education (Krigsskolen, 2015). Within the 2nd year at the NMA, the cadets are estimated to know themselves better than they did when they first arrived. However, in this research the cadets have evaluated themselves after having been through a physically and psychologically demanding field exercise. It is interesting to see what the cadets own assessment of the various character strengths during the CFC are, compared to their peers and their instructor.

This chapter has discussed the relevant framework and background for this dissertation. The next chapter (2) will present a review of the literature that is important for this study.
2 Literature review

2.1 Introduction

In this chapter the relevant theory for this dissertation will be discussed. First I will present a brief introduction to the understanding of an officer’s profession, before moving onto discussing the term “character” and its connection to behaviour. Pertinent theory on self-assessment and other assessment will be covered, along with previous research on character strengths in different militaries. Not all theory covered is used in the discussion, but it is relevant in order to understand important terminology and other aspects of the analysis and discussion.

2.2 The officer’s profession

“We need to examine how we educate and develop soldiers and leaders to have the character and competence that compose the non-negotiable contract between our Nation and its military professionals”.

(Doty & Sowden, 2009, p69)

The Norwegian Armed Forces has a collective identity connected to the officer’s profession, in order to strengthen the officers’ unity and ability to face current challenges (Forsvarets Stabsskole 2007, p157). The four attributes that make up the military profession are: responsibility, referring to the responsibility towards society and their members; identity, referring to how the military member identifies with his/her profession and their licensed status in society; expertise which reflects the military members specialised knowledge and skills necessary to solve the tasks of the profession and lastly the foundation of values that maintains the necessary principles that guides the members attitudes (Forsvarets Stabsskole, 2007, p157). The role of the officer more specifically is emphasised by Huntington (1957, p7) in his book “The Soldier and the State”, where he presents that the main focus of civil-military relations is the connection between the officer corps and the state. In general, the concept of a profession, comes with a license to perform distinct activities within their profession (Hughes, 1958). The profession of an officer provides him/her with a license and a mandate that in large effects how they perform their duty. The previous also refers to how society both expects and allows the officers to do things that others are not
expected or allowed to do. The military encourages personal growth and consolidates a belief that encourages every soldier to reach their potential (Matthews, 2014). However, it requires a great deal of organising and vigilance in order to secure that the officer accepts and embraces his/her profession and the responsibility that comes with it (Matthews, 2014).

2.3 Character

2.3.1 Peterson and Seligman’s 24 character strengths

For this dissertation the main theory on character originates from Peterson and Seligman’s (2004) book: “Character strengths and virtues: A handbook and classification”. Their research on character strengths has in large contributed towards the increase in attention towards the topic of character and character strengths (Hunter, 2000, as cited in Boe, 2014). Peterson and Seligman (2004) have defined 24 character strengths within six different virtues. What these authors have aimed to do by creating these classifications of strengths, is to bring back the study of character and show that good character can be refined.

The six universal virtues (also named “the High Six”) with their subsequent character strengths as defined by Peterson and Seligman (2004) are:

**Wisdom and knowledge**

This virtue does not refer to the knowledge acquired simply by the number of books one has read or the facts that one has accumulated. It includes cognitive strengths that allows one to obtain and use knowledge for the purpose of good (Boe, 2014; Peterson & Seligman, 2004). Character strengths: Open-mindedness, perspective, love of learning and creativity.

**Courage**

By courage it speaks to performing the right act despite experiencing resistance and a high risk of loss. Character strengths: bravery, persistence, integrity and vitality.

**Humanity**

Humanity looks to the interpersonal strengths that consist of attending to others, and
taking part in acts of generosity and kindness that inspire others around. Character strengths: love, kindness and social intelligence.

**Justice**
The virtue justice refers to the laws that give fairness a fair shot, it is there to accentuate the sense of fairness between people and the society they are a part of. Character strengths: citizenship, fairness and leadership

**Temperance**
Temperance consists of having control over excess and having the strengths that protect against it (Boe, 2014; Peterson & Seligman, 2004). Character strengths: forgiveness and mercy, humility and modesty, prudence, and self-regulation.

**Transcendence**
In this context, Peterson and Seligman (2004, p517) have separated the virtue of transcendence from being just about spirituality and religion. It is seen as the virtue that reminds us all how small we are, but that we belong to a larger universe. As such it provides us with a sense of meaning. Character strengths: appreciation of beauty, gratitude, hope, humour, and spirituality.

2.3.2 Connecting character and behaviour
According to Teigen (2012, para 1):

“Character is in its widest form the same as personality. However, in its more detailed form it refers to a person’s individually and typical way of behaving, and more specifically the aspects of their personality that reflects their motives and their formation (character as opposed to intelligence and temperament). (My translation)".

It is more common to approach the topic of character by using the more detailed form. An individual’s character is the sum of the constant fundamental qualities within an individual’s personality. This in turn has an impact on their moral compass, how they behave, and the individual’s traits e.g. will or tolerance for frustration (Boe, 2014).

According to Killingmo (2007) character is comparable to something which is
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4 This quote is my own translation from the original source: Teigen, 2012.
structuralised. Killingmo argues character is quite stable and that any changes that may happen will happen slowly. Killingmo further argues that when one is conversing on the topic of an individual’s character one is discussing a somewhat stable pattern that consists of different areas of the personality. As such, personality and character are considered to intertwine with each other. According to Doris (2002) when one associates a specific quality of character with an individual, it will invoke a certain portrayal of behaviour. When someone knows something about another person’s character, this presumably makes their behaviour more comprehensible, and it becomes easier for others to know what behaviour to expect (Doris, 2002). This is supported by Kaufmann (1998, p104) who states that personality is a collective term for all characteristics that an individual possesses, which combined can explain the consistent behavioural pattern.

On the other hand, Epstein and O’Brien (1985) argue that personality and personality traits cannot be predictive of behaviour, because behaviour is extremely situational specific. However, what they present is that personality traits can contribute towards predicting behaviour observed in the long run, which means collecting many observations of behaviour over time.

Peterson and Seligman (2004) argue that there is a plurality to character and it is capable of change. They believe that by specifying different strengths it shows the plurality of character. They think everyone inhabits all of the character strengths that they have classified, but the extent to which they are expressed differs between individuals. It is very rare for one individual to display them all, further Peterson and Seligman (2004) state that everyone has a signature strength. A signature strength is the character strength that is amplified within an individual. Character strengths are considered to be detectable routes to portraying the virtues in one way or another, and a person is considered to be of good character if he/she displays one or two of the character strengths within each virtue (Peterson & Seligman, 2004, p13). Further Peterson and Seligman argue that a virtue or a character strength can contribute towards explaining not just what an individual is like but also how they may behave.
In order to understand what is meant by the term character strengths, Peterson and Seligman (2004, p13) have defined them as psychological ingredients – processes or mechanisms – that delineate the virtues. Peterson and Seligman (2004, p23) created a set of criteria that needed to be in place for a character strength to be included. The fifth criterion relates specifically towards character and behaviour: “A strength needs to be manifest in the range of an individual’s behavior – thoughts, feelings and/or actions – in such a way that it can be assessed”. It is emphasised how different character strengths will show themselves at different times by separating between tonic and phasic strengths. A tonic character strength like humour, is likely to show itself more steadily than a phasic character strength like bravery (Peterson & Seligman, 2004, p. 23). In most cases the appearance of character strengths is considered to be positive, and the lack of them negative e.g. the character strength bravery showing itself in certain dangerous situations is considered positive, and the lack of it negative (Heiskel & Grande, 2015). Overall it would seem that character is considered to be something that people more or less have, and that if you have knowledge about someone’s character you may be able to somewhat predict their behaviour (Boe, 2014).

According to Bang, Boe and Nilsen (2015b) there exists a certain level of consistency in relation to observing character strengths. Vazire (2010) supports this statement to an extent by arguing that through action, and at different levels personality can be openly expressed. The former is dependent on how apparent the character strengths are and how they are expressed.

2.3.3 Previous research on character in the military
Peterson and Seligman (2004, p627) created a survey for self-assessment on the 24 character strengths (VIA-IS) where they made scales for all 24. Most of the VIA-IS items are comprised by Peterson and Seligman. The assessment uses 5-point Likert-style items to evaluate to what extent the respondents affirm the items that reflect the 24 character strengths in the VIA classification. The scores are then formed by the average response that occurs within the scales, the higher number reflecting more of the character strength (Peterson & Seligman, 2004). VIA-IS has been used as a tool for evaluating character strengths in various militaries around the world. The article “Character Strengths and Virtues of Developing Military Leaders: An International
Comparison” (Matthews, Eid, Kelly, Bailey, & Peterson, 2006, p. 64) was the first study to provide an empirical assessment of Peterson and Seligman’s 24 character strengths in a military context. The study consisted of a comparison between samples from cadets at West Point and the Royal Norwegian Naval Academy (RNA) and U.S civilians, whom all completed the assessment. The results of this study showed that the two military samples had a significant level of correlation among the ranking of character strengths, more so than either did with the U.S civilian sample. The two military samples rated themselves high in the character strengths; honesty; persistence; bravery; and teamwork (Matthews et al., 2006). This study was similar to the one performed by Cosentino and Castro (2012) in Argentina. They attempted to see what the differences in character strengths between military cadets and civilian college students were, as well as between cadets in their first and last year at a military academy. This study presented some diverse results, however the difference of character strengths between Argentinean cadets and civilians showed strong parallels to the study performed by Matthews et al. (2006). The results of both studies showed that military cadets score a higher level on many character strengths than civilians. Further Cosentino and Castro found that the cadets in their first and last year of the military academy show a relevant difference in their scores on character strengths. They believe the change in scores could be due to the final year cadets having been able to adapt to what is required by them in a military life. The cadets in their last year scored closer to the personal characteristics of the military leader that they are expected to be (Cosentino & Castro, 2012, p210).

Another study performed on a military sample was by Gayton and Kehoe (2015a), using the VIA-IS tool on applicants for the Australian Army Special Forces (SF). What they aimed to discover was whether or not character strengths could act as predictors of selection to the SF. Gayton and Kehoe believe specific character strengths may be used in the assessment of military personnel. The results of their study showed that there did exist a predictive value for failing the selection process using self-reported character strengths. The applicants that did not rank “team-worker”, “honesty/integrity” and “persistence” in their top four were almost certain to fail the selection. They argue that self-reported character strengths, may contribute towards the assessment and selection
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5 When a character strength is stated without using the term character strength before it, quotation marks will be used to show that I am referring to that specific character strength.
of candidates for the military profession (Gayton & Kehoe, 2015a). Gayton and Kehoe (2015b) also performed a study on another set of SF applicants whom were also asked to rank themselves on Peterson and Seligman’s 24 character strengths and hardiness. The aim of this study was to see if self-ratings of hardiness played a part in whether or not an applicant was successful. Their results were consistent with their previous study showing that if an applicant had the character strength team-worker ranked within the top four he/she was 2.6 times more likely to pass. Self-rating of hardiness showed no relevance (Gayton & Kehoe, 2015b, p857). All the studies mentioned above show similarities with the findings of Matthews et al. (2006; 2014) who argues that in terms of strengths of character there exists a “Band of Brothers”. What is meant by this is that on an international level it seems those in the military rate the same top four character strengths. This could contribute towards formally assessing character strengths that can help identifying those who will be able to succeed in the military.

2.4 The Norwegian Military Academy’s approach

2.4.1 Selected character strengths

All of the cadets in Company Linge completed the VIA-IS assessment with 240 questions before the CFC. The aforementioned, refers to the self-assessment part of the data collection. Another important element that has been researched, is identifying the most important character strengths for military leaders. The NMA in collaboration with Professor II Henning Bang have attempted to determine this, before they went onto creating an observational instrument for observing character strengths in the field (Boe et al., 2015b). The process of selecting the most relevant character strengths involved the formation of two groups. The first group consisted of eight expert researchers responsible for the R&D-project; the second group consisted of 27 experienced officers from the NMA. Both these groups were asked to rank Peterson and Seligman’s (2004) 24 character strengths in the context of which ones are most relevant for a military leader. Out of the 24 character strengths the expert group agreed on nine character strengths that they deemed most important for a military leader. Whilst the military group chose the same nine, they also chose three other character strengths they considered as important (Boe et al., 2015b).
The final 12 character strengths can be seen in table 1, categorised in the virtues they belong to. The character strengths in *italic* are the three others that the officers added.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courage</th>
<th>Wisdom</th>
<th>Justice</th>
<th>Temperance</th>
<th>Humanity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bravery</td>
<td>Open-mindedness</td>
<td>Team-worker</td>
<td>Self-regulation</td>
<td>Social intelligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persistence</td>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrity/honesty</td>
<td><em>Love of learning</em></td>
<td><em>Fairness</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Perspective</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The NMA performed another study with another set of experienced officers. The officers were asked to evaluate the 24 character strengths in order of most important for a military leader. They selected the same 12 character strengths as the other officers before them did. As such those 12 character strengths were decided to act as the foundation for the creation of the observational instrument "OBSCIF", and were named “The Big 12” (Boe, Bang, & Nilsen, 2014; Boe & Bang, 2016).

