Chapter 3

The Human Dimension

All soldiers are entitled to outstanding leadership; I will provide that leadership. I know my soldiers and I will always place their needs above my own. I will communicate consistently with my soldiers and never leave them uninformed.

Creed of the Noncommissioned Officer

3-1. Regardless of the level, keep in mind one important aspect of leadership: you lead people. In the words of former Army Chief of Staff Creighton W. Abrams,

The Army is not made up of people; the Army is people…living, breathing, serving human beings. They have needs and interests and desires. They have spirit and will, strengths and abilities. They have weaknesses and faults, and they have means. They are the heart of our preparedness…and this preparedness—as a nation and as an Army—depends upon the spirit of our soldiers. It is the spirit that gives the Army…life. Without it we cannot succeed.

3-2. GEN Abrams could not have been more clear about what's important. To fully appreciate the human dimension of leadership, you must understand two key elements: *leadership* itself and the *people* you lead. Leadership—what this manual is about—is far from an exact science; every person and organization is different. Not only that, the environment in which you lead is shaped first by who you are and what you know; second, by your people and what they know; and third, by everything that goes on around you.

3-3. This chapter examines this all-important human dimension. Later chapters discuss the levels of Army leadership and the skills and actions required of leaders at each level.

PEOPLE, THE TEAM, AND THE INSTITUTION

3-4. Former Army Chief of Staff John A. Wickham Jr. described the relationship between the people who are the Army and the Army as an institution this way:

The Army is an institution, not an occupation. Members take an oath of service to the nation and the Army, rather than simply accept a job…the Army has moral and ethical obligations to those who serve and their families; they, correspondingly, have responsibilities to the Army.

3-5. The Army has obligations to soldiers, DA civilians, and their families that most organizations don't have; in return, soldiers and DA civilians have responsibilities to the Army that far exceed those of an employee to most employers. This relationship, one of mutual obligation and responsibility, is at the very center of what makes the Army a team, an institution rather than an occupation.

3-6. Chapter 2 discussed how the Army can't function except as a team. This team identity doesn't come about just because people take an

PEOPLE, THE TEAM, AND THE INSTITUTION 3-1

COMBAT STRESS 3-6

THE STRESS OF CHANGE 3-8

CLIMATE AND CULTURE 3-12

LEADERSHIP STYLES 3-15

INTENDED AND UNINTENDED CONSEQUENCES 3-18

SUMMARY 3-19

oath or join an organization; you can't force a team to come together any more than you can force a plant to grow. Rather, the team identity comes out of mutual respect among its members and a trust between leaders and subordinates. That bond between leaders and subordinates likewise springs from mutual respect as well as from discipline. The highest form of discipline is the willing obedience of subordinates who trust their leaders, understand and believe in the mission's purpose, value the team and their place in it, and have the will to see the mission through. This form of discipline produces individuals and teams who—in the really tough moments—come up with solutions themselves.

Soldiers Are Our Credentials

In September 1944 on the Cotentin Peninsula in France, the commander of a German stronghold under siege by an American force sent word that he wanted to discuss surrender terms. German MG Hermann Ramcke was in his bunker when his staff escorted the assistant division commander of the US 8th Infantry Division down the concrete stairway to the underground headquarters. MG Ramcke addressed BG Charles D. W. Canham through an interpreter: "I am to surrender to you. Let me see your credentials." Pointing to the dirty, tired, disheveled—but victorious—American infantrymen who had accompanied him and were now crowding the dugout entrance, the American officer replied, "These are my credentials."

DISCIPLINE

I am confident that an army of strong individuals, held together by a sound discipline based on respect for personal initiative and rights and dignity of the individual, will never fail this nation in time of need.

General J. Lawton Collins
Former Army Chief of Staff

3-7. People are our most important resource; soldiers are in fact our "credentials." Part of knowing how to use this most precious resource is understanding the stresses and demands that influence people.

3-8. One sergeant major has described discipline as "a moral, mental, and physical state in which all ranks respond to the will of the [leader], whether he is there or not." Disciplined people take the right action, even if they don't feel like it. True discipline demands habitual and reasoned obedience, an obedience that preserves initiative and works, even when the leader isn't around. Soldiers and DA civilians who understand the purpose of the mission, trust the leader, and share Army values will do the right thing because they're truly committed to the organization.

3-9. Discipline doesn't just mean barking orders and demanding an instant response—it's more complex than that. You build discipline by training to standard, using rewards and punishment judiciously, instilling confidence in and building trust among team members, and creating a knowledgeable collective will. The confidence, trust, and collective will of a disciplined, cohesive unit is crucial in combat.

3-10. You can see the importance of these three characteristics in an example that occurred during the 3 October 1993 American raid in Somalia. One soldier kept fighting despite his wounds. His comrades remembered that he seemed to stop caring about himself, that he had to keep fighting because the other guys—his buddies—were all that mattered. When things go badly, soldiers draw strength from their own and their unit's discipline; they know that other members of the team are depending on them.

3-11. Soldiers—like those of Task Force Ranger in Somalia (which you'll read about later in this chapter) and SGT Alvin York (whose story is in Chapter 5)—persevere in tough situations. They fight through because

they have confidence in themselves, their buddies, their leaders, their equipment, and their training—and because they have discipline and will. A young sergeant who participated in Operation Uphold Democracy in Haiti in 1994 asserted this fact when interviewed by the media. The soldier said that operations went well because his unit did things just the way they did them in training and that his training never let him down.

3-12. Even in the most complex operations, the performance of the Army comes down to the training and disciplined performance of individuals and teams on the ground. One example of this fact occurred when a detachment of American soldiers was sent to guard a television tower in Udrigovo, Bosnia-Herzegovina.

3-13. After the soldiers had assumed their posts, a crowd of about 100 people gathered, grew to about 300, and began throwing rocks at the Americans. However, the soldiers didn't overreact. They prevented damage to the tower without creating an international incident. There was no "Boston Massacre" in Udrigovo. The discipline of American soldiers sent into this and other highly volatile situations in Bosnia kept the lid on that operation. The bloody guerrilla war predicted by some didn't materialize. This is a testament to the professionalism of today's American soldiers—your soldiers—and the quality of their leaders—you.

MORALE

NSDQ [Night Stalkers Don't Quit]

Motto of the 160th Special Operations
Aviation Regiment, "The Night Stalkers"
Message sent by Chief Warrant Officer Mike Durant,
held by Somali guerrillas, to his wife, October 1993

3-14. When military historians discuss great armies, they write about weapons and equipment, training and the national cause. They may mention sheer numbers (Voltaire said, "God is always on the side of the heaviest battalions") and all sorts of other things that can be analyzed, measured, and compared. However, some also write about another factor equally important to success in battle, something that can't be measured: the emotional element called morale.

