

Question

What role does trust play in the execution of Mission Command?

How is it developed?

Is it essential for mission command?

Role of Trust in Mission Command

MAJ Michael “Neal” Miller

A798: The Role of Character in Developing Trust

25 April 2016

“Character is like a tree and reputation like a shadow. The shadow is what we think of it; the tree is the real thing.”

Abraham Lincoln

Introduction

Trust is essential for the successful implementation of mission command, otherwise it is detailed command. Mission command requires a transactional and negotiable agreement between a commander and his/her subordinate leader to meet the intent of an explicitly defined task or mission¹. Although mission command is a tool of the commander during unified land operations², it is a philosophy that leaders, not just commanders, must utilize in their daily actions associated with the accomplishment of tasks. With this in mind, mission command should be redefined to be inclusive of all leaders and actions associated within the full range of military operations (ROMO) – garrison and unified land operation environments.

In the Center for the Army Profession and Ethic (CAPE) Annual Survey of the Army Profession Technical Report (CASAP FY15), 91% of respondents perceive their leader trusts them to properly perform their duties (activity control³). However, there is not a firm consensus that leaders are actively interacting with subordinates to encourage candid dialogue and define what is prudent risk, which would demonstrate that trust is present⁴ (capability control). This is reinforced in follow-on CASAP questions concerning the leader's ability to inspire subordinates to be persons of character (much less at 58% to 72%) or that the leaders are providing helpful coaching or counseling (also much less at 54% to 70%)⁵. This decline enforces that Soldiers are relating trust with activity control instead of the preferred capability control, which builds relationships and improves trustworthiness.

Problem Statement

How can the Army encourage unit leaders to develop the mission command philosophy through the establishment, sustainment, and strengthening of internal trust:

- Given a large and diverse work force;

- Against limited resources, competing requirements, biases, and a variety of expectations;
- Over varying career lengths and environments;
- In assorted and geographically dispersed units;
- With consideration for a variety of education levels, experiences, individuality, career and personal goals, cultures, core values, professional diversity, and requirements?

Research Methodology

Meta-analysis and introspective analysis were the primary methods used to develop this paper. The paper focuses on the relationships between character, trust, mission command, bureaucracy, leader engagement, and followership within garrison and warlike environments.

Outline

Mission Command

Mission command is a leadership philosophy that must begin before a leader and his/her subordinates participate in unified land operations. Mission command is easier to execute during combat operations where time, space, and operational tempo facilitate it but this becomes more complicated in other ROMO environments such as garrison. Combat requires units to disperse throughout a defined area of operation, disconnected from the commander. Trust and identification of trusted personnel occurs prior to arrival although it can be lost during operations. Garrison environments, on the other hand, are where trust is either built or can deteriorate due to ease of access (location, ease of mobility, micromanagement), abdication (distraction / overwhelmed by bureaucratic requirements), and understanding other quality of life requirements (family, personal goals) are present.

Army units have been operating in and out of defined combat operations since 2001. The majority of doctrine focuses on the Army within this environment, while inferring how it

prepares for unified land operation. As the Army continues to operate for longer timeframes within a garrison or near-garrison environment, many aspects of doctrine will need to include this environment in their guidance. Mission command, with its categorical metamorphosis from a defined commander-oriented philosophy into a generic leadership philosophy, is one such term. FM 6-22, states that leader development needs to include the “exercising of art and science of mission command”⁶ emphasizing that this does not begin exclusively with the commander.

Mission command cannot begin with a commander and end with the leaders they have designated to complete a mission/task; only to begin again with the next level of command. This is not the intent of the philosophy although the definition infers it is. Mission command requires subordinate leaders, not just commanders, to practice this philosophy. Mission command cannot end with micromanagement, or detailed command, at lower levels. *Mission command should not exclusively begin within the officer domain⁷; it must begin within the leadership domain.*

Through practice, all leaders must develop mission command in all environments, not just transactional, situational, or similar leadership models, to effectively engage and grow their teams.

