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In an age when the word "management" seems to have permeated the Army's language and life, the differences between industrial management leadership and Army command leadership sometimes become blurred.

If this thesis promotes any understanding of the differences in the two leadership doctrines it will be because of the assistance the writer received from his fellow students who assisted in the survey of industrial management and because of the generous assistance of the firms that cooperated in the survey.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

The Problem

The histories and traditions of military command and industrial management are in many ways different, but both are concerned with the efforts of people performing important work; therefore, it seems useful to know what is common and what is different about leadership in the two activities.

To determine the precise role or the exact contribution of leadership for either industrial management or military command is a task that could probably occupy the best social scientists for many years; however, the most cursory research into the writings about either activity reveals much support for the contention that leadership makes an important contribution to both activities. In "The Principles of Organization," James D. Mooney wrote "...that there must be leadership as the necessary directive of the entire organized movement." ¹ Catheryn Seckler-Hudson in a treatment of the

same subject said, "There is no substitute for good leadership." In discussing means for assuring a dynamic organization, Don G. Mitchell, President of General Telephone and Electronics Corporation, said, "Leadership is the key word." Practitioners and students of military command are equally as dogmatic about the importance of leadership. Field-Marshal Sir Bernard L. Montgomery said, "Although there is much to explain about my doctrine of command it can be summed up in one word: Leadership!" General Harry A. Smith, an early Commandant of the Army's Command and General Staff College, said, "Military leadership is not the most interesting part of the profession of arms but it is the most important."


"The most critical single human factor in the direction and application of military means is leadership."¹

To see that leadership has been the object of much inquiry and reflection, one need only scan leadership studies such as those of O'Sullivan² or Browne and Cohn.³ Lyndall Urwick said that in 1955 he was handed a bibliography of 750 articles about leadership published in American scientific and business periodicals during the period 1950-55.⁴ Consequently, any comparison of military command leadership with American industrial management leadership is complicated by the sheer volume of literature on the subject as well as by the fact that the great part of this literature has "...little in the way of common assumptions and


² Ibid., particularly see "Selected Bibliography" pp. 56-54.


theses. However, leadership is not only an object of scientific and academic interest; to its practitioners it is a practical matter for day-to-day operations.

A Method of Comparison

The method of comparison chosen for this paper is to compare the declared leadership concepts and principles of some practitioners, the United States Army and a segment of American industrial management.

There seem to be two obvious arguments against comparing military and industrial leadership by comparing declared principles. First, it could be argued that there is no scientific proof that leadership principles exist. This argument can be answered by saying that, if the declarers of such principles actually use them as principles, that is, as guides to action, leadership principles do then exist for the declarers. At least for this study, the argument about the existence or nonexistence of "true principles" for leadership in the abstract will be ignored. The other argument against comparing declared principles is that, although such principles may be easily isolated for the Army, generalizing about leadership principles for the

1 Browne and Cohn, op. cit., p. i.
hundreds of thousands of heterogeneous industrial firms in the United States would pose validity problems unless rather extensive enumeration were used. The approach used in this study is an attempt to escape between the horns of the dilemma by studying the leadership policies of a limited number of firms. Ten firms were surveyed; usable information was received from eight. Of the eight, six were giants, leaders in their respective industries by any standards; their employees total about 800,000 and their aggregate revenue for 1964 was nearly $16,000,000,000. The other firms are smaller, with fewer than 4,000 employees each and about $120,000,000 each in revenue for 1964. The list of firms surveyed is in the appendix. Although the number of firms is small, the impact of these particular firms on the American economy and on the American working force is considerable. Therefore, validly drawn generalizations about their leadership principles should have some importance despite the incompleteness of the induction.

**What Are Leadership Principles?**

In the fields of leadership, management, and command, whose relationships to each other are imprecisely defined in the body of literature on the subjects, the
attitudes toward principles are wide ranging. For leadership particularly, the attitudes of writers toward principles vary as leadership is viewed. Those who view leadership as an "...exact science....based upon eternal principles, [or] permanent facts...."1 seem to treat principles as immutable laws. Those writers who concern themselves with leadership as a practical art generally call for a situational evaluation and application of the "principles and treat them as guides to action."2 Those writers who treat leadership as "...a phenomenon related to ....interpersonal capacity for socio-group participation,"3 subject to investigation by such branches of science as psychology and sociology but not itself a body of knowledge, tend to look on the principles as "...a series of ad hoc maxims unsupported by either sound theory or empirical data."4 The three positions described by no means


constitute a complete listing of mutually exclusive positions on the subject of leadership principles, but rather represent the extremities of the area in which most writers on the subject seem to be found.

The Army as well as a number of the industrial firms surveyed have compiled lists of leadership rules that they have published under the title of "principles". If Gellerman was correct, a "...successful manager is guided by results and hard facts..."1 The assumption will be that the organizations have published principles because the principles work—or at least the management believes that they work—whatever they are in theory.

Some firms have not published "principles", but most of these firms have definite leadership policies, either expressed directly or as manager training policies or manager evaluation policies. By examining the firms' policies, sets of principles can be derived if it is assumed that the principles are general guides to action.

---

Leadership Defined

In setting out to compare leadership concepts and principles, one finds a certain amount of difficulty at the very beginning. A concept would seem to include a definition of what is apprehended in the concept, and a comparison of the definitions would seem to be an integral part of the comparison of concepts. Nevertheless, it also seems extremely useful to have some understanding of what constitutes leadership before the comparison is begun. However, a search through a portion of the great mass of leadership literature for an authoritative and acceptable definition of leadership reveals that there are nearly as many definitions of leadership as there are writers on the subject.

Leadership has been defined in a variety of ways. In earlier studies, it was quite frequently defined as a set of character traits. O'Sullivan asserts that, "more than nine-tenths of all expert studies on leadership since 1919 have been devoted to a search for the characteristics of the leader."¹ Harold J. Leavitt refers to the same tendency and then says, "But as the concept of leadership became more sophisticated, most

¹O'Sullivan, op. cit., p. 25.
people abandoned that idea...."¹ For Leavitt, leadership is "...a job, a function, not a set of characteristics....principally the job of building and policing an information system that solves problems."² Roger Bellows defines leadership as "arrangement of the situation so that group results may be achieved."³ Bernard Bass writes that "when the goal of one member of a group, A, is that of changing another member, B, ...A's effort to obtain the goal is leadership."⁴ Their definitions, as well as many others that can be found in management and psychology textbooks seem to attempt to include all leadership, and, consequently, the definitions are so broad that they are of little use to the practitioner in either industrial management or military service. The theoreticians might well heed the words of Harold Koontz who warned that "...a worthwhile theory must recognize that it is but part of a larger universe of knowledge and theory need not actually encompass

²Ibid., p. 266.
that universe."¹

Recent studies acknowledge four major aspects of leadership: (1) the leader, (2) the follower(s), (3) the situation or environment, and (4) the goal(s).² Chester Barnard pointed out a fifth major aspect—the organization, "...the instrumentality of action so far as the leader is concerned, and it is the indispensable instrumentality."³ By combining the five aspects one can form a definition of leadership that will at least serve as a foundation for the comparisons to be made in the remainder of this study, whatever the shortcomings the definition may have in theoretical application to all leadership.

As a basis for further investigation then, leadership is: the activity of leaders in influencing and directing the activities of people in organizations toward the attainment of specified goals.


Purists may argue against the use of "directing" on the basis that it has been a generally recognized "function" of management since Luther Gulick coined "POSDCORB" (planning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting, budgeting)\(^1\), and hence should not be used in a definition of leadership, one of the tools to be used in performing the functions. However, Barnard used "guide" in his definition of leadership\(^2\), and Gulick's co-editor, Urwick, used "guidance" in his definition.\(^3\) The American College Dictionary lists "direct" as a synonym for "guide" and "direction" as one for "guidance."\(^4\) The use of "directing" in the definition of leadership appears to have some validity.

Some Important Similarities and Differences

"Directing" conveys a bit more than simple guiding; it connotes authority. In the leadership that is to be examined, one of the fundamental similarities is that

\(^1\)Gulick and Urwick, *op. cit.*, p. 13.


\(^3\)Urwick, *Leadership in the Twentieth Century*, p. 38.

the people in titular leadership positions, both in management and in the Army, are in positions of authority, and at least some of the authority is passed to the leader from outside the group that he is to lead. That is, the authority is passed to the leader from the organization. Further, at least in part, the authority is recognized by law. In contrast, leadership in social groups and informal organizations generally draws all of its authority from within the group, and often times lacks any legal basis. Some writers disparage authority as an aspect of leadership. Nevertheless, authority is a distinguishing aspect of the leadership situation for both management and the Army. This is not to imply that leadership may not be exhibited by persons not in positions of authority; exploiting such leadership is a task of the leaders in positions of authority.

If the presence of authority marks a similarity in the leadership situation for industrial managers and military commanders, the legal bases, nature, and extent of the authority mark many differences. It is not the intent of the writer to explore authority in detail, but some of the major differences should be mentioned. The legal bases for the authority of the

---

1 For example, see chap. 2, "The Poverty of Authority" in Bellows, op. cit., pp. 16-30.
military commander are the statutes enacted by the Congress under the authority given it by the Constitution to "...make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval forces." The authority of the commander is extensive and reaches into almost all aspects of the lives of the people being led. On the other hand, his authority to dismiss people from the military service is limited. The legal basis for the authority of the industrial manager is the "master-servant" (in some cases the "agent-principle") relationship of the common law as expanded by statutes and court rulings of the various jurisdictions. The authority of the manager is far more limited than that of the military commander and generally extends only to the working place during the hours of work. However, the manager's authority to dismiss employees is generally greater than that of the military commander.