3-15. Morale is the human dimension's most important intangible element. It's a measure of how people feel about themselves, their team, and their leaders. High morale comes from good leadership, shared hardship, and mutual respect. It's an emotional bond that springs from common values like loyalty to fellow soldiers and a belief that the organization will care for families. High morale results in a cohesive team that enthusiastically strives to achieve common goals. Leaders know that morale, the essential human element, holds the team together and keeps it going in the face of the terrifying and dispiriting things that occur in war.

> *You have a comradeship, a rapport that you'll never have again...There's no competitiveness, no money values. You trust the man on your left and your right with your life.*
>
> Captain Audie Murphy
> Medal of Honor recipient and most decorated
> American soldier of World War II

TAKING CARE OF SOLDIERS

Readiness is the best way of truly taking care of soldiers.

Former Sergeant Major of the Army
Richard A. Kidd

3-16. Sending soldiers in harm's way, into places where they may be killed or wounded, might seem to contradict all the emphasis on taking care of soldiers. Does it? How can you truly care for your comrades and send them on missions that might get them killed? Consider this important and fundamental point as you read the next few paragraphs.

3-17. Whenever the talk turns to what leaders do, you'll almost certainly hear someone say, "Take care of your soldiers." And that's good advice. In fact, if you add one more clause, "Accomplish the mission *and* take care of your soldiers," you have guidance for a career. But "taking care of soldiers" is one of those slippery phrases, like the word "honor," that lots of people talk about but few take the trouble to explain. So what does taking care of soldiers mean?

3-18. Taking care of soldiers means creating a disciplined environment where they can learn and grow. It means holding them to high standards, training them to do their jobs so they can function in peace and win in war. You take care of soldiers when you treat them fairly, refuse to cut corners, share their hardships, and set the example. Taking care of soldiers encompasses everything from making sure a soldier has time for an annual dental exam to visiting off-post housing to make sure it's adequate. It also means providing the family support that assures soldiers their families will be taken care of, whether the soldier is home or deployed. Family support means ensuring there's a support group in place, that even the most junior soldier and most inexperienced family members know where to turn for help when their soldier is deployed.

3-19. Taking care of soldiers also means demanding that soldiers do their duty, even at the risk of their lives. It doesn't mean coddling them or making training easy or comfortable. In fact, that kind of training can get soldiers killed. Training must be rigorous and as much like combat as is possible while being safe. Hard training is one way of preparing soldiers for the rigors of combat. Take care of soldiers by giving them the training, equipment, and support they need to keep them alive in combat.

3-20. In war, soldiers' comfort is important because it affects morale and combat effectiveness, but comfort takes a back seat to the mission. Consider this account of the 1944 landings on the island of Leyte in the Philippines, written more than 50 years later by Richard Gerhardt. Gerhardt, who was an 18-year-old rifleman in the 96th Infantry Division, survived two amphibious landings and months of close combat with the Japanese.

The 96th Division on Leyte

By the time we reached the beach, the smoke and dust created by the preparation fire had largely dissipated and we could see the terrain surrounding the landing area, which was flat and covered with some underbrush and palm trees. We were fortunate in that our sector of the beach was not heavily defended, and in going ashore there were few casualties in our platoon. Our company was engaged by small arms fire and a few mortar rounds, but we were able to move forward and secure the landing area in short order. Inland from the beach, however, the terrain turned into swamps, and as we moved ahead it was necessary to wade through muck and mud that was knee-deep at times.…Roads in this part of the island were almost nonexistent, with the area being served by dirt trails around the swamps, connecting the villages.…The Japanese had generally backed off the beaches and left them lightly defended, setting up their defense around certain villages which were at the junctions of the road system, as well as dug-in positions at points along the roads and trails. Our strategy was to…not use the roads and trails, but instead to move through the swamps and rice paddies and attack the enemy strong points from directions not as strongly defended. This was slow, dirty, and extremely fatiguing, but by this tactic we reduced our exposure to the enemy defensive plan, and to heavy fire from their strong points. It must be recognized that in combat the comfort of the front-line troops isn't part of the…planning process, but only what they can endure and still be effective. Conditions that seriously [affect] the combat efficiency of the troops then become a factor.

3-21. Gerhardt learned a lifetime's worth of lessons on physical hardship in the Pacific. Mud, tropical heat, monsoon rains, insects, malaria, Japanese snipers, and infiltrators—the details are still clear in his mind half a century later. Yet he knows—and he tells you—that soldiers must endure physical hardship when the best plan calls for it. In the Leyte campaign, the best plan was extremely difficult to execute, but it was tactically sound and it saved lives.

3-22. This concept doesn't mean that leaders sit at some safe, dry headquarters and make plans without seeing what their soldiers are going through, counting on them to tough out any situation. Leaders know that graphics on a map symbolize soldiers going forward to fight. Leaders get out with the soldiers to see and feel what they're experiencing as well as to influence the battle by their presence. (Gerhardt and numerous other front-line writers refer to the rear echelon as "anything behind my foxhole.") Leaders who stay a safe distance from the front jeopardize operations because they don't know what's going on. They risk destroying their soldiers' trust, not to mention their unit.

The K Company Visit

1LT Harold Leinbaugh, commander of K Company, 333d Infantry Regiment, 84th Division,related this experience from the ETO in January,1945, during the coldest winter in Europe in nearly 50 years:

On a front-line visit, the battalion commander criticized 1LT Leinbaugh and CPT Jay Prophet, the A Company Commander, for their own and their men's appearance. He said it looked like no one had shaved for a week. 1LT Leinbaugh replied that there was no hot water. Sensing a teaching moment, the colonel responded: "Now if you men would save some of your morning coffee it could be used for shaving." Stepping over to a snowbank, 1LT Leinbaugh picked up a five-gallon GI [general issue] coffee can brought up that morning, and shook it in the colonel's face. The frozen coffee produced a thunk. 1LT Leinbaugh shook it again.

"That's enough," said the colonel,"…I can hear."

3-23. This example illustrates three points:

- The importance of a leader going to where the action is to see and feel what's really going on.
- The importance of a first-line leader telling the boss something he doesn't want to hear.
- The importance of a leader accepting information that doesn't fit his preconceived notions.

3-24. Soldiers are extremely sensitive to situations where their leaders are not at risk, and they're not likely to forget a mistake by a leader they haven't seen. Leaders who are out with their soldiers—in the same rain or snow, under the same blazing sun or in the same dark night, under the same threat of enemy artillery or small arms fire—will not fall into the trap of ignorance. Those who lead from the front can better motivate their soldiers to carry on under extreme conditions.

