

# THE ANATOMY OF LEADERSHIP

“What They Never Taught In Business School”

Definitions

Applications

Theories

Theorists

Management

W o m e n

A s

L e a d e r s

Leadership in Action:

“ROBERT’S RIDGE”

Most Influential

Leaders

Great Leaders

Speak-

Executive “PARETO”

Introducing A  
New Leadership  
Theory.

**“TWEAKING  
COMMON  
SENSE”**

Lawrence West

Ph.D., MBA

The Anatomy Of  
**LEADERSHIP**

*What They Never Taught  
In BUSINESS SCHOOL*

INTRODUCING

**“TWEAKING COMMON  
SENSE METHOD”**

**Lawrence West, Ph.D, MBA**

**Including:  
Leadership Quotes  
From World's Foremost  
Leaders**

**Copyright © 2006 by Lawrence West**  
**ISBN: 978-1-84728-616-1**

# CONTENTS

Dedication and Acknowledgment .....	v
Preface .....	vi
Introduction .....	vii
<b>Chapter 1</b>	
Collection of Leadership Quotes .....	1
<b>Chapter 2</b>	
Leadership .....	23
<b>Chapter 3</b>	
Rescue at ROBERTS' RIDGE .....	35
<b>Chapter 4</b>	
Tweaking Common Sense Common Sense Leadership .....	44
<b>Chapter 5</b>	
Thinking Leadership and Leading .....	50
Leadership .....	59
Leadership Styles .....	60
<b>Chapter 6</b>	
Management Theory .....	63
Scientific Management .....	63
Human Relations Theory .....	64
Hierarchy of Needs .....	64
Hygiene and Motivation Factors .....	65
Management, DRUCKER .....	65
Theory X/Y .....	66

## **Chapter 7**

Quality Management.....	67
TQM, Total Quality Management.....	67
Quality Planning.....	69
Zero Defects.....	69
In Search of Excellence / MWA.....	71

## **Chapter 8**

Update and Perspective.....	73
Corporate Culture.....	77
Cost Reduction Project.....	81
Executive Pareto Priority.....	81
Direct Leadership.....	84
Formal.....	84
Informal.....	85
Common Sense.....	96
Leadership Traits.....	86
Trait Theory.....	98
Social Scientific Study: Quo Vadis.....	100
OTHER THEORIES.....	106

## **Chapter 9**

Women as Leaders.....	112
-----------------------	-----

## **Chapter 10**

Tweaking Common Sense Method.....	124
Bibliography.....	135

## **Dedication**

This work is dedicated to my late mother. Lidie Bell West, who steadfastly believed that there was nothing that I could not do if I applied myself with common sense and a little education. I've spent a lifetime making certain that she would never be wrong about me.

## **Acknowledgments**

There are many names of those who were part of this experience and I'd like to collectively recognize all of them whether it was for good or otherwise. When you read this you'll know that I'm talking about you.

I recognize and acknowledge my family and everyone contributing to my continued wellbeing so that I would be in a position in health and life to complete this writing.

## PREFACE

So much has been written on the subject of leadership but interestingly enough most of it has evolved within the last century. This is a little understood practice that has been practiced since the beginning of mankind and is still a puzzle to those calling themselves leaders and to those looking to others for their guidance and direction.

### Leadership, what is it anyway?

There is a plethora of information, theories, lists, methods, procedures and books on the subject matter of this complex subject. Books are written by leaders such as generals and businessmen and women and all of the others who claim to know something about this subject. Many of the books are written by management or business consultants who have done studies and have their own ideas and therefore something to offer. Much of the writing is similar and practically all who write have their own theories, methods and lists.

I would like to also add to the argument, discussion and debate with the hope that I will contribute something to supplement that which already has been established. While I don't intend to write another dissertation on the subject of leadership, I will bring forth through examination an approach that will change to a great degree how this subject is perceived and practiced. Certainly I don't believe that I can write a book and change the way that leaders and scholars look at leadership in its entirety but I do think that in making the argument with all of the history included for comparative analyses many will appreciate my premise as just as cogent as those established and accepted as the tenet and doctrine to be accepted and practiced.

While I accept and don't dispute any of the earlier thought, my method is devised to make them all work to their optimum which none of them do at this time. My work and theory develops maximum in replace of optimum at all times. (Optimum The point at which the condition, degree, or amount of something is the most favorable whereas maximum is the greatest quantity or value attainable or attained **b**: the period of highest, greatest, or utmost development. **2**: an upper limit allowed (as by a legal authority) or allowable (as by the circumstances).

With optimum there is a tendency to settle, whereas with maximum there is a striving for total success. The absolutely highest point, the apex, the vertex the pinnacle. TWEAKING COMMON SENSE forces reaching the summit

rather than just another level of satisfaction or compromise. We have the ability to reach these levels. It is just a matter of calculating cost and value.

The introduction of a new leadership method is no new phenomenon. It seems that they are being introduced quite often. While there is nothing wrong with that there should be some concern with the questions of practicality and reality.

## **INTRODUCTION**

Supervision and leadership doesn't just appear and you start doing it effectively by virtue of being told or assigned. It doesn't come as a gift or by a process similar to osmosis or absorption. No, I'm sorry but it just doesn't work like that.

Contrary to previous thought it has to be learned and then developed through additional education, training and most of all experience, and whether you are attending ROTC, Drill Sergeants Academy, West Point or an AMA course, be assured that this is the most difficult of all of the subject matter. There is an ongoing argument if it can even be taught and then applied. I believe that it can be taught with the understanding that all people and situations are different and each has to be managed as an independent application.

Discard the outdated, outmoded and antiquated leadership and management methods. It's time for a new book and school of thought. It's time to bring yourself and your organization up to this modern age of management and leadership by learning what has worked and what does not work and then taking an encapsulated presentation of both and other progressive means that will work for you when taken into consideration. Every leader is different so you will see magic as we custom fit yours for you. Your style is different than that of another general's, sergeant's or manager's but you can all be successful in getting the job done if you know what you are doing and have a full appreciation of your capabilities and limitations.

We not only do what is promised for the above but then go directly to the boards of directors and field commanders in showing them how to turn their lagging and straggling organizations into what they must be to compete or survive in our times. Perhaps with adequate leadership we will establish more mutual respect also. You'll be in a better position to understand why



certain decisions that affect you are being made and how your leaders are reacting to their situations, incentive and catalyst. Leadership requires that you act on what you know, but you have to be sure that what you know is correct or as close to it as possible.

You've read from all of the leadership and management gurus what has worked in the past. We look at that also as we introduce the latest and most objective empirical analyses that are needed on today's battlefields, industrial plant floors, boardrooms and wherever you find yourself interacting with others, superiors, peers and subordinates. There have been a lot of books and theories written on this subject. We don't claim to have all of the answers to solve this riddle, however, our approach brings together the brilliance of many theorists with inclusion of our total approach. We're not taking anything away but merely supplementing what has already been established. Most of the work has already been done for us but when this is done in the proposed manner it all starts to come together.

# CHAPTER 1

## A COLLECTION OF LEADERSHIP QUOTES

### *The Voice of the Shepherd*

*The man that guards the gate opens the gate for the shepherd. And the sheep listen to the voice of the shepherd. The shepherd calls his own sheep, using their names, and he leads them out. The shepherd brings all of his sheep out. Then he goes ahead of them and leads them. The sheep follow him because they know his voice.*

- John 10:3-4
- His voice is his leadership sign.
- What is your sign of leadership?

## **GEORGE WASHINGTON**

1

A Lasting Leadership Lesson: How One Leadership Talk By George Washington Saved The Revolution

*By Brent Filson*

A Lasting Leadership Lesson: How One Leadership Talk By George Washington Saved The Revolution (And Our Fledgling Nation) From Catastrophe.

Leadership lessons come in many guises. One unforgettable lesson comes from George Washington and his contribution to the most important victory of the Revolutionary War.

That victory occurred neither at Saratoga or Yorktown but in a log hut in 1783 with a few heartfelt words that literally changed the world. And it's not just a history lesson, it's a leadership lesson -- for all leaders.

To realize what took place in that hut and its historical importance, we must understand what a Leadership Talk is and what was at stake at that moment in 1783 for America?

As to the Leadership Talk: There's a big difference between speeches/presentations on one hand and Leadership Talks on the other. Whereas a speech or a presentation communicates information, Leadership Talks do something more: It establishes a deep, human, emotional connection with the audience.

The Leadership Talk is a much more effective means of leadership communication. If Washington hadn't given a Leadership Talk in the log hut with this assembled officers, who were on the verge of revolt, the Revolution would have ended right then and there; and the history of America would have been far different.

As to what was at stake at that moment in history: This occurred a year and a half after the battle of Yorktown. Popular misconception has the Revolutionary War ending at that battle. However, in reality, the War continued to drag on; and as it did, the Continental Army became increasingly rebellious. Most of the troops hadn't been paid in at least two years. Their

promised pensions were not forthcoming. Popular sentiment in the army was gathering to overthrow the Continental Congress and install a military government.

On the ides of March in 1783, dozens of officers, representing every company in the army, met in a log hut to vote on taking this action when George Washington suddenly and unexpectedly walked in. He gave a speech denouncing the rebellious course they were on. But it wasn't the speech that carried the day; it was the Leadership Talk at the end of the speech. Witnesses report that Washington's speech left many officers unconvinced, and when he was finished, there was much angry muttering among them. To bolster his case, the general pulled out a letter he recently received from a member of the Continental Congress. As he began reading, his usual confident air gave way to hesitancy.

Then, unexpectedly, he drew out a spectacle case from his pocket. Few officers had ever seen him put on spectacles. Usually a severely formal man, he said in a voice softened with apology: "Gentlemen, you will permit me to put on my spectacles, for I have not only grown gray but almost blind in the service of my country."

The deep, human, emotional power of that moment can hardly be described. It electrified the officers. Here was their commander who had never taken a furlough during his eight years of command, who had faced storms of musketry fire, who through his daring and intelligence had kept the Army in tact in what most of the world thought was a lost cause, here was George Washington modestly asking his officers to bear with him in an all-too-human failing. It was an astonishing turning point.

As Maj. Samuel Shaw, who was present, wrote in his journal, "There was something so natural, so unaffected in this appeal as rendered it superior to the most studied oratory. It forced its way to the heart, and you might see sensibility moisten every eye."

After Washington left the hut, the officers unanimously voted to "continue to have unshaken confidence in the justice of the Congress and their country ...." The result was that the Continental Army disbanded without incident after the War formally ended a few months later and thereby set in motion the peaceful events that led to the creation of the Constitution.

Without Washington's intervention, America may very well have become a kind of banana republic, at the mercy of thousands of armed and angry soldiers and their officers. And it wasn't his speech that did it, it was a Leadership Talk.

Washington's Talk is a lesson for all leaders: The best way to communicate an idea is to bundle it in a human being. If you can't feel it, you can't lead it, and they won't do it.

### **George Washington: Quotations and Observations on the Leadership Style of George Washington**

“We have now a National character to establish, and it is of the utmost importance to stamp favorable impressions upon it.”

“Speak seldom....Never exceed a decent warmth, and submit your sentiments with diffidence. A dictatorial stile, though it may carry conviction, is always accompanied with disgust.”

“You are wrong. My countenance never yet betrayed my feelings.”

Response to Henrietta Lipton, wife of the British ambassador, who stated that she could see the pleasure he expected from retirement in his face.

“If I were to wish the bitterest curse to an enemy on this side of the grave, I should put him in my situation....In confidence I tell you that I never was in such an unhappy, divided state since I was born.”

*After his defeats at Long Island and Kip's Bay*

“When men are irritated and the Passions inflamed, they fly hastily and cheerfully to Arms; but, after the first emotions are over, to expect, among such People, as compose the bulk of an Army, that they are influenced by any other principles than those of Interest, is to look for what never did, and I fear never will happen.”

*Letter to the President of Congress from Harlem*

“...if the laws are to be so trampled upon with impunity, and a minority... is to dictate to the majority, there is an end put at one stroke to republican government...for some other man or society may dislike another law and oppose it with equal propriety until all laws are prostrate, and everyone will carve for himself.”

*Washington's observation about the Whiskey Rebellion*

“The Nation, which indulges towards another an habitual hatred, or an habitual fondness, is to some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest.”

*The Farewell Address*

“To be prepared for war is the most effectual means to promote peace.”

### **Quotations About George Washington's Leadership Style**

“If you are a prodigy or a genius, an Alexander or a Caesar, then you bring victory from whatever you touch. Washington was not in that class. But a successful general does not have to be the best general in the world. All he has to be...is better than the generals he faces.”

## **ABRAHAM LINCOLN**

1

In August of 1864, he referred to himself in one of those speeches as “temporarily occupying this big, white house.” And then he went on to say, “It is not merely for today but for all time to come, that we should perpetuate for our children’s children this great and free government, which we have enjoyed all our lives.” Now, this sentiment was not just something he made up for the occasion, to greet these soldiers.

Nearly thirty years earlier, as a young man, he had said in the Lyceum Address in Springfield, Illinois that “we find ourselves under the government of a system of political institutions, conducing more essentially to the ends of civil and religious liberty, than any of which the history of former times tells us. We, then mounting the stage of existence, found ourselves the legal inheritors of these fundamental blessings. We toiled not in the acquirement or establishment of them; they are a long legacy bequeathed to us by a once hearty, brave, and patriotic--but now lamented and departed--race of ancestors.

“Theirs was the task, and nobly they performed it, to possess themselves and through themselves, us, of this goodly land, and to uprear upon its hills and its valleys a political Oedipus of liberty and equal rights. ‘Tis ours only to transmit these to the latest generation that fate shall permit the world to know. Gratitude to our fathers, justice to ourselves, duty to posterity, and love for our species in general all imperatively require us faithfully to perform this task.”

Well, that was his sense of passing these things on. And in thinking about this transitional role, as the principles and history of our nation are passed on from one generation to another, I think it is interesting to examine the parallels between Lincoln’s leadership and things that are happening in our own time.

Several examples come to mind. When Ronald Reagan was elected, as Larry said, in 1980, there were pundits and politics in the press who regarded him only as a gun-slinging, former actor from the wild west, as many of them regarded California. Well, if you go back 120 years to Lincoln’s election as President and look at the way he was viewed, such as is described in the words of Donald Phillips, who wrote the book, *Lincoln and Leadership*, those were the ways in which the eastern establishment regarded Lincoln.

Phillips said, “the first Republican President, elected by a minority of the popular vote, was a Washington outsider, who was viewed widely as a second rate, country lawyer and completely ill-equipped and unable to handle the Presidency.” Well, I suspect that both presidents benefited greatly by being underestimated by their adversaries, as well as by the establishment of their respective times.

Another similarity is found in a description of Lincoln by the New York Herald in 1864, and I think that you could have had a similar description of Ronald Reagan—it would have had to be done, not by a New York paper, but by the Washington Times. But something along this line...they said that, “plain, common sense, a kindly disposition, a straightforward purpose, and a shrewd perception of the ins and outs of poor, weak, human nature have enabled him to master difficulties which would have snapped any other man.”

Further, let me mention that both Lincoln and Reagan shared one other characteristic, as illustrated in these words describing Lincoln: “He tended to be strikingly flexible while, at the same time, a model of consistency.”

Well, I would suggest to you that we can see other parallels in applying Lincoln’s advice to situations with which we are all familiar today. Clarence Thomas has told of how he overcame the malicious and the unfair criticism simply by not reading the newspapers or watching television. Compare that with Lincoln’s statement in his last public speech that he gave in April of 1865 when he said, “As a general rule, I abstain from reading the reports of attacks upon myself, wishing not to be provoked by that to which I cannot properly offer an answer.” Donald Phillips said, “He had the courage to carry with him to the White House his main strategy of simply ignoring slander and vilification.”

Likewise, in another contemporary situation, as Ken Starr stands up valiantly against the false and unfair attacks that are being made upon him, he could, perhaps, take comfort and inspiration from Lincoln’s words in his Cooper Institute address in February of 1860. He said, “Neither let us be slandered from our duty by false accusations against us.... Let us have faith that right makes might, and in that faith, let us, to the end, dare to do our duty as we understand it.”



Lincoln also understood the test of true leadership and the key to how a leader provides the necessary inspiration to his followers. James MacGregor Burns described it this way: “A leader is one who induces followers to act for certain goals that represent the values and the motivations, the wants and needs, the aspirations and expectations of both the leaders and the followers. And the genius of leadership lies in the manner in which leaders see and act on their own, as well as on their followers’ values and motivations.”

In this sense, Lincoln has advice that could, perhaps, well be used by the Republican leadership in Congress today. As he said in his first Lincoln-Douglas debate in August of 1858, “With public sentiment, nothing can fail; without it, nothing can succeed. Consequently, he who molds public sentiment goes deeper than he who enacts statutes or pronounces decisions.”

While those are examples of Abraham Lincoln’s relevance to our own times, and while they are, perhaps, an interesting kind of overview of the relationship between one century and another, I would suggest today that there are two major public policy issues on which Lincoln’s thought and actions are particularly valuable.

The first has to do with the role of the judiciary in our structure of government, including such things as judicial activism and judicial attempts at supremacy. Lincoln was very outspoken about this, although not an awful lot is said about his view these days. Of course, one of the things that was a catalyst to his thinking on the whole subject was the Dred Scott decision.

In his opposition to that decision, he talked about his view of the court and the importance of recognizing the co-equal character of the three branches of government. He said, “The candid citizen must confess that if the policy of the government upon vital questions and affecting the whole people is to be irrevocably fixed by decisions of the Supreme Court, the people will have ceased to be their own rulers, having, to that extent, practically resigned their government into the hands of that eminent tribunal.”

In a sense, Lincoln was echoing words that James Madison had written some considerable time before. Madison said, “The several departments, being perfectly coordinate by the terms of their common commission, neither of them, it is evident, can portend to an exclusive or superior right of settling the boundaries between their respective powers.” That was what Lincoln enjoyed hearing, and on the basis of Madison’s words, he had his

Attorney General prepare an opinion to justify his own decision to interpret the Constitution and then to act on what he believed the Constitution demanded.

He had his Attorney General, a gentleman by the name of Bates, issue an opinion the day after the address in which he made the statement I quoted, and Bates developed an argument based on the principles that were enunciated by James Madison.

Bates wrote the following opinion: “These departments, the executive, the legislative, and the judicial, are coordinate and co-equal. That is, neither being sovereign, each is independent in its sphere and not subordinate to the others, to either of them or both of them together. If we allow one of the three to determine the extent of its own powers and also the extent of the power of the other two, that one can control the whole government and has, in fact, achieved the sovereignty.”

This is an issue that we are wrestling with at the present time. I believe, following Lincoln’s example, that the Congress can be much more active and much more assertive in its role in relation to the judiciary. There are a number of ways in which this can happen. The Senate can more carefully fulfill its role in the selection of federal judges.

Lately, we have had quite a storm of what I believe is carefully calculated publicity that attempts to intimidate the Senate for carefully looking at potential judges and determining who is fit to assume the federal bench and who understands the Constitutional role of the judiciary among these coordinate branches of government. Furthermore, I think Congress can do much in reining in the judiciary by exercising its Constitutional power to determine the jurisdiction and the regulation of the courts; and, by Congress itself restraining its own actions, including the urge to create more federal laws and more causes of action—which only give more power to the courts and cause mischief.

The second thing that I believe is that Lincoln’s advice and Lincoln’s example are very important in the matter of national unity. Lincoln was compelled to unify the nation by force of arms, and he also sought to unify the people themselves emotionally, by patience, compassion, and persuasion. I would suggest that, today, we must unify the nation by the force of our ideas, by the validity of our principles, and by the persuasiveness of our rhetoric.

There are at least three ways that are very important to contribute to this unifying action. In one way, we must end the most divisive practice in our country today, which has had the effect of setting citizen against citizen. That is, of course, discrimination on the basis of race and sex through quotas and preferences. Much has been done, but much needs to be done.

We have to have a body of people that are willing to stand up so that the public themselves cannot be fooled, which was done recently in Houston. Opponents of the [affirmative action] measure were able to falsify the language on the ballot so that voters were flummoxed into taking a position the opposite of what they would have decided if the question were properly presented—at least according to opinion polls about the measure.

More than that, this is not a matter of public opinion polls. This is a question of simple fairness, simple justice, and the simple application of the constitutional provisions, the constitutional principles that Lincoln talked about, and equality under the law—for all people—where no one receives a detriment or a preference because of their race or because of their gender.

Another way of promoting unity is promoting a common language for this country. For too long we have been led to believe that we, as part of so-called diversity, have to accept a whole variety of languages, even in official matters, as opposed to policy decisions that could be made to help newly-arrived citizens in our country learn the English language and assimilate into the culture, through the practice of that language and becoming part of society, generally.

What has happened is—again in the name of diversity, in the name of multiculturalism or all the other buzzwords that are so common and are found on college campuses and, unfortunately, have spread into the rest of the community—we have tried to foster a multiplicity of languages, so that we have, in many of our cities, a replica of the Tower of Babel, in the sense of people not understanding each other. That, in itself, would be bad enough. The idea that in official documents, in voting, and in other official actions we would have a multiplicity of languages is bad enough.

What we are really doing, though, by not insisting on a common language for our people--besides the divisive effects on the people themselves--is dooming people to economic inferiority: the people who are not encouraged to get into the mainstream by learning the basic language of our country. It is for this reason that we need to exert a unifying force by promoting a common language.

Thirdly, I believe it is very important that we resist the politicians and the political forces, including the current administration, who engage in class warfare by appealing to the lowest and most base emotion of people, emotions such as greed and envy, and thereby attempt to divide Americans on the basis of their social status or their economic condition.

Just as Lincoln preserved the union by leadership and bold action, we must preserve the unity of our nation by our commitment and dedication to this cause. Ronald Reagan used to talk about a “shining city on a hill.” Lincoln, a century earlier, said it this way: “My dream is of a place and time where America will once again be seen as the last, best hope on earth.”

I would suggest to you on this, Lincoln’s birthday, 1998, that our task, as we work together, is to commemorate this great President by building a nation good enough for Lincoln.

### ***JOHN F. KENNEDY***

The President’s responsibility cannot be delegated.  
For he is the one focal point of responsibility.

A Great President should clearly understand what it means to be the  
Leader of the Free World. **John F. Kennedy**<sup>1</sup>

### ***MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.***

Ethical leadership does not emerge from an historical vacuum, but arises from the life worlds of particular traditions and speaks authoritatively and acts responsibly with the aim of serving the selective good.

Ethical leaders are leaders whose characters have been shaped by the wisdom, habits, and practices of particular traditions, often more than one, yet they tend to be identified with a particular ethos and cultural narrative.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> nsnews guest of honor February 12, 1960. JFK

<sup>2</sup> Excerpts, Leadership in The Life and Work of Martin Luther King, December 1, 2003, Miller Chapel

## **NELSON MANDELA**

*“I learned that courage was not the absence of fear, but the triumph over it. The brave man is not he who does not feel afraid, but he who conquers that fear.”<sup>3</sup>*

## **OPRAH WINFREY**

“Education is the way to move mountains, to build bridges, to change the world. Education is the path to the future. I believe that education is indeed freedom. With God’s help, these girls will be the future leaders on the path to peace in South Africa and the world.” — Oprah Winfrey

“The school will teach girls to be the best human beings they can ever be; it will train them to become decision-makers and leaders; it will be a model school for the rest of the world.”