Trust

ADRP 1 specifies that trust is the bedrock of the Army profession. Likewise, internal trust is the bedrock of mission command because it summarizes how professionals, leader/subordinate, rely on their view of the other’s character, competence, and commitment.⁸ In “Trust and Betrayal in the Workplace”, Drs. Dennis Reina and Michelle Reina routinely state that trust begins with each individual; specifically, their attitude, intention, and behaviors within the relationship⁹. A positive relationship results in a confident approach that is participatory, collaborative, and innovative since trust is fundamental for an effective relationship¹⁰.

Since internal trust requires a relationship, leaders must ensure that they are maximizing time with subordinates, primarily those directly reporting to the leader (direct report). Too often, leaders and followers prefer abdication over delegation. Abdication of responsibility is the antithesis of mission command since it severs communication - feedback and guidance.¹¹ If a task or mission is not completed to a perceived standard, abdication encourages blame, eroding trust. A leader may inappropriately identify fault with the subordinate who assumed he/she was meeting the leader's intent or a subordinate may quietly and slowly disconnect from a leader because he/she is not receiving the required guidance. Leaders are responsible for building and encouraging vertical trust¹².

Leader engagement

Leaders must maintain the proper direct support engagements so that they build trust – too little and a subordinate may perceive the leader as not caring, too much and it is micromanaging. According to a Leadership IQ study of 32,000 participants, a leader should attempt to engage with a subordinate (direct report) six hours per week¹³; which means a leader should be actively leading no more than six to seven subordinates¹⁴. The challenge occurs when leaders are distracted or overwhelmed by unrealistic bureaucratic expectations and unable to perform meaningful engagements¹⁵. Leader engagement must occur at every level of command including strategic, operational, and tactical; the difference is degree of experience and depth of development.

Followership

Just as a leader may fail to properly engage subordinates, followership can be a challenge for those being lead. The concept of followership emphasizes that followers have as much involvement in the success of an organization as leaders¹⁶. Followers are capable of developing

their own meaning through action and courage and want to be involved in making an organizational successful¹⁷. In “Followership and job satisfaction in the public sector”¹⁸, the authors conclude that capability control (emphasize development of skills and abilities with guidance as required (crucibles)), unlike activity control (provide specification of activities, monitoring, and administration of rewards (transactional leadership)), results in a positive job satisfaction¹⁹. Since job satisfaction can be correlated with trust, leaders should be actively involved in mission command but only to a degree where they are assisting with, not inhibiting, growth.

Developing Trust through Relationships

Using Abraham Lincoln’s quote, we develop trust for the tree (character) and not its shadow (reputation). Reputation is an outward interpretation by others based on circumstances or events. We may trust an individual in one circumstance but not every circumstance. The person, on the other hand, is the sum of his/her experiences, remaining the same even when others are not around – the persistent mental and moral qualities of an individual. To develop trust, within the context of mission command, leaders and those assigned to accomplish the task or mission must develop a relationship within this circumstance (e.g., a work environment). They must routinely interact on tasks that are similar to those associated with mission command – meaningful interaction that benefits the leader and the subordinate.

Three models assist leaders to actively develop trust and shared meaning with subordinate leaders: Build Trust of Character (self), Meaning-Making (relationship), and Crucibles (another). Build Trust of Character provides six behaviors that leaders and followers perform to earn trust; trust starts with the individual. Meaning-Making is a leader engagement technique that is especially useful with junior officers or when a subordinate may not have had

an experience earlier in his/her career. Crucibles focus on intentionally growing four key characteristics within subordinates by challenging them with unique experiences.