Another obvious difference in the leadership situations is in the tasks to be performed. Industrial management has the task of producing and marketing a usable product or service at a profit. In simple

1U.S., Constitution, Art. 1, sec. 8.

terms, the task of the Army is to be prepared to fight and win whatever wars in which the country may become engaged. War is, in the words of an infantry private, "...too damned serious....it's hell and they're getting men killed and wounded every minute and they're miserable and they're suffering....it's a matter more serious than they'll ever be able to understand."¹ Some may argue, as Robert Knapp seems to, that war has outgrown the need to worry about leadership to effect MacDonald's private because of "...the monstrous growth of the material aspects of warfare....to dominate....the battlefield."² Drawing different lessons from recent wars, S. L. A. Marshall believes that "...we learned anew that man is supreme, that it is the soldier who fights who wins the battles...."³ In January of 1966 when the United States finds that the great mass of its power to influence the situation in Viet Nam must be funneled through a relatively small number of men on the battlefield, Marshall's contention that "the battlefield is

the epitome of war...all else in war exists but to serve the forces of the battlefield... would appear to merit support. The military commander has the goal of victory on the battlefield, and the differences between the tasks required to reach that goal and the tasks required to reach the goal of profit in a business enterprise mark a difference in the leadership situation. The principle difference is probably in the violence and distastefulness of the battlefield where leadership such as Tead's "...influencing people to cooperate toward some goal which they come to find desirable," appears inadequate. Although the goal of victory is desirable, its desirability is so clouded on the battlefield that it apparently has limited effect on the leadership situation.

Summary

As background for a comparison of the leadership concepts and principles of the United States Army with

1Ibid., p. 27.


the leadership concepts and principles of a segment of American industrial management, a tentative definition of leadership has been proposed, and some fundamental similarities and differences have been identified. The comparison will be of concepts and principles derived from declared principles or declared leadership policies. Hopefully, the comparison will prove interesting for leaders from either activity, but it may prove useful for those leaders that move from industry to the Army or from the Army to industry.
CHAPTER II

THE ARMY'S LEADERSHIP CONCEPT AND PRINCIPLES

After considerable study of World War II battle problems, S. L. A. Marshall wrote:

I came to see more fully and more surely than I have expressed it in the tactical portions of this book, that great victories of the United States have pivoted on the acts of courage and intelligence of a very few individuals. The time always comes in battle when the decisions of statesmen and of generals can no longer affect the issue and when it is not within the power of our national wealth to change the balance decisively.¹

Fourteen years later, in the foreword to the leadership manual for the Army facing the potential problems of the nuclear battlefield, General George Decker, then Chief of Staff, wrote:

How the soldier, acting alone and in small groups, will react to the increased challenges, stresses, and strains of tomorrow's battlefield will largely determine the effectiveness with which our combat power is applied, our combat elements supported, and in the final analysis, the overall outcome of the war.²

The Army's leadership doctrine has the goal of solving the problem to which Marshall and General Decker

¹Marshall, op. cit., p. 208.
pointed—the problem of how to apply the power of the nation through individuals in battle. The purpose of this chapter is to examine the Army's published leadership doctrine of today in order to provide a basis of comparison with the leadership doctrine of American industrial management.

The Army's Definition of Leadership

The official Army definition of leadership is:

The art of influencing and directing men in such a way as to obtain their willing obedience, confidence, respect, and loyal cooperation in order to accomplish the mission.\(^1\)

The definition does not differ fundamentally from the tentative definition of leadership given in Chapter 1, except that it implies that the "influencing and "directing" must be done in some way that creates a particular relationship between the leader and the followers as a necessary step toward reaching the goal of the organization.

Leadership, Command, and Management in the Army

Before proceeding further with an examination of the Army's concept of leadership, it will be useful to have some understanding of the Army's use of the terms

"leadership," "command," and "management."

Command is defined by the Dictionary of United States Army Terms as "the authority vested in an individual of the armed forces for the direction, coordination and control of military forces."¹ Command in the military sense is "lawful authority,"² it is formal "headship" which may or may not represent leadership depending on the ability and behavior of the individual commander.³ Management is not defined in the Army's Dictionary of Terms, but it is defined in an army regulation entitled Army Management Doctrine as "a process of establishing and attaining objectives to carry out responsibilities."⁴ The Army's leadership manual defines management as "The process whereby the resources of men, money, material, and facilities are utilized to accomplish the missions and tasks of the


²U.S. Army, Military Leadership, FM 22-100, p. 4.


The manual goes on to list the functions of management as "planning, organizing, coordinating, directing, and controlling." The regulation lists the same functions as well as some additional ones, among which are "the motivation of personnel...and the development of workable relationships." At first glance it might appear that management embraces command because its listed functions add at least planning and organization to the directing coordinating and controlling of command, and certainly the function of motivating personnel seems to include the exercise of leadership. However, the regulation rejects the idea with the terse statement, "Management is inherent in command."4

The Army's senior tactical school, the Command and General Staff College, has attempted to clarify the relationship by denoting leadership and management as "coordinate tools of command."5

---

1 U.S. Army, Military Leadership, FM 22-100, p. 4.
2 Ibid.
4 Ibid.
material calls management "the science of employing men and material in the economical and effective accomplishment of the mission,"\(^1\) and contrasts it with leadership, another "prime tool of the commander designed to motivate his manpower resource."\(^2\) The explanation seems quite tidy, and the relationship seems acceptable as the Army's unique view of leadership and management despite the inconsistency with the "Management Doctrine" regulation which included motivation as a function of management. However, other doctrinal voices have spoken, and not all of them have tended to make the distinction clearer.

The United States Military Academy teaches that management "is a component of leadership."\(^3\) The Academy's contention is somewhat supported by the official Army leadership manual which lists "apply sound management principles"\(^4\) as a technique for applying one of the leadership principles; however, the general gist of the manual seems to support the Command and General Staff College explanation. The United States Army

\(^1\text{Ibid.}, \text{p. LL-4.}\) \(^2\text{Ibid.}, \text{p. IPI-12.}\) 
\(^3\text{U.S. Military Academy, } \text{Military Leadership}, \text{p. 11.}\) 
\(^4\text{U.S. Army, } \text{Military Leadership,} \text{F: 22-100, p. 27.}\)
Management School believes "...management is leadership."\(^1\) The point is further amplified in one of the school's textbooks which says, "Command, management and leadership are substantially the same. In almost every respect, the terms are virtually synonymous."\(^2\)

The entire body of official and semi-official literature on the command-management-leadership relationship seems hazy and confusing enough to deserve the remark that General Williston B. Palmer made about the Management Doctrine regulation. He wrote, "I remain confused as to the intended relationship of these rules to the exercise of military command...the AR is groping around in the 'gray area' between the traditional jargon of command and the jargon of so-called 'management engineers.'"\(^3\) On the other hand, perhaps the impact of the entire body of literature is to drive home the point that the relationship is a


fundamentally complex one that cannot be explained clearly. The person who reads all of the conflicting literature can simply take refuge in Emerson's contention that "...foolish consistency is the hobgoblin of little minds...".

The Army's Concept of Leadership

The concept of military leadership envisions a leader who is aware of his responsibilities, capitalizes on his strong traits, corrects his weaknesses, and is guided by the principles of leadership. He applies appropriate actions and orders to influence and direct his subordinates. He must be able to evaluate his unit in light of the indications of leadership in order to mold members of the group into an effective unit.

In the ultimate sense, military leadership is not inherent; it depends upon traits that can be developed and upon application of principles and techniques that can be learned. It is an art that can be acquired, developed, and practiced in varying degrees by anyone properly motivated and possessing the mental and physical ability, and the moral integrity expected of a commissioned officer or noncommissioned officer. Developing this art is a continuing process.

The two statements are both captioned "Concept of Leadership" in the Army's current leadership training.

---


2U.S. Army, Military Leadership, FM 22-100, p. 6.

3Ibid., p. 2.
manual, and, with the Army's definition of leadership, can probably be characterized as the Army's doctrinal concept of leadership.

A first reading could easily create the impression that the concept is one of a rather simple "cookbook" formula, the success of which is dependent solely on the actions of the leader. In particular the concept seems to ignore the interaction of the group and the leader pointed out by Likert, and the emphasis on leadership traits apparently overlooks the fact that "past attempts to define leadership in terms of leader characteristics were generally fruitless." However, the words of the concept were taken from a textbook meant for military men, and it assumes a knowledge of the military context. Before settling for any judgment that the concept is inconsistent with recent findings in the behavioral sciences, the concept must be examined more closely in the light of the military atmosphere.

An Integrated Concept

The concept is an integrated one; that is, it is not confined to any single approach to leadership or

---


2Tannenbaum, Wechler, and Kassarik, op. cit., p. 34.
leadership theory. It recognizes the leader and his traits, but it also recognizes the group—organized groups or "units", and the situation—the military situation. The concept is consistent with Cecil Gibb's theory that leadership is a function of the leader's personality traits and the situation in interaction. For example, the words "willing obedience", "confidence" and "respect" in the Army's definition of leadership reflect the desired attitude of the group toward the leader. As McGregor said, "Confidence..... rests heavily on the subordinates belief in the integrity of the superior." "Integrity" typifies what the Army means by "leadership traits." Some important aspects of the concept are worth expanding.

1For discussions of some of the various approaches to leadership see Browne and Cohn, op. cit., pp. 3-49. See also Joseph H. Trickett, The Psychology of Leadership (Santa Clara: University of Santa Clara Press, 1965) pp. 3-5. Some of the different approaches are: (1) the traitist (2) the behavioral (3) the situational (4) the group (5) the human relations.