## **Change**

- \* “Every organization must be prepared to abandon everything it does to survive in the future.” ~ **Peter Drucker**
- \* Managers think about today. Leaders think about tomorrow.  
~ **Dan McCreary**
- \* Leaders manage change. Managers control process. ~ **Anonymous**
- \* “We must be the change we wish to see in the world.”  
~ **Mahatma Gandhi**
- \* “Not everything that is faced can be changed. But nothing can be changed until it is faced.” ~ **James Baldwin**
- \* “As we, the leaders, deal with tomorrow, our task is not to try to make perfect plans. Our task is to create organizations that are sufficiently flexible and versatile that they can take our imperfect plans and make them work in execution. That is the essential character of the learning organization.” ~ **Gordon R. Sullivan & Michael V. Harper**

---

<sup>3</sup> Nelson Mandela

- \* “A new leader has to be able to change an organization that is dreamless, soulless and visionless ... someone’s got to make a wake up call.” ~ **Warren Bennis**
- \* “Think of managing change as an adventure. It tests your skills and abilities. It brings forth talent that may have been dormant. Change is also a training ground for leadership. When we think of leaders, we remember times of change, innovation and conflict. Leadership is often about shaping a new way of life. To do that, you must advance change, take risks and accept responsibility for making change happen.” ~ **Charles E. Rice**, CEO of Barnett Bank

## Integrity

- \* Whoever is careless with the truth in small matters cannot be trusted with the important matters. ~ **Albert Einstein**
- \* Managers are people who do things right, while leaders are people who do the right thing. ~ **Warren Bennis**
- \* Management is doing things right; leadership is doing the right things. ~ **Peter Drucker**
- \* Nearly all men can stand adversity, but if you want to test a man’s character, give him power. ~ **Abraham Lincoln**
- \* The quality of a leader is reflected in the standards they set for themselves. ~ **Ray Kroc**, Founder of McDonald’s

## Character

- \* Leadership in today’s world requires far more than a large stock of gunboats and a hard fist at the conference table.  
~ **Hubert H. Humphrey**

## Influence

- \* Leadership is influence. ~ John Maxwell

## Techniques and Style

- \* Lead, follow or get out of the way! ~ General Douglas MacArthur
- \* In matters of style, swim with the current; In matters of principle, stand like a rock. ~ Thomas Jefferson
- \* Don't tell people how to do things, tell them what to do and let them surprise you with their results. ~ General George S. Patton
- \* If it's a good idea, go ahead and do it. It is much easier to apologize than it is to get permission. ~ Admiral Grace Hopper
- \* Probably my best quality as a coach is that I ask a lot of challenging questions and let the person come up with the answer. ~ Phil Dixon
- \* Follow me! ~ Maj. Richard Winters
- \* If I have seen farther than others, it is because I was standing on the shoulder of giants. ~ Isaac Newton
- \* The key to successful leadership today is influence, not authority. ~ Kenneth Blanchard
- \* If you're not confused, you're not paying attention. ~ Tom Peters

## Motivation

- \* Leadership is the art of getting someone else to do something you want done because he wants to do it. ~ Dwight Eisenhower
- \* A leader is a dealer in hope. ~ Napoleon Bonaparte
- \* He who thinketh he leadeth and hath no one following him is only taking a walk. ~ Anonymous

## Qualities of a Leader

- \* Leadership is a quality of those who earn the respect of others through the wisdom of the combination of their words and their actions. ~ **Walter Grant IV**, past President — University of Redlands Whitehead Leadership Society.
- \* Orders shouldn't be given if you can't do it yourself, if you're in charge, don't blame others for not knowing things or doing things incorrectly because it's your fault, you never taught them and if you don't teach them don't consider yourself a role model.”  
~ **Harley Fricker**
- \* Superior leaders get things done with very little motion. They impart instruction not through many words, but through a few deeds. They keep informed about everything but interfere hardly at all. They are catalysts, and though things would not get done as well if they were not there, when they succeed they take no credit. And, because they take no credit, credit never leaves them. ~ **Lao Tzu**
- \* The most important quality in a leader is that of being acknowledged as such. ~ **Andre Maurois**

## Leadership and Planning

- \* Good plans shape good decisions. That's why good planning helps to make elusive dreams come true. ~ **Lester R. Bittel** The Nine Master Keys of Management

## Leadership and Vision

- \* A clear vision is usually assumed and rarely communicated.  
~ **Unknown**
- \* The leader has to be practical and a realist, yet must talk the language of the visionary and the idealist. ~ **Eric Hoffer**
- \* Never mistake a clear view for a short distance. ~ **Paul Saffo** Saffo.com



- \* All of the great leaders have had one characteristic in common: it was the willingness to confront unequivocally the major anxiety of their people in their time. This, and not much else, is the essence of leadership. ~ **John Kenneth Galbraith**, U.S. economist “The Age of Uncertainty”
- \* Give people a convincing reason and they will lay down their very lives. ~ **Patrick Dixon**

## Failure

- \* You may have a fresh start any moment you choose, for this thing that we call ‘failure’ is not the falling down, but the staying down. ~ **Mary Pickford**
- \* The different between vision and hallucination is action. ~ **Allen Patmarajah**

## Courage

- \* All serious daring starts from within. ~ **Eudora Welty**
- \* To put up with. . . distortions and to stick to one’s guns come what may — this is the. . . gift of leadership. (Abridged) ~ **Mohandas Gandhi**
- \* You gain strength, courage and confidence by every experience in which you really stop to look fear in the face. You must do the thing you think you cannot do. ~ **Eleanor Roosevelt**
- \* Fortune sides with he who dares. ~ **Virgil**
- \* A leader must have the courage to act against an expert’s advice. ~ **James Callaghan**

## Innovation

- \* Do not go where the path may lead; go instead where there is no path and leave a trail. ~ **Ralph Waldo Emerson**

## Miscellaneous

- \* In the face of adversity and personal pain, we continue to strive to achieve our ideals... to provide comfort and hope to those we care about... by converting our collective hopes, dreams and aspirations into reality. ~ **Boris M Struk**
- \* The real leader has no need to lead — he is content to point the way. ~ **Henry Miller**
- \* Most of the ladies and gentlemen who mourn the passing of the nation's leaders wouldn't know a leader if they saw one. If they had the bad luck to come across a leader, they would find out that he might demand something from them, and this impertinence would put an abrupt and indignant end to their wish for his return.  
~ **Lewis H. Lapham**
- \* Leadership consists not in degrees of technique but in traits of character; it requires moral rather than athletic or intellectual effort, and it imposes on both leader and follower alike the burdens of self-restraint. ~ **Lewis H. Lapham**
- \* I am a leader by default, only because nature does not allow a vacuum.  
~ **Bishop Desmond Tutu**
- \* People ask the difference between a leader and a boss. . . . The leader works in the open, and the boss is covert. The leader leads, and the boss drives. ~ **Theodore Roosevelt**
- \* The final test of a leader is that he leaves behind him in other men the conviction and the will to carry on. . . . The genius of a good leader is to leave behind him a situation which common sense, without the grace of genius, can deal with successfully.  
~ **Walter Lippmann**
- \* There is no such thing as a perfect leader either in the past or present, in China or elsewhere. If there is one, he is only pretending, like a pig inserting scallions into its nose in an effort to look like an elephant. ~ **Liu Shao-ch'i**

- \* In organizations, real power and energy is generated through relationships. The patterns of relationships and the capacities to form them are more important than tasks, functions, roles, and positions. ~ **Margaret Wheatly** Leadership and the New Science
- \* The quality of leadership, more than any other single factor, determines the success or failure of an organization.  
~ **Fred Fiedler & Martin Chemers** Improving Leadership Effectiveness
- \* There is no contest between the company that buys the grudging compliance of its work force and the company that enjoys the enterprising participation of its employees. ~ **Ricardo Semler**
- \* The first responsibility of a leader is to define reality. The last is to say thank you. ~ **Max DePree**
- \* When what you are doing isn't working, you tend to do more of the same and with greater intensity. ~ **Dr. Bill Maynard & Tom Champoux** Heart, Soul and Spirit
- \* A friend of mine characterizes leaders simply like this: "Leaders don't inflict pain. They bear pain." ~ **Max DePree**
- \* Ah well! I am their leader, I really ought to follow them!  
~ **Alexandre Auguste Ledru-Rollin**
- \* Dictators ride to and fro upon tigers which they dare not dismount. And the tigers are getting hungry. ~ **Winston Churchill**
- \* I used to think that running an organization was equivalent to conducting a symphony orchestra. But I don't think that's quite it; it's more like jazz. There is more improvisation. ~ **Warren Bennis**
- \* When the effective leader is finished with his work, the people say it happened naturally. ~ **Lao Tse**
- \* Most of what we call management consists of making it difficult for people to get their jobs done. ~ **Peter Drucker**

- \* I start with the premise that the function of leadership is to produce more leaders, not more followers ~ **Ralph Nader**
- \* To lead people, walk beside them ... As for the best leaders, the people do not notice their existence. The next best, the people honor and praise. The next, the people fear; and the next, the people hate ... When the best leader's work is done the people say, "We did it ourselves!" ~ **Lao Tsu**
- \* Unless commitment is made, there are only promises and hopes... but no plans. ~ **Peter Drucker**
- \* Leadership is understanding people and involving them to help you do a job. That takes all of the good characteristics, like integrity, dedication of purpose, selflessness, knowledge, skill, implacability, as well as determination not to accept failure.  
~ **Admiral Arleigh A. Burke**
- \* Lead and inspire people. Don't try to manage and manipulate people. Inventories can be managed but people must be led.  
~ **Ross Perot**
- \* A competent leader can get efficient service from poor troops, while on the contrary an incapable leader can demoralize the best of troops. ~ **General of the Armies John J. Pershing**
- \* It is important that an aim never be defined in terms of activity or methods. It must always relate directly to how life is better for everyone. . . . The aim of the system must be clear to everyone in the system. The aim must include plans for the future. The aim is a value judgment. ~ **W. Edwards Deming**
- \* The very essence of leadership is its purpose. And the purpose of leadership is to accomplish a task. That is what leadership does — and what it does is more important than what it is or how it works.  
~ **Colonel Dandridge M. Malone**
- \* We know not where our dreams will take us, but we can probably see quite clearly where we'll go without them. ~ **Marilyn Grey**

- \* It is not a question of how well each process works, the question is how well they all work together. ~ **Lloyd Dons** and **Clare Crawford-Mason** Thinking About Quality
- \* Do not follow where the path may lead. Go instead where there is no path and leave a trail. ~ **Muriel Strode**
- \* In war, three quarters turns on personal character and relations; the balance of manpower and materials counts only for the remaining quarter. ~ **Napoleon I**
- \* The final test of a leader is that he leaves behind him in other men the conviction and will to carry on. ~ **Walter J. Lippmann**
- \* Leadership should be born out of the understanding of the needs of those who would be affected by it. ~ **Marian Anderson**
- \* People are more easily led than driven. ~ **David Harold Fink**
- \* Leadership has a harder job to do than just choose sides. It must bring sides together. ~ **Jesse Jackson**
- \* What is character but the determination of incident, what is incident but the illustration of character? ~ **Henry James**
- \* The trouble is, if you don't risk anything, you risk even more. ~ **Erica Jong**
- \* No man will make a great leader who wants to do it all himself, or to get all the credit for doing it. ~ **Andrew Carnegie**
- \* The first responsibility of a leader is to define reality. ~ **Max DePree**, in The Art of Leadership
- \* Processes don't do work, people do. ~ **John Seely Brown**

- \* Leadership is practiced not so much in words as in attitude and in actions. ~ **Harold Geneen**
- \* The task of the leader is to get his people from where they are to where they have not been. ~ **Henry Kissinger**
- \* Jingshen is the Mandarin word for spirit and vivacity. It is an important word for those who would lead, because above all things, spirit and vivacity set effective organizations apart from those that will decline and die. ~ **James L. Hayes** “Memos for Management: Leadership”
- \* Uncertainty will always be part of the taking charge process. ~ **Harold Geneen**
- \* Remember that it is far better to follow well than to lead indifferently. ~ **John G. Vance**
- \* The only real training for leadership is leadership. ~ **Anthony Jay**
- \* The future is taking shape now in our own beliefs and in the courage of our leaders. Ideas and leadership — not natural or social ‘forces’ — are the prime movers in human affairs. ~ **George Roche**, A World Without Heroes
- \* The art of leading, in operations large or small, is the art of dealing with humanity, of working diligently on behalf of men, of being sympathetic with them, but equally, of insisting that they make a square facing toward their own problems. ~ **S. L. A. Marshall** Men Against Fire
- \* And when we think we lead, we are most led. ~ **Lord Byron**
- \* If you think you can do a thing or that you cannot do a thing, in either case you are right. ~ **Henry Ford**
- \* The price of greatness is responsibility. ~ **Winston Churchill**

- \* My goal is not to be a ‘well-rounded’ leader, but rather to focus on the unique gifts that I can bring, and then make certain that the strengths of others bring all that is necessary - including the things that I lack - to our work ... ~ **Wesley Granberg-Michaelson Wesley Granberg-Michaelson**, *Leadership from the inside out: Spirituality & organizational change* (2004)

Retrieved from “<http://en.wikiquote.org/wiki/Leadership>”<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> <http://en.wikiquote.org/wiki/leadership>

# CHAPTER 2

## **LEADERSHIP**

The military follows the leadership experiences of many of their recognized generals and heroes. With that, because of the sheer number it is best to come up with a consolidation of their outlook;

*Leadership is influencing people- by providing purpose, direction and motivation – while operating to accomplish the mission and improving the organization.*<sup>5</sup>

While I see that as an interesting definition this subject involves the need for the understanding that the study and application of leadership is a lifelong process and you must consider yourself a student of this study wherever you are and especially when dealing or working with others like you.

Any author writing on this subject would not use solely the military for guidance. The simplest reason is that although they are steeped in history it is not all positive or educational. While you can learn from their experiences you can learn more by also looking at some of the theorists that they have copied from. As a student or scholar you have to dig deeper and look further which we will do at this time by looking at the modern authorities on management and leadership.

---

<sup>5</sup> US ARMY FM No. 22-100, 2004, Part 1, page 5



While we will spend time on the book experts and gurus we will also introduce a well known, but often overlooked in this category, group that include the most influential and possibly the greatest leaders of our times. Refer back to the definition of leadership and really it doesn't matter if we are talking about that military definition or from Webster or dictionary.com (leader, one who leads) the capacity or ability to lead, (they show extremely strong leadership in that role).

Leader, one who has influence or power, especially of a political nature and to lead, or to play a principal or guiding role .

The good aspect of this major problem is that the management consulting industry is growing wildly with even unknown consultants, writers and college professors making major contributions. Most realize that we have a crisis of management and leadership that many know, or should know about, but few would venture a risk of mention.

“We have met the enemy and it iz us”. How many times have you heard that whether it be from a politician seeking office or more power, from a comedian commenting on how our government and the current war crises are unfolding, or in a scholarly paper emphasizing some ones view. It is a cliché and it is also a cliché when it is used to describe management, especially upper levels of management. Will we catch up with any competition and will this country prosper? Notice I didn't say continue to prosper!

The answer is a resounding “NO”.

Of course we can never catch up but the quality and management gurus never said we could. We couldn't even compete if we didn't regulate and tax our foreign competitors so closely to keep us minimally competitive, and that's a good thing.

The theorist don't bother with the actuality of this one because to do so is to unleash their own doom. You mustn't bite the hand that feeds you and even the dumbest dog subscribes to that. Who wants to be the bearer of gloom and doom?

The hands that feed all of the consultants are management (i.e. management consultants) and if we want to keep the checks and contracts coming in we have to tell them and sell them on what they want to hear. Tell them not only what they want to hear but also what might be popular to their

entire industry. So when we incorporate training as at least one arm of our consulting package pays attention to how often we include upper level management. We don't include them because they won't come or listen and to make any attempt at teaching them anything is to ask not to be called back again because of their hard heads, stupidity and arrogance. The thought of suggesting to them that they should learn something, anything at all, is considered a personal affront and because it is the way it is in practically all upper management circles, the word spreads and your phone stops ringing. This is a close knit network of highly paid morons.

They've got all of the answers but a quick look at their organization disclosed huge performance deficits and the biggest was usually with them. No, the training and education is for the lower levels. Why would you think to ask anyway? We have people here who are college educated and many even have MBAs and some higher. We don't need your little training but we will sign off on your payment if you don't bother us. This attitude filters down into middle management to where the only ones receiving the necessary training are the hourly employees and possibly a few supervisors who don't feel threatened and aren't afraid to learn the materials that will make them better at their jobs.

Degrees and education, you say. They have college degrees. When did they get them and what were their majors? The world is changing and all aspects of business is part of that world. International business has long since passed us by. Executives sit on a high throne controlled by a money market that is out of control and out of touch. It's not just the highly paid executives. No, of course not, because they play to the analysts and mega-money managers on wall street. Whatever happened to leadership from the boards of directors? With few exceptions it is non-existent with them taking their lead from executive and middle management and of course analysts. They all pass the buck up and down and nobody lets it stop at them, to look it over and show at least a minimal amount of leadership and direction.

You have just terminated 35,000 workers and your stock will go through the roof and on to fantasy levels of the atmosphere, stratosphere, ionosphere, troposphere and higher, higher and higher and to vaporization. The market loves you for today. Is this is leadership as we create many more hopeless, homeless, suicides and probably worse? 35,000 layoffs probably really represents 100,000 lives and more. I don't know the level of suicides but I know that level of hopelessness while the fat cats get fatter and the boards and wall street get dumber or more uninformed, if you will, and you should.

What about that 35,000 human beings that you laid off? Who cares? Certainly not the dumb executives and managers from the company who get a penny bonus, raises or more stock options for the destruction of those lives but they have to live with the fact that the workers were necessary if not absolutely essential. These were people that you knew. These are the families who awhile back you had picnicked with at the company parties. Remember those not too long ago days. These are, or at least were, your friends.

Monday morning starts the new learning curve of how to do more, to further prop up the stock with much less. How's morale? My workers love me!

These are the real life facts of our industrial situation and it's not going to get better. It can only get worse because people like me, theorists and consultants can only offer a bandage when tourniquets, amputations and possibly lethal injections are more suitable solutions.

I'm even going to offer a new theory that is tried and true and like I previously stated is sure to work if any of the old stuff is any good and anyone is listening.

We don't expect this book to be popular with those who are hiding out, and so many are. This is one that has to be neatly folded inside of your NYT(NY Times), WSJ(Wall Street Journal) or TOL(Financial Times of London) when you go into the bathroom two or three times a day for your hour sit. Though word will get out that this is an insider exposing all of these flanks, I do it with full knowledge that a major change has to take place in our country's business world, and I'm certainly anything but an insider. Hiding out will not get it any more because you have been fully exposed for what you really are.

It is long past the time when a vice president grabs the general managers and goes off to a week of golf on the company under the guise of a seminar. It's time to go back to where the money is being made, get your hands a little soiled, look at the quality of your product, see how you are treating your workers, your most important asset, view first hand how valuable they really are and stop making points by trying to screw them out of everything that they have coming to them. They made you what you are which doesn't include your deceitfulness to them.

How did we start this discourse? We started right with my position that consultants do not necessarily solve management problems. Dig deeper now to realize that everything that I've said is likely to be true.

Before I even get to my theory I offer something that will sit well with Wall Street, will improve your financial position tremendously and will greatly enhance the morale, productivity and profitability of your company. This is what I do for a little living. Put the savings in monetary terms and ratios. I can show you how it's done and it always is truthful and works without question or risk of failure. The reason that you can't sleep at night is because of how you treat the least of your employees and the way that you lie and falsify to maintain your life style and country clubs. Take this as a cliché, and you pay attention also Wall Street, your executives are worthless as you are seeing by the examples in today's newspapers. Those aren't the exceptions but the rule. Using the same principle that you so artfully use with supervisory and middle level management and just start cutting.

This is where a consultant can earn his/her money and it will be well deserved. Hire any outsider to just come in and give you a report after one month on what each of your highest paid executives do. Use the same techniques as for any other directed time/ motion study. You're going to find that they don't do anything worthwhile. With that justification, although you don't really need it because this is the same school of thought that just fired 35K workers and probably destroyed two or three times that many lives.

What is the ROI if you pay \$50K(one time) for this job and I can quickly justify the severing of at least \$20,000,000.00 in recurring annual salaries? Be mindful of the fact that each of these high salaries have an average life expectancy of approximately ten years, so you can see how I earn my money, but I'll settle for none of that to make a few bucks on selling enough of my books. I will go even further for you in advising how it can be done quickly and without the stench of litigation. They'll be glad to leave with an ironclad agreement.

Isn't it amazing that billions of dollars have been and are still being spent by all major industries developing the latest optimization models in their organizations but because they are too smart to learn anything new by getting personally involved in the learning process they just let the huge improvement and cost reductions pass right by. Just one afternoon sitting in an air conditioned classroom would reap millions in returns.

Why is this such a hard sell for this level of management? It is a very simple explanation for it. Many managers, while they take themselves very seriously, also know their failings and weaknesses. They were never that great in the sciences and math and this just brings back bad memories. Twenty of thirty

years and maybe even more and there is no way that you are going to sit them down and teach them anything at all and certainly not something that they truly don't understand and really need to learn. The math is for the accountants, that's what they're paid for. Pay attention because it is a sign of the times for the accountant and even CPA firms to be embroiled in the indictments when the accusations and allegations start flying all around you. Remember what Kennedy said about responsibility, "the president's responsibility cannot be delegated. For he is the focal point of responsibility". That was JFK talking about the presidency of the United States. Do you place yourselves above that? Certainly you do and you can get away with it because you're in bed, so to speak with a board of directors who are of the same school of thought. As long as this continues and there is an intellectual malaise over the boardrooms of this country industry will improve in baby steps rather than in leaps and bounds as other competing countries are doing.

Let's be a little scientific boards of directors and major investors. This is an area that the workers get into at all levels of the scientific approaches of six sigma, tqc, smc. Iso 9000, 9001 etc and whatever. Read up on it because it is the biggest cost savings that you can possibly ever engage in and it doesn't involve all of the work of going out in the plants or meeting with the sales teams. Other than being squeamish about your friends this money is made more simply than ever imagined and then we can move on to making the grunts more efficient. However there is one little caveat. Make the most of it because it is also your retirement package.

While the boards are out to lunch the shareholders are ringing their hands and wondering when the breakthrough will be forthcoming. You were promised big returns from this sector and they just seem to be at a standstill. They seem to be and they are. They are waiting and waiting for someone else to come up with a breakthrough, possibly a new drug or chemical or vehicle with minimally improved fuel mileage. Listen to what Ralph Waldo Emerson says about innovation, "do not go where the pay may lead, go instead where there is no path and leave a trail". The problem with our corporate boardrooms are that they are perfectly content in giving their stockholders something but not much. Follow Emerson and blaze a new trail. This is leadership for when you do you will have to beat off all of the Bozos that will be dead on your heels. Follow my lead and blaze this trail of innovation and you will not only be heralded as a trailblazer but possibly

as the greatest innovator of modern industrial times. You'll also make all of your stakeholders happy and then can settle back and write your book.

It's called "**EXECUTIVE PARETO**" and it is a part of my simplified leadership method. Let me explain how it will work for you. Grab a hold of it and you will be the biggest hero on wall street since the advent of the micro-chip and the portable and desk-top computer and the software to operate them. Use of this theory will free up millions and billions practically overnight. The investment is very small and all that is required is some amount of leadership that is sorely lacking in business. This is the first step for us (US) to start the catch-up process that was identified earlier.

Pareto analysis seeks to discover from a thorough analysis of defect reports or customer complaints which "vital few" causes are responsible for most of the reported problems. The old adage states that 80% of reported problems can usually be traced to 20% of the various underlying causes. By concentrating your efforts on rectifying the vital 20%, you can have the greatest immediate impact on product quality.

(Pareto analysis<sup>6</sup> is a statistical technique in decision making used for selection of a limited of number of tasks that produce significant overall effect. It uses the Pareto principle - *the idea that by doing 20% of work you can generate 80% of the advantage of doing the entire job.*

**Pareto analysis is a formal technique useful where many possible courses of action are competing for your attention. Basically, it consists in the estimating of a benefit delivered by each action with subsequent selection of a number of the most effective actions that deliver the total benefit reasonably close to the maximal possible one.**

Steps to identify the important causes using Pareto analysis"

- ***Step 1: You get a table with the causes and their frequency as a percentage.***
- ***Step 2: Arrange the rows in the decreasing order of importance of the causes i.e. the most important cause first***
- ***Step 3: Add a cumulative percentage column to the table***

<sup>6</sup> Source: Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia © 2001-2006 Wikipedia contributors (Disclaimer)  
This article is licensed under the GNU Free Documentation License.

- *Step 4: Plot with causes on X, cumulative percentage on Y axis*
- *Step 5: Join the above points to form a curve*
- *Step 6: Draw line at 80% on Y axis parallel to X axis. Then drop the line at the point of intersection with the curve on X axis. This point on the X axis separates the important causes and trivial causes.*

2

In our situation the vital few are the huge executive salaries and perks to jerks. Those ridiculously out of control compensation packages represent the bulk of a company's payroll and a high percentage of their costs. In ridding yourself of those salaries and individuals your operation will not suffer but rather will improve, so the affect is multi fold.