2.4.2 Description of “The Big 12”

A brief explanation of the 12 character strengths will be presented. How each character strength was defined to the experienced officers who took part in the development of OBSCIF will also be included (Boe, Bang, & Nilsen, 2015a).

“Leadership”

Individuals with the character strength leadership as their signature strength will often become informal leaders in different social situations. They will most often feel at ease with leading others and are likely to take charge in emergency situations. Defined as; "To organize activities and ensure they are implemented as planned...to get others to cooperate toward common goals; to safeguard positive relationships between members" (Boe et al., 2015a, p1129).

“Love of learning”

Having this as a signature strength will mean one feels a sense of happiness in relation to learning new skills and gaining more knowledge. This is the character strength that most parents hope their children will develop and that employers attempt to inspire in
their employees. Defined as: "To acquire and master new areas of knowledge, topics or skills, and to build on the knowledge one already has" (Boe et al., 2015a, p1129).

“Self-regulation”
The essence of self-regulation lies with an individual’s ability to consciously take control of his/her responses in order to achieve what they want. Responses are meant as thoughts, feelings, impulses and desires, achievements and actions. The regulation is conscious and deliberate; it is not compulsive self-control. Defined as: “To consciously regulate what one feels and how one acts, to exercise self-discipline, and to control one’s own impulses, needs and feelings” (Boe et al., 2015a, p1128).

“Bravery”
Bravery is not seen as the same thing as fearlessness, it relates to being able to do what needs to be done despite being afraid. Individuals who are brave are capable of disconnecting the emotional components of fear from the behavioural, and this makes them able to resist the desire to flee. Having bravery as a signature strength makes one likely to face unpleasant and threatening situations, in spite of the distress caused by the physical and subjective reactions. Defined as: “To stick to one’s opinions and actions despite opposition, to not walk away from threats, challenges, difficulties, danger or pain” (Boe et al., 2015a, p1130)

“Social intelligence”
Social intelligence is seen as being able to read how other people are feeling, what their state of mind is, and understanding the moods of others through facial expressions and intonation. It is also about being able to successfully employ emotional information in order to be able to cooperate well with others. Defined as: “To read and understand one’s own and other’s motives and feelings, knowing what to do to fit in different social situations, knowing what makes others thrive” (Boe et al., 2015a, p1130).

“Creativity”
Creativity refers to being able to find original ways of achieving goals and solving problems. By combining existing knowledge in new ways and seeing new approaches to the issues that one is working on. Individuals who have creativity as a signature strength
will rarely be content with performing tasks the conventional way. Defined as: “Finding original/surprising ways of acting and thinking that are useful and usable” (Boe et al., 2015, p1130).

“Team-worker” (also known as citizenship)
Being a team-worker is about feeling a commitment towards and identifying with the group one is a member of. An individual with team-worker as a signature strength is often considered loyal, good and a conscientious team player who always carries their share if not more of the workload. Defined as: “To work well as a member of a group or a team, to be loyal to the group and its goals, to set their own goals and needs aside in order to contribute to the realization of the overall goals” (Boe et al., 2015a, p1130).

“Honesty” (also known as integrity)
Honesty and integrity is about being honest with others and oneself. Individuals with integrity as a signature strength will often feel it is more important to be themselves than to be popular, and they will not approve of overstating the truth in order to achieve something. Defined as: “Being genuine, honest and sincere in everything one says and does, taking responsibility for one’s feelings and actions, dislikes pretence in others and self” (Boe et al., 2015a, p1131).

“Fairness”
Fairness refers to the human ability to make moral convictions about what is considered wrong and right/unfair and fair. Their sense of justice is very strong and they are concerned with everyone being respected and treated as human beings, despite what they may have done. Defined as: “To treat all people equally and fairly, not letting one’s own motives and emotions affect how one perceives and treats others, to give others a fair chance” (Boe et al., 2015a, p1131).

“Perspective”
In most cases perspective is something that will occur through the combination of: intelligence, acquired knowledge, a broad base of experience, good judgement and the ability to merge these sources of wisdom. With perspective as a signature strength one will often find it easier to deal with complex issues and will be able to hold a holistic
perspective, and others often come to them for advice. Defined as: “Giving wise advice to others, considering the world in ways that are meaningful and sensible for others, to see the big picture, to have enough insight to recognise their own limitations” (Boe et al., 2015a, p1131).

“Persistence”
Persistence entails managing to complete work regardless of it being frustrating, tedious or hard. It is about staying focused on the task despite when other more exciting things are distracting. With persistence as a signature strength one get things done with little or no complaining and with good nature. Defined as: “To conduct what one has begun, to stay the course despite obstacles, and take pride in doing things properly, and at the right time” (Boe et al., 2015a, p1132).

“Open-mindedness”
Open-mindedness is explained as the ability to think things critically and thoroughly through. It is about being open-minded towards evidence that contradicts what one believes, and processing information objectively and rationally. They will often dislike others who jump to conclusions/have preconceived judgments. Defined as: “Thinking things through and examining them from all angles, not jumping to conclusions, relying on solid evidence, being able to change your mind in light of evidence” (Boe et al., 2015a, p1133).

2.4.3 The use of self and peer-assessments as a method
As with many research methods; self-assessment is not flawless. Some argue that especially during stressful situations the accuracy of self-assessment can be poor (Ward, Gruppen & Regher, 2002). Being able to correctly asses one’s own strengths and weaknesses is according to Gordon (1992, as cited in Ward et al., 2002) essential to the adventure of learning throughout one’s life. However, several reviews have argued that the measurement of self-assessment does not often present promising results (Ward et al., 2002). On the other hand, self-assessment is considered essential in relation to self-directed learning and maintaining one’s professional competence. Alongside of self-assessments relevance for the individual, the way in which it is used is very important. There are some methodological issues to consider e.g. a weak or non-existent
relationship between self-assessment and the outside measurement may imply that the individuals within the specific group are not very good self-assessors, or that the tool used is not a very accurate one (Ward et al, 2002). According to Ward et al. the numbers that one collects from self and other-assessments are by themselves, meaningless. The individual’s interpretation and application of the scale is necessary to define before any conclusions on the numbers (in relation to the accuracy of self-assessment) can be made. An important element that is necessary when using self and other-assessment is the clear setting of the marking criteria, and also educating those who are going to be completing the assessments on their use. If one fails to do the previous, then an inaccurate correlation between self- and other-assessment could be the outcome (Nigel & Pope, 2005).

In relation to self-assessment, the situation in which the assessment is performed is likely to also have an impact. Matthews, Eid, Johnsen & Boe (2011) discovered that cadet’s self-assessment of situational awareness (SA) did not correlate with expert-observer ratings. What Matthews et al. argue is that under a high level of physical and psychological stress a self-assessment of situational awareness is not likely to present valid results. The cadets assessed themselves overall higher on their level of SA than the expert-observers, likely due to self-enhancement bias. The fact that the instructors’ had strong military backgrounds as well as being well rested, led to their observations being considered as an appropriate benchmark for the self-assessments. Matthews et al. argued that relatively inexperienced officer trainees are not very good at monitoring their own behaviour. As such using self-assessments results collected during extreme physical strain is something one should carefully consider (Matthews et al., 2011).

The possibility of bias is important to consider when using self and peer-assessment. Different sources of assessment are subject to different types of bias. According to Vazire (2010) the self could be prone to ego-protective bias. Ego-protective bias comes from an internal need to think well of oneself, and ignoring unfavourable comparison information in the process. There is also the possibility of an individual possessing a high level of self-esteem/strong ego also known as positive narcissism (Paunonen, Lönnqvist, Verkasalo, Leikas & Nissinen, 2006). Positive narcissism may present itself as a form of bias, as it can affect the accuracy of self-assessment. Peers and/or others on
the other hand, can be subject to the Halo-effect (and the opposite: Horns-effect), where one or two characteristics in an individual are overemphasised, whilst other equally important characteristics are ignored (Heery & Noon, 2008). The Halo-effect would be when a person creates a positive view of someone based on just few characteristics, whilst the horns effect is creating a negative view of someone. Another potential bias for peers and other-assessments is confirmation bias. Confirmation bias involves selectively looking for information that is consistent with prior expectations, which could also mean ignoring information that contradicts what one already believes (Hernandez & Jesse, 2012).

2.4.4 Who is a better judge of character?
When it comes to using self- and peer assessment in relation to character strengths specifically: some character strengths may be easier to self-assess than others and vice versa. Both Vazire (2010) and Peterson and Seligman (2004) support that some aspects of our personalities are more easily observed and judged by others. According to Vazire (2010) and her “Self-Other Knowledge Asymmetry (SOKA) model: the self is better at judging traits related to neuroticism; people in general are better at judging traits related to extraversion; and peers are better at judging traits related to intellect. Vazire believes that others are a better judge of one’s intellect, because self-assessment is easily impacted by ego-protective bias.

The results of Vazire’s (2010) study suggest that the self is the most knowledgeable when it comes to traits with low observability and low evaluativeness: peers are more knowledgeable about low observability, high evaluativeness traits: whilst all perspectives (self, peer and other/stranger) are knowledgeable about high observability, low evaluativeness traits. Vazire concludes that there does exist an asymmetry in the data she has collected, and that there are two main reasons for this asymmetry when comparing self-assessment and observation. The first reason is that the self and others have access to different information. The self-assessor has access to his/her emotions and thoughts, whilst the observer has only got access to the actual behaviour that they can see, and have to make assumptions based on that (Vazire, 2010). The simple fact that no one has better access to more information than the self, is an argument in support of them being the best judge of character. Vazire further states that, the self can
be affected by ego-protective bias. An individual’s thoughts and emotions can affect their observations and judgements of their own behaviour. Vazire states that the self may sometimes lie in order to present the ideal behaviour they wish to have performed, rather than the actual behaviour. It does not necessary have to be lying either, the individual might have a desire to simply enhance certain traits within themselves and as such, rate themselves higher. The other reason for the asymmetry, is that all the observers have different visual viewpoints. In many cases even if the self believes they have a decent amount of knowledge in relation to what they are doing, others will often have a more objective presentation of the behaviour that is expressed (Vazire, 2010). However, according to Funder (2012) there are four moderating factors that contribute towards others making an accurate judgement of personality:

1. Good target: when the target being observed is transparent and easy to assess.
2. Good trait: the trait being assessed is visible and easy to see in others.
3. Good information: when the observer has seen and known the target of observation for a while, the observer has more information to select from in regards to the target’s behaviour in different environments
4. Good judge: based on the observer being skilled in evaluating others and is an accurate perceiver.

2.4.6 Observation of character in field - OBSCIF

As mentioned, Boe, Bang and Nilsen (2014, 2015a) performed two separate studies that defined 12 character strengths deemed most important for a military leader. These 12 character strengths acted as the foundation for the observational instrument “OBSCIF”. The aim of OBSCIF is to use it in field exercises where it will be natural for different character strengths to appear. During the workshop, the officers who were to act as the observers, were asked to identify the best criteria of the 12 character strengths to be detected during the field exercise. At the end of the workshop, a discussion between two groups of observers was performed in order to set the final observational criteria (Boe et al., 2015a). The observational criteria that were created in this workshop were used later to assess cadets during the field exercise demands of war (Krigens krav). However, it was found that the criteria were not sufficient, because the data collected showed that the character strength bravery was omitted due to missing values (Bang, Boe, Nilsen & Eilertsen, 2015). Also in the same study only 1 out of 11 character strengths had
significant correlations. Feedback was provided and it was decided that some of the observational criteria were either not relevant or difficult to observe in the field (Bang et al., 2015). However, the observational instrument created is important, as it was the foundation for the one used to gather the data for this dissertation. The observational instrument "OBSCIF" and the changes that were made to it are discussed in chapter 3.

This chapter has covered the relevant theory for this dissertation and the discussion that will take place in chapter 5. The next chapter will discuss the methodology behind this dissertation.
3 Methodology

This chapter will elaborate on the method behind how I have attempted to answer the research question that was raised in the introduction:

To what extent is there consistency between self-assessment and observed behaviour in the cadets? What does the consistency or lack thereof mean?

3.1 Research approach

This dissertation is a quantitative study involving data collected from the cadets in Company Linge at the NMA. The data’s sample size consisted of 48 cadets (male and female) and two instructors. They have all used the observational instrument (OBSCIF) based on the observations of character strengths during the CFC, summer of year 2015. The data used in this dissertation was collected beforehand, as such it is considered secondary data (Jacobsen, 2015). The data was collected based on the observations that the cadets, their team-mates (referred to as peers) and instructors documented after the CFC was over. Only the data from one of the instructors was used in order to allow for more consistency. However, before making this decision I studied both instructors’ observations. I found that the general means for both sets of observations were quite similar, with few substantial variations. The data collected has been plotted into IBM SPSS 22.0, and a correlation analysis and discussion has been performed in order to answer the research question. The reason for why a correlation model was chosen for this dissertation is because it was requested by the NMA, and it is considered the predominant approach within the measurement of self-assessment (Ward et al., 2002).

3.1.1 Method and philosophy

According to Hellevik (2002, p110) when performing quantitative research, the researcher collects comparable information about a larger sample, expresses this information in the form of numbers, and performs a statistical analysis of the pattern in the numbers. In quantitative research there often exists already made recipes that one can follow in order to achieve a successful result (Hellevik, 2002). Jacobsen (2015) presents that when dealing with quantitative data there is a need for categorisation and operationalisation of variables and their definitions before the empirical study can take place. However, this dissertation is using secondary data, meaning that the
categorisation and operationalisation has already been done beforehand by Professor II Henning Bang and the NMA (Boe, 2014).

