An Analysis of US Army Leadership Doctrinal Manuals 1946-2006 ©

Dr. James M. Young

The First Generation of Doctrinal Manuals 1946 to 1973

The 1946 to 1961 Publications

The first doctrinal manual— *FM 22-5, Leadership, Courtesy, and Drill*—correctly defined the essence of leadership using the term "influence." However, it is obvious from the title as well as size and length (4 by 6 inches and 18 pages) that it lacked depth and focus. Although its definition of leadership was brief, the February 1946 manual offered 23 "qualities of leadership" that would appear again in future versions entitled as values (courage and loyalty) or leader attributes.[1]

In 1948, the Army issued two "interim" publications that elaborated on the basic concepts of the first FM. The first was issued on July 19, 1948, as Training Circular Number 6, entitled *Leadership*. Though its origins remain unclear (some believe that it was a product of senior officers gathered "in a smoke-filled room at Fort Leavenworth"), the primary content of this circular listed 11 "Principles of Leadership." Supposedly based on their own experiences, the authors believed these principles to be fundamental and universal in their application at any level of command.[2] The second publication, entitled DA Pamphlet 22-1 *Leadership,* was issued on December 28, and expanded the definition of military leadership to emphasize influencing people and

---

1. US War Department, *Leadership, Courtesy and Drill, FM 22-5* (Washington, DC: US Department of the Army, 1946), 8-9.
2. R. A. Fitton, "Development of Strategic-Level Leaders," *Executive Research Project S23*, (Washington, DC: National Defense University, 1993), 7.

human behavior toward specific goals. The substance of both documents would provide the baseline for the first doctrinal leadership manual solely dedicated to leadership.[3]

While the Army was at war in Korea, the Department of the Army released *FM 22-10, Leadership.* It was published in March 1951 and officially superseded the two 1948 documents. The contents of this small, 35-page manual retained the 1948 circular's 11 principles and officially made them doctrine. Although the utility of these principles has been questioned and debated over time, the principles themselves are still considered sound practices by Army leaders today. The authors also listed 19 individual traits that effective leaders should possess. Especially noteworthy is Section 8, "Role of Ethics." Here, ethics is defined as "the science of moral duty." Slightly different from all future focuses, ethics at this time is not viewed as the nucleus of leadership but rather as a close ally.[4]

Changing titles again from "Principles" to "Leadership Traits," the March 1953 doctrinal manual used the nomenclature FM 22-100 that would henceforth remain in place until 2006. Entitled *FM 22-100*, *Command and Leadership for Small Unit Commanders*, the manual acknowledged that the traits were not all inclusive but "served as a guide for self-assessment and self-improvement."[5] Planting the seeds of

---

3. Ibid., 7. Also, Jeffrey Horey, Jon J. Fallesen, Ray Morath, Brian Cronin, Robert Cassella, Will Franks, Jr., and Jason Smith, "Competency Based Future Leadership Requirements," *Technical Report 1148* (Alexandria, VA: US Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences, July, 2004), 5.
4. US Department of the Army, *Leadership, FM 22-10*, (Washington, DC: Headquarters, US Department of the Army, 1951), 8-9.
5. Fitton, 6. Also Horey,, 8.

consistency, two of the manual's traits would later become values (courage and integrity).[6]

Five years later, in 1958, the next revision of FM 22-100 was released under the name *Military Leadership*, a title it would keep until 1999. Sticking to the "leadership traits" approach, the manual added two more traits to its content for a total of 14.[7] One of the two—loyalty—would remain and later become an Army value. Other than that, this manual offered little by way of improvement or the further progression of leadership doctrine.

The 85-page 1961 release began FM 22-100's trek down the Social and Behavioral Sciences road with the inclusion of a chapter entitled "Human Behavior" (Chapter 3). This narrative stressed the roots of behavior as derived from psychologist Abraham Maslow's well-known 1943 model on the "hierarchy of needs." But undergirding the entire manual are the two pillars of Leadership Traits (Chapter 4) and Leadership Principles (Chapter 5). Compared to the manual released a decade earlier, this version listed 11 traits, dropping 6 off the original list and adding one (knowledge).[8]

In characterizing the nature of leadership doctrine from the end of the Second World War to the new John F. Kennedy Administration's focus on unconventional and counterinsurgency warfare, it is fair to say that the contents of the six publications released during this time frame remained consistent in the primary definitions of leadership. All six manuals lacked bibliographies, and the publications contained no

---

6. US Department of the Army, *Command and Leadership for Small Unit Commanders, FM 22-100*, (Washington, DC: Headquarters, US Department of the Army, 1953).