Again, understand the gospel that millions have been spent on problems that fall into the categories that comprise the trivial many while the vital few continues to be as elusive as ever.

You are getting rid of the stale dead weight while replenishing your management at a tremendous cost reduction and also maintaining your work force and probably saving the economy of an entire town, county or even perhaps a state in keeping the 35,000 and more workers on the job.

In satisfying the requirements for cost savings and streamlining you will also improve your operations in the area of profitability when middle managers see that it is finally coming to fruition. (the real dead weight, the drag is gone). This is a real "NO BRAINER" but creates the cosmic cataclysmic apocalypse that you don't have the intestinal fortitude/ guts to undertake. Truth be known, it must start with "YOU". Show a little leadership. You've already got yours. Give the next generation a chance to add new blood and thinking that will move your organization forward. This is leadership. It can't be continually selfish and all about you. No, you show leadership when you open up to the opportunity to new thought and leadership styles and methods that will move your organization in the right direction.

Though I'm not trying to be facetious it does come across as being a jocular presentation. It really is serious but when you look at the situation that we've allowed ourselves to get into with executive compensation rising while a fair and reasonable assessment will show that profitability is dropping one can laugh a little when you are on the outside looking in. When you see these same executives doing as little as they can to get by and when you see the

straight line relationship between their performance and the performance of their companies or organizations. Be fair in giving this an opportunity to work. Boards you have to be innovative in cleaning your houses. Watch the results of your Pareto and take the appropriate action. In most cases these are individuals and in many cases even positions that you have known were unnecessary and non-essential just as you called the peons. Remember that the peons represent peanuts when we look at the money. It is with the executives that you will immediately realize your biggest bang for your buck.

This is even more so if you can't do your job and save your organization. You still get a parachute although it might not have the same golden sparkle as your predecessors who got out before they were discovered. Take whatever is offered and run! Run and hide and hope like hell that there is no way for an audit evaluation and value analysis, dollar and otherwise, for the work that you've actually done in the last several years. You know in this age of scientific management that too can come back to haunt you. On the other hand perhaps you say that I don't know what I'm talking about and you have done a lot for your company. Was it directly through you? Was it through your leadership? In either case your true leadership potential is best realized when you step aside and let those who really did the work get more of the reward as you remove yourself and that huge package completely from the picture.

Why do we have so many still hanging on still in the executive suite long after their useful years have passed? Read on and you will see that many have already been replaced and they know it. They are just waiting to be told to leave and they will just have to wait because these are the same friends that you share your golf cart with and whose wife is probably on the phone with your wife right now. HELL NO! They aren't going any where unless and until youth enters the picture and sees a way to immediately become a shooting star which will then shoot straight through you.

In order to get rid of the dead wood from the executive suite you have to first ask them to leave, then tell them to leave with a phony ceremony and a gold plated bulova and finally make sure that the company security and car is waiting to take them out and take them home. Remember that 'friends don't let their friends drink and drive' so you have the responsibility of anticipating that he and probably his wife or significant other are going to be drunk after his going away bash so you have to take them wherever they want to go. Why will they be drunk? First because that is



their normal *modus operandi* and secondly and probably most importantly when looking at this individual as a leadership figure or role model (remember that is the subject of this treatise) is that this might be the last time that he gets to get drunk on the company. They will drink themselves straight into oblivion, eclipse and final limbo. This is the last dance.

Were they merely trying to reap another payday. This doesn't include many of the invited CEO s. In their cases it is the manifestation of greed and wanting and diminishing power, as we have seen lately from the executive officers of our largest corporations. They are simply trying to get the last bones of their tremendous greed and reap still another payday and perhaps a display of their former power. Why would someone have thievery on their mind when they are earning more than \$100,000,000 (that's one hundred million dollars) per year plus perks that might exceed that amount. These are great examples of pure greed and contempt to the very last breath. It also shows their terrible leadership, and we've seen both very recently. Convictions and last breaths have made the news lately showing the state of leadership emanating from our boardrooms and executive suites.

Yes, everybody has a leadership theory that they so readily expound and affix their names to but maybe somebody might ask why do you need all of those theories if the one before it (the former) really worked? They don't work because they are usually just gimmicks developed for the bottom line on reasons referenced above. Looking a few of them over, as you will have an opportunity to do collectively in this book you will find that some probably work to a limited degree, but one of the problems is that there are just too many of them and at times they seem to be in conflict. We also see theorist like Tom Peters, "In Search Of Excellence" encouraging the move from the "Taylor bean-counters", which is somewhat like disrespect for the "elders".

It is called another payday and it is the same reason that I work and also write books. I sincerely believe that my background, education and experience, be it in the military or civilian sector, better prepares me to talk to you on this subject than a general who doesn't even know where his troops are or were and would take hours even by helicopter to reach them in a combat crisis or a Chief Executive Officer or Chairman that has intentionally placed his executive offices as far away from the work and workers as possible so he doesn't ever have to see them but rather pay millions of dollars of the shareholders money to have the corporate offices set in the wealthiest area of Westchester County, NY. In the process of his extravagance, at the stockholders expense of

course, he hired a helicopter to hover at the point where he wanted to sit in his office, and probably sleep most of the time, to be sure that he had his perfect view of the panoramic setting. This isn't only an example of poor leadership but really the extreme of corporate extravagance.

Where does he come into the overall realistic picture other than having a name, possibly an illustrious history, which I sincerely doubt, the title and huge salary that he hasn't deserved in years. Put him out to pasture. That's what leadership is about, it is also common sense. The same type of example is also true for some military generals. They have been proved to be as obsolete, outdated and useless as the M-1 Rifle or tank of the same generation and name and should be treated respectfully in the same manner. Both were outstanding weapons and systems for their time but the time came that they had very limited effectiveness for the combat situations faced by our forces. The military went through the evaluation process of many weapons but ultimately decided that they had to go. It should do the same with the generals that have lackluster performance, because only the best should be the only requirement for our forces.

These people are in positions that can cause the loss of lives due to their incompetence, being out of touch with just about everything and lack of leadership. There was a recent program on "NBC's Dateline" showing, not merely depicting because this was the real stuff. The captain that handled himself superbly, was a true leader and hero, and deserves the "Congressional Medal of Honor" for his bravery and outstanding leadership. To this date he has received the "Silver Star". It really isn't my position to argue about who deserves what but when you do an evaluation of that medal and his leadership actions if anyone ever deserved it he set the example of what a combat leader is. Make it your business to view this piece because it is a vivid example of leadership under extreme stress and fire.

While you are looking at this young brave hero listen carefully to the orders that he was receiving from his superior officers at least in partial either a colonel or general. His support was lacking and practically nonexistent as was the communications that was required. When he needed leadership from his superiors it seemed to fade away and dissipate. It is my understanding that in order to be nominated for the CMH a field grade or general grade officer must witness the action. This is leadership or the lack of it as I ask why the young captain did not receive the CMH? The reason is probably simpler than most can imagine because while the general was doing everything wrong

and the captain's exemplary, flawless performance showed he deserved the nation's highest combat medal for bravery, the general, displaying minuscule leadership is envious of that hero. He probably thinks that if there are medals going around he should be at the top of the list and for the highest. Usually true too!

2

That is the way that it normally happens with a complete leadership vacuum by the senior officers and all of the blood, sweat and guts displayed by the junior officers and lower grades including the noncoms and privates. The envious generals won't sign off for one stupid reason or another, but anyway you look at it, this is part of the tremendous void in our military ranks. Let the old timers go when they are no longer useful! Youth probably pays higher dividends in this type of work.

# 3 CHAPTER

## **RESCUE AT ROBERTS' RIDGE**

### **NBC's Dateline on 'Roberts Ridge'**

NBC's TV magazine is going to cover the story of 'Roberts Ridge' this Sunday at 7pm. Roberts Ridge is named as tribute to Navy SEAL, Neil Roberts, who made a heroic effort to save the life of a helicopter crewman who had fallen out of a chopper during battle operations in Afghanistan. The TV show supposedly includes some images of the battle that 'have never been seen before' as well as interviews with some Apache helicopter pilots from Operation Anaconda.

Those of you not familiar with 'Roberts' Ridge' can consult this Michelle Malkin column for a brief summary. There are also a number of books out there that cover the story.

- \* by Sean Naylor - Not a Good Day to Die: The Untold Story of Operation Anaconda
- \* by Malcom MacPherson - Roberts Ridge

Below is summary of the Dateline episode that I received via The Special Operations Warrior Foundation newsletter. You can find their home page here.

Dateline's "*Rescue on Roberts Ridge*" Airs Sunday, June 11

Stone Phillips to Report on Men and the Mission

In March 2002, during a battle called Operation Anaconda in Afghanistan, a Navy SEAL named Neil Roberts fell from a helicopter as it attempted to land on a mountaintop controlled by al Qaeda fighters. "Rescue On Roberts Ridge" is the untold story of the soldiers who were sent in to find Roberts and bring him home. Reported by "Dateline NBC's" Stone Phillips, the special two-hour broadcast, airing on June 11th (7:00 PM, ET), presents a minute-by-minute account of what those soldiers faced when their own chopper was shot down. For the first time on television, viewers will be able to watch, just as the U.S. commanders did that day, spy plane footage of the downed chopper as the enemy closed in.

Phillips interviews many of the soldiers, from the ground troops who describe the extremely difficult fighting conditions to the general in command who acknowledges the flawed plans and failed communications that led to the events on Roberts Ridge. The story focuses on Ranger Captain Nathan Self, whose courage under fire earned him a Silver Star, and on one of his men, Specialist Oscar Escano, who recalls how he lived his life that day in fifteen second intervals, the time it took enemy fighters to reload, aim and fire their mortars.

## Rescue on Roberts Ridge

Army Rangers on a rescue mission in the Afghan mountains were caught in an ambush. It was a battle within that battle that came at a heavy price

Their battle prayer:

The Army Rangers hoped that prayers would be enough to keep their helicopter from being shot out of the sky by Al Qaeda fighters.

By Stone Phillips

Anchor

Dateline NBC

Updated: 11:32 pm. ET June 11, 2006

With so much of the world's attention focused on Iraq, and with American soldiers under fire for some of their actions there, it's easy to forget that the war on terror began and continues—hundreds of miles away in Afghanistan. Early in that war, there was an operation the military called a major success. But there was a battle within that battle that came with a heavy price: Army Rangers on a rescue mission caught in an ambush. Young American soldiers were out-manned and out-gunned. They were running out of time, but never out of courage. The report 'Rescue on Roberts Ridge' aired Sunday, June 11, 7 pm. on NBC.

Army Chaplain: "Heavenly Father, we read in sacred scriptures that there is an appointed time and place for everything under the heavens. Today is a day for war... Soon the coalition of nations will send forth troops to find those who seek terror over peace, and hatred over love. Lord, I ask your blessing on this aircraft. May all these helicopters soar as on eagles' wings and bring us safely to your rendezvous with destiny, a world secure in peace."

Stone Phillips

Anchor

Prayers were not enough to keep a helicopter from being shot out of the sky by al Qaeda fighters. The wreckage left behind on a mountain top in a remote corner of Afghanistan — now known to the U.S. army as "Roberts Ridge" — is a reminder of the young soldiers who died, keeping their promise to "never leave a fallen comrade."

**Stone Phillips:** Leave no man behind.

**Former Ranger Captain Nate Self:** No question.

Story continues below ↓ advertisement

Former Ranger Captain Nate Self was aboard that helicopter, leading his men deep into enemy territory to rescue a missing soldier.

**Self:** A lot of people don't understand it, they don't think it's worth it. It's worth it.

Nate is back home now in Texas with his wife Julie and their two sons. But what happened on that distant ridge top is never very far away.

**Phillips:** You've been thinking about it a lot and dreaming about it?

**Self:** I dream every night that I've always got a gun in my hands. There's always something that has to be done, there's always somebody shooting at me. And, you know—I kill people every night. It's been almost three years since it happened.

Three years since a series of command failures and tragic miscommunication, sent Nate and a team of Army Rangers into an al Qaeda ambush.

Wounded during the battle, Nate was among the lucky ones who made it out alive. If only his psychological wounds healed as quickly.

**Julie Self, Nathan's wife:** Nathan has told me that, in one of his times of being upset, that maybe he should have just died that day. And for me, that's hard to understand and you know, "How can you think that? You have two kids, and me and for him to say that he should've just died, what do you say to that?"

A graduate of West Point, Nate became a ranger, and in December 2001, received his captain's bars. He was 25 years old, one of the army's youngest at that rank.

**Phillips:** Reflections on interviewing the soldiers of 'Roberts Ridge'

**Julie Self:** He's known as being, I don't want to say perfect, but he strives to be excellent at everything he does. But very humble. He just always seemed to know what path he wanted to take. And if there was something he wanted he was gonna go get it.

Julie had never worried much about Nate's safety until 9/11. When the U.S. launched its war on terror, Nate knew the Rangers would play a key role.

**Phillips:** So that you would soon be on a plane headed for Afghanistan was not a big surprise.

**Self:** No. Not at all. I don't think there are many places in the army, at least prior to 9/11, many places in the army where the use of force, the sense of killing, is more palpable than it is in the Ranger regiment. I mean it's apparent, on even the youngest guys' faces.

Specialist Oscar Escano was one of those young guys.

**Specialist Oscar Escano:** Nate Self is sort of like, his toughness was understated, he was like the calm in the storm.

He was under Nate Self's command and fought beside him in Afghanistan.

**Phillips:** Why did you join the army?

**Escano:** It was almost like an obligation. Just a moral obligation. Just the fact that I live in this country where we enjoy so many luxuries and so many benefits of American citizenship.

The oldest of three brothers, Oscar grew up in New York, and later New Jersey. His parents, both immigrants from the Dominican Republic, worried about their son's decision to enlist.

**Phillips:** How did they feel about it?

**Escano:** They were definitely opposed to it. And they tried by whatever means parent use to try and change their children's minds.

**Phillips:** To dissuade you?

**Escano:** To dissuade me, yeah.

His mother, Juanita Jenyons, a physician, was especially concerned about Oscar's safety.



**Juanita Jenyons, Oscar Escano's mother:** We were very surprised. We did everything we could to try to prevent that. I remember his dad actually prohibited the recruiting officer to come into this home, you know. And we were very upset.

**Escano:** I made the decision after high school that this is what I wanted to do and damn it, I was gonna do it.

After 3 years of intense training, Oscar completed Ranger school. His last day was memorable for another reason.

**Escano:** That morning I woke up and our instructors at Ranger school told us—"Listen, men—two planes just crashed into the World Trade Center."

**Phillips:** 9/11 happened?

**Escano:** Right. And my reaction to that emotionally was very, very, very quietly and subtly intense. Because not only I'm a native New Yorker, but also I was a Ranger.

**Phillips:** You were ready to go?

**Escano:** We were ready to go.

In December 2001, his ranger regiment shipped out to Afghanistan. Oscar Escano and Nate Self were joining the hunt for al Qaeda targets including Osama Bin Laden.

**Julie Self:** We said our good-byes, and he left at 5 am. And I just sat there with Caleb, and by myself, and cried, and I went to put Caleb back down in his crib, and he had left a note for Caleb [crying] with a Ranger tab and his Captain's bars. And it just kind of struck me right then, that it's possible that he won't come back.

Julie had little contact with Nate during the next four months. As a special operations soldier, his missions were classified, his whereabouts secret.

## Excerpts from report

Landing in enemy territory

1 / 5

Landing in enemy territory

**June 11:** A team of young Army Rangers has crash-landed in a nest of al Qaeda terrorists. Ambushed, trapped in their downed helicopter, the Rangers -- who had been sent on a rescue mission -- now needed rescuing themselves. But first they'd have to survive the next few minutes.

## Dateline

In January 2002, Nate and his unit were deployed to Bagram airbase. One month later, they were tapped to join "Operation Anaconda," a major offensive to capture or kill Tali ban and al Qaeda fighters.

**Julie Self:** I remember sitting there, watching the news, and they were talking about Operation Anaconda, and they had mentioned Special Ops. And I just had this feeling that he was involved in that.

**Jenyons:** I had a network of friends that were helping me pray for Oscar, and for everyone that was around him. That's what kept me going, because it was very very stressful for me to think that Oscar was in harm's way.

For Captain Nate Self, Specialist Oscar Escano and the other Rangers, it would soon be time to fulfill their creed, come to the aid of fallen comrades, and for some, to make the ultimate sacrifice.

## Corporate Setting

In the corporate setting the people who are actually touching the products that you sell are the ones who are really making your money for you. When is the last time that you, yeah, you, made the product that your livelihood is based on? When is the last time you saw it made? How is it made? Another test of leadership and as always, of course another failure. Those who cannot pass these simple little silly tests are not leaders in any sense of the word.

3

It's the same with both or either, but that payday of writing a successful book on a subject that they have little or no recent experience in just might be the last bastion of their career. A glorious career goes out with a book usually with a co-author or the word *with* on the author's line. Whoever *with* is actually wrote the book but as has been the hallmark of his leadership the credit is given to the **BOSS**. It is also their last insult that they so willingly add to all of the devastation and injury that they have caused. So if it is only that kind of experience that you are looking for they might have something to say and sell. They are actually perfect for the talking heads who show no leadership or gumption in appearing every week with the same old, weak, stale questions and responses.

The advertising promotion comes on saying that they are having someone that you might be interested in but the frustration comes on Sunday morning when you see no signs of life from the questioners or the guests. People come back week after week because they have nothing better to do and because one of these phony shows is no better than the rest. So just settle back and settle as you sit on the edge of your seat and wonder why they aren't asking obvious questions that should be asked. Why don't they ask them? It is again a tremendous void brought on by stations that just want a certain position to be presented. They know that you and I are gullible and accepting because we keep coming back and also supporting their sponsors. The fallacy of that line of thinking is that there are those of us who fervently resent the facade and don't watch any more or even when we do there is a very low regard as to think of them as just a bunch of bumbling buffoons. The well paid guests know this too and know that it is like playing to a script with no risk at all.

If you disagree that is the beginning of awareness. But just for the record get up on Sunday morning and listen in to these well orchestrated travesties and charades. This is just common sense.

My experience is from the trenches as a grunt all the way as I rose through the military and corporate ranks as a quasi-peon who worked and slept with both eyes open to see, learn and expose the truth about the failings of the generals and their immediate subordinates and the so-called captains of industry. We offer a realistic alternative without the gimmickry. Your job as a leader is to learn all of that which you can about this subject and see where it applies to you and your situation which is always dynamic. Know without fail that the techniques that you are using today might not work tomorrow with the same situation and people. Don't believe that they do. Don't be fooled by those who would have you think that their experiments often predicated on no field experience will work for you. You could be wrong and even dead. How many young officers took the books quite literally and found out the hard way that it didn't work for them. In trying to use someone else's words to the letter they lost out but because of their leadership role there is a very good likelihood that others did too.

That understanding is what will always set me apart as a leader. While seeking the highest level of performance and achievement I learned early through direct experience that every situation has different, while similar, characteristics and therefore must be fine tuned to fit what is happening to you at the moment.

# CHAPTER 4

Dr. West's

## **THEORY OF TWEAKING COMMON SENSE LEADERSHIP**

Though it might sound a little corny at first and some would even say that it is closely related to other ideas mine stands apart in being both complimentary and complementary to them in that if theirs work mine will work even better because we are going to utilize all of their strong points and discard all that can't be used. I would never be as arrogant as Tom Peters who advocates that we move away from the Taylor-ist bean counters (Frederick W. Taylor considered the father of scientific management) The difference is that I am not advocating any hard and fast idea that defines the circumstances so closely that by the time you finish doing the math and modeling, the situation has changed and it's time to move on another scenario and requirement without displaying effective leadership or success. Your situation usually isn't static but dynamic.

Many people who write, teach and advocate those theories, are sometimes those who haven't been deep in the trenches of supervision and leadership. That theoretical blubber will always sell to those buying books and attending lectures but not to those who really know the difference and want to learn. The old general, old CEOs and theorists compliment each other.

Today's managers and supervisors need more than that rigidity that might have worked at one time or for one time, possibly only one time. That stuff is static and has to be force fed or backed into. They need more dynamics that will get them not only through the day on one minimized theory. They need to be able to live and work through today and onto tomorrow and beyond. They need a progressive way of thinking and the theories heretofore just don't deliver on that need in isolation.

## **LEADERSHIP EXPECTATIONS**

You walk into a store, school, other business or even for an interview for a job and immediately encounter someone that seems to be out of place and possibly not qualified for the job that they are charged with. Looks are deceiving and maybe this person is highly qualified and doing a very fine job of the assignment at hand.

At least that is what you would like to think but maybe you're right and then maybe this person is just another bozo in the world of those who wonder in, find a cozy, comfortable niche and nobody can figure out how to get rid of him or her.

What about the most prominent category of business dimwits, family, the relatives within the business? By virtue of birthright relatives usually have the arduous task of showing up for work every day. In so doing they are costing American business millions of dollars those days collectively simply by being so dumb and having the attitude of superiority and condescension while not putting the effort in to learn anything, not stretching to what they should be doing. Instead they take it as a personal affront when they are asked to learn anything. Remember that in many cases these are the family that decided for themselves or had it decided for them that they didn't need anything other than hands on to run the company, to be the boss, my boss, your BOSS. The same school of thought that causes the sacrifice of young, inexperienced officers in combat.

You're seeing it in major multinational corporations and you are also seeing relative failure. It should be clearly understood that growing up in a business doesn't necessarily qualify you to run it. Your father, uncle or other ancestor who you are following, and learning from, might have been just like you, dumb, a real bozo, but could get away with being that way at that

time. Times have changed. The competition is tougher and there is absolutely no tolerance for slackers. You won't be allowed to learn from your mistakes and grow into the position or the business.

More than ever leadership is being seen as being important to corporations and the military but in most cases little is being done to enhance it. Business is failing because of the same BOZO mentality that we earlier mentioned but at far grander scale. Look at some of the biggest and formerly most profitable corporation in this country that used to lead the world but are now reduced to, an also ran status or just mere weak competitors or just rubble.

Look at the military where the leadership vacuum is seen all of the time at this crucial stage in our history. Leaders that are afraid to stand up to what they believe and know is right for their troops and best for the country and instead cover themselves until they can gain an exit situation or strategy and then they go on television to criticize (for a huge payday) their own military family. It is an identical situation whether it is military or corporate. The idea is to look out for **NUMBER 1** at any cost and usually the expense of practically everybody else. There are signs of life of leadership here.

Open your eyes and look around you and it doesn't matter who you work for and where you work, whether it be in a small retail mom and pop or a major multi-national. If you are paying attention you are seeing the same thing, the cost and waste brought on by the tremendous void in leadership and competence. Many of the situations inherent to families and heir apparent that have no business pretending to lead. Deficit leadership is going to be the focal point if the responsibilities are from the family or others who have stayed too long or from those who are there for political reasons and are incapable of getting the job done and most likely shouldn't have been there in the first place.

Be reminded that after awhile they actually think that they know what they are doing, are allowed to make at first small and eventually big and major decisions which have an immediate or gradual snow ball affect. How and why do they go unchecked? How is this allowed in our major businesses that are then cutting employee salaries, but raising those of top executives while also removing hard working, capable, intelligent loyal people from the payroll? The incompetence of managers is actually being rewarded with promotions and larger salaries. When you look you will undoubtedly find that it is happening around you. How many days a week does your boss show up

for work? How many days is she/he really away on company business? You can bet she's being paid and at a rate that would make up for laying off ten, fifteen and many more hourly workers.

If you work for a publicly traded company the stock rises in a linear relationship to the amount of jobs cut. They are looking for cuts in the multiple of at least ten thousands. This makes the CEO look like the operations are more efficient and that productivity and profitability are up. None of that is true. When these executives get what they were expecting this is where the phrase "laugh all the way to the bank" originated. So much for how much the number crunchers and analyst from wall street really know. It is historical and inherent but a moron would know that it really doesn't wash. You don't have to be a business genius to figure out that boosting stock ratings in this way and ergo salaries is inherently bad business that is only allowing poor leaders and leadership all the way to the top to subsist in a weakened state for the short term. We're seeing that this pencil sharpening on the financial statements are also being exposed as illegal.

That sounds unlikely if not completely impossible. How can it be that leaders are actually being rewarded for not doing a good job? How can it be that field and general grade officers are able to pass the buck so that it appears that things are looking great while young soldiers are dying every day at an increasing and alarming rate? Just measuring of performance doesn't balance the equation which is balanced by a test of the measurement and criteria.