Behaviors that Build Trust of Character

Routine interaction, a relationship, is required to develop “mutual understanding between people that they’ll hold true to their promise”²⁰; Reina and Reina refer to this as Trust of Character. Some relationships are for a specific purpose, while others have grown over longer time periods through different types of interactions; acquaintances versus family members. Character is one of three dimensions, including capability and communication, that must be reciprocal and created incrementally. To earn Trust of Character, leaders and followers must “practice six behaviors: manage expectations, establish boundaries, delegate appropriately, encourage mutually serving intentions, keep agreements, and be consistent.”²¹ The challenge occurs when leader engagements are constrained or minimalized due to time availability or competing command-driven requirements. To maintain Trust of Character, leaders must recognize and honor that their subordinate’s expectations, boundaries, and perspectives are just as important as their own.²²

Before leaders and subordinates can trust each other, each must establish the six Trust of Character behaviors within themselves; trust begins with each of us. Each must walk-the-walk and talk-the-talk before they are trustworthy.²³ Trust of character occurs within a specific setting(s), such as work, home, relationship, or capability. For example, a Soldier may be beyond reproach at work with his/her peers but not on solid ground with his/her spouse because he/she is working all the time. He/she may have the same image of himself/herself at work and home but his/her behaviors are different, therefore trust by others is different for the same act. Work associates may state, “If MAJ Johnson says he’ll have it done, he will”, whereas the officer’s son

may state, “Daddy said he would be at my game but he’ll probably have to work late.” In this case, each behavior indicates the level of trust that the peer or son has for MAJ Johnson; at work he manages his behaviors better than he does at home where he probably takes them for granted.

Leadership Development: Meaning-Making

Experience is the best teacher. Life-of-hard-knocks is the best school. Although these are routine phrases, leaders can use experiential learning and meaning-making to help subordinates grow, improve trust, reduce mandatory requirements, and develop the mission command philosophy. Because leaders are too often distracted or overwhelmed, they do not spend enough time with subordinates ensuring they are continuing to grow; they abdicate responsibility instead of investing in delegation. Subordinates may learn by doing but they are not reaching their full potential because they may be unable to make meaning out of the event.

Reading a book requires that a reader (subordinate) perform an action to gain experience. If the reader simply or quickly reads the words in the book, he/she will not understand the writer’s purpose. Readers must take time to read, reflect, and comprehend in order for meaning to be discovered. In some instances, the reader still may not understand what he/she has read and needs to discuss the material with the writer (leader). If the writer is not available, then the reader will need to consult someone else (mentor) that can provide meaning²⁴. In this way, leaders must assist subordinate make meaning with many routine tasks, otherwise they may have completed the task but not learned a core principal or grown in any way. The goal of every leader should be to assist a team member’s progress from Lower Order Thinking to Highest Order Thinking²⁵; improve, if nothing else, his/her ability to think critically, reflect, and self-evaluate.

The Two-Phase Leader Development model focuses on enhancing experiential learning. “This means creating learning opportunities by placing subordinate leaders into challenging

assignments to stretch their thinking and behavior.”²⁶ This model is important throughout a career, although it is especially important with younger Soldiers. Cognitive growth takes practice and time; some will learn earlier and quicker than others. When young Soldiers join the military, most will not have the cognitive skills to maximize critical thinking²⁷ - purposeful and reflective judgment about what they believe or do in response to an experience²⁸. Additionally, Carey W. Walker and Matthew J. Bonnot, note that Robert Kegan’s theory on meaning-making has five-stages of which Orders 3 and 4 are most important in adult learning. In Order 3, Soldiers co-construct their meaning with other persons – such as the leader. Conversely, Order 4 Soldiers are critical thinkers and able to self-author. In the authors’ opinion “the principals of mission command are structured for self-directed, Order 4 leaders. The majority of junior leaders in the Army have not yet achieved this level of cognitive development.”²⁹ Given this, leaders that assist with meaning-making are developing subordinates and building trusting relationships because they are actively mentoring and guiding.