In relation to whether this dissertation has an inductive or deductive approach, the argument made by Moses and Knutsen (2012) is appropriate; inductive and deductive approaches are not necessarily mutually excluding. Jacobsen (2015, p23) describes deductive method as a “top down” method where one moves from the theory to the observations, meaning one’s findings are controlled by theory. By inductive method, Jacobsen describes it as having an open mind towards the data has been collected, and based on what has been observed, theory is implemented. In this study both a deductive and an inductive method have been used. Because this study is part of a larger project, a certain amount of relevant theory that has been collected beforehand has been used. Further I have included theory discovered independently after receiving and looking at the data provided.

It is possible to argue that as a research approach, this dissertation can be placed within a naturalistic philosophy, because statistics are often seen as a conventional tool that lies within the toolbox of methods belonging to a naturalist (Moses & Knutsen, 2012). A naturalist’s philosophy builds in great on the basis of a “Real World”, that there exists a real world out there independent of the senses of human beings. In this dissertation there is a foundation that argues there are 24 universal character strengths (Peterson & Seligman, 2004). Calling them universal implies that they exist and are established across the globe, leaning more towards a naturalistic perspective. However, due to the nature of what is being studied; character strengths, that argument is not necessarily correct. Some constructivist may argue that character strengths are not something that can be firmly established and quantifiably measured. Constructivist argue that a human being is an adaptable and malleable creature and that we construct our own perception of the world (Moses & Knutsen, 2012). Since this dissertation lies within a project that is attempting to establish whether or not one can develop and grow character strengths in cadets, it arguably accepts that individuals are adaptable, which leans towards the constructivists perspective. As such, it may be more plausible to say that the research approach is not one founded in the constructivist or naturalist methodology.
It is accurate to place it within the context that Johannesen, Tuftee and Christoffersen (2010, p. 362) present:

“The methodology is considered to be a tool that is used to gain insight, and one needs to be open and choose the method or methods that is best suited to answer ones research question”. (My translation).

3.2 Data

3.2.1 Data collection process

Hellevik (2002) highlights how when the data collected is not collected by oneself, it is important to remain critical to its source. As such it is important for me to remain critical towards the data throughout this process. As mentioned in the literature review the NMA created an observational instrument making it possible to measure character strengths in the field (Boe et al. 2015b). Through two separate workshops, the 24 character strengths were narrowed down to 12, and these were used to create OBSCIF giving a deeper insight into those 12 character strengths in the cadet.

The survey unit in this data consisted of 48 cadets. The data was collected after the cadets had completed the CFC. The CFC lasted for ten days where the cadets had close to no sleep, and they also had an extremely high calorie deficit. The instrument used: OBSCIF, had been extended and improved. This was a consequence of the results that came from its first use during Company Krebs’ exercise demands of war. After receiving and analysing the data the NMA and Professor II Henning Bang decided to change and improve the instrument, making it more specific. This was an attempt to ensure that observations for all of the character strengths could be made throughout the duration of the CFC (H.Bang, personal communication, 9.Feb, 2016). The new observational instrument (see appendix B) would include 3-4 observational criteria for each character strength and a 5 point likert-scale was used. The observational criteria used were based on the same measures that had been determined earlier in the workshops with the officers (Boe et al., 2015b). They were simply made more detailed and more targeted towards specific behaviour (H.Bang, personal communication, 9.Feb, 2016).

---

6 This quote is my own translation from the original source: Johannesen, Tuftee and Kristoffersen, 2010, p362.
7 Personal communication with Professor II Henning Bang, 9.February, 2016. The professor is one of the main researcher (alongside Ole Boe) behind the collection of this data.
The cadets used OBSCIF after they had slept for 12 hours. The NMA required that the cadets rest instantly after the CFC, due to the high level of sleep and food deprivation they were experiencing at the time. The cadets had used OBSCIF once before the CFC, and they were given an introductory lesson into each character strength by Professor II Henning Bang. This was done in order to make sure that they had a certain level of understanding of each individual character strength beforehand. The cadets had also earlier on completed the VIA-IS survey with 240 questions, making them better equipped at using the observational instrument (H.Bang, personal communication, 9.Feb, 2016). The instructors knew of the existing project and they had also been provided with knowledge of each character strengths and the observational instrument. The instructors’ observed squads of 8-10 at a time and were allowed to write notes on the observations they made of the cadets in order to help them accurately remember their observations afterwards. Since there were only two instructors, they were only able to observe the different squads all the time. The previous is one of the reasons why I chose to include the data collected using OBSCIF after the course. By that time both instructors would have observed and spent time with all the squads more than once.

The data collection was led by Professor II Henning Bang and he provided me with the data. The data had already been made anonymous by the NMA and was partly plotted into the statistical analysis tool IBM SPSS 22.0. The principle of anonymity within social research methods states that: the participants’ anonymity shall be maintained throughout the entire research (Hellevik, 2002). By anonymising the data, this principle has been upheld. Further this dissertation has been approved by the Norwegian Centre for Research Data, as a part of the NMA’s R&D-project “Character in Military Officers”.

3.2.2 Limitations
There is a variation of limitations with the data collection that should be considered. To begin with the data’s sample units vary in sample size. The instructors have included observations of the eight engineering cadets that also participated in the CFC, giving a survey sample of 56 cadets compared to the cadets’ self-and peer-assessed samples of 48. The eight engineering cadets were not asked to use OBSCIF after the CFC was finished, because it was the operative cadets that were the target of research. Though this obstacle is surmountable, it should be kept in mind that it could have had an impact
on the correlations depending on how the instructor scored those eight cadets. This is not possible to find out, because the data collected is anonymous.

There are also some limitations to the use of a 5 point likert-scale. The observational instrument included a mid-point scale which was somewhat neutral with the value “To some degree showed this character strength”. This value does not place the cadet in a lower ranking or higher ranking in relation to having shown observations of different character strengths during the CFC. According to Garland (1991) there exists a social desirability bias where the respondents’ do not want to give a socially unacceptable answer, so they often answer the mid-point instead of what they actually thought. Silvera and Seger (2004) have also discovered that Norwegians in particular tend to shy away from the extremes of rating scales. However, the cadets are used to providing each other with positive and negative feedback face to face (Krigsskolen, 2015). As such, it is unlikely that they would answer dishonestly on an anonymous project. The argument lies more so with the cadets being exhausted and somewhat cognitively impaired (Matthews et al., 2011), which may have led to less accurate scoring of themselves and their peers. According to Elstad (2010), if respondents are left to themselves the risks of losing focus increases. Even though the observational instrument was not that long, the cadets may have lost focus early on due to their physical and cognitive condition. Vaitl et al. (2005) argues that general cognitive impairment can affect the ability to focus.

Matthews et al. (2011) argue that during stressful combat fatigue courses cadets are more prone to self-enhancement bias. The fact that the instructors were well-rested and fed throughout the CFC, combined with the substantial knowledge and experience they have from before, the validity of their observations are arguably higher. Another potential limitation with the data collection is the use of observation. Fangen (2015) argues observing people can cause them to change their behaviour, so it is possible that the cadets may have adjusted their behaviour since they knew they were going to be assessed on it. However, since the cadets are used to being observed and assessed continuously, they may not be as subject to changing or adjusting their behaviour. Further, there were several instructors with them at the CFC, and they had no chance of knowing which instructor was assessing them for this project specifically.
There are some limitations to the use of correlation analyses. The correlation analysis performed here is only able to make claims on a group level, because it is a group-level analysis (Ward et al, 2002). This assumes that every cadet is equal in relation to the ability to self-assess, which may not be the case. As Ward et al. states the correlation will then present suggestions of a group being able to either correctly or incorrectly self-assess. Ward et al. (2002, p70) argues that using a single correlation to establish whether self-assessment is poor, moderate or good can have limited value. This is something that needs to be considered in relation to the findings discussed in chapter 5.

3.2.3 Data analysis
The data was presented to me after it had been plotted into IBM SPSS 22.0. It was not completely finished, and the labels and values needed to be added before any form of analysis could take place. After having done this I created scatterplots of each character strength from every assessment: peer/instructor, instructor/self and self/peer, a total of 36 scatterplots (See appendix C for illustration). Scatterplots present a picture of the relationship between two quantitative variables (Hinkle, Wiersma, & Jurs, 1994). It is therefore recommended to create and view scatterplots of one’s data before performing a correlation analysis. It can give the researcher a better understanding of whether there is a negative, positive or zero correlation (Hinkle et al., 1994). After reading the scatterplots, I organised all the data into correlation tables (see appendix D for illustration). Further, I created a graph presenting the means of all the assessments, in order to gain insight into how high or low the cadets had been rated. After this, I placed all the correlations into a separate table (see chapter 4 table 4) before moving onto the discussion.

3.3 Quality of Measurement
When performing a correlation analysis, determining which measure of correlation to be used is important. Further, deciding what size of correlation coefficient is significant is also necessary (Hellevik, 2002: Hinkle et al., 1994). For this dissertation the correlation coefficient used is the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient, symbolised by $r$. This means that the coefficient $r$ is asserted as the sum of the cross-product of the standards scores divided by $n-1$ (Hinkle et al., 1994, p108). Determining what size of $r$ expresses a significant relationship between two variables is somewhat arbitrary. The
interpretation is to a certain degree dependent on the variables that are under consideration (Hinkle et al., 1994).

Below in table 2, a representation of the interpretation of the correlation sizes for this dissertation are presented:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of correlation</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(-) .50 to 1.00</td>
<td>High correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-) .30 to .50</td>
<td>Medium correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(-) .10 to .30</td>
<td>Low correlation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The previous table coincides with the interpretation of several researchers using Pearson $r$ and other correlation coefficient models (Johannesen, 2009; Pallant, 2010; Rumsey, 2011). Christophersen (2009) presents that Pearson $r$ is considered one of the most frequently used mathematical formula for measuring correlations. As such, using Pearson $r$ increases this data’s validity.

3.3.1 Validity

Validity refers to a measurement of how well a test measures what it is meant to measure (Pallant, 2010). There is a difference between external and internal validity. According to Matthews et al. (2011), when it comes to measuring constructs that can help elaborate on and improve performance of professionals in high risk and stressful jobs, applying it to field settings is preferable to a laboratory. Arguably, studies in the field can provide good external validity, but internal validity is more difficult to provide (Matthews et al., 2011, p126). This is the case with the data collected here as well. The external validity is arguably more substantial than the internal. The selection process that the cadets already have been through, and the similarities in character strengths that have been established between military cadets previously (Cosetino & Solano, 2012; Matthews et al., 2006), both contribute to the strengthening of the external validity of the data. Internal validity refers to cause and effect. In this correlation analysis the aim is not to find whether or not there is a cause and effect relationship between the variables. Arguably, there is not cause and effect here because the assessments were made with no knowledge to each other’s ratings. As such, the external validity is considered more relevant.
3.3.2 Reliability

The reliability of the measurements used is relevant when it comes to whether or not the set of items used presents a satisfactory operationalization (Christophersen, 2009). Chronbach’s alpha (alpha) measures the internal consistency, and shows how closely the items in a group are related. It is a measure of scale reliability. A high value for a group of items indicates a high degree of internal consistency. The value will vary between 0 and 1, with values close to 1 indicating a high internal consistency. The desired alpha should be at least 0.70 (Christophersen, 2009). For the data in this dissertation the alpha for each character strength has been calculated, and can be seen in table 3 below.

Table 3: shows the Cronbach’s alpha for each character strength (provided by Professor II Henning Bang).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Cronbach’s alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honesty/Integrity</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persistence</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bravery</td>
<td>0.54 (0.64, if one removes Q.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-mindedness</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social/Emotional intelligence</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team-worker</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-regulation</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspective</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love of learning</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As seen in the table above, all of the Cronbach alphas have a value higher than 0.70 except for: “bravery”, “open-mindedness” and “creativity”. However, open-mindedness and creativity both come very close to 0.70 and still have a strong internal consistency. Whilst bravery suffers from a lower internal consistency landing on 0.54, but if question 15 from the observational instrument is excluded it rises to 0.64. As such, all character strengths except for bravery seem to have a very strong scale reliability.
3.4 Ethics

The research performed in this study have followed the ethical principles of social science research methods as according to Hellevik (2002). The cadets were informed of the voluntary participation by Professor II Henning Bang, no harm was done as a consequence of the research, and anonymity was upheld.

Some may find that there are certain ethical implications in relation to studying young men and women when they are extremely vulnerable after being deprived of sleep and food for a substantial amount of time. From a civilian perspective this may seem more controversial than from a military perspective. The cadets are being trained and educated to be the future officers of the Norwegian Armed Forces. Military leadership demands a certain level of robustness and the cadets must be capable of thinking clearly despite challenging circumstances (Forsvarsstaben, 2012). The CFC in part allows the cadets to determine if they in fact are capable of this, and it is essential for the NMA to know that they are. Researching their behaviour and character strengths during that time, from a military perspective, is not considered unethical, but rather a necessity.