The Group

The concept recognizes that results are achieved through group action; it recognizes the requirement for teamwork at every level of military operations. The leadership "indicators" mentioned are "morale, esprit de corps, discipline, and proficiency;"\(^1\) all but one of them are measures of team cohesion and effectiveness, and the one, "morale", is certainly interrelated with the others. The leaders' basic responsibilities are two: "the accomplishment of the mission, and the welfare of the men."\(^2\) This aspect of the concept is not unlike Likert's "task and maintenance functions"\(^3\) for groups; the mission is a unit or group task, and the men are always part of a unit or group. The concept recognizes not only the interdependence of members (including the leader) in given groups, but the interdependence of groups. The "mission" is the unifier because it injects that idea "... that fits right along with leadership, ... followership. Everybody who is a leader or a commander of any echelon is also a follower."\(^4\) The interdependence and

\(^1\)Ibid., p. 33
\(^2\)Ibid., p. 7.
\(^3\)Likert, op. cit., pp. 173-176.
necessity for mutual trust follows from the imperative requirement to decentralize in military operations. "The man who cannot bring himself to trust the judgment and good faith of other men cannot command very long,... there are generals who failed because they did not learn this lesson well when they were captains."¹

Despite the emphasis on teamwork, the concept also recognizes that in an activity where the goals of the organization may threaten the self-preservation of the individual, "perfect integration of organizational requirements and individual goals and needs is, of course, not a realistic objective..."² Consequently, it is also concerned with the members of the group as individuals--as men.

Human Relations

The concept is a human relations approach that is fundamental to American military doctrine but "... does not imply mollycoddling."³ As General Bruce Clarke stated it:

A commander and a leader owes a responsibility to his men to require them to do things which

¹Marshall, op. cit., p. 189.
²McGregor, op. cit., p. 55.
³U.S. Military Academy, Military Leadership, pp. 18-19.
are for their own benefit—and for the benefit of the command as a whole—even though the requirements are not popular.¹

Or in the words of S. L. A. Marshall:

The art of leading in operations large or small is the art of dealing with humanity, or working diligently on behalf of men, of being sympathetic to them, but equally of insisting that they make a square facing toward their own problems.²

Leadership Can Be Learned

The concept embodies a pragmatic approach to the problem of leadership that Peter Drucker expressed as "...making common men into uncommon men."³ The Army has thousands of commander's jobs—positions that require leadership—that must be filled every day. The Army cannot wait for its "...tremendous amount of scientific research aimed at the selection of leaders"⁴ to produce the perfect solution for choosing men to fill the leaders' jobs. The concept assumes that leadership can be developed in men in order to fill the leadership positions.

¹Clarke, op. cit., p. 22.


Some restrictions come to light when the Army's concept is examined to see who can learn to lead "...anyone properly motivated and possessing the mental and physical ability, and the moral integrity expected of a commissioned or noncommissioned officer."1 (Italics mine.) The possible impact of the restrictions can be appreciated in view of the fact that 4.6 million of the nation's current crop of 17.9 million draft registrants failed to qualify for military service because of physical or mental deficiencies.2 It seems safe to assume that some additional number will lack the physical, mental and moral qualifications for leadership. The concept recognizes the need "...that the military leader be a man who can make decisions under extreme situations of stress, physical exhaustion, and varying mental pressures."3 The modifiers or qualifiers delineating those who can acquire leadership also recognize that America expects to perceive its military leaders in a particular role,4 that of one "having been specially

1U.S. Army, Military Leadership, FM 22-100, p. 2.
4For discussions of perception and roles in leadership, see U.S. Military Academy, Military Leadership, pp. 31-32; Chris Argyris, Personality and Organization
chosen by the United States to sustain the dignity and 
integrity of its sovereign power...expected to be recognized as a worthy symbol of all that is best in 
the national character."¹ The tools of military leadership can be acquired by those who are otherwise fit 
to fulfill the role of a military leader and who have the will to lead in the military situation.

The Situation

In the words, "appropriate actions and orders to influence and direct", the concept recognizes that the 
military leadership situation has an infinite number of potential variations each of which will require sound judgment and carefully considered action on the leader's part. The frame of reference varies with the level of command, but regardless of the level, the commander "must be identified by his troops as a dynamic, vibrant source of direction, guidance and motivation rather than as a detached and obscure source of authority."²

Excellent contemporary examples in high positions are

---


the Chief of Staff, General Harold K. Johnson¹ and General William C. Westmoreland, Commander of United States Forces in Viet Nam.²

Authority

The Army's concept recognizes that military leadership is exercised in an atmosphere of command which "signifies a scope of authority to require ultimate disregard of individual self-interest if such self-interest is...in contradiction to the group interest."³ Although the Army cannot be separated from the democratic society that it represents, the society recognizes that its Army operates in an area that "...demands an intensity of discipline beyond anything demanded in other spheres."⁴ Consequently, because the society has entrusted its military commanders with unique and heavy responsibilities, it has also entrusted them with a considerable amount of authority to aid them in fulfilling those responsibilities. Unfortunately, "too often, 'authority' has been

¹TIME, Dec. 10, 1965, pp. 30-34.
³U.S. Army Command and General Staff College "Introduction to High Command," K1000, (unpublished lesson summary issued to students, Command and General Staff College, 1965).
⁴James D. Mooney, Principles of Organization.
confused with 'authoritarian' which is merely a particular type of authority."¹ A commonly held but outdated view of military leadership is that "formal authority along with the system of penalties, is relied on to obtain effective action in the achievement of goals. The military hierarchy can operate in this manner because participants cannot escape...."² Command authority is the lawful right to require action of others, but a subordinate willing to pay the price can always reject the requirements of the command authority. The stresses and dangers of combat try the wills of even the strongest men. "If nothing but the fear of punishment were depended upon to hold men to the line during extreme trial, the result would be wholesale mutiny and a situation altogether beyond the control of leadership."³ The effectiveness of authority

---


³Dept. of Defense, The Armed Forces Officer, p. 15-16.
rests on its acceptance rather than its lawfulness.  

The uninitiated who feel that leadership gives way to authority during times of extreme stress need only read the vivid accounts of command leadership under battle conditions in Korea reported in S. L. A. Marshall's *The River and the Gauntlet*.  

In almost every incident Marshall reported, the leader's behavior was obviously more important than his formal orders in rallying men during a perilous situation. The relationship seems to be recognized in the word order of the concept—"appropriate actions" are listed ahead of "orders." "Written and verbal information may be, at times, the least important information." The concept in application is explained in the words of General Clarke:

I have conscientiously tried throughout my career to live and conduct my job in such a way that I didn't exercise control of my organization through channels of command. I exercised it through channels of suggestion.

---


4Clarke, *op. cit.*, p. 38.
Yet there is no denying that authority is present and is an integral part of the Army's concept. Robert Dubin seems to express the starting point for meshing authority and leadership:

Members of an organization understand authority and leadership and their functions. The problem is not to destroy authority or get rid of leadership. That would destroy the organization itself. The real problem is to make leadership and the exercise of authority operate according to the accepted values and beliefs of our society.  

The authority is meant to be used when required, and at times it may be required in its most naked fashion. As McGregor stated it:

If authority is the only tool in the...[Leader's] kit, he cannot hope to achieve his purposes very well, but it does not follow that he ought to throw away this tool. There are many times when he will need it, when other tools will not be appropriate for his purposes.

In summary, it can be said that the Army's concept of leadership is an integrated human relations one that recognizes the interaction of the leader and the group in a situation—a particular military situation with its background of authority. The concept assumes that, given certain prerequisites, military leadership and the personality traits that help make

---


2 McGregor, op. cit., p. 31.
it effective can be developed. Further, it assumes that there are certain general principles that serve as guides to action for leaders.

The Principles of Leadership

Certain general rules which have stood the test of time appear to have guided the conduct and action of successful leaders of the past...The fact that every leader has not always made full use of each one of these principles does not make them any less valid. Although their application may vary with the situation, a commander who disregards them is risking failure.1

The principles:

1. Be technically and tactically proficient.
2. Know yourself and seek self-improvement.
3. Know your men and look out for their welfare.
5. Set the example.
6. Insure that the task is understood, supervised, and accomplished.
7. Train your men as a team.
8. Make sound and timely decisions.
9. Develop a sense of responsibility in your subordinates.
10. Employ your command in accordance with its capabilities.

1U.S. Army, Military Leadership, FM 22-100, p. 27.
11. Seek responsibility and take responsibility for your actions.¹

The origin of the principles is not clear. Except for minor changes in wording, they are the same as those listed in the 1951 version of the leadership manual.² The West Point leadership textbook reports that the principles "...have been derived from three sources--philosophical beliefs, experience of military men, and empirical studies..." and that they represent the best judgment of experienced officers in our Army today."³ The text goes on to explain that not all of the principles have been verified by experimental research but that studies of military leadership have tended to verify many of the principles.⁴ An earlier Military Academy text contains survey results that tend to verify those of the principles that are concerned with the leaders relations with the group.⁵

¹Ibid., p. 28.
²U.S. Army, Leadership, FM 22-100, pp. 18-31.
⁴Ibid., p. 68.
Whether tested by time or of scientific experiments, it is clear that the principles are not new nor are they, except in the numbering, uniquely military. In 1935, Ordway Tead, spoke of "a constant application of the principles...," and, although he did not list his principles in a numbered sequence, his book has corresponding rules for nearly all of the Army's principles.²

Again, as in the case of the Army's concept of leadership, the appearance of a total lack of sophistication and the almost platitudinous nature of the principles might tend to obscure the importance of their application in the complex phenomenon of leadership. The questioning attitude toward the simply expressed, traditional approach to leadership is well stated in the words of Professor Trickett:

We are living in an already-changed and fast-changing society—one that is generally not satisfied with the folklore of the past.... From this movement must come...new leaders, with new vision, new humility, and new competence.... [George Roman] says that "what a leader needs to have is not a set of rules but a good method of analyzing the social situation in which he must act."³

The attitude is somewhat reflected in the words of the

1Tead, op. cit., p. vii.
2Ibid., chap. iv-ix and chap. xii.
3Trickett, op. cit., p. 2.
Military Academy's textbook: "...principles that may be used as guides for military leaders.... Though they have not been experimentally verified, they provide good guide lines for the young leader in the development of his own leadership ability." (Italics mine.)\(^1\) However, the doctrinal field manual makes no apologies for the unsophisticated language of the principles, and it repeatedly implies that the principles are applicable at all levels of command. The chapter titled "Leadership in High Commands" stresses the "...essential skills of the higher commander in applying the principles of leadership throughout the command."\(^2\) Further, in listing techniques for applying the principles, the manual gives indications of the broad scope of ability required for meaningful application.\(^3\)

The Principles Examined

An exhaustive analysis of the principles is beyond the scope of this paper but some amplification seems necessary as background for comparison with industrial management leadership.