3-25. Taking care of soldiers is every leader's business. A DA civilian engineering team chief volunteered to oversee the installation of six Force Provider troop life support systems in the vicinity of Tuzla, Bosnia-Herzogovina. Using organizational skills, motivational techniques, and careful supervision, the team chief ensured that the sites were properly laid out, integrated, and installed. As a result of thorough planning and the teamwork the DA civilian leader generated, the morale and quality of life of over 5,000 soldiers were significantly improved.

COMBAT STRESS

All men are frightened. The more intelligent they are, the more they are frightened. The courageous man is the man who forces himself, in spite of his fear, to carry on.

General George S. Patton Jr.
War As I Knew It

3-26. Leaders understand the human dimension and anticipate soldiers' reactions to stress, especially to the tremendous stress of combat. The answers may look simple as you sit somewhere safe and read this manual, but be sure easy answers don't come in combat. However, if you think about combat stress and its effects on you and your soldiers ahead of time, you'll be less surprised and better prepared to deal with and reduce its effects. It takes mental discipline to imagine the unthinkable—the plan going wrong, your soldiers wounded or dying, and the enemy coming after YOU. But in combat all of these things can happen, and your soldiers expect you, their leader, to have thought through each of them. Put yourself in the position of the squad leader in the following example.

Task Force Ranger in Somalia, 1993

"Sarge" was a company favorite, a big powerful kid from New Jersey who talked with his hands and played up his "Joy-zee" accent. He loved practical jokes. One of his favorites was to put those tiny charges in guys' cigarettes, the kind that would explode with a loud "POP!" about halfway through a smoke. If anyone else had done it, it would have been annoying; Sarge usually got everyone to laugh—even the guy whose cigarette he destroyed.

During the 3 October 1993 raid in Mogadishu, Sarge was manning his Humvee's .50 cal when he was hit and killed. The driver and some of the guys in back screamed, "He's dead! He's dead!" They panicked and were not responding as their squad leader tried to get someone else up and behind the gun. The squad leader had to yell at them, "Just calm down! We've got to keep fighting or none of us will get back alive."

3-27. Consider carefully what the squad leader did. First he told his squad to calm down. Then he told them why it was important: they had to continue the fight if they wanted to make it back to their base alive. In this way he jerked his soldiers back to a conditioned response, one that had been drilled during training and that took their minds off the loss. The squad leader demonstrated the calm, reasoned leadership under stress that's critical to mission success. In spite of the loss, the unit persevered.

WILL AND WINNING IN BATTLE

3-28. The Army's ultimate responsibility is to win the nation's wars. And what is it that carries soldiers through the terrible challenges of combat? It's the will to win, the ability to gut it out when things get really tough, even when things look hopeless. It's the will not only to persevere but also to find workable solutions to the toughest problems. This drive is part of the warrior ethos, the ability to forge victory out of the chaos of battle—to overcome fear, hunger, deprivation, and fatigue and accomplish the mission. And the will to win serves you just as well in peacetime, when it's easy to become discouraged, feel let down, and spend your energy complaining instead of using your talents to make things better. Discipline holds a team together; the warrior ethos motivates its members—you and your people—to continue the mission.

3-29. All soldiers are warriors: all need to develop and display the will to win—the desire to do their job well—to persevere, no matter what the circumstances. The Army is a team, and all

members' contributions are essential to mission accomplishment. As an Army leader, you're responsible for developing this sense of belonging in your subordinates. Not only that; it's your job to inculcate in your people the winning spirit—the commitment to do their part to accomplish the mission, no matter when, no matter where, no matter what.

3-30. Army operations often involve danger and therefore fear. Battling the effects of fear has nothing to do with denying it and everything to do with recognizing fear and handling it. Leaders let their subordinates know, "You can expect to be afraid; here's what we'll do about it." The Army standard is to continue your mission to successful completion, as GEN Patton said, in spite of your fears. But saying this isn't going to make it happen. Army leaders expect fear to take hold when things go poorly, setbacks occur, the unit fails to complete a mission, or there are casualties. The sights and sounds of the modern battlefield are terrifying. So is fear of the unknown. Soldiers who see their buddies killed or wounded suddenly have a greater burden: they become aware of their own mortality. On top of all these obvious sources of fear is the insecurity before battle that many veterans have written about: "Will I perform well or will I let my buddies down?"

3-31. In the October 1993 fight in Somalia, one soldier who made it back to the safety of the American position was told to prepare to go back out; there were other soldiers in trouble. He had just run a gauntlet of fire, had just seen his friends killed and wounded, and was understandably afraid. "I can't go back out there," he told his sergeant. The leader reassured the soldier while reminding him of the mission and his responsibility to the team: "I know you're scared…I'm scared…I've never been in a situation like this, either. But we've got to go. It's our job. The difference between being a coward and a man isn't whether you're scared; it's what you do while you're scared." That frightened soldier probably wasn't any less afraid, but he climbed back on the vehicle and went out to rescue the other American soldiers.

3-32. Will and a winning spirit apply in more situations than those requiring physical courage; sometimes you'll have to carry on for long periods in very difficult situations. The difficulties soldiers face may not be ones of physical danger, but of great physical, emotional, and mental strain. Physical courage allowed the soldier in the situation described above to return to the fight; will allowed his leader to say the right thing, to influence his frightened subordinate to do the right thing. Physical courage causes soldiers to charge a machine gun; will empowers them to fight on when they're hopelessly outnumbered, under appalling conditions, and without basic necessities.

STRESS IN TRAINING

When the bullets started flying…I never thought about half the things I was doing. I simply relied on my training and concentrated on the mission.

Captain Marie Bezubic
Operation Just Cause, Panama

3-33. Leaders must inject stress into training to prepare soldiers for stress in combat. However, creating a problem for subordinates and having them react to it doesn't induce the kind of stress required for combat training. A meaningful and productive mission, given with detailed constraints and limitations plus high standards of performance, does produce stress. Still, leaders must add unanticipated conditions to that stress to create a real learning environment. Sometimes, you don't even have to add stress; it just happens, as in this example.

Mix-up at the Crossroads

A young transportation section chief was leading a convoy of trucks on a night move to link up with several rifle companies. He was to transport the infantry to a new assembly area. When a sudden rainstorm dropped visibility to near zero, the section chief was especially glad that he had carefully briefed his drivers, issued strip maps, and made contingency plans. At a road intersection, his northbound convoy passed through an artillery battery moving east. When his convoy reached the rendezvous and the section chief got out to check his vehicles, he found he was missing two of his own trucks but had picked up three others towing howitzers. The tired and wet infantry commander was concerned that his unit would be late crossing the line of departure and forcefully expressed that concern to the section chief. The section chief now had to accomplish the same mission with fewer resources as well as run down his lost trucks and soldiers. There was certainly enough stress to go around.