In this model, leaders do not just set conditions (identify an experience) to learn, they also engage with the subordinate through a five-step process: observation, feedback, dialogue, reflection, and adjustment. During the initial three-steps, the leader is actively involved helping the subordinate set the conditions for the final two steps. The model is not a formal developmental counseling, although it is an activity that some leaders may be using to improve subordinate duty performance.³⁰ For example, a leader may observe the subordinate performing a task (leading the clearing of a structure or NCOIC of a range). Once the task is complete, the leader may pull the subordinate, only, aside into a non-threatening environment and perform an after-action review outlining the steps of the tasks and the intended purpose. The leader and subordinate would then discuss what occurred, didn’t occur, should have occurred, and how it

relates to other tasks or responsibilities. The subordinate would then reflect on his/her performance, feedback, and dialogue to determine if his/her thoughts or actions should change (this may not occur immediately). Finally, if appropriate, the subordinate defines his/her own meaning from the experience and modifies his/her perspective and actions. If leader-engaged meaning-making had not occurred, the subordinate may not have fully appreciated every aspect of the experience or related it appropriately to his/her career.

As with Trust of Character, meaning-making develops trust through ordinary military tasks because the leader is investing in the subordinate through time, coaching, and caring. Since the leader and subordinate are continually developing meaning through ordinary work tasks, they have a process (baseline) for when it matters – during mission command. Meaning-making encourages trust through predictable, professional interaction and development of Trust of Character behaviors.

Crucible: Experiential Learning

In “Leading for a Lifetime”, Warren G. Bennis and Robert J. Thomas describe crucibles as a way for leaders to encourage growth in subordinates³¹. Leaders use crucibles to focus on developing four key leadership characteristics within a subordinate: adaptive capacity, engaging others through shared meaning, voice, and integrity³². The most important characteristic leaders can help subordinates develop is adaptive capacity – ability to reframe failure into a form of education. When leaders are able to challenge and encourage subordinates to adapt and learn despite possible failure, they are building critical thinking skills and an ability to identify prudent risk; each essential to mission command.³³ Crucibles are personal events, defined by the person experiencing the transformation. Therefore, leaders must engage with, and know, their subordinates using meaning-making techniques to adapt and encourage the crucible experience.

Crucibles challenge a subordinate's adaptive capacity within three types of experiences: new territory, reversal, and suspension³⁴. New territory crucibles occur when subordinates attempt tasks they did not prepare for (e.g., broadening assignment) with the intent of overcoming "the disorientation and weav[ing] it into one's own experiential tapestry, rather than being consumed in the newness, confusion, and deluge of foreign sensations."³⁵ Reversal crucibles occur when a subordinate is able to endure or identify creative solutions to experiences such as loss, defeat, or pressure (e.g., competition).³⁶ Finally, suspension crucibles encourage the subordinate to reflect on his/her purpose or values by taking a break from his/her normal routine (e.g., investigating officer).³⁷

In addition to adaptive capacity, leaders must be able to engage others through shared meaning, have a distinctive voice, and an unshakable integrity. Effective leaders are able to listen, engage, tell stories, enlist an audience in a vision, and seek the hard truths. They encourage candid conversation because it fosters communication.³⁸ They have a distinctive voice and know who they are and what is important to them. They have deep values that are unavoidable and encourage others to do the same. They ensure that the organization's/team's values are clear and encourage tolerance and diversity, so members can explore, articulate, and express their own in a way that is safe.³⁹ Finally, they value integrity and help subordinates "learn how to balance competence and ambition with a moral compass" through first-class mentoring and coaching.⁴⁰

Experienced leaders are able to identify a subordinate's shortcomings: fear failure, prima donna tendencies, poor decision-making, weak listening skills, or stage fright. Crucibles are a method for helping a subordinate improve this shortcoming. The leader just needs to ask a basic question about every task that they assign to a subordinate – Will this task help improve adaptive

capacity, engagement with shared meaning, voice, or integrity in the subordinate? The tasks can be routine or special, the opportunity lies in how the leader helps the subordinate with the meaning-making process or with developing behaviors that build trust of character.

Business Case: Trust is essential to mission command

Units operate most efficiently when trust is present. When trust exists, redundancy is less necessary, bureaucracy is less present, politics is not divisive, everyone is engaged, Soldiers enjoy being part of the team, dishonest acts occur less frequently, and Soldiers are able to live the Army values⁴¹. The result of higher trust levels is improvement in mission command and unit efficiency, which are important as the Army becomes a smaller force. If leaders and subordinates work from a foundation of trust they will be more creative because they are engaged and feel safe to make a mistake; teams collaborate instead of cooperate; units work better vertically by anticipating and discussing challenges before they become critical; they execute better; and all stakeholders have a heightened loyalty, which creates synergies that extend beyond the unit.