You keep asking the same type of questions that could be figured out by the average fifth grader (no slight intended fifth graders). The answer is leadership and the buck doesn't stop if the responsibility isn't aligned with authority and the reciprocal thereto. If you are responsible and have the authority those who are above you have to have a way of measuring your performance by the productivity of a manufacturing organization, the sales improvement of a retail sales company or the body count (both sides) of a combat military organization.

When we speak to the subject of any of these organizations the ancillaries must also be looked at. If sales seem to be up even though the cars that you are selling and producing are killing people because of shoddy manufacturing practices or if you can convince your superiors in government that the casualty counts are improving and also convince them that all of the incidents of misconduct and violations of standards are isolated to your



subordinates at the lowest level, you are clever. You are also a terrible leader and your malfeasance will catch up with you eventually. You won't always be able to fall back on the politics of the day or a dumb and blind public that doesn't realize that they are being hoodwinked, duped and bamboozled.

This leadership void goes to the highest fiduciary level of the corporation or the government where the final tests are still being sorted out in the courts. We will have to see what the powers of the executive really are and can they continue to violate established law and make up new law as they go along.

With something as simple as the car example you will be exposed when the board hires an objective look at the cost of the human casualties defined through litigation and lost liability law suits. That is simple enough. Barring having the car carry your name you will be asked to leave and escorted off of the premises kicking and screaming. It happens all of the time with executives but very seldom with the family members who are usually the prime offenders and perpetrators of high level and costly incompetence.

The military has a different and far more complex problem. The end results might have been the same with people dying because of your leadership. Many are considered accidents and normal casualties of war and can be passed along as such. You know the truth and you are the one who has to live with and ultimately answer for it because with the military it is far more willful. Leaders have lied, schemed, told half truths, violated their oaths of position, the code of conduct and every other code of being human without fear of repercussion, reprisal or redress. Let's chalk it all up to leadership because that's where it belongs. This is certainly at the highest levels of the services and of government.

It is hoped that people are intelligent enough to do the math. I'm talking very basic math that is as simple as  $1 + 1 = 2$ . There is absolutely no need for correlation and regression to figure out this problem and come to the right and best conclusions. Again, as always with me, all I ask is that you open your eyes and look around you. If it is spring be awakened by the smell of the roses. If that doesn't do it for you try some ammonium carbonate (and perfume) commonly known as smelling salts. Wake up, wake up! The errors and omissions of leaders and managers have a straight-line relationship to those above and below them and to the failure and ultimate doom of the organization and further weakening of the military.

There will be times when they will appear to go undetected. Read this book to know that they aren't and also to know that the vacuum that is created by your poor leadership can be improved on with knowledge and understanding. It is probably too much for you but the whole point of this book is to teach this complex subject matter so that it can be passed along. This is a late point but we have to give it a try. Secret this book and attempt to understand what you are reading. Make your approach to leadership just as you should model your attitude as a military or business leader with positivism and objectivity. You won't go wrong.

Let your legacy, epitaph, elegy and eulogy say that you were a poor leader who eventually realized your shortcomings and the errors of your ways and although it was too late for all of those lives that were lost because of you or the tremendous cost to your business you offer your support to the efforts of developing strong and insightful leaders in the future. As much as it annoys, agitates and infuriates you to have an author come so close to internalizing how you think or have performed, suck it up and just understand that you aren't alone in this dilemma of leadership. If it were just you we wouldn't devote this many pages of this important work to the subject. You are negligible but your outlook and leadership failings are noteworthy by virtue of the fact that they didn't work for you and usually don't work. Your failure and the study and understanding of it is a matter of study and an important component of future individual leadership development.

# 5 CHAPTER

## **THINKING LEADERSHIP AND LEADING**

Let's start the examination of that in this book as we develop my thoughts, opinion, theories and experience that the BOZOS are having a tremendously adverse affect on our businesses and ultimately the economy of our country.

It's not enough to look the other way or to criticize. This book will start the teaching process for those who have not been fortunate enough to learn what is expected of them. As hard as it is for some to believe, management is a learned skill, as is leadership. You don't just show up and do it. When on the job training is used with managers and supervisors expect the learning experience to be extended substantially and possibly to the point of total incompetence. Many managers never learn to manage and certainly not to lead which definitely isn't the same thing. Practice absolutely doesn't make perfect here. It perfects what you are doing in the way that you are doing it which just might be wrong. Qualified supervised practice tends to bring about a higher level of performance if you knew what you were looking for in the first place.

My purpose is to teach the basics of leadership that a supervisor or manager is expected to know but often that assumption is incorrect. After reading

this book and keeping it handy in your desk you will know how to do the leadership aspect of your job and will start to seek more knowledge that will take you far beyond this and to certain success.

A book of this type would often start out right to the point of supervision. That would be done with the thought that the supervisor at least knows that. Well there is really a hell of a lot to know. There is no simple answer to what supervision is because it is a complex system of applications that is somewhat universally thought to be like “of course she knows that”. Maybe she doesn’t and maybe you, as her boss doesn’t know it either so let’s start right from the beginning of what any supervisor or manager must know to be effective. The initial goal, which is no stretch at all, is to just be effective.

One of the serious problems with management is that there is too much hiding out by top level managers. They hide because the knowledge that is understood and expected of their subordinates is hard, distant or alien to them too. Many couldn’t do the jobs of their subordinate employees if the life of their first born son depended on it. This is absolutely true as it goes up the ladder with all levels of management relationships. Laugh that thought off as you erroneously conclude that you don’t need to know the jobs of your subordinates. My disagreement is only in part. You had better know what they do and to a large degree how they do it. Your mistake and a very common misnomer of lazy upper levels of supervision is one that permeates the management trenches and causes many of the failings of management and leadership. How can you lead by example if you are unaware of your leadership environment? So while you don’t have to know all of the nuances and integral components of a job you must know what your subordinates do and what is expected of them. How can you do a fair and impartial performance evaluation, if there is such a thing, if you don’t know what she is supposed to be doing. Setting the standards only on established written criteria is a very common mistake. It is coming back to haunt management as we speak and I write.

It is like having a child come home from school with homework that they are having difficulty with. Their teacher told them to have their parents work with them on it. How long can you fake it if you don’t know it yourself? Not long! What makes it harder on the child is that you don’t know and instead of just saying that you didn’t know you tried to fake it and got caught. Now you are really in a terrible situation. I’ve seen this happen and it happens every day at all levels of management in industry and in

the military. There was a great improvement when the Army went to the Drill Sergeant Concept where they taught us that you must always lead by example. When I went through basic, the fat and out of shape sergeants would each have his own coronary if he did five push ups or attempted to lead the jumping jack for more than one repetition. The best example of leadership is “follow me”.

This is a major problem in management that occurs at all levels. Upper management takes it a bit further in their expectations of subordinate managers and the real problems come when they too are exposed which commonly occurs. It happens because the subordinate, just like the child, would like to have someone to check back with on a subject that he is confused about or having trouble with.

5 On a recent business consulting engagement with a major corporation the topic of production efficiencies led to the need for the line personnel to know more about basic statistics if they were to be expected to perform certain analyses and bring about run efficiency improvements. Lengthy meetings were held with all levels of management when they realized that the entire plant would have to be introduced to the subject of SPC or Statistical Process Control. This meant that we would be doing something that progressive management would have done a very long time ago but it would establish controls, usually computerized, or by control charts or both from the receiving department through processing and distribution, the entire manufacturing operation with complete reconciliation. Control would be done by an internal quality audit,

These methodologies uncover the operational problems but they also get deep into shrink, which is an issue that is commonly overlooked sometimes through ignorance and other times for nefarious reasons that management knows about and is usually involved in. Thievery is usually attributed to the shipping clerk and her partners in crime. The partners in crime aspect is what should be looked at more closely and I have found that upper levels supplement their salaries and life styles with the side deliveries and what is supposed to be going to customers and never gets there. Companies also steal huge amounts from themselves in order to improve their tax situation while also enriching executives.

As a consultant and also as an executive I have been stopped when I got to close to the real problems. The real problems are often not in the direction

that you are pointed but someplace completely different which the good consultant will ultimately find. It's like the big prize and if you can find it you are offered a long term "no-show". This is a very serious matter which goes far beyond your individual trait of integrity. If you find it and don't report it properly you might find yourself answering government questions about your involvement in this illegal tax scheme.

As we were discussing the subject it seemed that all of the managers were not only familiar with statistical process control but were sort of like experts. This is the type of problem that comes up when people have heard of a subject and by virtue of the commonality of discussion mistakenly start to think that they know more about the technical aspects than they do. This is a common and terrible mistake, which I will illustrate here.

As a business consultant my company has a dream contract and my dream had come to fruition because we would have the assignment of teaching the twenty-four hour basic block of classroom and practical instruction to about eight hundred employees. This would keep us busy for several months. We agreed to established control and expectation parameters. Our agreement promised that there would be improvement in throughput, labor hour reductions, waste and line efficiencies and machine downtime when improved would open up more production opportunity and of course profitability. After conducting the platform instruction it is necessary to take it to the factory floor and put what you have taught into practice in controlled managed phases.

What this meant was that we would have our people out in the plant twenty four (24 X 7) hours a day on every shift and every application? Understanding that we make our money on our assurances and guaranties that our mathematical forecasts will be realized but there was one more preliminary requirement.

Management would have to live up to their promise to reinforce the teaching/training on the floor as well and on a continuous basis. To this point they were not sitting in on the classroom instruction because it was felt that they already knew SMC/SPC and really I was just trying to pad the project for financial reasons by adding to the training rosters. Having additional people in actual classroom instruction would increase the cost of the contract which was completely negligible when the finished results were in.

Questioning brought about an almost normal arrogant response. “We know that stuff”. That’s good but we are now going to have to add that to the contract language that you know it. This is vital because, our assurances, being based on management involvement, or really just plain management, requires that they not just stand around and look at what is going on and yell and scream when something isn’t working properly as they normally do. They have to know how to correct the problems and when you are running high-speed machinery and a simple incorrect adjustment can end up costing thousands and thousands of dollars on a single line this is not something that I cared to gamble with. One night with any machine being run out of tolerance and adjustment because of an X-BAR error would wipe out everything that we have promised in improvements. Our payment would be jeopardized. Shame on me if I am not pro-active with this situation. They could end up getting all of the training and not knowing how to apply it or even worse not having to pay us the contact fee if our promised results don’t materialize. This is also a common situation. As consultants our reputation is always at stake. Many firms, in their haste to get this lucrative contract, might have let this slide with the understanding that it was built into the fee and we would just pick it up. It wasn’t and we wouldn’t pick it up gratis, I wanted the money for the work that we did.

It is not uncommon for all aspects of a program to fall nicely into place and then have an understood such is this knowledge concern keep popping up. I had already been over this with John, the general manager, and plant manager, Jim, and received their assurances that there was nothing to worry about. I was really worried primarily because John had told me that he attended a course at Ford and he understood it fully. He even went to the trouble to pull out his Ford workbook (dusty and had been placed there when he returned and never looked at again) that had been in a cabinet for several years untouched. He mentioned several others who had taken the program. I was still uncomfortable even with his knowledge when I dropped a few simple terms in reference to what we would be looking to improve and the required levels after doing the initial studies.

If you are knowledgeable of SPC/SQC/TQM (statistical process control/statistical quality control, Total Quality Management) it’s not a stretch to speak about the range or the standard deviation, the tolerance expectations for the upper and lower control limits, or what types of charts should we be developing. These are money related items that should have been part of his

cost justification for bringing us in. In my pitch to get the contract all of the numbers were there but because of the relaxed culture and the outlook that we will just leave it to the consultants so they didn't even take notes. How could you not when everything is based on huge amounts of numbers and even computer printouts. They were too happy to be turning the problem to a stranger so that they wouldn't have to be bothered with it. Out of sight and certainly out of mind.

Of course I didn't expect him to just pop out with the answers but when I presented several histograms of some of his processes I also didn't expect him to start coughing and almost gagging with fear.

He knew absolutely nothing about the subject. He had been bullshitting his bosses, and he thought me, about his knowledge and training. Yes, he had attended. Both of them had spent the company's money in attending the prestigious FORD course. They paid no attention and didn't learn anything, or there is the very good likelihood that they were both too stupid to learn it. These are leaders not setting a good example.

These are the same leaders (sic) who require this knowledge of their subordinates. Let's drop it there. It's time to put up or shut up. This program was mandated and budgeted from the highest level of company management with next years profits partially based on this performance. They're looking for results and my company's reputation is riding on it. Clarity was very important and with the application of another form of leadership to get the required results, I made it clear to John that I fully understood from my executive briefing, that he might just be on the outside looking in if the timely improvements weren't seen. I also hammered him with the point that my company would not be his scapegoat and would be submitting copies of the progress reports that he'd be receiving to his superiors without modification. **NO GAMES! We're going to make this happen with your assistance or in spite of it!**

When I explained that while it wasn't really that important for him to know everything personally we couldn't complete our work without the assistance of the first and second line management. It was only at this point that we started to understand each other fully. He understood now that management involvement was key to the success of this process. They couldn't pretend if it was expected to work. This process improves the operations on a continuous basis and it requires progressive involvement, which involves all management operating in the manufacturing area to know basic descriptive statistics and



how they work as well as how to apply them to their operations. All that was needed from him was leadership. My company would provide all of the required direction and oversight leadership but he was their leader and I expected him to stand to leadership.

Although it wasn't my intention John had been exposed for what he was, a fraud, hiding behind his incompetence behind his position, which I later found that he had got because of his connections in the company and certainly not because he knew anything. He was just another good old boy and the golf partner to the president. There were a bunch of those type there and it could be seen from a distance. Being dumb and playing the game effectively paid off very handsomely for him. Always remember the old colloquialism, it ain't what you know. This book is for mixed company readers so just fill in the lines according to your own personal vernacular. He rose to the very highest levels of the corporation and beyond. This could be looked at when you want an example of what is really wrong with our management and corporate leadership.

5

So where were we? The program would only continue under the following condition that I set and we agreed to:

1. All supervisors and managers would take a basic written test that would involve the descriptive statistics terminology with a couple of test questions.
2. If it was determined that they were not knowledgeable of this subject a training program would be set up to run with the bargaining units training. They would not be expected to attend with the hourly personnel but would have to attain the same level of competence.
3. Those who passed the test of basic descriptive statistics would be excluded from the first sixteen hours of training. They would have to participate in the last eight hours and the practical exercises for their respective lines and departments.

When the results were in it was much worse than I thought because some of the supervisors didn't know very much beyond adding and subtracting and had never heard of central tendency, mean, median, mode, standard deviation, control charting, or even the range. Our contract would be expanded. When it was time to put up this entire management team had fizzled with John leading the way. That's the way it usually happens. Let's begin to look at the premise of leading by example.

I am fortunate that my entire background isn't in a laboratory or academia. Seeing a manager fade as we just witnessed with John is a sorry situation but I have had the misfortune to also see the same type of fading when lives really were in the balance. It is a different case to watch an assigned and educated leader not have the foggiest notion of how to lead his men when their lives depend on him. John and Jim are your typical good old boy success stories that have dragged management to the level that it is now at in this example. They are merely examples because their performance, or the lack of it, is very common and even acceptable in most organizations as long as they are part of the good old boy network.

In order to expedite the training process we purchased several quincunxes to add realism without having them have to work on the plant floor for all of the experimental exercises.

John was really nervous. He already had a bad twitch and was now confiding with me on a personal basis when he asked if I thought that he would have to attend. This is why I get paid so much. I told him that I would tutor him personally in his office from the Ford program that he was already familiar with and it just so happened that I, too, had attended and knew that it was an excellent training system.

He loved that idea and would have refreshments and lunch brought in whenever I showed up. He didn't know anything about this subject and had either slept through the classes or been out sipping or snorting and possibly playing eighteen holes, which is common in many companies and management. I know that course at FORD had cost my small company much more than \$1000.00 for the instruction alone plus travel and expenses. John and Jim were living examples of why bad leadership, even to the point of stealing company time, is what dooms business and industry. They are only two but this problem is rampant and widespread.

You're beginning to get a picture of how important it is to lead in management and even more importantly to set the example in your leadership. Don't ask or tell your subordinates to do things that you are either incapable of doing, unwilling, or uncomfortable with.

Where did John go wrong? In the isolation of this setting the answer might differ than looking at the larger picture. So I'd add that would depend entirely on your perspective. As far as his leadership is evaluated in this

situation he would get a low grade but remember, especially in a corporate or business setting, leadership is often a minimized criteria. His failings if equated to a more precarious setting such, as combat, in an equally weighted situation would have cost lives and possibly his own.

What is leadership and how does it affect your job as a supervisor or manager? Was John an effective leader? Let's put his actions to the test of leadership so we will start by finding the answer to that question.

Leadership is really influencing others to get the job done. Did you notice that in saying others I made no mention specifically of subordinates. That is because the effective leader influences many that are not his or her subordinates. The effective leader will employ several characteristics of influence. In doing this, the really effective leader is also having a tremendous affect on his superiors and peers as well. Pay attention to the fact that throughout the entire project I was in a position to lead John and all of his subordinates even though they didn't work for me and certainly were not my subordinates as such. By virtue of my position, in this case as a paid consultant it was my position to assume a supervisory, coaching and leadership role. The success of the project was riding on it.

When you need something done do you just ask your boss for it and receive it that easily? Of course not! You will have to justify that you need it and again you are utilizing characteristics of leadership in that process. It should be remembered from the outset that leadership isn't solely applied to your subordinates but rather to everyone that you work with in practically all situations.

Use your imagination and you will quickly see that it follows you home. Every day in your family relationships you are seeing leadership applied that goes far beyond simply supervising your children. Do you use leadership in your relationship with your spouse or mate? Do they apply it in living with you? Don't you have to assert yourself in negotiating contracts for home repair contracts, when dealing with school problems and many other times or do you just wimp out? This is leadership, and the most important aspect of it is that it is a constant and ongoing learning process. I learn from the people that I work with every day. I want to learn from them and it really doesn't matter who they are. Chances are they know more than I do about what they do and I want to learn more of it. Learning and education is power which are integral building blocks of developing into an effective supervisor, manager or leader.

We're finding out that leadership is working all around us in practically everything that we do so we had better learn a little more about it. It might seem odd that you have lived this long and heard it used so often from the expectations for politicians to high school athletes and most people have never given much thought to what it is. After giving it thought it is somewhat hard to define. The experts have also found it to be defined by the beholder somewhat like beauty. Read books about great military leaders and you will find the definitions will differ but the core (that's core not corps) establishes what leadership is. **It is the art or science of influencing and directing people in order to gain their willing and loyal cooperation to get what you would like to have accomplished done to your expectations and satisfaction.**

It doesn't just happen because you say that you are leading and that makes people follow you. It has been seen quite often in athletics, business and the military that the assigned leader often falls short of that responsibility. Rank, while important, does not establish leadership. Use your job as the example that you see most often. Is the person who is paid to be the leader really the one making the decisions or is there someone, usually with a somewhat stronger personality, making things happen in the background? Having the stronger personality really isn't the only prerequisite.

This is the case in most situations. The elected or assigned leader relies on someone who she has a lot of confidence in to help her with the tasks of making things work harmoniously. The assigned leader or manager is the formal leader. For all intents and purposes that is the person who is really responsible. If she or he has the confidence in someone else to delegate some authority that delegation is an informal act that does not remove the overall responsibility from the assigned leader. If something goes right or wrong it is still the elected or assigned leader that must take the credit, fault or blame. This delegation is usually only for operational purposes. **Read what President Kennedy said in respect to leadership, responsibility in this book.**

## **LEADERSHIP**

The military follows the leadership experiences of many of their recognized generals and heroes. With that, because of the sheer number it is best to come up with a consolidation of their outlook.

***Leadership is influencing people- by providing purpose, direction and motivation – while operating to accomplish the mission and improving the organization.<sup>7</sup>***

While I see that as an interesting definition this subject involves the need for the understanding that the study and application of leadership is a lifelong process and you must consider yourself a student of this study wherever you are and especially when dealing or working with others.

Any author writing on this subject would not use solely the military for guidance. The simplest reason is that although they are steeped in history it is not all positive or educational. While you can learn from their experiences you can learn more by also looking at some of the theorists that they have copied from. As a student or scholar you have to dig deeper and look further which we will do at this time by looking at the modern authorities on management and leadership.

## 5

### **LEADERSHIP STYLES**

***Do all leaders lead and interact in their relationships in the same way? Are they all effective:***

***What is their style of leadership?***

You should know the various leadership styles which we will discuss here now. You must also know that your style might have to be somewhat flexible and dynamic and that you can't apply the same style to every situation and to every individual that you are affecting or interacting with.

**The Laissez Faire Leadership Style** – The leader utilizing this style prefers to lead from afar with a hands off approach. This style can actually work if you have subordinates who are highly trained and well disciplined and you don't want to appear to be standing over them. From the subordinates perspective some like this style because it offers a great deal of freedom but you have to know and understand your boss because this style can turn into a blame game where the leader just lets things get out of control or just go wrong and then blame the subordinate. It has its strong and weak points.

---

<sup>7</sup> US ARMY FM No. 22-100, 2004, Part 1, page 5

**The Autocratic Style** – This is practically in direct contrast to the laissez faire type of leadership in that the leader is exactly what the name implies, an autocrat. The important aspect of this style is that the leader perceives himself as the boss and the authority. The subordinate must fall in line and essentially do what they are told to do, relatively in no uncertain terms.

**Participative Style** – This leader prefers to work right along leading by example and assuring productivity and quality levels are being maintained by showing and doing. This leader will also usually lead by persuasion rather than by the sole use of his/her authority. This is usually a leader who has come up through the ranks and knows most or all of the work assignments and is very comfortable with just jumping in.

Although this style seems to have more positive aspects remember that a further examination will disclose that although it is usually favored by some over autocratic it is also commonly considered as weak just as laissez faire is because it doesn't work well with unions because management is prohibited from working.

It usually works well in line combat where participating and setting an example during the process strengthens a leaders role.

It is a very effective method when supervising or working with trainees who are impressed and try to emulate whatever the drill sergeant does or says that he can do or expects them to do.

Keep in mind that there are combinations of these styles as well as other styles. Your boss might be like a cross-dresser and use one style one day and another at another time. It should also be remembered that the experienced leader will know how to combine the styles and use what is best for the situation or even individual. Organizations also have their styles with some being like dictators and others that just stand back and every point. Adapt to what the organization is like or maybe you won't be able to. If you are gentle and generally laissez faire it might be practically impossible to live up to the expectations of an autocratic organization. In most probably if you can't adapt and are not in a position to change it you don't belong there.

The autocrat will find great difficulty in the participative organization and could not perform well as a laissez faire leader. Your style while we have said might change for situations and individuals must be carefully maintained. The people who you lead are watching and receptive to however you are to

a point, but you can't be hands off with certain individuals or groups and autocratic with others. The question of fairness will start to crop up and start to diminish your effectiveness as a leader. Always remember the principles and the tenets of fairness.

Most books will never breach the subject of subordinate behavior based on your leadership and style. We will. How long do you think you might survive if you are an autocrat in a combat unit that has fallen on very hard times with casualties and little or no re-supply? While the conditions are getting worse and there doesn't seem to be any relief in sight you continue to be a dictator shouting and barking orders and treating your subordinates like you would when everything is going well. The fact is if you are treating them bad when everything is fine and you are able to get away with it don't expect the same behavior to be acceptable when times are bad and morale is down very low.

5 This is the kind of situation where you might have to be somewhat flexible and vary your style a little bit. In so doing you might find a relative comfort level in a less aggressive approach. Styles aren't clad in steel or stone. The effective leader or manager learns how to work within the purview of flexibility.

To answer the question in the previous paragraph the answer is, ***not long***.