After the section chief sent one of his most reliable soldiers with the artillery vehicles to find his missing trucks, he started shuttling the infantrymen to their destination. Later, after the mission was accomplished, the section chief and his drivers talked about what had happened. The leader admitted that he needed to supervise a convoy more closely under difficult conditions, and his soldiers recognized the need to follow the part of the unit SOP concerning reduced visibility operations.

3-34. The section chief fixed the immediate problem by starting to shuttle the infantry soldiers in the available trucks. During the AAR with the drivers, the leader admitted a mistake and figured out how to prevent similar errors in the future. The section chief also let the team know that sometimes, in spite of the best plans, things go wrong. A well-trained organization doesn't buckle under stress but deals with any setbacks and continues the mission.

THE STRESS OF CHANGE

3-35. Since the end of the Cold War, the Army has gone through tremendous change—dramatic decreases in the number of soldiers and DA civilians in all components, changes in assignment policies, base closings, and a host of other shifts that put stress on soldiers, DA civilians, and families. In those same years, the number of deployments to support missions such as peace operations and nation assistance has increased. And these changes have occurred in a peacetime Army. At the same time, Army leaders have had to prepare their soldiers for the stresses of combat, the ultimate crucible.

3-36. The stresses of combat you read about earlier in this chapter are classic: they've been the same for centuries. However, there's an aspect of the human dimension that has assumed an increasing importance: the effect of technological advances on organizations and people. Military leaders have always had to deal with the effect of technological changes. What's different today is the rate at which technology, to include warfighting technology, is changing. Rapid advances in new technologies are forcing the Army to change many aspects of the way it operates and are creating new leadership challenges.

TECHNOLOGY AND LEADERSHIP

3-37. Technology's presence challenges all Army leaders. Technology is here to stay and you, as an Army leader, need to continually learn how to manage it and make it work for you. The challenges come from many directions. Among them—

- You need to learn the strengths and vulnerabilities of the different technologies that support your team and its mission.
- You need to think through how your organization will operate with organizations that are less or more technologically complex. This situation may take the form of heavy and light Army units working together, operating with elements of another service, or

cooperating with elements of another nation's armed forces.

- You need to consider the effect of technology on the time you have to analyze problems, make a decision, and act. Events happen faster today, and the stress you encounter as an Army leader is correspondingly greater.

Technological advances have the potential to permit better and more sustainable operations. However, as an Army leader you must remember the limitations of your people. No matter what technology you have or how it affects your mission, it's still your soldiers and DA civilians—their minds, hearts, courage, and talents—that will win the day.

3-38. Advances in electronic data processing let you handle large amounts of information easily. Today's desktop computer can do more, and do it faster, than the room-sized computers of only 20 years ago. Technology is a powerful tool—if you understand its potential uses and limitations. The challenge for all Army leaders is to overcome confusion on a fast-moving battlefield characterized by too much information coming in too fast.

3-39. Army leaders and staffs have always needed to determine mission-critical information, prioritize incoming reports, and process them quickly. The volume of information that current technology makes available makes this skill even more important than in the past. Sometimes something low-tech can divert the flood of technological help into channels the leader and staff can manage. For example, a well-understood commander's intent and thought-through commander's critical information requirements (CCIR) can help free leaders from nonessential information while pushing decisions to lower levels. As an Army leader, you must work hard to overcome the attractiveness and potential pitfalls of centralized decision making that access to information will appear to make practical.

3-40. Technology is also changing the size of the battlefield and the speed of battle. Instant global communications are increasing the pace of military actions. Global positioning systems and night vision capabilities mean the Army can fight at night and during periods of limited visibility—conditions that used to slow things down. Continuous operations increase the mental and physical stress on soldiers and leaders. Nonlinear operations make it more difficult for commanders to determine critical points on the battlefield. Effective leaders develop techniques to identify and manage stress well before actual conflict occurs. They also find ways to overcome the soldier's increased sense of isolation that comes with the greater breadth and depth of the modern battlefield. (FM 100-34 discusses continuous operations. FM 22-51 discusses combat stress control.)

3-41. Modern technology has also increased the number and complexity of skills the Army requires. Army leaders must carefully manage low-density specialties. They need to ensure that critical positions are filled and that their people maintain perishable skills. Army leaders must bring together leadership, personnel management, and training management to ensure their organizations are assigned people with the right specialties and that the entire organization is trained and ready. On top of this, the speed and lethality of modern battle have made mental agility and initiative even more necessary for fighting and winning. As in the past, Army leaders must develop these attributes in their subordinates.

3-42. To some, technology suggests a bloodless battlefield that resembles a computer war game more than the battlefields of the past. That isn't true now and it won't be true in the immediate future. Technology is still directed at answering the same basic questions that Civil War leaders tried to answer when they sent out a line of skirmishers: Where am I? Where are my buddies? Where is the enemy? How do I defeat him? Armed with this information, the soldiers and DA civilians of the Army will continue to accomplish the mission with character, using their technological edge to do the job better, faster, and smarter.

3-43. Modern digital technology can contribute a great deal to the Army leader's understanding of the battlefield; good leaders stay abreast of advances that enhance their tactical abilities. Digital technology has a lot to offer, but don't be

fooled. A video image of a place, an action, or an organization can never substitute for the leader's getting down on the ground with the soldiers to find out what's going on. Technology can provide a great deal of information, but it may not present a completely accurate picture. The only way leaders can see the urgency in the faces of their soldiers is to get out and see them. As with any new weapon, the Army leader must know how to use technology without being seduced by it. Technology may be invaluable; however, effective leaders understand its limits.

3-44. Whatever their feeling regarding technology, today's leaders must contend more and more with an increased information flow and operational tempo (OPTEMPO). Pressures to make a decision increase, even as the time to verify and validate information decreases. Regardless of the crunch, Army leaders are responsible for the consequences of their decisions, so they gather, process, analyze, evaluate—and check —information. If they don't, the costs can be disastrous. (FM 100-34 discusses information management and decision making.)

"Superior Technology"

In the late fall of 1950, as United Nations (UN) forces pushed the North Korean People's Army northward, the People's Republic of China prepared to enter the conflict in support of its ally. The UN had air superiority, a marked advantage that had contributed significantly to the UN tactical and operational successes of the summer and early fall. Nonetheless, daily reconnaissance missions over the rugged North Korean interior failed to detect the Chinese People's Liberation Army's movement of nearly a quarter of a million ground troops across the border and into position in the North Korean mountains.