7. US Department of the Army, *Army Leadership, FM 22-100*, (Washington, DC: HQ, Department of the Army, March, 1958).

8. US Department of the Army, *Military Leadership, FM 22-100,* (Washington, DC: HQ, Department of the Army, June, 1961), 17–18. It dropped alertness, force, humility, humor, intelligence, and sympathy.

discussions related to other leadership source material. While the manuals became more detailed and grew more thorough and voluminous, Trait Theory clearly dominated the scope and structure of all 6 publications. In many ways, the Trait Theory-based chapters were offshoots of the Great Man Theory which had dominated leadership thought throughout the many preceding decades.[9]

In keeping with the prevailing preference for Trait Theory, the focus in every manual was on "who" leaders should be (in contrast to "what" they should be or "how" they should lead). This "who to be" approach offered little in way of structure. Missing in the first 6 manuals was a framework in which to house the content. Interestingly, no historic heroes were presented as specific examples, which would suggest that the authors were probably influenced by Ralph M. Stogdill's extensive work throughout the 1950s at The Ohio State University. Stogdill had previously studied naval leaders and was familiar with military leadership, posited that effective leadership may vary from leader to leader based on different situations.[10]

Much more apparent in the 1961 FM, though, is the work on Leader-Power Bases conducted by John French and Bertram Raven in the late 1950s. French and Raven looked specifically at power itself and suggested five forms of power that help to define leadership. These were: coercive power, reward power, legitimate power, referent power and expert power. While the manual included various dimensions of both Position Power and Personal Power (the two pillars of Leader-Power Bases), the manual suggests that the Army preferred the former. Most likely, French and Raven

9. For a good, ground level view of officership and how officers led soldiers since the 1780's, see Edward M. Coffman, *The Old Army: A Portrait of the American Army in Peacetime, 1784-1898*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986).
10. I believe this is an anomaly. Offering fewer examples of famous leaders did not diminish the emphasis on Trait Theory. The focus of these authors was on varying situations, not people to emulate.

validated the prevailing views of the senior leaders who, at that time, typically led from strong authoritative positions of power.[11]

The 1965 Publication

Coming at a time when the Army was heavily influenced by civilian management theories and practices, especially the field of Systems Analyses, the November 1965 release of the 59-page FM 22-100 emphasized the criticality of "supervision" as a primary focus of effective leadership.[12] Influenced by the worldwide increase in communist-inspired insurgencies and the entire Army's embrace of counterinsurgency warfare, the manual touched upon interpersonal skills that leaders must possess due to the likelihood of interaction and contact with indigenous civilian populations. However, despite this emphasis and the mention of the term counterinsurgency for the first time, the manual was essentially a recycled version of its predecessor. It is difficult to explain the shallowness of this revision, given the state of strong managerial practices so pervasive in the Army at that time. Missing was any indication of the work done by Robert Blake and Jane Mouton.   Pioneers in the field of organizational training and development, their model—The Management Grid—was used extensively by many organizations at that time to understand goals and purposes through "concern for production" and "concern for people."[13] One conjecture is that similar to its overt

---

11. Peter Guy Northouse, *Leadership: Theory and Practice* (Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, 2007), 7–9.
12. Ushered in by President John Kennedy, systems analysis was viewed at the time as the most effective means of managing large organizations and for solving complex problems. See David Halberstam, *The Best and the Brightest* (Greenwich, CT: Fawcett Publications, Inc., 1964), 264.
13. Northouse, 72–74. This model was used extensively and was later renamed the Leadership Grid.

preference for Position Power, the Army likewise may have viewed itself as already practicing within the optimum performance quadrant of Blake and Mouton's grid ("Team Management"). In sum, this FM changed very little in format and content over the 1961 version, and the "who to be" approach continued to offer a weak structure.[14]

The 1973 Revision

In the interlude between the 1965 and the 1973 releases of FM 22-100, the United States entered, escalated, de-escalated, and lost the war in South Vietnam. The 1973 release of FM 22-100 discarded the old manila-colored covers and presented a cover with artist-drawn sketches of various troops embedded in the large silhouette of a helmeted soldier. This lengthy manual was more than double the contents of its predecessor and included many cartoon-like sketches to illustrate chapters and key sections of the FM. Behind this cover's liberal makeover was a robust, detailed doctrinal re-write that hinted at the unprecedented transformation of the Army just then underway. Special sections on drug abuse and race relations made this point clear.

In an obvious response to the 1960s over-emphases on management, the manual clearly separated and subordinated management to effective leadership, thus demoting management to only an "important element of Command." A return to an emphasis on leadership over management corrected the most glaring reason for the defeat in Vietnam.[15]

---

14. US Department of the Army, *Military Leadership, FM 22-100*, (Washington, DC: HQ, Department of the Army, 1965)
15. Richard A. gabriel and Paul L. Savage. *Crisis in Command: Mismanagement in the Army* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1978.)

Issued in June, which coincidentally marked the end of conscription and the

beginning of the all-volunteer Army (one that would require a radical change in

leadership styles and methodologies), the manual contained, for the first time, an

impressive bibliography. At first glance, many of the authors listed in the bibliography

would suggest that the authors consulted numerous leadership theorists and theories of

that time. However, like in all the other FMs, no citations or footnotes ever appear to

attribute sources.