Another aspect that must be taken into consideration is that I know a great many of the cadets at the NMA and in Company Linge. This shows that I already have a relationship to the NMA. Further, the dissertation is written in collaboration with the NMA, but I am acting as an independent researcher. As an independent researcher, it is then important to acknowledge what feelings or opinions I have, and maintain them separate from the findings in this dissertation. Also I must avoid skewing or interpreting the data in an unfounded way in order to please the NMA. I have attempted to maintain transparent throughout my research, and have reflected on the decisions and arguments that I have made during this study.

This chapter has discussed the methodological elements relevant to this dissertation. The next chapter (4) will present an overview of the descriptive statistics and the correlation analysis.
4 Data

In this chapter a presentation of the descriptive statistics and the results from the correlation analysis performed in IBM SPSS 22.0 will be presented.

4.1 Descriptive statistics

The descriptive statistics present an overview of the means for the data that has been collected (appendix A). I have included an overview of the means for each character strength, in order to show the variance in the answers. I also wanted to see how high or low the cadets have rated themselves, and have been rated. Some standard deviations are included in the analysis in order to show that some scores deviate further than others. An overview of all the standard deviations can be found in appendix A.

The chart below (figure 1) shows the mean of the answers provided using OBSCIF, from the self-, peer- and instructor’s assessments.

![Figure 1: Chart of all the means for each character strength](image)

Figure 1 shows that the means are all placed within the value 3 but do vary to a certain degree. Here it is important to remember that there exist differences in the sample sizes. The instructor’s assessment $n=56$, peer and self-assessment $n=48$. Though the difference in the sample sizes are not substantial, they are worth mentioning.
For the self-assessed character strengths it is “persistence” that has the highest mean $\mu=3.90$, with a standard deviation of $\sigma=.60$. The lowest mean for the self-assessed character strengths is creativity where $\mu=3.21$, with a standard deviation of $\sigma=.66$. For 7 out of the 12 character strengths the self-assessed means are higher. However, it is only for “honesty”, “bravery” and “social/emotional intelligence” that the means are noticeably higher.

For the instructor’s assessment of character strengths the highest mean lies within “persistence” as well, with a mean of $\mu=3.92$, and a standard deviation of $\sigma=.78$. “Persistence” is also the only character strength where the instructor's mean is higher than both the self and peer-assessed means. The character strength with the lowest mean from the instructor is creativity $\mu=3.09$, with a standard deviation of $\sigma=.73$. The means for the assessments made from the peers also shows that the character strength persistence is highest here as well, $\mu=3.74$ and the standard deviation of $\sigma=.53$. The lowest mean for the peer-assessment is the same as the other two; “creativity” $\mu=3.26$, and the standard deviation is $\sigma=.31$.

So for all the three sources of assessment the character strength persistence had the highest mean, and the character strength creativity had the lowest mean. For these two character strengths there seems to be a certain level of consistency. For many of the other character strengths on the other hand, the means of the peers and the instructor’s assessment are more consistent. The instructor has the overall lowest means for most character strengths, with 8 out of 12 of the means being lower than the self and the peers-assessment. The most significant differences where the instructor's mean is considerably lower, are for the character strengths honesty, perspective and creativity.

For all of the scores the standard deviation was below $1\sigma$, which means that the data points are not widely spread. Though most of the instructor’s scores have a standard deviation higher than $\sigma=.70$, with most of them being closer to $\sigma=0.80$. Whilst the peer and self-assessed scores mostly have standard deviations under $\sigma=.60$. The instructor has more spread scores than the peers and the cadet’s.
4.2 Correlation analysis

Below is a table that presents an overview of all the correlations that will be discussed in chapter 5.

Table 4: A matrix of the correlations between the self-assessment, peer-assessment and the instructor’s assessment. The high correlations are marked in bold, and the medium correlations are marked in orange.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character strength</th>
<th>Self/Peer</th>
<th>Self/Instructor</th>
<th>Peer/Instructor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>.480**</td>
<td>.482**</td>
<td>.756**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honesty/Integrity</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td>.325*</td>
<td>.469**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persistence</td>
<td>.593**</td>
<td>.277</td>
<td>.524**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness</td>
<td>-.035</td>
<td>-.045</td>
<td>.221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bravery</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.353*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-mindedness</td>
<td>.402**</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>.230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team-worker</td>
<td>.352*</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td>.558**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-regulation</td>
<td>.241</td>
<td>.355</td>
<td>.560**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspective</td>
<td>.602**</td>
<td>.547**</td>
<td>.567**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>-.119</td>
<td>.425**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love of learning</td>
<td>.416**</td>
<td>.213</td>
<td>.603**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional intelligence</td>
<td>.553</td>
<td>.178</td>
<td>.337</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

The character strength leadership shows a medium high correlation between both the cadets’ self-assessment (self) and the peer-assessment (peer), Pearson $r=.48$. Also between the self and the instructor’s assessment there is a medium high correlation, $r=.48$. Whilst the correlation between peer and the instructor’s assessment is very high. It is in fact the highest correlation in the entire dataset, $r=.75$. Within “honesty/integrity” there are two medium high correlations between self and instructor where $r=.32$, and between peer and instructor where $r=.46$ closer to .47. Whilst self and peer has no significant correlation. For “persistence” there are two high correlations; the first between self and peer where $r=.59$; the second between peer and instructor where $r=.52$. The correlation between self and instructor was not significant.

For “fairness” there are no significant correlations found, they are all considered low correlations with the highest one being between peer and instructor, $r=.22$. For the
character strength bravery the only significant correlation is the one between peer and instructor where \( r = .35 \), it is only a medium high correlation. Whilst the other two are only \( r = .16 \) (self & peer) and \( r = .10 \) (self & instructor). For “open-mindedness”, the only significant correlation is the one between self and peer where \( r = .40 \), the other two show a low correlation.

Within the character strength team-worker there are two significant correlations. The highest correlation lies between peer and instructor where \( r = .55 \), whilst the correlations between self and peer \( r = .35 \) is a medium high correlation. For “self-regulation” the correlation between peer and instructor is high \( r = .56 \), whilst the correlation between self and instructor is medium high \( r = .35 \). Between self and peer there is a low correlation. The character strength perspective shows three high correlations. Between self and peer \( r = .60 \), self and instructor \( r = .54 \) and between peer and instructor \( r = .56 \). This is the only character strength with three high correlations. With “creativity” the correlation between peer and instructor is medium high \( r = .42 \), whilst the rest are low. “Love of learning” has a high correlation between peer and instructor \( r = .60 \), and a medium high correlation between self and peer \( r = .41 \). The correlation between self and instructor is low \( r = .21 \). The last character strength emotional intelligence has two significant correlations; high correlation between self and peer \( r = .55 \); a medium high correlation between peer and instructor \( r = .33 \).

As one can see there are many significant correlations. There is a definite pattern of high correlations between peer and instructor where 6 out of 12 correlations are above 0.5, and only two correlations are below 0.3. Between self and instructor there were most low correlations where 8 out of 12 correlations are considered low, and only one correlation is considered high. Between self and peer it is more mixed, with three high correlations, four medium high correlations and five low correlations.

The findings show that consistency was found in many of the correlations between the different sources of assessment. The cadet’s self-assessment correlates with their peers-assessment on 7 out of 12 character strengths, the self and the instructor’s assessments correlate on 4 out of 12, whilst peer and instructor correlate on as much as 10 out of 12 character strengths. These findings are higher than the ones found when the original
observational instrument was used with Company Krebs during Demands of War. In that study consistency between assessments were found for fewer character strengths, as well as most of the correlations being below $r=0.5$ (Bang, Boe, Nilsen, & Eilertsen, 2015). This suggests that the changes made to OBSCIF before the CFC, were successful in providing better criteria for observation.

In this chapter a description and analysis of the data has been presented. In the next chapter (5) the findings will be discussed and theory will be implemented.
5 Discussion

In this chapter I will be discussing the data presented and analysed in chapter 4. According to Hellevik (2002, p346) “a researcher needs to develop imagination to enable themselves to see different possibilities of interpretation, in order to not be too hasty to draw conclusions” (my translation). The principle of variety of interpretation is important to remember. It presents the paramount idea that just because one has found a way of interpreting a tendency found in the data, this interpretation is not necessarily correct. Hellevik believes that by coming back to the data and trying to imagine other possible explanations, one will soon find that there is a vast amount of opportunities in interpreting the different tendencies found. As such, a researcher within the field of social science research should never state that one specific explanation is the only possible answer (Hellevik, 2002, p347).

The discussion is divided into four parts. First I will discuss how an interpretation of the scales may have impacted how the cadets and the instructor used OBSCIF. Then I discuss the cadets’ ability to self-assess, and the potential biases that could have affected their assessments. The third part consists of discussing the instructor and peers’ abilities to assess the cadet’s behaviour, and the potential biases that they could have been subject to. Lastly I will discuss potential implications of the correlations of some character strengths within the framework of an officer’s ability to do his/her duty. The former will also be connected to what seems to be a reoccurring pattern of strengths of character in the military.

5.1 Interpretation of the scales

Ward et al. (2002) believes one of the main faults with a research design that uses scale measurements, is that it assumes all the respondents scale the dimensions of skills in a consistent way. In this study it would mean it is assumed that all the cadets and the instructor have scaled the dimensions of character strengths in the same way. Differences between rater-types have to an extent been explored, and many have concluded with there are differences between self and expert-ratings (Ward et al., 2002; Vaziire, 2010). Even though the cadets and the instructor have had much of the same
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8 This quote is my own translation from the original source: Hellevik, 2002, p346.
information provided on the use of the observational instrument, even the best scale is subject to different interpretations (Ward et al., 2002). The possibility of different interpretation of the scale should be kept in mind throughout the discussion. Different interpretation of scale is relevant on two levels: first of all, the cadets and the instructor’s perception of the actual observational criteria are subject to interpretation: secondly, the rating system itself is also open for interpretation. What the individual cadet considers as “To a very high degree”, can be different from what other cadets or the instructor would consider it to mean (see appendix B to see OBSCIF and the scale). Even if the cadets and the instructor observed the same behaviour, and found it to correspond with an observational criteria, they may have rated it differently because of their perception of the scales. Another interesting element that should be considered is that research has found that Norwegians tend to shy away from the extremes of rating scales. They tend to land closer to the mid-point (Silvera & Seger, 2004). This could be consistent with the current data, considering that all the means for all three sources of assessment linger between 3 and 4. However, another explanation for this, could be that there is a high level of variation in the scores. A high variation in the scores could also lead to a mean lying between 3 and 4. In some of the data it is quite clear that this is the case. A good example of the former is the character strength fairness, all the means are between $\mu=3.3$ and $\mu=3.6$, but the correlations between self/peer and self/instructor are negative $r=-.035$ and $r=-.045$. Further, the agreement between peer/instructor is low $r=.221$. This shows that the variation in the scores are quite substantial, as there is little or no correlation between the assessors, but the means are quite close. The same could be said for the character strengths bravery and creativity where there is also very little agreement between the assessors. However, for the previous two character strengths the peers and the instructor have a higher correlations, it is more likely that there are other reasons for the low correlations. The research performed with the experienced officer in establishing the observational criteria was quite detailed and specific (Boe et al., 2015a). As such, inconsistent use of the scales may not necessarily be as big of a threat to this data. However, it is still a possibility. Having different interpretations of the observational criteria and the rating scale, may contribute to variations in the data that otherwise may not have been there (Silvera & Seger, 2004: Ward et al., 2002).
5.2 Self-assessment: the individual cadet’s perceived behaviour

5.2.1 The cadet’s ability to accurately self-assess

Vazire (2010) believes that individuals are far from being perfectly precise about themselves. In some ways others are equally accurate or even more accurate in characterising a person. Ward et al. (2002) argue that especially during stressful situations the accuracy of self-assessment may be poor. However, being able to assess oneself correctly is important, and when it comes to certain characteristics the self is more accurate than others (Vazire, 2010). The cadets have performed various self-assessments throughout their education at the NMA. As such, the concept of self-assessment was not new to them. The cadets have been completing personality tests as far back as the recruitment and selection phase for the NMA (Vik, 2013). Particular for Company Linge is that they took part in another research project during their first year. They were required to complete a 360° feedback assessment, including assessments from self, peers and instructors (Cadet O.Kristiansen, personal communication, 21.Feb, 2016). This has provided the cadets with more experience in self and peer-assessments.

Before using OBSCIF the cadets were given an introduction to each character strength. They were also given a presentation for the use of OBSCIF, before they completed it the first time. The cadets can be said to have had a good foundation for understanding what behaviour they were self-assessing themselves on. On the other hand, researchers argue that people are capable of identifying good and bad behaviour, but are not as capable of applying those standards to their own performance (Ward et al., 2002). In light of this, the cadets may still have been subject to certain bias without their knowledge, despite knowing what behaviour to be observant of.