To be technically and tactically proficient simply

\(^1\) U.S. Military Academy, *Military Leadership*, p. 67.
\(^2\) U.S. Army, *Military Leadership*, FM 21-100, p. 52.\(^3\)
technical knowledge "...is of unquestioned importance....
\[but\] is not a substitute, ....for the other essential qualities of leadership,"¹ probably best expresses the doctrinal point of the principle.

Know yourself and seek self-improvement seems to be more a rule of life than a principle of leadership. Philosophers through the ages have been urging men to know himself,² but the magnitude of the problem is expressed by Karl Jaspers: "Man is fundamentally more than he can know about himself."³ The principle is an invitation to the leader, as it should be to any man, to determine what he "...should seek in himself in order to be four-square with his own life and all others who are related to his personal situation."⁴

Know your men and look out for their welfare has a deeper significance than the traditional admonition to the platoon leader to know the names of his men and end to see that they get a hot meal and dry socks. The

¹Bernard, op. cit., p. 93.


soldiers' needs that the leader is to be concerned with are the "physical, security, social approval, and recognition needs," which are similar to Maslow's hierarchy—physiological, safety, social, ego, and self-fulfillment. The common stress on the physical needs of the soldier is understandable because he "...is dependent upon his commander for the maintenance of his rights and material welfare." Nevertheless, as Marshall recognized, even in combat situations the stress can shift away from the mere physical needs.

The principle seems to connote "face-to-face leadership...inadequate...to the problem of organization in an ever more complex world," useful for the first-line supervisor but "...actually detrimental to the effective functioning of the high level." Suojanen's criticism is partially based on the fact that "...it is impossible for the chief executive of the large organization to see every participant often enough to make such a policy"

1U.S. Army, Military Leadership, FM 22-100, p. 11.
3Command and General Staff College, Military Psychology and Leadership, 1950/8, p. 1.32.
4Marshall, Men Against Fire, p. 105.
5Suojanen, loc. cit., p. 22.
6Ibid., p. 19.
The fact of the matter seems to be that communications in the "ever more complex world" can assist commanders at all levels in knowing their men and in having their concern for the men's welfare known, for example, Time's picture of the Chief of Staff of the Army talking to a group of trainees. In the opinion of one writer, we are in "an age of personal leadership science and technology have provided the senior officer with all the ingredients necessary."  

However, the central point of the principle is that every leader comes into regular, direct contact with some group of men, and it is through this group that he influences the leadership climate. As Urwick put it:

It is not what a leader says, still less what he writes, that influences subordinates. It is what he is. And they judge what he is by what he does. He can issue circulars galore about care for subordinates.... But care for subordinates in his organization will reflect precisely and exactly his own personal attitudes and behavior towards those responsible to him directly.

Keep your men informed is the principle that says

---

1Ibid., p. 21.
4Urwick, Leadership in the Twentieth Century, p. 10.
that group cohesion is self-evidently tied to communication. The assumption is that the soldier "...can better understand what is expected of him when he understands the mission of the unit."¹ This truism would seem to apply to any activity, but it has deeper and more urgent application in the Army. In combat, group cohesion is under attack by fear and physical deprivation, as well as the actual loss of members of the group who become casualties; additionally the means of communication often break down. Yet, it is precisely at that point that application of the principle is most important. In investigating seven incidents of battlefield panic, Marshall discovered that "one or two men made a sudden run to the rear which others in the vicinity did not understand. But it was the lack of information rather than the sight of running men which was the crux of the danger."² (Italics mine.)

Both Likert and Argyris attack the one-way communication concept³ implied in the principle. In relating the nature of highly effective groups, Likert stresses the importance of two way communications: "Just as there is high motivation to communicate, there is

¹U.S. Army, Military Leadership, FM 22-100, p. 30.
²Marshall, Men Against Fire, p. 146.
correspondingly strong motivation to receive communications."¹ That the Army is moving toward more emphasis on two-way communication in leadership can be seen in an article in a recent issue of the Army Information Digest which, incidentally, is the official magazine of the Army and is one of the techniques for applying the principle by the highest level of leadership. The author calls for "shoulder-to-shoulder communication which among other things means careful listening on the part of the commander."²

Let the example be one of the principles that seem patently self-evident; as Aesop's crab said, "Do but set the example, and I will follow you."³ The principle has more depth than simply showing the followers good workmanship. It is a reminder to the leader that "of all the qualities inherent in a respected person, ... the one dominant characteristic is self-discipline."⁴ If the leader is to expect loyalty, courage,

¹Likert, op. cit., p. 168.
and self-sacrifice from his men he must demonstrate the same qualities. "He must be a part of the climate of values, relatively unchanging, dependable, taken for granted." 

Insure that the task is understood, supervised, and accomplished, is another expression that the concept of the mission is the unifying element in Army doctrine. The leader must understand his own mission, and he must know that his subordinates understand their mission. A snappy salute and blind obedience to misunderstood orders is not the answer. The principle is an injunction to communicate with both superiors and subordinates. "Orders—to be obeyed—must first be understood, and understanding is helped by the free flow of ideas in discussion." 

Supervision is vital because in war armies "often...encounter obstacles which were impossible to foresee...and can triumph over such obstacles only with very great exertion...." The principle is not an invitation to oversupervision because the job can best be done when subordinates "...use their imagination in developing their own techniques in accomplishment of..." 

---


2Darwin, loc. cit.

tasks or missions."\(^1\) Perhaps most important, is the appeal of the principle for perseverance. "To grasp the spirit of orders is not less important than to ... keep faith with the contract."\(^2\) It is not the striving, but the winning that is important. "We must not despair of success in war until the last moment."

Train your men as a team. "Teamwork is the key to successful operations; it starts in the smallest unit and carries through to the largest organization."\(^3\)

The principle points out that military operations require teamwork in the most complete sense of the term. Every man is "... a factor in the equation which expresses the achievement or failure.... one man cannot make or break an Army, ... but he can help break it."\(^4\) Accomplishing the mission requires not only understanding, but ability, if every member of the team is to carry out his part of the task. The ability comes through training.

"Make sound and timely decisions" sounds like a superfluous addition to the principles. Who, in his

---


\(^2\) Dept. of Defense, *The Armed Forces Officer*, p. 137.

\(^3\) Clausewitz, op. cit., p. 69.


\(^5\) Dept. of Defense, *The Armed Forces Officer*, p. 159.
right mind would attempt to make unsound or untimely decisions? The principle is not so shallow as it seems. War is a dynamic activity conducted in a climate of confusion. Decisions are made on what is, at best, incomplete information. "Our uncertainty about the situation at a given moment is not limited to the conditions of the enemy only but of our own army as well...new doubts will arise. We shall want to wait ...

But the leader cannot indulge in the luxury of doubt and indecision. He "...must be able to reason logically under the most trying conditions and decide quickly what action is necessary...".

Develop a sense of responsibility in your subordinates to provide the basis for the decentralization and individual initiative that modern war demands. Teamwork and its accompanying esprit are "...the product of a thriving mutual confidence between the leader and the led, founded on the faith that together they possess a superior quality and capability." What Marshall said of only one infantry company applies to commands of any

1Clausewitz, op. cit., p. 63.

2U.S. Army, Military Leadership, FM 22-100, p. 34.