Conclusion / Recommendation

Trust is essential and has a significant role in mission command, otherwise it is detailed command. As the military force becomes smaller and we continue to operate throughout the ROMO, the relevance and importance of mission command will increase. Leaders, not just commanders, will have to trust that subordinate leaders are able to meet and execute the intent of their mission. Before developing trust in others, leaders and subordinates must strengthen their own Trust of Character behaviors. Leaders must engage with subordinates through meaning-making and crucibles, to build skills, trust, and shared meaning. Through ordinary, everyday tasks and predictable interactions, subordinates develop respect for their leaders, leaders develop

confidence in their subordinates, each develops a personal commitment to the other, and transparency promotes trust⁴².

Recommendations

1. Expand official definition of Mission Command to include leaders and Range of Military Operations not just Commanders and Unified Land Operations.

Bibliography

- Adler, Mortimer J., and Charles Van Doren. *How to Read a Book: The Classic Guide to Intelligent Reading*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1972.
- Bennis, Warren G., and Robert J. Thomas. *Leading for a Lifetime - How defining moments shape the leaders of today and tomorrow*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Publishing, 2007.
- Center for the Army Profession and Ethic (CAPE). *Annual Survey of the Army Profession (CASAP FY15)*. Technical report 2015-01, West Point: Center for the Army Profession and Ethic, 2015.
- Covey, Stephen M. R. "The Business Case for Trust." *Chief Executive*. June 2007. <http://chiefexecutive.net/the-business-case-for-trust/> (accessed April 8, 2016).
- Department of the Army. *ADRP 5-0: The Operations Process*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Officer, May 2012.
- . *FM 6-22, Army Leadership*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 30 June 2015.
- Human Dimension Capabilities Development Task Force. *Building Mutual Trust Between Soldiers and Leaders*. White Paper, Fort Leavenworth, KS: United States Army Combined Arms Center, 2015.
- Jin, Myyung, Bruce McDonald, and Jaehee Park. "Followership and job satisfaction in the public sector: The moderating role of perceived supervisor support and performance-oriented culture." *International Journal of Public Sector Management* 29, no. 3 (2016): 218-237.
- Kamena, Gene, and Lou Lartigue. "Setting the Conditions for Mission Command Through the 3-Ts: Time, Trust, and Transparency." *Fires*, 2013: 12-14.
- Law, Ho. *The Psychology of Coaching, Mentoring, and Learning (2)*. Somerset, GB: Wiley-Blackwell, 2013.
- Merriam, Sharan B., and Rosemary S. Caffarella. *Learning in Adulthood, 2nd Ed*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1999.
- Paolozzi, Paul. *Closing the Candor Chasm: The Missing Element of Army Professionalism*. Carlisle Barracks: United States Army War College Press, 2013.
- Paul, Richard, and Linda Elder. *The Miniature Guide to Critical Thinking: Concepts and Tools, 6th Ed*. Dillon Beach: Foundation for Critical Thinking, 2009.
- Reina, Dennis, and Michelle Reina. *Trust and Betrayal in the Workplace: Building Effective Relationships in Your Organization*. Oakland: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc., 2015.
- Thomas, Robert J. "Crucibles of Leadership Development." *MITSloan Management Review*, 2008: 15 - 18.
- Thomas, Robert J. "The leadership lessons of crucible experiences." *Journal of Business Strategy* 30, no. 1 (2009): 21-26.
- Vanderkam, Laura. *Why Managers Should Spend Exactly 6 Hours A Week With Each Employee*. July 14, 2014. <http://www.fastcompany.com/3032972/hit-the-ground-running/why-managers-should-spend-exactly-6-hours-a-week-with-each-employee> (accessed April 3, 2016).