The results can be deadly and might usually be. The military field manual will not tell you this but in teaching a subject that I am familiar with and many of those who write, even military field manuals are not, it is important that we stress that your conduct and leadership under the stress of battle is not only being evaluated on pencil and paper. It has to pass immediate muster and scrutiny. The cost of failure is likely death, even through your own incompetence leading to your death or somebody else, and this could be your own me, contributing to it. Don't take this lightly and stress to yourself that while you are in a position of leadership and must lead you are also part of a team and the other participants have something to say. Not allowing that freedom, especially under the aforementioned stress, coupled by your costly errors, taints the thinking of your subordinates and the informal leadership to the point of your destruction, another friendly fire leader, where ***friendly fire*** is the preeminent oxymoron. This is called fragging. (To wound or kill (a fellow soldier) by throwing a grenade or similar explosive at the victim: "He got fragged. Blown away")

# CHAPTER

## MANAGEMENT THEORY

### Scientific Management

#### Frederick W. Taylor (1856-1917)

Taylor believed that by the increase of specialization and dividing labor the process will become more efficient. Because it would not become more efficient just by that division he also proposed that management:

1. Systematically analyze the relationships between the worker and the assigned task
2. Use of documentation and written procedures and expectations
3. Reward the worker if they were performing to standard through pay and incentives directly related to work output
4. Qualify workers and get workers that are capable of doing the job that needs to be done
5. Make it clear that management and workers are equally responsible for the achievement of the goals. <sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> GOOGLE, Management Gurus Guide, Lyndsey Swinto 2004, page 6



## Human Relations Theory

### Elton Mayo (1880-1949)

Mayo's was concerned with the employee motivation and the relationships established and maintained between workers and management. He believed that worker satisfaction was based on the factors of recognition, security and being a part of the team. He advanced this thought and these ideas to rise over and beyond monetary rewards.

The underpinnings of his theory was that there was a need for management to be more involved with workers on an individual emotional and human level.<sup>9</sup>

## Hierarchy of Needs

### Abraham Maslow (1908-1970)

Maslow's theory is based on the needs stacked in layers to form a pyramid. At the base of his pyramid are our physiological needs and the self-actualization\* needs at the peak. The needs are:

1. Deficit (instinctive) needs become important and noticed if they aren't being met. These are usually the programmed instinctive needs.
2. Physiological – include eating, sleeping, having sex and all other bodily functions,
3. Safety and Security needs – After the physiological needs are met the need for a safe environment, stability and protection become more important.
4. Love and belonging needs – the third layer relates to the need for friends, intimate partner, family and a sense of community.
5. Esteem needs – lower level esteem needs includes respect from others in terms of attention, recognition, reputation, and status.

The higher esteem needs include self-respect, confidence, achievement and freedom. The higher level needs are harder to meet than the lower but also harder to lose.

---

<sup>9</sup> Ibid, page 7

Self-actualization\* is the continuous desire to fulfill potential or to be whatever you can be to the fullest extent, all.

This can further be broken down into “meta needs” such as truth, beauty, justice, effortlessness, etc. When these meta needs are not satisfied “meta pathologies” such as depression, despair and alienation develop.<sup>10</sup>

## Hygiene and Motivation Factors

### Frederick Herzberg (1923-2000)

Herzberg thought that satisfaction and dis-satisfaction at work lead to two distinct factors –

“Hygiene” and “Motivation” factors.

#### Hygiene factors

- Supervision, work conditions, salary, security, relationship with peers and management

#### Motivation factors

- Achievement, the job itself, recognition, responsibility, advancement

Herzberg taught that all hygiene and motivation factors had to be present for job satisfaction. Hygiene factors need to be present to avoid job dissatisfaction but if present will not bring about job satisfaction.<sup>11</sup>

## Management, People and Organizations

### Peter F. Drucker (1909)

Management:

1. Effective management is based on objective setting and results
2. Scientific management is required
3. “One cannot manage change. One can only be ahead of it”.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid, page 8

<sup>11</sup> Ibid, page 9

People:

1. Knowledge workers are assets
2. High quality personnel management is required
3. Educate and develop managers for future needs.

Organizations:

1. Decentralization is key to productivity and effectiveness
2. Aim for leaner organizations
3. Successful decision making based on high quality information
4. Focus on information, not technology provider <sup>12</sup>

## **Theory X / Theory Y**

**Douglas McGregor (1906-1964)**

McGregor believed that there were opposing assumptions behind every management decision or action.

Building on Maslow's Theory of Hierarchy of Needs McGregor set out two opposing assumptions about human nature and motivation.

6

### **Theory X**

People are lazy, dislike work and need the threat of job loss and financial incentives to work hard. They need direction and control and cannot take responsibility.

### **Theory Y**

People need to work, actively seek responsibility, and are generally creative and resourceful. They will be self-directed to achieve objectives that meet both organizational and individual goals. Intellectual potential needs to be utilized.

Douglas McGregor said that management style and decision making depends on which theory management believes applies to their staff. Theory "X" was adopted by Traditional Taylor-ist management and Theory "Y" by more modern management thinkers, following Elton Mayo's

Human Relations approach. <sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> Ibid, page 10

<sup>13</sup> Ibid, page 11

# CHAPTER 7

## QUALITY MANAGEMENT

### Total Quality Management and Deming's 14 Points

W. Edwards Deming (1900-1994)

Deming is considered the **father of modern quality movement**. After World War II he worked with Japanese industry introducing Statistical Process Control (SPC) and the concept of Total Quality Management (TQM) to them.

#### Let's review Deming's 14 Points To Total Quality Management

1. Create **constancy of purpose** and continual improvement – long term planning must replace short term reaction
2. Adopt a new (Japanese) philosophy – by management and workers alike.
3. Do not depend on (quality) inspection – **build quality into the product and process**
4. Choose quality suppliers over low cost suppliers – to minimize variation in raw materials and supply.
5. **Improve constantly** – to reduce variation in all aspects, e.g. planning, production and service,

6. Training on the job – for workers and management, to reduce variation in how job is done.
7. **Leadership not supervision** – to get people to do a better job, not just meet targets.
8. Eliminate fear – encourage two-way communication, employees to work in the organization's interest.
9. Break down internal barriers – department's in an organization are "**internal customers**" to each other and must work together.
10. Eliminate slogans (exhortations) – processes make mistakes not people. Management harassment of workers will create bad relations if no effort made to improve processes.
11. **Eliminate numerical targets** – management by objectives (targets) encourages low quality.
12. Remove barriers to worker satisfaction – including annual appraisals
13. **Encourage self improvement** and education for all
14. Everyone is responsible for continual improvement in quality and productivity – particularly top management <sup>14</sup>

In his work, "Out Of Crisis" he introduced identifying fourteen points for management to enable United States Industry to realize Japanese efficiencies. US industry went wild thinking that the application of his points would solve their productivity problems and bring them up to par with the Japanese auto industry. Of course they were sadly mistaken and disappointed to learn that it wouldn't be that simple and just embracing a concept or set of ideas and applying them to a totally historically mismanaged industry would not solve their dilemma. Deming had unleashed a monster on the US that is still having a tremendous competitive impact on this country.

It has to be said that the US can never catch up because as we are gaining additional knowledge so are our overseas competitors. The only difference is that if it is considered a one mile foot race they have the advantage of being at the five thousand two hundred (5200) feet line and we are starting from scratch (foot #1).

---

<sup>14</sup> Ibid, page 12

## Quality Planning

### Joseph Juran (1904)

Juran, another quality expert, who greatly influenced quality improvements in Japan taught that “quality does not happen by accident” which gave rise to his quality trilogy:

1. Quality planning
2. Quality control
3. Quality improvement

His key steps in implementing company – wide strategic goals are:

1. Identify customers and their needs – both internal and external – and work to meet those needs
2. Create measures of quality, establish optimal quality goals and organize to meet them.
3. Create processes capable of meeting quality goals in “real” operating conditions.

During the 1980 Juran added to his theories by recognizing that the common approach to total quality management – quality awareness campaigns and slogans – was not an effective as they did not have substance, and there is no short cut to quality. He believes quality must start at the top, irritating senior managers who believe training is for junior workers.<sup>15</sup>

## Zero Defects

### Right First Time

#### Philip Crosby (1926-2001)

Crosby was an American who promoted the phrases and theories of “zero defects” and “right first time”. Crosby’s “ZERO” defects is somewhat misleading in title in that he does not mean that there will be no defects in processes and quality but rather that there is no acceptable level of defects. He also argued that management should take prime responsibility for quality and that workers only follow their manager’s example. He defined four absolutes of quality management.

---

<sup>15</sup> Ibid, page 13

## **The Four Absolutes of Quality Management**

1. Quality is **conformance** to requirements
2. Quality **prevention** is preferable to quality inspection
3. **Zero defects** is the quality performance standard
4. Quality is measured in **monetary** terms – the price of non-conformance

Crosby also had 14 steps to quality improvement.

## **Crosby's 14 Steps to Quality Improvement**

1. Management is committed to quality – and this is clear to all
2. Create quality improvement teams – with (senior) representatives from all departments
3. Measure processes to determine current and potential quality issues.
4. Calculate the cost of (poor) quality
5. Raise quality awareness of all employees
6. Take action to correct quality issues
7. Monitor progress of quality improvement – establish a zero defects committee
8. Train supervisors in quality improvement
9. Hold “zero defects” days
10. Encourage employees to create their own quality improvement goals
11. Encourage employee communication with management about obstacles to quality
12. Recognize participants' efforts
13. Create quality councils
14. Do it all over again – quality improvement does not end

Crosby later broadened his approach to include wide improvement ideals. He defined the:

## **Five Characteristics of an “Eternally Successful Organization”**

1. People routinely do the right thing the first time.
2. Change is anticipated and used to advantage.
3. Growth is constant and profitable.

4. New products and services appear when needed.
5. Everyone is happy to work there.<sup>16</sup>

## IN SEARCH OF EXCELLENCE

### Tom Peters (1942)

There are additional theorists under the heading of quality and management such as Tom Peters and Robert Waterman who wrote a book and introduced a very popular theory of “In Search of Excellence”

Presents eight common themes of successful corporations:

1. A bias for action – getting on with it.
2. Close to the customer – learning from the customer.
3. Autonomy and entrepreneurship.
4. Productivity through people.
5. Hands-on, value-driven – management walk the talk.
6. Stick to the knitting – do what you know.
7. Simple form, lean staff.
8. Simultaneous loose-tight properties – have autonomy in some areas, central ideas/values in others.

These themes were based on Management Consulting Company McKinsey’s 7-S Model and from analysis from 43 fortune 500 companies. Peters emphasizes the role of people, customers and action and the need to move away from *Taylor-ist “bean-counters”*.<sup>17</sup>

The primary managerial productivity problem of many companies is that managers are removed from the detail and completely out of touch with their people and their customers. Many problems are really quite obvious but not to the untrained eye or the eyes that participate in them every day. You must go and find them. The big problems are where people don’t realize they have one in the first place.”

<sup>16</sup> Ibid pages 14,15

<sup>17</sup> Ibid page 15



## **Main Benefits**

Peters was also a contributor of the theory of Management by Wandering Around.

MBWA is a hyperactive, out-of-the office, interventionist top management practice. It frequently goes together with an open-door management policy. It was MBWA that made leadership more effective in many well-run organizations. It “lets senior management hunt for and enjoy chatting with the creative thinkers in the guts of the organization”.<sup>5</sup>

At first, employees may suspect that MBWA is just an excuse for managers to spy and interfere unnecessarily. This suspicion usually falls away if the walkabouts occur regularly, and if everyone can see their benefits.

MBWA has been found to be particularly helpful when an organization is under exceptional stress; for instance, after a significant corporate reorganization has been announced. It is no good practicing MBWA for the first time on such an occasion, however. It has to have been a regular practice before the stress arises.

Tom Peters, the guru of Excellence, saw “managing by wandering around” as the basis of leadership and excellence. Peters called MBWA the “technology of obvious”.

## **What Leaders and Managers Should Do**

As leaders and managers wander around, at least three things should be going on:

1. They should be listening to what people are saying.
2. They should be using the opportunity to transmit the company’s values face to face.
3. They should be prepared and able to give people on-the-spot help.

## **Case Study: Hewlett-Packard**

At Hewlett-Packard, where the MBWA theory was practiced, executives were encouraged to be out of their offices working on building relationships, motivating, and keeping direct touch with the activities of the company. The practice of MBWA at all levels of the company reflects a commitment to keep up to date with individuals and activities through impromptu discussions, “coffee talks”, communication lunches, and the like.

# CHAPTER

# 8

## **UPDATE AND PERSPECTIVE, LAWRENCE WEST. PHD.**

Of course we can never catch up with Japan and by now possibly the Korean auto industry but the quality and management gurus never said we could. We can't even compete if we didn't regulate and tax our foreign competitors so closely, and that's a good thing.

The good aspect of this major problem is that the management consulting industry is growing wildly with even unknown consultants, writers and college professors, simply taking a trip overseas, coming back to the US and visiting a few companies that will let them onto their premises and listen while they are there. Those steps become the point of departure for a new theory through their newly published books.

The United States has a crisis of management and a management crisis, if you will, that many know about but few would venture a risk of mention. We are in a state of panic with very few answers coming from within or from the corporate world itself. Business consultants, unlike company executives, offer an alternative to the knowledge vacuum that is corporate America by virtue of a wide variety of experiences and education. Let's stay away from saying that the consultants are smarter than the managers that they consult. Never let it be said, but also don't let it lie dormant as dead when you do a fair comparison.

The consultants are better prepared for the job at hand than the line or executive manager who has already hit the wall especially where a specific problem or situation is concerned. They are reasonably blinded by the reality of the situation and don't know their way out of the dilemma. The consultant looks with a fresh and objective set of eyes without biases or a set agenda or corporate mindset unless he is being programmed to come back with a certain corporate finding which compromises his effectiveness and renders him relatively useless.

Corporate management are lulled into a state of complacency through their own stupidity often by cultural deficiencies. Think back to the management satire of the mid 1980 when it was said that a company president and his tag alongs attended a management seminar on "corporate culture" and then ordered his flunky vice president to get one of those for us by Monday. As ridiculous and hilarious that seemed to me at the time after spending time with many companies and their leadership I am now convinced that it probably happened exactly as reported. It is sort of like a grand scheme to conceal how management really is run and who is running it. Yes, that president didn't understand the dynamic of culture and had never bothered to think more about how his company functioned other than his concern for the bottom line, which might be relatively inconsequential when weighed against the value of a culture of leadership, and strength in the work ethic. None of that kind of soft stuff really matters if the dollars aren't there. Right? WRONG! To a point you are right but also consider when leading your organization your objective is to build the strongest and best competitive team possible.

Is this a good approach and outlook? The entire scenario of find out more about your organization is a relatively new phenomenon because managers never knew or cared. Just keep "THEM" as far away from me as possible.

8

If you don't understand the makeup of your organization, how can you expect to lead it? This is one of the many shortcomings of our management. The executives secrete themselves as far away from the workers as they can get and just "do their job". The **sophistry** of that flawed line of thought is that as a leader, in case you don't realize it management connotes leadership, your job goes a lot further than merely counting money and spending your time in the offices with the secretaries. That's really what the bean counters are paid for. Your job is to lead and interact with the entire organization, not just the executives and perspective clients. I won't degrade you by asking you to rub shoulders with those that you go out of your way, as a decision maker,

to keep at a lower rung of the socioeconomic ladder. I won't ask you to go into their contaminated and dangerous workplace even for a short period of time, and it would surely be asking too much for this passage to expect that you would ever display, any of the established traits, or principles of leadership toward them. You are totally confused in your authoritarian outlook and approach, but this huge failing is acceptable if you satisfy certain other characteristics, which become far more important than your leadership, and even your job performance.

It would never be known that Bert was an authoritarian because he didn't act like one. How does one act? The secretaries thought him to be the nicest guy who even took his turn at bringing in bagels. He is meek and almost submissive in his mannerisms so he can't be an authoritarian, can he? Of course he is an authoritarian but he doesn't have to display it directly. The reasons that in looking at and knowing him, you don't think that he displays the characteristic of the authoritarian, is what makes him more dangerous to his peers, subordinates and superiors. He is a snake in high grass and can't be detected or trusted and hides in the corporate setting making decisions that have an adverse affect on his charges. He accepts no responsibility for his actions and as a matter of fact will lie and be totally dishonest and deceitful when it is time for issues concerning his decisions to be addressed. Bert has a different face for every group that he meets, always as previously described, very presentable. His most serious problem is when the groups come together, and he has to try to lie his way out of his precarious situation. He has displayed a complete disdain, contempt and disrespect for his subordinates in every aspect of his representation of them. This is a closet authoritarian. Bert is just like a typical sociopath found to be serial killers. Neighbors often describe them in very like terms as we have described Bert and John. You never know they are what they are.

Another danger that manifests itself with Bert is that because he takes no responsibility for his actions, the actions, usually negative, have to be attributed to some other faction. The easiest one to attribute/blame are the lower level managers and supervisors. They won't even know what hit them. When morale is low and the union is threatening to walk out, based on Bert and John's decisions there are stock responses that every corporate manager pulls out of his bag of garbage. The most popular is to say that the line management can't handle the people, or that they are harassing them, or even better pick out a supervisor or manager that you would like

to fire anyway and attribute the root problem on him or her and call it a personality conflict. He becomes your sacrificial lamb, with the union as the wolf. The union will go along in subscribing and even supporting it, because they would like to have a good relationship with Bert and John, and they just happen to not like the named manager anyway. This is a win-win with John and Bert coming out smelling like a rose, the manager out of a job (who cares?) and the union adding to their array and accumulation of bargaining chips.

Ask any worker that has met Bert, when he happens to come around with his bosses, what they think of either of them. The response will always be that he seems like a pleasant nice guy, and that is what he seems like. The only problem with this situation is reality that is a major failing of executives and corporate management. Fake it with the workers and everybody else that is involved or around you, to only concentrate on enriching yourself. Enriching often doesn't only directly involve money but remember if Bert, or John, or Marc can keep the contract costs down that difference is goes into a split of executive salaries. Unions have known this for many years and that is one of the reasons for their vehemence at the negotiation table.

It's called a split and is seen more in smaller corporations, but it is very common. When the final percentage is agreed to by upper management it is given to the negotiating team. They are told in no uncertain terms that they can't go over that number (actually a percentage). Let's take an arbitrary number like five percent as the top number. The union is arguing unrealistically for nine but you see openings to get them down to less than half of that. Little things mean a lot to unions so it might be something as small as getting rid of that manager and other personal favors, like giving the union president a car, or anything in the myriad of pay outs and payoffs, that this grungy lot have their hands out for. Many of the aspects of the contract that are in contention are meaningless. The side deals and favors are important and reciprocal. It is strictly between the executives, union and management. When the contract comes in, after all of the meetings and free meals for the union members, and leadership who look forward to this as an important part of the bargaining process. If the percentage comes in at 4 ½ % that leaves one half of one percent for the executives. This isn't a clean number, or part of any written procedure, but is used as sort of a kitty when the managers come up for salary review. Whatever that number is it is an add-on to what they were expecting anyway. It is unwritten and silent.

The thing about unions is that they actually display most of the traits and characteristics of leadership in representing their members. They often aren't very smart about the many important aspects of the contract that they are negotiating, getting bogged down in ruses, subterfuges and gimmicks from management negotiators and lawyers, but they are going to give it the best try that they can, to get past all of the gripes and get their people a decent contract, and remember that a primary union concern is check-off so if the contract is settled they, the union, have no lapse in their enrichment.

If unions and management rotated positions about every five years the management system, as such, would be stronger. They are beginning to look at, albeit much too late, quality of life and total benefits issues rather than just an extra \$50.00 in their paychecks. They are also getting more sophisticated in their negotiation of these very complex issues but they still have to follow, as well as lead, because the volatile union memberships who just know strike and \$50.00 in the paycheck and the best of all worlds some retro cash that unknowing to them who are standing out in the rain, heat, or snow yelling and screaming will most likely be taxed away.

### Corporate Culture

Is it possible to define and modify a corporate culture? Defining can be done in a modest amount of time. Think back to the old southern expression that an apple doesn't fall far from the tree. Think about that in looking at a corporation. What you see in the boardroom is characteristic of the organization. This initial analysis might also disclose, directly or indirectly some of the problems that this mentality is breeding. Look closely at our nation's politics and current and past executive branch of government. You immediately find that those who were brought into the organization are very similar to the leader and to each other and thus a culture of whatever they are is beginning to form.

How does a consultant, especially from the top consulting firms with million dollar directors, handle this and will they be successful in completing the assignment? It starts off in a relatively simple way. After the initial assessment of feeling each other out the working relationship is beginning to take place.

The consultant sees, by looking into the dull and often bloodshot eyes, of company boss that this is going to be easy money. This is further confirmed

after dinner, all paid by the perspective client, when the client and his whole team displayed no respect for themselves or their organization in their representation. There was free booze and they took advantage of it. The consultants are already taking notes and drinking coke or ginger ale.

The consulting firm also has high ranking executive, salesmen, that meet with company brass to sell their work. This is a very competitive field but it is also very political so if you have a connection, the chances are you will get the work.

The proposal is put together and this time the consulting calls the gathering for a very ostentatious establishment or their corporate offices. They really want to do it this way to show that they are who they say they are and get ready for this proposal. The proposal will have all of the razzle dazzle necessary to have the corporate executives' heads spinning. What do we need them for anyway? It doesn't matter at this point. The only thing that is important is that I make this presentation to my board, if necessary, or have a little time to make believe we are going to look it over. I already know that we will be going with them because they are well spoken, have on very expensive clothing and don't seem to be a bunch of luses like us. They are going to do a good/great job for us.

So now take a quick look back, way back. Ask the question again if the consultants are smarter than company executives and start answering by looking at the manner in which the company executives are spending their company's money. There was no competitive RFPs or no standard bidding for a job that will end up being several hundred thousand dollars. They got the job merely on initial presentation and con. They now think that the consultants are their new buddies, maybe some golf. The consultants know that most of them are a bunch of jerks but with the money and maybe some golf.

The con is necessary because they know what they are talking about and the company representatives don't know what they should know about what they are being presented. The first meeting made this clear so it was all easy from that point on. They will provide minimal sloppy work and ride their big name and fancy stretch limousines on into glory.

Will the company be any better for it. The annual report will be emboldened by their presence. Did they do you any good? Probably not but it looks good for the company executives and it appears that they are moving in the

right direction. Once again they actually moved in the wrong direction and cost the corporation a small fortune that could have gone toward employee raises. If the company is smart they should now start out by firing executive management and bring in the consultants to run the show as commonly happens.

“We have met the enemy and it iz us”. How many times have you heard that whether it be from a politician seeking office or more power, from a comedian commenting on how our government and the current war crises are unfolding, or in a scholarly paper emphasizing some ones view. It is a cliché and it is also a cliché when it is used to describe management, especially upper levels of management. Will we catch up with any competition and will this country prosper? Notice I didn’t say continue to prosper!

The answer is a resounding “NO”.

The theorist can’t answer this one because to do so is to unleash their own doom. You mustn’t bite the hand that feeds you and even the dumbest dog subscribes to that. The hands that feed all of the consultants is management (e.g., management consultant) and if we want to keep the checks coming in we have to tell them and sell them on what they want to hear. Tell them not only what they want to hear but also what might be popular to their entire industry. So when we incorporate training as at least one arm of our consulting package find out how often we include upper level management. We don’t include them because they won’t go and to make any attempt at teaching them anything is to ask not to be called back again. No, training and education is for the lower levels. Why would you think to ask anyway? We have people here who are college educated and many even have MBAs and some higher so we don’t need your training. Our hourly workers need your training.

The world is changing and all aspects of business are part of that world. The international business industrial complex has long since passed us by. Our executives sit on a high throne controlled by a money market that is out of control and out of touch. It’s not just the highly paid executives. No, of course not because they play to the analyst and mega-money managers on wall street. Say that you have terminated 50,000 workers and your stock will go through the roof and on to fantasy levels of the atmosphere, stratosphere, ionosphere, troposphere and higher, higher and higher and to vaporization. The market loves you and those who put this package together.



What about that 35,000 human beings that you laid off? Who cares? Certainly not the dumb executives and managers from the company who get a penny enny bonus for the destruction of those lives and have to live with the fact that those workers were necessary if not absolutely essential. So Monday morning starts the learning curve of how to do more, to further prop up the stock with much less.

It's not going to get better. It can only get worse because people like me, theorists and consultants can only offer a bandage when tourniquets, amputations and possibly lethal injections are more suitable solutions.

**Remember that** we're even going to offer a new theory and method in this book and while it is far advanced over what is out there now it is not a catch-all to solve all management and leadership problems and issues. If properly understood, developed and applied it will solve most.

I do not expect this book to be popular with those who are hiding out. This is one that has to be neatly folded inside of the NYT, WSJ or TOL when you go into the bathroom two or three times a day for your hour sit. Though word will get out that this is an insider exposing all of these flanks. I do it with full knowledge that a major change has to take place in our country's business world.