4Dept. of Defense, The Armed Forces Officer, p. 160.
...no commander is capable of the actual leading of an entire company in combat, the spread of strength and the great variety of the commander's problems are together beyond any one man's compass, and that therefore, a part of his problem in combat is to determine which are the moral leaders among his men, and having found them give all support and encouragement to their efforts...these ideas are basic in command.¹

Employ your command in accordance with its capabilities is another principle that says more than its initial platitudinous ring indicates. It says that the leader must know the capabilities of his command—a large order in itself—and then get the best out of those capabilities. He must know that uncertainties in the situation and shortages of combat support and logistical support "...must be considered as the normalities of combat."² If he calls for help that he does not need, he is further complicating the situation of the whole command. On the other hand, the principle recognizes that "to commit one's forces to desperate, unhelped enterprises when there is support at hand that may be had for the asking, may be one road to glory, but it is not the path to success in war."³

Seek responsibility and take responsibility for

¹Marshall, Men Against Fire, p. 62.
²U.S. Military Academy, Military Leadership, p. 344.
³Dept. of Defense, The Armed Forces Officer, p. 135.
for your actions is the corollary of developing responsibility in subordinates; it is part of setting the example. But it is more; it is what Emerson recognized when he wrote, "The strength of character is cumulative."¹ "...The difference in the leader and the non-leader is the degree to which the leader can accept exceptional stresses and still think and carry out his mission."² The leader assures himself that he can accept stress by accepting it. "There is no substitute for the experience of recognizing and seizing opportunities, or for making one's own place unaided and against interference and obstacles; for these kinds of ability are precisely those that followers expect in leaders."³

Leadership Traits and Command Leadership

The Army's concept of leadership lays some emphasis on the leader's traits despite a tendency in present day leadership literature to cast doubt on the "trait theory" of leadership.⁴

¹Emerson, loc. cit., p. 391.
²Ritchey, loc. cit., p. 34.
³Barnard, Organization and Management, p. 106.
⁴Trickett, op. cit., p. 6.
The Trait Controversy

The leadership trait controversy can probably best be illustrated by comparing Cleeton and Mason's idea that "the most satisfactory analysis of leadership provides a list of traits more or less commonly understood and recognized"¹ with O'Sullivan's findings. O'Sullivan made a chart showing lists of traits compiled from ninety-three leadership studies. Of a total of forty-two traits, only two appear on more than twenty lists, and twenty-seven of the traits appear on fewer than ten of the lists.² The inability of researchers to agree on a list of traits have lead some writers to acknowledge that the leader's traits are important but that a list of traits cannot be made because the importance of the traits varies with the situation and with the people being led.³ Alvin Gouldner has suggested that the researchers have been too engrossed with the outward manifestation of the traits to identify the actual leadership

²O'Sullivan, op. cit., p. 55.
Traits in the Army

The Army has not taken any doctrinal position in this theoretical argument. Instead it has taken the pragmatic view that "leadership traits are distinguishing qualities which, if demonstrated in daily activities, help the commander to earn the respect, confidence, willing obedience, and loyal cooperation of his men."\(^2\) (Italics mine.) The traits do not necessarily distinguish the leader from the follower. Many of the traits "...are those which would be desired of the good soldier, regardless of rank."\(^3\)

The leadership traits according to the leadership manual are:\(^4\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>Trait</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bearing</td>
<td>Integrity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Courage-Moral</td>
<td>Judgment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisiveness</td>
<td>Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependability</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)Gouldner, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 40.


\(^3\)U.S. Military Academy, \textit{Military Leadership}, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 63.

Endurance
Enthusiasm
Initiative

Loyalty
Tact
Unselfishness

Although the leadership manual devotes a chapter to explaining the traits, most of the meanings are straightforward and are consistent with the concept and principles of leadership. Several of the traits have special military importance.

Bearing, has a uniquely military connotation. It means not only the manner of carriage and appearance but also includes personal conduct, manner, voice, and language. It implies self-discipline and emotional control. There are some obvious overlaps with courage, tact, judgment, and integrity. It is the sum of the outward manifestations of soldierly presence that help men identify their natural leaders in times of stress. When the issue is in doubt and men are fearful, "could one clear commanding voice be raised—even though it be the voice of an individual without titular authority—they would obey, or at least the strong characters would do so and the weaker would take heart."

Endurance requires special emphasis in military service. In the Army, it means "mental and physical

1Marshall, Men Against Fire, p. 48.
Summary

The Army's concept of leadership, its leadership principles, and its attitude toward leadership traits, as well as the leadership-management-command relationship in the Army, have been examined in some detail to provide a basis for comparison with industrial management leadership. The concept and principles seem to present a unified doctrine that is slightly marred by some semantic difficulties with the relationship of command and leadership to management. Understanding the concept and principles requires an understanding of the Army's fundamental mission—being prepared to fight wars. The goals of the military leader are to accomplish the mission and to maintain the organization, but the nature of war can make the goals incompatible. The complex doctrine of leadership required is one of total leadership:

The effectiveness of the leader is dependent upon everything he does which contributes to cementing the bonds between him and his subordinates. Everything the leader does in his role as trainer, teacher, administrator, commander, or counselor either contributes to or detracts from the totality of this relationship.\(^1\)

\(^1\)U.S. Army, Military Leadership, FM 22-100, p. 5.
CHAPTER III
INDUSTRIAL LEADERSHIP CONCEPTS AND PRINCIPLES

"I wish to emphasize industrial leadership over all other elements that make for industrial progress."¹

If Gantt's idea is correct, leadership is as important to American industry as it is to the American Army. The goal of this chapter is to examine the leadership concepts and principles of a segment of American industrial management in the light of the previous chapter's examination of the Army's leadership concept and principles.

The Problem of Generalizing

Chapter i contained some discussion of the problem of generalizing about leadership for all of America's industry and attempted to rationalize some value for generalizations drawn from a small segment of American industry. Reducing the number of firms to be studied reduces the problem of data gathering, but other problems remain. Differences among companies in terms and in methods of expressing doctrine and policy probably represent the greatest difficulty in forming generalizations. For example, the eight firms surveyed for this study

¹Gantt, op. cit., p. 211.
ranged from those that published management policy textbooks containing lengthy chapters under the title of leadership to those which did not mention the word "leadership" in policy statements on supervision. Consequently, a considerable amount of interpretation was required to develop a generalized concept and set of principles. As discussed in chapter i, the assumption that the content of training programs for leaders and the leadership evaluation system were an indication of leadership principles was used in making the interpretations.

The Data Sources

This chapter was developed from information gathered through structured interviews with corporate officers, generally personnel vice presidents or management training directors, of eight large (2,500-2,600 employees) corporations. Most of the firms were extremely cooperative and went to considerable inconvenience to provide researched answers to questions as well as copies of company policy documents on leadership, leadership training, and leader evaluation. None of the firms objected to being mentioned as a source of material, provided that no particular policy or statement would be attributed to any particular firm.
Leadership Concept

The clearly labeled "concept of leadership" found in the Army's leadership manual has no counterpart in policy statements of any of the companies surveyed. Nevertheless, the elements of a concept of leadership can be pieced together from the information the companies provided.

Leadership, Management, and Command

If it is fair to say that the Army has created a certain amount of semantic confusion in attempting to make clear distinctions in the leadership--command--management relationship, it is fair to say that no such semantic confusion exists for industrial management. Command can be dispensed with hurriedly; it is not in the vocabularies of most of the companies, and those companies that include it do so in a negative sense.

"A professional manager leads rather than commands."\(^1\)

"The manager resorts to command only in emergencies where he must admit temporary failure...."\(^2\)

---

\(^1\) Company "A", Management Policy Book. To keep faith with the agreements concerning nondisclosure of company policies, only references available to the general public will be identified completely in the footnotes of this chapter.

is part of managing."¹ The terms are often used inter-
changeably because "it is not possible to 'manage' with­
out 'leading!'"² The extent to which the terms are
interchanged became apparent when high-level corporate
officers after some consultation with staff members
agreed that their companies had declared sets of leader­
ship principles and then produced material labeled
Management Principles which were in fact, by any reason­
able standard management principles. However, it is
generally held that "leadership pertains to the human
resources of the company, ...and it is...achieved
through inspiring, encouraging, teaching, stimulating,
and motivating all of the individuals in the enter­
prise...."³

The last quote in the previous paragraph was the
closest thing to a company definition of leadership
that the research revealed. Several companies simply
made reference to standard dictionary definitions.
There was general agreement that the definition derived
in chapter i was suitable.

Policy papers of two companies defined management
by listing functions of management. One listed "planning;

¹Officer, Company "D".
²Officer, Company "A".
organizing, directing, coordinating, and controlling. The other listed "planning, organizing, integrating, and measuring." The management training literature used in executive training courses for all companies included at least a portion of the vast range of definitions available in management textbooks. The most generally accepted view was that "management is doing whatever necessary to make the business go." In an organization as large as ______, it is difficult to be precise and specific. There are as many different approaches as one could find in texts on the subject.

Profit and Company Growth

If success in combat seems to be a pervading influence on Army leadership, the necessity for "adequate return to investors and continued growth of the company" understandably pervades the leadership atmosphere

1Company "G", Management Indoctrination Course.
3In the words of the Army Management School text, "Management is an elusive term, having almost as many definitions as there are writers in the field." U.S. Army Management School, Army Management, 1963, p. 5.
4Officer, Company "D".
5Officer, Company "B".
6With minor variations, this phrase was used by every company surveyed in describing what governs leader (manager) actions.
of industry. "The capital which they have furnished has created our jobs and provided our opportunities."¹ "We believe that the primary objective of employees and management is to ... ensure the preservation and continued growth of the company."²

The business leaders goal is to secure, from each employee, "responsible, loyal cooperative service...toward attainment of the general business objective."³

Service to Customers

A corollary to growth and profit for any company is "serving its customers as efficiently and effectively as possible."⁴ Understanding the "inseparability of profit and service"⁵ is necessary if the individual is to relate himself to the total situation, and one of the leader's jobs is to foster such understanding.

An Integrated Concept

As in the case of the Army's concept, the firms surveyed did not emphasize any particular approach to

¹Company "F", Principles.
²Company "D", Applied Employee Relations.
³Company "B", Creed.
⁴The language here is from Company "F", Principles, but with minor variations the same theme was repeated many times by every company.
leadership but rather seemed to hold to an integrated concept that recognized the interrelationship of leader, group, and situation. However, the words of the Army's concept emphasized declared principles and the leader's traits, and the importance of the group and the situation were deduced. Whereas, the words of any generalized concept for industry would emphasize the group and the situation; the importance of declared principles and the leader's traits would be secondary. Four of the eight companies have declared leadership principles, and sets of principles can be formulated easily from the policies of two other companies. Only four companies place any emphasis on leadership traits; the other four implied that "...leadership trait theory has gone the way of Theoretical and applied Phrenology."¹

As one vice president for personnel expressed it: "The specific leaders have the specific traits they need and if there were a particular one for a particular job, this would mean nothing,"²—an approach that leads back to the leader, the situation, and the group.