Overall, the 1973 release strongly embraced Situational Leadership theories by

which to prescribe new leadership styles and practices. However, in terms of

prescription and application, this FM failed to adequately make the leap from theory to

practice. Remaining predominantly conceptual despite its volume, the overwhelming

emphasis throughout several key chapters was on the Situational Approach. Here, one

theory clearly stood out--Fred Fiedler's work on Contingency Models. This FM

redressed the overemphasis on leader traits in the previous editions (which never

proved to have universal application) in favor of looking to the *context* in which

leadership occurs. Obviously influenced by the numerous failures in leader behaviors

during the war in Vietnam (the My Lai massacre being the most infamous), the doctrinal

authors appear to have consulted Fiedler's work that suggested the need for different

types of leadership for different types of situations. In essence, Fiedler believed that

within a given context, situational control (what he called "favorableness") was

determined by the alignment of commitment, structure, and power.[16]

It is also conceivable that the authors may have adopted the Situational Theory work

of Victor H. Vroom and Philip W. Yetton. Their Normative Decision Theory, though

16. Northouse, 113-116.

similar to Fiedler's, prescribed conditions in which different leadership styles could be appropriate. In short, this theory suggests that leaders should utilize *autocratic* styles when tasks are familiar, *consultative* approaches when tasks are unclear, and *participative* strategies when the commitment of followers is questionable. The 1973 FM dedicated a special section (Situational Studies) to paint different situations that illustrated these differing leadership theories and styles.

Hints of Path-Goal Theory also ran through the FM, although there is no clear connection to the work of Robert House. While situational theories provided an overall framework in this FM, House's view that leaders should assist followers in overcoming shortfalls in their abilities, support the tone of this doctrinal revision. However, a clear embracing of House's work would have required the Army to adopt components of Path-Goal Theory (specifically, the participative elements of House's theory) that were most likely too liberal for the Army at that time, even with the elimination of a conscript Army and the adoption of an all volunteer force. Conspicuously missing, as well, were any hints or suggestions that the authors considered Transformational Leadership and Servant Leadership; most likely for the same reasons.

In summary, the content of each release continued to bolster the fundamental nucleus of leadership that placed values, ethics, and beliefs above all else. Those attributes of character remained consistent throughout all revisions but, to be fair, may have lacked clarity to junior leaders who were forced to sort through new or shifting titles and traits as subsequent manuals were released. In terms of structure, the seven doctrinal manuals essentially took the same form. Each resembled a type of "who to be" handbook. Although the contents became more detailed over time and then

sprinkled with recent leadership theories in the 1973 release, these descriptive "who to be" handbooks failed to show developing leaders how to practice leadership in the real world.

Interestingly, the "who to be" approaches in the first seven editions excluded some important "who's," namely minorities and women. Certainly, the styles and narratives of all of these revisions spoke loudly to white men. Even the primary definitions of leadership, which specified the term "men" in all but two revisions, made this clear. These omissions are hard to explain or excuse since desegregation of the Army occurred in July 1948 and the fact that women had occupied an integral role in the institution since the Women's Army Corps' (WAC) creation in May 1942. In regard to the latter, women had been serving in the Army since 1901, when the Army established the Nurse Corps as part of the regular Army.[17] Rich historical references sprinkled throughout the various revisions overtly excluded the rich contributions made by minorities and women in World War II, the Korean War, and the Vietnam War. The inference in these doctrinal manuals was that army leadership primarily applied and would continue to apply to the historical core of the Army Officer Corps, namely white men.

Ten years would pass before the Army again would upgrade its leadership doctrine. In that decade, the Army underwent a transformation on a scale never before seen in American military history. In coming to grips with the trauma endured by American society from political turmoil at home to the defeat in Vietnam, the Army "re-invented" itself by revolutionizing the ways in which it would recruit and train soldiers. Above all,

---

17. Bettie J. Morden, *The Women's Army Corps, 1945-1978* (Washington, DC: United States Army, Center of Military History, 2000), Chapter One.

an Army that would consist of only volunteers, especially drawn from a pool of citizens who were shaped by the aforementioned events, would require a new approach to leadership doctrine and practice.

The Second Generation of Doctrinal Manuals 1982 to 2006

The 1983 Publication: First Round of "BE, KNOW, DO"

In the decade of transformation leading up to the 1983 edition of FM 22-100, the Army had successfully healed itself. Drug abuse and racial strife were largely problems of the past. Through the incentives of higher wages and subsidies in educational opportunities, the All-Volunteer Army had succeeded in filling all manning requirements. The Army had returned to the Cold War environment with a new operational doctrine (Air-Land Battle) and sought advanced technologies to provide a military edge over its potential enemies. Unfortunately, the soldiers manning advanced technology systems would be led by officers who would come to confuse technical management with leadership. While that thesis is beyond the scope of this work, the 1983 revision shows that leadership doctrine took a nostalgic step backwards to re-embrace management practices as effective leadership and "great men" as effective leaders.