Walker, Carey W, and Matthew J. Bonnot. "A Better Approach to Developing Leaders." *The Army Press*. April 15, 2016. <http://armypress.dodlive.mil/a-better-approach-to-developing-leaders/> (accessed April 15, 2016).

Wong, Leonard, and Stephen J. Gerras. *Lying to Ourselves: Dishonesty in the Army Profession*. Carlisle Barracks: United States Army War College Press, 2015.

Notes

¹ FM 6-0, 1-1. “Mission command is the exercise of authority and direction by the commander using mission orders to enable disciplined initiative within the commander's intent to empower agile and adaptive leaders in the conduct of unified land operations (ADP 6-0).” “Unified land operations describes how the Army seizes, retains, and exploits the initiative to gain and maintain a position of relative advantage in sustained land operations through simultaneous offensive, defensive, and stability operations in order to prevent or deter conflict, prevail in war, and create the conditions for favorable conflict resolution (ADP 3-0).”

² ADRP, 6-0, 1-3. Figure 1-1 clearly places the mission command philosophy and warfighting function subordinate to unified land operations, exclusively. Additionally, unified land operation is included in the definition along with the explicit use of the commander. ADRP 3-0 or ADRP 6-0 do not include the term “garrison”.

³ See followership section for more information on this topic. Capability control, the preferred method, emphasizes development of skills and abilities with guidance as required, while activity control provides specification of activities, monitoring, and administration of rewards.

⁴ Center for the Army Profession and Ethic (CAPE). Annual Survey of the Army Profession (CASAP FY15). Technical report 2015-01, West Point: Center for the Army Profession and Ethic, 2015, 23. “Mutual trust is essential for mission command. Respondents agree or strongly agree (91%) that their leader trusts them to perform their duties with discipline and to standard. However, there is less agreement regarding the leaders’ willingness to encourage candor and to understand that accepting prudent risk means that the desired outcome is not guaranteed. The ability to learn from setbacks and to support subordinates whose best efforts are not always successful is attendant to exercising disciplined initiative and to accepting prudent risk.” See page 24 for follow-on questions. Although Soldiers perceive that their leader trusts them (probably because leader’s abdicate instead of delegate), the leader’s actions still leave room for doubt – leaders and subordinates are not participating in meaningful dialogue.

⁵ Ibid, 28.

⁶ Department of the Army. FM 6-22, Army Leadership. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 30 June 2015, 1-1.

⁷ Commander is routinely associated with the grade of commissioned officer.

⁸ ADRP 1, 3-2. “It serves as the vital organizing principle that establishes the conditions necessary for mission command.” FM 6-22, 1-3, also emphasizes that trust “lays the foundation for mission command and effective teamwork.”

⁹ Reina, D., & Reina, M. (2015). Trust and Betrayal in the Workplace: Building Effective Relationships in Your Organization. Oakland: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc., CH 1, location 197. Accessed on Kindle version 1.15. Like ADRP 1, the authors define three dimensions of trust: character, capability (competence), and communication (instead of commitment).

¹⁰ Ibid, CH 1, location 211. In a business environment, this improves the competitive advantage of an organization while in the military this improves mission success.

¹¹ Ibid, CH 2, location 577. “Abdication removes the feedback mechanisms that allow people to voice their questions or concerns about how to accomplish their work. This lack of communication sets them up for lost productivity, stress, and possibly even failure.” Although leaders intend to demonstrate trust or followers prefer because they feel more empowered, abdication can result in diminishing trust if leaders are distracted or overwhelmed by other requirements.

¹² Human Dimension Capabilities Development Task Force. Building Mutual Trust Between Soldiers and Leaders. White Paper, Fort Leavenworth, KS: United States Army Combined Arms Center, 2015, 2-3. “Trust increases as the trustor accepts increasing amounts of risk as long as the trustee continues to meet the trustor’s positive

expectations. However, trust can also be reduced or eliminated should the trustee fail to meet the positive expectations.” Mission command is a leader action requiring trust to begin with the superior.