The Group

Group effort and teamwork are requirements for success in business if the policies of the companies

¹Trickett, op. cit., p. 6. quoting Fred Fiedler.
²Officer, Company "E".
surveyed have any foundation in fact. Every company stressed the importance of groups and teamwork. Teamwork is best achieved when the goals of the group and the goals of the individual are coordinated. "This is the way in which he can see how to do his own work ...in teamwork with his fellows so that the individual jobs integrate back to the end result, ...the goal of the enterprise."¹

Although there is general agreement that "...all must work together for the benefit of the company and the people who constitute [italics]"² there seemed to be some subtle differences among companies in the approach to teamwork. One company's policies are devoted to "...the development of the managerial attitude on the part of all employees,"³ (Italics mine) a policy that seems to foster a managerial style corresponding to Blake's team management (9.9) style.⁴ The policy statements of two other companies seem to fall into the same general category. The task of management

²Company "F", "Principles."
leadership is to "...help [the individual] with setting objectives so that they are in harmony with what the company and division is trying to accomplish. The relationship—common aims...mutual rewards...commitment—is the basic molecule of getting the job done."¹ Leadership at all levels must work for "...the development of team spirit and good morale through understanding of the individual employees attitudes, ambitions, problems and desires, ...[and] all work together for the benefit of [company and employees]."² Whereas, the policies of the other companies lean more toward the view that, in exchange for fair treatment and compensation, "each employee has the responsibility to ...cooperate full toward the business objective."³

For two companies, the leadership policies toward group effectiveness seemed to be somewhat inhibited by the legal aspects of labor relations. The judgment is obviously a subjective one, and it is based primarily on the content of management training programs which devote most of their time to the contractual obligations of management to labor and to the legal procedure

2Company "F", Principles.
3Company "B", Creed.
of leadership. There is a feeling that "there are too many workers today who are less concerned with doing a good job than they are with trying to get out of work but claim every possible advantage from the company.... The role of the Unions has been very big in this situation."\(^1\) An attitude that seems to be in contrast with the admonition of one company to "stop looking across the table at labor;...band together."\(^2\)

The Situation

A generalized concept would include a recognition of the situational aspects of leadership. The effective leader is one who has "...found a systematic approach to anticipate situations, ...developed a philosophy of accepting change, ...and recognizes that although problems are similar, answers are not always the same...."\(^3\)

Human Relations

Each company surveyed would undoubtedly characterize its concept of leadership as a human relations approach. The policies of each expressed concern for recognition, respect and self-fulfillment for every

---

\(^1\)Company "G", Management Indoctrination Course.


\(^3\)Ibid.
employee. There was general recognition that behavior is motivated, that people are different, and that understanding of human behavior is helpful to the leader. However, there was no policy to train leaders as psychologists. The most progressive companies in the group seemed to agree with Douglas MacGregor that the leader should "...become a behavioral engineer, nor a behavioral scientist."¹

There were policy differences in leadership approaches to human relations. One company feels that it has "...the best interests of the employees in mind, sometimes more so than the Union, but we must remember that the company must make a profit."² (Italics mine.) Another included questions about the applicable contract article and section in its case studies of human relations.³ The policies of most of the companies acknowledged that the good employee wants to do useful work and that "to do so he wants and needs understandable direction by inspiring firm and just leadership."⁴ (Italics mine.) A few of the companies policies seemed


²Company "G", Management Indoctrination Course.

³Company "D", Applied Employee Relations.

⁴Company "B", Creed.
to be more positive in the acceptance of the view that
the motivation to achieve results and accept responsi-
bility for directing one's own efforts toward organiza-
tion goals is already present in people.

People thinking and working like this do not
need detailed directions, orders, and commands
.... They need rather, and normally welcome and
want, leadership of those holding positions of
trust and authority to give unity, direction
and integrated purpose to the total effort....

All companies agreed that the approach to human
relations had to be one "to maintain the integrity of
this company. An integrity that is on the highest
plane possible.... [with] an honest, straight-forward
approach to problems...." There was further general
agreement that "if the policies and procedures do not
agree with the practices of higher managers, they are
quickly recognized by the organization as froth and
not substance."  

Leadership Can Be Learned

"The thesis at this point is that one can learn
how to be an effective leader." The study of


2 Company "D", Applied Employee Relations.

3 Richard J. Anton, General Electric Company,
"Improving Executive Effectiveness," an address to the
15th Annual Fall Management Conference, Northwestern
University, Nov. 11, 1965.

leadership is helpful but it is learned "...by putting skills into practice on the job." All companies subscribed to the philosophy of learning leadership. There seemed to be no particular limitation on who could learn, but there was agreement that a company president's letter opener was not in every tool box.

**Authority**

The industrial management view of the role of authority in leadership is not a simple one. The policies of most companies urge that "managers at all levels have the courage and competence to act within the authority delegated them." However, it is "the authority of inspirational leadership" that is most effective. Authoritarianism is used only in desperation. The good manager "leads rather than commands; the leader depends on authority; the dominator depends on imposed power." The general doctrine seems to view the effective leader as one that knows how to use authority and is not afraid to use it when required, but uses it only when required.

---

1 Officer, Company "E".
2 Officer, Company "D".
4 Ibid.
Leadership Principles

As discussed in chapter 1, some companies have expressed their leadership policies in "...a set of fundamental principles which guide its management at all levels in the daily conduct of its business."\(^1\) Other companies have not seen fit to publish principles, but most of the companies appear to have fundamental leadership policies from which sets of principles can be derived. For two of the companies surveyed, the best indications of leadership principles seemed to be in their management evaluation programs and management training programs.

Within the limits of interpretation, each of the following principles was derived from the policies of a majority of the companies surveyed. Perhaps they can serve as a generalized set of leadership principles.

1. Know your job.

A principle that corresponds directly to the Army's first principle and one that is held by every firm. "The leader of any enterprise or component needs to 'know his business.'"\(^2\)

2. Compensate employees equitably.

The second most widely held principle. As Gantt

---

\(^{1}\)Company "F", Principles.

said, "Reward according to service rendered is the only foundation on which our industrial society can permanently stand."¹

3. Provide safe working conditions.

"As a supervisor you become, in fact, your brother's keeper to the extent that you must be sure that his working place, his working tools, and his working methods are proper and sufficiently safe to keep him from getting hurt."² Safe working conditions would seem to be a technique of application (as would the principle of providing equitable compensation) for some broader principle parallel to the Army's "Know your men and look out for their welfare;" in fact, the Army lists it as a "technique of application."³ However because each company with a set of leadership principles included the provision of safe working conditions, the notion must be included in any generalized set of principles.

Industrial safety is certainly not all that is implied in Maslow's "safety needs,"⁴ but it is sufficiently

¹Gantt, op. cit., p. 225.
²Company "G", Management Indoctrination Course.
⁴James V. Clark, "Motivation in Work Groups: A Tentative View," Psychology in Administration: A Research Orientation, eds. Timothy W. Costello and
implicit to permit seeing some correlation between management's leadership principles and the satisfaction of one of the needs Maslow expressed.

The objective of the principle is not simply the well-being of the workers, but is also "...to encourage efficient operations and satisfied employees."¹

4. Create opportunities for employees to develop and advance.

"Developing people is implicit in the job. Since a manager gets results through others, it follows that the people working for him must be adequately qualified to get the desired results."² "Each employee should be trained to grow to the highest level of his talents on his job and by promotion and transfer to other jobs."³

The benefits of the principle are in two forms: increased competence of the workers to do their jobs and increased confidence of the workers that management's goals and the workers' goals are coordinate.

"A manager gains the support and confidence of those who work with him if he helps them to help themselves,


¹Company "B", Creed.

²Company "F", Foundations of Management.

³Company "B", Creed.
and if he encourages them in their own self-improvement.\textsuperscript{1} The principle may well be considered to be management's recognition of the necessity to help employees toward fulfilling two of Maslow's higher needs, "the ego needs and self-fulfillment needs."\textsuperscript{2}

Although it is not the purpose of this paper to discuss application of the principles, the research disclosed some striking statistics that attest to management's belief in this principle. For example, one company subsidized 495 college degrees for its employees in 1964; in the same year it had 12,000 employees complete courses in its after-hours education program and it devoted 1,067,000 man-hours of company time to up-grading employee skills.\textsuperscript{3} All companies surveyed apply the principle by filling higher jobs by promotion of employees from within the organization. "All but one of the principal officers of the corporation started his business career with this company."\textsuperscript{4} "Of 3,699 management and supervisory positions filled in this company last year, 3,500 were filled by

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{1}Company "A", Management Policy Book.
  \item \textsuperscript{2}Clark, loc. cit.
  \item \textsuperscript{3}Officer, Company "D".
  \item \textsuperscript{4}Officer, Company "G".
\end{itemize}
promoting company employees."