Where content lacked progression and modernization, *structure* took a significant leap forward. The 1983 doctrine adopted a solid structural framework that would properly house the contents of leadership doctrine for years to come. This new structure would transform the previous FMs from "who to be" leadership handbooks to

"how to lead" references. Beginning with the 1983 addition, the Army stated that all

aspects of leadership fall within three dimensions. Labeled as "BE, KNOW, DO." This

framework identified BE as values and attributes, KNOW as skills, and DO as

leadership actions. Unfortunately, BE would immediately take a back seat to KNOW

and DO, both of which facilitated the technological management elements of the Army's

new and widely accepted operational doctrine (the 20 August 1982 release of FM 100-

5, *Operations*).

By 1983, the Army succeeded in restoring a professional force that was well-trained,

well-manned, and combat ready. The new BE, KNOW, DO structural framework of the

1983 revision of FM 22-100 housed much doctrinal content that looked vaguely familiar.

The authors jettisoned the leadership traits that had fluctuated in number among the

previous editions in favor of 8 "values" and 4 "factors." The factors were essentially 4

generalized conditions labeled "the led," "the leader," "the situation" and

"communications." This manual abandoned the nebulous "-*ships*" of the 1973 release

(i.e. Leader*ship* and Leader*ship* Development) and replaced them with more descriptive

chapters on unit and leader development.[18]

With an undisguised re-embrace of Trait Theory, the manual began with a detailed

account of Civil War Colonel Joshua Chamberlain's gallant and heroic fight at the Battle

of Gettysburg. The FM then utilized Chamberlain, as well as other non-fictional and

fictional personalities, to illustrate key doctrinal points. Interspersed with appropriate

action sketches, the manual was pleasant to read and the content was well organized.

---

18. US Department of the Army, *FM 22-100 Military Leadership*, (Washington, DC: HQ, Department of the
Army, October, 1983).

In contrast to previous doctrinal releases, this FM flowed logically, and each chapter built upon and complimented the previous section.[19]

Overall, Trait Theory, managerial skills and the Situational Approach were the overarching themes of the 1983 doctrinal release. Abandoned were the more "socially problematic" considerations of leadership, such as race relations and drug abuse. The tone here was more overtly masculine and authoritative. For example, while the FM was illustrated with more than 30 sketches showing the faces of soldiers, only 2 each of minorities and women were included and all pronouns were masculine.

In addition to bringing the situational theories forward, only the work of one new leadership theorist was apparent in this FM. Reaching back more than a decade to adopt the work of T. O. Jacobs, the authors bought in heavily to Jacob's Social Exchange Theory.[20] In trying to be a "how to lead" reference manual, this FM focused in every chapter on the interactions between leaders and followers. Jacobs' research had been funded by the Navy and looked extensively into influence processes that occur within formal organizations. In seeking situational variables in the Trait Approach, Jacobs found value in some aspects of Transactional Leadership Theory to help understand motivations in the leader-follower relationship. This FM was the first to include many elements of Transactional Leadership Theory.[21]

Also missing from the 1983 FM was a wealth of leadership research that had evolved since 1973. Absent were House's advanced work on Path-Goal Theory and his

---

19. Ibid.
20. Jacobs is the only leadership theorist listed in the bibliography. T. O. Jacobs, *Leadership and Exchange in Formal Organizations,* (Alexandria, VA: Human Resources Research Organization, 1970).
21. For a broader view of his work with others on social judgment skills see Northouse, Chapter 3.

interesting "8 Classes of Leadership Behaviors."[22] Missing as well was the work of

Jeffrey Pfeffer, who defined leadership in terms of influence within organizations.[23] The

work of both theorists would have certainly been welcomed, given the close alignment

of both substance and relevance to the Army's existing doctrinal views. Not

surprisingly, the two "biggies" of the 1970's, Robert K. Greenleaf and James MacGregor

Burns, were ignored. Greenleaf's Servant Leadership and Burn's Transformational

Leadership must have been viewed as threatening, given the degree of empowerment

that each theory proposed for followers (and the necessity for leaders to lighten up on

control and to be more comfortable in their vulnerabilities).[24]

Finally, in terms of promoting character, this FM introduced the Ethical Decision

Making Process (Chapter 4). In fact, the BE, KNOW, DO structure relied heavily on

character throughout the content of most chapters. Certainly, the depth of discussion

on values, ethics, and beliefs throughout the entire manual made this FM vastly superior

to anything adopted up to that time. Still, although it saw itself as a practical "how to"

reference, nothing concrete was offered in terms of demonstration, practice, and

evaluation.

1990 – The Second Round of "BE, KNOW, DO"

In the seven years that transpired before FM 22-100 was again revised, the United

States fought two minor wars, Grenada in 1983 and Panama in 1989. More importantly,

the United States and its western NATO allies had also "won" the 44-year-old Cold War.

---

22. Ibid., Chapter 7.
23. See Jeffrey Pfeffer, *Power in Organizations* (New York, NY: HarperCollins, 1981).
24. James MacGregor Burns, *Leadership* (New York: Harper & Row, 1978).