5.2.2 Potential bias in self-assessment

Ego-protective bias

According to Vazire (2010), the perception of oneself should differ from other’s perceptions, because of the differences in perspective, as well as the relevant motivational factors that are present. The cadets have access to a much wider variety of information in regards to themselves; they have access to their thoughts and emotions.
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9 Cadet Oddar Kristiansen is currently a cadet in Company Linge at the Norwegian Military Academy. He provided me with some information in regards his class’s background in self-assessment, and the combat fatigue course. 21.February, 2016.
The former, provides the cadets with a so called “self-privilege” that can increase accuracy in their self-assessment. However, Vazire also states that one’s own thoughts and feelings could harm the self-assessor’s accuracy, because it may prohibit the self from creating an accurate perception of reality. The cadets have assessed themselves higher on 7 out of 12 character strengths, compared to the other assessors. To what extent their self-assessment is more accurate than the peers and instructor's assessment of the cadet, may arguably depend on what trait is being discussed. Vazire (2010, p292) believes the self will be more accurate in rating traits that are difficult to observe (they have low observability), whilst others will be more accurate on assessing traits that are very high or low in social desirability (high evaluativeness). For the latter, the self is likely going to enhance those traits in themselves, and this is known as ego-protective bias. As mentioned in chapter 2, ego-protective bias According to Peterson and Seligman (2004, p13) all the 24 character strengths they have established are morally valued and recognised everywhere. Bang, Boe and Nilsen (2015) argue that due to the character strengths being recognised and valued, all 12 character strengths used in OBSCIF are considered socially desirable and high in evaluativeness. This seems reasonable considering that OBSCIF was created in order to observe actual behaviour, and the higher a cadet is rated, the more of a desired behaviour he/she has demonstrated. This supports the argument that the character strengths are socially desirable and high in evaluativeness. The previous would increase the chances of the cadet being subject to ego-protective bias. If the cadets were subject to ego-protective bias, it would weaken the validity of the self-assessment. Vazire states that people appropriate more attention towards their own thoughts and feelings than on their behaviour when establishing a self-perception. As such, this would make it more difficult for the cadets to establish a reality based perception of their own behaviour. Vazire’s concept of ego-protective bias is similar to that of Silvera and Seger’s (2004) concept of self-enhancing motive. However, the latter argues that positive self-evaluation is not sufficient evidence to deduce that someone has a self-enhancing bias. On the other hand, Silvera and Seger’s argument is founded on that people tend to most often get positive feedback on certain traits, and then rationally believe that they have these positive traits. The aforementioned argument is more relevant in other contexts than this one. It is unlikely that the cadets were given positive or any feedback specifically on the character strengths that they have assessed themselves on after the CFC.
The concept of ego-protective bias seems more relevant, because the data shows that the cadets have assessed themselves higher in a majority of the character strengths. On the other hand, throughout their education and training the cadets are often provided with feedback from their peers and instructors. They are also required to self-assess their strengths and weaknesses, and write down their reflections on areas such as their leadership performance (Cadet O.Kristiansen, personal communication, 21.Feb, 2016). This could mean that the cadets are less prone to ego-protective bias, than civilians who are not as used to performing self-assessments.

It is important for the cadets’ future performance as an officer to maintain a realistic perspective of their behaviour and actions, especially in the field. In the field they are responsible for themselves, as well as those around them (Forsvarets Stabsskole, 2007). However, considering that the cadets assessed themselves not long after having completed the CFC, they were likely to be somewhat cognitively impaired due to sleep and food deprivation (FFI, 2013: Vaitl et al., 2005). Further, the cadets may also have been experiencing a heightened sense of glee from having completed the CFC, since it is a mandatory exercise to pass in order to graduate from the NMA. One of the main goals of the CFC is to provide the cadets with a sense of self-efficacy through performance achievement\(^{10}\) (Bandura, 2010). Self-efficacy at the NMA is considered very important, and it is one of the main areas that the NMA aims to develop in the cadets throughout their education (Krigsskolen, 2015). The NMA’s student handbook specifies that the CFC is one of the most important arenas where the cadets are expected to show a substantial level of competency and self-efficacy (Krigsskolen, 2015, p22). As such, it is reasonable to argue that the cadets were experiencing an increased sense of self-efficacy, from completing the CFC. The former combined with being exhausted and to an extent cognitively impaired, may have contributed to an establishment of ego-protective bias. If the cadets were experiencing an increased sense of self-efficacy, they may have desired to enhance their own character strengths. The former, may have caused them to spend less time on a rational consideration of their actual behaviour. In short, the cadets may have had a cognitive need to rate themselves a little higher, than they otherwise would

\(^{10}\) The NMA uses Albert Bandura’s definition and theory on self-efficacy when educating and training the cadets. Performance achievement is one of the four principle sources of information that self-efficacy is derived from (Bandura, 2010).
have done. Considering the correlations between the cadets’ self-assessment and the instructor’s, the possibility of the existence of ego-protective bias is more substantial. The analysis shows that there is agreement on only 4 out of 12 character strengths. Ward et al. (2002) argue that a weak or absent relationship (correlation) between self-assessment and other assessment, will often imply that the self has more poorly assessed themselves. This would suggest that the cadets may have done a poorer assessment when using OBSCIF, when compared to the instructor’s assessment. This may not be unlikely if the cadets’ were subject to ego-protective bias, and were less able to create an accurate perception of their behaviour. One could counter this argument, by emphasising that there are more significant correlations between the cadet and the peers, and that as such, the cadets may not have self-assessed so poorly. However, the correlations between peer and instructor are much stronger than those between cadet and peer, making the case of poorer self-assessments by the cadets more likely.

**Positive narcissism and self-esteem**

It does not necessarily have to be ego-protective bias that has caused the cadets high self-assessments. As stated, ego-protective bias comes from an internal need to think well of oneself, and ignoring unfavourable comparison information in the process (Vazire et al., 2010). This is different from positive self-assessment stemming from high self-esteem and high ego. Researchers behind the article “Narcissism and emergent leadership in military cadets”, argue that the cadets who were rated as the best leaders demonstrated high levels of the bright side of narcissism (Paunonen et al., 2006). According to Paunonen et al. some of the positive attributes of narcissism are a high degree of self-esteem and a strong sense of ego. A cadet with high self-esteem might be considered by the group to have self-confidence and other traits, which are considered necessary to motivate groups to accomplish their goals. Even though self-esteem or self-confidence was not one of the character strengths that was rated, it could be a factor that affected the cadet’s self-assessment. This is different from ego-protective bias. If the cadets simply have high self-esteem and/or a high ego, their high ratings are not originating from a need to protect their egos. The cadets would genuinely believe that they did, to that high degree, exert certain character strengths. If positive narcissism is a cause for the high self-assessments, it may not be the case for all the cadets. If the cadets (or some of them) have rated themselves high due to high self-esteem and/or a high ego,
it is interesting as it would not correlate with what is deemed typical for Norwegians. According to Silvera and Seger (2004) Norwegians tend to have less positive self-views, than compared with many western cultured countries. However, considering that the cadets have been selected in to the NMA, and they know this is a great achievement, so they may have a higher level of self-esteem or a higher ego than other civilian Norwegians.

5.2.3 Lower self-assessments and cognitive ability

**Self-assessment lower than other assessment**

An important factor that should be kept in mind, is that the overall means of the cadet’s self-assessments are not much higher than the other assessments. As mentioned, they have rated themselves higher on 7 out of 12 character strengths. For some of the character strengths, the difference between the overall mean was quite small. This could mean that the cadets overall have only been slightly subject to ego-protective bias, or that they do not have really high self-esteem and strong egos. On the other hand, the closeness of the means does not necessarily confirm this. High variations in ratings could create means that are close to each other, but low agreement in correlations (Christophersen, 2009). The findings actually show that the instructor’s standard deviation is much higher than the peer and cadets assessment (see appendix A-Instructor2#2). This supports why the correlations between self and peer, are stronger than self and instructor. The peers and the self's standard deviations are smaller for most of the character strengths, so their ratings have not deviated from the means as much as the instructor’s.

Another interesting finding in the data is the character strengths where the cadets have actually rated themselves lower, than their peers and/or the instructor has rated them. The former could also create less agreement in the correlations. The character strength where the cadets have most noticeably rated themselves lower is for the character strength fairness. “Fairness” is also the character strength where the self and other assessment have a negative correlation. When it comes “fairness”, one of the reasons why the cadets have rated themselves lower, may be connected to the element of access to information that Vazire (2010) presents. Access to information refers to how the individual has access to much more information than just what is observed, they have
access to their own thoughts and emotions connected to the observed behaviour. Hence, the cadets may not have felt that they acted as fairly as their peers and instructors observed them to. Two of the criteria used for assessing fairness were; “Does not favourite anyone on the team”; “Does not let one’s own feelings disrupt how one treats others” (See appendix B-RET). As mentioned, the cadets were in the same squads that they had been in for 16 months, so they have spent a lot of time together. Naturally, some may then have become closer friends than others. The feelings that the cadets have towards those they are closer to may have made them think they have treated the others less fair, or treated their friends more fairly. Even though this may not necessarily be the case. The former, could be an example of how an individual’s thoughts and emotions can affect self-accuracy, not just when it comes to enhancing specific traits in oneself, but also diminishing them. The latter, fits better with the theory that Norwegians are less likely to positively self-evaluate (Silvera & Seger, 2004). However, since that argument seems relevant for only one character strength, Silvera and Seger’s theory is less probable in this context.

The character strengths where the cadets have not rated themselves higher are: fairness, open mindedness and creativity (for “creativity” the instructor has rated the cadet lower whilst the peers have rated them higher). A potential reason for the low rating of “fairness” was discussed above. For “open mindedness” on the other hand, the correlations are not negative, but they are very low. Except for between self and peer r= .40. One of the criteria for “open mindedness” refers to the ability to be analytically thorough, and think critically whilst solving problems. Arguably it would seem natural that the cadets did not self-assess themselves very high for this character strength. Even if they were subject to ego-protective bias or a high self-esteem, they were cognitively impaired and they knew it. What is interesting with these low correlations and low ratings is that “open-mindedness” and “creativity” are the two character strengths most closely connected to problem solving, and not one’s behaviour towards others. Those two character strengths are more focused on the cadet’s ability to solve a task. Which is one of the most important elements of the cadets training and education. When they become officers and start working as platoon leaders (not all but many will), they will in large be responsible for solving the tactical challenges that they are faced with in the field (Forsvaret, 2016d). Throughout the CFC the cadets were cognitively impaired, and
after day three it is likely that many of them had started hallucinating, due to lack of sleep (FFI, 2013). According to Vaitl et al. (2005, p103) an alternative state of consciousness can spontaneously occur, due to extreme sleep deprivation. The cadets were suffering from extreme sleep and food deprivation. By day four most of the cadets’ ability to perform physically and cognitively is reduced with 50-60% (FFI, 2013, p38). Bringing it back to the character strength open mindedness, and also relevant for creativity, it is not surprising that the cadets have rated themselves low. Taking into consideration that their ability to draw logical conclusions and their memory was impaired. The previous, is likely to affect their ability to critically think things through and show originality in problem solving. This is perhaps something the cadets were more able to be realistically aware of afterwards, as it does not necessarily reflect upon their personality but rather their abilities. By knowing that their ability to perform was weakened due to their physical and cognitive state, they may have been less likely to rate themselves as high as the other character strengths. On the other hand, the cadets still rated themselves higher for “creativity” than their instructor did. This may have been because of the expectations that are set by the instructor, in relation to the cadet’s capability to be creative when solving problems. The previous, is considered a crucial element for an officer in the field (Forsvarets Stabsskole, 2007). As mentioned earlier, an officer must be able to perform regardless of the environment around. As such, it can be argued that the cadets are expected to be able to make creative plans and come up with innovative suggestions, despite physical or psychological strains.

Memory and ability to observe
I have briefly touched upon the factor of memory loss/impaired memory during the CFC, and the potential implications this may have for the cadets. Yet, there is a need for further reflection. It has been stated that the extreme sleep deprivation effects memory, and it impairs both the short and long term memory (Vaitl et al., 2005). As such, when the cadets used OBSCIF, they were asked to remember their own behaviour during the period they were deprived of food and sleep. The previous, is no easy task considering that the cadets’ ability to accurately observe is already impaired by day three of the CFC (FFI, 2013). However, research has found that the cadets are more alert and focused when they are given more responsibility, and have specific tasks to work on (FFI, 2013). This could mean, that most of the behaviour that the cadets were able to remember
came from the time period where they were acting as squad leader, and were responsible for their entire squad. The cadets in each squad take turns in acting as squad leader, this is an important part of the CFC, and the cadets are assessed on it by the instructors. As such, each cadet would have acted as squad leader at least once during the CFC (Cadet O.Kristiansen, personal communication, 21.Feb, 2016). The previous, is relevant for both self-assessment and the peers-assessment (further discussed in 5.3). If their observations mainly originated from when cadets were acting as squad leaders, it could both strengthen and weaken the validity of the data. Arguably the reason for observing and assessing character strengths during extreme field exercises, is to see how the cadets perform as leaders in tough environments. As mentioned, most of them are likely to be entering into positions of either platoon leader, or second in command in a platoon when they graduate. They will be responsible for leading their platoon and making important decisions (Forsvaret, 2016d). As such, it is crucial for the NMA to know how these cadets perform as leaders when they are suffering from sleep and food deprivation, because these are potential challenges faced during combat (FFI, 2013). On the other hand, knowing how the cadet behaves in a team when he/she isn’t in charge during extreme conditions is also very important, as it goes towards knowing how they contribute to the team and its success.