The principle is another that the Army lists as a technique for applying its third principle, looking out for the welfare of the men. Additionally management's principle seems to correspond to some extent with the Army's ninth principle, "Develop a sense of responsibility in your subordinates." 3

5. Establish two-way communication with employees.

Not only is it important for the leader "to explain all company programs and policies," "...it is important for him...to listen with open-minded patience and tolerance, ...receptive to others' ideas." 4 The listening part of the principle is not simply a matter of courtesy. If the leader "...listens well, he will stimulate imaginative creative thinking which ...might well result in better action than he would think of by himself." 5

6. Provide individual recognition, respect, and just treatment for all employees.

Platitudinous? Perhaps, but it is also a

1Officer, Company "D".
2U.S. Army, Military Leadership, FM 22-100, p. 30.
3Company "C", Basic Principles.
5Ibid.
recognition of man’s desire that his leaders "use
common sense, fair play, and justice in the handling
of all grievances."\(^1\) However, it is more than a plea
for justice. It acknowledges that "each employee
wants and needs friendly recognition and respect as
an individual person, to know that he is accepted as
a member of the team, ... to enjoy a 'sense of belong­
ing.'\(^2\) The principle seems to be a further corre­
lation of leadership with the individual needs that
Maslow described, in this case the "social and ego
needs."\(^3\)

The principle seems so fundamental that the
absence of it in the Army's list of principles seems
strange, particularly in view of the soldier's almost
total dependence on his commander "... for the main­
tenance of his rights..."\(^4\) Individual recognition
and just treatment are listed by the Army as appli­
catory techniques for "know your men and look out for
their welfare.\(^5\)

\(^1\) Company "C", Principles.
\(^2\) Company "B", Creed.
\(^3\) Maslow, op. cit., pp. 80-83. See also Clark, loc. cit.
\(^4\) CGSC, Military Psychology and Leadership, 1850/8, p. 1.32.
\(^5\) U.S. Army, Military Leadership, FM 22-100, p. 30.
7. Get the job done through others by setting mutually agreed upon goals.

The wording of this principle only approximates any one company's expression of the idea; each company had a different way of stating it. It embodies several thoughts. "The human relationships between a manager and his associates are not considered apart from the work he has to do, because by definition his function is to get work done with, by, and through others."  

1 (Italics mine.) "The 'Boss--man relationship' involves identifying and setting objectives, clarifying and reaching agreement on job functions, responsibilities and authorities."  

2 "There is a great need to make work a challenging, rewarding experience, evoking talent and intelligence and unusual effort because the individual person feels a spirit of self-fulfillment in working with his associates toward mutual, worthwhile goals."  

3 (Italics mine.) Goals appear to be mutual and worthwhile to leader and follower when "the work plan is


2 Company "E", Foundations of Management.

Jointly made by a man and his boss;"¹ when "together he and his superior set goals for performance."²

The principle requires substantive delegation and decentralization. As the president of General Telephone and Electronics Corporation once put it:

You give a man a job to do, and you give him the authority and the responsibility to do it, and you guide him and encourage him until he does it. But you don't do one thing—you don't do it for him under any circumstances.³

The policies of most of the companies surveyed tended to support Likert's conclusion that the leader exerts more influence over a situation when he permits subordinates to influence what goes on than when he makes all decisions himself.⁴ "A manager gains the support and confidence of those who work with him if he helps them to help themselves."⁵

The principle bears some similarity to the ideas expressed in two of the Army's principles, "develop a sense of responsibility in your subordinates," and

¹Company "A", Managing by Objectives.
²Officer, Company "B".
³Mitchell, loc. cit.
"insure that the task is understood, supervised, and accomplished." However, there is a fundamental difference. The military leader's "...primary responsibility is for the accomplishment of his assigned mission." Subordinate participation in goal setting and decision making is certainly not uncommon in the Army. "Yet in the heat of action... commander may have to make a quick decision without consultation, or even in the face of unanimous opposition from subordinate commanders."  

Leadership Traits in Industry

The firms surveyed were certainly not unanimous in emphasizing leadership traits. Nevertheless, four companies with a total of more than 400,000 employees either used leadership traits in manager evaluation or otherwise stressed their importance in policy statements. One company flatly stated that "the least that can be said is that the leader needs to possess in marked degree the company's list of leadership traits."  

---

1 U.S. Military Academy, Military Leadership, p. 62.
2 Ibid., p. 72.
The Role of Traits

Neither the interviews with executives nor the leadership policy papers of the companies surveyed revealed any doctrinal explanation of the role of leadership traits in industry. As pointed out, one company simply stated that the traits were required in a marked degree. The other three companies concerned with traits assess the traits as part of manager evaluations. The traits must be considered to have some effect on the manager’s ability to influence others. "What a leader is, not what he says or writes...is what influences subordinates. And they judge what he is by...the way he behaves."¹ It seems safe to assume that the companies which appraised traits consider that they at least assist the leader in doing his job.

Can the traits be developed? Because of the unanimous view that leadership can be learned and because of the consensus that the major purpose of an appraisal is to further the development of the individual appraised, the answer must be yes.

¹Urwick, Leadership in the Twentieth Century, p. 45.
Industry's Traits

The generalized list of traits for industrial management leadership is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>Integrity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Judgment</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Cooperativeness |

Each trait was listed by at least three of the four companies. A total of fourteen traits were listed by the four companies, but other than the five in the generalized list only "appearance," "decisiveness," and "imagination" were on more than one list.

Table 1 compares the generalized list of traits with those leadership traits stressed by some management writers.

As can be seen from the table, the generalized list does not necessarily jibe with the traits that the management writers stress. However, the list seems to support some ideas that management writers have emphasized. Urwick's belief that "integrity is crucial"\(^1\) seems to be shared by industrial management. Drucker's thought that "...leadership is not magnetic personality..."\(^2\) and "is not 'making friends and influencing people'"\(^2\) also seems to be supported.

\(^1\)Urwick, *op. cit.*, p. 52.
\(^2\)Drucker, *op. cit.*, p. 159.
## TABLE 1

**LEADERSHIP TRAITS, INDUSTRY VS. WRITERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Barnard(^1)</th>
<th>Tead(^2)</th>
<th>Seckler-Hudson(^3)</th>
<th>Cleeton-Mason(^4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrity</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperativeness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4 others)</td>
<td>(8 others)</td>
<td>(10 others)</td>
<td>(5 others)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Of the remaining traits on the writers lists, only two appear on more than one list, "endurance (or energy)" and "decisiveness."

---

\(^1\)Barnard, *op. cit.*, p. 93.

\(^2\)Tead, *op. cit.*, p. 83.

\(^3\)Seckler-Hudson, *op. cit.*, p. 262.

\(^4\)Cleeton and Mason, *op. cit.*, p. 96.
Management apparently believes that workers are influenced more by competence and character than by charm and that the industrial leaders' prime area for motivation is, as Professor Mosel pointed out, in getting people to work and not simply to come to work.¹

**Summary**

The elements of a generalized concept of leadership and a set of leadership principles have been derived from the policies of eight large American firms. As is true in most cases of aggregate analysis, the result does not describe the input from any particular firm, but it is probably a representation of the composite leadership doctrine of the firms surveyed.²

As such, the doctrine has been examined with the Army's leadership doctrine as the background.

As in the case of the Army, understanding the leadership concepts and principles requires an understanding of the fundamental purpose of industrial management—making a profit by producing and marketing usable products or services. However, the purpose is greater than simply making a profit—it is to "make


²Tables 4 and 5 in the appendix represent the declared elements of the concepts and principles of the individual firms.
the desired profit and ... properly manage the resources to perpetuate the enterprise... we are talking about... people as a resource."¹ The task then is similar to the Army's—accomplish the mission and maintain the organization, and for leadership, the emphasis is on the human elements of the organization.

As in the Army's concept, no single approach to leadership is used, but the concept is an integrated one recognizing the interaction of leader, group, and situation.

¹Company "E", Fundamentals of Management.
CHAPTER IV

THE CONTRASTS

The previous chapters have examined the leadership doctrine of the Army and a generalized leadership doctrine for industrial management. The doctrines are similar in many ways. The respective concepts of leadership include the same basic elements, and the principles expressed have much in common. Certainly, this is no surprise, the common roots for organizational theory for both the military and industry are generally recognized, and organization theory has influenced the leadership doctrines.\(^1\) On the other hand, differences exist. The goal of this chapter is to highlight some of the important differences.

The Concepts

The two leadership concepts examined appeared to have been synthesized from what the organizations believed useful in the various theoretical approaches to leadership. Each concept is concerned with the interaction of the leader and the group; each considers variations in the situation; each expresses a

\(^1\) Suojanen, loc. cit., pp. 17-18.
concern for human relations; each acknowledges that a set of principles is useful as a guide to the leader's personality or character; and each recognizes that leadership can be learned. The conceptual differences in the leadership doctrines lie within the elements of the concepts.

Objectives and Goal Congruence

The leadership doctrines of both industry and the Army seem to acknowledge human needs in about the same way that Maslow expressed them. Both concepts recognize the problem of dealing with individuals whose goals are strongly influenced, if not dictated, by basic human needs, while at the same time operating within the framework of an organization with its own particular organization goals.

The industrial management leadership concept is based on a broad overlap, if not congruence, in the goals of the organization and the goals of the leaders, the goals of the work group, and the goals of the individual workers. The task of leadership is to assist the followers in understanding that "in the long run, the interests of all are inextricably tied to the productivity and well-being of the component,

---

1Maslow, op. cit., pp. 80-106.
the Company, the community, the nation, and the world in which we live and work. The logic of the economic interdependency of the workers and the firms must be made meaningful in the specific sense. Likert has pointed to the effectiveness of work groups whose members identify themselves with organizational goals. McGregor has pointed to the possibility of leadership based on the possibility of integrating the goals of the organization and the individual. The generalized management leadership concept incorporates the ideas of Likert and McGregor, not completely, but at least to the point of recognizing the value of integrated goals.

The Army's command leadership concept is built around the idea that success in battle is the organization's goal, a goal that may well be in conflict with goals that the individual bases on needs that Maslow believed to be prepotent needs. The organization's goals or missions are assigned from outside the organization. The concept recognizes the value of having all members identified with the organization's goals, but it looks at the leadership

2 Likert, op. cit., p. 182.
4 Maslow, op. cit., p. 83.
the Company, the community, the nation, and the world in which we live and work.¹ The logic of the economic interdependency of the workers and the firms must be made meaningful in the specific sense. Likert has pointed to the effectiveness of work groups whose members identify themselves with organizational goals,² McGregor has pointed to the possibility of leadership based on the possibility of integrating the goals of the organization and the individual.³ The generalized management leadership concept incorporates the ideas of Likert and McGregor, not completely, but at least to the point of recognizing the value of integrated goals.