The aftereffects of the latter would soon have serious impacts on the contents of the new manual.

Under the Administration of Ronald Reagan, the 1980s was a booming period for the US Armed Forces. Taking advantage of huge advances in technology, the Army had expanded and modernized its conventional forces and had gained enormous confidence it refining the 1982 Operational Doctrine--Air-Land Battle (FM 100-5). In terms of modernizing leadership doctrine, this infatuation with technology further pushed BE well below KNOW and DO.

The authors clearly delineated the BE, KNOW, DO structure with separate, distinct chapters focused on the elements of each doctrinal pillar. More importantly, this leadership manual had a very clear and more direct connection to the realm of combat. In diminishing the emphasis on the Situational Approach, which was central to the previous FM, the authors shifted weight back to Trait Theory and, in addition to "Great Men," the authors used famous battles to illustrate leadership examples as well. The bibliography, which listed almost 50 sources, led readers to believe that the authors were very familiar with the most prominent leadership theories being explored at that time. Included were Bernard Bass, Warren Bennis, Burt Nanus, and James MacGregor Burns.[25] Upon closer examination, it is clear why these prominent theorists were attractive to the doctrinal authors. Bass, Bennis, and Nanus, especially, were looking at that time at the validity of specific traits in improving effective leadership. Their research was specifically focused on Visionary and Charismatic Leadership.[26] While neither

---

25. Bernard M. Bass, *Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectations*, (New York, NY: Free Press, 1985). Warren Bennis and Burt Nanus, *Leaders: The Strategies for Taking Charge*, (New York, NY: Harper and Row, 1985). Also, Burns, *Leadership*.
26. Northouse, 16.

theory stood out overtly in the FM, the narrative proposed simplistically that effective

military leaders were both charismatic and visionary.

The 1990 release also carried forth a more concise structural framework of BE,

KNOW, DO. One-third the length of its predecessor, this FM targeted leader

development and assessment as advocated by Stephen D. Clement and Donna B.

Ayres.[27] Their research, more than 15 years old, attracted the attention of the authors

because it focused on leadership competencies. [28] The COS, General Carl Vuono, as

the approving authority, believed that this FM would allow leaders to apply "leadership

theory at all organizational levels to meet operational requirements."[29]

Clement and Ayres proposed 9 leadership competencies, which the Army adopted

and formalized as official doctrine. However, this centerpiece, which appeared in this

FM as *Appendix A: "Leadership Competencies*," was disappointingly shallow in that it

simply repackaged leadership principles that we saw in earlier FMs. Though each was

succinct and well-written, they remained descriptive, contrary to Vuono's remarks in the

preface to the FM.

Overall, the structure of the 1990 BE, KNOW, DO was much stronger and the entire

work was well edited. Yet, beyond an initial embrace of core competencies, which

would improve in later releases, this FM was very similar in content to the 1983 version.

The same rich leadership theories, which had been refined and greatly explored by the

---

27. Their work had been conducted for the Army years before and published as part of the Army's Leadership Monograph Series. This FM draws on two documents: S. D. Clement and D. B. Ayres, "A Matrix of Organizational Leadership Dimensions," *Leadership Monograph Series No. 8*, (Fort Benjamin Harrison, IN: U.S. Army Administration Center, 1976); and S. D. Clement and D. B. Ayres, "Organizational Leadership Tasks for Army Leadership Training," *Leadership Monograph Series No. 9*, (Fort Benjamin Harrison, IN: U.S. Army Administration Center, 1977).
28. Horey,
29. US Department of the Army, *FM 22-100 Military Leadership*, (Washington, DC: HQ, Department of the Army, 1990), 1, See Vuono's comments in the Preface.

corporate world at that time, remained absent: Transformational and Servant Leadership.

1999 – The Third Round of "BE, KNOW, DO"

In the nine years leading up to the 1999 revision of FM 22-100, the Army was forced to reform itself again on par with the 1970s transformation. Unlike the defeat in Vietnam, which served as a catalyst for change in 1973, this transformation followed on the heels of the overwhelming victory of US forces in the First Gulf War (Operation Desert Storm) in 1991. In this case, US Armed Forces followed suit to previous victories by downsizing the armed services. What exacerbated this large reduction in force, however, was the noticeable, *voluntary* exodus of junior officers from the Army.

By 1996, the Army had reduced its active-duty size from a pre-Gulf War 770,000 to 495,000 personnel. The officer corps was reduced by 25 percent from 91,000 to 69,000 officers.[30] Many "survivors" of this reduction in force opted to leave as well due to their belief that careerism was out of control. Citing extreme micromanagement from their bosses to "zero defect" command climates, captains especially were attuned to an institutionalized "resume building" career path that was clearly counter to Army values.[31] Looked at in this context, almost the entire officer corps was in violation of all that the

---

30. David McCormick, *The Downsized Warrior: America's Army in Transition* (New York: New York University Press, 1998).
31. Ibid, Chapter 4. By 1999, the reduction of the officer corps would reach 30%.