¹³ Vanderkam, Laura. Why Managers Should Spend Exactly 6 Hours A Week with Each Employee. July 14, 2014. <http://www.fastcompany.com/3032972/hit-the-ground-running/why-managers-should-spend-exactly-6-hours-a-week-with-each-employee> (accessed April 3, 2016). The six-hour engagement timeframe includes contact and non-contact hours: meetings, phone calls, and electronic mail.

¹⁴ Ibid, para 13-16. This requires a limit on manager and contributor roles; if a leader is not only coaching-mentoring but also contributing such as with additional duties or special projects. Although six-hours may be challenging at time, leaders should attempt to at least have “one really good, meaning conversation” per week. Current army structure encourages a 1:6 leadership ratio. A battalion commander may command over 600 Soldiers but they are actively engaging with the XO, CSM, and Company Commanders. An XO is actively engaging with six to seven primary staff. A primary staff officer with five direct reports on their team. A company commander with an XO, 1SG, four platoon leaders, an and a supply sergeant. A platoon leader with four platoon sergeants. NCO’s with their corresponding teams. Platoon sergeant with squad leaders. Squad leaders with team leaders. Team leaders with teams. Each leader must be leader, manager, and contributor. Each leader must trust and participate in mission command and followership philosophies.

¹⁵ Wong, Leonard, and Stephen J. Gerras. Lying to Ourselves: Dishonesty in the Army Profession. Carlisle Barracks: United States Army War College Press, 2015. Within the paper, the authors provide three recommendations including that “leaders at all levels must lead truthfully” (ix) and accept appropriate risk within the bureaucratic, training, and mission arenas. These areas include mandatory training, maintenance, accountability, command inspections, off-post housing, TRIPs, initial counseling, quarterly counseling, sensitive items reporting, supply accountability, mission, readiness assessments, storyboards, indirect fire reporting, and distribution of cash report. If leaders are distracted by excessive requirements, they may be consumed by managerial instead of leadership requirements.

¹⁶ Terms such as leader, follower, or peer define roles in a single relationship. Soldiers are simultaneously performing each role regardless of situation or task.

¹⁷ Jin, Myung, Bruce McDonald, and Jaehee Park. "Followership and job satisfaction in the public sector: The moderating role of perceived supervisor support and performance-oriented culture." *International Journal of Public Sector Management* 29, no. 3 (2016): 218-237, 220.

¹⁸ Ibid, 222. This study is relevant because, as the authors point out, there are differences between private and public sector motivation opportunities. “...first, frequent changes in leadership as elected or politically-appointed leaders often have brief tenures; second, having goals that are often difficult to translate into units that are objectively measurable; third, strong employee protections, which makes it difficult for supervisors to deal with even the poor performers; and fourth, constraints put on the use of financial incentives.”

¹⁹ Ibid, 230. “The conflicting evidence on the moderating effect of supervisor support on the relationship between followership and job satisfaction can be, in part, explained by the conceptual work of Anderson and Oliver (1987) on supervisory control. They argued that there are two types of behavioral mechanisms that supervisors use to support their followers – activity control and capability control. Activity control refers to “the specification of the activities a person is expected to perform on a regular basis, the monitoring of actual behavior, and the administering of rewards on the basis of the performance of specified activities” (Challagalla and Shervani, 1996, p. 90). Capability control, on the other hand, emphasizes the development of individual skills and abilities. It involves providing guidance for improvement if needed. Research shows that while activity control is negatively associated with job satisfaction, capability control by supervisors is positively associated job satisfaction.

²⁰ Reina and Reina, CH 2, location 447.

²¹ Ibid, CH 2, location 447.

²² Ibid, CH 2, location 447. They later explain how the “crescendo effect” can further erode trust as leaders are unable to say no when they should because they are unable to meet all their agreements. CH 2, Location 671.

²³ Ibid, CH 2, location 466.

²⁴ Adler, Mortimer J., and Charles Van Doren. *How to Read a Book: The Classic Guide to Intelligent Reading*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1972, 6.