5.3 Observation: the peers and instructor’s observed behaviour
As mentioned the peers and the instructor’s assessments showed medium to strong correlations on 10 out of 12 character strengths, with six of them being strong. This finding overall seems to correspond with the theory that others are more accurate than the self in observing traits that are high in observability (Vazire, 2010). The level of consistency is higher between the peers and the instructor, which supports the theory that people are more able to identify good and bad behaviour in others, and less able to apply it to their own performance (Ward et al., 2002). However, there are still some relevant differences between the peers and the instructor’s assessments.

5.3.1 Instructor’s and peers’ skills of evaluation
Accurate judgement of personality
In this context, estimating that the instructor will be more skilled at evaluating and observing the individual cadet’s behaviour is reasonable. The instructor’s experience
and background provides him with a good foundation for evaluating the cadets (Matthews et al., 2011). The instructor has likely participated in other extreme field exercises with other Companies at the NMA before. Further, the instructors that partake in the CFC are there (regardless of any research projects) to observe the cadets, and follow them throughout the duration of the CFC (Cadet O.Kristiansen, personal communication, 21.Feb, 2016). In this case, the instructor was doing what he otherwise would have, but for the purpose of this study, he was looking for specific behaviour due to using the OBSCIF later on. Experience is relevant for skills of evaluation, but according to Funder (2012) it is only one of four important moderating factors, when determining the extent to which personality judgements are accurate. The other factors are also relevant for this study, and they can contribute towards the discussion on the potential differences between the peers and instructor’s assessments. First, when it comes to the factor of “good target”, the cadets are likely to vary in degree of transparency. Some cadets are probably more extroverted than others, and some will be more verbally active and outspoken than their squad members. This could lead to more attention being paid to the extroverted cadets than the introverted, and the extroverted are then more likely easier to evaluate and observe. Even though it is supported that most cadets tend to score high in extroversion, the degree of extroversion is likely to vary, and it is reasonable to assume that not all cadets are extroverts either (Paunonen et al, 2006; Weierud, 2012). For the cadets that are not as extroverted, their peers will likely be more able to accurately assess them than the instructor, due to the third factor “good information” (Funder, 2012). The latter, would mean that the cadets have more information on each other to make assessments on. Extroverted or not, according to Ward et al. (2002), friends assessments can be more accurate than self- and other assessments. Hence, the cadets who are close friends are likely to be more able to accurately assess each other’s behaviour. However, not all cadets will be as close and it is not possible to distinguish which peer assessments would be more accurate due to friendship. What is possible to argue, is that the cadets have spent more time together over the past 16 months, since they were matriculated into the NMA. They have also been out in the field with each other before, and experienced each other’s behaviour during stressful situations. The previous, supports that the cadets would know each other better than the instructor knows them.
To continue on Funder’s (2012) factor of “good information”, unlike the instructor, the cadets in each squad were together throughout the entire CFC. The latter, means they had a larger bulk of observations to assess the individual cadet on. On the other hand, as mentioned earlier, the cadets were likely cognitively impaired. Their memory may also have been impaired, this could make their ability to accurately remember a variety of specific observations from their peers, questionable. Even if the cadets did have a larger bulk of observations to choose from based on the past 16 months, they were asked to assess their peers on the behaviour observed during the CFC only. However, the cadets are likely to have used their previous knowledge of their peers to complete the OBSCIF. Avoiding using the knowledge one already has on someone is difficult when assessing their behaviour (Nisbett & Decamp Wilson, 1977) (potential biases will be discussed later on). However, the cadets may still have tried to focus on only the observations from the CFC. Referring back to the discussion on self-assessment, I argued that the cadets may have remembered most of their behaviour from when they were squad leaders. The former, could also be relevant for the peers’ assessment. Even though the cadets did have access to more observations, they may not have had the capacity to exploit this. The probability of the cadets’ ability to observe being impaired as early as day three of the CFC (FFI, 2013) supports this. It is not necessarily the case that the cadets were able to select from a larger bulk of observations than the instructor, due to the reduced ability to observe, and the potential loss of memory. It may conceivably be the opposite, the cadets may have had a more narrowed bulk of observations to select from. This could be the case, if the cadets were more observant of the behaviour and actions of their squad leader, due to that cadet being in charge. They may have only remembered their peers’ behaviour from when they were acting as squad leader, creating a more narrowed bulk of observations. None the less, it is still plausible that the cadets have to a certain degree been able to focus enough at times that they observed a variety of their peers’ behaviour. Even if the observations are narrowed to when their peers where acting as squad leader.

Vazire’s (2010) argument that low acquaintance impairs accuracy, supports Funder’s (2012) theory that the more information one has on a target the more accurate you can judge their behaviour. However, low acquaintance can impair the accuracy for certain traits, but not necessarily all. Vazire believes that the accuracy for traits such as
creativity, intelligence and self-esteem are impaired by not knowing the person one is assessing. In light of this, the instructor’s assessments could possibly still be accurate for many of the character strengths, despite the fact that he did not know the cadets as well as the peers. However, the instructor’s assessment on the character strength creativity may not be as accurate. One of the strongest arguments in favour of the accuracy of the instructor (combined with his experience and background), is the fact that he was fed and more rested than the cadets were. His cognitive ability was not as impaired, as such, he was able to focus on the cadets’ behaviour and look for the relevant behaviour with a clearer mind. This strengthens the instructor’s position as a “good judge”, more so than the peers. Further, the instructor was likely to observe the cadets under different settings, not just when they were acting as squad leader, and he could recollect these observations when completing OBSCIF. Even though observing the cadets behaviour when they are acting as squad leaders is very important during the CFC, it is also important to observe their behaviour when they are not in charge. Good examples where the former is relevant is perhaps the character strengths team-worker and persistence. The aforementioned character strengths, are arguably very important to observe when a cadet is not in charge, compared to “leadership” and “open-mindedness”, which may be more relevant for when a cadet is in charge. The previous, is of course not a conclusive statement, but rather an argument for why there is a need for observations on the cadets behaving in different settings. It is also important to see how receptive the cadet is and whether the cadet is able to maintain a holistic perspective, when they are not in charge. The character strength perspective is relevant here, because the instructor has rated the cadets noticeably lower than they have rated themselves and each other. It is also the only character strength with three high correlations, the highest being between the self/peer \( r = 0.60 \). "Perspective" refers to the cadets’ ability to e.g. see the bigger picture and recognise his/her own limitations. The correlations present a picture that this is the character strength where all three sources of assessment have rated closest to each other. Yet, the instructor has a mean lower than the peers and the cadets (which have almost the exact same means). This could perhaps be due to a larger variation in the instructor’s assessment compared to the cadets, and the instructor’s standard deviation is much higher (see Appendix A: Instructor2#2-Perspective). A reason for the instructor’s overall rating being lower could be connected to him being rested and fed. The former, may have made him more capable of evaluating
the cadets’ surroundings, and the cadet’s actual ability, rather than their perceived abilities. However, it is reasonable to argue due to the correlations, that the cadets have assessed themselves and each other similar to that of the instructor. As such, “perspective” may be the character strength the cadet has most accurately assessed themselves on.

5.3.2 Potential bias in peers and instructor’s assessment

Assessment bias

In relation to the peers and instructor’s assessment there are some aspects to the concept of observation that may have influenced their assessment, and in turn could have affected the correlations. Funder (2012) believes that in the case of assessing others, people can be exposed to biases that make their assessments wrong. The fact that the instructor is a graduate from the NMA, could make him prone to certain bias. The instructor most likely graduated from the NMA before its reform in 2005, when the current bachelor degree in military studies- leadership and military power was introduced (Forsvaret, 2016e). As such, his education and training at the NMA was likely to be different from that of Company Linge. The instructor could have certain bias and assumptions on how cadets should perform, based on his own experience from when he was a cadet. For example, the leadership education that the current cadets are being taught is likely to differ from that which the instructor was taught. The instructor may be bias in relation to emphasising behaviours that correspond better with his assumptions of a character strength (such as leadership) (Heiskel & Grande, 2015). Seen through a different perspective: the instructor having been a cadet could also act as an advantage. The instructor acted as a non-participant observer. One of the main challenges of a non-participant observer is that they do not understand the meaning behind the target of observations behaviour (Fangen, 2015). The instructor had to pass the CFC during his time as a cadet, so he should be able to understand the meaning of the different behaviours better than an outsider. The latter could strengthen the validity of his assessment. For the cadets, the concept of this type of assessment bias is not as relevant, since they are all undergoing the same education at the same time. Further, the cadets were not non-participants, they were a part of the social setting being studied.
Halo-effect and confirmation bias

As mentioned in chapter 2, the Halo-effect is what happens when someone emphasises one or two characteristics in an individual (Heery & Noon, 2008). The Halo-effect is known as one of the most common errors in global assessment (Ward et al, 2002). The instructor has met and possibly instructed the cadets before, meaning he is likely to have made impressions of the cadets before the CFC. However, the instructor has not interacted that much with the cadets. It is also likely that most of the interaction has taken place at NMA, and for the most part in a class-room setting. Due to the aforementioned, it is possible that the instructor could have been influenced by either the Halo or Horns-effect (Heery & Noon, 2008) when assessing the cadets. If the instructor had during his first interaction with some of the cadets experienced a strong impression of one or two of the relevant character strengths, he may have over or under evaluated certain character strengths in a cadet. As the instructor's ratings are lower than almost all of the cadets (9 out of 12 means were lower), the horns effect is more probable than the halo-effect. Even if the instructor is a skilled evaluator, it is arguably quite difficult to remove this type of effect from ones cognition, as most people tend to lack awareness of the influence of one evaluation on another (Nisbett & Decamp Wilson, 1977). If the instructor was influences from previous interactions, it is likely that the instructor was not aware of it. Based on the correlations between the peers and the instructor, it is possible argue against there being any evidence of the horns effect, since the level of agreement is so substantial. On the other hand, it is of course possible that the peers could have been influenced by the halo/horns effect as well. However, due to the likelihood of the cadets having spent more time together both at the NMA, as well as socially, it is less probable. As such, the probability of the instructor being exposed to the horns effect to such an extent that it reflects in the data, is unlikely.

The second type of bias that the peers and instructor could have been exposed to is confirmation bias. As presented in chapter 2: confirmation bias involves the individual actively seeking information that supports the already existing expectations (Hernandez & Jesse, 2012). This type of bias also involves an already established impression of the individual cadets from the instructor and peers perspective (which has been presented earlier). When exposed to confirmation bias the instructor would be actively looking for behaviours that supports his already existing impression of a cadet. It could also mean
the possibility of ignoring other behaviours, in order to support what he already thinks. For example, if one cadet has performed less optimally before, the instructor may believe he/she will do so now as well, and may look for behaviour that supports this. Leading to the instructor rating that cadet lower on the relevant character strengths. In turn, the instructor may have missed or subconsciously ignored positive behaviour that would have led to a higher rating within certain character strengths. It is also possible that the instructor would be actively looking for positive behaviour and ignoring negative. Confirmation bias is something that the peers also could have been exposed to.

More specifically, the peers could be bias towards the cadets in their squad that they do not necessarily know as well outside of the NMA. Within each squad there are two groups, the groups separately spend far more time together than the squad as a whole does (Cadet O.Kristiansen, personal communication, 21.Feb, 2016). It is possible that the cadets who are in the same squad, but different groups, were exposed to confirmation bias. Those cadets have spent less time with each other than the cadets in their own group. Based on the findings, if there was any form of confirmation bias from the peers it is more likely to be them looking for positive behaviour. It is difficult to establish whether or not the peers have been bias in any form. What can be established is that the peers and the cadets’ self-assessments correlate on almost twice as many character strengths as the self and the instructor. Further, the peers have rated the cadet higher than the instructor on 9 out of 12 character strengths. The latter, is likely to contribute towards the correlations between self and peer being more in agreement than self and instructor. However, it may not necessarily be confirmation bias that has caused the cadet to rate their peers slightly higher. Vazire (2010, p284) presents what she calls “the positivity effect”, referring to when someone rates a close other, he/she will begin with an accurate impression and then inflate their ratings, in order to make them more positive. The peers may have done this, leading to their scores being higher than the instructors, but not as high as the cadets. On the other hand, based on the correlations, any positivity effect would not have been that strong, since the peers and instructor agree more than peer and self.
5.4 Implications of some character strengths for the future officer

In this part of the discussion six character strengths and their corresponding correlations will be discussed in further detail. “Creativity” and “leadership” were chosen due to their correlations and overall connection to an officer’s operative ability. Whilst the four last ones: “bravery”, “persistence”, “team-worker” and “honesty/integrity”, were chosen because they were all rated within the top 4 and 5 of all three sources of assessments. The latter supports Matthews (2014, p. 27) statement of the existence of a “Band of Brothers”, in relation to strengths of character in the military.