BE had stood for in the previous two FMs (1983 and 1990). The current COS, seemingly acknowledged this, saying ". . . [t]he state of ethical conduct is abysmal. . . "[32]

While the transformation of the late 1990s has been well documented, a thorough examination of its impact on leadership and the shrinking force structure is well beyond the scope of this essay. In short, the senior leaders struggled with transformation in the downsized post Cold War Army while trying to visualize potential threats of the fast approaching 21st century. With so many captains leaving the Army, the stewards finally took a hard look at individual motivations in order to halt this hemorrhage of talent.

The result was a revision of FM 22-100 that would make all previous versions look simple and shallow. While the vestiges of the Trait Theory and the Situational Approach remained quite apparent, this FM built on the previous introduction of core competencies to a sophisticated extent. This FM listed 39 components that detailed out the competencies that "leaders of character" must BE, KNOW and DO. Articulating what it had never quite described before, the BE category of this FM laid out 7 values, 3 attribute categories, and 13 attributes. [33]   The depth of these core competencies allowed the authors to abandon the rudimentary descriptive lists of methods and activities that were promoted in previous FMs and never really effective in practice.

The Army clearly intended this FM to be its capstone manual on leadership and to encapsulate the multitude of complexities in modern warfare that had resulted in a more globalized, post-Cold War world. In doing so, this manual was voluminous as it included leadership for senior commanders operating at the operational and strategic

---

32. CSA comments as cited in David A. Jones, "Instilling Army Core Values at the Unit Level: Will FM 22-100 Get Us There?", Masters thesis, Command and General Staff College, 1999, 6.
33. Horey, 9.

17

levels of war.[34] Junior leaders, looking for practical methodologies at the tactical level, however, probably found less utility in this manual than should have been the case.[35]

The quality of this FM, with consistent sound structure and rich content, clearly reflected the research and thought of knowledgeable authors. Keeping in mind that this doctrinal release appeared to be the "fix plan" for the dysfunctional state of officer leadership that had been the impetus for the recent junior officer exodus, it was not surprising that traces of more progressive leadership theories appeared. However, they were interwoven throughout the familiar conservative theories and styles that had always characterized FM 22-100. The Army's strong preference for Trait Theory and the Situational Approach still provided the backbone. Great men and battlefield victories were still highlighted. Returning as well was the emphasis on self-development and core competencies that had made their debut six years earlier. However, core competencies were much matured in this release, with the inclusion of Key Performance Indicators (KPIs), then gaining popularity in the corporate sector of the United States.

The extensive bibliography contained the names and works of many contemporary leadership theorists. Tracing their work through the manual's content, though, requires thorough examination. On close inspection, it appears that the authors considered more progressive theories but inevitably "cherry picked" several that would compliment the traditional Trait Theory and Situational Approach. In looking for leadership theories that would support the caring, but authoritative, officer who places followers at the forefront of his or her leadership style, the authors dug deep into the 1976 work of

---

34. The study of warfare divides conflict into three dimensions or levels: tactical, operational and strategic.
35. Horey, 11.

George B. Graen's Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) Theory. Clear connections in

chapter 3, 4, and 5 showed the authors' interest in the dyadic relationships between

leaders and followers as explored by Graen and others in the 1970s and 1980s.[36] Also

present in the chapters on Direct Leadership were Ronald Heifeitz's advocation of

leaders helping followers with personal growth and change. Conspicuously absent,

though, was any of Heifeitz's emphasis on the real empowerment and commitment of

followers.[37]

At first glance, this FM appeared to finally embrace Transformational Leadership.

Indeed, the bibliography suggested a heavy emphasis in that direction, and for the first

time, Transactional and Transformational Leadership theories received attention *by

name*. In Chapter 3, Human Behavior, the authors presented both theories as "styles,"

describing Transformational Leadership as a style "which focuses on inspiration

and change," and the Transactional Leadership style as one of "rewards and

punishments."[38] Unfortunately, the narrative was brief and never offered any substance

beyond descriptions. In regard to this shallow treatment, the reader was warned to

avoid Transformational Leadership "when the mission allows little deviation from

accepted procedures."[39] The impression here is that the authors felt more comfortable

with the Transactional Leadership traits.

Very little trace of Transformational Leadership Theory was found elsewhere, even in

the chapters on Direct Leadership. This is unfortunate because that was the section

---

36. Northouse, Chapter 8.
37. Ronald A. Heifetz, *Leadership Without Easy Answers* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press) 1994.
38. US Department of the Army, *Army Leadership: Be, Know, Do, FM 22-100,* (Washington, DC: Headquarters, US Department of the Army, 1999), 3-16 – 3-17.
39. Ibid.

that pertained to leaders operating below battalion level of organization and had been the preponderance of all preceding manuals since 1946. "Cherry-picking" was at work again as some elements were extracted to support the Great Man and Trait theories. In fact, Gary A. Yukl's criticism that too much emphasis is placed on leaders motivating followers is very apparent in this FM where Transformational Leadership was narrowly viewed as one way to achieve "heroic leadership."[40]