We are long past the time when a vice president grabs the general managers and goes off to a week of golf on the company under the guise of a seminar. It's time to go back to where the money is being made, get your hands a little soiled, so how you are treating your workers, see how valuable they really are and stop making points by trying to screw them out of everything that they have coming to them.

How did we start this discourse? We started with my position that consultants necessarily solve management problems. Dig deeper now to realize that everything that I've said so far is materializing as we speak.

Before I even get to my theory I offer something that will sit well with Wall Street, will improve your financial position tremendously and will greatly enhance the morale and productivity of your company. **Cutting executives** is far more effective than gutting your hourly ranks and never fully recovering from that disgraceful debacle. With executive layoffs you get the biggest bang for the buck.

## Cost Reduction Project Executive Pareto Priority

To this point we have either established or expect that all self respecting knowledgeable managers and executives understand what pareto analysis is but for those of you who don't we will review it again. It's important that this concept is thoroughly understood because it is sort of the final activity that you will hear about or be involved with in your present assignment.

Through the use of some very elementary calculations pareto analysis shows that there is usually an imbalance (80/20%) between competing variables. This is where the concept of vital few (20%) and trivial many came about. (Start with major US auto manufacturers)

Executive Salary@avg:	\$112,000,000.00
Number of Executives:	5
Total Compensation Pkg. Cost:	\$560,000,000.00

Plant Workers including supervision @avg: \$40,000  
(this is a high number, you're probably paying much less)

Number of employees verses 5 executives: 14,000

With just these five executives the replacement value would be approximately 14,000 employees. These figures are before any calculations for value and productivity comparisons. Get rid of the five top level executives and they won't be missed by anyone and from a human relations perspective this action will actually be good for the organization and community as well.

Put the savings to in monetary terms. We can show you how it's done and it always is truthful. Take part of your overall cost improvement systems. Using the same methods that you so artfully use with supervisory and middle level management start cutting and bringing in millions more to the bottom line. This is so big and could ultimately affect the overall economy because high level executive salaries are so flush that reducing or removing some of them completely will start to improve corporate performance at heretofore unheard of and extraordinary levels to the point of affecting the economy.

This is where a consultant can earn his/her money and it will be well deserved. Hire any outsider, any objective unbiased high school graduate or bean counter to just come in to take notes and give you a report on what each

of your highest paid executives do. Use the same techniques as for any other directed time/ motion study. You're going to find that they don't do anything worthwhile and as with other standard cost studies could easily be replaced.

We are still talking about standard job analysis and evaluations/ cost studies as are commonly done when industrial engineers are brought in with fancy stop watches and calculators to see if you are getting your money's worth from your minimum wage employees. As a model of fairness we will use a less humiliating and more humane and discriminate process to determine if you are getting what you are paying for here with your executives. We won't stand over them, stopping and starting the stop watch, writing onto the notebook on the clipboard and do the calculations to intimidate them that they are doing something wrong. This further assures them that management doesn't trust them and will do whatever to get rid of them.

This process is much simpler. It is called observation and encompasses the daily paper trail, phone calls, and business transactions coupled with the hours away, over a period of about ten days, will give you a better answer than with the bargaining unit members. With that information we can start to put together how much your executive is really worth.

We already found out that you are getting more value than you pay for from your grunts now it is the million dollar babies' turn.

With that justification, although you don't really need it because this is the same school of thought that just fired \$40K workers and probably destroyed two or three times that many lives.

This is an area that the workers get into at all levels of the scientific approaches of six sigma, tqc, smc. etc. Read up on it because it is the biggest cost savings that you can possibly ever engage in. It's called "EXECUTIVE PARETO PRIORITY INDEX".

Pareto analysis seeks to discover from an analysis of defect reports or customer complaints which "vital few" causes are responsible for most of the reported problems or in our case out of control executive salaries verses hourly employees. The old adage states that 80% of reported problems can usually be traced to 20% of the various underlying causes. By concentrating your efforts on rectifying the vital few (20%), you can have the greatest immediate impact on overall results.

In our situation the vital few are individuals earning the huge disproportionate executive salaries and perks. Those ridiculously out of control vital few salaries and perks represent the bulk of a company's payroll. In ridding yourself of those salaries and individuals your operation will not suffer but rather will improve, so the affect is multi fold.

You are getting rid of the stale dead weight while replenishing and refreshing your management team at a tremendous cost reduction while also maintaining your work force and probably saving the economy of an entire town, county or even perhaps a state in keeping that many workers on the job.

In satisfying the requirements for cost savings, containment and streamlining you will also improve your operations in the area of profitability when middle managers see that it is finally coming to fruition (the real dead weight, the drag is gone). This is a real "NO BRAINER" but creates the cosmic cataclysmic apocalypse that you might not have the intestinal fortitude/ guts to undertake. Truth be known, it should start with "YOU" because we again recall the old adage the the fish rots from the head. That is also often where the first odor is detected from.

This is even more so if you can't do your job and save your organization or make it more productive, efficient or profitable. You still get a parachute although it might not have the same golden sparkle as your predecessors who got out before they were discovered. Take whatever is offered and run! Run and hide and hope like hell that there is no way for an evaluation and value analysis, dollar and otherwise, for the work that you've actually done in the last several years. You know in this age of scientific management that too can come back to haunt you. They might even seek reimbursement for what you cost them. It could be considered fraud.

**PARETO PRIORITY INDEX** can be used in the establishment of the priority order when determining which projects to complete first. It is excellent for executives because that happens to be where you will initially get the biggest bang for your buck.

What happens when you get down to the point where you don't need to just look at executives but you have several big cost savings that seem to offer very similar ROIs? This system will work very well for those applications also.

## Pareto Priority Index Formula = PPI

$$\text{PPI} = \frac{\text{Savings X Probability of Success}}{\text{Cost X Time to Complete in Yr. (or fraction thereof)}}$$

### Start learning these Definitions:

Tweak—To adjust; fine-tune

adjust finely; “fine-tune the like on an engine

### Common Sense

The term common sense (or as an adjective, commonsense) describes beliefs or propositions that seem, to most people, to be prudent and of sound judgment, without dependence upon esoteric knowledge. These beliefs and propositions are sometimes developed after having studied, or conducted, empirical research.

Sound judgment not based on specialized knowledge; native good judgment.

## DIRECT LEADERSHIP

### Formal

As the word formal connotes this position is established by authority even if it is the leader himself. The important aspect in remembering the formal leader is that she is the one with the title and everything that goes with it. The two most important tangibles that most of us look at is the title and the pay, but we should also appreciate that the formal leader also has the responsibility. Delegation is fair game but while you can delegate the authority of an assignment as the formal leader you have the responsibility and that can't be delegated.

As things are playing out today in the business world and even more so in the military it is becoming more and more confusing whether the responsibility can be passed along with the authority. Moving the responsibility down levels of government is the only way that such a large organization can be managed. That is not true in a smaller organization or business.

## Informal

This is the leader who is often preferred over the formal leader, sometimes by superiors and usually by subordinates. With that in mind this is the leader that subordinates sometimes listen to and follow over the formal leadership of the organization. This is often problematic because if the informal leader chooses to assert the informal role over or to challenge the assigned leader the organization will surely suffer. Again I ask you to look within your organization. In many companies this is common and accepted by higher management. It is also used by upper management to weaken an unpopular supervisor or manager.

What makes one individual able to assume leadership over others? How is it that a formal leader loses his assignment because someone comes along under her and before long that individual has the loyalty of her fellow workers who prefer to follow her over the formal leader. I thought that once the leader was assigned that settled the issue of leadership. I was wrong but why? Test and follow through on that question. What makes one individual able to assume leadership over others?

Remember that leadership is a science and a very complex one at that. There are many reasons for its complexity but if you consider that personalities and the strengths and weaknesses play a role in practically everything in our daily interactions and consider that with leadership you are affecting your wishes and desires on others, whether they are readily willing or not, the reasons start to establish themselves when we do simple comparisons based on the leadership characteristic of some leaders in your organization. These characteristics are sometimes referred to as traits. The word characteristics would do just as well but because we are following basic military leadership that is how they will be referred to.

Willing or not, the reasons start to establish themselves when we do simple comparisons based on the leadership characteristic of the some leaders in your organization.

The traits of leadership are the qualities that exemplify a good and effective leader if he or she is that and they also point out the shortcomings in the ineffective one. You should do the comparisons when looking at any two members of your organization who are considered for a position of leadership.

Keep in mind that leadership traits can be used negatively just as they are commonly used positive. When your boss or subordinates look at you in light of the traits and principles they want to put the positive slant on that view. Reality is left to you so as you understand them better and develop your traits to always make yourself look good.

## **LEADERSHIP TRAITS**

These 14 traits have been a part of basic military management and leadership training for years and are still used today in many colleges ROTC programs and until recent modification in the Armed Forces Officer and Noncommissioned Training Programs.

For our purposes we will look at them more in the corporate setting than in the military. Is there a difference? Yes, because while the characteristics are the same the system is so different that we can't just put them next to each other and say that they are the same.

For the experts who seem to think that they are the same I would remind them that the biggest discernible difference is UCMJ verses the civilian court system. As I have asked before you should do the comparison and before it is said that I am leaving too much to the individual's research and imagination, one need only know of the rigidity of the military system.

The UCMJ does use a pseudo system of due process the penalty can be meted out at the discretion of a low level, grade and competence, officer pending even the reading of charges or while an investigation is taking place. Very similar to the civilian counterpart but the big difference is that in the civilian courts you can receive and make bail whereas a lieutenant or Army Captain (grade 0-3), your company commander, can have you remanded to the post stockade without bail and usually without any representation. Military courts have been called KANGAROO COURTS because that is basically what the entire system is.

What does that have to do with leadership. Make a mistake, even involving leadership, and you can quickly be locked up and ultimately reduced in grade, fined and jailed. This is for a performance related infraction that I speak. So if we are talking about a peacetime situation where your subordinates, under your direction, violate the UCMJ you might be in store for

far more severe consequences than the same civilian situation where you might be reprimanded and at worst fired. They can't be directly compared when the consequences for failure are so different.

Traits of leadership are shown in a somewhat different light when introduced in what is known as the TRAIT THEORY which will be introduced immediately following the military traits.

1. **Bearing** is a good professional appearance and conduct. What you see is what you get in leaders as with most other expectations. The good leader should make a strong personal presentation and conduct herself in a manner that sees you can refer to you as a good example.
2. **Courage** to face a situation with common sense and not be afraid to take an unpopular position. It is also the willingness and ability to face adversity and danger.

To possess the state or quality of mind or spirit that enables one to face danger and personal fear, with confidence, resolution and bravery.

3. **Decisiveness** is the ability to make thoughtful decisions promptly, to be decisive, conclusive, crucial, definitive, determinative or determining or having the power to determine an outcome: the decisive vote; a conclusive reason; crucial experiments; a definitive verdict; the determinative battle.
4. **Dependability** is the certainty of proper performance of job and duty. Being at the appointed place at the expected time with few exceptions. Your organization must know that it can rely on you.
5. **Endurance** in both mental and physical stamina. You have to be able to keep up and also show that you can get out front with the expectation that others will follow you.

The act, quality, or power of withstanding hardship or stress as an infantryman's endurance. The state or fact of persevering: Through hard work and endurance, we will complete our mission or project.

6. **Enthusiasm** is the display of sincere, lively interest, zeal and excitement. Hold your head up to give the impression that things are going well sometimes when they really aren't up to your standards. Not dragging around making things appear worse than they possibly are.
7. **Initiative** is the ability to take actions in the absence of orders. Doing things on your own and not always waiting to be told. When a situation



arises that you might shine a little bit above your peers that first action can be equated to your leadership ability.

The power or ability to begin or to follow through energetically with a plan or task; enterprise and determination. A beginning or introductory step, an opening move. Take the initiative in trying to solve the problem without any direction.

**8. Integrity** is truthfulness and honesty which must be known of you and expected of others, the Steadfast adherence to a strict moral or ethical code, the state of being unimpaired; soundness, the quality or condition of being whole or undivided; completeness.

**9. Judgment is measurable and** viewed on your situation, solutions and alternatives.

The act or process of judging; the formation of an opinion after consideration or deliberation.

a. The mental ability to perceive and distinguish relationships; discernment: Fatigue may affect a pilot's judgment of distances.

b. The capacity to form an opinion by distinguishing and evaluating: His judgment of fine music is impeccable.

c. The capacity to assess situations or circumstances and draw sound conclusions.

**10. Justice** is the impartiality in giving rewards and punishments and knowing that one is just as important as the other. Rewards are more important than admonishments and punishments in many situations because while they both have a significant affect on morale it is the rewards, if due, that affect it positively. This is also tied very closely to your judgment.

It is the quality of being just; fairness.

The principle of moral rightness; equity.

Conformity to moral rightness in action or attitude; righteousness.

The upholding of what is just, especially fair treatment and due reward in accordance with honor, standards, or law.

**11. Knowledge** is knowing your job and your people. It is always important to know how to best get the job done with what you have available to work with.

The state or fact of knowing. Familiarity, awareness, or understanding gained through experience or study. The sum or range of what has been perceived, discovered, or learned.

Learning; erudition: teachers of great knowledge. Specific information about something.

12. **Loyalty** is faithfulness to the your organization, your superiors and your subordinates which must not be blind in the face of misconduct and/or wrongdoing.

The act of binding yourself (intellectually or emotionally) to a course of action; “his long commitment to public service or the military” through allegiance.

13. **Tact** is the ability to deal with others respectfully and forcefully while always setting your goals and agenda to accomplish your assignment or mission, the acute sensitivity to what is proper and appropriate in dealing with others, including the ability to speak or act without offending.
14. **Unselfishness** is placing others before yourself when possible and practical, the quality of not putting yourself first but being willing to give your time or money or effort etc. for others.

## Traits Theory

1. A strong desire for task accomplishment, the need to get things done.
2. Persistent pursuit of goals, a focus on planning and goal setting.
3. Creativity and intelligence used to solve problems, think out of the box.
4. Initiative applied to social situations, should be friendly, outgoing and well liked.
5. Self assured personality – knows his or her own strengths and weaknesses.
6. Willing to accept behavioral consequences, to take responsibilities for his actions (successes and failures)
7. Low susceptibility to interpersonal stress, handles conflict with others well.
8. High tolerance for ambiguity, able to deal with not having all of the facts needed; able to deal with the long-term (lack of closure on some issues in the short run)
9. Ability to influence other people.  
Ability to structure social interactions- manages groups of people/ teams well; able to get teams to buy into the goals and share the vision. (Chung and Megginson, Organizational Behavior)

10. Humility- a disposition to be humble; a lack of false pride; “not everyone regards humility as a virtue” 2: a humble feeling; “he was filled with humility at the sight of the Pope”
11. Daring- willing to take a chance or risk

## LEADERSHIP PRINCIPLES

1. **Know yourself and seek self-improvement** – You are what you are. That being said it is true that you have unique qualities and characteristics, strengths and weaknesses, but at this point you are no more or less than what you are. We should always be looking to improve through personal development and even in some situations by emulating someone that has an ability that you might need in the future, thus you are seeking self improvement.
2. **Know your subordinates and look out for their welfare** – As you look out for yourself you must always protect and look out for your subordinates. When a subordinate is assigned, especially in a dangerous situation such as combat you have to become almost like an appendage. They are an integral part of you. When you keep your head down make sure that they know to do the same or when there is incoming you can't just sit in your comfort zone and yell but rather have to take a risk and make sure that everyone has prepared himself/herself properly. It's called being proactive which was a big corporate type word in recent years. Executives, especially those with limited intelligence and vocabularies had no idea what was going on when one of the management gurus came up with this. Just try to think ahead which was something that most never did.

In being proactive as opposed to reactive if you have troops that expect something, maybe even leadership, from you, you are no hero when you take the precautions to assure their welfare so that you won't have to explain your lack of leadership at some future time.

The corporate world is replete with situations where managers must learn not only to lie and dodge the bullet but to face up to situations even when they are unpopular with upper management. Here is a time when it is also very important to know how upper management operates. It is unfortunate that upper management at times is really an oximoron-moron in that the definitions of the words actually cancel each other out.

There is a major problem with upper management in this country. While there are many reasons for the profitability and productivity losses the axiom that “the fish rots from the head” really applies here. This phrase is full spectrum but it usually means the same thing to everybody when we are discussing leadership whether it be military or corporate. It means that the problems that you see out in the field of combat or within the corporate setting the “fish rots from the head” is factual. Show me a military unit with a sharp, well informed, involved, well educated, people oriented and knowledgeable commander and I will show you a well functioning organization. One of the most important reasons for his success is that he has the respect of his superiors and is able to keep them out of his area of operations and off of his back. Things won’t always be perfect and the great leader leads with the adversity as well as success and he isn’t in the position to have to start blaming, usually his subordinates. This is common sense!

3. **Be technically and tactically proficient** – From a military perspective this simply means that you know your job on a technical and tactical basis. Study and learn the field manuals and stay awake in class and try to absorb what is being taught. It is also a good idea to take some initiative in seeking out additional information about such things as the training areas and future courses of study. You can never be proficient if you don’t put in the effort to learn something. How do you think you are going to get to that next level, the next promotion. You have said with great disdain that your boss doesn’t know his/her job. Study hard and learn and display your knowledge to take it away from her. Don’t just sit back and become another dumb member of a dumb team. It is through technical and tactical knowledge of your assigned job that you will get the additional responsibility that you say you deserve. My experience has always been to just have the opportunity to show my worth and my abilities and there was never any looking back. Remember loyalty but also remember common sense. This is just common sense.

As a supervisor or manager this involves learning your job and as in the military it is also best to learn your boss’s job too. In so doing you are moving closer toward being technically and tactically proficient. Common sense!

4. **Keep your subordinates informed** – I always operate on a need to know basis.

There usually aren't many secrets and it is part of your development to share knowledge with them. If you really want to kill morale and start watching accidents happen and or excessive casualties just hold information that could be shared too close to your chest.

In your being secretive and trying to not inform them at some point you will probably be quite surprised to know that they knew anyway.

In the corporate world you are probably the last to know. They even knew when you were on your way out. If you had been more forthcoming with some of them maybe they might have helped you possibly even to the point that you could go in and beg for your job.

They know future courses of study.

As a supervisor or manager this involves learning your job and as in the military it is also best to learn your boss's job too. In so doing you are moving closer toward being technically and tactically proficient and getting you advanced to the next level. This is common sense!

5. **Set the example** – I contracted for a very large food company. This was really a good job for me and for everybody who worked there. We seemed to have an inordinate amount of accidents and it seemed that when our workers went to the first aid station or hospital many, too many, were found to be on drugs of one type or another. It seemed to be at an epidemic level and was costing the company millions of dollars in workers compensation claims, the cost of absent workers and loss of efficiency and productivity not to mention the huge insurance reserves that were now necessary.

The problem was identified and very obvious. It was becoming a very dangerous place to work because accusing someone of being high on drugs or alcohol was directly equated to a defamation lawsuit if you couldn't prove it.

This is not the same thing as slicing the medulla oblongata, not even tonsils or a wood splinter. The simple solution was to set up a program of drug testing for everyone. Management should be the first in line. I volunteered to get it started.

What would be better than seeing that I, even though I wasn't an employee of the company, was clean. I was proud of the fact and wanted it to be well known. Shortly you will see how important that move was.

So move me at the front of the line and knowing that I wasn't an alcoholic, pot head, coke head or heroin or other type of fiend and be on with it.

I pushed for it with upper management and was shocked, amazed and appalled at the level of resistance. The hourly workers were fine with it because there was an intervention program for anybody with a problem.

Management bucked and resisted and I later found how truly naive I was about such matters. I didn't live nearby and was not one of the good old boys anyway. I thought I knew that there was a lot of drinking at the higher levels including a vice president who was an alcoholic who came to work buzzed every day and was completely ossified when he pulled out of the parking lot in the evening, but I never suspected any drugs in management. I would later find that the epidemic started in the executive offices and at the highest levels of the company.

Is this setting the example? Of course it isn't and it is these same hypocrites that write the policies and do everything humanly possible to keep the workers down. The same ones who go out of their way to terminate and destroy workers for even minor infractions. Thank GOD for unions and bargaining units.

Just for you to get a better idea of how out of control the executive drug problem was, a director was arrested for being under the influence of cocaine while driving home from work. This is a guy who virtually looked down on everybody and never spoke to anybody but his cronies, probably fellow dope heads. What kind of example is this? Certainly it is no example at all and know for an unequivocal fact that this is what goes on and the so called underlings (sic) are looked at with a jaundiced eye when it is the big shots, while being charged with the greater responsibility and paid tremendous salaries, who violate the laws and bring themselves down to the lowest levels which is really where they were all of the time. A position of leadership doesn't make a person any better than they are. As was so obvious with this company, if you are garbage that's what you are and in many cases forever will be. You can't be a wine-o or drug addict yourself and then look down on those assigned below you who have a similar circumstance, This falls under the category of common sense.

6. **Train your subordinates as a team** – It is important that all managers that we discuss the productivity advantages of having a team rather than a bunch of individuals each going their own way doing their own thing working for you. The effect of two or more agents working together to produce an effect that is greater than the sum of the parts. ie; The combination of two essential oils will be more effective than if used individually.

It isn't just your subordinates but the entire organization that must learn to function synergistically to make the whole far greater than the sum of its individual parts. This is an area where youthful managers are at a tremendous advantage over their superior managers. Why? It is simply because they teach synergistic subjects in high school and beyond so it the principle is understand the supervisor potential is somewhat greater than someone who has never heard of it.

The key need not be this technical when it is really simple. So simple that even the military knew how important it was many years ago. You will maximize the potential of your organization if the understand how they function as part of a larger organization and then a larger force the, company. Etc. Don't fight it because this is just plain common sense.

7. **Ensure the task is understood, supervised and accomplished** – The basic communications that are required for this one is developed throughout the principles. Keeping your people informed by building working relationships by example are good starters. There is always the principle of “need to know”. I believe that if there is a need to know then people should be brought into communications. There is some information that must remain closer to the chest but most likely telling your employees and maybe even your troops won't hurt anything. Know your chain of dissemination and follow it. Sometimes you have information that can obviously be released. How do you know that it can be released? You know by the fact that it is all over the place, everybody knows it and your subordinates are telling you about it and asking why they are the last to know. Your action and/or the lack of it falls under the area of common sense.
8. **Make sound and timely decisions** – The decisions that you make are under the constant scrutiny of yourself and everyone who works with you. Think about how you live your life, which is in the panoramic view

of everyone that knows you. Your decisions in life and in your position at work are open to the public. The idea of sound decision making goes far to say that you are thoughtful enough to make the best decisions with the best information that you have available. When you have looked at everything that you have about the situation, the past and the future and you evaluate that into the best possible decision that usually leads to a good sound decision and that is just common sense. Take it one step further in your understanding of decision making when the time parameter is determined or you are under pressure because of your situation or circumstances. The decision has to be made and it has to be made under the time constraints that you are given and remember consciously not making any decision is a decision. Your decision was sort of like a default decision of no decision at all. Get it out there, don't wait! The time is passing you've done all of the evaluation that is required, just make the decision. This is all common sense!

9. **Develop a sense of responsibility in your subordinates** – Who would take over if something happened to you might be predetermined by your subordinates in their planning? In leading and managing you should always do your own succession plan the goes down several levels depending on the size and mission/assignment.

The plan, when informal leadership is considered, might not be followed in many situations but if you are the leader you should make sure that if you are no longer there to provide leadership another capable leader can and will take your place.

This is almost rank driven in the military setting but because of the fear, back stabbing, envy, jealousy and acrimony that is inherent to corporation and especially executive management it must be decided by a higher level and then put in place when the time comes. In many corporations it is kept secret because this gives the devious boss the opportunity to know that he/she is going to be slipping someone that is unqualified, unheralded and unknown into a key position when the opportunity presents itself.

10. **Employ your unit in accordance with its capabilities** – Only accept assignments that can be accomplished by your organization. This is not to say that you are only looking for the easy work but it also means that you aren't going to try to be a hero and take on assignments that you



can't handle or will end up getting somebody killed. You have taken on a position of leadership and that also means that you are responsible for the mission and the men. The mission, the men and men sort of in that order so as a team it must be held in tact. Your suicide mission is actually homicide if you are taking it upon yourself to get people killed.