²⁵ Paul, Richard, and Linda Elder. *The Miniature Guide to Critical Thinking: Concepts and Tools*, 6th Ed. Dillon Beach: Foundation for Critical Thinking, 2009, Location 92. "Lower Order Thinking: Unreflective; Low to mixed skill level; Frequently relies on intuition; Largely self-serving / self-deceived. Higher Order Thinking: Selectively reflective; High skill level; Lacks critical thinking vocabulary; Inconsistently fair, may be skill in sophistry. Highest Order Thinking: Explicitly reflective; Highest skill level; Routine use of critical thinking tools in analyzing and assessing thinking; Consistently fair." Although this model requires additional intellectual traits to reach the highest level, it does suggest that meaning must be part of the process to progress between levels.

²⁶ Walker, Carey W, and Matthew J. Bonnot. "A Better Approach to Developing Leaders." *The Army Press*. April 15, 2016. <http://armypress.dodlive.mil/a-better-approach-to-developing-leaders/> (accessed April 15, 2016). 3.

²⁷ Sharan B. Merriam and Rosemary S. Caffarella, *Learning in Adulthood*, 2nd ed. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass In., Publisher, 1999. 166, 139. Quoted in Walker and Bonnot., 6.

²⁸ Department of the Army. ADRP 5-0, *The Operations Process*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Officer, May 2012, 1-40.

²⁹ Walker and Bonnot, 6.

³⁰ Ibid, 12-13. Summary of authors five-steps. Observation is the collection of information by the leader. Feedback is when the leader provides feedback in form of context and expected outcomes. Dialogue includes shared understanding through active listening and interactive conversation for the purpose of answering questions, clarifying learning points, and increasing knowledge. Reflection enables the subordinate to internalize, think about, and process the feedback and dialogue received with the intent of determining if a change is required for thinking or behavior. Adjustment is where meaning-making is demonstrated with changes to thinking or behavior; this may take time depending on the subordinate's cognitive development.

³¹ Bennis, Warren G., and Robert J. Thomas. *Leading for a Lifetime - How defining moments shape the leaders of today and tomorrow*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Publishing, 2007, x. "The crucible is too often seen as a life experience, as opposed to a job experience." "The trick for organizations is to learn how to identify these opportunities for change and to use them to perform their transformative magic."

³² Ibid, x-xvi.

³³ Ibid, 92-93. "Adaptive capacity, which includes such critical skills as the ability to understand context and to recognize and seize opportunity, is the essential competence of leaders." It "is also the defining competence of everyone who retains his or her ability to live well despite life's inevitable changes and losses."

³⁴ Robert J. Thomas, (2009), "The leadership lessons of crucible experiences", *Journal of Business Strategy*, Vol. 30 Iss 1 pp. 21 – 26. Permanent link to this document: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/02756660910926939>.

³⁵ Ibid, 22.

³⁶ Ibid, 24.

³⁷ Ibid, 25.

³⁸ Bennis and Thomas, xii-xiii.

³⁹ Ibid, xiii-xiv.

⁴⁰ Ibid, xv.

⁴¹ Covey, Stephen M. R. "The Business Case for Trust." *Chief Executive*. June 2007. <http://chiefexecutive.net/the-business-case-for-trust/> (accessed April 8, 2016). Additionally, Covey goes on to say that the leader, the CEO in this case, has a specific role that is threefold with number two being most relevant to this conversation. "First,

recognize the business case for trust and be an advocate instead of an obstacle. Second, see leadership as ‘getting results in a way that inspires trust.’ In other words, personally model trust through character, competence, and demonstrated behavior. Third, align organizational systems and structures around trust. In the words of Campbell Soup CEO Doug Conant, ‘The first thing for any leader is to inspire trust.’ Bottom line, nothing is as fast as the speed of trust. Nothing is as profitable as the economics of trust. It’s truly the one thing that changes everything.”

⁴² Kamena, G., & Lartigue, L. (2013). Setting the conditions for mission command through the 3-ts: Time, trust and transparency. *Fires*, 12-14. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/1364749551?accountid=458>.