When the first reports of Chinese soldiers in North Korea arrived at Far East Command in Tokyo, intelligence analysts ignored them because they contradicted the information provided by the latest technology—aerial surveillance. Tactical commanders failed to send ground patrols into the mountains. They assumed the photos gave an accurate picture of the enemy situation when, in fact, the Chinese were practicing strict camouflage discipline. When the Chinese attacked in late November, UN forces were surprised, suffered heavy losses, and were driven from the Chinese border back to the 38th parallel.

When GEN Matthew B. Ridgway took over the UN forces in Korea in December, he immediately visited the headquarters of every regiment and many of the battalions on the front line. This gave GEN Ridgway an unfiltered look at the situation, and it sent a message to all his commanders: get out on the ground and find out what's going on.

3-45. The Chinese counterattack undid the results of the previous summer's campaign and denied UN forces the opportunity for a decisive victory that may have ended the war. The UN forces, under US leadership, enjoyed significant technological advantages over the Chinese. However, failure to verify the information provided by aerial photography set this advantage to zero. And this failure was one of leadership, not technology. Questioning good news provided by the latest "gee-whiz" system and ordering reconnaissance patrols to go out in lousy weather both require judgment and moral courage: judgment as to when a doubt is reasonable and courage to order soldiers to risk their lives in cold, miserable weather. But Army leaders must make those judgments and give those orders. Technology has not changed that.

3-46. Technology and making the most of it will become increasingly important. Today's Army leaders require systems understanding and more technical and tactical skills. Technical skill: What does this system do? What does it not do? What are its strengths? What are its weaknesses? What must I check? Tactical skill:

How do this system's capabilities support my organization? How should I employ it to support this mission? What must I do if it fails? There's a fine line between a healthy questioning of new systems' capabilities and an unreasoning hostility that rejects the advantages technology offers. You, as an Army leader, must stay on the right side of that line, the side that allows you to maximize the advantages of technology. You need to remain aware of its capabilities and shortcomings, and you need to make sure your people do as well.

LEADERSHIP AND THE CHANGING THREAT

3-47. Another factor that will have a major impact on Army leadership in the near future is the changing nature of the threat. For the Army, the twenty-first century began in 1989 with the fall of the Berlin Wall and subsequent collapse of the Soviet Union. America no longer defines its security interests in terms of a single, major threat. Instead, it faces numerous, smaller threats and situations, any of which can quickly mushroom into a major security challenge.

3-48. The end of the Cold War has increased the frequency and variety of Army missions. Since 1989, the Army has fought a large-scale land war and been continually involved in many different kinds of stability operations and support operations. There has been a greater demand for special, joint, and multinational operations as well. Initiative at all levels is becoming more and more important. In many instances, Army leaders on the ground have had to invent ways of doing business for situations they could not have anticipated.

3-49. Not only that, the importance of direct leaders—NCOs and junior officers—making the right decisions in stressful situations has increased. Actions by direct-level leaders—sergeants, warrant officers, lieutenants, and captains—can have organizational- and strategic-level implications. Earlier in this chapter, you read about the disciplined soldiers and leaders who accomplished their mission of securing a television tower in Udrigovo, Bosnia-Herzegovina. In that case, the local population's perception of how American soldiers secured the tower was just as important as securing the tower itself. Had the American detachment created an international incident by using what could have been interpreted as excessive force, maintaining order throughout Bosnia Herzegovina would have become more difficult. The Army's organizational and strategic leaders count on direct leaders. It has always been important to accomplish the mission the right way the first time; today it's more important than ever.

3-50. The Army has handled change in the past. It will continue to do so in the future as long as Army leaders emphasize the constants—Army values, teamwork, and discipline—and help their people anticipate change by seeking always to improve. Army leaders explain, to the extent of their knowledge and in clear terms, what may happen and how the organization can effectively react if it does. Change is inevitable; trying to avoid it is futile. The disciplined, cohesive organization rides out the tough times and will emerge even better than it started. Leadership, in a very real sense, includes managing change and making it work for you. To do that, you must know what to change and what not to change.

3-51. FM 100-5 provides a doctrinal framework for coping with these challenges while executing operations. It gives Army leaders clues as to what they will face and what will be required of them, but as COL Chamberlain found on Little Round Top, no manual can cover all possibilities. The essence of leadership remains the same: Army leaders create a vision of what's necessary, communicate it in a way that makes their intent clear, and vigorously execute it to achieve success.

CLIMATE AND CULTURE

3-52. Climate and culture describe the environment in which you lead your people. Culture refers to the environment of the Army as an institution and of major elements or communities within it. Strategic leaders maintain the Army's institutional culture. (Chapter 7 discusses their role.) Climate refers to the environment of units and organizations. All organizational and direct leaders establish their organization's climate, whether purposefully or unwittingly. (Chapters 5 and 6 discuss their responsibilities.)

CLIMATE

3-53. Taking care of people and maximizing their performance also depends on the climate a leader creates in the organization. An organization's climate is the way its members feel about their organization. Climate comes from people's shared perceptions and attitudes, what they believe about the day-to-day functioning of their outfit. These things have a great impact on their motivation and the trust they feel for their team and their leaders. Climate is generally short-term: it depends on a network of the personalities in a small organization. As people come and go, the climate changes. When a soldier says "My last platoon sergeant was pretty good, but this new one is great," the soldier is talking about one of the many elements that affect organizational climate.

3-54. Although such a call seems subjective, some very definite things determine climate. The members' collective sense of the organization—its organizational climat —is directly attributable to the leader's values, skills, and actions. As an Army leader, you establish the climate of your organization, no matter how small it is or how large. Answering the following questions can help you describe an organization's climate:

- Does the leader set clear priorities and goals?
- Is there a system of recognition, rewards and punishments? Does it work?
- Do the leaders know what they're doing? Do they admit when they're wrong?
- Do leaders seek input from subordinates? Do they act on the feedback they're provided?
- In the absence of orders, do junior leaders have authority to make decisions that are consistent with the leader's intent?
- Are there high levels of internal stress and negative competition in the organization? If so, what's the leader doing to change that situation?
- Do the leaders behave the way they talk? Is that behavior consistent with Army values? Are they good role models?
- Do the leaders lead from the front, sharing hardship when things get tough?
- Do leaders talk to their organizations on a regular basis? Do they keep their people informed?

3-55. Army leaders who do the right things for the right reasons—even when it would be easier to do the wrong thing—create a healthy organizational climate. In fact, it's the leader's behavior that has the greatest effect on the organizational climate. That behavior signals to every member of the organization what the leader will and will not tolerate. Consider this example.