The Army's command leadership concept is built around the idea that success in battle is the organization's goal, a goal that may well be in conflict with goals that the individual bases on needs that Maslow believed to be prepotent needs.⁴ The organization's goals or missions are assigned from outside the organization. The concept recognizes the value of having all members identified with the organization's goals, but it looks at the leadership

²Likert, op. cit., p. 182.
⁴Maslow, op. cit., p. 83.
problems as one of determining "what will make a man risk his life bravely to accomplish the organization's goals." ¹

Human Relations

Both concepts express the importance of the leader having an empathetic understanding of his followers. Nevertheless, the conceptual views of human relations have some subtle, difficult-to-express differences. The differences can perhaps be seen by first looking at writings that tell of industrial management's fairly recent disenchantment with human relations as an end in itself. As Leavitt expressed it, "The theme here is not that human relations theory is either incorrect or immoral....it is simply insufficient." ² Professor Odiorne traced the rise and fall of the "psychology of contentment" ³ and James Menzies Black expressed it as "Farewell to the Happiness Boys." ⁴ The notion that there can be too

---

¹ Marshall, Men Against Fire, p. 161.
much emphasis on human relations is somewhat hidden but nevertheless present in industry's concept. The Army's recognition of morale (of the individual), esprit de corps (of the organization), discipline, and proficiency as coordinate indications of leadership and as the measures of group effectiveness helps prevent confusion about contentment or happiness being the goal of human relations.

The Leader's Traits

The leadership policies of the Army and of half the companies surveyed place some importance on the traits of the leader. The outlook of the Army and those particular firms toward leadership traits seems to be that certain personality or character traits will assist the leader in influencing others and that the traits can be developed. The outlook persists despite a considerable number of firms and management writers who believe, as Professor Odiorne does, that "the old game of seeking a pattern of personality traits...is getting rather outworn....[and that] there's no point in trying to inculcate certain traits...."1

Of the generalized list of traits for industrial

1Odiorne, loc. cit., p. 3.
management leaders--initiative, integrity, judgment, knowledge, and cooperation--all except cooperation appear on the list of traits in the Army's leadership manual. Cooperation, as well as three other traits listed by individual firms but omitted from the generalized list, appears on the list of traits rated on Army officer's efficiency reports. In other words, all of the traits stressed by industry are important to the Army, but seven traits--courage, endurance, enthusiasm, justice, loyalty, tact, and unselfishness--from the Army's list were not on the list of any firm.

Certainly, the disagreement in the trait lists may only support the conclusion that there is no agreement about the traits of leaders as well as confirm O'Sullivan's idea that lists of military leadership traits "...tend to add up to human perfection...." On the other hand, the lists may also tend to show that to lead Americans in either industry or in the

1Table 6 in the Appendix compares the Army's leadership traits with the traits for each firm surveyed.


3O'Sullivan, op. cit., p. 33.
Army, the leader should have initiative, integrity, judgment, and knowledge, and that, in either activity, the leader must be able to get along with the other people in the activity. A more tenuous, possible, additional conclusion is that some traits important to the Army leader receive less stress in industrial management leadership.

**Learning Leadership**

Both concepts agree that leadership can be learned, but the statement may be one of the more misleading ones in each concept.

The idea of learning leadership is clearly opposed to Drucker's notion that "leadership cannot be created or promoted...cannot be taught or learned."¹ The implications are somewhat at variance with Gellerman's thought that "if...leaders are made, much of the making occurs before they are formally appointed to leadership."² Trickett explains the problem as one of developing the latent leadership potential that every normal person possesses to some degree.³ An application of Trickett's idea seems to be the foundation for developing leadership both in the Army and in industrial management. The whole idea of learning

leadership is inextricably intertwined with leader selection, job placements, training programs, evaluation programs, and as such is beyond the scope of this paper. However, a look at formal leadership training may prove useful.

Despite quite extensive schooling programs for leaders in the Army and in industry, there can be little quarrel with the statement that most leadership learning or development takes place on the job. Nevertheless, leadership and subjects related to leadership are taught in the schools of both activities. Without detailed analysis, it is almost impossible to correlate company sponsored management training with the Army's officer schooling system. However, Table 2 shows a comparison of the course hours devoted to the interpersonal aspects of leadership in representative Army officer schools and company-run management courses. The table is somewhat misleading because the Army school courses are about nine months long while the industry courses average about six weeks. Despite the difference in lengths, the industrial management courses generally devote more time to courses dealing with interpersonal skills than Army schools devote to like subjects.
The Principles

As in the case of the concepts of leadership, the Army's leadership principles have much in common with the generalized leadership principles for industrial management. Table 3 shows the correspondence between the two sets of principles. The similarities in the
principles tend to show that leaders in both activities must know their jobs, must look out for the welfare of subordinates. The differences in the two sets of principles seem to point to an emphasis on industrial management leadership creating opportunities for the individual needs in contrast to the Army's emphasis on creating a more tightly knit group with particular respect for the leader's ability to guide the group.

TABLE 3

COMPARISON OF LEADERSHIP PRINCIPLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Army</th>
<th>Industrial Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Be proficient</td>
<td>Know job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Know self and improve</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Know men and look out for welfare</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inform men</td>
<td>2-way communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set example</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accomplish task</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train men as team</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound and timely decisions</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop responsibility in subordinates</td>
<td>-- Opportunities for employee development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employ command in accord with capabilities</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Seek responsibility

--

-- Get job done through others with agreed upon goals

Summary

The doctrines of Army command leadership and industrial management leadership have many similarities, but they also have important differences.

A fundamental difference in the concepts of leadership lies in the approach to individual and organizational goals. The Army's leadership concept involves subordination of individual's safety needs to the goal of the organization.

The doctrines also place different emphasis on human relations and involve a somewhat different application of a common point—learning leadership.

Industrial management's principles of leadership traits (for firms that stress leadership traits) generally have corresponding principles and traits in the Army's leadership doctrine. The Army's doctrine includes principles of leadership and leader's traits that are not a part of industrial management's leadership doctrine.
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

American industry and the American Army do many things that are similar. Many of the Army's problems are doubtless similar to those of management in giant corporations. Many of the Army's field units have counterparts in industry. Truck fleets, pipelines, construction jobs, ports, laboratories, warehouses and a myriad of other operations are common to both. Whatever the task, both the Army and industry require leadership. An indication of the similarities and differences in leadership in the two activities has been sought in a comparison of leadership doctrines. Leadership doctrine is not leadership, but it must be considered to be evidence of the type of leadership that is believed to be effective.

The foundations of the Army's leadership doctrine are expressed in a declared concept of leadership and a published list of leadership principles. No such clear declaration of doctrine exists for industrial management leadership. However, a generalized concept and set of principles can be developed from the leadership policies of individual companies to provide a basis for comparing management leadership doctrine with that of the Army.
The two doctrines are based on a common view of human needs, and they promote common respect for the individuality and dignity of people. They have a common interest in those social sciences that promote understanding people. They can probably learn from each other in the areas of common interest. For example, the Army might profit by looking into the effectiveness of industry's greater emphasis on leadership subjects in high-level schooling. Some companies might save some policy oscillations by studying the Army's doctrinal view of human relations.

Industrial management's concept of leadership is based not only on its understanding of human needs and respect for the individual but also on the premise that the goals of the individual can be integrated with the goals of the organization. The leadership principles are guides for the leader in his actions to influence followers to help achieve the goals of the organization--producing and marketing a useful product or service at a profit.

The task to which the Army's leadership doctrine is addressed is the task of winning victory in battle—a task that has no counterpart in industry. The doctrine is specifically aimed at leadership for the fighting units, and correctly so. If all of the other
parts of the Army were skillfully directed, but the fighting units were poorly led, the Army would fail. If the leadership doctrine does not quite fit the other parts of the Army, but produces well led fighting units, it is the correct leadership doctrine for the Army.

The Army's doctrine is designed to promote strongly knit organizations whose members will, when necessary, willingly forego satisfaction of their own needs to accomplish the organizational mission. The doctrinal view of the relationship between the leader and the led is one of a strong mutual respect based on confidence that each will do his job and fulfill his responsibilities to the organization, its members, and its mission. The confidence and loyalty of the followers are earned by the leader whose physical and mental ability, personality, character, and application of the principles of leadership demonstrate that he can and will guard the rights and welfare of the men while leading them to success in battle.

Industrial managers do important things outside the area of leadership—resource allocation, for example. The Army's commanders do the same sort of things; much has been learned, and more can be learned from industrial management and management science about
how to do those things. However, the main jobs of industrial management and of military command are to direct people. The respective doctrines for directing people—the leadership doctrines—are different.

The Army would be foolish to fail to adopt the useful tools of management, but the Army would be equally foolish to confuse its doctrine of command leadership with the doctrine of management leadership. American industrial management leadership is different from United States Army command leadership.
TABLE 4

ELEMENTS OF LEADERSHIP CONCEPTS FOR INDIVIDUAL FIRMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept elements</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Declared concept</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set of principles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principles in policies</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Strength</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated goals</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situation important</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human relations</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership can be learned</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authority a leader's tool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depends on acceptance</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership traits</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army Traits</td>
<td>Firms</td>
<td>Industry only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bearing</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Appearance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Adaptability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependability</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endurance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiasm</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Imagination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrity</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgment</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyalty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unselfishness</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cooperativeness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Human understanding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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