5.4.1 Why creativity and leadership is important for an officer’s operative ability

“Creativity”

Creativity was the character strength that received the lowest rating from all three sources of assessment. The lowest rating overall in all the data, was the instructor’s assessment on the cadets’ “creativity”. “Creativity” also had the strongest negative correlation \( r = -0.119 \), between self and instructor. It has been mentioned that creativity is a character strength that can be inaccurately assessed due to low acquaintance (Vazire, 2010). However, that theory may not be a strong enough argument to support such a large difference in the assessments. Creativity within the military profession is essential as it is a big part of military operational art. Operational art as presented by Forsvarets Stabsskole (2007, p105), refers to the military leader’s use of the tools he/she has access to in order to achieve the desired goals. Creativity and imagination are considered key traits in order to achieve successful operational art, they are not the only elements, necessary but they are important. Hence, why it is troublesome that creativity is the character strength that received the lowest rating overall. Perhaps it is the importance of creativity and the awareness of its importance, which has led to it being scored so low. The standard that is required by the cadets in this character strength, could potentially be higher than in some others. It is of course also possible that the cadets simple have not been creative enough, due to their cognitive state at the time. However, this is one of the reasons why the cadets have to take part in the CFC, before they graduate from the NMA. The NMA needs to know that the cadets can successfully perform under pressure and in an impaired state, before they can allow the cadets to become officers (Krigsskolen, 2015). This also means that the NMA needs to be sure that
the cadet cannot only survive, but can operationally perform as well. An assurance that the cadet can lead and deal with the various dimensions of combat: both the physical, social, informational and cognitive aspect of it, is essential. This is directly correlated with the officer’s ability to act in coherence with the expectations of society. Yet, there is perhaps a slight paradox. The NMA as mentioned, has strict guidelines and goes to great lengths to create disciplined officers, but being disciplined and following guidelines may also contribute to a lack of creativity (Amabile, 1998). The future officer is required to in the best way possible, deal with the unpredictable and complex operations that they face (Forsvarets stabsskole, 2007). A lack of creativity would likely prohibit the officer from being able to find the best and most strategic solutions. Creativity is therefore very important, and arguably an arena where the cadets need to improve. However, an important element with regards to the CFC, is that its main purpose is to give the cadets an opportunity to push their own psychological and physical barriers. By pushing these boundaries they strengthen their ability to function as a leader in demanding field operations (FFI, 2013). It would seem that the point is, for the cadets to realise how weakened and impaired they become without sleep and food, so that in a real life situation they ensure that they do not reach that stage. This could mean that the cadets may not actually perform as low on character strengths such as creativity or open-mindedness, in a real life mission. Because the CFC shows them how less able they are to do their duty, without taking the right measures to secure their abilities, such as making sure they eat and sleep when they can.

“Leadership”
Matthews (2014, p129) states that one of the unchangeable truths of war is that leadership matters. Leadership is a major aspect of the cadet’s training and education. Throughout their entire degree the emphasis is on leadership (Krigsskolen, 2015). In “Officer Development: the NMA’s concept for leadership development” (Boe et al., 2014), there is an entire paragraph discussing how military leadership is characterized by the officer taking their societal responsibility through five different areas of leadership. One of the areas is “To have the will and ability to efficiently lead military departments and use military power and resources adapted to the situation in times of peace, crisis and war”
...focusing on the concept of leadership, it may not be too surprising that the correlations show agreement across all three sources, with the strongest correlation being between peers and instructor where $r=.75$. This is the strongest correlation in all the data. Further, the means here are very close, supporting that the different sources of assessment actually have rated close to each other. However, the overall means are quite low compared to the amount of leadership training that the cadets have had at the NMA. Arguably with so much attention being placed towards making the cadets’ good leaders, presumably this would be one of the character strengths where they would be rated highest. However, it may be of a similar cause as what was argued earlier for “creativity”. The importance of the character strength leadership may cause it to be assessed more critically, meaning that high ratings are not given lightly. On the other hand, this definition of leadership is limited to that of Peterson and Seligman’s (2004) classification. It has further been narrowed down to three observational criteria, which can indeed be considered important behaviors connected to leadership e.g. “Motivates, is supportive...Takes charge, delegates and makes decisions” (See appendix B – LED). However, one could argue that leadership expands beyond this. Perhaps in some ways, all 12 character strengths that the cadet is observed and assessed on contributes towards his/her ability to lead in the manner that has been deemed necessary in order for them to fulfill their societal responsibilities. Perhaps another way of phrasing it would be through asking if one thinks an officer could be a good leader without a decent level of e.g. self-regulation, emotional intelligence and perspective. The idea of focusing on developing character strengths in the first place was to contribute towards the cadet’s education and leadership development (Boe, 2014), which supports that leadership expands beyond the classification used in this study. With the character strength “leadership” it is then important to remember that it has been very specified and limited. A cadet’s leadership abilities should perhaps not be evaluated based on the assessment of this character strength alone.

---

11 This quote is my own translation from the original source: Boe, et al., 2014, p9.
5.4.2 The repeated character strengths

In the study performed by Matthews et al. (2006) four of the character strengths that were amongst the greatest strengths evident within both military samples from West Point and RNA were: “honesty”, “bravery”, “team-worker” and “persistence”. There seems to be a pattern of four character strengths that repeats itself. The same four character strengths are rated highest by the cadets in Company Linge, and three of them are also rated in the top three by the peers and the instructor. Only “bravery” was not in the top four, as the peers and instructor rated “fairness” slightly higher. This finding also correlates with the studies of Gayton and Kehoe (2015a; 2015b), their findings discovered that the SF applicants that did not, rank “team-worker”, “honesty” and “persistence” in their top four were almost certain to fail. To further supports this pattern, Matthews (2014) gave a survey to Army captains who had recently returned from combat in Iraq and Afghanistan. Matthews asked the captains to rate the 24 character strengths in order of how important they were in relation to successfully dealing with the difficulties that they faced during the recent combats. The captains ranked “team-worker” as most important, followed by “bravery”, “capacity to love”, “persistence” and “honesty”. The findings of these different studies support Matthews (2014, p27) notion of the existence of a “Band of Brothers”, in terms of strengths of character, at an international level. Meaning that men and women in the military seem to value the same four character strengths over the other 20, and emphasise them more than civilians do. Therefore, these four character strengths will be discussed more thoroughly in an attempt to gain insight into why they may be rated so high, and what purpose these character strengths may have in relation to the officer’s competency and duty to society.

“Bravery”

This is the character strength the cadets have rated themselves noticeably higher than the others in. The correlations for this character strength are almost over all low, except for peer/instructor where it just passes the mark to be considered significant \( r = .35 \). However, “bravery” was also the character strength that had the lowest Cronbach’s alpha, which to an extent is enough to not place too much emphasis on its scores. Further, “bravery” is also considered one of the character strengths that is most difficult to observe and measure. According to Peterson and Seligman (2004, p23) it is a phasic
character strength that does not show itself often, and phasic character strengths are in
general considered difficult to observe. Though it is argued that a character strength
such as bravery, is more likely to show itself during an exercise like the CFC, it does not
necessarily mean it is easily observed. According to Funder’s (2012) factors for accurate
judgement of personality, this character strength would not be considered a “good trait”,
that is visible and easy for others to see. Also one could argue that interpretation of scale
would be especially relevant here, e.g. the observational criteria #14 (see appendix B-
Mot) “Is brave. Dares to expose oneself to challenging/uncomfortable situations”. For a
cadet who has participated in international operations and been in combat, this
observational criteria is potentially going to mean something very different from a cadet
who has not. The same can be said between a cadet and the instructor. Overall “bravery”
is perhaps the character strength where individual interpretation is a more significant
threat. On the other hand, it is not the character strength that has received the lowest
rating and its means are higher or at the same level as many others. So the instructor
and the peers have been able to assess observations connected to it. It is more so that
the cadets’ simple have done so to a higher degree. However, if seen from another
perspective, if it means that the cadets think they are braver than they are observed to
be, this is perhaps a better alternative than the opposite. A potential reason for why this
class strength is valued so highly by the cadets and others in this profession, could
be due to what they are told they have to able to endure in the future. Being able to
participate in combat and if necessary take a life does require a certain amount of
bravery, as it places a tremendous amount of pressure and emotional strain on an
individual (Moldjord et al., 2005). Bravery as according to Peterson and Seligman
(2004) refers to individuals who are brave and capable of disconnecting the emotional
components of fear from the behaviourial, and this makes them able to resist the desire
to flee. Being able to resist the desire to flee is arguably an essential character strength
for an officer and others in the military. Bravery may be the most demanding character
strength, and this could be why it is rated so highly by many.

“Team-worker”
Being a team-worker is about feeling a commitment towards and identifying with the
group one is a member of. The character strength consists of an individual working hard
towards achieving success for the group, rather than focusing on one's own success
(Peterson & Seligman, 2004). Considering the importance of loyalty and unity in the military (Moldjord et al., 2005; Matthews, 2014), it may not be so surprising for anyone with knowledge of the military culture that the cadets have been rated and rated themselves high for this character strength. Though there is a lack of correlation between the cadet and the instructor, this could be due to the high level of variation in instructors ratings (see Appendix A-Instructor2#2-Team-worker). Team-worker is one of the four character strengths that seem to be rated highest by cadets and other military applicants. In Gayton and Kehoe’s (2015a) study, 72% of the successful applicants to the SF top-ranked “team-worker”. The concept of being a team-worker in this context can be seen in connection with the officer being able to convince their team to go into risk full missions with them, because the team knows that the officer puts them in front of his/her own needs and works hard for their success (these are observational criteria for “Team-worker”, see appendix B-Lag). The previous corresponds with another aspect of the core values of the military profession stating that: “The profession is a collective one, and all attitudes and behaviours that contribute towards strengthening the unity is absolutely crucial (Forsvarets Stabsskole, 2007, p159) (My translation12). Being able to take care of one’s team, and work with them is essential for an officer to be able to do their duty to society and the military (Boe et al., 2014, p9), and they rely on each other to achieve their mission (Matthews, 2014). This is likely to be a shared perspective amongst those in this profession and perhaps why it is rated so highly.

“Persistence”

The character strength “persistence” was the character strength rated the highest by all three sources of assessment. In fact, it is the only character strength where the instructor’s mean surpasses both the peers and the cadets. The instructor has overall rated the cadets highest, but the cadet’s self-assessment is not far behind. For this character strength as well, there is little agreement between the self and the instructor, but strong agreement otherwise. Since the peers mean is lower than the cadets, but the correlation is high it is probable that some cadets have rated themselves higher causing the overall mean to increase. “Persistence” is represented by the behaviours of not

12 This quote is my own translation from the original source: Forsvarsstaben, 2007, p159.
giving up, showing commitment and enduring without complaining (Boe et al., 2015a). The context is referring to not only physical persistence but also persisting psychologically. Referring back to Clausewitz (1976) who stated that the ability to maintain stable and balanced, even in times when the environment around is stressful, complex and one is experiencing strong emotions, are important elements for a strong character. The previous can be connected with being able to psychologically persist, which for an officer is equally important to persisting physically. For an officer and others in the military profession the concept of persistence is tested from day one of recruitment and selection (Vik, 2013). Some of the physical tests that one has to pass to get into the NMA consist of simple not giving up (Vik, 2013). This is also the case for the cadets during the CFC, if they give up they are expelled from the NMA (Krigsskolen, 2015). However, this type of testing is not uncommon in most military selection processes, and this may be why it is rated so highly by many. Matthews (2014) also states that being head strong is crucial for the officers and soldiers of today, they need to be psychologically hardy. It is essential for the NMA to know that their cadets can withstand during extreme conditions, and this is not just for the NMA, arguably this is important for all academies that are educating future officers. Perhaps why this is such an important character strength for the cadets and others is connected to what Matthews attests (2014, p87) “...they do not have the luxury of mulling over whether to kill or not, nor can they simply quit if they find circumstances to be overly stressful”. An officer needs to be able to do his/her duty no matter what, this is entrusted upon them by society, and it contributes towards legitimising their profession.

“Honesty/integrity”

Peterson and Seligman (2004) state that this character strength can be difficult to measure. However, the significant correlations between self and instructor, and peer and instructor shows that relevant observations were made. Here it is interesting that the correlation between self and peer was so low. Since this character strength seems to be one that cadets and other military applicants consider so important. However, the low correlation does not suggest a low rating, as the peers have a higher mean than the instructor. Also here the standard deviation presents that variation in the scores have contributed to weaker correlations. What this character strength refers to is the cadet’s ability to be genuine and sincere in everything he/she says and does, and feeling
confident in who they are. Matthews (2014, p91) believes that it is very difficult to train soldiers who in one moment are supposed to be unhesitant killers, and in the next become nurturing and sensitive representatives of cultural support. However, as mentioned the latter is for many of the cadets the most probable role. Norway tends more often to engage in peacekeeping missions where the officers act as peacekeepers and builders of new relations, rather than going out to war (Moldjord et al., 2005).

However, an officer needs to be able to satisfy all these roles in order to meet the requirements of their profession. Hence, being secure in oneself, and being able to communicate honestly and openly with not only the people under the officer’s command, but also the surrounding civilians is pivotal. Being able to stand by one’s decisions even when they are unfavourable is one of the observational criteria for honesty, and society demands a certain degree of honesty from its officers. In order for society to trust this officer with the responsibility to make unpopular decisions that only they are licensed to make, they need to be ensured that they will stand by these decisions. This is connected to the license and mandate that Hughes (1958) discusses, the officer does indeed have a license to make decisions that no one else can make and arguably many of these decisions are not popular. Hence “honesty” may be rated higher by those in the military due to its strong association with all the roles that they are expected to fulfil.