Changing a Unit Climate—The New Squad Leader

SSG Withers was having a tough week. He had just been promoted to squad leader in a different company; he had new responsibilities, new leaders, and new soldiers. Then, on his second day, his unit was alerted for a big inspection in two days. A quick check of the records let him know that the squad leader before him had let maintenance slip; the records were sloppy and a lot of the scheduled work had not been done. On top of that, SSG Withers was sure his new platoon sergeant didn't like him. SFC King was professional but gruff, a person of few words. The soldiers in SSG Withers' squad seemed a little afraid of the platoon sergeant.

After receiving the company commander's guidance about the inspection, the squad leaders briefed the platoon sergeant on their plans to get ready. SSG Withers had already determined that he and his soldiers would have to work late. He could have complained about his predecessor, but he thought it would be best just to stick to the facts and talk about what he had found in the squad. For all he knew, the old squad leader might have been a favorite of SFC King.

SFC King scowled as he asked, "You're going to work late?"

SSG Withers had checked his plan twice: "Yes, sergeant. I think it's necessary."

SFC King grunted, but the sound could have meant "okay" or it could have meant "You're being foolish." SSG Withers wasn't sure.

The next day SSG Withers told his soldiers what they would have to accomplish. One of the soldiers said that the old squad leader would have just fudged the paperwork. "No kidding," SSG Withers thought. He wondered if SFC King knew about it. Of course, there was a good chance he would fail the inspection if he didn't fudge the paperwork—and wouldn't *that* be a good introduction to the new company? But he told his squad that they would do it right: "We'll do the best we can. If we don't pass, we'll do better next time."

SSG Withers then asked his squad for their thoughts on how to get ready. He listened to their ideas and offered some of his own. One soldier suggested that they could beat the other squads by sneaking into the motor pool at night and lowering the oil levels in their vehicles. "SFC King gives a half day off to whatever squad does best," the soldier explained. SSG Withers didn't want to badmouth the previous squad leader; on the other hand, the squad was his responsibility now. "It'd be nice to win," SSG Withers said, "but we're not going to cheat."

The squad worked past 2200 hours the night before the inspection. At one point SSG Withers found one of the soldiers sleeping under a vehicle. "Don't you want to finish and go home to sleep?" he asked the soldier.

"I…uh…I didn't think you'd still be here," the soldier answered.

"Where else would I be?" replied the squad leader.

The next day, SFC King asked SSG Withers if he thought his squad's vehicle was going to pass the inspection.

"Not a chance," SSG Withers said.

SFC King gave another mysterious grunt.

Later, when the inspector was going over his vehicle, SSG Withers asked if his soldiers could follow along. "I want them to see how to do a thorough inspection," he told the inspector. As the soldiers followed the inspector around and learned how to look closely at the vehicle, one of them commented that the squad had never been around for any inspection up to that point. "We were always told to stay away," he said.

Later, when the company commander went over the results of the inspection, he looked up at SSG Withers as he read the failing grade. SSG Withers was about to say, "We'll try harder next time, sir," but he decided that sounded lame, so he said nothing. Then SFC King spoke up.

"First time that squad has ever failed an inspection," the platoon sergeant said, "but they're already better off than they were the day before yesterday, failing grade and all."

3-56. SFC King saw immediately that things had changed for the better in SSG Withers' squad. The failing grade was real; previous passing grades had not been. The new squad leader told the truth and expected his soldiers to do the same. He was there when his people were working late. He acted to improve the squad's ethical and performance standards (by clearly stating and enforcing them). He moved to teach his soldiers the skills and standards associated with vehicle maintenance (by asking the inspector to show them how to look at a vehicle). And not once did SSG Withers whine that the failing grade was not his fault; instead, he focused on how to make things better. SSG Withers knew how to motivate soldiers to perform to standard and had the strength of character to do the right thing. In addition, he trusted the chain of command to take the long-term view. Because of his decisive actions, based on his character and competence, SSG Withers was well on his way to creating a much healthier climate in his squad.

3-57. No matter how they complain about it, soldiers and DA civilians expect to be held to standard; in the long run they feel better about themselves when they do hard work successfully. They gain confidence in leaders who help them achieve standards and lose confidence in leaders who don't know the standards or who fail to demand performance.

CULTURE

When you're first sergeant, you're a role model whether you know it or not. You're a role model for the guy that will be in your job. Not next month or next year, but ten years from now. Every day soldiers are watching you and deciding if you are the kind of first sergeant they want to be.

An Army First Sergeant
1988

3-58. Culture is a longer lasting, more complex set of shared expectations than climate. While climate is how people feel about their organization right now, culture consists of the shared attitudes, values, goals, and practices that characterize the larger institution. It's deeply rooted in long-held beliefs, customs, and practices. For instance, the culture of the armed forces is different from that of the business world, and the culture of the Army is different from that of the Navy. Leaders must establish a climate consistent with the culture of the larger institution. They also use the culture to let their people know they're part of something bigger than just themselves, that they have responsibilities not only to the people around them but also to those who have gone before and those who will come after.

3-59. Soldiers draw strength from knowing they're part of a tradition. Most meaningful traditions have their roots in the institution's culture. Many of the Army's everyday customs and traditions are there to remind you that you're just the latest addition to a long line of American soldiers. Think of how much of your daily life connects you to the past and to American soldiers not yet born: the uniforms you wear, the martial music that punctuates your day, the way you salute, your title, your organization's history, and Army values such as selfless service. Reminders of your place in history surround you.

3-60. This sense of belonging is vitally important. Visit the Vietnam Memorial in Washington, DC, some Memorial Day weekend and you'll see dozens of veterans, many of them wearing bush hats or campaign ribbons or fatigue jackets decorated with unit patches. They're paying tribute to their comrades in this division or that company. They're also acknowledging what for many of them was the most intense experience of their lives.

3-61. Young soldiers want to belong to something bigger than themselves. Look at them off duty, wearing tee shirts with names of sports teams and famous athletes. It's not as if an 18-year-old who puts on a jacket with a professional sports team's logo thinks anyone will mistake him for a professional player; rather, that soldier wants to be associated with a winner. Advertising and mass media make heroes of rock stars, athletes, and actors. Unfortunately, it's easier to let some magazine or TV show tell you whom to admire than it is to dig up an organization's history and learn about heroes.

3-62. Soldiers want to have heroes. If they don't know about SGT Alvin York in World War I, about COL Joshua Chamberlain's 20th Maine during the Civil War, about MSG Gary Gordon and SFC Randall Shughart in the 1993 Somalia fight, then it's up to you, their leaders, to teach them. (The bibliography lists works you can use to learn more about your profession, its history, and the people who made it.)

3-63. When soldiers join the Army, they become part of a history: the Big Red One, the King of Battle, Sua Sponte. Teach them the history behind unit crests, behind greetings, behind decorations and badges. The Army's culture isn't something that exists apart from you; it's part of who you are, something you can use to give your soldiers pride in themselves and in what they're doing with their lives.