However, the authors clearly drew on Transformational Leadership Theory for the sections dealing with operational and strategic levels of leadership. In these sections, the primacy of *vision* underscoring strategic leadership was made apparent. The authors used Jerry Hunt's work on Charismatic Leadership to underscore the criticality of vision leading to trust.[41] Boas Shamir's work on expert and referent power were seen in Chapter 7 (Strategic Leadership), which made the point that senior leaders will both lead and become members of diverse teams, civilian and military.[42]

By far the most impressive standout from this FM was the thorough treatment ethics and character received. In clear terms, the authors described the proper relationships of ethics, values and character. This clarity, missing in the previous manuals, essentially stated nothing new but rather placed the terms within the context of leadership styles that readers could truly understand. Here, the reader had no doubt that character was the centerpiece.[43] Further, two noteworthy annexes were included in this FM. Annex E: "Character Development" and Annex D: "A Leader Plan of Action

---

40. Ibid, see especially Chapter 6: *Organizational Leadership*, Also Northouse, 193.
41. Ibid, see Part Two. Also, James G. Hunt and Robert L. Phillips, "1996 Army Symposium: Leadership Challenges of the 21st Century Army," *ARI Research Note 96-63*, (Washington DC: United States Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences, May, 1996), A-3.
42. Ibid, A-4. Chapter 7, 7-13 – 7-26. See also, Northouse, 190.
43. *FM 22-100 (1999)*, 2-19 – 2-24.

and the Ethical Climate Assessment." The latter marked the first time that doctrine had ever offered an actual tool to perform an act of leadership.

By far, the least impressive treatment in this FM was the omission of any discussion or examples of women and leadership. Following on the heels of the most widespread, highly publicized sexual harassment cases in the Army's history, this FM largely ignored the topic and continued with a heavily masculine tone.[44]

In sum, the 1999 release of FM 22-100 was an impressive, giant step forward in terms of structure and content, especially with the latter's greater utility and the adoption of more progressive leadership theories. Unfortunately, neither elevated the BE far enough. The situation was far too broad and encompassing for younger practitioners and addressed too much descriptive narrative directed more toward senior leaders. The content flirted with Transformational Leadership but overall fell back into the comfort zone of Trait Theory, the Situational Approach and Transactional Leadership Theory.

In looking back on the last decade of the 20th Century, the Army had once again squandered an opportunity to reform the officer corps. Just as it had failed to do so following the loss of the Vietnam War, the Army was faced with an adaptive problem which it did not recognize. In both cases, *people* and *leadership* were at the heart of each crisis. [45] Yet, the stewards never once considered that the primary practitioners, the center of mass of Army leadership—*the officer corps*—might have been the root of the problem. The culture of conformity continued to exclude proven leadership

---

44. To be fair, the authors may have believed that the topic was addressed well enough by using a female soldier in the scenario for the ECAS. Ibid, D-2.
45. In Heifetz terms, they failed to address the issues (i.e. those that centered around people and leadership) as an adaptive problem. Instead, they approached the problem as a technical one that could be resolved by a doctrinal upgrade.

methodologies that could have yielded a more effective Army. One that would have been better prepared for the dark times ahead, only two years later, when terrorists would kill more than 3000 people in September 2001. That event ushered in a higher complexity of warfare that Army leaders were ill-prepared to meet.

2006 – The Fourth Round of "BE, KNOW, DO" or a Third Generation?

No sooner had the ink dried on the 1999 release of FM 22-100 than the new Army COS, General Erik Shinseki, convened "an Army panel to review, assess and provide recommendations for the development and training of 21st century leaders."[46] Known as the Army Training and Leader Development (ATLD) Panel, members released the survey-based report (the Officer Study portion) to the Army on May 25th, 2001. The ATLD Panel began its work by utilizing the official Army Vision of R*eadiness*, *Transformation*, and *People,* as a framework for analyses. From the beginning, the ATLD Panel assumed a primary focus on *Transformation* but soon discovered that the real scope of its efforts was fundamentally about *People*. For the officer corps especially, this meant getting at the essential elements of training and developing leaders.[47]

The work of the ATLD was first rate. The right people came together to form effective partnerships with Army researchers, private industry, academia, and policymakers. The end-state was the formulation of a process by which doctrine could be improved based on the comprehensive inclusion and adaptation of numerous best

---

46. Horey, 1. Although Shinseki's signature was on the 1999 FM, he had only been CSA for 9 weeks. The 1999 FM was clearly General Reimer's project.
47. The Army Training and Leader Development Panel, Officer Study Report to the Army, OS-1.

practices.[48] In examining past and current leadership theories, research personnel

specifically consulted theorists who had examined competencies in both individuals and

organizations. In terms of looking at the "BE," the competency of "Exemplifying Sound

Values and Behaviors" was derived from the work of four key theories. These were:

Trait Approach (Stodgill, 1948 and 1974), Leadership Attribution Theory (Lord, 1985),