This idea applies nicely into business also. You can only do what you are capable of doing, so if your department's throughput is 1000 items per day and the new boss wants 2000 items in the same time frame under the exact same conditions you should make it clear that you will try to get it done. Who knows there is always the possibility that it can be done but remember that you have capabilities and limitations. Maybe she knows something that you are unaware of or maybe she is testing you or setting you up for the kill. The one thing that both she and you have to be fully cognizant of is that the kill might not be of you and if you are a seasoned fighter or manager the kill zone does not necessarily favor her over you.

11. **Seek responsibility and take responsibility for your actions** – As a leader you should always seek responsibility. This is not the same as saying you should always volunteer your team or organization. Once the assignment is made and the responsibility is accepted, and this isn't always voluntary, you are responsible for the actions of your organization.
12. **Make a succession plan** – Make sure that if something happens to you there is a plan of action of who takes over. This is more of a necessity in a corporate situation than in a combat setting. In combat there might be some degree of uncertainty even though rank should prevail. It should prevail unless there is a reason for the exception and unless clearly understood that the ranking person can't take over that is who is supposed to take over. In the case that two people have the same grade you have to make that decision based on performance and who is best to lead the organization.

## LEADERSHIP THEORY AND SCHOLARLY PAPERS

### Great Man Theory

#### Assumptions

Leaders are born and not made.

Great leaders will arise when there is a great need.

#### Description

Early research on leadership was based on the study of people who were already great leaders. These people were often from the aristocracy, as few from lower classes had the opportunity to lead. This contributed to the notion that leadership had something to do with breeding.

The idea of the Great Man also strayed into the mythic domain, with notions that in times of need, a Great Man would arise, almost by magic. This was easy to verify, by pointing to people such as Eisenhower and Churchill, let alone those further back along the time line, even to Jesus, Moses, Mohammed and the Buddha.

#### Discussion

Gender issues were not on the table when the 'Great Man' theory was proposed. Most leaders were male and the thought of a Great Woman was generally in areas other than leadership. Most researchers were also male, and concerns about androcentric bias were a long way from being realized.

[www.changingtimes.com](http://www.changingtimes.com)

Search- Great Man Theory

## **TRAIT THEORY OF LEADERSHIP**

Even though Trait Theory, one of the earliest leadership theories gave way to the Behavioral Theory and to Contingency Theory, the research on traits has not been abandoned. All theories involve some traits, or characteristics, that have been correlated with some aspects of leadership. Certain traits are associated with leaders in leadership situations. The traits of intelligence, dominance, self-confidence, high energy and activity level and task-relevant knowledge are most often mentioned and are commonly agreed upon across all leadership analysis. That others possess such traits and are not leaders does not refute the evidence in this regard any more than does the evidence that not all leaders in all situations possess these characteristics. Some, for instance, have suggested that leadership is a trait that only need exist in the perception of others, particularly followers.

Trait theory is a more sophisticated, specific version of the great-man theory. It states that certain clusters of characteristics differentiate leaders from followers, effective from ineffective leaders. These qualities, or traits, are assumed to be stable in nature. An effective leader in one situation is assumed to be effective in any situation.

Reviews of studies of leadership all tend to show that no single trait or group of traits has been isolated that sets off the leader from members of the group. One researcher (Jenkins) looked at 20 different studies. From these, he found 79 different leadership traits. However, only 5% of these traits were found in four or more studies.

Intelligence, as we have mentioned before, is one of the most researched traits pertaining to leadership. The research on the connection between intelligence and leadership is contradictory – although some researchers indicate that there is a strong correlation. One review of studies indicated that 88% of the 196 relations between leadership and intelligence were positive, 92 of these 196 relations were significant, and 99% of the significant relations were positive. In these studies, there was a low median correlation between leadership and intelligence. However, other reviewers point to the consistency an indication of the relationship between intelligence and leadership.

While experience is not considered a trait by most researchers, it has been investigated and is important to the next discussion about traits. Fielder reviewed studies of that examined experience. These studies involved the

military, post office, and various trades. These studies were done in the United States and foreign countries and involved basic tasks that each group would be expected to do. Fiedler found that there was no significant linkage between leadership experience and overall group performance.

Moss and Liang have shown that leadership responsibilities (which will be discussed later) have been correlated with certain leadership characteristics. These characteristics – both personal and professional- reflect the overall behavior of the leader. (Another tie-in between traits and behavior.) Experience cannot be seen as a leadership characteristic, however, it may impact the leader's use of various characteristics or traits that have been learned through experience.

Attribution theorists propose that in achievement related contexts, success or failure can be attributed to four basic factors – ability, effort, difficulty, and luck. These four descriptors have been used in empirical research and have been shown to account for a large portion of the causal inferences made by individuals. These four factors have been placed on two general dimensions: external-internal and variable-stable. The internal-external dimension refers to the degree to which individuals attribute success or failure to personal versus situational characteristics. The stable-variable dimension refers to the degree to which perceived causes for performance are of a variable or relatively permanent nature. The internal-external dimension is referred to as *locus-of-control*. In other words, does the person see the results as something that came from within him or her or is this something over which they had no control.

Between World War I and World War II, leadership theorists were concerned with finding definite attributes (or traits) that identified a successful leader. However, this has not been termed a success. Stogdill reviewed the literature and concluded that the link attributes and leadership was very weak. In fact, many of the findings were contradictory. In the 1970's, there was still research being conducted on traits or attributes, however, it was of a limited nature. Fielder and Chemers, in the 1970's were not ready to eliminate this area of research. They claimed:

The endless array of conflicting findings result from the fact that trait studies cut across situations with varying tasks, physical arrangements and group compositions. It is undoubtedly true that the personality or motivational orientation of the leader

plays its part, for it will affect the likelihood of his attaining a leadership position and the way he will behave in that position, and hence, the likelihood of his success.

<http://tech.clayton.edu/eddins/trait.htm>

## THE SOCIAL SCIENTIFIC STUDY OF LEADERSHIP: QUO VADIS

House, Robert J. & Aditya, Ram N. (1997) *Journal of Management*. vol. 23, No. 3, 409-473

Outline below. Scroll down to see section with notes embedded in the outline.

### I. Introduction

A review of research from '30s to '90s.

Assumptions: Western culture based.

1. Individualistic, not collectivistic;
2. follower responsibilities, not rights;
3. hedonism, not commitment
4. centrality of work and democratic values
5. assumptions of rationality

### II. Leadership Traits Paradigm

Questions:

1. What were the primary problems with the trait paradigm?
2. What are the most common elements between McClelland's LMP and Bass' transformational leadership characteristics?

A. Problems with early trait paradigm

B. Revival of Trait Theory

C. Unrecognized yield from early trait research

D. Recent Trait Perspectives

1. Social Influence Motivation and Leader Motive Profile (LMP) McClelland
2. Charismatic Leadership Theory (House)
3. Leader Flexibility (Kenny and Zaccaro)

- A. Summary of Trait Research
- B. Leaders Born or Made?
- III. The Leader Behavior Paradigm
  - A. Assumptions and Limitations of Leader Behavior Paradigm
- IV. Contingency Theories
  - A. Fiedler' Contingency Theory
  - B. Path Goal Theory (House & Mitchell, 71)
  - C. Life Cycle Theory (Hersey & Blanchard, '82)
  - D. Cognitive Resource Theory (Fiedler, '87)
  - E. Decision Process Theory (Vroom & Yetton, '73; Vroom and Jago, '88)
    - 1. Validity of the prescriptive model
    - 2. Reformulated Theory
  - F. Cumulative Contribution of Contingency Theories
- V. Recently Introduced Theories
  - A. Leader Member Exchange Theory (LMX) Graen & Uhl-Bien, '95)
    - 1. Opportunities for Further Development of LMX Theory (from VDL)
  - B. Implicit Leadership Theory (Lord et al. '78)
    - 1. Future directions for Implicit Leadership Theory
  - C. Neocharismatic Theory (Burns, Bass, '78)
    - 1. Differences among Neocharismatic Theories (does Transformational subsume Charismatic Leadership?)
    - 2. Short Scale to measure Charismatic Leadership (MLQ)
    - 3. Future directions for Neocharismatic paradigm
- VI. Additional Opportunities for Future Research
  - A. Leadership vs. management Supervision
  - B. Need for more Organizational Focus
  - C. Strategic Leadership
  - D. Generic Leadership Functions and Specific Leader Behaviors
    - 1. Generic functions and specific behavioral manifestations of leadership
  - E. Leadership Styles

- F. Management of Diversity
- G. Cross Cultural Leadership
  - 1. Theory of cross cultural leadership
- H. Toward a Theory of Political Leadership
- I. Distributed Leadership Revisited
  - 1. Delegated Leadership
  - 2. Co-leadership
  - 3. Peer leadership
  - 4. Future opportunities for research on distributed leadership
- J. Management training and development
- K. Universal or near universal effective behaviors
- VII. Conclusion
  - A. Cultural Limitations of Extant Theory
  - B. The cumulative Gain
  - C. Some prevailing problems

## **The Social Scientific Study of Leadership: Quo Vadis**

### **Introduction:**

- Study of leadership did not begin until the early 1930's
- 98% of the empirical evidence at hand is rather American in character: individualistic rather than collectivist, stressing follower responsibilities. Rather than rights, assuming hedonism rather than commitment to duty, assuming centrality of work and democratic value orientation and emphasizing assumptions or rationality rather than asceticism, or religion

# 8

### **The Leadership Trait Paradigm**

- Research concerned with leadership first focused on the search for individual characteristics that universally differentiate leaders from non leaders
- Large number of personal characteristics were study: gender, height, physical energy, appearance, as well as psychological traits and motives such as authoritarianism, intelligence, need for achievement and need for power

- Research at the beginning did not support the trait idea
- Recently trait theory have reappeared and there is empirical support

### **Problems with early Trait Paradigm**

- Little personality theory to lead the way for leadership traits
- Traits operationally defined differently
- Situations were not considered in leadership
- Sample composed of adolescents, supervisors, lower level managers, rather than individuals in significant position of leadership

### **Revival of Trait Theory**

- Began 1970's
- Have now clarified when and how traits are likely to explain individuals behavior
- Empirically traits are more predictive of behavior for some people
- Mischel made the important observation that the behavioral expression of disposition is likely to be suppressed by highly constraining "strong" situations, but that dispositions will likely be enacted in "weak" situations
- Strength of situations had not been considered in earlier research
- Earlier critics of trait theory argued that traits must be stable and predict behavior over substantial periods of time and across wide variety of situations
- Recent research states that traits are predictive of an individuals characteristics behavior in select situations rather than across all situations
- Also recently observed that ind.'s disposition may be stable over extended periods of time but not necessarily for life
- When adolescents are excluded from earlier studies results show rather consistent set of relationships between some traits, followers' perceptions and indicators of leadership
- More consideration for intelligence, prosocial assertiveness, self confidence, energy, task relevant knowledge



## RECENT TRAIT THEORIES

### Achievement Motivation Theory

- 1940's
- a non-conscious concern for achieving excellence in accomplishments through one's individual efforts
- Ach. Motivated inds set challenging goals for themselves, assume personal responsibility for goal accomplishment, persistent in pursuit of goals, take risks, use feedback
- Theory suggests that ach. Motivation will be positively related to the effectiveness of leaders of small task-oriented groups and companies, negatively related to large complex orgs.

### Social Influence Motivation and Leader Motive Profile

- Thought that social influence motivation as measured by power motivation measures desire for influence or measures of prosocial influence motivation will be predictive of managerial success and effectiveness – this is supported
- This lead to Leader Motive Profile LMP
- McClelland 1975 argued that the following combination of non conscious motives are generic to and predictive of leader effectiveness; high power motivation, high concern for the moral exercise of power and power motivation greater than affiliation motivation
- Power motivation is defined as a non conscious concern for acquiring status and having impact on others
- Affiliation Motivation is defined as a non conscious concern for establishing, maintaining, and restoring close personal relationships with others
- LMP is predictive of managerial effectiveness under conditions where leaders need to exercise social influence in the processes of making decisions and motivating others to accept and implement decisions
- LMP is limited to the boundary conditions of moderate to large, nontechnically oriented orgs and to managers who are separated from the work of the org by at least one organizational level

- Several studies have supported theory
- Need to look more at the behaviors

## Charismatic Leadership Theory

- speculated that charismatic leaders are exceptionally self confident, are strongly motivated to attain and assert influence and have strong conviction in the moral correctness of their beliefs
- Charismatic leaders are persistent in the face of obstacles, advocate change and challenge status quo therefore resist those that defend status quo
- More recent version of Charismatic leadership theory incorporates LMP as an antecedent to charismatic leadership emergence and effectiveness
- Charismatic leaders, to be effective, must mobilize a critical mass of followers in the interest of the leader's vision, thus need a high power motivation
- They also need to be resist to criticism thus need a low affiliation motivation

## Leader Flexibility

- Leader flexibility and social sensitive are needed for leadership emergence process
- Empirically supported

## Summary of Findings from Trait Research

- Three salient points emerge from trait theory and research
  1. There appears to be a number of traits that consistently differentiate leaders from others
- Physical energy, intelligence greater than average follower, pro social influence motivation, adjustment, self confidence, achievement motivation, and motives of LMP
  1. The effects of traits on leader behavior and leader effectiveness are enhanced to a great extent by the relevance of the traits to the situation in which the leader functions
  2. Traits have a stronger influence on leader behaviors when the situational characteristics permit the expression of ind. Dispositions
- Weak vs. strong situations

## **The Leader Behavior Paradigm**

- Began after trait theories
- Identified two broad classes of leader behaviors – task-oriented vs. person-oriented
- Developed specific behaviors for each

## **Assumptions and limitations**

- Used observation with lower level managers, students rather than high level managers – trait theory had same criticism
- Limitations of measurement because lack of theoretical background
- Little thought about specific role demands of leaders, the context in which they function, or differences in dispositions of leaders or followers

## **CONTINGENCY THEORIES**

### **Fielder's Contingency Theory**

- First to specify how situational variables interact with leader personality and behavior
- Posited two way interaction between a measure of leader task motivation versus relationship motivation, and a measure of situational control
- Situational control is the degree to which the leader can control and influence the group process
- As predicted task or relationship motivated people were shown to manifest the same behavior (e.g. consideration, structuring) under selected different conditions of situational control and different behaviors under the same conditions of situational control
- Criticized for conceptual reasons and inconsistent empirical findings
- Hypothesized that task motivated leaders perform best in situations of high or low control while relationship motivated leaders perform best in moderate control situations

## Path Goal Theory

- Developed to reconcile prior conflicting finding concerning task and person oriented leader behavior
- Theory specifies several moderators of the relationship between task and person oriented leadership and their effects
- Not adequately tested

## Life Cycle Theory

- A situational leadership theory of leadership
- Postulated four leadership styles: telling, selling, participating, and delegating each was appropriate for a certain type of situation defined by subordinates level of maturity
- Leadership style contingent upon followers maturity, defined as the degree to which followers are ready and willing to tackle the task facing the group

## Cognitive Resource Theory

- A person by situation theory in which the
- person variables are leader intelligence and experience
- situational variable is stress experienced by leader and follower
- considerable empirical support
- Low stress – intelligence positively correlates and experience negatively correlates with performance
- High Stress – intelligence negatively correlates, experience positively correlates with performance
- Implies under conditions of high stress a highly intelligent person should rely on experience rather than intelligence to be effective

## Decision Process Theory

- Intended to help managers make decisions that ensure high technical and economics quality solutions to problems and obtain solutions that are acceptable to subordinates, if acceptability of solutions is important for effective implementation

- Seven decision making methods – range from autocratic to democratic
- Use a decision tree
- More support in field studies than laboratory studies
- Criticisms
- Theory assumes decision makers' goals are the same as the orgs goals
- Training is required to use decision tree
- Theory ignores the discussion and conference skills required of the manager to actually solve problems on a group decision
- Complex theory

## Reformulated Theory

- Added criterion variable to above – overall effectiveness and decision effectiveness
- Overall effectiveness is composed of decision quality, decision commitment
- Decision effectiveness: the effect of the decision process on subordinate development and time available to make the decision, assumed to be an indicator of decision cost

## RECENTLY INTRODUCED THEORIES

### Leader Member Exchange Theory (LMX)

- Theory about the development and effects of separate dyadic relationships between superiors and subordinates
- Distinguishing feature is that theory looks at relationship rather than traits or behavior
- High degree of mutual influence and obligation between superior and subordinate produces positive outcomes: high performance, citizenship behavior, satisfaction, commitment

## THE SOCIAL SCIENTIFIC STUDY OF LEADERSHIP: QUO VADIS? PART II

- I. Implicit Leadership Theory
  - A. Addresses the evaluations people make about leaders, and the cognitive processes underlying evaluations and perceptions of leadership.
  - B. Leadership – the process of being perceived as a leader
  - C. All leadership behaviors will not make one a leader *unless that person is also perceived as a leader*
  - D. Leadership traits are seen as important constructions of perceivers that help them make sense of social situations.
  - E. Forming Leadership Perceptions:
    1. formed through either deliberate and controlled inferential or automatic and spontaneous recognition-based processes
    2. can be explained in terms of categorization theory. form a number of hierarchically organized cognitive categories which represent a prototype.
      - a. prototypes are formed through exposure to social events and interpersonal interactions
      - b. person is categorized based on his/her fit with a prototype
- A. Categorization perspective
  1. has implications for organizational leadership
    - a. different prototypes exist for different roles and contexts
- II. Neocharismatic Theory
  - A. Major paradigm shift in the mid 1970's
    1. New paradigm of leadership theories emerged under a common genre
      - a. Theory of Charismatic Leadership
      - b. Theory of Transformational Leadership
      - c. Attributional Theory of Charismatic Leadership
  - A. This class of theories is referred to “the New Leadership Theories”
    1. Common characteristics:
      - a. they all attempt to explain how leaders are able to lead organizations to attain outstanding accomplishments

- b. They also attempt to explain how certain leaders are able to achieve extraordinary levels of follower motivation, admiration, respect, trust, commitment, dedication, loyalty, and performance
  - c. They all stress symbolic and emotionally appealing leader behaviors
  - d. The leader effects specified in these theories include follower self-esteem, motive arousal and emotions, and identification with the leaders vision, values, follower satisfaction and good follower performance
1. Differences in the theories:
    - a. they differ with respect to their leadership behaviors
  2. House and Shamir (1993) provide a theoretical integration of the leader behaviors of charismatic, transformational, and visionary leadership theories
    - a. Lindholm (1990) says the term *charisma* refers primarily to socially undesirable and destructive behaviors
    - b. Howell and House (1992) disagree and distinguish b/n 2 types of charismatic leadership:
      3. personalized
        - a. self-aggrandizing, exploitative, and authoritarian
      4. socialized
        - a. altruistic, collectively-oriented, egalitarian
        - b. Bass (1997) argues that transformational leadership theory subsumes Charismatic leadership theory
        - c. House and Shamir (1993) see transformational, charismatic, and visionary leadership as the same
        - d. Other minor differences b/n the theories
- A. Measurement of Charismatic Leadership
    1. MLQ
      - a. most widely used
      - b. 3 sub scales
    2. charisma

3. individualized consideration
4. intellectual stimulation

#### A. Future directions

1. These theories offer inadequate explanations of the process by which the theoretical leader behaviors are linked to, and influence, the affective states of followers
2. Transformational rests on Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs, which has been disproven by empirical tests
3. There is little evidence that charismatic, transformational, or visionary leadership does indeed transform individuals, groups, or organizations as they claim they do.

### III. Future research

#### A. Leadership v. Management

1. what's the difference?

#### B. Need more research on strategic leadership

#### C. Generic v. Specific leadership functions

1. Research needs to prove what the difference is b/n the two

**<http://home.ubalt.edu/tmitch/642/house.htm>**



# CHAPTER

## **WOMEN AS LEADERS**

What is a woman leader? Are there women leaders? Are women capable of being leaders?

Some of the literature actually accuses the theories that we commonly subscribe to of being gender biased and then questions if women should be weighed against the same criteria as men.

That is the type of bias that would be expected in these United States where white men make such statements and determinations. It was like that then and it is like that now and they were wrong about other minorities then and they are wrong about women now. These are the same people and the same thoughts that said and still say that minorities, especially African Americans, are inferior.

Those same stale statements, that were never true but are very useful, in establishing superiority for themselves while watching as those that they view as inferior overwhelmingly prove them wrong all of the time in practically every situation.

Now we find that women who have had to fight for every right and privilege that they now enjoy cannot even fight alongside of men in combat, if they choose to, but yet are placed in positions that are as dangerous as those that

are isolated to the men. It was found that women in the military were still at risk in rear units in a combat situation such as Iraq

In 1994 Defense Secretary Les Aspen announced a new criteria for women assigned in combat areas. With that the 1988 “risk rule” was changed so that they could serve closer to the actual combat but not directly with the men or as the men do. With this policy change women wouldn’t be excluded from some more positions simply because they were thought to be too risky for them. Women were still not allowed to serve in the direct combat arms such as infantry, armor, artillery and special forces.

Fast forward to the current Iraq war where women are serving, still not assigned to direct combat, but performing assignments such as was Jessica Lynch, Shoshana Johnson, who were both wounded, and Lori Piestewa who died in combat. Johnson and Lynch were both captured and held prisoner. (Female POW s, what about that?)

Although the regulations say what they can and can’t do by regulation that is sometimes a facade and a cover your ass tactic of the military. They can’t fight alongside of a male soldier who might never engage or even see anything close to the enemy but they can drive a truck loaded with jet fuel where support and supply make regular trips each day. As they put it they were armed, trained and prepared for combat. In the words of the tanker truck driver, she was a moving bomb on wheels moving through enemy mortar fire. There is no more dangerous assignment. This is a different type of war and if they are placed in harms way, and anywhere in Iraq fits that description, they have to be prepared to fight and possibly die. They’re doing it.

What is a leader in combat and what will it take for us to understand that there is a lot more than pointing your rifle in the direction of the enemy and yelling “follow me”. It is folly. All that means is that if it is a realistic situation and you are within the maximum effective range of your armed adversary you are telling those that you are leading to all follow you to their deaths.. If women were stupid enough to do that they could, but I hope that they won’t, and that’s not leadership anyway.

It is sort of a sad state of affairs that either they are not allowed or they are not properly rewarded for what they are doing. It could be something as simple as some scared and selfish individual not wanting to sign off on

them getting hazardous duty pay. It also might be systemic in that by virtue of them being women and therefore discriminatorily assigned that they can't get rightfully paid for their service.

So that's the military and some might question if they have what it takes to be there. I've been there and although I'd be the first to admit that I wouldn't feel that comfortable with some women having to back me up as I move into position or pull her shift on guard while I catch a few z's I feel exactly the same way about a lot of men that I've served and worked with. The military is changed and I use that as a real example. I see it as unusual to see two soldiers being kidnapped but it's happening in Iraq. Does anybody question how an armed soldier is kidnapped instead of just being killed? This type of situation would appear that they were asleep and therefore it was opportune for someone to just come along and snatch or take them. These are American Fighting Men?

If it was a situation of being captured which usually connoted some type of engagement then is very logical. It could just be a matter of semantics with the military trying to use more politically correct and user friendly language. With me it doesn't fit well when a two men are both kidnapped and there are no reports of enemy deaths or close order fighting. All of that to say that it really does matter if I have a sorry man partner or sorry woman. If I have nobody to back me up I'm a goner anyway and if we are both sleeping it doesn't matter either.

Who writes this leadership stuff anyway? Think about testosterone and that will start to clear up why there would ever be a question of whether women can lead. What do women do anyway as I asked before? If you can answer that question truthfully and you know of any real women, and I'm sure that you do, this is the case of born and bred leadership. Many women are taught leadership at a very young age at home. It might not go by that characterization but as you watch what their lives are about, and I keep on saying that I wouldn't want a women's life, it should be clear to anybody that can see that they are leading and coaching and driving situations all of the time. Men commonly hide behind their women who actually wear the pants in the family or situation.

I'll give you two men, at least I'll call them that because they still are labeled in that way that I would either shoot or desert if I saw either of them heading my way in a combat scenario. Like they say, not in my neighborhood.

This would be not in a position with me.