LEADERSHIP STYLES

3-64. You read in Chapter 2 that all people are shaped by what they've seen, what they've learned, and whom they've met. Who you are determines the way you work with other people. Some people are happy and smiling all the time; others are serious. Some leaders can wade into a room full of strangers and inside of five minutes have everyone there thinking, "How have I lived so long without meeting this person?" Other very competent leaders are uncomfortable in social situations. Most of us are somewhere in between. Although Army leadership doctrine describes at great length how you should interact with your subordinates and how you must strive to learn and improve your leadership skills, the Army recognizes that you must always be yourself; anything else comes across as fake and insincere.

3-65. Having said that, effective leaders are flexible enough to adjust their leadership style and techniques to the people they lead. Some subordinates respond best to coaxing, suggestions, or gentle prodding; others need, and even want at times, the verbal equivalent of a kick in the pants. Treating people fairly doesn't mean treating people as if they were clones of one another. In fact, if you treat everyone the same way, you're probably being unfair, because different people need different things from you.

3-66. Think of it this way: Say you must teach map reading to a large group of soldiers ranging in rank from private to senior NCO. The senior NCOs know a great deal about the subject, while the privates know very little. To meet all their needs, you must teach the privates more than you teach the senior NCOs. If you train the privates only in the advanced skills the NCOs need, the privates will be lost. If you make the NCOs sit through training in the basic tasks the privates need, you'll waste the NCOs' time. You must fit the training to the experience of those being trained. In the same way, you must adjust your leadership style and techniques to the experience of your people and characteristics of your organization.

3-67. Obviously, you don't lead senior NCOs the same way you lead privates. But the easiest distinctions to make are those of rank and experience. You must also take into account personalities, self-confidence, self-esteem—all the elements of the complex mix of character traits that makes dealing with people so difficult and so rewarding. One of the many things that makes your job tough is that, in order to get their best performance, you must figure out what your subordinates need and what they're able to do—even when they don't know themselves.

3-68. When discussing leadership styles, many people focus on the extremes: autocratic and democratic. Autocratic leaders tell people what to do with no explanation; their message is, "I'm the boss; you'll do it because I said so." Democratic leaders use their personalities to persuade subordinates. There are many shades in between; the following paragraphs discuss five of them. However, bear in mind that competent leaders mix elements of all these styles to match to the place, task, and people involved. Using different leadership styles in different situations or elements of different styles in the same situation isn't inconsistent. The opposite is true: if you can use only one leadership style,

you're inflexible and will have difficulty operating in situations where that style doesn't fit.

DIRECTING LEADERSHIP STYLE

3-69. The directing style is leader-centered. Leaders using this style don't solicit input from subordinates and give detailed instructions on how, when, and where they want a task performed. They then supervise its execution very closely.

3-70. The directing style may be appropriate when time is short and leaders don't have a chance to explain things. They may simply give orders: Do this. Go there. Move. In fast-paced operations or in combat, leaders may revert to the directing style, even with experienced subordinates. This is what the motor sergeant you read about in Chapter 1 did. If the leader has created a climate of trust, subordinates will assume the leader has switched to the directing style because of the circumstances.

3-71. The directing style is also appropriate when leading inexperienced teams or individuals who are not yet trained to operate on their own. In this kind of situation, the leader will probably remain close to the action to make sure things go smoothly.

3-72. Some people mistakenly believe the directing style means using abusive or demeaning language or includes threats and intimidation. This is wrong. If you're ever tempted to be abusive, whether because of pressure or stress or what seems like improper behavior by a subordinate, ask yourself these questions: Would I want to work for someone like me? Would I want my boss to see and hear me treat subordinates this way? Would I want to be treated this way?

PARTICIPATING LEADERSHIP STYLE

3-73. The participating style centers on both the leader and the team. Given a mission, leaders ask subordinates for input, information, and recommendations but make the final decision on what to do themselves. This style is especially appropriate for leaders who have time for such consultations or who are dealing with experienced subordinates.

3-74. The team-building approach lies behind the participating leadership style. When subordinates help create a plan, it becomes—at least in part—their plan. This ownership creates a strong incentive to invest the effort necessary to make the plan work. Asking for this kind of input is a sign of a leader's strength and self-confidence. But asking for advice doesn't mean the leader is obligated to follow it; the leader alone is always responsible for the quality of decisions and plans.

DELEGATING LEADERSHIP STYLE

3-75. The delegating style involves giving subordinates the authority to solve problems and make decisions without clearing them through the leader. Leaders with mature and experienced subordinates or who want to create a learning experience for subordinates often need only to give them authority to make decisions, the necessary resources, and a clear understanding of the mission's purpose. As always, the leader is ultimately responsible for what does or does not happen, but in the delegating leadership style, the leader holds subordinate leaders accountable for their actions. This is the style most often used by officers dealing with senior NCOs and by organizational and strategic leaders.

TRANSFORMATIONAL AND TRANSACTIONAL LEADERSHIP STYLES

A man does not have himself killed for a few halfpence a day or for a petty distinction. You must speak to the soul in order to electrify the man.

Napoleon Bonaparte

3-76. These words of a distinguished military leader capture the distinction between the transformational leadership style, which focuses on inspiration and change, and the transactional leadership style, which focuses on rewards and punishments. Of course Napoleon understood the importance of rewards and punishments. Nonetheless, he also understood that carrots and sticks alone don't inspire individuals to excellence.

Transformational Leadership Style

3-77. As the name suggests, the transformational style "transforms" subordinates by challenging them to rise above their immediate needs and self-interests. The transformational style is developmental: it emphasizes individual growth (both professional and personal) and organizational enhancement. Key features of the transformational style include empowering and mentally stimulating subordinates: you consider and motivate them first as individuals and then as a group. To use the transformational style, you must have the courage to communicate your intent and then step back and let your subordinates work. You must also be aware that immediate benefits are often delayed until the mission is accomplished.

3-78. The transformational style allows you to take advantage of the skills and knowledge of experienced subordinates who may have better ideas on how to accomplish a mission. Leaders who use this style communicate reasons for their decisions or actions and, in the process, build in subordinates a broader understanding and ability to exercise initiative and operate effectively. However, not all situations lend themselves to the transformational leadership style. The transformational style is most effective during periods that call for change or present new opportunities. It also works well when organizations face a crisis, instability, mediocrity, or disenchantment. It may not be effective when subordinates are inexperienced, when the mission allows little deviation from accepted procedures, or when subordinates are not motivated. Leaders who use only the transformational leadership style limit their ability to influence individuals in these and similar situations.