Transformational Leadership (Avolio & Bass, 1991 and 2002), and Charismatic

Leadership (House, 1976).[49] The result was a research effort that drilled down

extensively on core competencies. The authors essentially dissected multiple

dimensions of BE, KNOW and DO and came up with an extensive compilation of

competencies for each of the 3 leadership pillars.[50]

The 2006 FM, the current doctrine, is undoubtedly the most thorough and content

rich of all leadership manuals ever produced. The authors reshaped the numerous

chapters of the previous manual into four logical parts: Part One: "The Basis of

Leadership"; Part Two: "The Army Leader: Person of Character, Presence and

Intellect"; Part Three: "Competency-Based Leadership for Direct Through Strategic

Levels"; and Part Four: "Leading at Organizational and Strategic Levels." This

organization sets up an internal framework for content that is well written and

compartmentalized. While part one serves as a primer of sorts to place doctrine within

the larger context of civil-military relations and the Constitution, the concept of

competencies is introduced early on as the core of leadership excellence. It is clear,

---

48. Horey, v. See remarks of Barbara A. Black, Acting Technical Director.
49. Ibid, 54.
50. US Department of the Army, *FM 6-22, Army Leadership: Competent, Confident and Agile*,
(Washington, DC: HQ, Department of the Army, October, 2006).

though, that despite the change in the name of the title, BE, KNOW, DO is still very much alive as the structural framework for the entire manual's content.

Part Two finally elevates BE (character) to its highest level to date. Values, ethics, and beliefs are all here and well-described. Quality narrative describes the link of ethics to character development better than any previous FM. Surprisingly, the authors eliminated the Ethical Climate Assessment Survey (ECAS) and replaced it with an appendix focused on personnel counseling. This was an unfortunate omission. The scenario that the 1999 authors used to explain the ECAS centered around the fictional Second Lieutenant Christina Ortega, who correctly identified and properly addressed a growing ethical dilemma in her platoon. This storyline was rich in both overt and subtle leadership examples. It painted a minority woman working hard within a stressful, dynamic male dominated environment to influence her soldiers to do the right things, both by doctrine (the ECAS) and by her demonstrated behaviors. Because opportunities for robust examples are few within the structure of doctrinal writing, the 2006 authors eliminated an important means of illuminating numerous leadership, race and gender examples.

Unfortunately, an improved emphasis on character, good organization, and quality authorship do not make this FM more progressive or modern. Indeed, in some important ways, this FM takes a step backward. In addition to dropping the ECS, the authors also dropped the definitions and distinctions of Transformational and Transactional leadership, terms that were included straight from theoretical work in academia. Very light flirtations with transformational elements appear in Chapter 8, within very short and broadly descriptive paragraphs entitled "Fairness and

Inclusiveness," "Open and Candid Communications," and "Learning Environment." Other than these cursory moments, this FM remains firmly entrenched in the same conservative construct that has always been rooted in Trait Theory and the Situational Approach.[51]

Given the thorough exploration of progressive leadership theories that the ATLD panel undertook from 2001 to 2004, especially in defining core competencies against prominent theoretical works, the final product is disappointing. Compared to the previous FM, there was no further development of Transformational Leadership despite the ATLD's thorough and deliberate look at the work of Avolio and Bass. The same shallowness occurred with House's Charismatic Leadership. Both were "cherry-picked" to compliment the foundation of Trait Theory and the Situational Approach. In continuing the strong preference for Trait Theory, the authors included more than 25 vignettes of courageous leaders throughout the manual. With the skillful interweaving of these historical examples in the FM, the authors succeed in tying Army values to tradition in order to enrich Army culture.

In sum, the "core competency" approach is the closest that the Army has come thus far to truly inculcate core values into actionable traits. However, this current FM still falls short because the Army has not yet overcome the primary obstacle to effective doctrine: translating theory into practice and then requiring a demonstration of such behavioral skills. Once in practice, values and character behaviors could be observed, assessed, and evaluated as the components of KNOW and DO have always been. As

---

51. Compared to previous FM bibliographies, this FM cited predominantly military sources. Exceptions were: David A. Heenan and Warren Bennis, *Co-leaders: The Power of Great Partnerships*, (New York: Wiley, 1999), and Peter M. Senge, *The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organization*, (New York: Doubleday/Currency, 1990). And for strategic leaders: Warren Bennis, *On Becoming a Leader*, (Cambridge, MA: Perseus Publishing, 2003), and Burns, *Leadership*.

the architects of the competency framework noted as far back as 2000, ". . . evidence of a competency is demonstrated by actions that can be observed and assessed to allow one to distinguish the levels of performance in that competency."[52] This could easily be accomplished if officers were required to demonstrate the doctrinal leadership behaviors in their annual efficiency reports (personal evaluations). Forcing rating officers to record observed demonstrable behaviors with written narratives as the KNOW and DO sections require, would finally make the BE pillar the strongest of the three, not the weakest. Until this occurs, however, the BE will always be more espoused than practiced.

---

[52]. Horey, 3.