Both of these guys sit at the heads of their own companies. One of them wears a yellow raincoat all year long and prides himself in being some sort of genius. I dealt with him for several months and only saw him to be a below par I.Q. dolt who like Nero, playing the fiddle while Rome was ablaze, spends his life running around all over the world with his little effeminate coat and little else trying to charm as many women as he can while his company is literally being taken from right under his eyes. Would I rely on him as my combat partner in any way? He is an assigned leader by virtue of inheritance. Nobody respects or obeys any of his request, commands or demands. Some how we call him a leader.

The other is somewhat less complex. While he has the identical testosterone issue he is much younger and the reason he could not be trusted to watch your back is because he doesn't have the nerve. This is the kind of president sitting at the top of his company and not knowing anything about his operations and not having the nerve to find out. At least the other guy would show up, this degenerate doesn't even show up for work even if anything or everything is wrong. How would you feel about needing him to be alert on a cold winter night? He's too lazy to support you and so when you reach the point where you just can't stay awake any longer, and that's usually after a couple of days, you're finished and you will be in a position to be kidnapped without a whimper.

I give living examples of men (sic) that could not serve at the same level of efficiency as most women. The examples that I gave are not that exceptional. I say that because as a drill sergeant we saw grown men that knew nothing about even taking care of their own personal hygiene needs or their left side from their right. You can't fake that kind of stuff. That's what we got in the men's ranks probably to a much higher degree than with women, especially those who try and think that they have to prove themselves in a man's world and then especially as leaders.

It becomes a little confusing to me when I keep getting the single gender focus from the literature and also in speaking with people that have spent considerable time studying the subjects of leadership and management. They seem to be driven toward a masculine model and question if a woman can fit into that mold, maybe not that mold. Perhaps we should look at if the mold is modeled correctly. They really don't have to fit that mold. This is part of

the thinking outside of the box that separates intelligent people and leaders. Why is it necessary for me to list the women in the history of the world who have been stronger and better leaders than their male counterparts?

Look at the world as it presents itself today and you will find women with the power to lead. What is leadership again? I think it went something like “the art of influencing and directing someone else to get them to loyally do what you need them to do”. Is that exclusive to the powerful men in the world. No it is not because you have women heads of corporations, countries, we have a woman secretary of state and several senators, including one that is a leading candidate for the presidency.

Stop thinking that it’s a man’s world like was once said by James Brown. It wasn’t then and it isn’t now. There is mutuality in the genders and it is universal. Women are leaders and just as strong and powerful as men and then there are the aberrations.

As women now lead corporations they also lead nations. Let’s do a quick synopsis of today’s women leaders of the world:

Mary McAleese, President of Ireland (1997-)

Vaira Vike-Freiberg, President of Latvia (1999-)

Helen Clark, Prime Minister of New Zealand (1999-)

Tarja K. Halonen, President of Finland (2000-)

Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo, President of the Philippines (2001-)

Khaleda Zia, Prime Minister of Bangladesh (1991-1996, 2001-)

Luisa Diogo, Prime Minister of Mozambique (2004-)

Maria do Carmo Silveira, Prime Minister of Sao Tome and Principe (2005-)

Angela Merkel, Chancellor of Germany (2005-)

Ellen Johnson-Sirleaf, President of Liberia (2006-)

Women have been are are leaders all over the world. The United States and the white man’s mentality has a retarded

perception. The list that I presented is of the current women leaders but the list is really very extensive. Take a quick look at the following:

<b>Continent</b>	<b>Since</b>	<b>Number *</b>
Africa	1975	6
Americas	1974	15
Asia-Pacific	1960	17
Europe	1979	30

\* Number of *Women Rulers*

The United States is a little slow but other than us practically the whole free world appreciates the role of women as leaders. While we are behind the rest of the free world as we are behind a large percentage of the world at large in so many other areas, one being the death penalty, we'll be taking positive steps toward catching up within the next few years.

Think about this, if you will?

How many men will become a millionaire in their lifetime?

How many will do it before reaching the age of fifty?

How many men will have a world following that is so powerful that he could probably gain to top office in many other countries besides his native country, the United States?

How many men have had audiences with presidents, leaders of business and other world leaders at their appointed time and not the time of the visitor?

How many men have built schools for impoverished children around the world and is an ongoing contributor to their welfare?

How many men will become a billionaire in their lifetime?

How many men will accomplish that level of wealth before reaching the ripe old age of fifty?

If I told you that there is a leader alive and well and living amongst us you'd probably think that it is another of my fantasies or even better just another fabrication or maybe even a figment of my imagination. This can't be, at best it is a tremendous exaggeration or aggrandizement of someone that I wish could accomplish this. At worse could be the manifestation of a dormant insanity.

Leadership takes on many forms and has many definitions. Try to commit to your memory that leadership is dynamic and ever changing. If you are locked in the box you'll never be able to figure out this riddle because we are talking about one of the greatest leaders of all times in the name of **OPRAH WINFREY**. If you don't know who she is or of her leadership and power it would be best if you just crawl back into the area of your rock and hope that you still have a place there.

*Oprah Winfrey was born in 1954 in Kosciusko, Mississippi which is slightly northeast of Natchez and Jackson and northeast of Bude that turned out to be the most hospitable place that I've ever been stranded in in the entire world, and I am a world traveler (see my novel, SURVIVAL OF AN URBAN RENAISSANCE MAN).*

*Even though she had a somewhat troubled early life she was always taught how important it was to read and learn. Her father, Vernon Winfrey, required her to read and study hard starting at a very early age because he had some concerns about her making something of her life. She made something of her life and now has one of the largest following and audiences of any entertainer. She is an actress, talk show hostess, entrepreneur, philanthropist and billionaire.*

*She is also a leader that measures far above our current and many of our former presidents. If she chose to run she would undoubtedly be our first African American President. Her leadership is not the kind that basic books speak to or even understand. The truth is that Oprah Winfrey is a world apart and even though I will mention other powerful women in this book there is surely none as powerful, persuasive, authoritative and charismatic as this youthful Black Leader. Hers is true and natural that can't be cultivated through the finest schools and or universities. She's a true leader who is fully able to lead at any level including the Presidency and Commander and Chief of the United States.*

9

Leaders are no longer the stereotypical white male with mixed gray hair, blue eyes, wing tip shoes and a three piece suit. Leaders are now of many stripes and dimensions. Probably the preeminent world leader of our time is Oprah Winfrey. She chose her lot as an entertainer rather than as a politician. If I was to do a humble evaluation I'd say that she made the correct choices.

Do we have others who could lead our beloved country? Earlier we discussed how leadership is assumed. One of the many ways that we select our leaders in a free society is through elections. Does everyone placed in a position of leadership successfully fulfill the responsibilities of that position? You don't have to be a genius to answer that question. What you need is to be able to do is use a little good reasoning and common sense, look at how the job was done or is being done and make your best conclusion. We won't always, or even usually, especially with me, agree but we can come to a conclusion. Our system provides and even mandates this as part of our responsibility. When that is done and we look at the best possible candidates to fill the top spot, looking objectively we find more women leaders who are candidates and could readily be elected president.

*Hillary Rodham Clinton had already spent eight years in the white house as the First Lady and wife of former president William Jefferson Clinton. Does being the former first lady make her a candidate for president or even qualify her as a leader? Certainly not if that is all that you look at. So let's take a closer look.*

*Bill Clinton will go down into history as a successful president in most respects. Practically everything from the economy to the world situation was well controlled and even blossomed and flourished during his watch. His wife and partner, Hillary, was part of that success story. When you look into the annals of presidencies and president's wives very few are remembered even recent ones and possibly that might apply to the present.*

*Hillary was different and respected for being so because most people respect her brilliance and the fact that she participated in the process. Not equal in the rite of the presidency as she was as wife but it wasn't long before she made her move on her own. She did not return to Arkansas and even Illinois where her election would have been virtually assured but rather chose one of the most difficult senatorial races in the United States, New York going up against America's Mayor, none other than Rudolph Giuliani who was thought to be unbeatable at the time.*

*It didn't take the political pundits long to realize that the Democratic Party had produced a candidate who was at least equal in all political measurements and probably superior in most. Rudy was at one time*



*seen to be the wonder boy until Hillary Rodham Clinton arrived. In looking, those in power started to waiver as they realized that they were in for the fight of their lives. Rudolph had future political aspirations and the party saw him as a future winner that they didn't want to get too bloodied up and possibly knocked completely off the block by this Washington and/or Illinois and Arkansas carpetbagger, so things start materializing to get him out of the race.*

*It sort of reminds me of my youthful days as an Army pugilist. They had put me up against several bums that were much less skilled than I. I actually thought that I was a boxer. I was beginning to think I was tough. A match came up with a guy who had beaten everybody in our class. The trainer and coach told me that I really wasn't ready for this guy. I was naturally offended. I was bad and they wanted to hold me back. If I beat this bum I would be slated to fight in the states at Fort Dix, NJ which was near my home.*

*I worked and trained hard. I was to the point that my trainers started believing that I really did have a shot at winning. When we arrived at the fight I looked him over and started thinking that I had possibly overstepped. He looked completely calm and relaxed but not flashy. He wasn't showing off and I noticed that he was avoiding staring me down. He wasn't even looking toward my corner. When we met in the center of the ring I could see that he was nervous, just as I was. I had a little rep and had two knockouts under my belt so he had something to worry about just as I did. He was extremely friendly and spoke cordially. We had nothing against each other, two young Black men, but both were after the same thing, another win, and both realized that we have to get past the other to get it.*

*The fight was three rounds. In the first half of the first round we just started feeling each other out but with a short fight you have to step it up to score points, a knockdown or the ultimate knockout. Remember what I said about Rudy being bloodied up in a fight with Hillary. He got confident and started grandstanding. I saw an opening and my training paid off for me at the exact moment that my corner yelled, "left". I let loose with my best left hook. It buckled his knees and he went down and jumped right back up at the count of three.*

*I was feeling very confident now and knew that I could take him.*

*My only regret was that he would get a little rest and recovery during the break. This was like putting your sword in the bull and not killing him. He came out like a ferocious fire feeding dragon with that fire spewing from every opening. I quickly realized that I had just pissed him off but I knew that I could defend myself if he didn't paralyze my arms any more than he'd already done. He'd opened a gash under my right eye and on top of my my left eye. My lips were swollen so badly that I couldn't breath through my mouthpiece or my nose which was probably broken.*

*We made it though the round and he came over to ask me if I was alright. My corner looked me over and told me that I was done. I was crying like a newborn but I wasn't ready to throw in the towel. I still had a shot and felt confident because I had knocked him down. My cornerman told be "he's killing you" when the buzzer went off adding that I should say I have a cramp and they'd have to stop the fight and it wouldn't be considered a knockout. He cautioned me that my opponent was well conditioned and was getting stronger. I told him that the cramp was killing me and for him to work on it. I sat on my stool and stretched my leg, they rubbed in some liniment as the bell rang. The ref said "get him up, get him out here". The fight was called at that point. Shades of what happened with Hillary and Rudy. It was clear that they had a challenge that was far more formidable than they had anticipated. It was time to protect Rudy and bring out a sacrificial lamb for the wolves or in this case Hillary Rodham Clinton who was about to become the first Former First Lady elected to the United States Senate and the first woman elected statewide in New York. November 7, 2000 she made that history.*

*That's leadership and to a magnitude that couldn't be attributed to any man.*

*How would she do in a national election if she gets the nomination from New York. Again whether it be the best that they have to put out there or a bum for her to just beat to death, they had better bring their lunch when they get ready to take on this sure winner and leader who just happens to be a woman.*

*We're not finished!*

*This chapter would not be complete without recognition of Dr. Condoleezza Rice the Secretary of State of the United States. Dr. Rice, who the president refers to as Condoleezza became the 66<sup>th</sup> Secretary of State on January 25, 2005. During questioning at her confirmation hearing Dr. Rice said, “we must use American diplomacy to help create a balance of power in the world that favors freedom. And the time for diplomacy is now”.*

*Ms Rice is a much traveled diplomat with most of her recent travels have been to the middle east where all types of continuing problems seem to be getting worse rather than improving. She is a very loyal friend to President Bush but doesn't seem to be negatively affected by his low approval ratings for performance domestically or internationally. Most perceive that Dr. Rice does a splendid world class job in the face of adversity and almost an impossible situation with a boss like Bush.*

*Prior to Dr. Rice assuming the role that she now hold she was the Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs or the National Security Advisor from January 2001 when Bush assumed his first term. She sits on several boards including Chevron Corporation, the University of Notre Dame as well as the Advisory Council of J.P. Morgan, the San Francisco Symphony Board of Governors and others.*

*Dr Rice speaks several languages and is a concert pianist.*

*Although she doesn't have the same depth of government experience as Mrs. Clinton or the popularity of Oprah Winfrey she is certainly a world class leader who is making decisions that impact the troubled regions especially of the Middle East in particular and the world at large in general.*

*Is Dr. Rice a leader who could assume the presidency more readily than most members of the current cabinet, including the vice president, or members of congress? Authors don't usually make that type of prognostication but this one will take a risk and state my learned opinion that she is more qualified than most of those occupying any and all of the aforementioned positions. My only hope is that she wouldn't be tainted or associated to the point of being stereotyped by*

*her current employment. Objectively one would conclude that she is going to be an excellent, superior and outstanding candidate for the position of her choice including the office of the president and commander and chief of the United States.*

# 10 CHAPTER

## **TWEAKING COMMON SENSE LEADERSHIP THEORY/METHOD**

Lawrence West

This concept is fully applicable to any of the other methods that are based on standards. That will include all of the leadership theories that realize imperfections of people, management and systems. The mathematical/statistical applications are naturals for improvement and therefore the use of TCS (Tweaking Common Sense).

Tweaking simply means to fine tune which is an ongoing process in getting better at whatever we do. The standards that are usually set are based on common sense and some amount of mathematical manipulation. The question is how do we get from the common sense standard to perfection?

This really shouldn't be oversimplified but we get to perfection by understanding the capability of whatever we are working with, whether it be man, machinery, materials or methods and placing the dollar and human value of moving from that position to the improvement level that it takes to set an optimal/maximum level standard.

As hard as it might be to believe many organizations have no idea of what these levels are. There are also an equal amount that have no idea of how to

go about getting to them. They are used to have the same system that they've had for the last several years as what they accept as their operating standard.

How were these standards established? When is the last time they were tweaked? What is the cost of tweaking them now? What is it costing you to keep running at the level of efficiency that you now have?

These are questions that you have to answer in the process of using this theory. Let's make sure that we have a clear understanding. Before you conclude that you have an ongoing process of tweaking your systems I will argue that unless you are updating your training, personnel and equipment that is a common fantasy that is costing you a tremendous amount.

Let's stop right here and introduce our very limited **GLOSSARY OF TERMS**. We'll have to make sure that we understand how this system works because many will think that it is a little redundant. It isn't but as you have worked to develop your quality and leadership systems it is only natural and obvious that you have neglected the constant updates and upgrades that are necessary, so just stick with me on this one. You just might learn something and then maybe not. This method is quite obvious but you will certainly agree that we have stopped short of optimization of either our processes or people. This method takes us there.

***COMMON SENSE: The current standard previously established by the use of other methods such as zero defects or statistical manufacturing and quality control. If a target and standard has been established naturally it can be improved on or tweaked.***

**Tweaked Objective:** The maximum goal that can be attained and maintained based on capability improvement. This is not merely bringing a process under statistical control but rather bringing it to its maximum level and maintaining it at that level.

This applies evenly to developing leaders and managers. With this theory coupled with an understanding of such as any of the traits theory and application of anything similar to the military leadership principles tweaking can be readily applied.

## GLOSSARY OF TERMS

1. Attain—to gain, accomplish, achieve; to reach or arrive at. Once attained the target must be maintained. That is accomplished by the process of tweaking back to the common sense level.
2. Capable—capability, having the ability required for a specific task or accomplishment; qualified: able to improve to the higher standard.
3. Common Sense—(Not really than common and the opposite can actually be equated to stupidity) Good sense or practical judgment.
4. Control—to regulate, to verify by comparison.
5. Discrete—separate
6. Equally as good—unacceptable
7. Exceed—to go beyond the limit. (as in standards)
8. Hire—to employ
9. Limit—the point, line, etc., where something ends, the boundary.
10. Maintain—to keep or keep up, to keep in continuance or a certain state of control or being.
11. Maximum- (maximal) the greatest quantity, number, etc. possible, permissible or acceptable
12. Minimum- (minimal) the lowest or smallest number or quantity that is acceptable.
13. Optimal – most favorable, optimum
14. Optimum- most desirable possible under expressed or implied; an optimum target, maximum
15. Perfect- (a) complete in all aspects to the highest possible level, flawless. (verb) to make perfect
16. Range- the limits of possible variation
17. Specification- something specific or specified; a statement of enumeration of particulars as to size, weight, strength, quality or terms.
18. Standard- established as a rule or basis of comparison such as in measuring quality, quantity, tolerances, etc.
19. Sustain- to hold, to keep in existence and at a certain level.
20. Target- exact goal, what you are shooting for or at.
21. Training- to instruct so as to make proficient or improved.

22. Tweak- to adjust slightly
23. Variation (not to be confused with variance) varying, changing in form, extent, etc.
24. Virtual- in effect, whereas actually is in fact.

The goal of a process capability analysis is to compare a sample of items obtained from a production facility against established specifications for a product. It will estimate the percent of the product that will meet the specifications and compute several capability indices. In addition, statistical tolerance intervals can be computed to determine new specifications if current limits are not being met.

The optimal situation is to bring your system into a stable condition that does not change or if it does change that change is only acceptable when in a steady state where it is minimized and then continually balanced by the change from one direction to the other.

When establishing control limits closer scrutiny must be given to the capability of the process and the cost variable or continuing without full capability verses the constant and continuous tweaking that brings about a perfect process and greatly improved product.

The common sense variable is established by the acceptance that most processes have just run on a common sense basis or when they were analyzed that process was only taken to a point where the process would run. That's sort of like knowing that your car needs a valve job but opting to just continue driving it the way that it is. You know that the bad valve will cause other problems and eventually will blow your engine but your decision is to deal with the short term problem of adding a couple quarts of oil once or twice and respond in kind when people in traffic complain about your smoke stack.

This is what we have done. Instead of finishing the job we have stopped short of the optimal target.

This was done because your limited analysis showed that you were as far along as you could get but it also showed that you were missing the target at least fifty percent of the time and then using the upper and lower control limits that you established weren't even close most of the time.



Management made the decision based on their very limited knowledge of what you had done and unwillingness to get involved to even look at your results. The small improvement was better than no improvement at all and therefore was fine with them.

My process brings to light these failings in most industries and in the area of human development. We give up on people just as we do machines. At some point we just write them off as being as well developed as they are going to get instead of investing on their necessary improvement. That's simple human development and we have fallen terribly behind in industry, in our executive offices and in the military to name but a few..

You have the idea and when you go out and look at your processes most will be ashamed of what it is costing the organization under your watch and with your knowledge. I use that advisedly because you just might not know. If you don't know, you should know and shame on you for this tremendous leadership and management failing.

This process takes the previous paragraph into full consideration. **Tweaking Common Sense** is not only for having your quality people go out and tighten up a few of your processes and come back with a report that shows a couple hundreds of thousand dollars in annual savings. No, it's about developing a new way of thinking, a new mindset that says that if we tweak away at the common sense standards we will eventually attain perfection. When we are at that level we will no longer set mediocrity as our standards.

So while you initially thought that this was just another leadership or management system you are really sadly mistaken. For those of you who are bold enough to realize that processes need improvement and that everyone is a part of the process and therefore the problem, you will be a trailblazer in your organization. The tweaking causes maximization.

**Tweaking-Common Sense** takes everybody and all processes under its fold. So while you are used to presenting or happily signing off on and approving a cost reduction project that will realize a a sizable cost reduction or process and quality improvement now figure that TCS (Tweaking-Common Sense) will bring in whatever your grand dreams were (and they probably are extremely limited because many of you have no idea of what is going on in your operations) exponentially. That's right what you have thought could be realized multiplied by the exponent of 2, 5, 10 or even more. With

this system if you can imagine it and are willing to eliminate the constraints and weaknesses in your systems you can attain what heretofore had been considered unimaginable levels of performance and productivity. This is not a small method because it uses all of my predecessors methods and system to improve everything including the processes that are used for the improvement.

Although you gurus didn't think of it you can use it to make your theory or methods more palatable to your clients. Conduct your initial experiments on a simple process utilizing this model. The idea is to continue tweaking and running capability analyses until you have maximized with (not zero defects) zero tolerances. Your exact target must be maintained without variation and at a steady state.

Okay, I understand that this can't be done under your current conditions and with what you have to work with. Show a leadership and take more responsibility and then take responsibility for that action. With this dynamic system you are going to work hard but you are going to see the fruit of your labors in your lifetime, and reap the rewards.

What's the alternative? Whether you are the company , battalion or brigade commander who has got lazy in your cushy assignment where you wear dress uniforms every day or never even break starch in your utilities and in the process have allowed your unit to fall behind your younger and more assertive counterparts. You've falling under the scrutiny of your superiors so don't be surprised when another slim young replacement shows up and you're on your way to Korea of maybe even worse Iraq or Afghanistan. That's probably what you deserve anyway and the way that the current world situation is there is no reason to single out just the afore stated for hostile duty. Practically anyplace you go you are going to find the same conditions (including parts of the US border areas) so prepare yourself by learning all that there is to know about the application of TCS (Tweaking Common Sense). The real losers are your subordinates.

This is the alternative, whether you are the sorry military officer or the same state executive, and it is to find a way to improve your operations and leadership. By the utilization of TCS you will get back to where you are seen as a growth candidate rather than as somebody that they either can't wait for you to leave or are thinking of how to get rid of you.

**Hiring** and getting the best possible people into your organization is the key to your success and growth. Listen to all of the losers around you who are telling you that a system such as this is impossible while trying to figure out how to implement it before you do. Screen and hire the best possible talent that is out there. Be willing to pay them what they are worth (you have to know what they're worth, don't think about saving money on salaries because with strong management you will find that there is a direct relationship between salary and job satisfaction and performance, you're not fooling anybody with substandard salaries) and then be willing to train them to the extent that you can get beyond your objectives.

It is fully expected that you will employ and train your team as such and in accordance to its capabilities. You must set that capability standard and as you do understand that your world and the world of leadership and business is changing at an unimaginable and inconceivable pace you might find that you should now follow the advice given by another great leader;

Lead, follow or get out of the way! **General Douglas MacArthur**

## WORKSHEET EXECUTIVE PARETO

<u>Title</u>	<u>Salary</u>
President	\$5 MM ↑
Executive VP	\$4 MM ↑
Executive VP	\$4 MM ↑
Executive VP	\$4 MM ↑

A careful and objective evaluation should be done to determine which executives should be evaluated by Pareto verses labor cuts of hourly personnel.

This one is a freebie and “No Brainer”. When the evaluation is completed you are going to undoubtedly find that the fat and excess is closer to you than you want to admit even though you already knew it. Now that it is exposed through a system such as this it begins to beg a simple question of “YOU” or “THEM”.

Call in the HR and financial guys and sharpen your pencils.

## **TWEAKING COMMON SENSE WORKSHEET**

# **TWEAKING COMMON SENSE WORKSHEET**

## **TWEAKING COMMON SENSE WORKSHEET**

## **THE ANATOMY OF LEADERSHIP BIBLIOGRAPHY**

Excerpts, Leadership in the Life Of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., Miller Chapel Dec. 1, 2003

Google, Management Gurus Guide, Quick and Easy Guide to Management Gurus, Lyndsey Swinton

NsNews, Feb. 12, 1960, John F. Kennedy

Wikipedia, Pareto Analysis. 2001–2006

US Army FM 22–100, 2004



“He who dares to teach or lead must never cease to learn” is a very famous anonymous quotation. While acknowledging this unknown brilliant writer’s work I’d like to insert the two words “or lead” thus completing it as:

***“He who dares to teach or lead must never cease to learn.”***

Leadership is an application that is alive and well around and with us practically all of the time, You are either leading or being led which makes you a subject of leadership.

***THE ANATOMY OF LEADERSHIP*** presents this often-misunderstood subject in some of its many forms attempting to bring it into this century for our military, business and everyday leaders.

We have put in something for everyone having a reason to be interested but have given special emphasis to business and field leaders with the introduction of my new leadership method,

***“TWEAKING COMMON SENSE”*** and a monumental cost reduction and efficiency model using the age old Pareto Analysis which we have ascribed as ***“EXECUTIVE PARETO”***.

Leadership will always be recognized as the under taught management requirement.