Transactional Leadership Style

3-79. In contrast, some leaders employ only the transactional leadership style. This style includes such techniques as—

- Motivating subordinates to work by offering rewards or threatening punishment.
- Prescribing task assignments in writing.
- Outlining all the conditions of task completion, the applicable rules and regulations, the benefits of success, and the consequences—to include possible disciplinary actions—of failure.
- "Management-by-exception," where leaders focus on their subordinates' failures, showing up only when something goes wrong.

The leader who relies exclusively on the transactional style, rather than combining it with the transformational style, evokes only short-term commitment from his subordinates and discourages risk-taking and innovation.

3-80. There are situations where the transactional style is acceptable, if not preferred. For example, a leader who wants to emphasize safety could reward the organization with a three-day pass if the organization prevents any serious safety-related incidents over a two-month deployment. In this case, the leader's intent appears clear: unsafe acts are not tolerated and safe habits are rewarded.

3-81. However, using only the transactional style can make the leader's efforts appear self-serving. In this example, soldiers might interpret the leader's attempt to reward safe practices as an effort to look good by focusing on something that's unimportant but that has the boss's attention. Such perceptions can destroy the trust subordinates have in the leader. Using the transactional style alone can also deprive subordinates of opportunities to grow, because it leaves no room for honest mistakes.

3-82. The most effective leaders combine techniques from the transformational and transactional leadership styles to fit the situation. A strong base of transactional understanding supplemented by charisma, inspiration and individualized concern for each subordinate, produces the most enthusiastic and genuine response. Subordinates will be more committed, creative, and innovative. They will also be more likely to take calculated risks to accomplish their mission. Again referring to the safety example, leaders can avoid any misunderstanding of their intent by combining transformational techniques with transactional techniques. They can explain why safety is important (intellectual stimulation) and encourage their subordinates to take care of each other (individualized concern).

INTENDED AND UNINTENDED CONSEQUENCES

3-83. The actions you take as a leader will most likely have unintended as well as intended consequences. Like a chess player trying to anticipate an opponent's moves three or four turns in advance—if I do this, what will my opponent do; then what will I do next?—leaders think through what they can expect to happen as a result of a decision. Some decisions set off a chain of events; as far as possible, leaders must anticipate the second- and third-order effects of their actions. Even lower-level leaders' actions may have effects well beyond what they expect.

3-84. Consider the case of a sergeant whose team is manning a roadblock as part of a peace operation. The mission has received lots of media attention (Haiti and Bosnia come to mind), and millions of people back home are watching. Early one morning, a truckload of civilians appears, racing toward the roadblock. In the half-light, the sergeant can't tell if the things in the passengers' hands are weapons or farm tools, and the driver seems intent on smashing through the barricade. In the space of a few seconds, the sergeant must decide whether or not to order his team to fire on the truck.

3-85. If the sergeant orders his team to fire because he feels he and his soldiers are threatened, that decision will have international consequences. If he kills any civilians, chances are good that his chain of command from the president on down—not to mention the entire television audience of the developed world—will know about the incident in a few short hours. But the decision is tough for another reason: if the sergeant doesn't order his team to fire and the civilians turn out to be an armed gang, the team may take casualties that could have been avoided. If the only factor involved was avoiding civilian casualties, the choice is simple: don't shoot. But the sergeant must also consider the requirement to protect his force and accomplish the mission of preventing unauthorized traffic from passing the roadblock. So the sergeant must act; he's the leader, and he's in charge. Leaders who have thought through the consequences of possible actions, talked with their own leaders about the commander's intent and mission priorities, and trust their chain of command to support them are less likely to be paralyzed by this kind of pressure.

INTENDED CONSEQUENCES

3-86. Intended consequences are the anticipated results of a leader's decisions and actions. When a squad leader shows a team leader a better way to lead PT, that action will have intended consequences: the team leader will be better equipped to do the job. When leaders streamline procedures, help people work smarter, and get the resources to the right place at the right time, the intended consequences are good.

UNINTENDED CONSEQUENCES

3-87. Unintended consequences are the results of things a leader does that have an unplanned impact on the organization or accomplishment of the mission. Unintended consequences are often more lasting and harder to anticipate than intended consequences. Organizational and strategic leaders spend a good deal of energy considering possible unintended consequences of their actions. Their organizations are complex, so figuring out the effects today's decisions will have a few years in the future is difficult.

3-88. Unintended consequences are best described with an example, such as setting the morning PT formation time: Setting the formation time at 0600 hours results in soldiers standing in formation at 0600 hours, an intended consequence. To not be late, soldiers living off post may have to depart their homes at 0500 hours, a consequence that's probably also anticipated. However, since most junior enlisted soldiers with families probably own only one car, there will most likely be another consequence: entire families rising at 0430 hours. Spouses must drive their soldiers to post and children, who can't be left at home unattended, must accompany them. This is an unintended consequence.

SUMMARY

3-89. The human dimension of leadership, how the environment affects you and your people, affects how you lead. Stress is a major part of the environment, both in peace and war. Major sources of stress include the rapid pace of change and the increasing complexity of technology. As an Army leader, you must stay on top of both. Your character and skills—how you handle stress—and the morale and discipline you develop and your team are more important in establishing the climate in your organization than any external circumstances.

3-90. The organizational climate and the institutional culture define the environment in which you and your people work. Direct, organizational, and strategic leaders all have different responsibilities regarding climate and culture; what's important now is to realize that you, the leader, establish the climate of your organization. By action or inaction, you determine the environment in which your people work.

3-91. Leadership styles are different ways of approaching the DO of BE, KNOW, DO—the actual work of leading people. You've read about five leadership styles: directing, participating, delegating, transformational, and transactional. But remember that you must be able to adjust the leadership style you use to the situation and the people you're leading. Remember also that you're not limited to any one style in a given situation: you should use techniques from different styles if that will help you motivate your people to accomplish the mission. Your leader attributes of judgment, intelligence, cultural awareness, and self-control all play major roles in helping you choose the proper style and the appropriate techniques for the task at hand. That said, you must always be yourself.

3-92. All leader actions result in intended and unintended consequences. Two points to remember: think through your decisions and do your duty. It might not seem that the actions of one leader of one small unit matter in the big picture. But they do. In the words of Confederate COL William C. Oats, who faced COL Joshua Chamberlain at Little Round Top: "Great events sometimes turn on comparatively small affairs."

3-93. In spite of stress and changes, whether social or technological, leadership always involves shaping human emotions and behaviors. As they serve in more complex environments with wider-ranging consequences, Army leaders refine what they've known and done as well as develop new styles, skills, and actions. Parts Two and Three discuss the skills and actions required of leaders from team to Department of the Army level.