This chapter has provided a discussion on the data analysis presented in chapter 4. The findings have been discussed in light of relevant theory. Further, the data has been connected to the wider framework introduced in chapter 1; securing officer competency and the officer’s responsibility towards society. The next chapter will provide a conclusion and suggestions for further research.
6 Conclusion

This dissertation started with presenting a framework of the Norwegian Armed Forces’ relation and responsibility towards the nation state in which it represents. In this framework the modern day officers and the roles they must complete were also included. Securing the competency of a modern day officer is arguably something one can never be 100% sure of having achieved. However, implementing and organising the right measures and tests that can at least say something as to where future officers may need to improve is seemingly more feasible. For officers who may quickly have to switch between extremely different roles, it is essential that their organisation do its utmost to ensure that these officers inhabit the necessary competency through training, education, and behaviour. This places a tremendous amount of pressure on both the cadet, and the institution that has the responsibility of providing the necessary tools for the development of this competency. The cadets are first and foremost being trained to be leaders, as well as fulfilling all the roles of a soldier. The NMA has the responsibility of selecting the right cadets for their academy. The cadets go through a vigorous selection and recruitment process, and they are continuously tested and evaluated throughout their education. Testing the cadets in all areas of education, training and behaviour is important. It is a way for the NMA to tests its’ output, and more importantly it contributes towards making them better leaders. This dissertation has discussed the data collected on the cadets’ observed behaviour. The data has been discussed both in light of theory on self and peer-assessment, as well as in light of the future officer’s competency and development. This has hopefully contributed towards a more holistic view of why the study of character strengths is important. It goes towards showing how the assessment of observed character strengths is important both for the individual cadet’s leadership development, as well as for the NMA and the Norwegian Armed Forces.

The findings in this dissertation have provided an answer to the research question: to what extent is there consistency between self-assessment and observed behaviour in the cadets? What does the consistency or lack thereof mean? There was a low level of consistency between the cadet’s self-assessment and the observed behaviour from the instructor, but the consistency between self and peers was higher. However, the consistency between the two sources of observed behaviour: peers and instructor, were
significantly more substantial than any other. Which supports the theory that others are more capable of accurately assessing behaviour. The severe decrease in both physical and cognitive ability is likely to have affected the cadet’s ability to self-assess. Further, the lack of consistency and/or low scores on character strengths such as “creativity” and “open-mindedness” has shown that essential areas for a cadet are impaired when they are extremely sleep and food deprived. Hence the CFC shows them that in combat and during real missions, the cadets must consistently pursue measures to avoid becoming so physically and cognitively impaired, or else they may not be able to perform their duty. By testing the cadets at this level the NMA allows the cadet to push their own boundaries, and find where their limits are. This is necessary for an officer to know, because they need to be able to avoid reaching that limit in real life situations. The observation of these character strengths can also contribute towards finding whether or not the cadets have what it takes to be able to do this, before the CFC. Those who cannot handle the strain are likely to drop out of the CFC and be expelled. In which case the NMA has then invested 2 to 3 years (depending on if they were an NCO beforehand) of training and education on a cadet that will not become an officer. This shows how important the early selection and recruitment stage is. If the NMA is capable of detecting the relevant character strengths as early as the selection and recruitment phase into the NMA, the previous could be prevented.

Possibly the most important finding in this dissertation, is that the use of the observational instrument “OBSCIF” has provided many significant correlations. This increases its validity and strengthens the idea that it is actually possible to observe character strengths in future officers. The concept of detecting character strengths or the lack of them in cadets, could contribute greatly to the NMA’s officers’ leadership development. It could also contribute towards assessing other military applicants in other military institutions. It could be possible to shape the cadets’ behaviour through developing and emphasising the necessary character strengths. The Big 12 character strengths that are included in OBSCIF, were established by officers at the NMA and the expert group. One cannot necessarily be certain that the same 12 character strengths will reflect as strongly in other areas of the Norwegian Armed Forces, or other nation’s armed forces. However, it may be more feasible to emphasise these four character strengths internationally; bravery, honesty/integrity, persistence, and team-worker.
Those four are repeatedly emphasised by cadets and others in the military profession based on various studies (including naval cadets, Australian SF applicants and U.S Army captains).

6.1 Further research

In order to determine whether or not these 12 character strengths are equally important for all military leaders on an international scale, more research is necessary. First more research into the use of the observational instrument “OBSCIF” at the NMA, is reasonable before considering implementing it in other units. It may be good to pursue the other military academies in Norway first, in order to see if there is consistency along cadets in the different branches: naval, air-force and the army. All the cadets that graduate from these academies are going to become officers. Seemingly it is important that the officers who become leaders within the Norwegian Armed Forces exert the same behaviour built on the same character strengths. This expands the scope of character strengths beyond just the cadets at the NMA. If research shows that the same character strengths are regarded important across the branches, it would be possible to consider studying beyond the academies. Perhaps it is important to establish the self-assessed behaviour and observed behaviour of those who already are officers, and in active duty. As this could help determine to what extent those officers are exerting the desired behaviour and inhabit these character strengths. This is important as those officers are currently representing the Norwegian Armed Forces and Norway in international operations.

Further research that is already planned is how the NMA will be able to develop and grow these character strengths in their cadets. This part of the R&D-project “Character in Military Officers” will be essential in relation to how the concept of character and character strengths will expand beyond the NMA. Arguably it will also be important for the time that comes after the cadet has graduated. If these character strengths become part of the selection process, as well as are emphasised throughout a cadet’s education and training must it not be followed up on after? Is it going to stay within the Army? Will the Norwegian Armed Forces on an organisational level pursue measures in order to maintain these character strengths in their officers? Arguably measures must be taken in order to secure that the officer continues to grow and maintain these character
strengths. Measures taken at an organisational level can contribute to helping the officer exert these character strengths through their behaviour throughout their entire career as an officer. If the NMA is able to figure out how one can contribute towards developing and strengthening distinct character strengths in their cadets, it is perhaps something that should be focused on even after they graduate. The former is beyond the scope of the NMA, rather it lies at a more organisational level within the Norwegian Armed Forces.

If character strengths can be predictive of military performance, it is reasonable to say that it is relevant to almost every branch of the Norwegian Armed Forces. The development of character and character strengths should perhaps already be discussed at an organisational level. Its importance can no longer be denied.

“Character must be developed, not taught. Training results in a skill, education results in more or new knowledge, and development results in a changed person”.

(Doty & Sowden, 2009, p. 78)
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# APPENDIX

## A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
<th>Descriptive statistics of the data used in the dissertation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self- Leadership</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self- Honesty/Integrity</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self- Persistence</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self- Fairness</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self- Bravery</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self- Open mindedness</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self- Social/Emotional intelligence</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self- Citizenship/Teamworker</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self- Self-regulation</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self- Perspective</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self- Creativity</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self- Love of learning</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer- Leadership</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer- Honesty/Integrity</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer- Persistence</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer- Fairness</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer- Bravery</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer- Open mindedness</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer- Social/Emotional</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer- Citizenship/Team-worker</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer- Self-regulation</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer- Perspective</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer- Creativity</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer- Love of learning</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor2#2- Leadership</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor2#2- Honesty/integrity</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor2#2- Persistence</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor2#2- Fairness</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor2#2- Bravery</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor2#2- Open mindedness</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor2#2- Social/Emotional intelligence</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor2#2- Citizenship/Team-worker</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor2#2- Self-regulation</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor2#2- Perspective</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor2#2- Creativity</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor2#2- Love of learning</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Valid N (listwise) 44
OBSCIF- observational instrument used to collect data, there is no English version of it yet.

*The ciphers on the left side under the title «styrke» were not included when used by the assessors.
*Everyone was given the same version of OBSCIF, just with a different title at the top.

Veileders vurdering av kadetter på Stridskurset vår 2015

DITT NAVN: __________________________________________

NAVN PÅ KADETT SOM DU VURDERER: __________________________

LAG: __________________________ DTG: __________

Instruks
Du skal vurdere alle i laget du veileder på de ulike væremåtene som er beskrevet nedenfor – ett skjema for hver kadett. Konkret skal du ta stilling til i hvilken grad kadetten har vist den aktuelle væremåten eller siden av seg selv i løpet av Stridskurset. Bruk følgende skala:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I svært liten grad vist denne siden under Stridskurset</td>
<td>I liten grad vist denne siden under Stridskurset</td>
<td>I noen grad vist denne siden under Stridskurset</td>
<td>I stor grad vist denne siden under Stridskurset</td>
<td>I svært stor grad vist denne siden under Stridskurset</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB!! Hvis du ikke opplever at du har grunnlag for å vurdere væremåten – f.eks. fordi kadetten ennå ikke har vært i en situasjon hvor vedkommende har hatt mulighet til å vise denne siden av seg selv – setter du ikke noe kryss.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Styrke</th>
<th>Indikatorer på karakterstyrker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LED</td>
<td>1. Tar styring, organiserer arbeidet, gir ordrer, delegerer, tar beslutninger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LED</td>
<td>2. Motiverer, er støttende, bidrar til gode relasjoner innen laget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LED</td>
<td>3. Fremstår som en typisk ledertype</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ÆRL</td>
<td>4. Er ekte, tør å vise hvem en er, gjør seg ikke til, virker trygg på seg selv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ÆRL</td>
<td>5. Er åpen, direkte og ærlig i kommunikasjonen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ÆRL</td>
<td>6. Tør å stå for upopulære standpunkter og avgjørelser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ÚTH</td>
<td>7. Er utholdende og viser innsatsvilje</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ÚTH</td>
<td>8. Gir seg ikke og gjenomfører oppgaven helt til mål, til tross for hinderinger og fristelser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ÚTH</td>
<td>9. Står på uten å klage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ÚTH</td>
<td>10. Er villig til å ta på seg ekstra belastninger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RET</td>
<td>11. Behandler andre likeverdig og rettferdig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RET</td>
<td>12. Favoriserer ikke enkeltpersoner på laget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RET</td>
<td>13. Lar ikke egne følelser forstyrre hvordan andre behandles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOT</td>
<td>14. Er modig, tør å utsette seg for skremmende og/eller ubehagelige situasjoner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOT</td>
<td>15. Tør å stå imot gruppepress og kan utfordre flertallet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOT</td>
<td>16. Tør å se kritisk på seg selv og innrømme feil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indikatorer på karakterstyrker</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOT</td>
<td>17. Takler kritikk og negative tilbakemeldinger uten å gå i forsvar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VUR</td>
<td>18. Er analytisk grundig og utviser kritisk tenkning under oppgaveløsning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VUR</td>
<td>19. Er åpen for å se en sak fra flere perspektiver og å endre standpunkt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VUR</td>
<td>20. Gjør nyanserte vurderinger, er ikke svart-hvitt-tenkende</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMO</td>
<td>21. Tar inn over seg og forstår andres følelser og motiver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMO</td>
<td>22. Skaper gode relasjoner med andre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMO</td>
<td>23. Tilpasser egen oppførsel til situasjonen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAG</td>
<td>24. Er en typisk lagspiller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAG</td>
<td>25. Setter lagets behov foran egne behov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAG</td>
<td>26. Arbeider hardt for at laget skal lykkes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Selvstendighet

| SEL | 27. Har god kontroll over egne impulser, behov og følelser |
| SEL | 28. Bevarer roen under stress |
| SEL | 29. Har god selvdisiplin |

### Personlig Selvforståelse

| PER | 30. Viser klokskap, helhetsperspektiv og godt skjønn |
| PER | 31. Viser realistisk tro på egne ferdigheter og styrker |
| PER | 32. Blir ofte spurt til råds av andre på laget |

### Kreativitet

| KRE | 33. Viser originalitet i tenkning og problemløsning |
| KRE | 34. Er løsningsorientert |
| KRE | 35. Er fantasifull og kreativ |

### Læring og utvikling

| LÆR | 36. Er sulten på å tilegne ny kunnskap og ferdigheter |
| LÆR | 37. Stiller spørsmål og viser interesse for å lære |
| LÆR | 38. Viser evne til å lære av sine feil og endre seg når det er nødvendig |

---

**39. Hvordan vil du alt i alt vurdere denne kadettens prestasjoner under Stridskurset? Kryss av i den rubrikken som passer best:**

|-------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|

Illustration of Scatterplots created

Scatterplot Peer/Instructor

Scatterplot Peer/Instructor

$y = 1.85 + 0.47x$

$y = 2.20 + 0.38x$
D

Illustration of correlation tables created

### Correlations Honesty/Integrity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Instructor2# 2-Honesty/integrity</th>
<th>Peer-Honesty/Integrity</th>
<th>Self-Honesty/Integrity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructor2#2-Honesty/integrity</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.469**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer-Honesty/Integrity</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.469**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Honesty/Integrity</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.325*</td>
<td>.185</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).**  
*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).*

### Correlations Persistence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Self-Persistence</th>
<th>Peer-Persistence</th>
<th>Instructor2#2-Persistence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self- Persistence</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.593**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer- Persistence</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.593**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor2#2-Persistence</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.277</td>
<td>.524**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).**